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Summary

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Ireland saw the emergence and decline of a manorial economy based largely on the supply of the Welsh and Scottish campaigns of Edward I. It was an extremely vulnerable economy, as many parts of the lordship of Ireland were exposed to attack. This threat came either from Gaelic septal lands beyond the crown's jurisdiction, or from a growing number of over-mighty Anglo-Irish magnates.

Local conditions, in particular the proximity of any given manor or group of manors, to the march, were of considerable importance in determining the size of the manor, the nature of its sub-tenements and, frequently the severity of labour service exacted from its unfree and semi-free tenants. This, together with the survival of pre-Conquest settlement patterns and the rapid expansion of the march and the land of war, were to pose certain significant structural and administrative problems.

The exposure and vulnerability of the economy reflected the crises of the late thirteenth and early to mid fourteenth centuries. In particular, the combined impact of the agrarian crises, the 1315-18 famine and the Bruce Invasion led to the abandonment of direct cultivation of the demesne on behalf of the lord, widespread leasing of demesne land and the emergence of estate management on a purely rentier basis. The four case studies examined in this thesis provide localised models of various stages of this economic transition. These, together with the material cited in the more general chapters on structure, tenurial conditions and the economy, form the basis of this examination of manorial administration and the manorial economy in the lordship of Ireland during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.
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INTRODUCTION

Although the political, administrative and military history of the lordship of Ireland in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has, in the research of the past three decades, been examined in considerable depth, little has been written on the economic, and in particular the agrarian economic history of the lordship. Articles on individual manors, occasionally with brief commentaries on tenurial conditions, have been produced. With some few exceptions, no attempt has been made to examine the manorial economy as a whole.

The earliest articles were produced by Berry and Mills in the 1890's. Both were effectively based on material derived from extents. Berry examined Mallow, using the 1282 extent, while Mills made use of the 1326 extents of the manors of the archbishopric of Dublin. In Berry's case the extent was examined in the context of the ownership of the manor, while Mills used the 1326 extents to produce a general commentary on agriculture in fourteenth century county Dublin and a brief commentary on the forms of tenure found in these extents. This form of article continued to be produced with certain modifications. Where Berry concentrated on the ownership of his manor, subsequent authors, Curtis, O'Loan and Empey being the most notable, followed the lead set by Mills, in attempting to provide a more general framework for their extents. Though important and useful, Curtis' work on betagh status had certain serious shortcomings, stemming largely from interpretative problems with sources such as the Pipe Roll of Cloyne. O'Loan's edition of, and commentary on the 1304 extent of Cloncurry was careless. More recently, Empey's article on Knocktopher includes a useful re-appraisal of tenurial conditions and structure.

Only two articles of a synthetic nature were produced, these being the address by McEnery on his accession to the presidency of the R.S.A.I., and Otway-Ruthven's article on the organisation of Anglo-Irish agriculture. The McEnery address was primarily an attempt to prove that a high standard of living could have, and did exist in thirteenth century Ireland. Purveyance data was used to show that certain crops were being produced and sold within the lordship, and that the volume of this production was considerable. The importance of this address lies in the fact that while McEnery did not appreciate the nature of the connection between the manorial economy in the lordship and purveyance, he was the first to consider purveyance data in an economic context.

Otway-Ruthven dealt primarily with the open field question. She appreciated the difficulties raised by the lack of any series of extant terriers for manors in the lordship, but was able to draw certain tentative conclusions from evidence on the size and dispositions of holdings contained in deeds of conveyance. Little can be added to her work on this question. Her work on tenurial relationships and status is the most concise and accurate to have been published. Nevertheless, it did not include a comprehensive examination of source material, and this is its major weakness.

To date, in effect, manorial Ireland has been seen through the prism of Lisronagh and Cloncurry. This has led to a number of interpretative cruxes, for while both of these manors exemplify certain regional types at a specific time, it is unwise to argue from the narrowly specific to the general. Nor was the manorial economy static during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the weakness of the argumentum ad extentam is precisely that it relies on data from a manor, or group of manors relating to a single point in time. Thus, a vacuum existed, which I have attempted to fill here.

Given the massive destruction of local material in the explosion in the

Public Records' Office in 1922, it was inevitable that the nature of the surviving sources would dictate both the structure and the scope of this thesis. No single series comparable to the Winchester accounts has survived for any manorial group within the lordship of Ireland. Amongst the casualties of 1922 were the inquisitions post mortem compiled within the lordship, of which copies had not been dispatched to England, registers such as the Pipe Roll of Cloyne, and collections like the Christ Church deeds. It is, however, possible to overcome some of the problems posed by the destruction of 1922. A number of the Irish extents which were not dispatched to England have survived in transcript. The Pipe Roll of Cloyne was twice edited and published prior to 1922. A considerable body of material has also been preserved in the calendars of plea rolls and memoranda rolls, which survived 1922 intact, though, as with all calendars, one is at the mercy of the compiler. The major gap, then, is that caused by the lack of a surviving continuous series, like the Winchester accounts, for Irish manors or groups of manors, court rolls, terriers, custumals and rentals.

It is fortunate that the Ministers' Accounts class in the Public Records' Office in London contains both the accounts of the Bigod lordship of Carlow during the 1280's, and Elizabeth de Clare's extensive holdings from the 1330's to the time of her death in 1360. These are the only Irish accounts generated within their respective lordships to have survived. Much has also survived in the Chancery Miscellanea, like extents of manors in the King's hand in the 1320's as a result of the Mortimer forfeitures, and in the classes of Surveys and Rentals. A considerable number of Irish inquisitions post mortem were also transmitted to England, primarily because the lords of the estates in question were also major landholders in England, but this is by no means a complete series. The extents of the

---


9. i.e. Killallon in 1351. A transcript of this Meath extent was enrolled on M.R. 24-5 Ed III, P.R.O. I. R.O. 8/25 pp 196-200.


11. The class R.C.7 in the P.R.O.I. is mostly comprised of calendars of plea rolls, intermixed with some memoranda rolls.

12. The class R.C.8 in the P.R.O.I. is the main collection of calendars of Irish memoranda rolls compiled by the Record Commission.


14. i.e. the extent of the manor of Rathfeigh in 1322, P.R.O., C47 10/18/3.

earldom of Ulster compiled on the murder of the Brown Earl in 1333 were transmitted to England. Similar extents would have been compiled as a matter of course on the death of Richard de Burgh, the Red Earl, in 1326, but these were apparently not dispatched to England. Nor is the quality of the surviving extents uniform. Many of both the earlier and the later extents are unsatisfactory from the point of view of the economic historian. Their compilers frequently chose to give a place-name and the amount of money due from that area, without describing the nature of the source or sources from which the revenue in question was derived. Of themselves, these omissions reflect the prevailing conditions. At the time of the compilation of the earlier extents, the precise nature of the lordship, particularly if it lay within a marcher area, may not have been known to the jurors. By the 1360s and 70s, apart from problems caused by the expansion of the march and increasing lawlessness, the administrative basis of the manorial group or lordship had moved from the direct exploitation of the demesne of the thirteenth century, to rentier management. Thus, detail beyond the sums owed by the constituent parts of the lordship would have ceased to be relevant.

Despite the problems posed by 1922, much can be accomplished with the surviving material. Through the Ministers' Accounts, the data generated by vacancies in and sequestrations of the archbishopric of Dublin and material relating to the royal manors of Dublin and Kildare, it is possible to examine, for varying periods of time, four of the most important manorial groups within the lordship. The nature of this examination is, however, heavily dependent on the nature of the source, but the four groups in question do, in fact, permit a continuous examination of the manorial economy of the lordship spanning the period from the mid to late thirteenth century to the mid-fourteenth century.

Continuity over a long period of time is the main strength of the material surviving for the royal manors of Dublin and Kildare. It spans both centuries, but is mainly administrative in nature. As these manors were administered on a rentier basis from the mid-thirteenth century onwards, 

17. i.e. C.D.I. 1171-1251, No 2607. This is the 1243 extent of Richard de Burgh's Munster lands and the extents of Lionel, duke of Clarence's lands in Ireland compiled in 1369, P.R.O. C135, file 208(5) and Cal. Ind.P.M. vol XII pp 320-1, is a rather extreme example of the later type of extent in question.
18. See below, p. 34.
the sources merely reflect the nature of their management. Thus, the problems addressed were not those connected with productivity, the size and use of the demesne or cropping techniques, but rather those of debt collection. As far as the Exchequer was concerned, the manors were merely another source of crown revenue, which had to be administered as efficiently as possible. Broader issues, such as the problems posed by the Irish of the Leinster Mountains\textsuperscript{19}, and the impact of the first and subsequent visitations of the Black Death,\textsuperscript{20}, together with the problems posed by inefficient or corrupt farmers and reeves and debt collection,\textsuperscript{21} form the bulk of what is preserved in this material.

The surviving accounts for the Bigod lands relate to the years when the Irish agrarian economy was probably at its most buoyant in the thirteenth century, and the supply trade to Wales and Scotland still profitable.\textsuperscript{22} This is the body of source material that most closely resembles the Winchester accounts in Ireland.\textsuperscript{23} Accounts have survived for each manor within the group for approximately a decade. These are of the standard form, the main account being a balance sheet of manorial receipts and issues, with the accounts of the grange and of the stock being given on the dorse.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, the actual management of these manors, together with the cropping and stocking practices then prevalent can be subjected to close examination.

A series of fortuitous vacancies occurred in the archbishopric of Dublin at the time when climatic conditions were worsening throughout northern Europe, the supply trade to Scotland was ceasing to be profitable and the central administration less capable of maintaining stable conditions in the area under its jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{25} Like the royal manors of Saggard, Bray, Obrun and Othee, a number of the archiepiscopal manors were under

\textsuperscript{19} See below, pp 13-20.
\textsuperscript{20} See below, pp 37-6.
\textsuperscript{21} See below, pp 40-2.
\textsuperscript{22} See below, pp 94-5.
\textsuperscript{24} See below, pp 56-7.
\textsuperscript{25} See below, pp 95a-6.
threat from the march conditions spreading to the foothills of the Dublin mountains, but unlike the royal manors, the archiepiscopal demesnes were still under direct cultivation. The primary importance of this data is that it permits an examination of the impact of the Bruce Invasion and the series of agrarian crises that reached an apex in the famine of 1315-18. When this is coupled with material from Alen's Register - the Account Roll of the Priory of Holy Trinity, it is possible to produce a limited commentary on the possible impact of the regional famine of 1330-2. It is also feasible to subject tenurial conditions both on the archiepiscopal manors and on the lands of the priory to closer scrutiny.

The de Clare accounts cover a substantial portion of the lordship of Ireland. Not only was Elizabeth de Clare one of the heiresses between whom the liberty of Kilkenny was partitioned, but also through her marriages to John de Burgh and Theobald de Verdun, she was an extensive landholder in Ulster, Connacht, Limerick, Tipperary, east and west Meath and Louth. These lands were administered on a rentier basis. The accounts permit an examination of the use of cadet members of collateral branches of both the de Burgh and de Verdun family in administrative capacities, the effects of local anarchy caused by men such as Maurice fitz Thomas and the impact of the Black Death on the agrarian economy.

Thus, the manorial economy in the lordship of Ireland can be seen in microcosm in the four groups of manors from which data has survived. However, to rely solely on this material would merely be to fall back on a formula similar to the argumentum ad extantem. Data from one area, relating to a limited period of time, cannot be used in a more general argument unless it can be examined in a broader context. It was therefore

27. See below, pp 112-13.
29. See below, pp 101-3 and pp 124-5.
30. See below, pp 173-4.
31. See below, pp 188-9.
32. See below, pp 165-6.
33. See below, p. 161, p. 131.
33a. See below, p. 191.
34. See below, pp 153-61.
35. See below, p. 186.
necessary to establish the actual framework within which these groups existed, in order to test the validity of their data. Therefore, it was of primary importance to establish the nature of manorial structure and estate management throughout the lordship, to examine the related problem of the definition of tenurial relationships and to plot the course of the manorial economy in the lordship throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Sufficient extents and rentals have survived to permit an extensive examination of manorial structure on a regional basis. In this context, the two main limitations of the extent as a source, no longer pose major problems. While the extent is merely a description of the manor as it stood at a particular point in time, and the possibility of undervaluation in certain of its categories cannot be ruled out, the actual descriptions are probably accurate. An examination of a sufficiently broad sample of extents for each region could be further buttressed with material from transcripts of accounts of issues arising from episcopal and archiepiscopal lands during vacancies of the sees in question. The available material was such that I was able to examine structure throughout the lordship, though I would have preferred not to have been so heavily dependent on the 1333 de Burgh inquisitions for both Connacht and Ulster.

This study underlined the importance of the march and marcher conditions in the lordship of Ireland. There were certain very clear differences between the manors of the land of peace, which lay mainly in east Meath, Leinster and certain parts of Munster, the marcher manors and the manors of the land of war. These differences were mainly reflected in the size of the manor, the distribution of tenurial categories, the size and nature of the demesne, the relative severity of customary services and the actual organisation of the manors. Manors of the land of peace were, in general, tightly organised, with considerable diversity in the categories of their tenantry. If within reach of a major port, their demesnes were, from the mid-thirteenth century to the first decade of the fourteenth century, geared toward the supply trade generated by the Welsh and Scottish campaigns.

56. See below, pp 190-3.
57. A collection of transcripts of 'representative' accounts, one or two from each diocese or archdiocese was compiled for the antiquarian, Madden, and is preserved in T.C.D. Ms 804.
59. See below p. 34 for the importance of proximity to a current centre of export and pp 34-52 for the general importance of this trade.
The nearer a manor was to an area of marchland, with some notable exceptions, like the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne, the looser the structure became. In the case of manors of the land of war, it was clear that these were frequently little more than bridgeheads in a certain area, from which a limited income, usually in the form of rents, might be forthcoming.

In turn, the structural analysis raised certain other problems. Given the relationship between the location of a manor and the class of its tenantry, it was essential to provide as comprehensive an examination as possible of the tenurial categories found within the lordship. Here, the lack of surviving custumals raised difficulties, for while customary services are mentioned in extents and rentals, the extent containing a full custumal, like that of Rathfeigh or Lisronagh, is relatively rare. Nevertheless, using all the available material contained in extents, but concentrating on those with good custumal elements, it is possible to conduct a comprehensive examination of forms of semi-free and unfree tenure within the lordship.

Certain parallels between tenurial conditions prevailing in the lordship and those prevailing in Wales and areas like Cumbria became apparent, particularly in the customary and semi-free categories. Labour service at its heaviest in Ireland was considerably lighter than that in areas of relatively early settlement, remote from any major march in England. Within the lordship of Ireland the determining factor in the nature and severity of service tended to be either the proximity of the manor in question to the march, or, in the case of manors in the land of peace, the intensity with which the demesne was cultivated. Intense cultivation and commutation tended to go hand in hand.

The evidence of existing extents and rentals validates Otway-Ruthven's conclusions in terms of status between the various categories of tenant. Cottagers, particularly those owing labour

40. See below, pp 24-28
41. See below, pp 237-45
42. See Chapter VI; Tables I and III for abstracts of these extents' custumal elements.
43. See below, p. 270.
44. See below, p. 270, n. 40.
45. See below, pp 283-4 and pp 286-8.
46. See below, pp 284-6.
service, and some of the gavellor smallholders, would have been the most
disadvantaged groups, while the betagh, seen as providing the base to the
feudal pyramid in medieval Ireland could be considerably better-off than
either the cottager or the gavellor, despite the legal connection between
the betagus and the English nativus or villanus. This is a point
developed by Empey in his work on the manor of Knocktopher. 48.

The lack of surviving court rolls, both for the manorial and the hundred
courts, has, to some extent, limited the scope of my examination of
tenurial conditions. Precise declarations of customary service and disputes
relating to failure to perform these services would have been dealt with
within the manor court. Records generated by hundred courts might possibly
have assisted in producing sub-categories of burgess and, in certain
instances, have facilitated the examination of customary service owed by
certain burgess tenants. The earliest surviving manorial and hundred
court rolls are, however, fifteenth century, and not particularly
detailed. 49.

To place the four case studies, the structural and tenurial work in their
historical context, it was necessary to examine the agrarian economy of
the lordship, local factors likely to affect the market and the impact of
purveyance. The grain market in late thirteenth century Ireland was
inextricably linked to the supply of Edward I's wars in Wales and Scotland,
either through private ventures or purveyance. The problems faced by the
Irish Exchequer as a result of Edward's policy of over-using Irish
revenues, 50 while under-investing in the defence of the lordship,
ultimately destroyed the financial base from which the purveyance and
supply trade had been conducted. At the same time weather conditions in
northern Europe changed dramatically. The most severe famine resulting
from this change, that of 1315-18, was examined in considerable detail
by Lucas in 1930 51 and Titow subsequently examined the impact of the
preceding local crises on the estates of the bishopric of Winchester. 52.
It was also essential to determine what was happening to the market in

48. C.A. Empey, 'Medieval Knocktopher: a Study in Manorial Settlement',
49. See below, pp 326-8
50. cf J.F. Lydon, 'Edward II and the Revenues of Ireland in 1311-12',
I.H.S. XIV (1965), pp 39-53. This article contains an appendix
listing sums of Irish treasure received by the King.
51. H.S. Lucas, 'The great European famine of 1315, 1316, and 1317',
Speculum V (1930), pp 343-77.
52. M.M. Postan and J.Z. Titow, 'Heriots and Prices on Winchester Manors',
grain and livestock for as much of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries as possible. These tasks posed problems of varying severity relating to sources.

Because of Lydon's seminal work on the subject, the impact of supply and purveyance on the economy was relatively easy to trace. Purveyors' accounts were enrolled on the pipe roll, commissions to purvey on the memoranda roll and, by the early fourteenth century, there was widespread evidence in the courts of resistance to purveyance. The market had been buoyant in the 1280's and early 1290's, but by 1295, a year in which purveyance coincided with a severe famine and civil unrest arising from the private war between the de Burghs and the Geraldines, it was clear that purveyance and supply were ceasing to be profitable.

The examination of weather in Ireland was somewhat more complicated, involving as it did the use of Gaelic and Anglo-Irish annals. The provenance of these annals had to be determined and a suitable apparatus devised to display the data contained in their entries. The two main Anglo-Irish annals, Clyn and St. Mary's, and the Annals of Inisfallen, were all probably contemporary for much of the period in question. The annals of Connacht, Loch Cé and Clonmacnoise all formed part of a group of inter-related western annals derived from a single source or collection of sources of the late fifteenth century, while the Annals of Ulster appear to have been compiled in the early sixteenth century. Using these sources, it was possible, with the addition of some other annalistic material and comparative data, to compile a weather, plague and famine table for Ireland in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This gives the incidence of famine and harvest failure in considerable detail for the critical period from 1294 to 1332, when the manorial economy of the lordship was first under pressure and then contracting.

The most serious problem was that posed by the lack of any work comparable to that undertaken by Thorold Rogers for England for the lordship of Ireland. Price data had not been systematically compiled and analysed.

54. See below, pp 343-6.
55. See below, pp 346-52.
56. See Chapter VII; Table I .
This third element was to be of critical importance in determining the actual course of the economy and the immediate impact of harvest failure, murrain and famine. Apart from the Carlow price data, which Rogers also used in his massive compilation, I was entirely dependent on material generated by the central administration in Dublin. This effectively meant valuations in court actions, purveyors' accounts, valuations of goods sequestered by the crown and recognisances of debt. All but the last of these categories were problematic. Valuations in cases where damages were being sought may occasionally have been over-valuations. Purveyors did not pay the market value of goods purveyed, and local juries in forfeiture cases may have been amenable to bribery. Despite these limitations, a pattern consistent with that already displayed by the weather data emerged from an analysis of the prices material. This, in turn, tallied with the developments evident from an examination of the four case studies.

Thus, put briefly, my thesis is that both manorial structure and administration, together with the manorial economy, were influenced primarily by the marcher nature of the lordship of Ireland, the agrarian crises of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century and the importance of both purveyance and the supply trade. Ireland, like Wales, was primarily a marcher lordship. Its manors and the tenurial conditions prevalent there reflected that fact. Indeed, parts of the lordship were what could be termed a march within a march. Profitability and the concomitant expansion of the area of demesne land under cultivation - both stemmed from the supply trade to Wales and purveyance for the Welsh campaigns. The breakdown of this economy coincided with a period of severe crises arising from worsening weather conditions and increasing local anarchy within the lordship. This was to culminate in the transition from direct cultivation of the demesne lands to a rentier economy more in accord with a constantly contracting market for agrarian produce.

58. See Chapter VII; Table III for an abstract of this data.
59. See below, pp 333-4.
CHAPTER I

An examination of the royal demesne manors of Dublin and Kildare in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is of considerable importance in any overall examination of the manorial economy of the lordship of Ireland. They are the only group of manors for which a continuous, if rather unsatisfactory, body of data has survived for the period in question. Briefly under direct cultivation, their demesnes, together with the rents accruing from the other manorial lands, were leased at a composite fixed farm. Thereafter, whether or not these manors were in the hands of farmers, the exchequer's expectation of an annual income was based on the 1261-2 fixed farms. The manors themselves were administered on a rentier basis and were to become severely burdened by an accumulation of arrears of farm in the early fourteenth century. Administrative reforms were undertaken in an attempt to clear these debts, increase the profitability of the manors themselves, and accommodate the two manors acquired from Ralph Pippard within the overall structure of the royal demesne of the vale of Dublin. These attempts were unsuccessful both in the short and the long terms. The 1261-2 farms were ultimately proved to be unreasonably high, given deteriorating military and climatic conditions, and a possible decline in fertility of some of the more marginal land. The strategic importance of many of the manors was, however, to ensure a constant interest in their administration, as was the impoverishment of the Irish Exchequer. Attempts to retrieve both the military and fiscal problems of the lordship thus underlay the continuing interest in the royal manors.

The royal manors formed a potentially effective defensive barrier along the borders of south county Dublin, with Newcastle Lyons and Saggard as the western limit of this defensive system. Saggard straddled the main inland approach to Dublin from the Leinster mountains and, together with Newcastle Lyons, dominated that part of the Liffey valley. Bray and Newcastle McKynegan provided potential coastal defence from any threat posed by the Irish of the mountains. Linking them with the Newcastle Lyons-Saggard group were the smaller manors of Obrun and Othee and substantial areas of royal forest. There was also a chain of relatively smaller manors stretching westward from the river mouth along the course of the Liffey, these being Crumlin, Esker and Chapelizod. The later acquisitions, in Kildare, of Leixlip and Castlewarden with its borough of Ughterard,\(^1\) would have formed an additional line of defence, screening these weaker manors from any western threat.

---

1. C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 149
The Military Position of the Royal Manors

One of the earliest indications of the military threat to the vale of Dublin is to be found in a petition by Robert Owen to the King, in which he proposes an exchange to the King's advantage between royal lands 'in the district of Saggard near the land of war' and his own lands 'in the manor of Newcastle Lyons adjoining the land of peace'. This petition probably pre-dates the de Genville expeditions, though Richardson and Sayles are of the opinion that it was submitted in 1274-5. The threat to Saggard was underlined by a damaging daylight raid in 1277.

Attempts to ward the vale of Dublin which both preceded and followed de Ufford's successful campaign of 1277, were probably part of an overall plan aimed at consolidating this line of defence. Vacancies in the archbishopric of Dublin in the late thirteenth century may also have exacerbated the situation. In defensive terms, the archiepiscopal manors completed the southern protective cordon and the intrusion of royal officials may well have disrupted arrangements between the archbishopric and the local Irish septs, thereby further destabilising an already precarious peace.

While pressure from the Leinster mountains must have continued throughout the closing years of the thirteenth century, it does not appear to have had any obvious effect until the beginning of the fourteenth century. That the Irish of the Leinster mountains caused a certain amount of trouble during the political crises of 1294-5, following the abduction of the earl of Ulster by John fitz Thomas, and the concurrent famine of 1294-6, can hardly be doubted. The effect of this instability on the royal manors cannot now be gauged. Few receipt rolls survive for those two years, and no manorial accounts were enrolled on the pipe rolls for this crucial period. Revenue, and shortfalls in revenue, therefore, be estimated. This curious gap may in itself be an indication of disruption in local administration.

2. C.D.I. 1252-84, no. 930. See also Map I.
3. Richardson and Sayles, Admin. of Ireland, p. 230, n. 1
5. See Chapter III, pp 96-101
6. See Chapter VII, pp 335-6 and Chapter VII: Table I.
The motivation for raiding was probably twofold. The diversion created by the de Burgh-de Vescy/fitz Thomas conflict provided a unique opportunity, and the crippling famine of 1294-6, the impetus. This dual motive is one which must always be taken into account when dealing with such raids. They were, to a great extent, economically motivated, but it is hardly any coincidence that the frequency of such raids was considerably greater in times of political instability. It was the consistent or cumulative impact of such raids on the royal manors over a protracted period, rather than any single raid or group of raids which would ultimately have diminished their value both in strategic and economic terms.

The fact that Newcastle McKynegan was, by 1305, 'a very weak and small castle in a strong march' and that a grant of this manor and castle to John fitz Thomas was under review, is an indication of the growing threat from the mountains. Had the grant been made, it would have been an interesting extension of the policy expounded in the 1297 statutes, of attempting to place increasing responsibility for the security of the lordship on the local magnate. This threat to the security of Newcastle McKynegan was part of a more general threat to the royal manors on the east coast. Allowances were also made to various reeves of Bray in respect of unpaid rent in June 1313 because of divers occasions of war caused by the Irish of those parts and of land lying waste and uncultivated.

In as much as both Bray and Newcastle McKynegan formed part of the same strategic defence, one could conclude from this that the entire south county Dublin-Wicklow coastline was at risk and part of a growing area of marchland in the county itself. It is also worth noting that Bray was the only manor where damage caused by the Leinster mountain septs during the Bruce Invasion was directly linked to the Scottish presence immediately afterwards. The farmer, Hugh Lawless, was able to claim successfully that the only profit he had from the manor were two small salmons from July 1314, because of the burning and rapine. The claim was settled in 1320, and both the preciseness of the description and the rapidity with which it was made after the Invasion, implies an awareness of the significance of such raids. This is absent in the less specific petitions filed by the tenants of Newcastle Lyons, complaining of poverty and the effects of the Bruce Invasion. The difference may well be explained

7. C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 335
9. Mem. Roll 7-8 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/12 pp 200-7 and Ex. 1/2 m 21
10. See below p. 18.
by more frequent raiding at an earlier date in Bray than was the case at Newcastle Lyons.

There was a second threat to the security of the manors from the Kildare-Offaly march. Leixlip was one of Ralph Pippard's castles where custody was carefully maintained. When William Giffard was accused of despoiling the royal lands at Okethy in 1310, by removing stones with which he subsequently built himself a house, he stated in reply that his use of the stones in constructing a house on the royal tenement was in the King's interest. He alleged that the house aided in the defence of the locality against the Offaly Irish who frequently pro defectu resistencia hominum partium illarum, tenentes Regis ibidem depradarunt et rotarunt. It was also alleged that certain hibernici who held land there offered no resistance to these felons during their raids, but rather received them. The reply to this accusation was that the betagii in question were frequently forced to flee their lands due to the depredations of the Offaly raiders. Okethy was a member of Leixlip, so that this activity on the part of the Irish in Offaly must have reflected a more general threat to the western manors. This case also bears out the fact that it was the frequent recurrence of raids rather than the effect of one particular operation that caused the damage.

The threat to the western portion of the Liffey valley was a growing problem in the years leading up to the Bruce Invasion. Two tenants of Leixlip, John and Robert Osbern stated, when called to account in 1312, that they were unable to hold their tenements because of occasione malefactorum in those parts. Under the terms of a regrant of this tenement to the Osberns, it was stipulated that, in the first year of their ten year lease, they were to build a stone house. This was considered to be the course of action most conducive pro concervacione pacis in partibus illis. Thus, immediately prior to the Bruce Invasion, the vale of Dublin was threatened on two fronts: both from the Leinster mountains and the Offaly march.

11. There is consistent evidence of the appointment and activity of constables: Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/4, p. 504 and Ex 1/1 m13d., gives the appointment of Maurice Barefot and P.R. 18 Ed.II, D.K.R. vol. 42 allowances to John de Baddeby in this capacity.


The single most serious threat to the safety of the royal manors came during the famine of 1315-18 and the Bruce Invasion. While one cannot argue that these raids were caused solely by economic factors, it is likely that famine, rather than political turmoil occasioned by the Invasion, was the prime motive. The Invasion facilitated such enterprises, but the attacks on manorial targets were mainly the result of the near complete failure of the harvests and general scarcity of food during those years.

In the autumn of 1315, it was thought necessary to commission Warin Owen and Walter Fox to array eighty men from the cantonment areas of Newcastle Lyons, Lucan, Esker and the tenements of the bishop of Killaloe in order to cope with the threat from the Leinster mountains. They were to keep night watch in the neighbourhood of Saggard with the array and an additional six mounted men-at-arms, whom the King had already sent on that expedition. Shortly afterwards, the constable of Newcastle McKynegan was ordered to munition his castle, and was given leave to purvey from the immediate neighbourhood. The Escheator was ordered to provision Castle Kevin, which was then in the King's hand, against the same threat. This integration of the most important of the outlying archiepiscopal manors, from a strategic point of view, into the defensive system aimed at controlling the mountain Irish underlines the seriousness of the situation.

The timing of these measures clearly demonstrates that the major threat from the Irish occurred in the period immediately preceding or following the harvest, thus implying that raids launched against the royal manors were food raids rather than punitive expeditions. Two subsequent operations were mounted in 1316 when the famine was at its worst. The first of these was a local levy, under Elias Lawless and Reginald de Bernevall. Men were to be arrayed from Newcastle Lyons, Saggard and all the villages and hamlets lying between the river valley and the mountains. The second was a much larger expedition mounted in September, at harvest time, under William Comyn, for which a force of twenty men-at-arms, forty hobelors and eighty foot soldiers was to be arrayed.

15. Ibid., pp 460-1.
16. Ibid., p. 467.
commission mentioned the need to contain the incidence of robbery, arson, homicide and other crimes, perpetrated daily by the Irish of the Leinster mountains.

While none of the royal manors are specifically cited in this commission as having suffered on account of this increased activity on the part of the Irish, they were the most likely targets for such raids. The size of the autumn 1316 expedition underlines the fact that raiding was a more serious problem, and, therefore, more frequent in this season. Although the political upheaval caused by the Bruce Invasion would have provided increased opportunities for raiding by the mountain Irish, the major causative factor could only have been the great famine.

Due to lack of evidence, the effects of these raids in the individual manors are impossible to gauge. In Hilary 1316, the seneschal of the King's lands in Dublin was ordered to assign a good watch to the neighbourhood of Newcastle Lyons. Tenants were fleeing with their goods and chattels from this area because of the malice of the Irish. The claim submitted by Hugh Lawless, with regard to the unprofitability of Bray in 1320 is the only other contemporaneous example of a petition showing the local impact of both the famine and the Bruce Invasion. His complaint was standard in as much as he alleged that the manor was unprofitable due to the invasions, burnings and destruction caused by the Irish. The unusual point in this case was that the manor had been unprofitable since the summer of 1314 and that Hugh had linked the attacks mounted by the Irish with the presence of the Scottish enemy in Ireland. There is no evidence that the harvest of 1314 was particularly bad. Unless the manor's unprofitability can be traced to a local famine of proportions similar to the 1308-10 famine, the logical conclusion is that Bray's profitability had been damaged by a series of raids and attacks spread over a much longer period of time.

The most serious casualties would seem to have been Newcastle Lyons and

22. J.F. Titow, 'Evidence of Weather in the account rolls of the Bishopric of Winchester 1209-1350', Econ. Hist. Rev. 2nd Series XII (1960) pp 382-3, see also Chapter VII: Table I.
Bray, were one to argue that the absence of similar evidence of fleeing or distressed tenantry in the case of Saggard or any of the other manors is an indication of stability. The Owen-Fox commission of the autumn of 1315 indicates that Saggard was threatened.23 Leixlip was one of the manors raided by Bruce and army.24 It is likely that other damage occurred on the royal manors because of both the famine and the Invasion, despite the lack of evidence currently surviving.

The impact of raiding and famine is, however, best assessed in cumulative terms. Petitions addressed to the King by the tenantry of the royal manors should thus be seen as an indication not only of immediate hardship but also of more retrospective and chronic problems. In a petition which can be tentatively assigned to either the 1320's or the early 1330's, the tenants of Newcastle Lyons sought pardon of arrears of rent on the grounds that they were scarcely able to hold their tenements.25 They blamed this on the depredation and destruction caused by the Scots during their presence in the country. The vagueness and lack of detail of this petition and the fact that it may not have been submitted until either the late 1320's or early 1330's leads one to believe that the tenants were using the Bruce Invasion as a convenient excuse for their financial difficulties. While the instability caused by the Scottish presence and the famine of 1315-18 must have damaged the manor, it is more likely that the famine of 1330-2 or the crises of the 1320's provided the immediate excuse for this petition.26

An undated petition addressed to the King by the tenants of the royal demesnes and manors of Ireland, which was probably made in the 1330's or early 1340's,27 though it may be of later provenance, claimed that these lands were en fort marche. Tenants were robbed and destroyed by English and Irish felons and their lands were waste. The implication of this petition is that by the mid-fourteenth century all the royal demesne of south county Dublin was within the land of war. In fact, it probably originated in Saggard, Newcastle Lyons, or, though this is far less likely, one of the coastal manors. An interesting feature is the fact that the Scots were not mentioned. By the time of its submission they had either

25. P.R.O., S.C. 8, file 96 (4296), a tentative date of c. 1320 is given by R.L. Atkinson in its margin in 1932.
26. See Chapter VII: Table I.
faded from memory or been replaced with more convenient and plausible excuses of poverty. It also refers to lands waste through mort' et occasion des tenaunts. While there is in this phrase an indication of death through murder, i.e., killing, the use of the term 'mortality' is unusual. This was a frequent euphemism for death in a famine or plague, and might, therefore, indicate that this petition post-dates the first visitation of the Black Death.

The last petition from royal tenants to have survived can be more closely dated to either 1333 or 1334. It originated from the tenantry of Newcastle Lyons, who were seeking pardon of £200 in rent arrears. Both the Scots and the Irish enemies were cited as the reasons for this poverty. This is yet another example of the cumulative effect of raiding. One must always allow for a certain amount of exaggeration in this type of petition. Any person or body facing massive demands from the Exchequer, or attempting to gain reductions or even a total discharge of rent arrears would tend to overstate their case. Having made such allowances, it is clear from these petitions that the royal manors, and in particular Newcastle Lyons, which had been relatively safe in the late thirteenth century, were under continuous military pressure and were, therefore, becoming even less profitable than had been the case.

At least two other petitions, neither of which now survives were sent to the King by royal tenants on the demesne lands in Dublin. The first of these was from the tenants of Saggard. They sought pardon for a small debt of £5 probably in the winter of 1342-3, with which Adam Talbot, a sheriff of Dublin, had been charged on his account. This, they alleged, was a small portion of a much larger debt, with which the manor had been burdened since the war of Art Mac Murrough. They also referred to the present poverty of their tenements, claiming that they were scarcely able to pay their rents, let alone the massive arrears. This was one of a number of attempts by the tenants of Saggard to evade debts totalling £1,311 - 1 - 6½, which dated from the 1290's. Were it merely a question of damage inflicted by Art Mac Murrough between de Ufford's expedition of 1277 and Mac Murrough's assassination in 1281, the debt would have been swiftly cleared, for arrears in Saggard only began to reach unmanageable proportions in the early fourteenth century.

In the second of these petitions, the burgesses of Newcastle McKynegan sought pardon from arrears of rent.\textsuperscript{31} Their liabilities amounted to £94, of which they were pardoned £74. They claimed that eighty years prior to the submission of the petition, i.e. in the early 1260's, the manor was destroyed by the Irish and waste for ten years. While this may have been the case, a substantial income was generated in the manor towards the end of the thirteenth century, despite its location. This would have been known to the Treasurer and Barons who, in pardoning most of these arrears, were clearly acting on the basis of the manor's condition in 1342-3. While the Exchequer may have had some hope of collecting part of what was owed in Saggard, it had recognised that there was no such hope in Newcastle McKynegan, and modified its policy accordingly.

Perhaps the clearest indication of the continuing threat from the mountains is to be found in the terms under which Geoffrey Cromp ultimately held Bray in the 1330's. He had originally been granted the manor in August 1334 at an annual rent of £7-1-6\textsuperscript{32}. In March 1340, a number of extensive concessions were made to him.\textsuperscript{33} For repairing a castle called Rokelescourt, two years' rent were remitted. A further remission of seven years' rent was granted for good service, expenses and labour in containing the Irish. He was then pardoned a further seven years' rent for his expenses, losses and continuing good service. Had these concessions not been made, it is likely that no lessee would have been found for Bray, and that the marchland surrounding the manor would have been completely undefended for the period in question.

Thus, the defensive positioning and function of the royal manors of Dublin and Kildare was, in a sense, a double-edged blade. Their strategic location ensured continuing royal interest. This same location left them exposed to constant attack thereby dooming any attempt to restore their profitability.

Valuation of the Demesne Manors, together with their extents

Although contemporary extents have survived for the two Pippard manors,\textsuperscript{34} as well as for Bray\textsuperscript{35} and Newcastle McKynegan,\textsuperscript{36} together with the 1540

\textsuperscript{32} Mem. Roll 6 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/16, p. 195.
\textsuperscript{34} See Chapter I: Abstracts V and VI.
\textsuperscript{35} C.D.I. 1252-84, no. 2340.
\textsuperscript{36} C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 335.
extents of Newcastle Lyons, Saggard, Esker and Crumlin,\(^{37}\) it is, nevertheless, necessary to use the farms fixed for the royal manors in the course of the thirteenth century as a gauge of their relative importance.\(^{38}\) This is essential, as the earliest of the surviving extents, the Bray extent, dates from the 1280's, when this manor was acquired by Edward I. Farm data is available for most of the 'core manors' from the early thirteenth century, and fluctuations in farms up to 1261-2, when they were finally fixed, provide a view of the beginnings of the classic cycle of profitability in the cultivation of virgin land.

With the exception of Crumlin in 1228, where there may have been some specific local problem, as both Crumlin and Esker were re-extended in the following year, and Newcastle Lyons in 1235, these farms rose in value. Increases, increments and continuous re-assessments point to one thing: a consciousness that the real value of the land itself was increasing as its full potential was realised. The plateau of 1261-2 would seem to indicate that this process ceased in the late 1260's or early 1270's, as no further increases occurred thereafter in the value of these farms. The military problems of the 1270's and the following decades would probably have precluded any development of this nature in Newcastle Lyons or Saggard. This explanation could hardly be advanced for the static farms of Crumlin, Chapelizod and Esker. Most farms would have allowed a certain margin of profit to the farmer. This may explain the level of farm at both Crumlin and Chapelizod. The very severe drop at Esker, would, on the other hand, seem to indicate the existence of some particular local problem.

The two most valuable of the Dublin royal manors were Newcastle Lyons and Saggard. Their high farms reflected their size and once they came under more direct royal management in the early fourteenth century, both had more than one reeve. Saggard eventually had two reeves, one of whom had responsibility for the burgage tenements and the demesne, the other administering the more scattered peripheral lands.\(^{39}\) Newcastle Lyons was so large that it ultimately acquired three reeves, a reeve for the manor itself and two subordinate reeves, one for Balycolman and the other Athgoe.\(^{40}\) Crumlin, Esker and Chapelizod were, by comparison, relatively small and compact. Their location militated against their having a large

---

37. See Chapter I: Abstracts I, II, III and IV.
38. See Chapter I: Table I, Movement in the farms of Royal Manors, 1212-1262.
number of outgranges. Both Esker and Chapelizod could only expand from
the course of the Liffey. Crumlin, while not directly constrained by any
natural boundary, was probably not much larger than either of these
manors. From its farm, Newcastle McKynegan must have been another
comparatively small manor. It lay in a coastal plain, with the Leinster
mountains forming a western barrier to its potential expansion. The
other two mountain manors of Othee and Obrun appear to have been considerably
larger, but both were more exposed to attack from the Irish of the
mountains. In a roll of profits, scutage and assizes drawn up between
1279 and 1284, revenue from both manors was categorised as uncertain due
to the activities of the local Irish. Thus, while the size of farm could
never be considered as full a valuation of a manor as an extent, the farm
of the royal manors provides some indication of their relative size
and importance.

Bray

Bray was extended in 1283-4, when the manor was still in Christina de
Mariscis' hand. It was probably only a half-manor, as the Butlers
held the adjacent manor of Bray and the structure revealed in the
1283-4 extent is somewhat unusual. Demesne land was not separately
valued, and the manor itself appears to have contained only 419½ acres.
Its borough was worth 31s. per annum. The borough in the Butler manor
was worth 32s. per annum, and this is one of the main indications that
an original single manor of Bray had become two half-manors by the late
thirteenth century. There were no betaghs or gavellors on the royal manor,
while both categories were represented amongst the tenantry of the Butler
manor. Most of the cottagers in both manors owed labour services,
although both also had some unburdened cottage tenements.

Thus, the original manor at Bray would have been of the structural type
associated with Leinster, similar in form to Cloncurry. The royal manor
was merely half of the original unit. Its value declined on a regular
basis, falling from £21 - 15 - 8 in 1283-4 to an annual fixed farm of
£15 - 3 - 0½ in 1304, and an annual farm of £7 - 1 - 8½ when it was
granted to Geoffrey Crompe in 1332. Its loss of profitability can be
explained entirely in terms of the expansion of the Leinster mountains

41. C.D.I. 1252-84, no. 2340. See also C.D.I. 1.
march in the early years of the fourteenth century and the turmoil caused by the interaction of the 1315-18 famine and the Bruce Invasion.

Newcastle McKynegan

A contemporary extent also survives for Newcastle McKynegan. It was compiled in 1305, when it was proposed to grant this manor to John fitz Thomas. The demesne was clearly delineated, and contained 2 carucates and 52 acres of arable, each being worth 8d. Meadow, of which there was 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres was worth 8d. an acre per annum. This parity between the value of arable and meadow is somewhat unusual. In general, meadow tended to be more valuable than arable. Were the meadow in this instance pasture rather than meadow suitable for mowing, it would explain the parity in valuation. As was the case in Bray, there were also a considerable number of burgage tenements in Newcastle McKynegan, where there were eighty of these tenements. These were held by 11 burgesses, so that it is likely that there were a considerable number of multiple consolidated burgage holdings in this borough. The pleas of the manor court and the prise of ale were each worth 40s. per annum and the manor's two mills 100s.

There do not appear to have been any unfree or semi-free tenants attached to this manor in 1305, though issues of betaghgs were mentioned in John de Strattone's 1298-9 account as bailiff of Newcastle. This may be an indication of betagh land lost through the expansion of the march. The total valuation of the manor was £62 - 5 - 8, considerably more than the £31 - 2 - 2 set annual farm. This was, presumably, the maximum value of the manor in time of peace and the difference between this and any intermediate annual valuation and the farm would have been seen as the legitimate profit accruing to the farmer.

A specific statement to the effect that Newcastle McKynegan was 'a very weak and small castle in a strong march' was made in the writ ordering the compilation of this extent. Certainly, by 1298-9, both Othee and Obrun were under considerable pressure. In Strattone's account Othee was listed as one of Newcastle's external lands and John Otyr, farmer of Obrun, was making payment of the issues of his manor directly to Strattone. No further payments were made for either manor, and the

45. C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 335. See also Map I.
47. C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 335.
most likely reason for their inclusion with Newcastle McKynegan would have been that they were no longer viable manorial centres. This in itself is an indication of the pressure from the local Irish in this area at the close of the thirteenth century.

Obrun and Othee

The initial importance of Obrun and Othee lay in the fact that both were extensive betagh settlements. The first extant account for Othee, rendered in Michaelmas 1212, was for £12 in betagh rent. By Easter 1228, the betaghs, the Christmas food render and the increase of Talachfin, were worth £14 - 3 - 4. One cannot establish what exact proportion of the fixed farm of £56 - 11 - 6 was ultimately represented by betagh rent, and it is possible that the manor remained merely a betagh settlement until its absorption into Newcastle McKynegan as an outgrange in 1293-9. Indeed, the only evidence that it was a fully independent manorial centre stemmed from the fact that it had a manor court, whose pleas and perquisites formed part of the farm due in 1261-2.

The first complete account for Obrun, that of Easter 1228, was similar to that rendered for Othee. The rent of betaghs, the Christmas food render and the increment all came to £11 - 4-0. Obrun, though less valuable than Othee, its farm being fixed at £51 - 13 - 6 per annum, seems to have been a more fully developed manorial centre. Its strategic location, midway between Bray and Newcastle McKynegan, meant that it could have acted as a manorial centre for scattered royal tenements in this area. Two extensive grants of land made in March 1283, conveying a total of 4 carucates and 95 acres in the mountains, were linked by the fact that this land all lay within the tenement of Obrun. Land specified in William le Deveney's grant lay within the tenement itself, while Ranulph le Mareschal owed suit to the court at Obrun for his land at Balycorus. In Thomas Godfroy's 1287 account for the manor, certain named tenements, Balyotir, Garvach, Claslaur and Balycorus, were listed...

---

49. P.R. 14 John, ed. O'Davies and D. Quinn, Ulster Journal of Archaeology, 3rd ser. IV (1941), p. 10. For probable location see Map I.
54. P.R. 46 H. III, Ibid., p. 43.
55. C.D.I. 1252-84, no. 2069 (Ranulph le Mareschal) and no. 2070 (William le Deveneys).
amongst the allowances for default of rent.\footnote{56.}

Other areas were associated with and may well have been members of the manor of Obrun. The farmer of Obrun frequently made payments for the issues of the King's wood of Glencree or for an area of betagh settlement called Mundelay. In 1287 Thomas Godfrey paid 40s. of the rent of Glencree and £1 - 16 - 8\footnote{57.} of the issues of the manor court.\footnote{57.} In Hilary 1288, he paid 40s. of the rent of Mondelay\footnote{58.} and, subsequently, in Easter term of the same year he paid 14s. of issues from the court, 16s. for the sale of copse wood in Glencree and a further 5s. 4d. for pannage there.\footnote{59.}

Royal forest would thus appear to have formed an important part of the manorial demesne. Its main use would have been as pasture. The only other consistent form of revenue would have been the sale of underwood, as to take more than a certain number of mature trees on an annual basis would ultimately have reduced the value of such woodland. There do not appear to have been any burgage tenements attached to this manor. Thus, Obrun seems to have acted fleetingly as the manorial caput of many widely-dispersed royal tenements in the mountains, much as Loxeudy or Loughrea were also to provide caputs for very widely dispersed areas of land. Othee remained, as it had been in origin, largely a betagh settlement.

\textbf{Saggard and Newcastle Lyons}

Saggard and Newcastle Lyons were the largest, the most important in strategic terms and also the most valuable of the royal manors of Dublin. There was one fundamental difference in their structures: Newcastle Lyons had a number of subordinate caputs, and was quite close, in structural terms, to the Meath marcher manor,\footnote{60.} while Saggard had a dominant central caput. When both manors acquired additional reeves in the 1330's, the number and designation of these extra officials underlined this divergence. One of the two reeves at Saggard accounted for the farm of burgage land, the rents of the demesne, the mill and the manor court, while the external reeve accounted for the rent of Balymargyn, Ballinteer and Westpailston, certain other external lands and the pleas and perquisites of these tenements.\footnote{61.} Newcastle Lyons acquired two

\footnote{57.} C.D.I. 1285-92, no. 309.  
\footnote{58.} Ibid., no. 361.  
\footnote{59.} Ibid., no. 371.  
\footnote{60.} See below, Chapter V, pp 221-6. For location, see Map 1.  
\footnote{61.} P.R. 6 Ed. III, D.K.R., vol. 43, p. 61. For location see Map 1.
additional reeves, one with specific responsibility for the tenements centred on Colmanstown \textit{(prepositus Balycolman)}, and another, whose bailiwick was centred on Athgoe.\footnote{There were definitely three reeves in 1321-2, P.R. 15 Ed. II, D.K.R., vol. 42, p. 29. However, there is, in the same account, mention of a reeve of Ballycolman active in 1318-9.}

The structural differences glimpsed in the reform of 1332 are reflected more clearly in the extents of both manors compiled in 1540.\footnote{See Chapter I: Abstracts I (Saggard) and II (Newcastle Lyons). I am indebted to Gearoid MacNiocaill, who drew my attention to the material in P.R.O. S.C. 11, 934 (Ireland).} Saggard had declined in value and contracted in size between the late thirteenth century and the compilation of this extent, but its structural core appears to have remained the same. In 1540, a central borough containing 63 messuages rendered £7 - 3 - 8 per annum, while a subsidiary borough of Ballychyer, probably the old external lands at Balytyr, now the townland of Ballinteer, contained 5 messuages and rendered £2 - 15 - 4 per annum. All of these tenements with their appurtenances were held in \textit{libero burgagio}, and a number of holdings in the main borough were multiple tenements, the largest being that of Robert Preston, containing 16 messuages and their appurtenances. The remainder of the land at Saggard, with the exception of some wasteland and a small wood, was described as lying in \textit{forensecis campis manerii} and comprised 299 acres. Absence of any demesne lands was commented on in the 1540 extents of Saggard, Newcastle Lyons, Crumlin and Esker,\footnote{See also Chapter I: Abstracts III (Crumlin) and IV (Esker).} and probably confirms my view that the leasing of demesne had taken over from direct cultivation by the mid-thirteenth century.\footnote{The sale of corn and other produce from the royal manors in 1234-5 is the latest indication of major direct cultivation, P.R. H.III, D.K.R., vol. 35, p. 34.} No attempt appears to have been made to resume direct control of this land, even with the appointment of manorial reeves in 1307.\footnote{See below, p.42.}

Despite the proliferation of burgage tenements in all of the manors extended in 1540, all tenants holding in \textit{libero burgagio} owed suit to the manor court. No attempt seems to have been made to force them to do suit at a local hundred court.

Newcastle Lyons had a single manorial borough containing 49 burgages and
rendering £5 -12- 1 per annum. Despite the size of this borough, the 
structure of the residue of the manorial lands, as extended in 1540, goes 
far to explain, in retrospect, the introduction of the two additional 
reeves of Colmanstown and Athgoe. The area of this manor does not seem to 
have contracted to the same extent as Saggard, and in 1540 it had 1,238½ 
acres of arable land apart from that contained in the borough. This was 
distributed in a number of granges similar to those found on the Meath 
manors of Rathfeigh or Killallon. The largest grange was that formed 
by the terra forinseca, which contained 304½ acres, but the other seven 
granges each contained between 60 and 220 acres. While the medieval sub-
caputs of Colmanstown and Athgoe were not the largest of these granges, 
they were strategically placed. It would have been difficult to use 
Milltown as a caput, because of the central location of the large mill 
tenement with its 60 acres of adjacent land in Kilmactawley. In relative 
terms Newcastle Lyons did not decline to the same extent as Saggard 
between the late thirteenth century and the compilation of the 1540 
extents. While both would have been equally affected by the impact of the 
Black Death in the mid-fourteenth century, a significant degree of 
contraction had already occurred in Saggard by the 1330's, stemming from 
its greater vulnerability to attack from the mountains.

From the late thirteenth century onwards, the mills at Saggard and 
Newcastle Lyons were held at farm. These tenements, in particular the 
mill tenement at Newcastle Lyons, were much sought after, but despite 
interest on the part of various entrepreneurs and Exchequer officials in 
them, no attempt appears to have been made to reassess the value of 
their farms. None of the early commissions appointing farmers have 
survived and the earliest evidence of the value of mill farms is in the 
form of payments recorded on the receipt rolls. From this evidence, it

---

67. See below, Chapter V, pp 223-4.
69. A typical example of the entrepreneur would be Henry de Frenes, who 
held both the mills of Newcastle Lyons and Saggard, together with 
the royal mills at Dublin Castle at the close of the thirteenth century, 
C.D.I. 1293-1301, nos. 264 and 300. A Seneschal of Demesne, William 
Barton, has a long-term lease of and interest in the mill tenement at 
Kilmactawley, in Newcastle Lyons, (Mem. Roll 24-5 Ed. III., P.R.O.I., 
R.C. 8/25 pp 244-5 (the original grant of March, 1351), latest 
recorded assignment on its rent while de Barton was tenant occurred 
would appear that the mill at Taney in Saggard rose in value from 8s. per annum in 1292 to 23s. 4d. per annum in 1335. In actual fact the 1292 payment may have been the farm of a half-year, and if the increase of 4s., then paid by the farmer, was also due on a half-yearly basis, the overall farm would have remained more or less static into the mid-fourteenth century. Similarly, the farm of the mill at Kilmactalway in Newcastle Lyons remained completely static from the late thirteenth century onwards. The first recorded payment of an annual farm of 40s. was made by Thomas the miller in Trinity term, 1296. Fourteenth century leases of the mill included 60 acres of land at Kilmactalway worth 1s. per acre, the farm of this consolidated tenement being 100s. per annum.

Chapelizod

In the case of Chapelizod, where no contemporary or 1540 extent survives, it is possible to establish its basic structural form using farmers' accounts, grants and receipt roll evidence. One of the smallest of the royal manors, William de Lyndes' account as farmer for the year 1261-2 specified an annual farm of £17 - 6 - 8, including payments for the mill, the fishery and the manor court. Henry de Crues' account as bailiff for the manor from May to September of 1276, itemises the issues for which he accounted, thus providing some indication of the relative importance and size of the yearly income from different sources. The most valuable of these was the mill, for which he owed £8 - 3 - 9 and the least valuable, the court, for which he owed 6d. The fishery was worth £3 - 8 - 2 and the remaining £4 - 12 - 1¼ came from rent.

The total value of the manor over this period was £16 - 4 - 6¾, which, as the term of account represented well under a half-year, demonstrates that Chapelizod was worth rather more than £17 - 6 - 8 in the year. Clearly the value of the farm could not have been the exact value of the manor. Were this the case, there would have been no inducement to the farmer to hold the tenement. The comparative value of the mill, noted in de Crues'
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70. C.D.I. 1293-1301, nos. 1078 and 1148.
72. C.D.I. 1293-1301, no. 300.
73. For two grants of this particular tenement see Mem. Roll 21-2 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/24, p. 337 and pp 338-9.
74. P.R. 46 R. III, D.K.R., vol. 35, p. 43. For location see Map I.
account, is borne out by the fact that when, in 1292, it was thrown down by inundations of the Liffey, an allowance of £6 was made for a little over a half-year's loss of revenue and £18 - 5 - \(\frac{3}{4}\) was spent on reconstruction.\(^76\).

Crumlin and Esker

Although no thirteenth or fourteenth century extents have survived for Crumlin and Esker, both manors were extended in 1540.\(^77\). The structural contrast shown between these two manors in the 1540 extents is remarkably similar to that between Saggard and Newcastle Lyons: Crumlin was a small and relatively centralised manor, while Esker was larger and organised on a grange model similar to that of Newcastle Lyons. One of the most interesting elements in both of these extents was the fact that neither manor had declined in value and that Esker had more than doubled in value. The explanation was that many tenements in both manors were held at unusually high rents in 1540. James Reere held 60 acres in Esker at an annual rent of £2 - 12 - 7, or 10\(\frac{1}{3}\)d. per acre.\(^78\). Acreage rents of this approximate level can be found in at least 15 other cases in Esker and 8 of the Crumlin tenements. The impact of these higher rents would have been reinforced by the fact that the tenements in question were relatively substantial, comprising between 20 and 80 acres. These were probably recent leases, held at an economic rent, rather than the old medieval fixed rent.

Neither manor had any demesne, but, alone amongst the royal manors extended in 1540, Crumlin still had a number of customary tenants.\(^79\). No disabilities such as customary services or payment of heriot were noted in the extent and the main difference between this category and the listed free tenants is the fact that all of the free tenants were religious corporations. The Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, the Vicars Choral of St. Patricks', St. Thomas' Abbey and the nunnery of Gracedieu were amongst those holding land in Crumlin in this way.\(^80\). Between them, the 22 customary tenants held 502\(\frac{3}{4}\) acres and the free tenants 199\(\frac{5}{4}\) acres. Crumlin had no mill and the issues of its court were worth 13s. 4d. annually.

Apart from the central grange at Esker, there were four other granges at Finnestown, Ballydowd, Ballyowen and Kishoge. The central grange contained

---

\(^77\) See Chapter I: Abstracts III (Crumlin) and IV (Esker). See also Map 1.
\(^78\) P.R.O. S.C. 11 934 (Ireland) m 13.
\(^79\) Ibid., m 12, these were copyholders.
\(^80\) Ibid., m 12d.
243½ acres, the smallest of the fully extended sub-granges, Finnestown, 190 acres, and the largest of the sub-granges, Ballyowen, 255 acres.

There was only one tenant in Kishoge, John Baggot, who held a messuage and certain unspecified lands at an annual rent of £3 – 11 – 4. Conditions under which land was held at Esker in 1540 were uniform and somewhat unusual, for although no customary tenants were mentioned in the extent and the jurors had stated that there were no nativi nec aliqua alia plural proficuæ, all of the tenants on the manor owed heriot, and their heirs relief on obtaining seisin of their lands.81 Some early fourteenth century grants of land at Esker shed a certain amount of light on this problem. In January 1329 William Loterell was granted 10 acres of the original demesne, which he was to hold as a free tenant-at-will, and 7 acres of socage land.82 Socage land was normally held to be free, and unburdened with military service. It would also have been untainted by any of the forms of villeinage or betaghry. The differentiation in the commission between socage land and, apparently, freely held demesne land can only imply that there was some taint of servitude associated with the latter in this particular context. An earlier grant in 1310 of a messuage and 30 acres to John le Chamberlyn and Thomas de Bremesgrene named the former tenant of the land as William Broun, hibernicus domini Regis.83 Brown may or may not have been a betagh, but he would certainly have been a semi-free rather than a free tenant because of the taint of Irishry.

The 1540 extent may well reflect some form of levelling-out process between the forms of free and semi-free tenure on the manor and the general application of the resulting standardised form of tenure to all tenements.

The mill at Esker had declined in value by 1540, and may have been vulnerable to flood damage. Robert Juvinis, a reeve of the manor, was allowed 40s. against his charge at the Exchequer in 1325 for a year's loss of revenue stemming from the prostration of the mill.84 In 1540, the jurors noted that its original value, within living memory, was 20s. per annum but that it was nunc prostratum et nichil valet ad presens. The manor court was worth £1 – 6 – 8 in 1540. It was probably outside the circuit of the Seneschal of Demesne, as there appears to have been a local manorial seneschal, an interesting parallel with the situation in Leixlip.85

81. P.R.O. S.C. 11 934 (Ireland) m 14.
83. Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/4, pp 844–5 and Ex. 1/1, m 51d.
85. See below, pp 31–2.
This office had been granted by Peter Bermingham, who held the manor under Henry III, to Hugh fitz Oweyn, and was granted to Thomas fitz Owen in 1331. No mention is made of the court at Esker in the sole surviving Seneschal of Demesne's account.

Leixlip and Castlewarden: the Pippard acquisitions

Leixlip, the more valuable of the two Pippard manors acquired by the King in 1302, was extended in 1341. This was probably undertaken in connection with its lease at farm three years earlier to the Prior of Kilmainham. This was a typical Leinster manor, with one modification: it was well fortified, the caput being a stone castle with four towers and having also five military tenements, each comprising a Knight's fee. These precautions were probably aimed at the Irish of the Kildare-Offaly march. The central demesne at Leixlip comprised 212 acres, while there were 50 acres in a subdemesne at Stacony and 21 acres in a similar subdemesne at Dungoul. A manorial borough contained 54 burgages, 39 frontages, 1 small parcel of land and had 180 acres of external land, most of which was waste and valued as pasture by 1341. The betagh held 364 acres rendering £15 - 3 - 4 per annum, while 20 non-military free tenants held 1,116¼ acres, together with unspecified land at Donaghcumper, rendering £26 - 14 - 11 per annum.

This manor was administered by two reeves. The division of their respective bailiwicks was on the basis of all land attached to the borough being under the control of one reeve, and the remainder of the manor under the other. Effectively this meant that the borough reeve, who had been liable for £7 - 1 9½ per annum in the 1341 extent and £10 per annum in the 1320's, was subordinate to the reeve of the manor. Apart from the two reeves, a constable for Leixlip castle was also appointed while the manor was in royal hands. He may also have discharged the functions of the Seneschal of Demesne on a local basis, presiding over the manor court and supervising the practical end of conveyancing within the manor itself. There is no evidence that the Seneschal of Demesne ever acted in

88. For all data derived from this extent see Chapter I: Abstract V. See also Mhp.
89. See Chapter V, pp 193-201.
Leixlip, and so it seems reasonable to assume that John de Baddeby, who is known to have acted both as constable and seneschal there in 1325, was, in this, typical of both his predecessors and his successors.

Both of the mills at Leixlip were of considerable value. When extended in 1341, one was assessed as being worth 10 marks per annum beyond 5 marks in repairs and routine maintenance, while the other was extended at 5 marks per annum. A fishery also associated with the two mills was worth £1 - 10 - 0. When the mills were held by Robert Leyngenour from 1323-7, he was only obliged to account for an annual farm of £6 - 13 - 4, leaving an annual profit of £4 - 16 - 8. While he undertook extensive repairs to both mills, he was allowed his expenditure against his debts as a farmer. An idea of the mills' capacity can be gained from the fact that these repairs involved the purchase of two French mill stones worth £7 - 13 - 4, and a third stone worth £1 - 13-4. Both were probably vertical mills, close to the weir at Leixlip. Their capacity and value, which even outstripped that of the archiepiscopal mills at Ballymore, would have been due to the pace and volume of water passing over this weir.

An early fourteenth century extent, possibly compiled in the reign of Edward II, has survived for the manor of Castlewarden and its member of Ughterard. This, though undated, could well have been compiled when the manor and its borough were granted in perpetuity to Arnald le Poer and his heirs in 1315. It was a small manor, with 29 free tenants, only two of whom owed scutage. The demesne comprised 366 acres and was not served by any betagh or semi-free tenants. It was probably under direct cultivation when the extent was compiled, as only one small parcel of demesne land, 4 acres, was then held at farm. Although all of the tenants were allegedly of free status, two of the manorial tenements were held

92. In the only surviving seneschal's account, his circuit appears to have been Newcastle Lyons, Crumlin and Saggard, P.R. 6 Ed. III, D.K.R., vol. 43, p. 66.


95. See Chapter III, p. 114.

96. This extent is undated, but by its hand it is probably of the reign of Edward II, and was possibly drawn up prior to the 1315 grant of the manor and borough to le Poer. For all data derived from the extent See Chapter I: Abstract VI. See Chapter I: Abstract VI.

under peculiar conditions. One, a free tenement of 48 acres, was held by 18 named tenants for £1 - 4 - 3 per annum, giving each little more than a glorified cottage holding. The other was a tenement of 12 acres, held by an annual render of 12 crannocs of wheat and oats, assessed at 24s. This was not a mill tenement, for both of the Castlewarden mills were small and separately valued in the extent. Thus, it may either be the survival of a servile food render, or the survival of an earlier, and not necessarily pre-conquest, share-cropping agreement. At the time of the compilation of the extent there were 58 burgesses in the manorial borough of Ughterard, holding between them 132 acres at an annual rent of £1-0-5 and owing suit to the hundred court. Were it not for the apparent lack of tenurial diversity, particularly the absence of unfree and semi-free categories of tenant, this manor could be seen as conforming to the small Leinster structural prototype.

Like most of the other royal manors with boroughs, Leixlip did not have a separate hundred court. This is unusual, in that the other Pippard acquisition, Castlewarden did not dominate its borough to that extent. Cloncurry, originally a Pippard manor and part of that same group, also had a separate hundred court for its borough. Normally, one would expect to find uniformity of practice within any given lordship. Therefore, this difference may well reflect the closer integration of Leixlip, which was a very much larger and more valuable manor, into the infrastructure associated with the other royal demesne manors of the vale of Dublin. Structural standardisation of this sort may not have been deemed necessary in the case of Castlewarden. The 1315 grant to Arnald le Poer may be of significance in this context, in as much as the integration of this manor may have been precluded by some administrative or strategic problem. The fact that both Castlewarden and Ughterard were separately administered and accounted for while in royal hands may have some bearing on this matter.

Demense land and land usage on the Royal Manors

During the early years of Henry III's reign, the demesnes of the royal manors were under cultivation as single units, under the supervision of royal officials, for whom the sheriff of Dublin was ultimately answerable. In the autumn of 1227, some £62-16-8 worth of grain from Esker, Crumlin and Saggard was sold to Richard de Burgh. Grain sales of this magnitude

are a clear indication of direct cultivation of the demesne or a substantial portion of the demesne. In the same county account an allowance of 36s. of the rent of Crumlin was made, because the demesne had been in the King's hand in Michaelmas 1227. The account rendered for Newcastle Lyons in 1234-5 indicates that the demesne, or a substantial portion of it, was then being cultivated in a similar manner. While the manor, the mill and the court were together worth £36-0-4, some £30 was realised from the sale of grain and £14-3-8 from the sale of wool, cheese, sheep, skins, cowhides and horses. No similar evidence of demesne cultivation survives for the second half of the thirteenth century. Thus, the stabilisation of manorial farms in 1261-2 may have marked the turning from direct cultivation of the demesne to a rentier-type exploitation of the demesne through leasing.

One exception seems to have been the demesne at Chapelizod. This was certainly under direct cultivation in the 1270's. In July 1273, Henry de Gorham was compensated for losses sustained by the farms of the manor and by his corn being taken into the King's hand after the letting of that land to him. He had been granted the autumn corn sown in the manor at the same price as the corn which had been taken into the King's hand. Clearly, Henry, as farmer, had sowed a substantial portion of the demesne, which the King had, for some reason, taken into his hand. Hugh de Crues, who acted as bailiff of the manor from 5th of May 1276 to Michaelmas term 1277 was allowed £28-18-9 spent in the purchase of seed and in the previous year, seven oxen were bought for the plough at Chapelizod. This all points to the fact that a substantial portion of the manor's arable land, probably the entire demesne, was then cultivated as a unit by the official accountable for the issues of the manor.

There is similar, though scantier, evidence of demesne cultivation in David de Offyntoun's account for the issues of Newcastle McKynegan from May 1280 to sometime in 1281-2. He accounted for the receipts of corn sold there, cows and cowhides and was allowed the expenses of

101. P.R. 19 H. III, Ibid., p. 34.
102. The rent of the manor was worth £69-14-0, the mill £4 and the court 46s. 4d..
104. C.D.I. 1252-84, no. 964.
husbandry. Evidence of this nature for the other royal manors might have revealed similar methods of cultivation in the second half of the century, but its non-existence may be of itself an indication that this form of cultivation had ceased. In this context, it is worth noting that when John de Strattone accounted as bailiff for Newcastle McKynegan for 1298-9, he accounted for the rents of demesnes as opposed to issues arising from the sale of what, in the case of Offyngtoun's account, was clearly demesne produce. Thus, by the end of the thirteenth century, even the demesne land at Newcastle McKynegan had been leased out.

Land usage in the royal manors amongst the tenantry seems to have been directly related to the size of the holding. When a group of smallholders in Crumlin were distrained for rent arrears by order of the Treasurer in Michaelmas 1319, the sheriff of Dublin distrained and valued their sheep. Some 171 sheep were taken into the King's hand, while no grain or other animals were distrained. The valuation of Richard de Wodehouse's goods in Chapelizod and elsewhere following his death in Trinity term 1323 provides a complete contrast to the Crumlin distrains. He had 39 crannocs of wheat, 21 crannocs, 4 pecks of oats and 4 crannocs of peas in the haggard at Chapelizod, together with 42 acres sown with wheat there. He also had two carts, two ploughs, 12 oxen and 4 affers. Thus, the larger the holding and the better the land, the greater was the likelihood that the tenant would engage exclusively or almost exclusively in tillage. While the tenants at Crumlin may have tilled a certain portion of their holdings, the importance of this possible tillage is reflected in the fact that no grain was distrained there despite the fact that the distrains were made at harvest time.

108. P.R. 27 Ed. I, D.K.R., vol. 38, p. 55 and P.R. 26 Ed. I, D.K.R.; vol. 38, p. 47 - a similar account by John de Strattone, allowance was made for the entire demesne, which was untitled from 1294-6 because no one was willing to rent it. This probably reflects the uncertainty caused by the political instability and famine of those years.

109. Mem. Roll 13-14 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/12 pp 94-5 and Ex 1/2 m.l. The greatest amount for which any of them were distrained was 69s. 2d. spread over two years. The more usual level was 15s. or 12s. 6d. over the same period.


111. Horses suitable for farm work, of light build.
The impact of both the 1315-13 famine and the Bruce Invasion on the profitability of the royal manors is evident in the contraction and loss of value that occurred in the 1320's and 1330's. Manorial farms were adjusted, probably in recognition that a certain amount of income from rents had been irretrievably lost, waste land was let as efficiently as possible and attempts to ensure that marcher manors were held against the threat from the Irish of the Leinster mountains. Two of the manors most severely affected, Saggard and Newcastle Lyons, had already been in considerable arrears early in the fourteenth century, and the reasons for their subsequent indebtedness can be seen in the petitions from their tenants seeking relief and terms of payment. Newcastle McKynegan was also hit, much of its land being absorbed into a new, expanding march. From 1325 to 1332, when the latest known account was rendered by a reeve of Newcastle McKynegan, revenue was derived solely from the manorial borough.

Obrun, which had ceased to exist as a manorial centre in the late thirteenth century, was included in an extended marcher tenement of Brun, Staghcony, Kyllenyn, Staghnanwyn and Lesnekyll. This tenement, much of which would have lain waste or amongst the Irish was granted to Elias de Assheburn in July 1329. In accounting for this land from July 1329 to February 1331, he answered for £6-17-6. When Robert Holywode held these lands in 1361, the annual farm was £6-15-0. It had thus decreased slightly in value. It comprised 760 acres or approximately 6½ carucates. The farm at which both de Assheburn and Holywode held these lands was minimal given this acreage, probably because the annual revenue was uncertain and dependent on the activity of the local Irish. It is worth noting that in 1365 Holywode provided a local ward in this area, so that concessionary rent in this case may have been intended

112. See Chapter I: Table II, Decline in the Farms of Newcastle Lyons, Saggard and Newcastle McKynegan post 1318.

113. See Chapter I: Table III, Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Century Arrears of Farm from the Royal Manors.


119. Ibid., p. 92.
to induce the tenant to provide some form of defence for the tenement, as was the case with Geoffrey Cromp's twenty year lease of Bray.  

The leasing of scattered lands also took place in Saggard. A commission was drawn up in Michaelmas term 1346 granting 5 carucates, described as royal demesne land in Saggard, to Thomas de Blackbourn at a yearly rent of £7-6-8. Many of the royal manors of Dublin had, thus declined considerably in value in the two decades preceding the first outbreak of the Black Death.

The Black Death does not appear to have had any immediate effect on the royal manors of the vale of Dublin. As was the case with raids mounted by the Leinster mountain Irish, it was the cumulative effects of the plague in its recurrent visitations, rather than any particular outbreak, that provoked official action. No action was taken in 1348 to cope with its effects on royal manors. It was not until 1362, a year after the third visitation of the plague, that any attempt was made to deal with waste land which had fallen out of cultivation due to the death of tenants. It should be noted, in this context, that Elizabeth de Clare's lands recovered relatively well and swiftly from the first two visitations of the plague, which may indicate, pace Clyn, that the later outbreaks were more severe in Ireland than the first visitation of 1348.

In July 1362 Walter Somery, the then Seneschal, was ordered to lease plague vacated lands to any who would be willing to hold them in Crumlin, Saggard and Newcastle Lyons.

The joint effects of the plague and Irish raids on these three manors were so severe that in Michaelmas term 1363 the reeves and receivers were informed that the Council did not intend taking any further measures with regard to land which was waste and had been cultivated prior to the pestilence. They were probably due to have been allowed certain deficits in their accounts on the basis of a practical contraction in revenue due both to the plague and the raids of the Irish in causing these lands to become untenanted and fall out of cultivation. Any attempt made by Walter Somery in the previous year to lease waste land in these three manors must either have been largely unsuccessful from the beginning or have been nullified in Saggard and Newcastle Lyons.

122. See below, Chapter IV, p. 186.
where such activity was more likely to be damaging, by raids mounted by the Irish of the mountains.

The situation in the royal demesne lands and lands temporarily in the King's hand had deteriorated to such an extent by 1365 that the Council found it necessary to reduce rents. Land which had been valued at 16d. and 12d. an acre was now reassessed at 12d. and 8d. an acre. Decreases were proportionally lower where the original estimate was under 12d. an acre. Land originally worth 10d. an acre was revalued at 7d. and land assessed at 8d. an acre was reassessed at either 6½d. or 4d. The ultimate effects of the Black Death and consistent raiding are clearly reflected in the large amount of waste land in Newcastle Lyons in the mid 1370's. When Robert Lok, reeve there in 1372-3, accounted at the Exchequer in July 1374, he sought allowance for 106½ acres 4½ stang of waste land. It was found that this land could have been leased as pasture and was valued at 8d. an acre for this reason. Subsequently, Reginald son of Thomas, another reeve of Newcastle Lyons, claimed a similar allowance for this land. His claim was rejected for the same reason. The importance of these two cases lies in the fact that land, which had previously been in cultivation, had now definitely passed out of cultivation and become, potentially at any rate, part of the manor's pastureland. Neither reeve was expected to replace the lost tenants, rather they were expected to extract revenue from this waste land in the only way possible, through leasing it as pasture.

Thus, while the first visitation of the Black Death does not seem to have had any immediate effect on the profitability of the royal manors, its cumulative impact was considerable. Demesne rents had to be substantially decreased and special attempts to recruit new tenants made in the 1360's were clearly not successful. The creation of the large new pasture holding in Newcastle Lyons by 1372-3 is of itself a very clear indication of long-term depopulation.

Administration

The administration of the royal manors underwent certain important structural changes in the early years of the fourteenth century. These

127. Ibid., pp 127-30.
manors were held at farm until 1306, when, for the most part, they came under closer crown control with the appointment of manorial reeves, who were accountable for their revenue. At roughly the same time, the office of Seneschal of Demesne was established. This officer was responsible for holding the manorial courts, the receipt of land escheated to the King within the royal manors and the delivery of land within these manors to the heir or person to whom it had been granted. The office of receiver was established by 1310, and may have been in existence in 1307. One of the reasons for these reforms was undoubtedly, the acquisition of the Pippard lands in November 1302. Two of these manors, Leixlip and Castlewarden, were thus to become part of the network formed by the royal manors of the vale of Dublin.

The shire of Dublin had been structurally reformed for similar reasons. By the end of the thirteenth century, the land under the sheriff's jurisdiction included the Verdun Lands in Meath, the crosslands in all adjacent liberties and the lordship of Kildare. The acquisition of Kildare in 1297, with the consequent extension of the jurisdiction of the sheriff of Dublin, clearly precipitated the action of the parliament held in that year. The shire was divided in an attempt to increase the quality and efficiency of local administration. Thus, the separate shires of Kildare and Meath were established. In Kildare the transition from liberty to shire took place within the year, while the shiring of the de Verdun lands was not complete until 1302, the year in which

128. William Kissok, reeve of Esker, and John Clement, reeve of Bray were summoned to appear at the Exchequer in Hilary 1307, Mem. Roll 31-5 Ed. I, P.R.O.I., Calendar, p. 181.
129. See below, pp 46-7. Thomas de Kent may have been commissioned on 1st August 1307. Mem. Roll 1 Ed.II, P.R.O.I., Calendar, p. 248.
130. See below, pp 43-4. However, the first receiver's commission may have been that issued to Robert Chyld in Bray in Hilary 1307. Mem. Roll 31-5 Ed. I, P.R.O.I., Calendar, p. 196.
131. C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 149.
133. In a case of novel disseisin heard before Walter de la Haye, locum tenens of the Justiciar, on 8th July 1297, Hugh Canon was described as being of Kildare and it was noted that 'which county of Kildare when the assize was taken was part of Dublin, although newly made a county by itself'. C.J.R. 1295-1303, p. 145. For cession of Kildare to the King of J. Otway-Ruthven, Medieval Ireland, London 1968, p. 174 and 214.
134. The sheriff of Dublin ceased to account for Meath on 18th October 1302. Adam de Sancto-Bosco accounted for Dublin from 6th May 1302 to 14th May 1304, P.R. 30 Ed.I,D.K.R., vol.38, p.60. He accounted for the profits of Meath from 6th May to 18th October 1302, P.R. 30 Ed.I, D.K.R., vol. 38, p. 61. John Wodeloc then accounted for the profits of Meath from that date to 26th May 1303, P.R. 30 Ed. I, D.K.R., vol. 38, p. 61. Separate sheriffs were thereafter appointed for both shires.
the Pippard lands were acquired by the King. It was, however, the growing indebtedness of the royal manors that probably precipitated the reforms of 1307-10.

Debt and the Royal Manors

While most of the royal manors were heavily burdened by debt at the end of the thirteenth century, it was the magnitude of the debts from Saggard and Newcastle Lyons that gave cause for alarm.135 Since the resurgence in raiding by the Irish and the campaigns of the mid 1270's, Saggard had always been in considerable straits.136 A standing debt of £492-11-1½ in 1279 has risen to £644-19-11 in 1281-2 and was to peak in the early years of the following century. Newcastle Lyons did not become heavily encumbered until the mid 1280's, and was never indebted to quite the same extent as Saggard. Indeed, as far as Newcastle Lyons was concerned, the famine of 1294-6137 was far more likely to have been the turning-point in profitability. Debts owed by the other royal manors were never so severe, and were cleared relatively swiftly by the local farmers.

The importance attributed to restoring the profitability of the largest of the royal manors is clear from the solution ultimately adopted by the Exchequer. This was to ensure that as few as possible of the manors were held at farm. Chapelizod, the only manor of the original core to remain at farm, was small, and was also one of the more profitable demesne manors.138 It was never administered by royal reeves, but its farmers were always men of considerable substance like Richard Woodhouse,139 or the priors of Kilmainham.140 Responsibility for the debt both at Newcastle Lyons and Saggard as it stood in 1312-13, was divided between the reeve and community of the manor. This is a further indication of the Exchequer's concern to restore the profitability of these manors, as likely severe indebtedness would have discouraged men of ability from acting as reeves. In Newcastle Lyons the reeve accounted for the farm of half the year and various unspecified arrears, amounting to £515-9-10,

135. See Chapter I: Table III.
136. See above, p. 13, p. 19.
137. See Chapter VII: Table I.
138. See Chapter I: Table III.
140. P.R. 7 Ed. II, Ibid., p. 50, and, for subsequent grants to the Priors of Kilmainham, Mem. Roll 5-6 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/6, pp 16-8.
of which he discharged £371-17-5. In the same account it was noted that John Lymput and the community of the manor owed £541-3-11½, of which only £34-16-8 was discharged. The reeve was clearly accounting for recent arrears of farm - hence the fact that so much of his debt was discharged. The community must, on the other hand, have been accounting for the debt which had accumulated since the late 1280's. This communalisation of the large standing debt left the reeve with what, in relative terms, was virtually a blank sheet, in that he did not enter on the period for which he was accounting already encumbered with the debts of several of his predecessors. The farmer had to account for whatever his predecessor had failed to clear, and thus the accumulation of debt under a system of lease by payment of farm was more likely.

The situation at Saggard was similar to that in Newcastle Lyons. The reeves accounted for their terms of office and for certain specified debts. Under this dispensation, the community answered for a debt of £1,311-1-6¼, which was the residue of the Saggard debt of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century.

While it became less common for the royal manors to be held at farm, leasing in this manner remained an important part of royal patronage. Richard de Wodehouse, who held Chapelizod in 1310-11, was engrossor of the Exchequer in 1309, and subsequently held the offices of Escheator, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Deputy Treasurer. Roger Outlaw, who served as Deputy Treasurer, Chancellor and Keeper of the Seal and also as Deputy Justiciar, held, in his capacity as prior of Kilmainham, both Chapelizod and Leixlip at farm. The Hospitallers had a constant interest in Chapelizod, which adjoined their property at Kilmainham. Acquiring the farm of Leixlip was a logical extension of this interest. The annual farm of the manor was £77-10-0½, but the July grant of 1338

142. Ibid., p. 37.
143. Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.0.I., R.C. 8/4, p. 441 and Ex. 1/1 m5.
gave to Kilmainham, through the person of Outlaw, the farm of the manor at a concessionary rate. 149. In return for a loan advanced by the Order to the King of £200, the prior was to hold the manor at an annual farm of £60. of which £10 was pardoned in return for £100 of the loan. The residue of the loan was to be repaid in the form of a rent rebate spread over two years.

Grants of manors at farm were also used to reward persons who had rendered outstanding military service. After an initial grant of 100 marks of the revenue of Newcastle Lyons to Nickolas Verdun, in return for his service both against the Scots and the Irish, he was granted the manor itself on 20th of September, 1338, to hold during pleasure, rendering the balance of the farm. 150. Esker was granted at farm to Reginald Lovel under similar circumstances on 14th July, 1368. 151. In return for service in the King's wars in Wales and elsewhere, he was granted a daily wage of 12d. which was to be offset against the farm of Esker.

Thus, while attempts made in 1306-7 to restore the profitability of the Dublin royal manors took the form of drastically reducing the number of royal manors held at farm, one manor, Chapelizod, was consistently leased at farm. The leasing of royal manors at farm became far less common in the course of the fourteenth century as a result of these measures. Because of this development such leases came to be solely an expression of royal patronage and were only granted in return for services rendered.

The Offices of Reeve and Receiver

Reeves had been appointed to the royal manors by Hilary term 1307, 152. when the first extant summons of reeves to the Exchequer was enrolled on the memoranda roll. The office may well have pre-dated this summons and may have existed as early as 1303. Complaints made by the tenants of Newcastle Lyons in autumn 1309 about the corruption of John Lympit, the reeve, state that he had held that office for the past five and a half years. 153. It is, however, possible that this identification of a

149. This grant is noted in a case involving the value of this farm in Mem. Roll 40 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/29 pp 143-67. The grant is noted on p. 143.


reeve active in 1303 may actually stem from confusion or a loose use of terms given the closeness of the new office to that of farmer. The farmer held his manor at lease either during pleasure or for a specific period of years, whereas the reeve held office for a specific period, generally a year. A farmer was liable for even his more remote predecessors' debts, while the reeve was in practice answerable only for those debts incurred by him and for the farm of the manor during his period of office. Thus, both the farmer and the reeve were accountable for the farm of the manor, the major difference between them being the fact that the reeve usually accounted for a considerably shorter period of time and would have been less likely to have been encumbered with massive debt.

As a further check on the office of reeve, the office of receiver was established. The manorial receiver may have been in existence prior to the commissioning of the receivers of the shires in 1310. Robert Chyld was elected to collect the King's rent at Bray in Hilary 1307. He may have been the first of the manorial receivers, though it is possible that this commission was merely describing the office of reeve, rather than using the actual term. The office of receiver was in any case, firmly established by 1309-10. In Michaelmas of 1309, the Seneschal of Demesne was ordered to cause all reeves and receivers in his bailwick to come to the Exchequer on the morrow of the Purification, with the money they owed the King. Summonses and orders of a similar nature were frequently issued. The office of receiver ultimately became part of

156. The continuity of the debt in Saggard from 1301-5 is a brief, if clear example of this.
157. Robert Ailmer's account as reeve of Newcastle Lyons in 1320-1 is an excellent example of this type of account. He accounted for the farm for that year, discharging all but £26-4-4½ of the debt. He subsequently accounted for these arrears, P.R. 15 Ed. II, D.K.R., vol. 42, p. 33.
159. Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/4 p. 636 and Ex. 1/1 m27.
the office of reeve, which while eliminating an extra official, also eliminated the sole local check on the reeve as an accounting official. This amalgamation of office was first clear in Michaelmas term 1350, when William Renrys was styled reeve and receiver (prepositus et receptor Regis) of Newcastle Lyons.161. The style of officials on writs of assignment on manorial revenue is another indication that by this stage, these offices had been fused.162.

It is just possible that the offices of reeve and receiver were one and the same, even in the early fourteenth century, though the evidence is far from conclusive. In 1314 Richard de Clongher was receiver of rent, farmer and reeve of Newcastle McKynegan.163. While he may have been the exception, it is interesting to note that although reeves were frequently mentioned by name, receivers never were, and that the office is only referred in conjunction to that of reeve. However, it is precisely because the reeve was the main accounting official that there was a greater chance of his being named in official records, whereas the receiver would merely have been the official who kept the counter-roll.

Monies accounted for and collected were clearly the reeve's responsibility until they were paid into the Exchequer. Two further attempts were made to increase the efficiency and reliability of the reeve, through forcing him to proffer at Michaelmas and Easter, as did the sheriffs, seneschals, mayors and bailiffs of towns. These took place respectively in 1323-4164. and 1334-5.165. Neither was successful, and on both occasions the attempt was abandoned after the first year. The reeves simply failed to comply through ignorance of the procedure or refused to proffer.

162. Thereafter, the style of reeve or receiver is indiscriminately used. In Michaelmas 1362 John Robard, reeve of Newcastle Lyons, was ordered to pay John Scrope 13s. 4d. of the issues of the manor, Mem. Roll 36-7 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/28, pp 183-4. John Robard, then styled nuper receptor of Newcastle Lyons, was given a day to render account in Trinity term 1363, Mem. Roll 36-7, Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/28, pp 272-3.
165. Mem. Roll 8-9 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/18 pp 272-4 and pp 494-5. Farmers also proffered on both of these occasions.
The office was elective, but could not be held by an hibernicus. In April 1320 John Francis of Esker attempted to evade office by pleading, after his election, that he was an hibernicus. Electors were expected to act as mainpernors for all newly elected reeves, in providing surety that the reeves would carry themselves well toward the King and the tenants of the manor, satisfying the King of the rent, farm and other issues of the manor. This particular phrase indicates that an oath was probably administered to the reeve on his election.

As was the case with the Seneschal of Demesne, reeves could be called upon to give expert advice in inquiries. When it was necessary to ascertain what arrears of rent were due from Marchelsrath, a tenement of Newcastle Lyons, in 1311, the sheriff of Dublin was ordered to have the reeves certify the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer. The obligations of the office were discharged without much obstruction throughout the fourteenth century. There were no conflicts of jurisdiction in Leixlip, where the reeve had a superior officer, the constable of the castle. One such incident did occur in Newcastle McKynegan, where, at some time prior to Easter 1310, Walter Haket, the constable, imprisoned Hugh Costellin, the reeve, and prevented him from levying the term's rent. Subsequently, in Trinity term, Haket was ordered to permit the reeve to levy without impediment. There also appears to have been only one occasion on which a subordinate officer defied the reeve's authority. In the autumn of 1350, John Whythend, receiver of the King's rent at Balycolman refused to account for £4-19-10, for which he ought to have acquitted the reeve, William Penrys. Thus, obstruction and problems with the central administration, other than those associated with indebtedness, do not appear to have affected the incumbents of this office to any great degree.

 Reeves of royal manors were either exceptionally good at concealing their corrupt practices or exceptionally honest. On only three occasions was action taken against specific reeves. The first was in 1309 when John Lympit, reeve of Newcastle Lyons, was found to have retained rent

166. Mem. Roll 13-14 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/12, p. 351 and Ex. 1/2 m 34d.
169. Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/4 pp 677-80 and Ex 1/1 m34d.
170. Ibid., p. 737 and Ibid., m40d.
for which he should have accounted. Walter Jordan, reeve of the borough of Ughterard was found guilty of unjust amercement and of deliberately holding the court at times when the tenants were unable to attend in 1315. The third instance occurred in 1359, when Peter, son of Reginald, reeve of Newcastle Lyons, was stripped of office for attempting to claim an allowance on a forged tally.

The Seneschal of Demesne

The most conspicuous innovation in the administration of the royal manors was the establishment of the office of Seneschal of Demesne. This office was first specifically mentioned in the memoranda roll of 3 Edward II, when, in Trinity term 1310, the mayor and bailiffs of the city of Dublin were ordered to have Thomas de Kent seneschallus terrarum dominicarum Regis, in the Exchequer to render account for the time he held office. There is a link between the emergence of the reeve and the formation of this office. The first seneschal's commission of appointment, that issued to Thomas de Kent in August 1307, was clearly part of the same general reform that led to the appointment of the manorial reeves. The actual terms of this commission were extremely vague. No specific office was mentioned, though he was to hold 'the courts of the said manors . . . and to receive the fealties of the tenants of the said lands'. A subsequent grant of the demesne lands of Dublin and Kildare made to Robert de Mouncens as Thomas de Kent had them, made in June 1308 and repeated in the following month, does not appear to have become effective. One cannot be categorical in this instance, given that little survives of the memoranda roll for 2 Edward II.

By 1309-10 the office was firmly established. In Michaelmas term of that year Thomas de Kent, acting as Keeper (custos) of the King's demesnes was commanded to cause all reeves and receivers to attend at the Exchequer on the morrow of the Purification. There may have been a short-term division of the office into local seneschalcies in the following year.

172. Me. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/4 pp 440-3 and Ex 1/1 m5.
175. Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/4, p. 738 and Ex. 1/1 m40d.
In Easter 1310, when the mills at Newcastle Lyons were granted to William Douce, the seneschal of the King's lands there (ibidem) was instructed to effect the conveyance, and the seneschal of Saggard was ordered to inhibit rent in the hand of Martin le Lang. There were certainly local seneschals at both Esker and Leixlip. Ultimately, the Seneschal of Demesne does not appear to have functioned outside Newcastle Lyons, Saggard and Crumlin, but became the sole official acting in this capacity within those manors. His services would not have been required in Chapelizod, which was continually at farm, and probably could not have been expected in the case of manors like Obrun and Newcastle McKyneegan, which were, by the early fourteenth century, on the verge of being absorbed into the land of war.

The Seneschal of Demesne was both a local manorial official and an agent of the Exchequer. In functions such as the collection of debts, the summoning of juries, and in ensuring the presence of manorial officials in the Exchequer, when they were called on to account, the office overlapped with that of the sheriff, and occasionally that of municipal officials. Indeed, the seneschal was to take over one of the sheriff's functions. In 1303 the goods of a deceased royal betagh called Clement O'cathye were valued by the sheriff, while in 1322 the Seneschal of Demesne, rather than the sheriff, was ordered to take all goods belonging to Richard Beg of Saggard on his death into the King's hand.

The collection of debts was an area in which the office of both the sheriff and the Seneschal of Demesne clearly overlapped. Responsibility for levying debts due to the King in any shire ultimately rested with the sheriff and receiver of that shire. There were, however, occasions on which the seneschal was ordered to make such levies, but this may have been confined to royal demesne land. In Michaelmas 1319, the Seneschal of Demesne was ordered to levy, through the sale of grain and other goods, all arrears of rent at Crumlin and elsewhere in the county. The closeness of this relationship with the sheriff is underlined in the 1324

---

179. Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 1/4 pp 703-4 and Ex. 1/1 m37.
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182. Mem. Roll 3 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/4, p.726 and Ex 1/1 m40.
186. Mem. Roll 13-14 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/12, p. 114 and Ex. 1/2 m12d.
order addressed to both officials to have all reeves, from Esker and elsewhere in the demesnes, render account and satisfy the King. The same could be said of the Seneschal of Desmesne's involvement in summoning bodies which acted in a similar manner to a jury. When the sheriff and the seneschal were associated in the summoning of the reeves and receivers to appear in the Exchequer in Michaelmas 1324, they were also ordered to have present 24 persons from the tenement of Esker, both Irish and English. Some form of enquiry must have taken place. On two separate occasions, the first in Michaelmas 1315 and subsequently in Easter 1320, the Seneschal of Demesne was ordered to have elected and bring to the Exchequer two men from Newcastle Lyons to take part in a similar form of enquiry.

The seneschal's main local functions were the holding of the manorial courts, the conduct of enquiries into the state of the manor and the supervision of rudimentary local defences. He also supervised the delivery of tenements to new tenants or farmers, though on one occasion the sheriff was called on to act in this capacity. This was in Trinity 1348, when the mill at Newcastle Lyons was granted to Thomas Pipard, the then Seneschal of Desmesne.

Only one seneschal's account survives, that of Thomas de Warilow, who held office from 1st of July 1327 to 17th of March 1332. He accounted for £30 during this period, the extent of the pleas and perquisites of Newcastle Lyons being £3-6-8 per annum and those of Saggard and Crumlin being respectively £2-6-8 and £1 per annum. None of the other manors of the vale of Dublin was mentioned in this account. The seneschal's involvement with the manor court was what lay behind the association of William de Barton, then Seneschal of Desmesne, with the repairing of the house in which the court met in Newcastle Lyons in 1357.

The most spectacular attempt by the seneschals to assert their power as conveners of these courts were the two attempts to enforce the suit of court they felt was owed for a tenement held by the abbot of St. Mary's for a tenement held in Newcastle Lyons. This had been granted to the

Abbey as compensation for damage done to its mill through the erection of the royal double mill at Dublin Castle. According to a complaint dealt with by the Exchequer in Michaelmas 1339, Walter de Coumbe, then Seneschal of Demesne, attempted to establish that the abbot owed suit of court for this tenement. The Treasurer and Barons ultimately decided that no service was due from this land except the 8d. per annum, which made up the balance of the value of this tenement after an annual allowance of 10 marks was paid to the abbot in compensation for the damage to the abbey mill. A subsequent unsuccessful attempt to enforce this suit of court was made by Thomas Pipard.

The Seneschal of Demesne was also obliged to enquire into any use of royal timber or waste on the royal demesne manors. Grants of wood from the royal woodland on the manors had to be cut in such a way as to minimise waste. When wood was required for the repair of the mill at Newcastle Lyons in 1321, the seneschal was obliged to supervise the cutting. Enquiries into waste on royal manors took place on the 10th of July 1374 under Walter Somery, who was then seneschal. The cases of waste examined in this enquiry were largely concerned with the theft of wood or trees, most of which took place on Esker. He was subsequently ordered to enquire into the general state of Esker. Its farmer, Reginald Lovell, had become an absentee and was liable for considerable arrears of farm at the Exchequer. Somery was to ascertain how much rent remained in the hands of the tenants and to find the most efficient ways of levying these debts.

Seneschals were also obliged to oversee the local defences of the three manors in which they acted. The fact that two of these, Saggard and Newcastle Lyons, were so vulnerable to raiding from the mountains meant that their defence largely formed part of the defence of the city and county and would have been undertaken in the form of highly localised watch and ward operations. Full dress expeditions against the mountain Irish and other major defensive operations could not have been undertaken by the Seneschal of Demesne. The two occasions on which that officer is known to have taken an active military role in the defence of the royal manors illustrate the scope of his power.

The first of these occasions was in Hilary term 1316, when the seneschal was ordered to assign a good custody to the neighbourhood of Newcastle Lyons, because the tenants were fleeing with their goods and chattels on account of the malice and rebellion of the Irish of the Leinster mountains. In comparison with the major campaigns, like the autumn expedition of 1315 led by Warin Oweyn and the subsequent attempt to ward the area between the mountains and the river under William Comyn, this pales into insignificance. At best, it could only have been seen as a token gesture against a threat of such magnitude. The other occasion on which the seneschal was involved in local defence was when Walter Somery was paid 100s. by one of the Saggard reeves to construct a ditch for the defence of the manor. Somery was called to account for this money in November 1373. Both instances indicate the restricted nature of the Seneschal of Demesne's power and responsibilities in respect of the defence of the royal manors.

The seneschalcie was initially held by men with no responsibilities other than those involved in the discharge of this office. Neither Thomas de Kent, Maurice Tyre, Hacketus de la Sale nor Henry de Nasshe appears to have been attached either to the Chancery or to the Exchequer. Of these men, only Thomas de Kent appears to have been retained as a major administrator of royal lands outside the vale of Dublin and then only in the initial months of his tenure of office. In February 1308 he was ordered to guard the goods, chattels, lands and tenements of the Templars at Fulletoun in Tram.

This situation changed with Thomas de Dent's appointment as Seneschal of Demesne in Trinity term, 1332. This was Dent's first important appointment. He was subsequently to act as a Justice of the Common Bench and as Chief Justice of the Bench. His successors, Walter de Coumbe.

200. Ibid., pp 768-70 and Ibid., pp 380-3.
205. See Chapter I: Table IV, Seneschals of Demesne, for his term of office. He was also a Chamberlain of the Exchequer, Richardson and Sayles, Admin. of Ireland, pp 122-3.
and William de Epworth, both had strong Exchequer connections. An experiment, the appointment of an absentee, Thomas Pipard, who acted by deputy and appears to have had no connection with the administration, was finally abandoned in 1358, with the appointment of another Exchequer official, William de Barton. Walter Somery, the last seneschal of the reign of Edward III, was a valletus in the household of either Lionel of Clarence or William of Windsor.

Clearly, from Thomas Dent's tenure of office onwards, the seneschalcie was increasingly treated as a sinecure within the gift of the Council or the Treasurer. This did not mean that the quality of administration declined, though some of the more inactive seneschals were, like Thomas Dent himself, or William Epworth, Justices or Exchequer officials. Against this, however, must be set the record of men like Walter de Coumbe and Walter Somery, whose activity compares favourably with that of earlier seneschals like Thomas de Kent and Henry Nasshe, despite their additional obligations. Thus, the office that had emerged as part of the structural reform of the royal manors in 1307, had by the end of Edward III's reign, become a sinecure. This was ultimately only as useful to the administration as its holder was prepared to be an active officer.

The significance of the royal manors cannot be understated. They formed the only manorial group for which a consecutive series of data has survived, spanning both the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries. They were also the first group known to have been managed on a strictly rentier basis. This group is also of importance in that it was one of the major Leinster lordships. Extent material has enabled an examination of the administrative structures of these manors, and the degree to which such structures were adapted or modified in the constant struggle to restore profitability in the case of the two most valuable of the royal demesne manors, Saggard and Newcastle Lyons.

206. See Chapter I: Table IV for his term of office, he was also a Baron of the Exchequer, Richardson and Sayles, Admin. of Ireland, pp 110-11.
207. See Chapter I: Table IV for his term of office, and for the brief term of office of his immediate successor, William Botte.
208. See Chapter I: Table IV for his term of office. He was a senior clerk in Chancery and Chief Engrosser of the Exchequer and subsequently Chamberlain, Richardson and Sayles, Admin. of Ireland, p. 18 n. 4 and p. 123.
209. See Chapter I: Table IV for his term of office and also Mem. Roll 47-8 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/30, p. 367.
In a sense, these manors can be seen as reflecting the overall development and decline of manorial Ireland. Their initial profitability in the first half of the thirteenth century was not sustained in the face of pressure from the Irish of the Leinster mountains, one of the most intractable areas of march and land of war in the lordship of Ireland as a whole. The famines of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries would have compounded the problems caused by raids from the mountains, as would the upheaval caused by the Bruce Invasion.

While the impact of individual crises cannot be quantified, the cumulative impact of these crises, particularly visible in the impoverished tenantry of Newcastle Lyons and Saggard by the 1330's, cannot be ignored. Similarly, the effects of the Black Death should be seen more in cumulative than in immediate terms. The first visitation of plague does not appear to have posed any specific problems for the authorities, but the revisions of rents in the 1360's and 1370's were a direct result of recurring visitations of the plague, coupled with a low demographic replacement level. Thus, in general terms, the royal manors of Dublin and Kildare can be seen as an important economic and administrative sounding-board, vulnerable to political reverses, worsening weather conditions and famines and the subjects of a number of largely unsuccessful reforms, aimed at restoring their profitability.
CHAPTER II

The survival of a series of excellent accounts for both the manors and the boroughs of the lordship of Carlow in the late thirteenth century was probably due to Edward I's interest in and ultimate acquisition of the lands of Roger Bygod. It is also possible, though not as likely, that these accounts were not brought to London until shortly before Edward II granted the lordship, along with Bygod's other lands and his earldom of Norfolk, to his half-brother, Thomas de Brotherton in 1312.

Bygod, in his capacity as Earl of Norfolk and Marshal of England was one of the most powerful magnates and had played a leading role in opposing the King during the constitutional crisis of 1297. Any diminution of his influence would have been in the King's interest. For reasons which remain unclear, whether for debt or for some matter of politics, Bygod's Irish lands were taken into the King's hand at some time prior to the 15th September 1299 and for a second time on some date prior to the 24th May 1301. In 1302 Bygod, as a result of financial embarrassment and with the consent of his brother and heir, John surrendered the earldom, the marshalsea and his lands to the King. These were regranted to him and to the heirs of his body. As he was childless this merely amounted to the grant of a life interest in the titles and lands, which were, on Bygod's death, to revert to the crown. In return for this surrender he was relieved of his financial difficulties. From 1302 until the Earl's death in 1306, the lordship of Carlow was in a similar position to that of the liberty of Kildare following William de Vesey's surrender of this lordship to the King and his subsequent death in 1297. The accounts of the manors and boroughs and of the liberty

1. These accounts, along with a number of receivers' accounts of Elizabeth de Clare's Irish lands in the mid fourteenth century and two accounts with duplicates and a third badly damaged account of Kildare lands in the hands of the Earl of Ormond in the early fifteenth century comprise P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237-9.
5. Ibid., no. 813.
Carlow were probably removed to London to provide some indication of the value of the lordship other than that given in either the inquisition of March 1305 or the inquisition post mortem of April 1307. There are, thus, three possible reasons for their removal to England. Bygod might have been required to produce some evidence as to the value of his Irish lands prior to the arrangement of 1302, in which case they would probably have been sent to London in the winter of 1301-2. It should be noted in this context that none of the accounts postdate 1294.

It is also possible that they might have been brought over for use as exemplars by royal officials estimating revenue due from the lordship following Bygod's death or to give de Brotherton some indication of the value of the Irish lands granted to him with the earldom of Norfolk in 1312.

The surviving accounts for the liberty of Carlow, with the exception of accounts for two wardships and the Treasurer's accounts, are for manors, boroughs and mills which would have been continuously in the Earl's hands. Comparatively little of the lordship was administered directly on behalf of the Earl. Accounts have survived for the manors of Fennagh and Fothered in Carlow, the manor of Ballysax in Kildare and the manor of Old Ross in Wexford. Of these manors Old Ross was the

---

8. C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 367. This inquisition merely gives valuations and contains no detailed extents.
9. Ibid., no. 617 for a translation of the original which is occasionally inaccurate; Cal. Inq. vol. IV, London 1913 no. 434 and P.R.O. C 133/127 m31-m37.
10. The latest of the Treasurer's accounts runs from 30th September 1293 to 30th September 1294, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/1-9.
11. The wardships are those of Tullagh (Tullowphelim parish County Carlow) which was in the Earl's hand from the death of Theobald Butler in 1285 to 29th September 1287, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/58-61 and Rathbile (Rathvilly Co. Carlow) in 1289-90, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/24.
13. The manor of Fynuagh clearly lies within the parish of Fennagh in Co. Carlow. This parish lies in three separate baronies, Rathvilly, Firth and Idrone. The townland of Fennagh lies in the barony of Idrone (Townland Index) and this is the portion of the parish nearest the mountains and therefore, most likely to have been within the march in the late thirteenth century.
14. Now the parish of Grangeford, Co. Carlow. The more usual identification of this name is with the barony of Firth, E. St. John Brooks, Knights' Fees in Counties Wexford, Carlow and Kilkenny, Dublin 1950, p. 51, p. 60, pp 62-3 and G.H. Orpen, Normans III, Oxford 2nd edition 1966, p. 82 and the barony of Firth did form part of the liberty of Carlow. The acreage of the manor of Pothered as calculated from the 1307 extent was as follows, demesne and land held by free tenants 975 acres 1 stang, 73 burgages (each burgage: 6 acres; 1289 extent of Newtown Jerpoint P.R.O. S.C. 11 794) and 29 cottages multiplied by 2.5 (the medieval acre is equal to 2 2/3 statute acres)= 3,562 statute acres. The acreage of the parish of Grangeford is 3,503 acres 0 roods 12 perches (Revised Ordnance Survey, Carlow 1873-4). All acreages listed in the text of this chapter are given in terms of medieval acres.
largest. It was primarily a centre for stock rearing, especially sheep, though the importance of tillage and the area of land under grain expanded consistently during the 1280's. Both Fothered and Ballysax were centres of mixed farming. Operations in stock rearing in both of these manors were closely co-ordinated, with surplus animals being moved from one to the other. Fennagh was the smallest of the four manors. A large proportion of its tenants were of betagh status. The primary importance of this manor was as a centre of grain production, the stock kept there being mainly oxen and affers for ploughing, harrowing and carting. These manors, together with the boroughs of Fothered, Carlow, New Ross, Old Ross and Insula 15 formed the nucleus of the lordship of Carlow. The borough of Carlow was the administrative centre and caput of the liberty. New Ross was one of the two major trading centres of the south-east. It had come to prominence as a port from which purveyed grain and other supplies were sent to the Welsh wars, and also the port from which the agricultural produce of the liberty was exported. Although a prosperous centre of trade during the period from which accounts have survived, it seems, if one takes the great custom on hides, fleeces and wool as an indication of prosperity, to have declined considerably by the early fourteenth century. 16. This may reflect a shift in trading patterns which would have favoured the northern ports, especially Drogheda, as a result of purveyance for the war in Scotland, but could also be an early indication of a more general decline in the prosperity of the ports of the lordship of Ireland. The boroughs of Old Ross and Fothered were considerably smaller than those of Carlow and New Ross. They were essentially off-shoots of manorial centres where privileged conditions of tenure would have been offered as an inducement in order to establish areas of strong, nucleated settlement. The borough at Insula was the smallest and least important of the non-manorial boroughs of the lordship of Carlow in terms of its revenue.


16. G. MacNiocaill, Na Buigeisi, vol. 2, Dublin 1964, p. 525 for a table of receipts from the great custom at Drogheda and p. 528 for receipts from the great custom at New Ross. While the volume of trade at New Ross is undoubtedly greater than that at Drogheda there is a steady decline in receipts from this custom overlaid by periodic erratic fluctuations. Receipts at Drogheda are more stable. See also pp 94-5 below.
Its significance may have been strategic and probably lay in the fact that Great Island commands the entry to the Barrow estuary and was a landing place for ferries connecting various points along the coastline of the bay.

Accounts of individual manors and boroughs within the lordship of Carlow fulfilled a double purpose. They formed one of the particulars for payments made by the local reeve to the Treasurer and by the Treasurer or by other reeves to the local reeve, thus providing a control for certain sections of accounts rendered either by the Treasurer or other officials. These accounts also provided a thorough record of the issues of the manor or borough in question and of necessary expenditure there during a given period. Reeves of boroughs were answerable for the fixed rent of the borough, revenue derived from the prise of ale, tolls, the pleas and perquisites of the hundred court, stallage, revenue derived from the annual fair, if a fair was held in the borough, and the pleas and perquisites of the court held during that fair. In the case of three of the boroughs, Carlow, New Ross, and Insula, the issues of the mill were accounted for separately. There are no accounts of this nature for the boroughs of Old Ross and Fothered which would have been served by the manorial mill. Meadow attached to boroughs could also be a source of considerable revenue and was accounted for separately at both Carlow and New Ross. These meadow accounts were subsequently integrated into the main body of the borough account. Reeves of manors were answerable for income arising from the sale of stock and grain and the issues of the manorial court and mill. Certain items were not, however, accounted for in detail in their accounts. Both fixed rent, whether for land held by free tenants with charters or land held by betaghs, and farms were expressed in global terms of acreage held or leased rather than individual tenements and the revenue generated by this land during the period of account. There are three extant rentals separate from the series of manorial accounts for Old Ross, and there is also a rental with what amounts to a manorial account for Old Ross in this series. These rentals predate the main body of manorial

17. P.R.O. Sc 1237/18, 19, 20.  
18. P.R.O. Sc 6 1238/26, 34, 36, 38, 40.  
20. P.R.O. Sc 6 1237/12, 13.  
22. P.R.O. Sc 6 1239/11, 12.  
accounts for this manor. There is no section in any of these later accounts dealing with the fixed rent of and land held at farm in Old Ross. Similar rentals may have existed for the other manors of the lordship, though it is possible that the large number of tenements held at farm in the baronies of Old Ross and of Insula prompted this form of accounting as a measure of convenience. While sections dealing with fixed rents and farms appear in the accounts of the manors of Ballysax and Fennagh, they do not appear in the manorial accounts of either Fothered or Old Ross. No rentals have survived other than those for Old Ross. Thus, while annual rentals may have been compiled for all the manors in the lordship of Carlow, it is more likely that such rentals were only compiled for Old Ross. The rents of free tenants, cottagers and burgesses were accounted for by the reeve of the borough at Fothered.24. The system of accounting was similar to that in the royal Exchequer in Dublin.25. Reeves of manors and boroughs were answerable for the issues and revenues generated in their bailiwick during their term of office. Their accounts were accompanied by receipts, tallies, indentures and other forms of particular relating to monies either collected or expended. The Treasurer's account was the master, or central, account for the liberty, while the accounts of the reeves of manors and boroughs and keepers of mills and meadows formed a subsidiary series of dependent accounts.

The surviving ministers' accounts for the liberty of Carlow are of immense importance in that they are the only surviving source for Ireland which reflects in detail the final phase of the agrarian boom associated with the provisioning of the Welsh wars. Consistent expansion of the area under cultivation and a steady growth in the amount of the marketable grain surplus produced, together with the manorialisation of hitherto unmanorialised centres like Fennagh, were all symptomatic of the impact of this continuous increase in demand. The systematic expansion of the flocks at Old Ross and Fothered, together with the maintenance of the flock at Ballysax was another aspect of the response

to this particular economic stimulus. However, by 1307, when the
lands were extended on Bygod's death, signs of considerable
contraction and decline, are discernible, even given the propensity of
medieval jurors to undervalue and conceal. This stemmed from two major
factors: the impact of the agrarian crises of the 1290's and in
particular the famine of 1294-6 and the steady collapse of the purveyance
economy during the same period due to the impoverishment of the
Exchequer. Thus, the data surviving from the Carlow estates, the
ministers' accounts and the 1307 extents, is of critical importance
in examining what was ultimately a pivotal period when the agrarian
economy of the lordship of Ireland was poised between the expansion
and prosperity of the mid-thirteenth century and the unceasing decline
and contraction of the first two decades of the fourteenth century.

Fothered

By the time of the 1307 inquisition post mortem, the manorial caput
at Fothered had become somewhat dilapidated.26 There was a small
chamber and a grange which was nearly levelled to the ground.
Neither building was valued, and it was stated in the extent that no
one was willing to rent the stone chamber. The jurors said that
there were 168 acres of demesne land which they valued at £12-5-4
or 17½d. an acre. There were also 20 acres of meadow, worth 13s. 4d.,
a valuation considerably lower than the more usual late thirteenth
century valuations of meadow in Carlow at 2s. an acre, and a pasture
called Oxmiles containing 10 acres, which was worth 3s. 6d.. The
jurors were unable to extend a further 10 acres of pasture.

The amount of demesne land attached to this manor appears to have
contracted considerably by 1307, in comparison with the acreage of

26. For all material relating to this extent see C.D.I. 1302-7,
p. 174; Cal. Ing. P.M., vol. IV p. 305 and
P.R.O. C. 133/127, m 32. See also Map III.
demesne cultivated there during the 1280's. The acreage given by the jurors in the 1507 extent would have included land lying fallow. In no year during the period for which accounts have survived for the manor of Fothered were less than 127 acres sown. At the beginning of the 1280's the acreage under cultivation varied from 146 acres in 1279-80 to 127 acres in 1280-1. On the basis that this amount of land was cultivated during these years under three course rotation, 73 acres and 63½ acres respectively lay fallow, indicating that there were between 190½ acres and 214 acres of demesne in the early 1280's. The area of demesne under cultivation during this decade grew steadily, so that by 1286-7 and 1287-8 there were 189 acres and 196 acres respectively under cultivation. This is an indication that there would probably have been between 270 acres and 280 acres of demesne land at Fothered by 1288. While there is no direct evidence to support this supposition, it is possible that such a steady increase in the area of demesne land under cultivation may have been brought about in part through very simple forms of land reclamation or assarting. This expansion may have been a response to a lively grain market. While deliberate undervaluation on the part of the jurors in 1307 may go some way towards explaining the contraction in the area of demesne which is apparent from their extent and the manorial accounts of the 1280's, it may also be an indication of a slackening in demographic expansion and a decline in the price of grain. Marginal land used for the cultivation of grain in Fothered during the 1280's may have lapsed into waste by the early fourteenth century.

Some, but not very much, of the land which fell out of cultivation might have originally been meadow. In 1279-80 there were 32 acres of meadow mowed at Fothered. During the following decade the largest acreage of meadow mowed there and noted in the accounts was 19½ acres in 1282-3. No meadow was mowed in 1286-7 and only 11 acres in the following year. While pasture is not specifically mentioned in the accounts and demesne land lying fallow was probably used for this purpose, the amount of stock kept at Fothered was such that the 20 acres of pasture noted in the 1307 extent may also have been used for this purpose during the 1280's. Thus, while the surplus demesne of the 1280's may have reverted in part to meadow or pasture by the early fourteenth century.

27. See Chapter II: Table I.
29. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/47.
30. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/53 and 55 respectively.
century and some of it may have been leased to farmers on a casual basis or concealed by the jurors in 1307, it is likely that a significant proportion of this land fell into disuse.

Despite short-term fluctuations, the amount of grain under cultivation at Fothered increased during the 1280's. The crop produced for the market was wheat. While the acreage sown with oats was often larger than that sown with wheat, the relative yield in relation to the amount of grain sown was considerably lower. Most of the oats harvested at Fothered, and in the other manors of the Bygod lordship, was retained for use as fodder for the oxen, the affers and the horses of local or visiting officials or as seed grain for the following year. Apart from grain retained as seed, most of the wheat harvested was sold. Acreages under cultivation rose during the decade and with them the yields of wheat and oats. The most significant feature of this increase was the proportionally greater rate at which the acreage under wheat was added to in relation to that under oats - a clear indication that increased demesne acreage was a response to an expansion of the market. In the first four years for which accounts survive at Fothered, the amount of land under oats was consistently greater than that under wheat. From 1283 to 1287, the area of land under wheat was closer in size to that under oats, exceeding it on two occasions. In 1287-8, the last year for which accounts have survived for Fothered, the area of land under oats was increased to 103 acres, 10 acres more than were sown with wheat. This may have been the beginning of a return to the practices of the early years of the decade. If this was the case it is worth noting that in relative terms the gap between the acreages under wheat and oats had, by this stage, narrowed considerably.

Sowing techniques appear to have changed during the 1280's. Initially, seed grain was sown at the rate of \( \frac{1}{10} \) crannoc to the acre, both in wheat and oats. By 1282-3 that pattern had begun to change, when the amount of seed in both grains sown fell slightly short of this rate. In the following years this shortfall became more apparent in the amount of wheat used to sow an acre. With the exception of 1286-7, when 47 crannocs were used to sow 96½ acres, the amount of wheat sown never exceeded 41 crannocs and 1 bushel, while the area under wheat varied from 79 acres to 96½ acres, with the mean acreage under wheat in this period being 87½ acres. It should be noted that a change of this sort

31. For all statistics relating to grain yields at Fothered see Chapter II: Table I.
in the sowing of oats first became apparent in 1286-7 and 1287-8, when the acreage under oats rose considerably. While these changes at Fothered may have affected grain yields, it is impossible to quantify or even to determine such effects with any degree of accuracy. An initial examination of the table of yields at Fothered seems to indicate that the harvests of the 1280's represented a considerable decline on the harvest of 1279. It is unlikely that all the grain in the granary there at the beginning of the year came from the harvest of 1279. A considerable proportion of this grain may have been bought in or kept in store from the previous year's harvest. It is unlikely that the acreage sown in 1278-9 was appreciably higher than that of 1279-80 and equally unlikely that a yield of approximately 4 crannocs to the acre would have been obtained in either wheat or oats. The mean return for a grain of wheat sown at Fothered in the 1280's was 3.27 grains, considerably lower than the mean on the estates of the bishopric of Winchester in the thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth century of 3.83 grains and the fivefold yield of wheat expected in the 1304 Cloncurry extent, while the mean return for a grain of oats sown was 2.85, somewhat higher than that expected in the Cloncurry extent. There were three extremely poor harvests in wheat in 1280, 1283 and 1287, though the effects of the dry summers of this decade seem to have been considerably less severe at Fothered than on the manors of the bishopric of Winchester. The manor had extremely poor harvests in oats in 1280 and 1281 but yields did not fall to those levels for the remainder of the decade.

The most important form of stock rearing practised at Fothered was sheep rearing. This appears to have been begun as a means of accommodating surplus animals from Ballysax in what may originally have been intended as an attempt to spread wool production in the northern portion of the lordship of Carlow between these two manors. In 1280-1, 149 lambs were sent from Ballysax to Fothered. Sometime during that year 13 ewes were also acquired. A further 150 lambs were sent from Ballysax to Fothered

33. The Red Book of Ormond, Ed. N.B. White, pp 28-9. An acre of wheat required 5 bushels of seed while an acre of oats required 12 bushels. An acre of wheat was expected to yield 2 3/4 crannocs, while an acre of oats was expected to yield 2 crannocs.
34. For all statistics relating to sheep rearing and also the sale of ewes' and cows' milk at Fothered see Chapter II: Table II.
in the following year. These attempts to build up the flock at Fothered met with initial success to such an extent that 80 wethers were sent from Fothered to Ballysax in 1282-3. Up to this point there had been no major outbreak of murrain. In the following year when 28 ewes, 25 yearlings and 30 wethers were lost as a result of murrain, 196 lambs were sent from Ballysax, which was itself severely hit by murrain, in an attempt to replace the lost stock. Despite a severe incidence of murrain in the yearlings in 1284-5 and a more general outbreak in the following year, no further re-stocking from Ballysax was attempted until 1286-7, when 124 lambs were sent to Fothered, and 1287-8 when a further 145 lambs were received from Ballysax. This seems to indicate that concerted efforts were being made to ensure that Fothered remained adequately stocked.

Initial sales of wool from Fothered were low. In 1280-1 only 6 stones of lambs' wool and 8 of a stone of wool were sold. By the end of the decade this had risen considerably. More than 20 stones of wool were sold for the first time in 1284-5 and while wool sales in the following year only amounted to 9 stones, it is worth noting that 130 fleeces never reached the market. In the last year for which accounts have survived, 1287-8, 38\(\frac{3}{4}\) stones of wool were sold. It is apparent from figures in the Fothered accounts that a stone of wool contained between 9 and 11 fleeces of mature sheep or from 19 to 32 lambs' fleeces. The milk from ewes was also sold, initially in the form of cheese, following the practice at Ballysax and Old Ross, but subsequently as milk. The number of ewes kept at both Ballysax and Old Ross was considerably greater than that kept at Fothered, where it might not have been profitable to retain a dairymaid to make cheese on a regular basis. A small vaccary had been established at Fothered by 1282-3. From this year the milk of both cows and ewes kept on the manor was sold. As milk producing units the cows were more efficient than ewes. The valuation of milk produced by a single cow in the course of a year was 2s.. Twice in the accounts, in 1284-5 and again in 1287-8, it was asserted that the milk produced by 10 ewes was equal in value to that produced by a cow. This was a conservative valuation of the cow's worth, for in 1283-4 the milk of 16 ewes was worth 2s.. The number of ahrs and oxen kept at Fothered increased slowly until 1283-4, when it became more stable.

35. In that year there were 9 cows at Fothered (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/44). This subsequently rose to 21 cows in 1286-7 (P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/53) and 19 cows in 1287-8 (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/55).

36. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/49 and 55 respectively.
From that year to the final year for which accounts have survived there were usually between 5 and 7 affers and 24 oxen on the manor in any particular year.37 This increase in draught stock over the 5 affers and 6 oxen of 1279-8038 almost certainly mirrors the expansion in the area of demesne under cultivation in the 1280's.

**Fennagh**

The extent of Fennagh in the 1307 inquisition post mortem is an extent of a district or area of settlement rather than a manorial extent.39 No land was specified by the jurors as forming the demesne or being beneath the lord's plough. There were no buildings forming a manorial caput and the mill, which the jurors described but did not value had collapsed and was waste. Fennagh seems to have been in an area of march-land by 1307, for of the 6 carucates 47 acres and 1 stang valued and extended by the jurors Donough Mac Murrough held 2 carucates 8 acres and 1 stang for life. The harvest works of tenants there and a monetary payment in lieu of suit to the mill by the betaghs were both valued at 6s. 8d. per annum. There were also 15 acres of meadow worth 7s. 6d..

Fennagh appears to have been established as a manorial centre in the late 1270's or early 1280's on an experimental basis. The first account for the manor to have survived was that rendered in 1281 by Thomas de Clene, its bailiff.40 A substantial sum of money, £4-14-5, was received by Thomas from the reeves of the borough and manor of Fothered and Ely de Boly, reeve of Ballysax. Total receipts from the manor in that year, including monies thus received, were only £6-8-3. A man was hired to measure the land of the betaghs, and while 5 acres of meadow were mown, the only grain sown was 11 acres of oats. The seed had been sent to Fennagh by Henry le Porter, reeve of the manor of Fothered. A small area of land, not more than 2½ acres, had also been set to farm. No accounts have

---

37. cf. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/53, the account for 1286-7. In that year there were 6 affers and 24 oxen at Fothered. By the following year this had increased to 10 affers and 28 oxen (P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/55) though it is impossible to establish whether or not this growth continued in the 1290's as the account for this year is the last surviving manorial account for Fothered.


39. For all material relating to this extent see C.D.I. 1302-7, Ed. H. Sweetman, London 1886, p. 175, Cal. Inq. P.M. vol. IV p. 306 and P.R.O. C 133/127 m 32d. See also Map III.

40. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/32.
survived for Fennagh in the following year. The bailiff was still dependent on monies received from Fothered and Ballysax in 1282-3, though the extent of this dependence had decreased considerably. Receipts for that year totalled £14-3-3½ of which only £4-15-4¾ was received from the reeves of the manor and borough of Fothered and the reeve of Ballysax. The amount of land under cultivation in Fennagh during that year is an indication of the initial success of the manorialisation of this area, with 64 acres of wheat and 94 acres of oats sown.

Grain sales were considerable, given the acreage under cultivation and the length of time for which Fennagh had been a manorial centre. The income derived from rents at Fennagh fluctuated from year to year throughout the decade. A majority of the tenants were betagh. Their rent was worth £25-9-11½ in 1283-4. This had risen to £29-2-7 in 1287-8 and £30-2-0 in 1288-9. The other income derived from rents at Fennagh came from a number of cottagers. Their rent fluctuated from 8s. 4d. in 1283-4 to 6s. 2d. in 1288-9. Payments made to enter into a tie of avowary with the Earl were also classified as rent. These rose from 3s. 8d. in 1283-4 to 10s. in 1289-90. The large number of betagh tenants at Fennagh and the amount of money derived from payments for avowary is another indication that Fennagh was probably within the march. Its location may account in part for its loss of value and abandonment as a manorial centre.

An experiment similar to that at Fennagh was attempted at Dunleckny in the mid 1280's. In an account rendered by a master ploughman at Dunleckny, which ran from 1st of August 1287 to 2nd February 1288, it was stated that 16 acres were sown with wheat and 42 acres with oats. The yield of oats from the previous year's harvest had been 8 crannocs. A little under half the amount of oats sown, 9 crannocs, were received from the bailiff of Fennagh. Of 8 crannocs and 7 bushels of wheat sown 5 crannocs also came from Fennagh. In the following year 16½ acres were sown with

41. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/33.
42. See Chapter II: Table III.
43. Ibid.
44. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/34.
45. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/38 and 39 respectively.
46. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/34 and 39 respectively.
47. Ibid.
48. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/27. This account was for Dunlec'. For location see Map III.
wheat and 29 acres with oats. Less grain was received for use as seed from Fennagh. Of the oats harvested at Dunleekny in 1288 46 crannocs and 3 bushels were sold. There were 5 cottagers holding land in Dunleekny in 1287-8. No further accounts have survived for this putative manorial centre. There is, thus, no indication as to whether the experiment met with a degree of success similar to that at Fennagh. The fact that the official accounting for Fennagh and one of the officials accounting for Dunleekny were styled bailiffs rather than reeves may have been an indication of the newness of both these areas as manorial centres. By 1307, all attempts to organise Dunleekny as a manorial centre seem to have been abandoned. The jurors extended 55 acres of land at Dunleekny and Leighlin, of which 14 acres were worth 7s. per annum. The remainder lay waste 'for defect of tenants and the poverty of the land'. There were 6 cottagers at Dunleekny in 1307 whose cottages were worth 6s. Both Fennagh and Dunleekny appear to have been experiments in the formation of manorial centres in areas from which the only income previously accruing to the Earl had come from rents. They may have been a response to expansion in the increasingly lucrative grain market. Of these two experiments, Fennagh was spectacularly successful for a little over half a decade, while Dunleekny, from surviving material, does not seem to have grown to the same extent.

Patterns of cultivation at Fennagh were similar to those at Fothered. From an extremely low base of 64 acres in 1282-3, the area of land under wheat increased steadily, reaching a maximum expanse of 92 acres and 1 stang in 1286-7, levelling off to 83 acres and 82 acres respectively in the two years following. There was no similar increase in the area under oats. This had stood at 94 acres in 1282-3 and had, by 1286-7, declined to 80 acres and 1 stang. In the two following years the acreage sown with oats was identical to that sown with wheat. Techniques of sowing had also undergone a change similar to that seen at Fothered. Initially \( \frac{1}{2} \) crannoc of seed was used to sow each acre. By 1286-7 there was a significant shortfall in the amount of wheat being sown, ranging from


50. Nicholas de Earne was bailiff of Dunleekny from 1st May to 1st November 1288 P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/28.

51. For all material relating to this extent see C.D.I. 1302-7, p. 175, Cal. Inq. P.M. vol. IV p. 306 and P.R.O. C 133/127 m 32d.

52. For all statistics relating to grain yields at Fennagh see Chapter II: Table III.
A slight shortfall also occurred in the amount of oats used as seed. Crop yields at Fennagh were initially extremely high. The mean yield in wheat in the four harvests from 1283 to 1286 was 4.5 grains to each grain of seed as opposed to an overall mean yield for the period from 1283-9 of 3.7 grains. There were two exceptionally good harvests, in 1284 and 1286 when this ratio was as high as 5.1 and 4.6 respectively. The yields in oats were equally high in the first four years for which they can be determined. As the decade progressed yields dropped considerably. The harvests of 1287 and 1288 were well below average in 1287, the harvest of the following year was the second best of the six years for which such ratios can be determined. The pattern of yields at Fennagh during this period of seven years may provide some indication as to why the manor was eventually dismantled or abandoned. If, as seems to have been the case, intensive cultivation had only begun in Fennagh in the early 1280's, soil which was probably marginal would, on first being cropped, have produced misleadingly good results. Following the first years of cultivation, this exceptional fertility would have diminished. This appears to have been the case with wheat in Fennagh. Yields in oats were better and more consistent, an indication that the soil may have been either too damp or not sufficiently rich to produce good crops of wheat over a protracted period. Changing patterns of trade may also have affected the profitability of such experiments. By the early fourteenth century New Ross seems to have begun to decline in importance as a port. The trade in victualling the war in Scotland would have been carried on from Drogheda and Dublin rather than from Waterford and New Ross. Grain was a bulky commodity and would have been relatively costly to transport from Carlow to the main Irish supply centres for the war in Scotland. Together with this shift in the focus of trade, demographic stagnation and problems associated with the solvency of the Irish Exchequer led to a general contraction in the grain market, thus decreasing still further the profitability of centres such as Fennagh. The only stock kept at Fennagh were draught animals, so that its viability as a manor depended entirely on a buoyant grain market. Its situation in or near a march, coupled with this probable decline may have been of crucial importance in causing the decline apparent at Fennagh in 1307.

In 1282-3 there were 6 affers and 17 oxen at Fennagh (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/33), and in the following year there were 11 affers and 18 oxen (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/34). By 1288-9 there were 11 affers and 11 oxen at Fennagh (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/39).
Despite certain signs of decline in the 1307 inquisition, Ballysax seems then to have been in much the same condition as in the 1380's. The tower and wooden grange roofed with straw were both described but not valued by the jurors, who also stated that the tower was ruinous. None of the land held by free tenants was waste by 1307, and while land held at farm was probably undervalued, the relative differences in rents paid by farmers remained undisturbed. Throughout the 1280's, the rent derived from the main body of land held at farm, 2 carucates 56 acres and 1 ½ stangs was £17-5-9½ or 14d. an acre, while the rent from 52 acres at Mothyl was 10d. an acre. In the 1307 extent the 2 carucates 56 acres and 1 ½ stangs were valued at 8d. the acre, while the land at Mothyl was only assessed at 6d. an acre. The valuation of 9 acres of meadow at 8d. each in this extent seems excessively low but cannot be compared with rents or valuations of the 1280's on that manor. Demesne land at Ballysax also seems to have been undervalued by jurors in 1307. It was valued at 8d. an acre, an assessment similar to that for the main body of land held at farm. Ballysax was a productive manor in the 1280's and while the demesne was never valued in any of the manorial accounts, it is unlikely that it would have been worth less than the best of the land leased at farm. It seems to have grown considerably between the 1280's and 1307.

The most extensive acreage cultivated during the years for which accounts have survived was 164 acres, giving, with an allowance of a third of the area of demesne as fallow, a demesne of 245 acres. In 1307 the jurors stated that there were 354 acres of arable land under the lord's plough. While the acreage in cultivation at Ballysax might have increased slightly during the 1290's, it is unlikely that it would have grown to such an extent. There is no indication in any of the accounts that a substantial portion of the demesne, other than the normal amount of fallow, was not under cultivation. Some of this land might have been used as pasture for the extensive flocks of sheep at Ballysax. The 12 acres of pasture called Oxelese and valued in 1307 may have provided, as its name suggests, pasture for draught beasts kept at the manor.

54. For all material relating to this extent see C.D.I. 1302-7, pp 174-5, Cal. Inq. P.M. vol. IV, p. 305, P.R.O. C 133/127 m 32d. See also Map III.
56. See Chapter II: Table IV.
rather than pasture for all the manorial stock. The statement by the jurors that land was arable and under the lord's plough would seem to preclude this possibility unless the nature of farming practised at Ballysax had altered considerably during the 1290's with a cessation of wool growing in favour of increased tillage. This, however, also seems unlikely. The consistent undervaluation in the 1507 extent for Ballysax was probably deliberate on the part of the jurors although it could also reflect, in part, a certain levelling out of demographic pressure on the land.

The acreage of demesne land under cultivation at Ballysax was not increased during the 1280's. An optimum balance between the amount of land needed for sheep rearing and the amount of land most profitably used in tillage seems to have been already established. A feature of tillage in the other three manors, the rapid growth, in relative terms, of the amount of land under wheat was absent at Ballysax, nor was there any imbalance between the acreages sown with wheat and oats. In 1280-1, 84 acres were sown with wheat and 80 with oats. This pattern of land usage is to be found with minor variations in the other five surviving accounts. Despite the fact that the amount of land under cultivation was not augmented during this decade, the changes in sowing techniques already noted in both Fennagh and Fothered are to be found at Ballysax. As was the case in these other manors, this change was more noticeable in the sowing of wheat. The rates of sowing for both wheat and oats in 1280-1 were \(\frac{1}{2}\) crannoc to the acre. A decrease in the amount of wheat sown to the acre became apparent in 1282-3 and remained consistent until 1287-8, when the discrepancy between the sowing rate of the early years of the decade and the decreased rate became most obvious. In 1287-8, 80 acres were sown with wheat while only 33 crannocs of seed were used. The shortfall in that year was 7 crannocs of seed whereas in previous years it had only been approximately 2 crannocs. Changes in the sowing technique used with oats were less consistent. In 1282-3 a bushel of seed more than was needed to maintain the rate of \(\frac{1}{2}\) crannoc to the acre was used. Both in the following years and also in 1285-6 the amount of oats sown exceeded the rate of \(\frac{1}{2}\) crannoc to the acre. This was not the case in 1287-8, when the shortfall between the old rate of sowing and the rate for the year was \(\frac{13}{2}\) crannocs. The new practices in sowing wheat do not seem to have had any obvious adverse affects on the yields at Ballysax. Harvests of 5.1 grains and 4.9 grains to each grain of seed occurred in 1283 and 1285.

57. For all statistics relating to grain yields at Ballysax see Chapter II: Table IV.
The yield in oats at Ballysax does not seem to have been as high as the average yield at either Fennagh or Fothered but this may be explained in terms of soil type. Poor land tended to give surprisingly good returns for oats, while land that cropped well under wheat could produce mediocre crops of oats. The best harvest in oats was that of 1285 when the yield was 2.7 grains to every grain of seed. Mean yields in oats in Fothered and Fennagh were respectively 2.85 and 3.26 to a grain of seed.58. Because of the chronological sequence and condition of the surviving Ballysax accounts it is impossible to determine such ratios for wheat in harvests other than those of 1283 and 1285 and in oats for harvests other than those of the years 1283-5. It would be unwise to use such scattered figures as a base from which to derive a mean yield. They can best be used as an indication of the quality of the soil at Ballysax and the crops most suited to that soil. The land at Ballysax was not as well suited to the cultivation of oats as was the land at Fothered or Fennagh, but seems to have been better suited to the cultivation of wheat than the land of either of these two manors. Wheat yields in Ballysax in 1283 and 1285 were considerably higher than those recorded in either Fennagh or Fothered for the years in question.

Intensive sheep rearing was practised at Ballysax during the 1280's59. as was also the case at Old Ross and Fothered. The size of the flock and the large number of ewes kept at that manor was such that most of the initial stock for Fothered came from Ballysax. On four subsequent occasions substantial numbers of lambs were sent from Ballysax to Fothered.60. The essential difference between these two manors lay in the number of ewes in the manorial flock and therefore, in the amount of potential breeding stock on either manor. There were never less than 125 ewes at Ballysax in any year of the period for which accounts have survived. While the milk from ewes at Fothered was sold because there was not sufficient to warrant the employment of a dairymaid to make cheese despite that manor's vaccary, ewes' milk at Ballysax was made into cheese. This was also the case at Old Ross, where sheep rearing was practised on an even more intensive scale than at Ballysax. In terms of the amount of wool produced by the manorial flocks, Ballysax was the less productive of the two manors. Wool production was directly related to the size of the manorial flock.

58. See Chapter II: Tables I and III.
59. For all statistics relating to sheep rearing at Ballysax see Chapter II: Table V.
60. See above pp 61-2.
Severe and recurring outbreaks of murrain effectively prevented the expansion of the flock at Ballysax. The average annual loss there through murrain would have been 135 sheep, including wethers, ewes, yearlings and lambs. Following the first occasion on which there was an extremely low incidence of murrain, in 1282-3, 58 stones of wool were produced at Ballysax as opposed to 43\frac{3}{4} stones in the previous year. The number of sheep on the manor rose from 746 in 1280-1 to 925 in 1283-4. This trend was reversed in the following two years, when numbers were hit by increasingly severe outbreaks of murrain. In 1286-7, 142 lambs were sent from Ballysax to Fothered, further diminishing the number of sheep there. As no local manorial accounts survive for that year, it is impossible to establish what the incidence of murrain may have been there. If the incidence at Ballysax was similar to that in Fothered, it would have been less severe than that of the previous two years. Despite this possible decrease in the incidence of murrain, the number of sheep continued to decline at Ballysax, probably because of a continued commitment to the re-stocking of Fothered. The number of affers and oxen at Ballysax did not increase significantly during the period for which accounts have survived. There were on average 8 affers and 16 oxen kept on the manor each year as working rather than as breeding stock.

Old Ross

By 1307 the manorial caput at Old Ross had become dilapidated through lack of maintenance. Two halls, a stone house which was unroofed and nearly levelled, a kitchen which had collapsed, a grange in poor condition and a storehouse roofed with straw were all extended 'at no price because there is no one who would rent them'. There were 76 acres of arable land and 4 acres of moor and pasture which the jurors extended at 26s. 8d., or 4d. an acre, and an oak wood of 20 acres with pasture worth 2s. Of 4,247 acres 1 stang held at will and 2,292 acres held by betaghs, 233 acres and 80 acres respectively lay waste. A decline of considerable severity appears to have set in at Old Ross during the 1290's and the early years of the fourteenth century.

The 76 acres of demesne land extended in 1307 only represented a portion

61. cf. the stock accounts in P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/1-6.
62. For all material from this extent see C.D.I. 1302-1307, Ed. H. Sweetman, London, 1896, pp 175-6; Cal Ing. P.M. vol. IV, p. 306 and P.R.O. C 133 127/33. See also Map III.
of the demesne lands under cultivation in the 1280’s and during that
decade the area of demesne under cultivation was continually added to
through clearance and land improvement. It should be noted that the
amount of waste land at Old Ross fluctuated in the early 1280’s and
exceeded, at one point, the amount mentioned in the 1307 extent. Land
cultivated at outgranges of the demesne in Kilcolman and Ballyconnor
had dropped out of cultivation by 1307. Land improvement and clearance
had been in progress since the early years of the 1280’s. In an account
of expenditure attached to the receiver’s account of 1280-1, 15s. worth
of sand was bought for spreading on land and some acres of wooded land
were cleared through burning. If the cost of sand in 1280-1 was
similar to that of 1283 when sufficient sand for 5½ acres cost 13s. 4d.,
approximately 6 acres were probably sanded in 1280-1. In 1284 and 1285
3 acres and 9½ acres of land respectively were sanded. A considerable
amount of land was cleared by burning during this period. The first
major clearance was of 22 acres in 1282. In 1283 16½ acres were
cleared in this manner while a further 10 acres were cleared in 1285.
Fertilisation with animal dung played an important role in land
improvement at Old Ross. Manure of this sort was gathered and spread
on at least three occasions during the decade. The amount of land
under cultivation there for the years in which manorial accounts have
survived always exceeded that valued in the 1307 extent as arable demesne.
On only one occasion, in 1280-1, were less than 76 acres under cultivation.
In the period for which manorial accounts have survived, there were
never less than 113 acres and 1 stang under grain on the home demesne
at Old Ross. By 1287-8 160 acres were under cultivation there.

Land was also tilled on certain outgranges of the demesne, most of this
land being used for the cultivation of oats or rye. Initially, the
only land worked outside the home demesne lay at Ballyconnor. In 1282-3,

---

64. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/44.
65. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/45 and 48 respectively.
66. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/43.
68. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/43 and 53.
69. cf. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/10. 59 acres were probably under cultivation
    as 29½ crannocs of seed were bought and sown.
71. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/53.
32 acres and 1 stang were sown there with oats. In the following year the area there under oats had risen to 34 acres. A sharp drop in the amount of land under cultivation at Old Ross occurred in 1284-5. In that year only 8 acres appear to have been sown with oats at Ballyconnor and 4 acres and 1 stang to have been sown with oats at Kilcolman. In the following year 32 acres were sown with wheat and oats at Ballyconnor while 20 acres were sown with the same crops at Kilcolman. While a manorial account has survived for 1286-7, it has been so severely damaged that its accounts of the grange are now illegible. Thus, a link of potentially crucial importance between the accounts of 1285-6 and 1287-8 has been lost. By 1287-8 the total acreage under cultivation at Old Ross had risen dramatically. On the home demesne 160 acres were sown with wheat, rye and oats. At Ballyconnor 36 acres were sown with oats and 2½ acres with rye, while at Kilcolman 85 acres were sown with wheat, rye and oats. Land was brought into cultivation for the first time at Cumbe, where 3 acres were sown with rye. Thus, allowing for fallow, there seems to have been a demesne of approximately 430 acres at Old Ross in 1287-8. It is unclear as to whether or not the amount of waste land at Old Ross increased significantly between the 1280's and 1307. In 1281-2 there were 180 acres of waste land on this manor from which no rents could be collected because of the poverty of the tenants. By the following year this had risen to 420 acres of

72. Baliconwr (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/51), Balicongor (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/53), Balyconkyr (P.R.O. C153 127/33, C.D.I. 1302-7, p. 176, Cal. Ing. P.M. vol. IV, p. 306. This place lay within the barony of Old Ross, (see P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/10-12), which now no longer exists. The civil parish of Old Ross lies within the modern barony of Bantry, County Wexford and there is no townland or area in that parish which now carries this name. The only townlands of this name in County Wexford are Ballyconnor Big and Little, both of which lie in the barony of Forth (Townland Index). Orpen in 'The Battle of Dunaddell', R.S.A.I. in vol. 34 (1904) p. 355, gives a possible identification with Connagh in the parish of Fethard for the amount of land sown with oats.

73. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/45.

74. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/48 and see also Table VI. Like Ballyconnor, Kilcolman is impossible with certainty to identify. Kilcoleman (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/51), Kilcoleman (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/53) lay within the barony of Old Ross (see P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/10-2), possibly Coleman in the barony of Shelburne, Townland Index.

75. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/49.

76. This particular account (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/51) has been badly damaged by damp and by rubbing. It has also been torn in a number of places. The most severe mutilation and damage occurs at the top of the membrane.

77. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/53.

78.Obsolete place-name, lying within the parish of Old Ross.

79. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/11.
which 240 acres was land held by betaghs at Ballyconnor.80 This land was not waste in 1307 and may only have been unproductive for a short period in the 1280's. If this was the case, the 313 acres of waste land of 1307 represents an increase of approximately a third over the amount of waste land with a pauperized tenantry in 1281-2. The decline apparent at Old Ross in the 1307 extent seems to have been most severe in its effects on the demesne lands and the manorial caput. This was probably in part a reflection of decreased prosperity, although the contraction of the demesne may also have been caused by the reversion of marginal or recently cleared lands to their natural state of waste or woodland.

The area of demesne under cultivation at Old Ross expanded considerably during the 1280's. In 1280-1, only 59 acres were sown, of which 32 acres were under mixed grain, 26 acres were under oats and 1 acre was under barley. By 1282-3 the total acreage tilled had risen steeply.81 New crops were being used. Barley, which had been under cultivation, was abandoned as a crop, while wheat and rye were sown. With the exception of rye, the cropping pattern throughout the decade at Old Ross was similar to that in both Pothered and Fennagh. Initially the amount of land under oats far exceeded that under wheat and rye. Between 1283 and 1286 the acreage under wheat rose steadily while that under rye fluctuated, declining on the whole. In relative terms, however, the differences between the acreage under oats and the combined acreages under wheat and rye had narrowed slightly. The total acreage under cultivation in 1287-8 rose dramatically. Due to the condition of the account for the preceding year it is impossible to determine whether or not this was a gradual development, though from the size of the harvests of 1287 this would seem to have been the case. Despite considerable increases in the amount of land under both wheat and rye the relative difference between their combined acreage and the area under oats was not significantly decreased. The crops sown at Old Ross and the uniformly low yields in wheat and oats go some way towards explaining the need for constant land improvement and clearance. While the yields in wheat and oats were both low, the return from oats was, in relative terms, considerably better than that from wheat. Most of the land under cultivation was sown with oats. This seems to indicate that the soil at Old Ross was damp and insufficiently rich to sustain cropping with wheat. Apart from their profitability oats were an essential fodder crop and the amount of stock kept on Old Ross and their need for fodder would have added to the attractiveness of oats as a main crop. The low yields in wheat at Old Ross may have been due in part to the technique of sowing employed there.

80. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/12.
81. For all statistics relating to grain production at Old Ross see Table VI.
At both Fothered and Fennagh, and latterly at Ballysax, a change occurred in sowing techniques used with wheat, when the standard practice of the early 1280's of sowing a \( \frac{1}{2} \) crannoc of seed to the acre was abandoned and the amount of seed used per acre was decreased. This was also the case at Old Ross with both wheat and rye. Despite the possible effects of this change on the yield in wheat, it does not seem to have had any adverse effect on yields of rye, which were exceptionally high in two of the three years for which they can be determined. The rate at which oats were sown seems to have remained consistently above \( \frac{1}{2} \) crannoc to the acre, although it was a \( \frac{1}{2} \) crannoc short of this rate in both 1285-6 and 1287-8. Low yields in the two main crops, wheat and oats, coupled with the poor quality of the land at Old Ross may explain both the massive increase in the acreage under cultivation at that manor during the 1280's and the subsequent contraction of the demesne by 1307. The expansion of the 1280's may have been an attempt to produce a greater surplus of grain in order to avail of high prices and a buoyant grain market. Subsequent decline and contraction probably mirror a growing slackness in the grain market in the south-east and the growing unprofitability and ultimate loss of much of the marginal land brought into cultivation during the 1280's.

Sheep rearing was the main basis of prosperity at Old Ross in the 1280's. The flock expanded throughout the decade, being checked in its expansion by the high incidence of murrain in 1285-6 and 1286-7. Even in 1280-1, when the flock was at its smallest, its breeding potential, reflected in the number of ewes kept on the manor, was more than double that of the Ballysax flock at its apogee in 1283-4, but in absolute terms the flock there was not larger than that of Ballysax until 1284-5. Despite this more wool was sold from Old Ross than from Ballysax, probably because more mature sheep were kept at Old Ross than were kept at Ballysax.

No account of the numbers of sheep at Old Ross in 1282-3 have survived, but as the incidence of murrain at Ballysax and Fothered was high in that year this was probably also the case there. The incidence of murrain in the following year was high, but not so severe as that of 1280-1. There was thus a relatively secure base from which the flock could expand.

82. See above pp. 60-1, 66-7, and p. 68.
83. For all statistics relating to sheep rearing, cheese making and the sale of wool at Old Ross see Chapter II: Table VII.
84. See Chapter II: Table V.
In 1284-5 there were 1,446 sheep, including ewes, yearlings and lambs at Old Ross. The incidence of murrain in the following two years was as heavy there as it was in both Ballysax and Fothered but its long term impact on the flock appears to have been minimal. The quick rate of replacement at Old Ross and the consequent expansion of the flock there were probably due to two factors. No lambs were moved from Old Ross during these years, while at the same time lambs from Ballysax were being used to restock Fothered. The ewes at Old Ross were also exceptionally fertile. A sufficient number of lambs survived to offset the total losses through murrain. The subsequent expansion of the flock was dramatic. By October 1289 there were 2,423 sheep at Old Ross, including ewes, yearlings and lambs.

Sales of wool from this manor kept pace with the expansion of the flock. In 1280-1 only 54 stones of sheep's wool and 9½ stones of lamb's wool were sold. By 1284-5 this had risen to 84 stones (2 sacks) of sheep's wool and 11½ stones of lambs wool. In 1287-8 2½ sacks of sheep's wool and 5 stones of lamb's wool were sold. The other important by-product of sheep-rearing, ewe's milk, was made into cheese and sold. There was also a vaccary at Old Ross, with never less than 24 cows being kept in any particular year between 1283 and 1288 and in 1289 there were 38 cows on the manor. Thus, the raw material for the manorial output of cheese came from both the vaccary and the sheep flock. A small amount of butter was also churned.

The usual draught animals were kept at Old Ross, where there were on average 6 affers and 30 oxen in any particular year during the 1280's. These numbers increased at the end of the decade and in 1289 there were 13 affers and 56 oxen at Old Ross. The increase in the number of draught animals kept was probably necessitated by the expansion of the area of demesne land under cultivation towards the end of the decade. However, the importance of Old Ross as a centre of stock rearing lay in its sheep and the continuous expansion of its flock throughout the decade.

85. See above pp 61-2.
86. See the stock accounts for the manor in P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/44, 45, 48, 49, 51 and 53.
87. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/55.
The number and nature of the *famuli* on the manors of the lordship of Carlow in the 1280's were a direct reflection of the size of the manor on which they were retained and the forms of tillage and stock rearing carried out there. Unlike the manors of the Bishopric of Winchester, where most of the *famuli* held base serjeanties, i.e. rent free tenements, while also receiving food allowances, the *famuli* of the lordship of Carlow were all retained by stipend and food allowance. By the 1280's the food allowance offered on the Bigod manors had been commuted to a monetary payment of 4d. per week received by most of the *famuli*, though in the case of persons employed for a short period of time, stipend and food allowance were frequently coupled. This level of allowance compares very favourably with that received by stipendiary ploughmen on the Bishop of Winchester's estates in the thirteenth century.

As has already been stated, the number and type of the *famuli* retained tended to reflect the development of the individual manor. Initially there were only four ploughmen at Pothered, but by 1283-4 this had risen to six, reflecting the expansion in the amount of demesne land under cultivation there. Similarly, a shepherd was retained there for the first time in 1280-1, the year in which a large number of lambs were sent from Ballysax in order to start a flock at Pothered. The number of shepherds retained there did not increase during the decade, nor did the flock expand significantly. Due to the small number of ewes in the flock at Pothered a dairy was never established there. A cowman was retained for the first time in 1283-4 on a half-yearly basis to look after the small vaccary there and was subsequently retained on

89. These payments are listed in the potura famulorum section of the manorial accounts.
90. M.M. Postan, 'The Famulus. The Estate Labourer in the XIIth and XIIIth centuries', Econ. Hist. Rev. supplement no. 2 (1954) p. 22. The ploughman on the Bishop of Winchester's estates received 4 3/4 quarters of grain per annum. The 17s. 4d. received by the *famulus* on the Bigod manors would have purchased a little over 4 1/2 crannocs of grain if the crannoc was selling at 4s.
91. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/40.
92. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/47.
93. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/42.
94. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/47.
this basis for the remainder of the decade. Fennagh seems to have been established as a manorial centre by the early 1280's. Its only product was grain. Initially four ploughmen were retained there. This number was increased to six in 1284-5, reflecting the expansion of the demesne at Fennagh during the first half of the decade. Despite the fact that the main officer accounting for Fennagh was the bailiff, a reeve was retained from 1283 to 1288. One of the reeve's functions was to act as keeper of the grange (grangiarus), in which capacity he received a food allowance of 6d. a week as well as his stipend of 6s. 8d. per annum. When no reeve was retained in 1288-9, a keeper of the grange was retained. This official received the reeve's food allowance of 6d. a week, but not his annual stipend. Only two ploughmen were retained at Dunleckny, and then for only part of the year. Neither the area under cultivation nor the sheep flock at Ballysax increased significantly during the 1280's. When the flock reached its maximum, an extra shepherd was retained for a year. Apart from that instance two shepherds and four ploughmen were retained on a regular basis throughout the decade. The number of famuli retained at Old Ross increased consistently, in line with both the expansion of the flock and the area of demesne under cultivation. In 1282-3 eight ploughmen, three shepherds and a cowman were retained there. By 1284-5, ten ploughmen and five shepherds were attached to the manor, with a further two ploughmen being retained in 1287-8. Two ploughmen were also retained for 38 weeks at Kilcolman in 1287-8.

Certain categories of workers were only retained for part of the year or on a casual basis on the manors of the lordship of Carlow. Dairymaids were only retained for the half of the year when cows and ewes produced

---

95. See above pp 63-4.
96. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/32 and 33.
97. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/35.
100. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/27 and 28.
102. As was the case in 1280-1 cf. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/1.
103. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/43-4.
104. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/48 and 53 respectively.
105. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/53.
most milk, generally from sometime in May to the following Michaelmas. 106. Harrowers were retained for the spring and winter sowings. 107. The annual stipend paid to the *famuli* varied little on the manors of the lordship of Carlow. There were two basic stipendary scales, a higher one of 6s., which was received by the reeves, with one exception, and the holders of the plough (*tentores*) and a lower scale of 4s. which was received by the shepherds, the drivers of the plough (*aguatores*) and the reap reeve (*messor*) who frequently doubled as a watchman. 108. Carters usually received an annual stipend of 4s., but at Ballysax, where two carters were retained, the master carter was paid at the higher rate. It is worth noting that the higher rate at Old Ross was only 5s. and that the reeve's stipend there was only 4s. per annum. 109. Much of the seasonal work at harvest time on the manors of the Carlow lordship was done by casual labour at piece rates (*ad tascham*), 110. though there are instances in the accounts of the *famuli* threshing grain. 111. The *famuli* of Bigod's Irish manors formed a hard-core of specialist labour and were retained by stipend and food allowance rather than by the granting of base serjeanties.

Manorial Mills in the Lordship of Carlow

Accounts of grain received from manorial mill tolls have survived for only Fennagh and Fothered. The mills at Ballysax and Old Ross were set to farm during the 1280's. The rate at which this toll was levied is uncertain. If the practice laid down in the Statuta Pistorum were followed this toll would have been taken 'according to the custom of the king to the twentieth or twenty-fourth part of the grain'. 112. A

---

106. As was the case with the dairymaids of Ballysax and Old Ross.

107. i.e. a harrower was retained for 10 weeks during the sowing of oats at Fothered in 1284-5 (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/49).

108. These differentials were noted by Postan, 'The *Famulus*. The Estate Labourer in the XIIth and XIIIth centuries', *Econ. Hist. Rev.* supplement no. 2 (1954), p. 16.


110. This was also the case on the manors of the Bishopric of Winchester. See M.M.E. Postan 'The *Famulus*. The Estate Labourer in the XIIth and XIIIth centuries'. *Econ. Hist. Rev.* supplement no. 2 (1954) p. 3.

111. As, for instance, was the case at Ballysax in 1284 when 22 crannocs and 14 bushels of oats were *triturandi per famulos*, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/3, account of Richard White.

mid-sixteenth century commentary gave more elaborate gradations in toll, 1/20 or 1/24 for free tenants, 1/16 for tenants at will and 1/12 for bondsmen. It is impossible to determine with any great certainty the rate of mill toll imposed in the lordship of Ireland during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Toll rates can, however, be determined for one particular group of mills in Ireland, which might have constituted some form of special case. The toll charged at the King's mills at Dublin Castle was 1/16. When Walter Kippok and Randolph de Lounge, keepers of these mills, complained in 1319 that they had been unduly charged with toll on grain milled for various royal officials, the amount of grain milled was 148 crannocs and 5 bushels and the amount of grain which should have been retained as toll was 9 crannocs and 2 bushels. If the custom of the King referred to in the Statuta Pistorum could, for Ireland, be interpreted as the toll levied at the royal mills at Dublin Castle, the general rate at which mill tolls were levied in the lordship would have been 1/16.

An interpretative problem raised by the Carlow multure accounts, the issue of the miller's due, presents an even greater difficulty. On occasions when a miller paid a specific rent for a mill, he would have received a certain proportion of the grain milled there. Nothing can be ascertained about the proportion of the grain milled forming the miller's due and whether it was levied as part of the general mill toll or was a separate toll for which the miller did not render account. In cases where the miller did not pay a rent, this due might not have been levied.

The mill at Fennagh was the smaller of the two manorial mills for which toll accounts have survived. This mill does not appear to have been functioning prior to 1283-4, when at least 161 crannocs of assorted grains were milled. The amount of grain passing through the mill at Fennagh seems to have declined considerably throughout the decade. In part this decline was due to the fact that many of the betagh tenants who owed suit to the mill were prepared to pay for the privilege of owning and using their own hand mills. This commutation of suit of mill

114. Ibid., vol. 4, pp 16-20
115. No toll would have been levied on grain from the Lord's demesne milled at the manorial mill. For all statistics relating to the mill and mill tolls at Fennagh, See Chapter II: Table VIII.
does not seem to have been granted on a regular basis. The betaghs paid 12s. for this privilege in 1284-5 and 20s. in the following year. They also paid 26s. 8d. in 1287-8. There were, thus, years in which either the payment made by the betaghs of Fennagh was not noted in the manorial account, an omission which might have occurred once, but would hardly have recurred on a regular basis, or the suit to the mill was not commuted. The productivity of the land at Fennagh and the quality of harvests, especially harvests of oats, were the major factors determining the amount of grain passing through this mill. The year in which least grain was milled, 1287-8, also saw very poor harvests of both oats and wheat on the demesne lands there. With the dismantling of Fennagh as a manorial centre, the importance and value of the mill ultimately dwindled to the situation described in the 1307 extent. Its betaghs still rendered a payment of 6s. 8d. to be quit of suit to the mill while the mill itself was 'waste and laid low'.

The mill at Fothered was a good deal larger than that at Fennagh and served both the manor and the manorial borough. Only three accounts of its mill toll have survived, but nevertheless its structure can be determined from them. There was a tenement of 12 acres attached to this mill which was set at farm for 12s. per annum. Suit of the mill was owed by the men of Tolach and was commuted for a monetary payment. The value of this commutation varied from year to year but never fell below the 7s. 3½d. paid in 1286-7. A rent was paid by the miller at Fothered which rose from 54s. 8d. in 1284-5 to 57s. in 1286-7. This is probably an indication that the miller at Fothered received some proportion of the grain milled there, but it is impossible to determine what proportion of the toll was involved, or whether the miller's due was levied separately. As was the case at Fennagh, the quality of the harvest was reflected in the amount of grain milled there. The worst annual returns for the mill were those of 1285-6. By comparison with the years which preceded and followed the harvest in wheat on the demesne lands was well below average. The mill at Fothered was capable of handling at least 590 crannoc of grain in the year. By 1307 it seems

116. See Chapter II: Table III.
118. For statistics derived from these accounts see Chapter II: Table IX.
119. Tolach (P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/49), villa sancti Johannis de Tullagh (P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/53) probably the townland of Johnstown adjacent to the parish of Grangeford in the barony of Carlow, County Carlow.
120. See Chapter II: Table I.
to have declined somewhat in value. It was extended by the jurors at £3-6-8.\textsuperscript{121} This may have been a deliberate undervaluation for, in the year when the mill at Fothered was least profitable, 1285-6, sales of grain levied as mill toll were worth £6-5-11½.

The mills at Ballysax and Old Ross were set to farm during the 1280's. At Ballysax the annual farm of the mill was £6.\textsuperscript{122} In 1307 the jurors stated that the site of this mill was worthless.\textsuperscript{123} There were three mills at Old Ross. All of these mills had declined in value by 1307, but not to quite the same extent as the mills of the other manors of the lordship of Carlow. As was the case at Fothered, these mills served both the manor and the manorial borough. In the early 1280's the main mill at Old Ross was set to farm for £4-13-4, the mill at Kilscallan for £3, and the mill near New Ross which was held by Lorcan at £3-6-8.\textsuperscript{124} The fact that they were set at farm is an indication that a profit greater than the value of the farm could be obtained which was sufficiently large to induce a farmer to take these mills. Thus, they were worth at least £11 per annum in the early 1280's. By 1307 the main mill was only worth £4 annually 'in all issues besides expenses', while the mills at Kilscallan and Lorcan were worth respectively £2 and £2-13-4.\textsuperscript{125} It is evident that the manorial mills of the lordship of Carlow declined in value between the 1280's and 1307, as did the value of the manors themselves. This decline probably reflects demographic stagnation, a decrease in the amount of land under cultivation and a slackening in the price of grain, but may not have been as severe as the decreases in value found in the 1307 extent seem to indicate. Allowances must always be made in using the 1307 assessments for deliberate undervaluation in circumstances such as these, where a juror, as a future farmer, might have had a personal interest in depressing the level of farm assessed.

Manorial Courts

The potential revenue of the manorial courts of the lordship of Carlow given in the 1307 extent appear either to have been gross undervaluations or to reflect considerable demographic contraction. Relative differences between the values of these courts seen in the accounts were broadly maintained. During the 1280's revenue from the manorial court at Ballysax

\textsuperscript{122} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/1.
\textsuperscript{123} C.D.I. 1302-7, p. 175, Cal. Inq. P.M. vol. IV, p. 307, P.R.O. C133 127 m 32d.
\textsuperscript{124} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/12.
\textsuperscript{125} C.D.I. 1302-7, p. 177, Cal. Inq. P.M. vol. IV, p. 307, P.R.O. C 133 127 m 33d.
fluctuated between 6s. 8d. in 1287-8 and 19s. 1d. in 1280-1. The potential revenue was assessed at 3s. in 1307. The fluctuations in revenue from the manorial court at Fothered were from 43s. 9d. in 1286-7 to 10s. 8d. in the following year. The assessment of potential revenue from this court in 1307 was 6s. 8d. At Fennagh the manorial court was worth, at its least profitable, 43s. 1d. in 1284-5 and at its most profitable in 1288-9 73s. 2d. This court was neither valued nor mentioned in the 1307 extent. Apparent decline in court revenue was as extensive in the case of the court of the barony of Old Ross as in that of all of these other courts. Due to the large number of freeholders at Old Ross, this was the most valuable of the manorial courts of the lordship. Its value fluctuated from £5-6-2 in 1285-6 to £16-10-10 in the following year. This court was assessed at 26s. 8d. by the jurors in 1307. It seems unlikely that differences of such magnitude can be explained by anything other than deliberate undervaluation but in view of other indications of local decline, it would be unwise to stress this point. Nothing can be deduced from either the manorial accounts or the 1307 extents about the operation of these courts or the frequency with which they were held.

The Boroughs of the Lordship of Carlow

Borough customs and conditions of tenure were standardised throughout the Marshal lordship of Leinster, and, therefore, throughout the liberty of Carlow, which was originally part of that greater lordship. Certain specific customs and privileges were granted to all of the Leinster boroughs. A charter granted by William Marshal to his burgesses of Carlow c. 1223 was almost identical to that granted by him to his burgesses of Callan. Burgess were only to answer for pleas which

126. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/6 and 1 respectively.
128. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/53 and 55 respectively.
130. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/35 and 39 respectively.
132. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/49 and 51 respectively.
133. For the texts of these charters see C. Mac Niocailly Na Buirgéise, vol. I, Dublin 1964, pp 109-112 (Callan) and pp 150-4 (Carlow).
arose within the bounds of the borough \textit{(infra metas burgi)} in the hundred court of the borough. No homicide committed within the bounds of the borough was to be construed as murder, and therefore as one of the four royal pleas, nor were the burgesses of either borough liable to answer by ordeal of battle any case against them, unless it were a homicide, robbery or some other plea for which an ordeal by battle might reasonably be sought. The hundred was to be held on a weekly basis.

Three extremely important privileges were also granted to the burgesses of the lordship of Leinster. They had the marriages of their sons, daughters and widows without licence unless they held land in chief of the Earl outside the borough and as a corollary to this, no other lords of whom the burgesses held land had any right of custody over land within the borough or over the disposal of children or widows of those burgesses in marriage. All burgesses were quit of tolls throughout the Earl’s lands. In the charter granted to the burgesses of Carlow this particular privilege was further clarified by comparison with the customs granted to the boroughs of Pembroke and Wexford. Maximum limits beyond which the burgesses could not be amerced were also stipulated. In the case of a manor plea the maximum was 10s. while in the case of minor pleas the maximum was 2s. These privileges, together with the uniform rent of 1s. per burgage represent a fusion of elements of both the law of Breteuil and the customs of Bristol, unique to the liberties of the old lordship of Leinster.

The earliest surviving charter to have been granted to the burgesses of New Ross was that of 1283-6.\footnote{Na Buirgeisi, G. Mac Niocaill, vol. I, Dublin 1964, pp 300-4 (text of the New Ross charter).} No Marshal charter appears to have been granted, for had an earlier charter been granted the later document would have taken the form of either a confirmation or a series of additional articles. The customs were identical to those granted in the Marshal charters, a comparison with the Marshal customs was in fact written into the first article of this charter which stated that the burgesses were to pass freely through Bigod’s lands ‘\textit{sicut burgenses de Bonna vel Kylkennie vel Weysefordie sive aliqui burgenses Lagenie sunt (sic!) liberiores.} The main function of this provision, however, was to preserve the rights of Leinster burgesses to move about without being subject to the payment of tolls in the lordship of Leinster, an indication that this later charter had to be drawn up in such a way as to avoid violating pre-established custom. The rent of the burgage plot
was stated to be 12d. per annum in both the Carlow and New Ross charters, but the size of these burgage plots was not specified. The survival of a number of late thirteenth century borough extents for some of the Kilkenny boroughs is the only extant evidence on the size of the Leinster burgage plots. They also corroborate the evidence of the charters that the standard rent of one of these plots was 12d per annum. At both Coillach and Newtown Jerpoint the annual rent of a burgage was 12d, and the plot itself comprised a frontage and 6 acres.  

An examination of the manorial borough of Fothered seems to indicate that this was the size of burgage plot held there. None of the accounts specifies the number of burgage plots for which the burgesses were paying rent and the number was not specified in the extents of any of the Wexford boroughs in 1307. The rent of the 79 tenements in the borough of Fothered and the 160 tenements in Carlow was 12d. per annum. At both Insula and Old Ross the burgesses held land 'pro burgagiis suis', some of which may not have been burgage plots, but rather land held by the borough as a corporate entity. The burgesses at Insula were assessed as owing 110s. 3d. for 3 carucates of land in 1307. This was also the amount of fixed rent paid by them on an annual basis during the 1280's. At most 360 acres of land would have produced 60 burgages of the size found at Newtown Jerpoint and Coillach, while a strict division of the 110s. 3d. on the basis that every shilling equals one burgage would seem to indicate that there were 110¼ burgages at Insula. The opposite would have been the case at Old Ross if the rent paid on an annual basis and at which the borough was assessed in 1307 represented the rent of burgage plots only. In this borough the burgesses held 5 carucates and paid for this land an annual rent of 58s. 10d. The burgesses at New Ross paid an annual fixed rent of £25-6-8 throughout the 1280's and were also assessed at this rent in 1307. for burgages
held both inside and outside the walls of the borough. The exact amount of land held by these burgesses was not specified, but if all of this fixed rent was paid for burgage plots alone, the number of plots in question would have been $506_4^3$, an entirely plausible figure, given the prosperity of New Ross during the Welsh wars.

Boroughs of Old Ross and Fothered

The manorial borough at Old Ross was the smallest of the boroughs of the lordship of Carlow. Both the prise of ale and the borough roll were fixed throughout the 1280’s at 5s. and 6d. respectively, while only 58s. 10d. was owed each year in fixed rent. $^{143}$ The profits of the hundred court there fluctuated considerably during that decade. In 1283-4 the issues of this court were worth 10s., while in the following year they were worth 11s. 9d., $^{144}$ there being only a narrow difference between the points of extreme profitability and lack of profitability within which revenue fluctuated in the early years of the decade. The value of this revenue rose sharply in 1286-7 when it was worth 42s. 8d., but in the following year its value dropped to 21s. 9d. $^{145}$ Only 4s. was derived from this court in revenue in 1293-4. $^{146}$ No revenue from this court was recorded in 1280-1, when the rolls were in the hands of Edmund le Denes, who had died. $^{147}$ The issues of the hundred at Old Ross were valued at 6s. 8d. in 1307. $^{148}$

The manorial borough at Fothered was at least as large as the smallest of the non-manorial boroughs, Insula. There were 79 burgages and 29 cottages in this borough $^{149}$ which also seems to have acted as an administrative centre for the adjacent manor. Both the rents received from the free tenants of the manor at Fothered and those who held land at farm were included in the borough accounts $^{150}$ and when the manorial mill was set to farm in 1287-8 for £9-6-8, this farm was also noted in

143. i.e. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/41.
144. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/46 and 47 respectively.
145. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/50 and 52 respectively.
146. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/54.
147. P.R.O. S.C. 6, 1238/41.
150. i.e. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/41.
the relevant section of the borough account.\textsuperscript{151} Revenue from fixed rent remained at a constant level throughout the decade at £4-15-\textsuperscript{10/2}, as did the rent of free tenants holding land in the manor at £3-4-6, of which 11s. was paid annually to the Abbot of Baltinglass as rent.\textsuperscript{152} The amount of land held at farm decreased throughout the decade as a result of the expansion of the demesne. In 1280-1 a carucate was leased at farm for £7 and 112 acres were leased for £6-10-8 or a rate of 14d. per acre. A weir was also set at farm for 1s. 9d. By 1282-3, 12 acres of the 112 acres set to farm in 1280-1 were in the Earl’s hand while a further 43 acres of this tenement were also added to the demesne.\textsuperscript{153} In the following year 11 acres more of the original 112 acres were added to the demesne, but by 1284-5 this addition had been diminished by 2 acres and stood at 46 acres for the remainder of the decade.\textsuperscript{154} Both the toll and the price of ale were fixed in Fothered by 1280-1 at a composite figure of 8s. 4d. per annum.\textsuperscript{155} The revenue from the hundred court fluctuated throughout the decade varying from 19s. 11d. in 1283-4 to 40s. 7\textsuperscript{1/2}d. in 1287-8.\textsuperscript{156} No record of this revenue has survived for 1280-1, when the court was in the hands of the Earl.\textsuperscript{157} The potential revenue of this court was assessed at 6s. 8d. per annum in 1307.\textsuperscript{158} Records of the issues of the manorial court were included in the borough accounts for 1286-7 and for the following year.\textsuperscript{159}

Indebtedness at Fothered and Old Ross had a cumulative effect on annual revenue derived from the borough. While the individual debts of particular reeves were hardly ever spectacular, the cumulative effect of a large number of small bad debts occasionally coupled with one major bad debt could considerably augment the annual debt incurred by the reeve. Of 21s. 9\textsuperscript{3/2}d. owed by Thomas fitz James, reeve of Old Ross in 1283-4, 4s. 9\textsuperscript{1/2}d. was owed by Philip de Bocland, a former seneschal of the liberty, 5s. 3\textsuperscript{3/4}d. by Simon Plecy, who had been reeve in 1279-80 and was also reeve in the following year, 9s. 4d. by Richard Cork reeve in 1281-2 and 1s. 10\textsuperscript{3/4}d. by Thomas Invenis, the reeve in 1282-3.\textsuperscript{160} A bad debt of £4-0-7\textsuperscript{1/2} owed by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{151} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/54.
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\item \textsuperscript{153} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/45.
\item \textsuperscript{154} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/46 and 48 respectively.
\item \textsuperscript{155} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/41.
\item \textsuperscript{156} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/46 and 54 respectively.
\item \textsuperscript{157} P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/41
\item \textsuperscript{158} C.D.I. 1302-7, p. 175, Cal. Inq. P.M. vol. IV, p. 306, P.R.O. C133 127 m 32d.
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Philip de Bocland since 1282-3 recurred in all of the extant borough accounts for Fothered following that year. \(^{161}\) Thus, the two manorial boroughs of the lordship of Carlow were different both in size and function. Old Ross seems merely to have been a relatively small nucleated settlement enjoying the privilege of borough custom while Fothered was the administrative centre for the free tenements and lands at farm attached to the adjacent manor.

Boroughs of Insula, Carlow and New Ross

Insula was the smallest of the non-manorial boroughs in the lordship of Carlow. Much of its prosperity was derived from its location on an island in the tidal estuary of the Barrow. Signs of poverty and decline became apparent there from the mid 1280's, following the destruction of the mill. Apart from the fixed rent, the value of many other issues of the borough had been fixed by 1280-1. The prise of ale was fixed at 53s. 4d., while the two ferries, one at Portyllach and the other at Colkery, were worth respectively 5s. and 4s. per annum. \(^{162}\) Revenue derived from the oven or furnace (furium) was valued at 13s. 4d. per annum. \(^{163}\) A garden and a small marsh with the herbage of green places before the castle door were worth respectively 7s. and 1s. 4d. \(^{164}\) The six weirs in the estuary were worth 37s. 10d. \(^{165}\).

A decline in prosperity first became apparent in 1283-4 and may have been in some way connected with the overwhelming of the mill on 1st of August 1284 by an inundation of the sea. \(^{166}\) In a schedule attached to his account, the reeve, John Willoc, sought allocations for 26s. 8d. of the prise of ale, 2s. 11d. of the annual valuation of the ferry at Colken, 14s. 7d. of the rent of the weirs and the entire rent of the mill, the farm of which had been fixed at 66s. 8d. in the preceding year. \(^{167}\) The mill was still unusable in the following year, \(^{168}\) but the amount of money sought in allocations did not rise significantly until 1285-6. In this year the ferry at Colkery was worthless through disuse and the weirs much destroyed.

---

162. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/1. For location see Map III.
163. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/1.
164. Ibid.
165. Ibid.
166. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/5 gives the actual date of the tidal inundation.
by the sea. The mill, which had by then been repaired, was burnt accidentally, and merely functioned for a quarter of the year. 169.

The allocations sought by Reginald de Bello and William le Pamer, the reeves of 1288-9 show the full extent of the decline at Insula by the end of the decade. All of the weirs had been carried away by the sea, the oven or furnace was only worth 3s. because hardly anyone came to it 'propter pauperitatem tenencium', an allocation of 32s. 10d. was sought on theprise of ale quia villa fere vaxta, and the reason given for the worthlessness of the ferry at Colkery was that the Templars had a ferry at le Crek. 170. Only one ferry, that of Kynmak was functioning in 1307, when it was assessed at 2s. 6d. per annum. 172. A further decline seems to have set in between 1289 and 1307. By then the garden was worth only 4s., the prise of ale 10s. and the herbage near the castle 6d. 173. The issues of the mill at Insula were worth 104s. in 1280-1 174. and a further 6s. 11d. was owed by the men of Cullagh and Balidowny in lieu of suit to this mill. 175. The farm of 66s. 8d. appears, thus, to have allowed for a considerable profit margin, for when Philip le Hore was keeper of the mill in 1288-9, the issues were worth £7-19-6 176. No tenants seem to have made payment in lieu of suit to the mill in that year. The only indication of the mill's capacity comes from this account of 1288-9. 177. If the mill toll were being levied at 1/16, then approximately 828 crannocs passed through the mill at Insula in that year.

By 1307 the value of the mill was assessed at 66s. 8d., the amount for which it was set to farm in 1282-3. Revenue from the hundred court at Insula fluctuated between 18s. 6d. in 1280-1 and 57s. 11d. in 1284-5. 178.

169. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/5.
171. This seems to have been the ferry of Portcullagh (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/6) or Portyllach (P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/2). A direct identification seems certain as this ferry was called the ferry of Kilmuk in 1288-9 (P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/8). The ferry would have plied from the eastern side of the island to land in the parish of Kilmoken.
174. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/1.
175. Possibly Cull in the barony of Bargy, County Wexford and Ballydoyle in the half barony of Forth, County Wexford (Townland Index).
177. See Chapter II: Table XV.
178. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/1 and 4.
Its potential as a source of revenue was assessed at 4s. in 1307. Together with the decline of Insula in the late 1280's, the indebtedness of the reeves increased considerably. The reason for the general decline at Insula from 1284 onwards is unclear, but seems to have been connected with the destruction of the mill and possibly with the violence of the sea in the second half of the decade. While further signs of decline and decay are discernible in the 1307 extent, the tempo and scope of this decline seems to have decreased slightly by then.

Carlow

Carlow, the caput of the lordship, does not seem to have declined appreciably in overall value between the 1280's and 1307. While certain sources of revenue were diminished by 1307, new forms of revenue had by then replaced them. During the 1280's the annual fixed rent paid for burgages was £8-11-6. This had declined to £8-1-41 by 1307, reflecting, perhaps, a slight decline in the number of burgages held and possibly, therefore, of the population of the borough. Both the 29s. 41d. from the rents of gardens and frontage and the 4s. 6d. received from the cottagers of the borough, whose cottages lay below the castle, received annually throughout the 1280's and also in 1293-4 were not noted by the jurors in 1307. The tolls of the borough and the prise of ale had been fixed at certain rates prior to 1281-2. The tolls were worth 8s. 3d. per annum, a value they retained in the 1307 extent. The prise of ale was fixed also by then at 40s. per annum, but seems to have been reassessed subsequently in 1284 at 55s. 4d. It was still fixed at this rate in 1293-4. The only occasion on which revenue from this source fell below 53s. 4d. was in 1285-6, when 42s. 3d. was collected because the farmer was ejected after three quarters of the year.

180. i.e. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/12. See also C.D.I. 1302-7, p. 173, Cal. Inq. P.M. vol IV, P. 304, P.R.O. C133 127 m. 32.
181. i.e. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/12 and 22.
183. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/12 and 15 respectively.
by the seneschal. The prize of ale was only valued at 40s. in 1307.

A considerable amount of meadow, 53\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres and 1 stang, was attached to the borough throughout the 1280's.

Issues of the meadow were accounted for separately in 1281-2 and also in the following year by keepers of the meadow, possibly because more meadow was then retained in the lord's hand than was the case later in the decade. In 1282 the crop of 34 acres of meadow were sold and in the following year the crop of 29 acres was sold. All meadow attached to the borough was sold in 1284. In the following years the crop of all the meadowland not damaged by the excessively dry weather was sold. By 1293-4 more land was being set to farm in Carlow, with 16 acres of moor leased for 22s. and the land of the island for 2s. The seneschal had 6 acres mowed and the price of 5 acres was allowed. The meadow which was dropped from the account, 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) and 1 stang, may have been included in moorland leased in that year. Throughout this period all meadow in Carlow was worth 2s. an acre. By 1307 more land seems to have become attached to the borough, though this increase might be explained in part by the possible fall in the number of burgage plots rented. There were, in 1307, 68 acres of arable land of which 50 acres were worth 50s. per annum and 18 acres were worth only 6s. Meadow of which there was then 50 acres, was also assessed at 50s. and the 16 acres of moorland and the island were extended at 16s. The apparent decrease in the value of meadow at Carlow may stem from undervaluation.

Two new sources of revenue were mentioned in the 1307 extent. An oven or furnace was held by the burgesses at will for 20s. annually and 3 pools, probably mill pools, for there were three mills at Carlow, were leased for 5s. per annum.

---

188. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/12 and 13 respectively.
190. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/22.
191. i.e. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/12.
193. Ibid.
194. Ibid.
£3-2-1 in 1286-7 and £5-14-6 in 1293-4.²⁹⁵ The potential value of this court was assessed at 20s. in 1307.²⁹⁶ The mills at Carlow seem to have declined somewhat in value between the late 1280's and 1307, when their annual value was assessed at £5-6-8.²⁹⁷ On only one occasion, in the late 1280's, in 1286-7, when the grain sold was worth £6-1-0, was the grain sold worth less than £10.²⁹⁸

Although there were three mills at Carlow, the amount of grain handled there does not seem to have been significantly higher than that handled at Insula, where there was only a single mill. In the keeper's account of 25th of March 1285 to 14th of April 1286 there is evidence that at least 1038 crannocs of grain passed through the mill, if the roll was levied at 1/16 in Carlow. This was the greatest amount of grain processed by these mills in the years for which accounts have survived. In 1286-7, approximately 902 crannocs of grain passed through these mills. By 1293-4, the amount of grain processed by the Carlow mills dropped to approximately 544 crannocs. The decline in the amount of grain passing through these mills may be an indication of a contracting grain market which might, in turn, explain the further decline in the value of the mills between 1293-4 and 1307. Thus, while Carlow was not impoverished as was Insula, it does seem to have declined slightly in value between the late 1280's and 1307, possibly because of demographic stagnation or actual decline.

New Ross

New Ross, largest and most profitable of the boroughs of the lordship of Carlow was also one of the major ports of the lordship of Ireland. Together with Waterford, it had grown in importance and prosperity due to the trade in provisioning the Welsh wars. Despite the fact that no burgages were vacant in 1307, the £25-6-8 at which the burgage tenements were then assessed being equal to the annual revenue derived from these plots throughout the 1280's,²⁹⁹ New Ross appears to have declined in prosperity and profitability by the early years of the fourteenth century.

²⁹⁵. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/21 and 22 respectively.
²⁹⁷. C133 127 m. 32d.
²⁹⁸. Ibid.
²⁹⁹. For all statistics relating to the mills at Carlow see Chapter II: Table XVI.
Revenue derived from the borough varied from Michaelmas to Easter terms and accounts were rendered by the reeves, who also held office in this manner – on a half-yearly basis.

A fair was held on some date in Michaelmas term and revenue generated from the pleas of the fair and the leasing of houses during the fair, the Earl had half of the rent generated by these short term leases, added considerably to the receipts of that term. Receipts from both sources declined steadily throughout the decade. In 1280-1, the pleas of the fair were worth £5-3-0, while the Earl’s portion of rents from the leasing of houses was £6-16-3.200. By 1283-4, the pleas were worth £2-6-6 and the Earl’s portion of the rent £2-14-9.201. A trough in the profitability of these two sources of revenue was reached in 1287-8 when the pleas of the fair were worth 23s. 6d. and the Earl’s portion of the rents 29s. 8d.202. Revenue from both sources rose substantially in the following year, the pleas being then worth £1-19-4 and the Earl’s portion of the rents £4-19-2,203. but as this is the last Michaelmas term for which accounts have survived for New Ross it is impossible to determine whether or not this was merely a temporary recovery. The pleas of the fair were valued together with the rent of the stalls at £3 in 1307.204. A number of stalls in front of the church of Saint Saviour came into the Earl’s hand as escheats in Michaelmas term 1283-4 and were worth on average 36s. a term until the heir to whom they descended came of age in Easter term 1286.205.

The profitability of the ferry at New Ross had been virtually halved in value by 1307, an indication of a decline in river traffic and therefore, of a decline in prosperity. This ferry had been worth £7-6-8 in 1280-1 and was, by 1283-4 worth £8 per annum.206. The ferry was accounted for separately from Michaelmas of 1285.207. An account rendered by Thomas Andrew, keeper of the ferry from 20th of January 1286 to 29th of September following seems to indicate that in the short term it was

201. P.R.O. S.C 6 1238/29.
203. P.R.O. S.C 6 1238/39.
205. P.R.O. S.C 6 1238/29, 30 and 31.
206. P.R.O. S.C 6 1238/25 and 29 respectively,
207. P.R.O. S.C 6 1238/33.
becoming an increasingly profitable source of revenue. The total amount of revenue generated by the ferry was £11-16-10. Two ferrymen were retained for 36 weeks, one receiving a stipend and food allowance of 2d. per diem and the other of 1½d. per diem. The keeper also received a stipend of 6s. 8d. per annum. The profit generated during this period of account, three quarters of a year, was £7-16-8. The annual value of this ferry was assessed at £4. in 1307.

While less meadow was attached to the borough of New Ross than to the borough of Carlow, the meadow at New Ross was more valuable in terms of rent per acre and, therefore, more productive than that in Carlow. The amount of meadow sold in New Ross during the 1280's varied between 18 acres and 1 stang, according to the reeve's account, in 1285 and 23½ acres and 1 stang in 1287. The only indication of the maximum amount of meadow in New Ross during the 1280's is to be found in the 1287 account for it was noted then that the Earl retained 6½ acres, which seems to indicate that 29 acres and 1 stang of meadow were attached to New Ross in that year. The average price of an acre of meadow there was 3s., though on one occasion an acre described as debilitated was sold for 2s. or the average price of an acre of meadow in Carlow during the same period. Only two accounts of keepers of the meadow have survived, and both were rendered by Luke Archull in 1285 and in the following year. These almost certainly formed part of a series of similar accounts. By 1307 the amount of meadow at New Ross had increased and stood at 38 acres but either lost value or was undervalued deliberately at 2s. an acre.

210. There is an interesting discrepancy between the amount of meadow noted as sold in the reeve's account (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/30) and the first of two accounts kept by the keeper of the meadow (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/32). According to the keeper's account 23 acres and 1 stang of meadow were sold in that year.
211. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/35.
212. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/30.
213. Ibid.
214. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/32.
There were five water-mills at New Ross with a potential annual capacity of at least 3,659 crannocs if the toll was levied at the rate of 1/16. When these mills were held at farm by William de Severene from 1279 to 1285, the annual farm was £33-6-8. They seem to have declined somewhat in value in 1286-7 and the following year, but were worth £40-10-0 in 1288-9, excluding the value of arrears noted in the account before any expenses were deducted. By 1307 one of these mills was levelled and the annual valuation of the remaining mills was assessed at £13-6-8. £20 less than the annual farm paid by William de Severene in the early 1280's. Despite the possibility of undervaluation, the mills at New Ross appear to have declined considerably in value between the 1280's and 1307, probably reflecting a decline in both the production of grain and the grain market in general. The decline in the value of the borough's hundred court can be seen as another symptom of general contraction. Revenues derived from this court varied between £11-8-0 in 1280-1 and £32-5-1- in 1283-4, averaging at approximately £24 per annum. The potential revenue of this court was assessed at only £6-13-4 in 1307.

There were two other important indications of incipient economic decline and stagnation in New Ross, the fluctuating and declining revenue derived from the great custom and the dispute over landing rights with Waterford, which appears to have surfaced for the first time in 1292. As a liberty port, New Ross enjoyed certain privileges but could only be used by ships trading with the liberty. The citizens of Waterford alleged that certain ships had docked at New Ross in an attempt to avoid the prise of wine and that this resulting diversion of trade damaged the prosperity of Waterford. It is unlikely that this particular abuse suddenly became a major problem in 1292. It was probably

---

217. See Chapter II. Table XVII.
219. See Chapter II: Table XVII.
221. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1238/25 and 29 respectively.
223. See above, p 55, n. 16.
countenanced by the citizens of Waterford while economic conditions were more buoyant and competition between these two centres was dulled by an expanding market. Such disputes are generally a sign of decline and of a contracting market. A decline of this order may well reflect the shift in the focus of the bulk export trade from the ports of the south-east during the Welsh wars to Drogheda and Dublin during the war in Scotland.

The 1280's saw a period of expansion and economic buoyancy throughout the Bigod lordship. A strong grain market and relatively high prices for grain led to the manorialisation of Fennagh and the attempted manorialisation of Dunleckny, together with a considerable expansion in most of the other manors of the area of demesne under cultivation. It is apparent that during the 1290's and the early years of the fourteenth century some form of decline set in, for while it is tempting to see deliberate undervaluation behind most of the low assessments of 1307, a certain amount of decline and stagnation can also be discerned. Marginal land, such as that brought into cultivation at Fennagh, Dunleckny and Old Ross appears to have been abandoned. More well established manors like Fothered and Ballysax also declined in value, though overall contraction seems to have been less marked at Ballysax than at any of the other manorial centres. The most significant factor in this general decline seems to have been the contraction of the grain market. By 1307 it was no longer sufficiently profitable or, indeed, necessary to maintain a weak manorial centre such as Fennagh. The effects of demographic stagnation, a contracting grain market and more general decline were also apparent in the boroughs of the lordship of Carlow. Thus, the contrast is that between the relative prosperity and economic buoyancy of the 1280's and the apparent stagnation and decline of the early years of the fourteenth century.
Apart from the manors of the royal demesne, the other major Dublin manorial complex was that formed by the manors of the archbishopric. Evidence of their economic development is, however, sporadic in nature dating mainly to the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. These manors are primarily of importance as the only large group for which evidence survives that was in the hands of a locally based lord, but the series of vacancies which facilitates analysis would have tended to draw the administration of the archiepiscopal lands closer to that of the royal manors. The period from which most of the data relating to these manors survives can best be categorised as the beginning of agrarian decline in the lordship of Ireland which culminated in the great crises of the first two decades of the fourteenth century. Some accounts, a rental and a valuation have also survived for a very much smaller group of ecclesiastical manors in Dublin - those belonging to the priory of Holy Trinity. The Holy Trinity material complements that on the manors of the archbishopric. For the most part it is slightly later than the archiepiscopal corpus, and together they provide an overview of the effects of these crises on the manorial economy in the greater Dublin area, and the response of that contracting economy to these problems.

A series of vacancies and reversions of the archbishopric occurred in the last quarter of the thirteenth century when the march in Leinster was expanding and the general climatic conditions worsening. The Irish in the mountains had become more active in raiding all of the more exposed manors of the Wicklow-Dublin march as a result of this general deterioration and as a consequence of these raids considerable tracts of archiepiscopal property faced the same pressure as royal manors, such as Saggard in the west of the county and Obrun and Othee in the east. The sources reflect the effects of the rains, crop failures, subsequent famines of 1315-18 and the Bruce Invasion, showing clearly, if not in

2. See above, Chapter I, pp. 13-5.
precisely quantifiable terms, the decline in profitability and partial disintegration of one of the richest groups of ecclesiastical estates in the lordship.

Due to the nature of the sources tenurial relationships can be examined in considerable detail and placed within their general context. The sequestration of the temporalities following the disgrace of Alexander Bicknor produced a series of comprehensive extents, which, when taken together with the other leases and charters preserved in Alen's Register provide a fairly complete picture of the tenurial categories found on the archiepiscopal estates and also of the structures of most of the manors which survived into the 1320's.

Because the lands of the archbishopric formed a separate ecclesiastical liberty within the shire of Dublin, some of the powers and functions of archiepiscopal officials reflected those of shire officials, and in many aspects the administration of this manorial group paralleled that of the royal manors with one significant exception - whereas the royal manors were managed on a rentier basis from the mid-thirteenth century onwards, the archiepiscopal demesnes were still under direct cultivation in the mid 1320's. It is possible that similarities between the administration of these two groups stem from the fact that the practices common to the royal manors were introduced during vacancies and were subsequently continued by the incumbent's ministers.

The Archiepiscopal March

The structure of the archiepiscopal estates following the union of the archdiocese with the see of Glendalough was, in many ways, the fons et origo of the instability and vulnerability of the southern marcher manors of the archbishopric in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. An examination of the lands and their disposition shows that they fall into three regional groups: the manors north of the Liffey, the manors south of the Liffey and the manors in the Kildare-Wicklow-Dublin march. This latter group was the most vulnerable to raids launched from the heartland of the mountains and contained much of the land acquired through the absorption of Glendalough. Castlekevin appears to have been the largest and may even have been the only manorial centre associated with the lost bishopric, but the manors of Brittas (Le Bretach) and Kilmesantan, together with Hollywood, which was generally treated as a submanor of Ballymore, may also have been acquired from Glendalough. Ballymore, the largest of these marcher manors to have survived into the
1320's. was probably never associated with Glendalough, as, with the exception of its submanor, Hollywood, which might have been grafted on for administrative reasons at some date in the mid to late thirteenth century, its lands lay in Kildare and the portion of Wicklow bordering on Dublin and Kildare. It is unlikely that a small bishopric with a caput in the east of the Wicklow mountains, which was absorbed into the archdiocese by 1216, would have managed to acquire extensive holdings in Kildare and the western ranges of the mountains.

The destabilization and disintegration of these manors of the south eastern march, together with the increasing vulnerability of more secure manors such as Shankill, Tallaght, Rathcoole and Ballymore provide a unique insight into the increasing activity of the Irish of the Leinster mountains. While the most dangerous escalation in the frequency of raiding was that which occurred in the closing years of the thirteenth century, associated with the famine of 1294-6 and possibly with other less spectacular local crop failures, raiding was posing severe problems in the early 1270's. This coincided with the long vacancy following the death of Fulk of Sandford in 1271 and the brief reign of the absentee archbishop, John of Darlington. The sudden intrusion of royal officials into manors like Castlekevin may well have been the spark which set off the conflagration culminating in the de Gervill-de Ufford campaigns of 1274-7. It is likely that the archbishops' hold over much of the land in this area was more in the nature of suzerainty than absolute control, a situation similar to that found on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne, where a nominal control was exercised over lands held by the Mac Carthys. This type of delicate balance could easily have been overturned by the presence of royal officials attempting to exercise a form of control never exercised by archiepiscopal ministers.

The decline was most spectacular in the case of Castlekevin. No extent has survived for this manor but its size can be gauged from the extensive list of feofees by deed compiled sometime in the decade following 1256.

7. See Chapter V, p. 205.
The compilation of such a list, can only have been an indication that Castlekevin was then a significant source of revenue to the archbishopric. When Thomas Chaddesworth rendered his account as custos for the issues of the archbishopric from July 1272 to September 1277 he answered for £609-9-1½, but was allowed the entire amount in his discharge of account.

Nothing had been received because of the continuing war in that area. A subsequent account rendered by John of Sandford for the issues of the archbishopric for the first four months of 1279 shows that despite the campaigns, matters had not improved. Castlekevin was one of a number of destroyed manors which no one wished to rent because of the war of the Irish. While Richard de Abyndon's account of the temporalities of the archbishopric from 30th September 1296 - 13th January 1297 may not have included all of the michaelmas term rents, the £3-10-0 rent of free tenants at Castlekevin appears to have been the only income from that manor during his period of account. Taken in the context of a manor which should have been worth £118-3-2 per annum while de Chaddesworth was custos in the 1270's, this represents a continuous decline in profitability. By 1306 it had ceased even to be self-sufficient in grain and was merely a military centre provisioned with grain from Shankill. Despite the campaigns of 1309-12, Castlekevin had been lost as a manorial centre and thereafter was only of strategic importance as a base or bridgehead in the land of war.

Because of its size, the relatively protracted decline of Castlekevin tends to overshadow the total eclipse of the manors of Brittas, Kilmesantan, 

9. C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Allen's Register, pp 118-20 and pp 120-3 respectively. Similar lists were also compiled for Swords and Ballymore at this time.


15. As can be seen in the provision made for keeping Castlekevin during the vacancy following Richard de Havering's death in 1310, Mem Roll 4-5 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/5, p. 286 and John de Lekc's death in 1313, Mem. Roll 9 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/10, p. 419.
and Newtown. Their decline can be attributed mainly to the raiding of the 1270's. When de Chaddesworth accounted for Kilmesantan and Brittas in 1277 he was allowed their issues against his account. He was allowed £37-10-10¼ against the issues of Newtown, or just over half the revenue for which he was answerable from that manor. John of Sandford was unable to account for the issues of Kilmesantan and Brittas and only answered for £3-11-5 of the issues of Newtown in 1279. None of these manors surfaced in Richard de Abyndone's account of 1276-7 or in any of the subsequent accounts. Both Kilmesantan and Newtown were originally fairly small manors, being worth £13-1-0 and £13-13-0 respectively per annum prior to John de Chaddesworth's custody of the temporalities. Brittas, at £49-8-3, was worth substantially more, but was even more vulnerable to attack. Kilmesantan was absorbed into Tallaght and was by 1326 worth nothing because it was waste amongst the Irish. Newtown, which had become part of Rathcoole and Brittas which had become part of Clondalkin, were, by that time both worthless and within the terre guerre.

It is also clear from de Chaddesworth's accounts that many of the 'second line' of archiepiscopal manors south of the Liffey were under serious pressure due to the threat posed by the instability and unrest in the mountains. In proportion to annual assessed value, allowances for decrease in rents were substantial, occasionally almost equalling twice the annual value of the manor in question. Shankill, Tallaght, Rathcoole and Clondalkin all fell within this category while Ballymore and Colonia were, by comparison, more profitable. In the case of Shankill, Rathcoole and Tallaght, the spread of the march and the impact of raiding almost certainly lay at the root of this decline, but the lack of profitability of Clondalkin can hardly have been due to the impact of

17. Ibid., p. 162.
21. Ibid., p. 158.
23. Ibid., p. 184.
25. See Chapter III: Table I.
raiding. This manor was as well-screened by its position from attack as the northern portion of Newcastle Lyons or Esker and it is more likely that the decline in the quality of the soil noted in the 1326 extent had already begun to assert itself. Due to its location, Colonia would, in any case, have been one of the least vulnerable of the south Dublin archiepiscopal manors to raiding, but the profitability of Ballymore is somewhat more remarkable. A comparison could usefully be drawn between Newcastle Lyons and Ballymore in this particular context. At the end of the thirteenth century Newcastle Lyons was under considerably less pressure than its sister manor Saggard, probably because it was that much further to the west of the county. The pattern of raiding appears to have been such that manors in the eastern portion of the Dublin-Wicklow march as far west as Rathcoole and as far north as Saggard, were in considerably more danger than Newcastle Lyons, which lay on the border of Kildare, and Ballymore, which lay in the Kildare-Wicklow-Dublin march. It should be noted however, that Finglas, one of the north Dublin manors also had substantial allowances made against its issues in the de Chaddesworth account.

The 1326 extents provide a considerable indication of the increased threat posed to many of the manors south of the Liffey. Buildings at Tallaght had been burned and alternative valuations were given for demesne lands based on whether or not the land was at peace. Dual valuations of this type are an indication that the manor in question had passed into the march. The position at Shankill was very similar. By 1326 there were no buildings at the caput. These had long since been burnt and demolished by Irish raiders. Dual valuations were given for a portion of the demesne lands, but for the most part, demesne which used to be under the lord's plough was 'waste, and untilled for want of tenants, because near Irish malefactors'. Betagh tenements were untilled, cottages waste, the burgesses had fled and the rents of free tenants were all worthless either because of the proximity of the march or because the land itself was actually in Irish hands.

Even Ballymore, one of the more profitable manors listed in the de Chaddesworth account, was, by 1326, firmly within the march. The
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30. Ibid., pp 194-5.
31. Ibid., pp 189-90 and see also Chapter III: Table II.
castle hall had been thrown down and the constable’s chamber and the granary had also been thrown down and burnt. Dual valuations were given for substantial portions of the demesne. Pasture in Barrets Mountain was worthless through lack of beasts. This was presumably due to the frequency with which it was raided but could also reflect the drop in stocking levels caused by the cattle and sheep plagues of 1315-48 and the early 1320’s. Many of the outlying free tenements were waste: substantial tenements were listed in the decrease of rent section of the extent, many, if not all, in the Wicklow lands attached to the manor. Some of these tenements were merely in a strong march but others were firmly among the Irish.

The Famine of 1315-18 and the Bruce Invasion

The rains of 1315-48 caused more serious damage in the more prosperous archiepiscopal manors north of the Liffey and in Clondalkin than they did in the marchland manors. Terrain and soil type may well explain this phenomenon, as many upland manors in England escaped some of the worst consequences of the 1315-48 rains and the subsequent rains of the early 1320’s. In Ufford’s allowances on his account of the issues of the archbishopric in 1315, 120½ acres of land in Wherue, a member of Swords, 82½ acres of the central demesne at Swords and 48 acres of demesne in Ballymore lay waste and uncultivated for lack of tenants. Clearly the flat terrain and rich, heavy soil at Swords would have been far more susceptible to water-logging than the lighter and rather better drained demesne at Ballymore. The effects of the rains in Swords in 1314-5 can be most clearly seen in the loss of revenue from the manor’s meadows. In Swords itself 70 acres of meadow were worthless and the revenue from a further 12½ acres of meadow in the grange of Wherue had to be written off. Rathcoole, one of the southern manors with a demesne entirely devoted to meadow, only lost the revenue from 23½ acres of its meadow in the same years. The most serious weather damage to the southern manors appears to have been to the mills. The mill at Ballybough, a member of Ballymore, was thrown down and out of action for most of August and September in 1315. This

33. Ibid., pp 17-9
35. Ibid., p. 421.
36. Ibid., p. 421.
37. Ibid., pp 421-2.
was a watermill and was probably overwhelmed by a greater torrent than usual flooding the mill race. Had the damage been caused by Irish raiders this would have been noted in the allowances like the yield of 13 acres of meadow in Shankill which was removed per Hibernicos de Montanis Lagenie. 38. The mills at Tallaght, Swords and one of the smaller Swords mills at Seatown were also repaired during this period. 39.

The effects of the wet years in Ireland were compounded by those of the Bruce Invasion, and both the measures taken to stem the Scottish advance and the Scottish forces themselves caused a certain amount of damage to the archiepiscopal manors. Both the assembly and passage northwards of the earl of Ulster's army were cited as the reason for the destruction of 20 acres of meadow in Colonia, 3 acres of meadow in Finglas, the wood of Clondalkin and the gardens and orchards of Colonia, Clondalkin and Finglas. 40. The movement of any medieval army caused a certain amount of destruction through foraging, petty pillaging and the incidental damage resulting from the passage of a comparatively large body of men and horses. This sort of damage was largely accidental and unavoidable. On the other hand, the Scottish forces may have destroyed manorial centres in their path as a matter of policy. The deliberate destruction of Kells and other manors through which they passed on their first winter campaign would seem to indicate as much. Swords appears to have been the only archiepiscopal manor to have been attacked by the Bruces. Ralph le Clerk, guylour de la Rent le Roy au Swerdes complained in a petition of Michaelmas 1319 that he had been robbed of £18 in rent by the men of Ulster and the Scots which, on the day of the robbery, he was in the process of delivering to the Exchequer. 42. A subsequent inquisition by the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer vindicated Ralph's claims and stated that the Scots had invaded and were destroying the area at the time in question, just before the Bruce army bypassed Dublin. Whatever the scale of this destruction, other than the theft of £18, it seems to have had little or no long term effect. In the 1326 extents only two

39. Ibid., p. 420.
40. Ibid., p. 422.
41. This has been an issue of considerable controversy. In his article 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', Historical Studies, IV (1963), pp 111-25, J.F. Lydon has advanced the theory that Edward Bruce was following a scorched earth policy. R. Frame in 'The Bruces in Ireland 1315-8', I.H.S. vol. 19 (1974) pp 3-37, has raised some important and valid objections to this approach.
buildings in Swords were described as prostrate and blame for this was not attributed to the Scots.43.

Thus, the main effects of the crisis of 1315-18 were only felt by the two manors north of the Liffey and, to a lesser extent, Colonia and Clondalkin. Though there is no indication that the bad weather of these years had any serious impact on the marcher manors of the archbishopric, it would be unwise to assume that they escaped the effects of this natural catastrophe. Their location on higher ground than manors like Finglas and Swords would have meant that their natural drainage could have mitigated the effect of the rains just as appears to have been the case in some of the upland areas of England. Unrecorded attacks by the Irish on these manors probably overshadowed the impact of the rains, and, from the evidence of the 1326 extents, appear to have led to the inclusion of much of Ballymore, almost all of Shankill and areas of Tallaght and Rathcoole in the Wicklow-south Dublin march.

Manorial Structure within the Archiepiscopal Lordship

Virtually every form of manorial structure found in the lordship of Ireland generally also occurred on the lands of the archbishopric. The large marcher manor and the manor on the fringes of the land of war was represented respectively by Ballymore44 and Castlekevin,45 while Finglas, Rathcoole, Tallaght and Shankill were essentially variations on the same theme, the manor of the land of peace.46 Both Colonia and Clondalkin could be seen as belonging to the same overall category, but the size and importance of their demesnes in relation to the remaining lands within the manor was such as to place them within a distinct subdivision of that category.47 All of the three 'lost' manors of Newtown, Kilmesantan and Brittas appear to have been primarily betagh settlements with adjacent demesne land similar to the royal manors of Obrun and Othee.48

44. The comparison would be with a manor like Dunamase in the 1280's, see Chapter V, p. 243 and see also Chapter III: Table II.
45. Here the comparison would be with Dunamase in the 1320's and some of the Connacht lands of the earldom of Ulster, Chapter V, pp 243-4 and pp 236-41 respectively.
46. See below Chapter V, pp 143-201 and see Chapter III: Table II.
47. See Chapter III: Table II.
48. See above pp 98-9 and see Chapter I, pp 24-5.
Swords, the most prosperous of the archiepiscopal manors, was, of itself, something exceptional in the Irish context, a large manor which may well have been the result of consolidation and rationalisation and which continued to be relatively profitable with a substantial demesne under direct cultivation well into the 1320's. It is impossible to trace the early development and formation of these manors as the only corpus of extents to have survived are those compiled in 1326 and so the structural examination of the archiepiscopal estates is essentially one of the manors as they were in the early 1320's.

**Ballymore, Castlekevin, Newtown, Brittas and Kilmesantan**

In physical terms Ballymore was the largest of the archiepiscopal manors to have survived into the 1320's, as the only other manor which might have matched it in size was Castlekevin. By 1326 there was a double demesne at Ballymore, with a central demesne and a slightly larger subsidiary demesne at Ballybough. This second demesne may well have been the betagh land noted in Thomas de Chaddesworth's account, as the demesne lands of the manor were then approximately a third of the size of the demesne at Swords. No betagh lands were extended in 1326 and if the original relationship between demesne acreage and land in betagh hands is that represented by the ratio of the Ballymore to the Ballybough demesnes, it would indicate a near equivalence, something extremely unusual in the marcher manor, where much larger betagh granges with relatively light services would have served the demesne. The strategic location of the manor's four burgages was clearly aimed at holding this extremely large area together with substantial nucleated settlements, but whether this original intention was as efficiently fulfilled at Ballymore as on most of the other Leinster manors with manorial boroughs is open to question. Burgages in Ballymore, though held under the law of Breteuil, were very much larger than the standard Leinster burgage, or the burgage tenements at Rathmore, containing the standard frontage and 10 acres.

49. See Chapter III: Table II.
50. C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, pp 189-92 and Chapter III Table II. See ala Map U
52. C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, p. 120.
53. See Chapter VI pp 308-12
55. C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, p. 120.
Allowing for consolidation of holdings similar to that found in the burgage extents of Newtown Jerpoint and Old Coilleach, where tenements of two or more burgages were not uncommon, and for waste tenements, these boroughs despite their size may never have provided the local stability necessary to protect the integrity of the manor.

The most characteristic element of the structure of the marcher manor, a large number of substantial free tenements, formed the bulk of the land attached to Ballymore, though the ratio between the military and non-military holdings was somewhat unusual, given the location. Marcher manors on the Butler estates in Tipperary tended to have a much higher proportion of military tenements than was the case at Ballymore. This might be a reflection of some earlier entente cordiale between the archbishops and the local Irish or perhaps more stable conditions throughout the thirteenth century in the western sector of the north Wicklow march. Ballymore's submanor of Holywood, which was not extended with the rest of the manor in 1326 was another classic structural element of the larger marcher manor.

Although Castlekevin was not extended in 1326 having long since passed into the land of war, it is possible to establish the basic structure of the manor using the list of tenants by deed compiled for Fulk of Sandford, and Thomas de Chaddesworth's account. The demesne at Castlekevin appears to have been slightly less extensive than that of Ballymore. In de Chaddesworth's account the Ballymore demesne was worth nearly £31 per annum, while the Castlekevin demesne was worth only £24, but conditions might have deteriorated to such a degree by then that insecurity would have affected its value. There may have been two settlements of betaghs at Castlekevin one associated with the manorial caput itself and one associated with the demesne of the submanor at Killiskey. As the submanor was a self-contained unit with its own court, it is unlikely that its betaghs were those accounted for by de Chaddesworth in 1277. Considerably less feoffees by deed were listed at
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Castlekevin than at Ballymore, but the nature of the holdings there is even more indication of the strength of the march in that area. All of the free tenements at Ballymore were quantified in terms of a specific acreage in the 1326 extent, while a number of the Castlekevin holdings were unspecified, like many of those on manors such as Loxeudy or Dunamase. Considerable tracts of land were held as forest and much of the area of land associated with the manor must always have lain beyond the control of the archbishop and his ministers. No attempt appears to have been made to integrate tracts of land in the hands of local Gaelic magnates as part of the tenurial structure of Castlekevin, as was done on the manor of Donoghmore in the bishopric of Cloyne.

Nothing can be said of the submanor of Killiskey other than that it had a betagh settlement and its own court.

The manors of Newtown, Brittas and Kilmesantan appear to have been close in form and structure to the royal manors of Obrun and Othee, both of which were little more than extended betagh settlements in origin, although they all acquired a number of free tenements by 1272.

Remnants of manorial structure survived longest in Brittas, where the 1326 extent listed a demesne of 80 acres and a holding of 1,091 acres which had been in the hands of betaghs. The annual value of the works of these betaghs in de Chaddesworth's time was £1-9-9. Kilmesantan had a slightly larger demesne of 100 acres with a further 60 acres of wood also forming part of the demesne. In 1326 there was one free tenant, the Prior of St. John's, and no land was then noted as lying in betagh hands. The evidence of extensive betagh holdings on this manor is to be found in de Chaddesworth's account. Kilmesantan was a smaller manor than Brittas, being then worth £20-1-7 as opposed to £35-1-9 per annum.
Despite this, the works of its betaghs were valued at £1-3-0\frac{3}{4} per annum. Thus, the proportion of betagh tenants there must have been equal to or possibly even greater than that at Brittas. Nothing of the original structure of Newtown had survived by 1326, apart from three named tenements in Rathcoole, though an area of land in Johnstown containing 1,005 acres and noted by Alen may have formed part of this manor. It was the smallest of the three, being worth only £13-13-0 per annum in 1277. Its demesne was extremely small, being worth only a fifth of that of Castlekevin and its betaghs' works were worth only 5s. 9d. per annum. The betaghs of Newtown also owed a food render worth 5s. 1d. annually. It is unlikely that any of these manors were ever anything more than scale models of Othee.

**Finglas, Rathcoole, Tallaght and Shankill**

Finglas, Rathcoole, Tallaght and Shankill were all similar in basic structural form: their location in relation to the march was what ultimately determined the local variations in type, which had become evident by 1326. There was one significant variant within the group in demesne size as the demesnes at both Finglas and Shankill were considerably larger than those of Rathcoole and Tallaght, but another divergence, the larger acreage in the hands of free tenants at Shankill, is also such as to warrant comment.

Rathcoole was the least valuable of the three, being worth only £41-6-2\frac{3}{4} per annum during de Chaddesworth's period as custos of the issues of the archbishopric; and the first to lose all vestiges of its betagh settlements. While de Chaddesworth answered for betagh rents in his account, no labour services appear to have been either exacted or sold. The demesne was not extensive and had been leased out in its entirety by 1326. There is no indication of when this leasing began save that it was after 1277, but if a substantial amount had been leased before the 1315-18 crisis and cultivation had been relatively unprofitable, betagh works, their commutation, and, by inference, the tenurial category from which they were derived would have been increasingly irrelevant. In any case, Rathcoole's importance in the overall context of the estate, seems

75. For extent see C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, pp 183-5 and Table II, Chapter III. See also Map II.
77. See Chapter III: Table II.
to have lain in the size and quality of its meadows, which were second in area only to those in Swords.78. One feature of Rathcoole in 1326, for which one cannot account, is the size of its manorial borough.79. The borough at Tallaght, the manor closest in size to Rathcoole seems to have been less than a quarter of its size, and while there were more burgage tenements in the manor of Shankill, these were dispersed in three separate centres.

Finglas was still functioning as a major centre of demesne cultivation in 1326 but signs of a decline, more gradual than that occurring in Shankill and Tallaght, were discernible.80. Most of the original 321 acres of demesne was still under cultivation. Only 24 acres had become detached from the enterprise to form a park. Payments for the commutation of labour services were being exacted from tenants holding betagh land. When these payments, which amounted to 19s. 5d. per annum are compared with the corresponding income from betaghs in de Chaddesworth's time of £14-12-3½ per annum,81 some measure of the change and decline which had taken place in the intervening period can be seen. There were originally at least two and probably five betagh granges. By 1326 the land in these granges was held by free tenants-at-will, with average holdings of less than 10 acres each. Although these tenants were paying annual sums in lieu of commuted services, it is probable that the services had been modified before these payments were fixed. The loss of betagh labour and fragmentation of betagh holdings is an indication that Finglas had begun to move from being a manor whose primary raison d'être was the income from its demesne, to one from which rents constituted the primary source of income. Its lost betaghry and decline in value may well stem from the impact of the 1315-18 crisis and other crises of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries thus neatly paralleling the known situation at Clondalkin.

Shankill, and, to a lesser extent, Tallaght, lacked the structure and size to cope with the threat posed by the expansion of the south Dublin march. Less than a third of the demesne at Shankill was under cultivation in 1326.82 The betaghs from Shankill and Kilmacberne had fled, the cottages were waste and all but the Dalkey burgages were also waste. Conditions may even have been worse than those prevailing in Ballymore,

78. See Chapter III: Table II.
79. See Chapter III, Tables II and III.
80. For extent see C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Allen's Register, 173-5 and Table II, Chapter III. See also Map II.
82. For extent see C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Allen's Register, pp 194-6 and Table II, Chapter III. See also Map II.
and while a manor with almost 20,000 acres held by its free tenants, a demesne and substantial sub-demesne, four boroughs and a large submanor was in some position to weather the storm; this was not the case with Shankill. Though larger than Finglas, Tallaght or Rathcoole, it was, nevertheless, a manor of the land of peace in origin, and not one which could have hoped to survive in the prevailing conditions. Tallaght, on the other side of the county, was less vulnerable to this form of attack, but signs of the encroaching menace can be seen in the proliferation of dual valuations contingent on whether there was either peace or war. By 1326 the betagh granges at Tallaght had ceased to exist, with almost half of the betagh land then being leased at will and the remainder lying waste. Its original structure was, with the exception of its small borough, similar to that of Finglas, and, like that of Shankill, entirely inappropriate to the conditions beginning to develop in the western sector of the south county march in the 1320's.

Clondalkin and Colonia

Both Clondalkin and Colonia were, in structural, as well as in actual terms, manors of the land of peace, though Colonia was to become part of a new march. In both cases the demesne and the betagh land servicing them were the most important elements in the overall structure. By 1326, signs of decline were apparent in both manors. Apart from Rathcoole, Colonia was the only archiepiscopal manor with a substantial amount of demesne land leased. One of its betagh granges, Boly major, had three farmers holding a third of the land, while the remainder lay waste because its tenants were undone. The original tenements in the other betagh grange, Boly minor, were still in the hands of betagh tenants, but their rent was linked to prevailing conditions and their labour services worthless because their tenements lay in the march and they were unwilling to remain on this land after nightfall. Thus, the size of the demesne had been decreased through leasing, an indication of declining profitability, and the tenements originally intended to service this demesne had become vulnerable to attack. Free land in Taney and Milltown had also passed into a new marchland, but in all of these cases the problem was caused by evil-doers rather than by the Irish, so that this new march may have been the direct result of anarchy caused by the Bruce Invasion.

83. For extent see C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Allen's Register, pp 180-3 and Chapter III: Table II.
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Contraction of the demesne may have been the result of long-term damage caused by the rains of 1315-18, while the waste tenements in the Dublin streets administered as part of this manor may well reflect the continued effects of the famines associated with the crop failures of those years.

Clondalkin was, to a very much greater extent the casualty of the 1315-18 crisis and soil exhaustion. Some 55 acres of the demesne land sown with oats was of markedly poorer quality than the other 49 acres thus sown, and the waste land extended as pasture was described as being poor and worn-out. Damage to this land may have preceded the 1315-18 crisis, but the lack of beasts needing pasturage was almost certainly a result of the murrains of those years and of the early 1320’s. Only two of the betagh tenements serving the demesne were still in the hands of betaghs by 1326, though Alen notes that in an extent of 1351 there were 23 betaghs holding 126.8 acres. Were this the case, it would imply an increase in the betagh population of the manor which could only have occurred between 1326 and 1351 and was sustained despite the Black Death and against the general trend. It is more likely that the extent was one of 1297 (25 Edward I) and that the date was misread by Alen. As there was a vacancy in 1297, but none in 1351 this would seem to be the most likely explanation. The decline in the betagh population of Clondalkin implied by this adjustment to Alen’s original figures is more in line with the type of demographic attrition caused by the famines of the early fourteenth century.

By 1326 most of the betagh land still under cultivation appears to have been either in the hands of farmers or gavellors. In general the population of Clondalkin appears to have decreased considerably in the course of the first quarter of the fourteenth century; most tenements were waste pro defectu tenencium, and in some cases poverty of the land was also cited with lack of tenants as the reason for waste. There were even some waste tenements amongst the lands held by the burgesses of the manorial borough. Thus, both Colonia and Clondalkin were severely damaged by the crisis of 1315-18, one in terms of the growth of what appears to have been an Anglo-Irish march, and the other in terms of
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demographic attrition and increasing problems with over-worked soil.

Swords

By 1326, Swords was the most prosperous of the archbishop's manors, outstripping Ballymore, which was, in physical terms, the largest of the manors within the estate. That this was due to a combination of the fertile soil of north county Dublin and its location, far from any of the Dublin marches, cannot be doubted. Although size and prosperity sets Swords apart from many of the manors of the land of peace extended in the fourteenth century, the structural relationship between the various categories of land is typical. A central demesne at Swords and two subsidiary demesnes were served by the betagh lands of Wherue, Boly, Sillenstown and other minor granges. There may also have been a third subdemesne at Clenmethan, where an area of 487 acres was in the hands of 10 English tenants in 1326. All of the named tenants of Clenmethan owed harvest reaping services, and so it is possible that their lands were originally intended to service the land unencumbered by services of any sort in the hands of the 10 un-named tenants. This latter area was probably an instance of a demesne leased, not because of any problems with fertility, but rather because of its location, which may have rendered direct management less efficient than in the other subdemesnes.

Swords was unusual in that, apart from its betagh, some of its cottagers and all of its burgesses owed labour service. This spreading of the burden of labour services may have been an initial response to the size and importance of the demesnes. In structural terms, the relationship found on manors such as that of Rathfeigh is more general. The boroughs and concentrations of cottage tenements coincided with the main demesne and one of the subdemesnes, with the exception of Portrane, where there was a small cluster of cottage tenements, possibly occupied by fishermen. There is evidence of some demographic contraction in the case of the cottagers of Swords, as only 6 cottars held the 20 cottages of Portrane, 20 the 46 cottages at Lusk, and the built and unbuilt cottage tenements of Swords were, for the most part, waste. Thus, it would seem that in Swords the problem of the vanishing cottar was rather more serious than that of the vanishing betagh. Apart from the amount of land involved, the proportional relationship between the size of the

89. For extent see C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, pp 175-80 and see Chapter III: Table II. See also Map II.

90. See Chapter III: Tables II and III.

91. See Chapter VI, pp 271-3.
demesne and the amount of land held by free tenants was similar to that in most of the other manors of its basic type within the archbishoppal estates: in round terms a ratio of 1:7.

Land Usage and Stock Rearing

The crop and stock valuations compiled at the time of the 1323 sequestration provide some indication of the nature of farming undertaken on the lands of the archbishopric, the relative fertility of the land, the distribution of stock and the extent to which the estate functioned as an integrated unit. The first significant factor to be seen in these figures is the fact that the demesne acreage under cultivation in 1323 is far less than the acreage extended in 1326. In the case of Swords, where, with a main demesne of 660 acres, and three course rotation, one would expect to find at 440 acres under cultivation, only 260 acres were sown in 1323. There are a number of possible explanations for this shortfall. Demesne land may have been leased on a short term basis, so that there could have been considerable annual fluctuations in the area of demesne actually sub carucis domini in any given year. Not all the land may have been valued: if the goods and land valued were initially being used to cover a pledge in case of distrain, and the initial sequestration may have been little more than that before the seriousness of the Bicknor frauds was realised, the valuers may have applied certain local limits to their actions. Of course it is also quite likely that a certain degree of undervaluation could have taken place. Nevertheless, if used in comparative and relative terms, and not viewed as an absolute statement of size, these statistics are perfectly valid.

The largest single sowings were at Swords, Clondalkin, with its grange of Ballyfermot, and Finglas. Ballymore's relatively small sowings may have been the result of local instability. Fertility when land is sown with wheat is usually a fairly reliable indication of soil quality. Both Swords and Finglas had a relatively high expected rate of return, which, given their location, was to be expected, as had the land sown with wheat at Clondalkin itself. The comparatively lower rate for the land at Ballyfermot may be a reflection of the soil exhaustion that appears in the 1326 extent of Clondalkin. Neither Tallaght nor Colonia was as fertile as Swords and Finglas, and the thin upland soil at Ballymore was least able to support wheat. Oat yields were lower, and of a more

even standard throughout the estate. The highest returns were those expected in Clondalkin and Colonia, where, in one case, there is evidence of declining soil quality. Perhaps the most dramatic contrast is that between the wheat and oats yields at Ballymore. There the wheat yield was abnormally low, while the oats yield, though not as high as that of Colonia or Clondalkin, was on a par with the other manors of the lordship. This illustrates amply the fact that wheat was very much harder on soil than oats and that therefore oats were more suited and more likely to crop relatively well on poorer soils.

Certain patterns of stock rearing also emerge from these statistics. Three manors, Swords, Ballymore and Clondalkin, had vaccaries. All of these manors had extensive pastures. Manors with relatively few animals like Colonia and Tallaght had, at least, sufficient affers or oxen to constitute a full plough-team, though one manor, Finglas, had no plough beasts of any description valued. Affers from Swords might have been used at Finglas, or the necessary animals might have been hired locally when the need arose, as was the case with affers used for harrowing on Bigod's lands in the liberty of Carlow.93 Sheep were of considerable importance in three of the archiepiscopal manors. There were extensive flocks at both Finglas and Clondalkin, and there were a large number of lambs at Ballymore. Sheep rearing did not require pasturage of the quality needed to maintain a vaccary, and, while the land at Finglas does not seem to have been of poor quality, the quality of even some of the pasturage at Clondalkin was questioned in the 1326 extent.94 One feature of animal husbandry at Ballymore is of considerable significance: the fact that bullocks rather than oxen and lambs rather than sheep were valued on its lands. This could be an indication that Ballymore specialised in the first stage of stock rearing, caring, in particular, for lambs from other manors. No lambs were valued at either Finglas or Clondalkin, where one would have expected to find the lambs produced by ewes amongst the mature flocks.

The Archepiscopal Mills

Location and size of the manor in question were the two factors governing the distribution and profitability of the mills on the lands.

93. See the account of Ballysax for 1285-6, Exitus Necessarie, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/5, Text given in M.C. Lyons 'The Manor of Ballysax 1280-88' Retrospect, new series No. 1 (1961), pp 40-50.

94. See Chapter III: Table II.
of the archbishopric. With one known exception, all of these were water mills. The contours of the land and the nature of the rivers which formed the mill races would, therefore, have had a significant bearing on the efficiency with which the mill in question functioned. Mills of the two manors north of the Liffey would thus probably have been less efficient as working units than those of manors south of that river. As the income from any mill was governed by the amount of grain processed in any given year, unless it was leased out at farm, the number of tenants either likely, for convenience's sake or obliged, under the terms of their tenurial contract to render suit to the lord's mill, also played a manor role in determining profitability.

Swords and Ballymore, the largest of the archbishopopal manors to have survived the thirteenth century, had the greatest concentration of mills. Ballymore had five mills in 1326, and may well have had a sixth, Balyllomn, in the mid thirteenth century. At least two water mills were functioning in Swords in 1326, with another mill thrown down and ruined also noted in that extent. A horse mill (molendinum equinum) is known to have existed there in 1279, and it is possible that the tidal mills at Seatown (le Seton) repaired in 1315, was not amongst those extended in 1326. As John of Ufford differentiated between it and the mills at Swords in his accounts of 1315, this latter contingency is more likely. Despite the fact that only three of the Ballymore mills were functioning in 1326, income from either their tolls or farms amounted to £14, whereas the four mills at Swords were only worth £5 in the same year. Both manors had large numbers of tenants, but the Swords tenantry would have probably sold more unmilled grain and would have had easier access to other mills than the tenants of Ballymore. The power of the rivers serving the mills of Ballymore and Dunlavin would also have been such as to ensure that they had the greatest possible potential for efficiency of all of the mills on the archbishop's lands, while the capacity of water mills on a manor forced to acquire additional milling capacity through operating a horse mill must have been reflected in much lower efficiency.

95. This was the horse mill at Swords, see below n. 99.
96. See Chapter III: Table II.
98. See Chapter III: Table II.
The two mills at Colonia were a greater source of income than all of the Swords mills in 1326. One of these, the 'wodemill' held by the prior of Holy Trinity, was near St. Thomas' and would probably have serviced the burgesses of New Street, Patrick's Street and Kevin's Street.¹⁰² Both mills may also have handled surplus grain which could not have been processed at the King's mills near the Castle. A third mill had been functioning in Colonia in the 1270's,¹⁰³ but it cannot have survived into the fourteenth century, as it is not mentioned in the 1326 extents. It may have been in the part of Colonia that became vulnerable to attack, but it is far more likely that its disappearance was symptomatic of the general decline and contraction, which began with the growing problem associated with the financing of purveyance in the 1290's.

Where comparative figures are available, a large decline in mill revenue from the levels of the 1270's to the 1326 valuations is visible.¹⁰⁴ This decline merely reflects the impact of the agrarian crises and the famines of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Famine mortality cannot be quantified, but a contracting population would have needed less grain. Worsening climatic conditions and local soil exhaustion, such as that at Clondalkin, would have meant that less land was under cultivation and that some land still under cultivation had ceased to be as fertile as it had been in the mid-thirteenth century.

The Lands of the Priory of Holy Trinity

The only manors in Dublin for which a corpus of data similar to that available for the lands of the archbishopric are those of the priory of Holy Trinity. Their importance is primarily that of a control group, in that they can validly be compared to the manors of the archbishopric. Because the period covered by the Account Roll was later than much of the archiepiscopal material, it provides a sense of continuity, a link between the period of the agrarian crises of the early fourteenth century and the first visitation of the plague. The Account Roll post dates the major crises of 1315-8 and the 1320's, as well as the local Dublin famine of 1330-2. In as much as such a thing can be done, these accounts reflect the optimum likely extent of any pre Black Death recovery on the more prosperous and less exposed manors of county Dublin.

¹⁰⁴ See Chapter III: Table V.
Although no complete extent has survived for the lands of the priory, it is possible, using a c.1326 rental and the tithe valuation of 1306, to establish the nature and dispersal of the various categories of tenement and the likely size of the demesne. Establishing the demesne acreage poses certain problems, and only an approximate figure can be determined from the data in both sources. As it is impossible to determine from the rental how much of the original demesne was leased either at farm or at will by 1326, any estimate of the demesne lands derived from this source is likely to err on the conservative side. Any acreage thus computed would also represent the total demesne, the lord's pasture and woodland as well as the arable land and there is no way of establishing how much land would have fallen into either of these categories. Further problems are posed by the fact that the surviving grange accounts, from which it is possible to establish likely acreages under cultivation, date from the 1340's, by which time the demesnes may have been diminished through additional leasing.

Total acreages for all three manors were given in the 1306 valuation, and as the 1326 rental indicated that there was an average rent of 1s. per acre, an estimate of manorial land under the direct control of the prior and convent can be established by a simple process of converting the 1326 money rents to acres and subtracting the result from the 1306 valuation. One further caveat should be noted at this point: the 1306 acreages may have been rounded up or down slightly for the sake of administrative convenience. The smallest of the demesnes was thus that of Glasnevin, where 95 3/4 acres of land remained under the prior's control, while at Clonkeen and Grange-Gorman 296 2/3 acres and 338 acres would have fallen into this category. By the mid 1340's, the demesne at Glasnevin seems to have been completely abandoned, as no haggard accounts have survived for this manor. This would have been a recent development, for between 1337 and 1339, two horses, a number of ploughs and some carts were bought for use there. Thus, by the mid 1340's the land was


106. Land held by tenants at Glasnevin in 1326 was worth £13-4-0, and the total acreage extended in 1306, 3 carucates; land held by tenants at Grange-Gorman in 1326 was worth £7-2-2 and the total acreage extended in 1306, 4 carucates; land held by tenants in Clonkeen in 1326 was worth £27-4-3 and the total acreage extended in 1306, 7 carucates. For location of these manors see map II.

either leased or being used as pasture for the prior's stock. It is surely logical that what was clearly the weakest of these three manors in terms of demesne cultivation would have been the first to abandon it, probably on grounds of cost efficiency. It is likely that some of the more substantial tenements at Glasnevin listed in the 1326 rental, such as those held by John de Barry and Geoffrey Pynch,\(^{108}\) represented early examples of this form of leasing.

The survival of haggard accounts for both Grange Gorman and Clonkeen in the mid 1340's mean that it is possible to compute tentative estimates of the acreages under cultivation in Grange Gorman in 1343 and Clonkeen in the following year. If one assumes a yield similar to that of 1323 in the archiepiscopal manors,\(^{109}\) the factor of variance is such that the acreages sown in both 1343 and 1344 would be encompassed. Unfortunately, the Winchester statistics can only be used as a guide, not a control, as no data has survived for any of the Winchester manors in 1323, but one can say, on the basis of the \(-15.14\)\(^{\text{th}}\) deviation of 1343 and \(+27.68\)\(^{\text{th}}\) deviation of 1344,\(^{110}\) that the GrangeGorman estimate, because of the lower proportion of spring crops is likely to be nearer, and the Clonkeen estimate farther from the maximum possible acreage under cultivation.\(^{111}\)

An examination of the Grange Gorman statistics reveals that a relatively small part of the 338 acres in the prior's hand in 1323 was still under cultivation in 1343. The maximum acreage projected on the basis of the haggard accounts is less than a third of this possible demesne acreage.\(^{112}\) There is, however, some evidence that, for whatever reason, the 1342-3 sowings were less extensive than usual. Using the rate of sowing quoted in the 1504 extent of the manor of Cloncurry, the wheat retained as seed for the following year would have served approximately 55\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres.\(^{113}\)

\(^{108}\) J. Mills, Account Roll of Holy Trinity, p. 189 and p. 191 respectively.

\(^{109}\) See Chapter III: Table IV.


\(^{111}\) See Table V. The Grange Gorman and Clonkeen data is abstracted from the two haggard accounts given in J. Mills, Account Roll of Holy Trinity, pp 49-53 and pp 77-83.

\(^{112}\) See above, p.116 ,p.106.

\(^{113}\) This is 5 bushels or just over \(\frac{3}{4}\) crannoc per acre. Newport B. White, Red Book of Ormond, Dublin 1932, p. 29.
This is slightly greater than the maximum projected acreage under wheat in the previous year. No attempt was made to provide for the following year from the barley and oats in the haggard; thus the spring seed was probably not purchased until closer to the time of sowing. It might also imply that there was not sufficient spring grain in store to serve both as fodder and as seed for the coming year. Excluding areas of woodland and poor pasture, it is therefore likely that the area of demesne land under direct cultivation at Grange Gorman underwent considerable contraction between 1326 and 1343. This would have been entirely consistent with both an increase in the amount of land leased at will or at farm and a general contraction in the market for basic agrarian products such as grain, resulting from the demographic crises of the early fourteenth century and the collapse of the supply market.

It is clear from the amount of grain produced on Clonkeen in 1344 that the demesne remained approximately the size it appears to have been in 1326, as an acreage of 138-185 acres is entirely consistent with a demesne of 296 acres, due allowances having been made for fallow, pasture and woodland. When further allowances are made for land used for sheep rearing on this manor, the amount of leasing at Clonkeen must have been considerably less than that at Glasnevin or Grange Gorman. An interesting imbalance, which also appears in the case of the Grange Gorman statistics, the fact that substantially more land was sown with wheat in both manors, is a reversal of the pattern emerging on the archiepiscopal manors in 1323. On the archbishop's lands, with the exception of Clondalkin, the area under spring grain was either greater than, or equalled, the area under wheat. Oats are a safer crop than wheat for water-logged or poor soil, and the high acreage under spring crops on the archiepiscopal manors may have been the result of lessons learned during the crisis of 1315-18. The balance on the lands of the priory may well reflect a long-term improvement in weather conditions which obviated the need for the more cautious policies pursued on the lands of the archbishopric in the 1320's. The importance of the income from tithes on the manor of Clonkeen is also apparent from the 1344 haggard account.

Stock rearing does not appear to have played as important a role in the manors of the priory as it did on the archiepiscopal manors. Although animals were bought for both Glasnevin and Grange Gorman in 1339, most

114. See above, p.116, n.106 and See Chapter III, Table V.
115. See Chapter III: Table IV.
of these were plough beasts.\textsuperscript{116} The only exception was a bull purchased for Grange Gorman, which may be an indication of a small vaccary or a local experiment.\textsuperscript{117} Sheep appear to have been kept both at Glasnevin and Clonkeen, with the main flock being based at Clonkeen - the situation resembling that at Clondalkin in 1323.\textsuperscript{118} There is evidence of sheep being moved from Glasnevin to Clonkeen in 1344 and this either marks the amalgamation of the Glasnevin flock with that of Clonkeen or some form of local transhumance.\textsuperscript{119} The only substantial sales of wool from the priory's lands in 1344 was of $14\frac{3}{4}$ stones of sheep's wool and 3 stones of lamb's wool from Clonkeen.\textsuperscript{120} This would seem to indicate that amalgamation, rather than pastoral migration, lay behind the transfer of sheep from Glasnevin to Clonkeen.

In structural terms the manors of the priory were very unlike those of the archbishopric. There was a clear lack of diversity in tenurial categories, with most tenements being servile to a greater or lesser degree.\textsuperscript{121} Clearly, the original function of the tenant on all of these manors was the servicing of the demesne, but it is of interest to note that this effect was not attained through the use of betagh tenure, but rather through the use of the servile cottager and small-holder. A rough similarity in the number of encumbered tenements both in Glasnevin and Grange Gorman may point to original demesnes of a similar size, though the proliferation of the servile messuage at Glasnevin, which tended to be larger than most of the other servile holdings on priory land may conceal a degenerate betagh settlement, the taint of betaghry having vanished with the last tenants of that type to have held the land in question. Demesne cultivation on both of the northern manors is likely to have taken place at a later stage than was the case at Clonkeen. Despite the burden of services exacted from the unfree tenants of these manors, hired labour and possibly the retention of a famuli would have been essential to manage the lands in question. The multiplicity of servile tenements at Clonkeen would have come closer to providing for the cultivation of the manorial demesne, an indication that cultivation had been intensive prior to the agrarian boom of the 1270's and 1280's. The smaller scale of all of these manors vis à vis the size of even the middle range of archiepiscopal manor would also have tended to obviate the need for diversity in the form of tenurial holding.

\textsuperscript{116} J. Mills, Account Roll of Holy Trinity, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., p. 27.
\textsuperscript{118} See Chapter III: Table IV.
\textsuperscript{119} J. Mills, Account Roll of Holy Trinity, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., p. 56.
\textsuperscript{121} See Chapter III: Table VII.
The primary importance of this material lies in the extent to which it reveals the managerial re-alignment on relatively prosperous manors prior to the Black Death. Abandonment of the demesne at Glasnevin owed much to its small size and diminishing profitability, and nothing to external pressures such as those experienced by marcher manors like Shankill. The contractions at Grange Gorman were such as could reasonably have been expected to occur at Clondalkin, where soil exhaustion had rendered unprofitable the cultivation of a considerable portion of the demesne. A continuous, if scaled down, interest in the direct cultivation of the priory's demesnes, does, however, set these manors apart from the major mid-fourteenth century group of estates for which accounts have survived, those of Elizabeth de Clare. While the move towards rentier management is discernible, the pace and extent is slower and lesser, stemming, probably, from the fact that the priors were resident on their estates, while Elizabeth de Clare was merely interested in the most efficient and profitable forms of management possible.

The distribution of certain forms of servile and non-servile tenure on both the lands of the archbishopric and the priory were governed by the structural needs of the estates in question. Scale alone would have counted for much in this instance, for the archiepiscopal lands constituted a lordship and liberty in their own right, while those of the priory formed a very much smaller estate. It is for this reason that strategic questions relating to settlement would not have posed any major problems on the priory's manors. Divergence can be seen both in the nature of servile holdings and the customary labour owed by their tenants on both groups of manors and in the chronologies of adaption, change and decline on both estates. Changes occurring on archiepiscopal manors were a response both to the expansion of the march and the agricultural boom of the 1280's. By 1326, the long-term decline of these manors, casualties of the crises of the early fourteenth century was reflected in a dramatic loss of revenue from the sale of commuted labour services. Similar indications of decline do not occur in the priory rental of 1326. Indeed, with the exception of the Clonkeen grange of Villa Grangie, this rental seems to reflect a certain atrophy in tenurial structures, but this impression may be misleading and would be reinforced by the absence of any earlier rentals and customals for the lands in question. It would,

122. See Chapter III: Table II.
123. This group of estates is examined in Chapter IV.
124. See Chapter III: Tables VIII and IX.
125. See Chapter III: Table X.
therefore, appear that the cumulative impact of the crises of the 1320's and early 1330's was the major impetus behind the changes in demesne cultivation and possibly also tenurial structures in the 1340's.

Tenurial Categories and Customary Service on the Lands of the Priory and the Archbishopric

The most obvious difference between the manors of the archbishopric and those of the priory is in size, hence the absence of manorial boroughs on priory land. Manors as large as Swords, Ballymore and Shankill needed areas of nucleated settlement and burgess tenure was a popular inducement used to ensure that such desirable patterns of settlement occurred. Most, if not all, of the burgage tenements on archiepiscopal land seem to have been held under the law of Breteuil.126. It provided a useful foundation for charters given to small boroughs and, because it was not over-elaborate, was flexible and could be adapted to local needs. Its adaptability can be seen in a comparison of the size of tenement found in the boroughs of Ballymore and the borough at Rathcoole. In both cases the burgesses enjoyed the law of Breteuil, but individual burgages at Ballymore were considerably larger than those in Rathcoole.127. Ballymore was a large marcher manor. Nucleated settlement would have been essential to ensure the existence of strategically located bases from which the manor could have been administered and defended from any concerted attack. Large tenements held at a low rent in these boroughs would have attracted a number of settlers who might not otherwise have taken land in such an isolated and vulnerable area. Rathcoole was less vulnerable and probably very much more attractive from the small settlers' point of view. Such divergence was possible under the law of Breteuil. This would not have been the case with more elaborate bodies of custom, such as the customs of Bristol and may not have been possible under the Leinster borough custom, which appears to have been a fusion of modified elements of the customs of Bristol with the law of Breteuil.128.

The versatility of this borough custom can also be seen in the fact that labour services could be and were grafted onto its stem.129. Semi-servile forms of burgess tenure were not uncommon in the lordship of Ireland, particularly in episcopal or archiepiscopal boroughs. Kilmacloonine, a

126. See Chapter III: Table III.
127. Ibid.
129. See Chapter III: Table III.
borough on the lands of the bishop of Cloyne, was, with the exception of a brief interval in the mid thirteenth century, a borough tenanted by betaghs.\(^{130}\) Services owed by the burgesses of Swords and Lusk, and, to a lesser extent, those of Clondalkin and Shankill, originally buttressed the servicing of the adjacent demesnes by betagh or cottager tenants. The existence of such services at Swords and Lusk, where extensive demesnes were under cultivation is, in this context, entirely reasonable. Such was the fertility of the land there that these services would have been unlikely to discourage settlement.

Most of the customary labour on the lands of the archbishopric was drawn from two particular tenurial categories, the betagh and the unfree cottar.\(^{131}\) This was originally extremely valuable in the case of manors like Swords, Finglas and Ballymore.\(^{132}\) In the early to mid thirteenth century, it would probably have been exacted in the form of certain or uncertain services, the latter, in the eyes of John Alen, compiler of the Register, being a particularly clear indication of the taint of servitude and betaghry.\(^{133}\) By the second half of the thirteenth century many such services were being commuted to money payments. No attempt was being made to use betagh labour on newly created manors such as Fennagh, in the liberty of Carlow, and de Chadeshor's account of the temporalities of the archbishopric from 1272-7 show that such commutation had become a normal practice on the lands of the archbishopric.\(^{134}\) Certain specified services may have been expensive to exact, as the lord may have been obliged to provide food for betaghs discharging these services, and, in any case, would not have been particularly flexible. It was thus more efficient and ultimately more profitable to rely on a hard core of specialist labour provided by the famuli and on additional labour hired at certain times of the year like that of the sheep-shearing or the harvest — hence the coincidence of an agrarian boom with the widespread commutation of labour services.

Betaghs, and probably also unfree cottars, appear to have suffered severely as a result of the famines of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. If one examines the 1326 extent of the manor of Finglas, where there can be no question of an expanding march engulfing the local servile tenements, most of the original betagh lands were in

130. See Chapter VI, pp 280-2
131. See Chapter III: Table IX.
133. C. McNeill, Cal Archbishop Alen's Register, p. 188.
134. See Chapter VI, p. 285 and also Chapter III: Table VIII.
the hands of the farmers.\textsuperscript{135} Vacant holdings of this type increasingly came into the hands of farmers and gavellors, and ultimately many of the original services or their commutations owed to the lord from such tenements were lost.

A comparison between the income accruing from the sale of services in de Chaddesworth's time as keeper of the temporalities and the value of those services listed in the 1326 extents shows the degree to which the distinctions between the categories of smaller tenement on the archiepiscopal estates had become blurred as a result of this transition. Manors where such services were extended were all manors with relatively large demesnes. The most detailed extent of services came from Swords, the manor with the largest area of demesne land still sub carruca domini.\textsuperscript{136} No income from services was forthcoming on Shankill or Tallaght, both of which were exposed to attack from the march.\textsuperscript{137} Betagh services on Colonia had been lost through the growth of the Dublin march and, probably, Anglo-Irish lawlessness in the area.\textsuperscript{138} No income was extended for the sale of betagh works on Ballymore, and even the knowledge that there had once been such tenants had ceased to be current by 1326.\textsuperscript{139}

By comparison with the archiepiscopal extents, the 1326 rental of the lands of the priory of Holy Trinity is almost archaic in tone. There is no indication that any of the services listed represented a diminution of an original corpus of customary labour, and evidence only in Clonkeen of consistent widespread commutation. None of the priory's unfree tenants were betagh, though the services rendered by the holders of messuages at Glasnevin were very similar to those of the betaghs of Lisronagh.\textsuperscript{140} No appreciable distinction can be drawn between the services owed by the cottars and messuage holders of this manor. The cottars merely undertook extra reaping in lieu of carting at harvest time. Although these tenants were listed in different categories by the compilers of the rental, they would seem to be of the same basic social stratum, the only significant difference between them being the size of their holdings, as many of the messuages were considerably larger than cottage holdings. Both groups could be said to fulfil the function performed elsewhere by the betagh or the more encumbered type of unfree cottar.

\textsuperscript{135} See Chapter III: Tables II, VIII and IX.
\textsuperscript{136} See Chapter III: Table IX.
\textsuperscript{137} See Chapter III: Tables II and IX.
\textsuperscript{138} C. McNeill, Cal Archbisho~ Alen's Register, pp 170-1.
\textsuperscript{139} See Chapter III: Tables VIII and IX.
\textsuperscript{140} See Chapter III: Table IX and Chapter VI: Table III.
There was only one encumbered messuage at Grange Gorman and there the services, mainly ploughing, could be said to have been of a specialist nature. Although there were more unfree cottage tenements there than in Glasnevin, the larger local demesne and very much lighter services raise certain interesting questions. It is possible that the larger demesne meant that Grange Gorman had been more heavily dependent on hired labour from an earlier date than Glasnevin. Under these circumstances, however, one would expect to see services listed purely in monetary terms. The detailed description of the services seems to indicate that commutation was relatively recent and possibly still optional at the will of the lord. There is also a possibility that more heavily burdened tenants discharged some of their obligations at Grange Gorman, whose very name suggests that it may originally have been a manorial grange rather than a manor in its own right. It is hard to reconcile the disparity between the services and the size of the demesnes on Glasnevin and Grange Gorman, and this form of transference of labour might go some way towards explaining what otherwise seems to be an irrational situation.

The demesnes at Clonkeen were primarily serviced by the tenants of the Villa Grangie, most of whom were smallholders. Commutation of labour services appears to have been well established in the case of these tenants, for no detailed schedule of their actual services appears in the 1326 rental. From the amounts involved, it seems likely that much of the commuted work would have been harvest service, probably reaping. Ploughing, carting and a certain amount of reaping were also undertaken by the cottars of Killiney, together with a cottar and a number of tenants of the Villa Ecclesie. The systematic listing of commutation rates without a service equivalent points to a probable earlier introduction of commutation in the Villa Grangie than elsewhere on the lands of the priory. It is likely that the size of the demesne at Clonkeen, the need for and potential profits from its efficient cultivation may have provided the impetus for this development.

If the dating of this rental is correct, it points to a sustained level of activity and prosperity on the lands of the priory very much at odds with the evidence of decline found in the contemporary extents of archiepiscopal manors. It seems to indicate that the smaller, less

141. See Chapter III: Table VII and X.
142. See Chapter III: Table X.
143. See Chapter III: Tables VII and X.
144. See Chapter III: Table X.
commercially organised units may have managed to escape the most serious effects of the first great agrarian crises of the fourteenth century. The onset of decline can only have post-dated this rental, for, had it already begun, demesne land held at farm or at will would have been listed and there would probably also have been evidence of vacant holdings. Therefore this decline probably began during or after the localised agrarian crises in the greater Dublin area in 1330-2, gathering momentum in the course of the decade, and culminating in the situation reflected in the Grange Gorman haggard account of 1343 and the Clonkeen haggard of 1344.

Management and Administration

The administrative problems posed by the management of the archiepiscopal manors would have been similar, in many ways, to those faced by Bigod's ministers in Ireland. These lands formed one of the liberties of the lordship of Ireland, although it was never as strong a palatinate jurisdiction as that exercised by the lords of Trim and the great Leinster liberties. The sheriff of Dublin and the King's surveyors could act within the liberty of St. Sepulchre without the instruction quod non omittas propter libertatem, 'to act regardless of the liberty's legal status', and the archbishop's seneschal, the bailiff of St. Sepulchre, accounted with the sheriffs of Dublin at the Exchequer. Apart from these strictures, the liberty of St. Sepulchre appears, from the depositions taken during the 1264 inquisitions, to have functioned in much the same way as any of the other liberties within the lordship.

Comparatively little material on the nature of local courts on the lands of the archbishopric has survived, despite the jurisdictional problems posed by the limited form of franchise enjoyed by the liberty of St. Sepulchre. The only court rolls to have survived are the late sixteenth century rolls

145. See Chapter VII, Table I.
146. See Chapter III: Table VI.
147. See Chapter II, pp 56-7.
148. C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Allen's Register, p. 103. This is the clear legal implication of this presentment.
149. i.e. the accounts in Pipe Rolls 28 and 30 Ed. I, D.K.R. 38, pp 51-2 and pp 60-2.
Little can be satisfactorily established from surviving Escheators' and Keepers' accounts or from the 1326 extents. Indeed, the only evidence on the frequency with which such courts were held is Alen's own statement on the matter.

It is clear from de Chaddesworth's account as keeper of the temporalities that manorial courts must have been held on a regular basis, though their nature is far from clear. Despite the proliferation of manorial boroughs on the lands of the archbishopric, there is no evidence, either in this account or in the 1326 extent that the boroughs had their own hundred courts. It was common form for terms of suit of court to be noted in borough charters. This did not occur in the case of the charters or confirmations noted in Alen's Register. On this basis, it would seem likely that the burgesses were judged in the manor courts together with all other tenants owing suit to those courts. It is just possible that tenants of the Dublin streets attached to Colonia may originally have owed suit to the city hundred, but they owed suit to the manor court and it is unlikely, despite the fact that their tenements would have been in a form of no man's land of burgages at the edge of the city limits that they would have been burdened with double suit.

No courts seem to have been held in the outlying manors of Brittas, Castlekevin or Kilmesantan in de Chaddesworth's time, nor does any estimate of potential revenue from this general source surface in his accounts. This would seem to imply that, rather than being unable to hold such courts because of any recent deterioration, they had not been held within memory by the 1270's. It is, however, inconceivable that these manors were originally without courts, for one of the submanors of Castlekevin had its own court. Perhaps later events in Ballymore may reflect what had already happened in these manors. Court revenue from that manor was considerable in de Chaddesworth's time, but the compilers of the 1326 extent did not extend the revenue of the court. Pleas and

153. See Chapter III: Table III.
perquisites of the market there were extended at £5 in the extent, but no mention was made of the revenue of the court itself. The explanation may be relatively simple: a misreading of feria for curia and could be accepted without cavil were it not for the fact that Ballymore had a weekly market and a 15 day fair. Both the total loss of revenue or the decline to £5, would, however, point to the same problem, difficulties relating to the holding of the court, the exercising of distress and the collection of fines and amercements.

Like the decline in the value of customary labour, the decline in revenue from these courts reflects the extension of the march and the effects of the 1315-18 famine. The pleas heard at these courts would have been substantially similar to those recorded in the court book of the liberty of St. Sepulchre in the late sixteenth century, with one major exception. There would have been a number of cases concerning failure to perform customary labour which would have surfaced in thirteenth and early fourteenth century court rolls. These manor courts had no cognisance of the four royal pleas, and for the most part cases heard concerned debt, transgression, damage and unjust detention. Notice of recognisance of debt was also made at these courts.

Had the order and times at which the manorial courts of the archbishopric remained unaltered from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to the time of Alen's memorandum on the subject, each court would have been held twice a year, after the octaves of Easter and Michaelmas. Six sessions were to be held, one at St. Sepulchre, another at Swords and a third at Finglas. The fourth session was to be held, at the senschal's discretion in Tallaght, Clondalkin or Rathcoole and the remaining sessions were to be held at Shankill and Ballymore. This shared session at Tallaght, Clondalkin and Rathcoole may explain the absence of court revenue from Tallaght and Rathcoole in de Chaddesworth's account, though it should be noted that all three courts were valued separately in 1326. The seneschal presided over all the archiepiscopal manorial courts in person or by deputy, acting as did the seneschal of royal demesne at

160. Ibid., pp 17-8.
Saggard, Crumlin and Newcastle Lyons. This function is clearly delineated in the letter confirming the appointment of William fitz William in September 1379 which stated that the seneschal was "to govern, hold, exercise and adjourn the archbishop's courts as often as he thinks fit for the archbishop's advantage" having "power to appoint and remove a deputy or deputies".

Although some commissions of appointment were included in Alen's Register, it is necessary to turn to the allowances claimed by men like John de Ufford and Thomas de Chaddesworth, together with other memoranda generated by archiepiscopal vacancies to establish as accurately as possible the number and nature of the archbishop's manorial officers. Relatively few statements of allowances survive. One is therefore heavily dependent on the two accounts already mentioned, de Chaddesworth's of 1272-7 and de Ufford's of 1315.

Amongst his allowances, de Chaddesworth claimed £20 for providing the constables of Ballymore, Swords, Clondalkin and St. Sepulchre with a winter robe and summer tunic during his period of account. He also claimed allowances for the fees of the bailiffs and repairs of the houses, mills and other expenses of the manors of Swords, Finglas, Clondalkin, Shankill, Colonia, Tallaght, Rathcoole and Ballymore during the same time. The office of constable appears to have been an offshoot of that of seneschal: only one commission of appointment survives, that of Thomas fitz Eustace as constable of Ballymore in 1373, but in it the duties and functions of the office are clearly delineated. He was to reside at Ballymore with a competent household, to guard and govern its tenants, to maintain the archbishop's other officers and to uphold his rights of lordship. There was a castle at Ballymore, and its position in the march would have meant that the office of constable would have had an important military dimension, hinted at in the requirement of personal residence and the maintenance of a competent household. Only one of the other constablistships mentioned, that of Swords, appears to have had a continuous existence. The sheer size of Swords manor may have been the reason

---

162. C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, p. 225 and see also Chapter I, p. 48.
153. Ibid., p. 225.
that this office emerged, providing as it did a tier beyond that of bailiff or reeve. The fluidity of these offices is shown by the fact that John de Ufford claimed allowances for three constables, those of Ballymore and Swords, together with a constable of Castlekevin, in 1315. Given the prevailing situation it is likely that the functions of these three constables were then, primarily, of a military nature. Thus, the archiepiscopal constable fulfilled two important functions: firstly, as was the case with the royal constables of Newcastle McKynegan, he provided military leadership in a large and vulnerable marcher manor and secondly, he would have permitted a clearer definition and demarcation of the functions of the manorial reeve or bailiff in a large manor. The reeves and bailiffs of Swords and Ballymore would thus have been exclusively involved in farm management.

Certain problems arise in examining the office of bailiff on the manors of the archbishopric. For the most part these appear to have been one and the same office, the change in terminology being the result of borrowings from the administrative structures of the royal manors during long vacancies. de Chaddesworth had claimed allowances for the fees of bailiffs, together with the repairs of houses, mills and other expenses of the manors of Swords, Finglas, Clondalkin, Shankill, Colonia, Tallaght, Ballymore and Rathcoole. The fees in question were not specified in the account, a factor which implies that they would not have been substantial enough to warrant this form of mention. It is clear from a series of accounts between Walter de Shakenhurst and John de Bretton, on the one part, and officials of the archiepiscopal manors, on the other, that there were reeves (prepositi) active in Finglas, Clondalkin, Rathcoole, Swords and Ballymore during the vacancy following John de Leek's death. These officials appear to have been fulfilling duties similar to those of the reeves on the royal manors, acting as administrators and managers of their respective manors. As the office of reeve appears to have surfaced only during vacancies it is more likely than not that the explanation lies in a continuity of usage on the part of Exchequer or Escheatry officials. Reeve was the term used on the royal manors and known to royal officials. Bailiffs on royal manors such as Newcastle McKynegan were purely military officials. The bailiff of Clondalkin, for

168. See Chapter I, p. 16.
171. See Chapter II p. 76-8.
whose fee John de Ufford claimed allowance in 1315 would seem to have been something of an exception. Had there been bailiffs in the other manors during the vacancy, de Ufford would have submitted claims for their fees also, while there was, in de Chaddesworth's time, a fully-fledged constable on this manor. The de Ufford bailiff of Clondalkin may thus have represented some form of survival of this earlier office. Although manorial bailiffs were appointed in both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, no commission of appointment has survived.

Two administrative offices associated with the archiepiscopal manors from the early fourteenth century onwards were direct borrowings from both shire administration and the administration of the royal manors. These were the receivers and the serjeants. Both the county receivers and the receivers in the royal manors were not appointed until 1310 and were part of an attempt by the Exchequer to tighten its control over sheriffs and reeves of royal manors. Receivers acted both during archiepiscopates and vacancies. Ralph le Clerk and Walter Cakeden late collectors and receivers of the rent and farm at Swords in the time of John de Leek made recognisance of arrears of their account in the Exchequer in February 1315, while le Clerk was still acting as collector of the rent in Swords in 1317, during the vacancy preceding the provision of Alexander Bicknor to the see. Serjeants acting on the lands of the archbishopric appear to have fulfilled similar functions to those of the county serjeants, essentially acting as an official of the local court and, ultimately, as a subordinate of the seneschal in this matter. In December 1360 Adam White, seneschal of the archiepiscopal liberty ordered Richard Walsh, serjeant of Clondalkin, to deliver lands and tenements in that manor to a tenant's heir, who had come of age. While the office of receiver does not appear to have survived the fourteenth century on the lands of the archbishopric, serjeants continued to be appointed into the sixteenth century.

Little evidence on the actual management of the manorial demesnes in

173. i.e. There is a late fifteenth century (1482) mention of the office of bailiff of Dalkey, which had then become synonymous with the near defunct manor of Shankill, C. McNeill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, p. 247, also p. 250.
the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century has survived, so that one may only proceed by inference. By the time of de Chaddesworth's account of the temporalities, it is clear that most betagh and cottar works on the archiepiscopal manors were commuted to a monetary payment. Labourers must therefore have been hired on a casual basis, ad tascham, but it seems unlikely that these manors could have been administered without a famuli. Nevertheless, only one official who could conceivably have been part of a famuli, apart from reeves, a keeper of the haggard at Swords, is mentioned in any of the documentation generated by vacancies. This custos haggardi would presumably have acted as did the messor on the Bigod lands in Carlow and Wexford, supervising the harvest and compiling the local equivalent of the Carlow manors' compoti grangie. Absence of this sort of evidence is easily explained. No mention of the famuli in the liberty of Carlow survives outside the manorial accounts, apart from records in liberty accounts of sums received from individual reeves. Manorial accounts do not survive for the lands of the archbishopric and the hire of famuli is not the type of occurrence likely to have been included in a compilation such as Alen's Register.

Administrative structures on the manors of the priory of Holy Trinity were similar to those on the manors of the archbishopric. The seneschal seems to have co-ordinated the administration of the three manors and scattered tenements of the priory. It is likely that he presided at the manorial courts, though in the absence of court rolls or of a commission of appointment it would be unwise to speak ex cathedra on this issue, for on one occasion the bailiff of Clonkeen answered for the issues of the court of that manor. It is clear from the 1343-4 account of the haggard of Grange Gorman that Glasnevin had a bailiff and serjeant and Grange Gorman itself a bailiff and two serjeants. The very compilation of haggard accounts for Grange Gorman and Clonkeen may indicate the existence of at least one typical member of the famuli, the messor, on both manors but in this context one would do well to remember the rather archaic practices with regard to labour services on the manors of the priory north of the Liffey.

178. cf. Chapter II, pp 76-8
180. See Chapter II, pp 77-8.
182. Ibid., p. 56.
183. Ibid., p. 50.
184. Ibid., p. 51.
Despite the fact that a manorial court sat at Clonkeen, there is no extant evidence of similar courts in Glasnevin or Grange Gorman. While courts of this nature were probably held in both manors, one must also consider the possibility that the court at Clonkeen had a wider jurisdiction, functioning as the seneschal's court for all tenants of the priory. No detailed analysis is given of the sum for which the bailiff of Clonkeen answered. Were this merely the estreats of Clonkeen it would be reasonable to assume that both Grange Gorman and Glasnevin had their own courts. Indeed, the hardship involved in travelling from Balscaddan to Clonkeen would have been such that there must have been some judicial centre north of the Liffey. Thus, on a superficial level, there were considerable similarities between the administrative structures of the archiepiscopal manors and those of the priory of Holy Trinity. However, due to the lack of extant sources, it is impossible to examine these structures in greater depth.

While the evidence surviving for the archiepiscopal manors and the manors of the priory of Holy Trinity does not cover as broad a span of time as that surviving for the royal manors, it is of greater importance in examining the effects of the crises of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and the contemporaneous expansion of the Dublin marches. The divergent development of the two largest of the archiepiscopal manors, Swords and Ballymore, illustrates the magnitude of this latter threat. It is also possible to examine in greater detail the structure and use of demesne land together with the various forms of tenancy on both of these manorial groups than on the royal demesne lands. Thus, while an examination of the royal manors provides an important insight into the development of administrative structures within a manorial group run on a rentier basis in county Dublin during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, these other two groups, apart from being under the control of resident lords and not being managed on a rentier basis during the first half of the fourteenth century, provide the necessary complementary model in land use and tenurial structure.

187. Ibid., pp 198-200.
As a result of land acquired through her Irish marriages, first to John de Burgh, eldest surviving son of and heir apparent to Richard, earl of Ulster, and then to Theobald de Verdun, lord of half the de Lacy lordship of Meath and her purparty of the liberty of Kilkenny, Elizabeth de Clare became one of the most important of the absentee magnates of the lordship of Ireland during the mid-fourteenth century. The survival of a fine series of accounts for her Kilkenny lands, a number of accounts for her Meath lands and an isolated block of accounts for her lands in Ulster and Connacht is probably due to the fact that her grand-daughter, Elizabeth de Burgh, married Lionel of Clarence. Through this alliance the crown acquired a direct interest in the earldom of Ulster and Elizabeth de Clare's purparty of Kilkenny. These accounts, none of which post-dates 1360, the year in which Elizabeth de Clare died, may have passed into crown custody sometime between her death and the appointment of Lionel as King's lieutenant in Ireland in 1361. While the crown interest in the Meath lands, all of which subsequently reverted to the heirs of the four de Verdun heiresses, was not similarly direct, it is likely that Elizabeth's Irish accounts were taken en masse into royal custody.

The primary importance of the data generated by the administration of Elizabeth de Clare's Irish lands is that it facilitates the examination of techniques used by a major absentee lord in rentier estate management in the mid-fourteenth century. While it could be argued that her estates were so large as to be atypical, it should be remembered that the only absentee to have liquidated their Irish assets were the de Grandisons of Tipperary. They had acquired the old de Burgh lands in Munster in the 1280's, but by 1339, Peter de Grandison was left only with a rump of the original lordship, in territory coveted and menaced by the first earl of Desmond. He, therefore, cut his losses and sold out to Desmond. 5.

2. The latest of these accounts is that of John of Knaresborough, receiver general (P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/29). It runs from 18th November 1359 to 29th September 1360 according to its title, but in fact only covers the second half of this year. The preceding receiver general, William Bennet, was accountable for the first half of the year, but did not render any final account.
Other absentee lords were clearly reluctant to take this step. This may have stemmed from little more than inertia and an unwillingness to abandon any claim once exercised, but may as easily have stemmed from a desire to maintain control of lands from which a profit, however small, could be derived. The sheer size of Elizabeth de Clare's Irish holdings was unusual. Both she and the Mortimers of Trim would have had the strongest incentive to ensure that their Irish lands were competently administered. To a greater or a lesser extent, the other absentees would have shown an interest in their lands. While their administration may not have been as efficient as that of either Elizabeth de Clare or the Mortimers, there is no reason to believe that it was non-existent or conducted on a radically different basis.

One of the other important factors in an examination of the de Clare lands is their distribution throughout the lordship. Because of this spread, the impact of the demographic and military crises of the mid-fourteenth century can be seen over a wide, and very diverse area. Her Connacht lands all lay within the march. Many could justly be claimed to have formed part of the land of war. There, manorial structures were those of the extreme march, and local warfare, together with royal intrusion, were more serious reasons for loss of revenue than the Black Death. Although the Munster and Ulster lands also lay within the march, they were less vulnerable than the Connacht lands. In the case of the Ulster estates, not only can a recovery from the Black Death be seen, but also signs of an earlier recovery in the 1330's, after the anarchy following the death of the Brown Earl. Both the Kilkenny and Meath manors, most of which lay within the land of peace, were more severely affected by the plague than these other lands, possibly because their rents were closer to an economically reasonable rate than those derived from lands where only a tenuous foothold could be maintained. Thus, the near concessionary rents of the Connacht tenements would still have been forthcoming despite any crisis of this nature, because they had been artificially low from the start.

The surviving accounts of Elizabeth de Clare's lands fell into two distinct

---

7. See below, pp 149 - 57 and see also Chapter V, pp 237 - 45.
8. See below, pp 157 - 65 and see also Chapter V, pp 201 - 19, 223 - 37.
10. See below, pp 173 - 87 and pp 165 - 73 and see also Chapter V, pp 193 - 201 and pp 219 - 28.
categories, more general and less detailed accounts being rendered by Elizabeth's receiver generals in Ireland, and more detailed accounts being rendered either by individual local receivers or by regional sub-receivers subordinate to the receiver general. General accounts were ultimately derived from local accounts. Receipts and arrears were listed in the body of the general accounts, with the receipts being entered under separate regional headings.\(^\text{11}\). The structure of the general accounts varied little throughout the period. A certain improvement on the rather scrappy structure of John de Laurence's account of 26th July 1333 to 21st April 1337, the earliest of these accounts to have survived,\(^\text{12}\), is to be seen in later accounts. While the general accounts always dealt with revenue from Kilkenny, Meath and the de Burgh manors in Limerick and Tipperary, revenue from Ulster and Connacht was only dealt with in the earlier accounts.\(^\text{13}\). However, Thomas Hubrig, a Connacht receiver, was to account for 18s.4d. in the last of the general accounts, that for the half-year from Easter to Michaelmas in 1360.\(^\text{14}\). The apparent failure of the receiver general to note receipts from Elizabeth's lands in Ulster and Connacht may have been due to the two separate occasions on which these lands were in the King's hands, in 1345, or in the hand of Queen Phillipa, in 1352.\(^\text{15}\).

Receivers in Ulster and Connacht may, in any case, have rendered separate accounts throughout the entire period. While it is possible to determine the gross income generated by the various manors and boroughs in the years for which receiver generals' accounts survive, the exact nature of such income cannot be established from this source.

Monies received from the various local reeves, receivers and farmers were recorded in the general accounts, but an itemised analysis of this

---

11. These accounts followed a fairly standard form. The receiver general accounted for arrears and for monies received during the period of his accountability. Expenses, payments made by the receiver general on Elizabeth's behalf and payments made to her officials were then offset against the sum for which the receiver general was answerable. The sectionalisation of the receipts is apparent in Nicholas Mason's account as receiver general in 1338-9 (P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/15) and in all subsequent accounts rendered by receiver generals.


13. i.e. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/14 and 15.


15. See below pp\(136-9\).
income is only to be found in the accounts of the local officials, or in what appear to have been the accounts of regional sub-receivers. Accounts rendered by local officials or fair copies of these accounts delivered by the sub-receivers, would have formed, together with lists, tallies and copies of other documents pertaining to the lands, the particulars of the receiver general's accounts. The survival of groups of individual accounts of local reeves and receivers, especially for Elizabeth's Kilkenny lands during specific periods of time, corresponded in certain instances, to periods for which a receiver general also accounted. This is an indication that these local accounts were probably produced during the view of the receiver general's account. They would have been kept with the other particulars pertaining to this account.

On at least two occasions, in the case of the Kilkenny lands, copies of local receivers' accounts were gathered together to form a single enrolled account. In the case of both of these compilations, it is possible to prove that the enrolled accounts were copies of individual local officials' accounts. The identity of the official responsible for the compilation of these two accounts is unclear. Both are severely damaged and in neither case has a specific title to the account survived. The final section in the first of these enrolled accounts is concerned with the total amount of money received from diversis subreceptoribus in comitatu Kilkenniensis, an indication that the roll was probably compiled under the aegis of a receiver of Elizabeth de Clare's lands in that county.

In 1344 John Spelly, receiver of the demesne lands at Callan was paid a fee

16. For an example of these local accounts with their itemised examination of the sources of income see M.C. Lyons 'Elizabeth de Clare's Purparty of Callan, c.1338-1360', Decies, No. XVI, January 1981, pp 30-4. These are three accounts, one for the demesne lands at Callan, (P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/8) and two for the borough (P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/9). (Please note that the order of pp 32 and 33 have been transposed in the Journal).

17. i.e. separate accounts of local officials in P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/17 are for Easter and Michaelmas terms in 1343-4 (17 Edward III), while in Alexander Charman's view of account as receiver general (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/18) the period of accountability ran from Easter in 1343 to the same feast in the following year.

18. The enrolled accounts in P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/22 run from Easter 1350 to Michaelmas 1350 and those of P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/23 run from Michaelmas 1350 to Easter 1351.

19. i.e. separate accounts for the demesne at Callan have survived from Easter to Michaelmas 1350 (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/8) and from Michaelmas to Easter 1350-1 (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/10).

as the receiver general's sub-receiver in County Kilkenny.21 A similar form of duplication in account occurred in the case of Elizabeth's Meath dower lands. A triple account for Duleek, Kells and Coolock was compiled in 1350-1 on a single roll.22 The Duleek account on this roll, which was submitted by the receiver there, John Jurdan, ran from 25th March 1350 to 16th April 1351. A separate account for Duleek running from 27th March 1350 to 16th April 1351, rendered by John Jurdan, has also survived.23 The Meath roll is a compilation of three separate and distinct accounts. No attempt is made in this roll to produce a final general synthetic section on receipts, whereas in the first of the Kilkenny rolls, for Easter 1350, such a synthetic summation is to be found on the dorse of the roll. Some significance might also be attributed to the fact that both the Kilkenny and the Meath series of enrolled accounts appeared in a year when, in the case of the Kilkenny lands, the accounting process appears to have been dislocated. During this year receivers accounted on a half-yearly rather than a yearly basis. Thus, the possibility that the enrolled regional account was either part of a temporary administrative reform or some form of response to the second visitation of the plague cannot be excluded.

Accounts rendered by receivers in Ulster and Connacht appear to have been regional in character.24 It is likely that there was a continuous series of these accounts, due to the fact that neither area was accounted for in any of the later receiver generals' accounts, with the exception of a single Connacht receipt for 1360.25 The Connacht receivers may have been accountable to the Ulster receiver for in the Ulster account for February-August 1354, John of Knaresborough accounted for £15-6-4 received from the receiver in Connacht.26 The failure of the receiver in Connacht to make any return in 1357-8 was noted on the Ulster receivers account and

21. In this year Spelly received an annual fee of 40s. and a robe worth 3s.4d. as Alexander Charman's sub-receiver in County Kilkenny. (P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/18 (dorse)).
24. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/30, 31 (Connacht), 32 and 33 (Ulster).
excused causa guerre inter dominum Edmundum de Burgo et Ricardinos. 27.

It is impossible to ascertain whether the structure of the Ulster and Connacht accounts remained static or whether these later accounts were improved and developed versions of an earlier prototype. Elizabeth’s lands in Ulster and Connacht had been in the hands of Queen Phillipa’s ministers prior to the compilation of both sets of accounts, so it is even possible that their structure owes as much to the accounting techniques employed by these ministers as those used by Elizabeth’s own men. Thus, the administration of Elizabeth de Clare’s lands in Ireland generated at least two and possibly three forms of inter-related account: the less detailed but comprehensive account rendered by the receiver general, the accounts rendered by local reeves and receivers and the accounts of regional sub-receivers.

Through her marriage to John de Burgh, Elizabeth de Clare acquired a life interest in substantial areas of Ulster and Connacht, and a number of manors in Limerick and Tipperary. In 1310, she and her husband were jointly enfeoffed of the five Connacht manors of Brownrath, Strothir, Kylcolgyn, Clancoscry and Loughmesk. 28. The manor of Antrim, various lands in that county and the borough, with its dependent tenements at Coleraine also formed part of this settlement in jointure. 29. While no documentary evidence of the transaction has survived, the Munster manors of Exlon, Tristielaurens, Grallagh, Typeraght and Lisronagh were probably settled on John and Elizabeth on a similar basis. 30. The Red Earl had settled four of his other Munster manors on his daughter Alicia, following her marriage to Sir John de Multon of Egremont. 31.

Elizabeth’s interest in the Ulster and Connacht lands was challenged twice in the mid-fourteenth century. Her determination to assert control of this property was typical of her interest in every aspect of the management of her estates. On the first occasion, Roger Darcy, the Escheator, took

27. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/33.
28. P.R.O. C47 10/22 (10) mm 1-2. See Map VI and below pp149-155a.
29. Ibid. mm 3-4.
30. The annual rent paid by Elizabeth de Clare for Lisronagh, following the death of the Red Earl, a single rose, would seem to indicate as much. E. Curtis, ‘Rental of the Manor of Lisronagh, 1333 and notes on ”Betagh” tenure in Medieval Ireland’, R.I.A.proc., vol. 43, (1935-7), p. 41.
these lands into the King's hand acting either maliciously or under the misapprehension that they had been entered without royal licence. In reply to a petition from Elizabeth in June 1345, Edward III pardoned any trespass which might have been committed and confirmed her possession by a regrant of the lands in question. Issues accruing from these lands during the seizure were subsequently restored. Following a 1346 grant of all lands held by William de Burgh to the Queen until such time as his heiress came of age, Phillipa's ministers succeeded in ejecting Elizabeth from her Connacht lands. By August 1352, her Ulster lands had also been taken into the King's hand. Record of the joint enfeoffment of both the Connacht and the Ulster lands was dispatched to England, with the result that by February 1353 John of Knaresborough was acting for Elizabeth in Ulster, and by the following September in Connacht.

Ulster

The lands held by Elizabeth de Clare in Ulster lay, for the most part, in the modern county of Antrim. In as much as these holdings had a caput, it would have been the manor of Antrim. This was, prior to the settlement in jointure, the caput of the medieval county of Antrim. She also held the borough of Coleraine, with certain lands dependent on it, the tenements of Portrush, Portkaman, and Donsomery, and fisheries of the Bann and the Bush. The earliest surviving evidence of the value of Elizabeth's holdings is to be found in the account of Henry de Mandeville, Keeper (custos) of Tweskard running from 1st November to the same date in the following year. No details of the structure of these tenements are given in de Mandeville's account and without more exact knowledge of

32. C.P.R. 1343-5, p. 481.
33. C.P.R. 1345-8, p. 87.
34. See Chapter IV: Appendix II.
35. See Chapter IV, Appendix I.
36. See Chapter IV, Appendix II.
37. Portros (P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/32 and 33).
38. W. Reeves, Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor and Dromore, Dublin 1847 p. 77 cited by T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 145 identifies Portkaman as Bushmills, County Antrim.
the economic circumstances prevailing in that part of Ulster between the 1260's and 1333, the occurrence of local famines and the incidence of warfare, it would be unwise to draw a parallel between these and later figures. Coleraine was then worth £11-10-4 per annum. Its value did not increase significantly if the accounts of the 1350's are an accurate reflection of its value while it was in Elizabeth's hands. This assumes that the tenement itself remained unchanged, as appears to have been the case. Portrush doubled in value between 1261-2 and 1353-4, an increase from £10 to £20-7-0 respectively. The value of Portkaman more than trebled in the same period, while the amount of revenue derived from Dunsomery and what later became its subtenement of Dundrif increased, though not as dramatically as was the case with either Portrush or Portkaman. With the exception of receipts of sums paid by three Ulster receivers in receiver generals' accounts for 1333 to 1337 and 1341 and the later local accounts of the 1350's, there is little to indicate either the state or the profitability of Elizabeth's Ulster lands. Because they were already in her hand they were not extended with the rest of William de Burgh's earldom following his murder in 1333. It is, therefore, impossible to estimate the direct effect on these lands of the considerable turmoil which followed that murder.

While the findings with regard to adjacent lands in the 1333 inquisition post mortem may be taken as an indication of the possible condition of Elizabeth's lands, it would be unwise to over-stress the importance of such evidence. The profitability of the County of Coleraine appears to have been seriously affected by the earl's murder. Lands attached to the castle of Northburgh, formerly worth £60 per annum, and the castle itself were worthless, as was the manor of Le Roo, which had been worth £73-6-8

41. Coleraine was worth £11-7-0 in 1353-4 and £12-13-6 in 1357-8. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32 and 33 respectively. See also T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 137. Dr. McNeill consistently misdated the 1357-8 roll. (1st August 31 Ed.III - 1st August 32 Ed. III) as being of the year 1358-9.


44. In 1261-2 Dunsomery was worth £4-8-4 and Dundrift (G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 3, p. 288 Dunluc, County Antrim) £13-6-8. By 1353-4 Dunsomery was worth £21-8-6, while Dundrif was worth £4-6-8.


46. Ibid. p. 126 Limavady, county Derry.
prior to the murder. Rent was still received, however, from most of the free tenants in the county. The situation was somewhat similar in the county of Antrim in 1333, although the waste and destruction noted there was attributed by the jurors to the war of the Scots rather than to any more recent calamity. Both the manor of Dunnedergale and a carucate of land at Douagh were worthless.

The reliability of these extents appears to be confirmed by the surviving receipts from Elizabeth's lands in the 1330's, though it should be noted that the period for which William Logan was accountable for the issues of the Ulster lands is unclear. In an addition to the receiver general, John de Laurence's account, William was noted as having delivered £173-13-4 received from the Ulster lands. The period of accountability given, the regnal year 7 Edward III (1333) was subsequently cancelled. John de Pynchboke was the second Ulster receiver noted in this account and his period of accountability almost certainly included the whole of 10 Edward III (1336) and the first portion of the following year. He delivered £63-13-4 to the receiver general. If, as seems most likely, these receipts represent the issues of the Ulster lands during the entire period of the receiver general's account, the average annual income from these lands was c. £43. A low annual return of this order would seem to be consistent with the decline reflected in the 1333 extent. The last of the extant early receipts for Ulster is a payment made by John Scynchebel in the term of the Purification in 1339 of £39-13-4. If, as seems likely, this was a half-yearly payment, and there are indications in the structure of the account that this was the case, it represents a recovery of sorts. This would seem to indicate that the initial cause of the decline reflected in the 1333

47. For an abstract of the Coleraine inquisition see G.H. Orpen, 'The Earldom of Ulster', R.S.A.I. jn. vol. 45 (1915) pp 127-9, for a fair copy of the original see T.C.D. Ms. 1060, copies of Ecclesiastical Records and the inquisitions taken on the death of William de Burgh, earl of Ulster in 1333, pp 190-3.

48. A tempore guerre Scotorum, T.C.D. Ms. 1060 p. 185. For an abstract of this inquisition see G.H. Orpen, 'The Earldom of Ulster', R.S.A.I. jn. vol. 43 (1913) pp 141-3 and for a fair copy of the original see T.C.D. Ms. 1060 pp 185-6.

49. G.H. Orpen, 'The Earldom of Ulster', R.S.A.I. jn. vol. 43, (1913), p. 141, n. 2 probably the Grange of Nilteen, Upper Antrim, the name being preserved in the townland of Dunadry.


52. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/15.
extents was the murder of the Brown Earl. Recovery would have begun once the local political situation had become more stable. If the surviving accounts rendered by John of Knaresborough as Elizabeth's receiver in Ulster during the 1350's are typical, the average annual income derived from these lands in that period would have fluctuated between £121 and £131.53. There seems to have been little waste land in Elizabeth's Ulster tenements, a possible indication that the effects of the first two visitations of the plague in Ulster were less severe than was the case in other parts of Ireland or that the rate of demographic replacement and general recovery was quicker there than elsewhere. Little detailed information can be gleaned about the internal structure of Elizabeth's Ulster lands from Knaresborough's accounts. The land and mills of the various tenements were either held by tenants paying a fixed rent or were leased at farm, so that entries in these accounts frequently merely mention the place and the amount of rent received from that place. This lack of detail is typical of accounts of lands and manors exploited on a rentier basis. It is possible, nevertheless, to make general assertions about the structure of these tenements.

Coleraine appears to have been a moderately large borough, functioning as a manorial caput, with a number of substantial dependent tenements. The annual fixed rent of £4 in the borough is an indication of a fairly large settlement. The rent of an individual burgage is not given. If the borough was established under either the law of Breteuil, as was the case with boroughs in the de Lacy lordship of Meath and many episcopal boroughs, or a modified version of the Leinster custom, the rent of an individual burgage would have been 1s. per annum. Different customs may have been used in Ulster, for burgages in the manorial borough of Antrim were worth 2d. each per annum, and three burgages there in Elizabeth's hand through escheat were worth 6s. in 1353-4 and 7s. in 1357-8. The court at Coleraine was not specifically designated as a hundred court in any of the surviving accounts, so that there may be a structural parallel with the courts of the Dublin archiepiscopal manors. A fixed annual income of 3s.4d. was derived from the tolls of the borough.

53. In 1353-4 they were worth £121-7-3½ and in 1357-8 £131-0-1, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/32 and 33 respec... See also T.E. McNeill, Ulster, pp 137-141.

54. For all material relating to this borough and its dependent tenements see P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32 and 33, Appendix I and also T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 137.

A ferry across the Bann was worth 3s. in 1353-4 and 3s.4d. in 1357-8 and meadow, which was presumably used as pasture, was worth 2s. per annum. No acreages are given in the accounts for four of Coleraine's five large dependent tenements. The smallest and least valuable of these, Pertyland, was a carucate which was worth 10s. per annum. Ardbegan realised 14s.2d. in 1353-4 and 16s.8d. in 1357-8. The increase in the value of rent from Ardbegan is mirrored in similar increases in the rents of Kirketon and Sumterton from £1 and £2-10-0 respectively to £1-6-8 and £3. Rent from Dondouan was fixed at £2 per annum, a possible indication that the tenants there were free and held their land by charter.

Portrush was a flourishing port during the 1350's, though there are indications in the final account of damage caused by Henry Sauvage and by night raids mounted by the O'Cahans. The fixed rent of tenants there amounted to £20 in 1353-4 and £16-19-0 in 1357-8. Two officials, Henry Thoule and Thomas Crokeschank, acted as mayors there, collecting and accounting for the rent in 1357-8. There is also evidence that a mayor was acting in Portrush in 1353-4. Tolls were levied in Portrush in both 1353-4 and 1357-8. Thus, Portrush was probably a borough with some dependent outlying tenements. As was the case at Coleraine, the court at Portrush was not designated a hundred court in any of the accounts. What appears to have been a fixed payment of 2s. per annum was made for the prise of fish there.

Neither Portkaman nor Dunsomery appears to have had any specific manorial


58. Unidentifiable and misread by T.E. McNeill as Sumpeton (Ulster, p. 137).


60. For all material relating to Portrush see P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32 and 33 and also Chapter IV: Appendix I, and also T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 138.

61. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/33.

62. Ibid.

62a. cf. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32, Account for February to August 1354 when William Hulit, mayor of Portrush, paid 6s.3d. in arrears of the fixed rent. See also T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 140.
caput, and although there was a demesne at Portkaman, it was small and it is unlikely that its cultivation would have produced a significant amount of revenue. Both manors appear to have been closer to manorial settlements - in form nearer to the royal manors of Obrun and Othee, rather than the classic form of manor associated with the land of peace in Meath and Leinster. This could have been a case of the most rudimentary form of manorial structure, the small demesne and manorial court being superimposed on a number of relatively manageable tenements for administrative convenience.

Portkaman was the smaller of the two, the amount of land attached to it serving to emphasize the likely size of both Dunsomery and Antrim. The tenants there held a total of 9 carucates of land at an annual fixed rent of £9. There was a carucate of demesne land set to farm and a subsidiary demesne of 80 acres at Stanton, which was leased for 13s.4d. per annum. The remainder of the land was set at farm, with the exception of two small settlements of cottages. A single cottage at Seton was held for an annual rent of 4d., but as the prize of fish was levied there this was probably in origin a group of fisherment's cottages. There was also a group of cottages near the mill.

Dunsomery was measured and accounted for in terms of villates rather than carucates and acres. The use of the term villata as a measure of land is of considerable significance, usually indicating that the manor in question lay within the march. It seems to have been used where settlement was weak or widely dispersed, denoting land only more firmly in its lord's hand than that designated the terra of wherever, which was the ultimate form of large, probably unextended, marcher tenement. The actual amount of land involved probably varied from region to region. Walton

63. For all material relating to this manor see P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32 and 33, Appendix I and T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 140.
66. For all material relating to Dunsomery see P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32 and 33, Appendix I and T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 138.
67. See below, Chapter V, p. 324, n. 237.
has quoted an estimate of between 8 and 18 carucates in her work on settlement in Connacht. The villate in Ulster, and more specifically in Dunsomery, appears to have been considerably smaller, and can be computed from the value of waste land quoted in allowances and measured in acres. A villate would have contained approximately 337 acres if this valuation were general for all land within the villate. Thus, there were probably a little over 14 carucates attached to the manor of Dunsomery.

The form of tenure by which the five villates were held and the status of their tenants was never specified in any of the accounts, though some indications of its racial nature are to be found in the fines listed as estreats of the manorial court in the 1357-8 account. Money received from the sale of a cow, the heriot of an Irish widow, and two fines of 10s. each for killing an hibernicus domine were accounted for by the receiver, John of Knaresborough. This indicates that a certain and probably fairly large proportion of the tenantry at Dunsomery were Irish, which is what one would expect on a marcher manor. Thomas fitz William, the killer of Gilbert Galloglah, may have been Anglo-Irish, though this need not necessarily have been the case. An Irishman named Thomas, son of one William might well have dropped his septal name in order to pass as one of the middle nation and evade whatever local disabilities were associated with being an hibernicus. There is no indication, however, that any of the hibernici of Dunsomery were also of betagh status. No valuation of works and services of such tenants is to be found in any of the surviving accounts. The absence of any demesne at Dunsomery, as none of the tenements listed in the account ever appear to have been designated as demesne land, may well have meant that the existence of a corps of unfree tenants from whom customary service could be exacted was of little local relevance.

Although Antrim was larger than Portkaman, and almost as large as Dunsomery, it was by no means a typical marcher manor. Both its size and its

69. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/33.
70. Ibid.
71. For a full discussion on surnames and settlement see A.J. Otway-Ruthven, 'The Character of Norman Settlement in Ireland', Historical Studies, V (1965), pp 75-84.
72. For all material relating to Antrim see P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/32 and 33. See also Chapter IV: Appendix I and T.E. McNeill, Ulster, pp 139-40.
structure, which was very much tighter than that of the marcher manor probably reflect the fact that it was a county caput within the liberty of Ulster. Its large manorial borough is also probably indicative of its importance as an administrative centre.

There was a considerable demesne attached to the manor, comprising 4 carucates. By the 1350's this land was held at lease, and there is no evidence in any of John of Knaresborough's accounts for Ulster that he was involved in the cultivation of any of this land. The demesne was originally serviced by a betagh settlement at Irishtown, containing a little over 3 carucates. This settlement survived into the 1350's, and the ratio between its land and the demesne is more reminiscent of demesne: betagh holding ratios on Dublin archiepiscopal manors such as Colonia, than marcher manors like Rathfeigh. These holdings increased slightly in value during the period for which accounts have survived, rising from £3-5-7 in 1353-4 to £3-16-7 in 1357-8. A commutation payment of 10s. per annum in lieu of customary labour was made by these tenants. It is worth noting that Knaresborough specified in one of his accounts that this payment was made at the lady's will. While it is unlikely that Elizabeth de Clare would actually have exacted these labour dues, her option so to do was still of sufficient legal importance to merit this mention. In view of the erosion of betagh numbers on manors in the land of peace by the mid-fourteenth century, the situation in Antrim is relatively unusual. Even if some of these tenants were gavellors or farmers owing all of the original services by virtue of the nature of the land held, there seems to have been some form of betagh nucleus. It is from this that the rent of the Makuans, noted in the earliest of the surviving accounts, was probably derived. There may also have been a betagh settlement at Croykenland, though as this was only in Elizabeth de Clare's hand as an escheat, it would probably never have serviced the demesne at Antrim.

The manorial borough at Antrim was large, containing 83 burgage tenements. No Ulster borough charter survives, but it would seem from the evidence of the 1357-8 account that the burgage rent at Antrim was abnormally low. An annual rent of 1s. per burgage appears to have been standard in the lordship of Ireland, whether the law of Breteuil or the custom

73. Irish Antrim, Irishtown, See Chapter IV: Appendix I.
74. See above Chapter III. Table II.
75. See below Chapter VI pp 271-3.
76. See below Chapter VI pp 264-6.
of Leinster prevailed, thus the rent of 2d. per annum in Antrim either reflects exceptionally small tenements or special conditions engineered to ensure the establishment of a nucleated settlement. Three burgages in Elizabeth's hand as an escheat were worth 7s. in 1357-8, or just over 2s. each. Other Antrim escheats in the lady's hands at the same time were producing an average annual income of 1s. an acre, which would imply that the burgages contained 2½ acres, or possibly 2½ acres. This is quite close to the size of burgage specified in the de Lacy charter to Drogheda, but at a fraction of the Breteuil rent. These low rents could only have been intended to stimulate settlement.

There were relatively few free tenements attached to the manor of Antrim, and none of these were exceptionally large. Apart from the smaller free tenements owing fixed rents, there were three larger tenements, of which Hontonescotes, the largest, contained 1 carucate. None of these were military tenements, but the protection afforded by the castle may have been deemed sufficient to safeguard the manor in all but the times of greatest instability.

Unlike most of the other mills in Elizabeth's Ulster lands, the mill at Antrim was accounted for as part of the manor, possibly because it was not leased to a farmer on a long lease until 1355-6. It was worth £2-6-8 in 1353-4 and was leased at an annual farm of £2-10-0 from 1355-6 to Roger Spenser for a term of 6 years. The toll of the borough at Antrim was worth 10s. in 1353-4 and 13s.4d. in 1357-8. The manorial court at Antrim was an increasingly lucrative source of income throughout the period for which accounts have survived. Thus, Antrim was a large and fairly prosperous manor in the 1350's with a mixed population of betaghs, free burgesses and free tenants with a valuable mill, an indication of a high degree of local agricultural activity and no apparent problems caused by demographic contraction.

Income from the mills on Elizabeth de Clare's lands was fairly consistent during this period. While some of the mills appear to have been run

77. See below Chapter VI pp 304 and P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/33. In the 1257-8 account 60 burgages = 13s.4d. or 2d. per burgage.
78. See Chapter VI p. 304.
79. Unidentifiable. Misread by T.E. McNeill as Hantoncotes or Hontoncotis, Ulster, p. 139.
80. For all material relating to the farm of these mills see P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/32 and 33, Appendix I and also T.E. McNeill, Ulster, p. 139.
down during the intrusion of Phillipa's ministers, most appear to have been restored to their full value by 1357-8. The relative size of these mills is reflected in the farms for which they were leased. No indication is given in the accounts of either their nature or the capacity. Given the extent of many of the farms and the fact that the farmer should also have derived some profit from his mill, it is likely that all of these mills were water mills, most having a fairly extensive capacity. The most valuable of Elizabeth's Ulster mills was that at Portkaman, which was worth £3-6-8 in 1357-8. A smaller mill at Ballyboye, attached to the manor of Portkaman, was worth 13s.4d. in that year. Evidence of waste and ruin dating from the intrusion of Phillipa's ministers, is to be found in the case of at least two of Elizabeth's Ulster mills. Both the mill at Ardbeg and the mill at Tiberdornan were noted as having lain waste from the time of the Queen in the account for February to August 1353. By 1357-8 the mill at Ardbeg was worth 16s. per annum, while the mill at Tiberdornan had only been recently repaired. It was in the hand of its farmer, Adam fitzWilliam for the second year of a term of three years with remission of farm. This was a widely used form of payment in kind used to induce farmers to carry out necessary repairs to mills in their hands. The mill at Coleraine was also noted as being ruinous in the February to August 1353 account, but recovery there appears to have been swift, for the mill was worth £2-6-8 in 1353-4. By 1357-8, the issues of the mill at Coleraine were worth £4-13-1, but part of this increase is probably explained by the inclusion of the mill at Lyn, which had been ruinous since 1353, as a functioning unit in this account of the farm of the Coleraine mill. Milton, a small mill attached to Portrush, doubled in value between 1353-4 and 1357-8, when its farm increased from 10s. to £1 per annum. There appear to have been two mills at Dunsomery. The mill at Lecheton was worth £1-16-0 in 1353-4 and £2 in 1357-8. A mill at Dunsomery itself was worth £1-2-0 in 1353-4. This mill did not appear in the 1357-8 account. It had been repaired in the second half of 1353 and may have subsequently fallen into a state of disrepair. It is also possible that the mill at Aldton, one

81. See P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32 for approximate identification of Ardbeg. See above note 56. Tiberdornan is the townland of Tiberdornan, Townland Index.

82. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/33.

83. G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 3, p. 290, the Cutts of Coleraine, two miles upriver from the town of Coleraine.

84. W. Reeves, Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor and Dromore, Dublin 1847, p. 76 identification as Ballywillin.
of the five villates in Dunsomery, noted for the first time in 1357-8 and worth £1 in that year was the mill at Dunsomery listed under a new name.

The fisheries of Bann and Lyn were an important and increasingly lucrative source of revenue during the 1350's. In 1353-4 the issues of these fisheries amounted to £15-13-10. By 1353-4 revenue from this source had grown considerably. The farm of the fishery at Lyn was then worth £4, while the farm of 15 boats on the Bann was worth £15. The farm of a larger named boat, the Kychenbot, was worth £1-10-0 in that year. Licences issued to various persons permitting them to fish the Bann with one boat for that year brought an income of 4s. Staksilver, which appears to have been a toll levied on fixed nets and weirs, was worth 5s. in 1353-4, while the issues of the Bann fisheries court were worth 3s.6d. in that year. The issues of this court were worth 4s.6d. in 1357-8. Both the Bann and the Lyn fisheries had increased considerably in value by 1358-9. Receipts from the fishery at Lyn amounted to £20 in that year, while the farm of 18 boats on the Bann realised £25-6-8. The Kychenbot was set to farm for £2-6-8. The issues of the fisheries court and staksilver were 16s.8d. and 14s. respectively. Thus, the value of these fisheries clearly increased, for whatever reason, during the course of the 1350's.

Connacht

The organisation of the de Burgh lands in Connacht lacked the basic cohesion found in either their Ulster or their Munster lands. There were only two de Burgh manors in Connacht, Sligo and Loughrea. The cantred was the most usual regional subdivision of land in Connacht. It was generally subdivided into tenements of a villate, a number of villates or a portion of a villate. This loose organisational structure probably reflects weak initial settlement in the thirteenth century and the subsequent failure or disinclination of the earls of Ulster to extend a more thorough form of control over their Connacht lands. The size of the villate in Connacht is uncertain. While it is clear that the villate found on the Ulster manor of Dunsomery contained approximately 337 acres,

85. For accounts of revenue from the fisheries see P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/32 and 33 Appendix I and also T.E.McNeill, Ulster, p. 139, p. 143.
there is no similar evidence to enable one to establish the extent of its Connacht counterpart. As although it would be tempting to argue that the villate would have been a standardised unit of measurement throughout the earldom, the evidence cited by Walton concerning the possible size of the villate cannot be ignored. The overall impression conveyed, both by the 1333 inquisitions post mortem in Connacht and by the accounts of receivers acting in Elizabeth de Clare's lands there, is of a thinly populated area. It must be remembered, however, that the rents derived from most if not all of this land were probably extremely uneconomic. Such low rents might actually conceal a greater density of settlement than is apparent in the surviving accounts.

Elizabeth de Clare was jointly enfeoffed with John de Burgh in 1310 of what were described as the manors of Brounrrath, Strothre, Kilcolgan, Clancoscry, Kynaleth and Loghmesk. These were actually portions of cantreds, or, as may possibly have been the case with Clancoscry, an entire cantred.

As there were only two formal manors in the de Burgh lordship of Connacht, the use of the term manerium in this context requires further comment. If the organisational structures revealed both in the 1333 extent and the de Clare receivers' accounts also prevailed at the time of the settlement, a familiar term was being loosely used to describe unfamiliar structures. A more remote possibility is that the process of organisational degeneration seen on the manor of Dunamase between the 1280's and the 1320's, was also occurring throughout the de Burgh lands in Connacht. Control over these lands was probably not established on a sufficiently firm basis for the Dunamase parallel to apply, as the earldom had only

---

88. P.R.O. C 47 10/22 (10) mm 1-2.
89. Brounrrath as held by Elizabeth de Clare did not represent the entire cantred. Lands pertaining to this cantred were extended in 1333 (H.T. Knox, 'Occupation of Connaught by Anglo-Normans after 1237', R.S.A.I. jn. vol. 32 (1902) p. 396-7, T.C.D. Ms 1060, p. 212. Strothir may have only been a half cantred (see below note 120), Kilcolgan or Offeragh was a half cantred (see below note 94). Elizabeth did not hold the caput of Dunmore or Kynaleth, most of which was held by the Berminghams of the de Burghs (see below note 115). The extent of Lough Mask is unclear. Clancoscry was designated a cantred but may have been either a half cantred or an incompletely settled cantred (see below note 110).
90. See below, Chapter V pp 243-4.
been re-created in 1264 and de Burgh interest had been based in Limerick and Tipperary rather than in Connacht and Ulster until the time of the re-creation. Elizabeth held tenements within these cantreds rather than nucleated manors. While there was, in the case of most of these groups of tenements, a chief holding or caput, the organisational structure was extremely loose. No extents have survived for any of these Connacht lands, and because of the areas of land involved it would be unwise to attempt to use the 1333 extents of other portions of the Connacht lordship to project the probable condition of Elizabeth's Connacht lands during the 1330's. Most of William de Burgh's Connacht lands had declined to half or two-thirds of their original value by 1333 and the annual value of the serjeantry and pleas and perquisites of the Great Court of Connacht had fallen from £364-13-4 to £106-3-4.92. Thus, while it is likely that her lands had declined in value by 1333, the extent of this decline cannot be quantified. Using the receivers' accounts of the late 1340's and early 1350's it is possible to determine what tenements ultimately represented the manors of 1310.93.

Kilcolgan was the caput of the lands held by Elizabeth in the half cantred of Offeragh.94. These lands were described in Thomas de Staunford's account, which ran from December 1346 to August 1349, as the half of Offeraht, of which cantred the chief manor was the borough of Kilcolgan. Elizabeth held 2½ villates in Corbothy95 and Kyntarly,96 a half villate in Dorus,97 a quarter villate in Kyldourys98 and a villate in Rathfergyn.99

93. For all materials pertaining to these accounts see the abstracts in Appendix II Chapter IV
94. See Appendix II and G.H.Orpen, Normans, vol. 3 p. 206. The lands held here by Elizabeth de Clare seem to be roughly equivalent to the barony of Dunkellin. See Map VI
95. Unidentifiable.
96. Unidentifiable.
97. Doorus, Killenavarra, County Galway, see Townland Index. See Map VI
98. Now obsolete, possibly adjacent to Doorus.
99. Unidentifiable but possibly Rathbaun, Killeenavarra, County Galway, see Townland Index.
all of which lay within this half cantred. There were also extensive demesne lands and lands from which fixed rents were derived attached to Elizabeth's portion of Offeragh. During Thomas de Staunford's period as receiver £7-10-0 of rent was levied from the borough of Kilcolgyn, an average of £3 per annum. William de Nessefeld, who acted as receiver for Michaelmas term 1350-1 accounted for £1-6-8 received from this borough. By 1353-4, when John of Knaresborough was acting as Elizabeth's receiver the annual fixed rent of this borough had been set at £1.

During this period the amount of land effectively under the receiver's control appears to have contracted in extent and in value. Two tenements, Balymacduky and Dromkelyn, were by 1350 no longer part of the Offeragh portion of the account. The average annual income during Thomas de Staunford's time as receiver was £10-14-9, while William de Nessefeld accounted for £8-13-4. Some of the monies received by William might have been annual rather than termly payments in which case the situation was even more serious. By 1353 another two tenements, Rathcoscry and Morvolga, were omitted from this portion of the account. The income derived from Offeragh in that year fell to £2-15-0, though it is worth noting that in the case of many tenements John of Knaresborough only accounted for a single term's rent.

It is impossible to establish the precise reasons for this decline, which affected most of Elizabeth's Connacht lands. The impact of the first two outbreaks of the plague, coupled with the possible waste of some of the lands and mills by Phillipa's ministers were probably the more important factors in this case. Local warfare, which had such an adverse effect receipts from Clancoscry in 1353-4, may also have affected the prosperity and profitability of Offeragh during this period. John of Knaresborough's inability to collect many of the rents in Michaelmas term 1353-4, may be of significance, pointing to some general problem found throughout these lands between the time of William de Nessefeld's account and Elizabeth's resumption of the lands in 1353.

Elizabeth de Clare's lands in Brounrath appear to have been located around the borough of Clare. The fixed rent derived from this borough remained constant throughout the late 1340's and early 1350's at 17s. per annum. The designation and possibly also the extent of the other lands

100. Possibly a borough in Kilmacduagh and Dunkellin parish, See Townland Index, County Galway.
101. Rathcosgry, Dunkellin, County Galway (Townland Index), I have not succeeded in identifying Morvolga.
102. See Chapter IV: Appendix II.
103. H.T. Knox, 'Occupation of Connaught by the Anglo-Normans after 1237', R.S.A.I. jn. vol. 32 (1902), pp 396-7, probably Rahoon. See Map VI
held by Elizabeth there appears to have fluctuated from year to year. This would indicate that the actual holdings associated with the caput in question had never been clearly defined: land could be dropped in successive accounts without explanation. It is perhaps a rather extreme example of how the old de Burgh lordship of Connacht was little more than a thin veneer of suzerainty, de jure rather than de facto seisin. During Thomas de Staunford's time as receiver, he accounted for a substantial tenement at Cregricard and Crosbarry,105, worth 10s.8d. annually. A tenement at Durlarkan106 was worth 8s. per annum during the term of this account. The island of Kilcarrok,107 which apart from Clare was the only tenement in Brounrath to be mentioned in each of the surviving accounts, was worth 1s.4d. per annum during this time. William de Nesefeld accounted for 2s. received from the island in Michaelmas term 1350-1. Neither Durlarkan nor the tenement of Cregricard and Crosbarry were mentioned in his account. They were replaced by two other tenements: a carucate of land at Towe,108 from which 6s.8d. of rent was collected and land at Droumgravyn109 which was worth 10s. during that term. In 1353-4 John of Knaresborough accounted for the borough of Clare, the island of Kilcarrok, which was then only worth 6d. and the rent of the tenants holding the carucate at Towe, which amounted to 3s.4d. Revenue from Elizabeth's lands in Brounrath did not decline appreciably during the receiverships of either Thomas de Staunford or William de Nesefeld. However, in 1353-4 John of Knaresborough only accounted for £1-0-10 received from these lands. The reasons for this decline were probably identical to those cited in the case of the similar decline in the half centred of Offeraagh.

While Clancoscry was described as a cantred in the accounts rendered by Thomas de Staunford and John of Knaresborough,110, it seems to have been a half cantred or an incompletely settled cantred. Both in Spencer's View of Ireland and the thirteenth century Exchequer document cited by Walton, the cantred is said to contain 30 villates.111. In the most complete account for this tenement, that of Thomas de Staunford two main holdings, one of 7 villates and the other of 3 villates, were mentioned.

105. Cregricard is unidentifiable. Crosbarry may be Crosbar, Annaghdowne, County Galway (Townland Index) though this is unlikely.
106. Unidentifiable.
107. Possibly Gilkagh, Moylough, County Galway (Townland Index).
108. Unidentifiable.
109. Possibly the parish of Clontuskert, County Galway, (Townland Index).
110. See above pp 144-5.
He also accounted for two other sub-tenements there: one un-named and held by Thomas Haket at an annual rent of 21s.4d. and the other in Walynduff and Balivaluan, worth 2s.8d. per annum. At most Haket's tenement is unlikely to have contained more than \( \frac{3}{2} \) villates. The tenement at Walynduff and Balivaluan was probably little more than a minute fraction of a villate. Thus, Clancoscy would seem to have contained at most 14 villates of tenanted land, lying within the control of the receiver, or a little under half a standard cantred. De Staunford accounted for rent from the tenement of 7 villates for only two of the five terms of his receivership. (The annual farm of this land was then £4-13-4). While William de Nessefeld succeeded in collecting 46s.8d. from this tenement, it had become unprofitable by 1353.

In accounting for Clancoscy, John of Knaresborough only answered for the tenement of 7 villates, collecting only £1-3-4, half a term's rent, because the land was totally destroyed by war. During de Staunford's term of office, the average annual return from Clancoscy was £4-1-5 and the total return £10-3-6. In William de Nessefeld's time the cantred generated £3-13-4. Thus, the decline in profitability suffered by this cantred between 1350 and 1353 was of massive proportions. As was the case with Offeragh and Brounrathe, the impact of the first two visitations of the plague must have affected the profitability of the land. The failure of de Staunford to collect more than two term's rent from the chief tenement of the cantred seems to indicate, that there the initial outbreak of the plague in 1348 caused considerable dislocation. If Clancoscy was sparsely populated, the impact of such a major demographic disaster would have been maximised through an extremely slow rate of replacement, but the relatively low rents would have tended to mitigate its effects. The localised warfare of the early 1350's would thus have exacerbated an already precarious situation, and may also have lain behind the earlier losses.

Elizabeth's lands in the cantreds of Dunmore and Lough Mask were not accounted for by either Thomas de Staunford or William de Nessefeld. Both probably lay in vulnerable areas, affected by the internal feuding of the cadet branches of the Connacht de Burghs in the 1350's, hence their accountancy debut in John of Knaresborough's account. Reymund de Burgh, the principal landholder in Dunmore, and Edmund de Burgh, his Lough Mask counterpart, were both involved in this private war.

112. See below, pp 156-7. For location see Map VI.
113. See Chapter IV: Appendix II.
The structure of the lands associated with Dunmore appears to have undergone certain fundamental changes following the jointure settlement of 1310. It was then described as the manerium of Kynaleth, implying, amongst other things, that the original caput of the tenement would have been Balykillilth. There is no indication in Knaresborough's account of any special form of tenement at this place, while Dunmore was designated as demesne, despite the fact that it was being held for an annual rent. This seems to point to the abandonment of the old caput at Kynaleth sometime after 1310, and the subsequent formation of a new unit with its caput at Dunmore, probably prior to 1333. It is unlikely that demesne would have been created and maintained after the murder of the Brown Earl. Given a flat rate of 6s.8d. per villate in fixed rent, Dunmore appears to have contained 10½ villates.

While the only complete account of the rents of Lough Mask was that rendered by John of Knaresborough, the general area was mentioned as part of a marginal title with Strothir in de Staunford's account. It would, thus, seem to have been slightly less exposed than Dunmore. Some 11½ villates attached to this cantred were specified by name in the account, and much of the land not so designated was described as the land of Lough Mask. Given that Ballinrobe lay within the cantred, it is unlikely that this land formed part of a borough. The actual area involved, approximately 4 villates, could point to the possibility that this land originally formed part of a major sub-manor, not unlike Meelick in Sil Maelruin. Elizabeth de Clare also held half of the borough of Ballinrobe. Whether or not this holding formed the administrative centre of the cantred is unclear, but it is worth noting that, alone of all of her Connacht boroughs, Ballinrobe had a named reeve, one Nicholas Stevyn, from whom £1 was received by and accounted for by John of Knaresborough.

114. Probably Ballykillada, Killinny, County Galway.
115. G.H. Orpen identifies this area with the barony of Dunmore, County Galway, Normans, vol. 3, pp 211-2. For all data preserved in Knaresborough's account see Chapter IV: Appendix II.
116. For all data relating to Lough Mask see Appendix II, Chapter IV.
117. Alias Roba. See Chapter IV: Appendix II.
118. See Chapter V, pp 239-40.
119. See Chapter IV: Appendix II.
The last group of Connacht lands of which Elizabeth was enfeoffed in 1310 were those of the half-cantred of Strothir. A substantial borough formed the caput of this tenement. There was a mill attached to the borough and some demesne land at Delgy. Income from the borough appears to have declined slightly, during the period for which accounts have survived, falling from £3 per annum under de Staunford, to £1 in a single term under William de Nessfield. Knaresborough's account seems to indicate that this decline led to its farm being fixed at £2-6-8 per annum in 1354. De Nessfield's account may reflect the impact of the second visitation of the Black Death. The mill was set to farm at 10s. per annum, maintaining its value throughout the entire period for which accounts have survived. There were 10 named villates attached to this tenement, and a number of named, but unspecified in terms of area, holdings. These latter probably contained approximately 2 villates. Loss of income from Strothir appears to have been marginal during this period despite the Black Death and localised warfare. The entire holding was worth £9-10-4 per annum in the 1347-9 account. While the returns for Michaelmas 1353 were problematic in the case of all of the Connacht de Clare lands, the £4-10-6 realised from Strothir in Easter 1354 shows that the ultimate loss in income had, in fact, been minimal.

The early receipts in John de Laurence's account as receiver general provide little indication of the annual income of Elizabeth de Clare's Connacht lands. Robert de Emeldon, who was acting as Elizabeth's receiver there accounted for £43-6-8 in the Easter term of 1334, but the period for which he was accounting is unclear. Roger de Fleto accounted for two separate sums paid to the receiver general during his term of office, one of £20 for the year 1337 and the other of £18-9-0 for an unspecified period. If both of de Fleto's payments represented the issues of Connacht for the year 1337 and Robert de Emeldon's payment also represented the revenue derived from the Connacht lands in 1334, the average annual income of Elizabeth's possessions in Connacht during the 1330's would have been approximately £40. Allowing for the average rate of decline

120. G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 3, pp 207-8. Maurice fitz Gerald obtained the castle of Struther with a half cantred of land from two de Burgh sub-tenants. Orpen identifies Strothir with the barony of Shrule, County Mayo. For all data relating to Strothir see Chapter IV: Appendix II.

121. The money was rendered in Easter term 8 Ed. III, P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/14.

122. The £20 represented revenue for 11 Ed. III, P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/14.
found in the Connacht extents of the 1333 inquisition post mortem, the value of these lands could have been between £60 and £80 during times of greater stability in the 1320's.

By the late 1340's the income from these lands had declined sharply. During Thomas de Staunford's receivership, from 1347-9 the average annual income derived from the Connacht lands was £25-10-4. William de Nessefeld accounted for £19-11-6 in receipts from these lands in Michaelmas term 1350-1. John of Knaresborough accounted for only £17-1-0 received in 1353-4, when he resumed control of the lands in Connacht on Elizabeth's behalf, following the intrusion of Queen Phillipa's ministers in those lands from December 1346 to September 1353. Thus, revenue from the Connacht lands seems to have fluctuated considerably even in the 1350's. William de Nessefeld's account points either to a short term recovery, or to more efficient management than was within the capability of either de Staunford or John of Knaresborough.

By 1353-4 the overall income received from the Connacht lands had plummeted alarmingly, despite the inclusion of land from the cantreds of Dunmore and Lough Mask in John of Knaresborough's account. In this receiver's account for Elizabeth's Ulster lands in 1357-8 it was stated that there was no income from the lands in Connacht because of war between Edmund de Burgh and the Clan Rickard de Burghs. To appreciate the significance of such a war it is necessary to examine the names of tenants listed in the 1353-4 Connacht account. Edmund de Burgh held at least 11 named tenements, many of which lay in Strothir and Lough Mask, while 7 tenements in Dunmore were held by Reymund de Burgh. The importance of these cadet branches of the de Burgh family is also apparent from the surviving accounts of Elizabeth's lands in Limerick and Tipperary. Thus, a local war involving cadet branches of the de Burgh family in Connacht would have had serious consequences and reduced both the profitability and manageability of the lands in which it occurred.

A reference occurs in the Annals of Connacht in two separate entries for 1355 to what may have been the local wars referred to in the 1353-4

123. See above note
124. £63-15-10 for 5 terms. See Chapter IV: Appendix I.
125. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/33.
126. See below p.161.
Connacht account and the Ulster account of 1357-8. In the first of these entries the Galls, i.e. Anglo-Irish, of west Connacht were said to have inflicted a heavy defeat on the Mac William Burkes, of which branch of the family Edmund de Burgh was the founder. A subsequent entry records a great defeat inflicted on Mac William's . . . 'that is to say Edmund Burke's household' by Ricart Og. A large measure of the decline in revenue from Connacht must also be attributed to the cumulative effects of the first two outbreaks of the plague and other less well-known local wars between both the Irish of Connacht and various groups of Anglo-Irish tenants on the lands of the old de Burgh lordship.

Munster

Elizabeth de Clare held five of the de Burgh manors in Munster, Esclon, Tristerlaurens, Grallagh, Typeraght and Lisronagh. The extent of the de Burgh lordship in Munster in the early fourteenth century is unclear, due to the surrender of lands in return for the earldom of Ulster and subsequent re-acquisition. Following the death of Richard de Burgh in 1242, the Munster lands and manors were extended in March 1243. Nine manors were specifically named in this inquisition, Esclon, Castle Conil and Castle Wilckin, which lay in County Limerick together with the Tipperary manors of Kilsilan, Tipperacht, Watermore, Lisronagh, Grallagh

128. For relationships between the cadet branches of the de Burgh family see G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 4, p. 159, de Burgh Pedigree.
129. Ibid., p. 159.
130. Esclon or Aes Cluana (Irish) now comprises the parish of Kilkeedy, County Limerick (G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 2, p. 167), Tristelaurens, the parish of Inch St.Laurence, County Limerick (G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 3, p. 165, n.5). Grallagh or Grallagh in Muscry, the townland of Grallagh in the parish of Dulla, County Tipperary (G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 3, p. 165, n.5), Typeracht, probably Tibberaghny parish County Kilkenny (G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 3, p. 165, n.5) or possibly Toberahena in the parishes of Inislounaght and Kiltegan, County Tipperary (Townland Index) and Lisronagh, Lisrotheragh, the parish of that name in County Tipperary (G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 3, p. 165, n.5).
Richard de Burgh also held land at Kilfeakle, Ballyhobin in the parish of Ballybrood, and Tristelaurens, which had not been manorialised by 1243, as well as the borough and mill of Clonmel. In return for the grant of the earldom of Ulster from the Lord Edward, Walter de Burgh surrendered most and possibly all of the de Burgh lands in Munster. Many of these lands were subsequently granted to Otho de Grandison in 1281. De Burgh interest in the Munster lands was re-asserted by Richard, the second earl of Ulster. In June 1290 he secured a grant of all of de Grandison’s lands in Estermoy and Otheny for the duration of Otho’s life for an annual rent of £72, payable in two moieties at Clonmel.

Following de Grandison’s demise, de Burgh regained absolute control over these lands. De Grandison had granted Richard de Burgh’s rent to Gerald de Orum and in July 1304 Richard exchanged the manor of Morton in Devon for the lands held by Gerald in Estremoy and Otheny. A small portion of the old de Burgh lands in Tipperary must have remained in the control of the de Grandisons, for in 1339 Maurice fitz Thomas, the first earl of Desmond, bought Clonmel and Kylkyban from William de Grandison. Elizabeth de Clare held the mills of Clonmel at the time of this sale, so that fitz Thomas only purchased the borough. With the exception of Lorrha and Terryglass, and the lands of which Elizabeth de Clare was enfeoffed, most, if not all, of the remaining de Burgh lands in Munster were settled on Richard’s daughter Alicia when she married Sir John de Multon of Egremont.

With the exception of her holdings in Connacht and Loxeudy, the de Burgh manors in Munster were probably the most vulnerable of Elizabeth’s marchland possessions. The activities of some of the more enterprising Anglo-Irish magnates, in particular Maurice fitz Thomas, the first earl of Desmond,

139. C.D.I. 1254-85, no. 1847.
141. C.D.I., 1302-7, no. 327.
142. Clyn, Annals of Ireland, p. 29, Kylkyban = Kilsilian.
had turned Tipperary and most of Munster into an extremely unstable
marchland. It was fitz Thomas' interest in and subsequent use of
Clonmel as an operational base that posed the greatest potential threat
to Elizabeth's lands. In February 1332, during the justiciarship of Anthony
de Lucy, during which the earl was ultimately imprisoned, having first
received 60 marks in protection money from the borough of Tipperary and
then incited the local Irish to burn that borough, fitz Thomas extracted
£40 in a similar black rent from the borough of Clonmel.

After the death of James le Botiller, first earl of Ormond, Maurice fitz
Thomas acquired custody of the Butler lands during the ensuing minority
on 4th April 1338. It was in the following year that he bought Clonmel
and Kylkyban from William de Grandison. With the arrival of Ralph de
Ufford in Ireland in 1344, to discharge the office of Justiciar, there
was a definite change in official policy towards the earl of Desmond.
In October 1344, the custody of the Butler lands was removed from Maurice
fitz Thomas and granted to Thomas Dagworthy and Eleanor, his wife, widow
of the earl of Ormond. The earl's reply to governmental hostility
was soon forthcoming. During de Ufford's term of office fitz Thomas
attempted to exert suzerainty over as much of Munster as possible. In an
attempt to force John de Byford to acknowledge that he held the villate
of Isterkeran of the barony of Kilsilan, men of the earl's rout illegally
distrained John in May, 1344 when rumours of a change in Justiciar were
probably rife, taking and driving 40 of his cows to Clonmel. Maurice
fitz Thomas was described in this inquisition as dominus baronie de Kylsylan,
a title which was of considerable significance in as much as it shows that
his purchases from de Grandison conferred on the earl a considerable portion

Studies, presented to Aubrey Gwynn, pp 203-29, and 'The Legal
Proceedings against the First Earl of Desmond', Analecta Hibernica,
vol. 23 (1966), pp 1-48. See also C.A. Empey, 'The Butler Lordship

146. G.H. Orpen, Normans, vol. 4, p. 235 and pp 244-5.

147. G.O. Sayles, 'The Legal Proceedings against the First Earl of


149. See above, note 142.

150. C.A. Empey, 'The Butler Lordship in Ireland', unpublished Ph. D.

151. G.O. Sayles, 'First Earl of Desmond' Analecta Hibernica, vol. 23,
(1966), p. 29.
of what might be termed the de Burgh interest in Munster. Clonmel was also used as a base at which the rout could be received in Tipperary on several other occasions.\(^\text{152}\).

A number of members of cadet branches of the de Burgh family in Munster were heavily involved with Maurice fitz Thomas and may have been among his indentured retainers. Whether or not they were regular members of the rout is, however, unclear. When Ralph de Ufford was attacked by Desmond's men on 2nd July 1345, five of the eight named leaders were de Burghs.\(^\text{153}\). It was also alleged that three de Burghs, Richard, son of Edmund, Reymund, son of Geoffrey and David, son of David were part of the semi-permanent private army maintained by the earl at Clonmel and Kingswood.\(^\text{154}\).

Elizabeth appears to have been fairly successful in protecting her lands from the ravages of the earl of Desmond. The only occasion on which there is evidence of any payments being made which might have been black rent is in 1340-2. During this period a payment of 20s was made to Walter de Mandevyle, who was acting on behalf of the earl, to spare and maintain Elizabeth's tenants in parts of Munster for those three years.\(^\text{155}\). A similar payment of 20s. was made to Richard de Sancto Albyno to spare Elizabeth's tenants and to castigate his men lest they rob her tenants at Lisronagh.\(^\text{156}\). This period, 1340-2, seems to have been one of general disturbance in Elizabeth's Munster lands. An attempt was made by the Berminghams, possibly acting with some of the local Irish, to occupy the manor of Grallagh following the cessation of the term of a Bermingham receiver there. John Arundel, acting on Elizabeth's behalf made a point of holding a court there on Les Ocuyels and the Irish (hibernici) of that manor.\(^\text{157}\). John, son of David was paid a fee of £4 for castigating the Irish at Grallagh during the term of his seneschalce there.\(^\text{158}\). An attempt made by the Dublin administration to have Lisronagh taken into the King's hand in November 1342 was circumvented by a payment of £2 to Richard Grasses, the Escheator, to deliver the manor and revoke the King's mandate.\(^\text{159}\).

---


\(^{153}\) Ibid., p. 25.

\(^{154}\) Ibid., p. 27.

\(^{155}\) Ibid., p. 27.

\(^{156}\) Ibid.

\(^{157}\) Ibid.

\(^{158}\) Ibid.

\(^{159}\) Ibid.
Payments of this nature were frequently made by Elizabeth's ministers to royal officials in order to expedite her affairs in Ireland. Elizabeth's relationship, or at least that of her ministers with Maurice fitz Thomas seems to have remained cordial throughout the 1340's and into the 1350's. In 1353 the custody of the lands and the marriages of the heirs of Cloncorikeran and Glascro were sold to the earl for £40, giving him a useful temporary foothold in the north-western portion of county Kilkenny. 160.

The use of members of cadet branches of the de Burgh family as both receivers and farmers in the Munster manors may have provided the amount of local interest necessary to maintain these manors despite the worsening conditions. While the use of such men did provide for localised security and management, it also meant that certain irregularities in the payment of rents and farms had to be tolerated, as, indeed, had the occasional levying of monies from outlying manors such as Grallagh by members of these families. Initially the cadet de Burghs seem to have been more interested in the Limerick manors of Esclon and Tristelaurens than in the Tipperary manors, though by the mid 1350's a de Burgh receiver was established in Grallagh. 162.

Thus, the effects of the growth of the march and the depredations of Maurice fitz Thomas' retinue appear to have been minimised on Elizabeth de Clare's Munster lands as a result of her ministers' ability to hold the earl's goodwill and through the maintenance of a strong local de Burgh interest in the profitability of some of these lands.

Lisronagh was the most important and the most valuable of Elizabeth's Munster lands throughout the three decades for which accounts have survived. The manor was extended in January, 1333 by William Lymbergh, then seneschal and keeper of Elizabeth's Irish lands. 163. According to this extent there were 358 acres, 1½ stangs of demesne land in Lisronagh, each acre of which was worth 14d. This valuation and the way in which the land was extended are consistent with leasing rather than with direct exploitation of the demesne. Gavellars, who were holding land ad voluntatem domini, paying 14d. an acre held 218 acres, ½ stang and 6 perches in 1333. The betaghs of Lisronagh were extended as holding 560 acres of land in six granges, a seventh betagh grange was leased to a free tenant, at a similar rate.

160. P.R.O. S.6 1239/25.
161. See below p. 164.
162. See Chapter IV: Appendix III.
163. For the text of this extent see E. Curtis 'Rental of the manor of Lisronagh, 1333 and notes on "Betagh" tenure in Medieval Ireland', R.I.A. proc., vol. 43, (1935-7), pp 41-76.
These betaghs also paid \( \frac{1}{2} d \) per acre for the privilege of using their own hand mills. There were 74 acres and 5 perches of pasture and 39 acres, 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) stangs and 11 perches of meadow at Lisronagh in 1333, worth respectively 29s.7d. and 60s.9d. per annum. There were also 14 cottagers holding their cottages and 3 acres and 22 perches of land on this manor. Customary service rendered by the betaghs and cottagers there was potentially fairly valuable. It also had a manorial borough, where the burgesses held 260 acres for an annual rent of 48s.1d. Three free tenants held between themselves a knight’s fee and a carucate of land. The three mills at Clonmel were included in the 1333 extent. They were then held by William de Grandison for an annual fixed rent of £9. Perquisites and profits of the manorial court and the burgesses' hundred were valued at 6s.8d. and 3s.4d. respectively per annum. The jurors returned that the annual income from Lisronagh as extended and, excluding expenses, should have been £78-0-10½.

Actual receipts from Lisronagh never amounted to more than £50 per annum and declined fairly steadily from 1333 onwards. By 1340 income from this manor had fallen to £36-6-6. In 1343-4 no more than £18-8-1 was received from Lisronagh because of "Les Tobyns", and in 1348-9, the year when the effects of the first outbreak of the plague were most apparent, the receiver only answered for £15-9-1. A recovery occurred in Lisronagh during the 1350's in the aftermath of the second visitation of the plague. In 1352-3 Hugh Noet, the receiver at Lisronagh, answered for receipts of £34-8-0 and the income of this manor did not fall below £30 until 1356-7, when a number of receivers accounted for £27-5-10. If this was the beginning of a second decline, the Easter term 1360 payment of £7-14-5 received from Lisronagh may have marked the continuation of this trend.

The decline in Lisronagh following the first and second outbreaks of the Black Death is closely mirrored in the three surviving accounts for that manor. As was the case throughout Elizabeth de Clare's lands in the accounting year 1350-1 Lisronagh was split into two separate half-years. The effects of depopulation were obvious. In Easter term 1350, 234 acres, 2\( \frac{1}{2} \) stangs and 39 perches of arable land lay waste pro defectu tenencium and 162 acres, 1\( \frac{1}{2} \) stang held by the gavellars was waste for the same reason. During this term 323 acres of land held

---

164. For all such receipts of Lisronagh see Chapter IV: Appendix III.
165. Ibid.
166. See above, p. 137.
by betagh land waste. The account for the following term is damaged and
so the amount of waste arable cannot be computed. The amount of land
waste through depopulation in gavellar and betagh lands had begun to
contract and stood at 123 acres, \( \frac{3}{2} \) stangs and 6 perches and 285 acres,
\( \frac{1}{2} \) stang respectively. This process of recovery continued in the following
year when 111 acres, 2 stangs and 36 perches of arable land, 173 acres,
2 stangs and 10 perches of gavellars' land and 279 acres, \( \frac{2}{3} \) stangs of
betagh land lay waste for lack of tenants. \(^{168}\). This recovery following
the second visitation of the Black Death was not confined to Lisronagh,
and can also be seen on Elizabeth de Clare's Kilkenny lands. Given the
speed with which it occurred, it is more likely to represent re-alignment
of holdings, rather than the replacement of demographic losses. In a
comparative context it is worth noting that Lisronagh was worth £39-10-9\(^\frac{1}{2}\)
in 1351-2, though only £22-14-8\(^\frac{1}{2}\) of this sum was paid by the local
receiver or allowed against his account. During these two years the value
of an acre of land in Lisronagh remained 14d. per annum, the rate noted
in the 1333 extent. The mills at Clonmel, which were part of this
tenement, were ruinous in 1343-4, \(^{169}\) and were only worth £4-11-8 in 1348-9. \(^{170}\).
Other than this it is unclear whether or not they kept their value, because
of the lack of separate entries for their receipts in most subsequent
receiver generals' accounts, though it should be noted that their farmer
delivered £9-18-9 to the receiver general in 1356-7. \(^{171}\).

No extents or individual accounts have survived for any of Elizabeth's
other Munster manors, though on examining the receipts from receiver
generals' accounts, it is possible to determine, to some extent, the decline
in profitability found in many of these lands from 1333 onwards. Typeraght
was the only Tipperary manor held by Elizabeth to maintain its annual
income at a constant level throughout the three decades for which such
accounts have survived. \(^{172}\). In 1333, £4-13-0 was received from Philip
Wasmeir for Typeraght. By 1338-9, Griffyn Hewali delivered receipts
amounting to £6-13-4 to the receiver general and in 1340 the annual farm
of the manor was £8. This slumped to £6-13-4 in 1350-1, probably a
reflection of the impact of the plague on the profitability of the manor.
However, by 1354-5 the farm of Typeraght was restored to £8 per annum and
remained at this level up to 1360, when Oliver Howell paid £4 for the
farm of this manor in Easter term of that year.

\(^{168}\) P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/13.
\(^{169}\) P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/18.
\(^{170}\) P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/21.
\(^{171}\) P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/26.
\(^{172}\) For all material of this nature relating to Typeraght see Chapter:
IV, Appendix III. See also Map IV.
Grallagh in Muscry was considerably less profitable than Typeraght, possibly because it was separated from Elizabeth's other lands in Tipperary and also because of the involvement of some of the local de Burghs in the affairs of this manor.\textsuperscript{173} This interest was apparent in 1333-7 when Henry de Pakram, the receiver, only paid 118s.7d. to John de Laurence for the entire period and stated that the residue could not be levied because Edmund, son of the earl of Ulster levied the remainder, putting it to his own use from year to year. The next mention of Grallagh in a receiver general's account does not occur until the account of 1340-2. In 1340-1 £3-6-8 was received from Walter de Bermingham for Grallagh. Nothing was received from the Prior of Athassel, who was receiver there in the following year, probably because of the Bermingham occupation of that manor. In 1342-3 £6-13-4 was received from various tenants in Grallagh. The first two outbreaks of the Black Death do not appear to have had any lasting effect on the value of the manor for in 1350-1 Donat Carburr delivered £6-13-4 of the rents of Grallagh to the receiver general. This would seem to indicate that, when properly administered, the manor was worth considerably more per annum, as 1350-1 was a year in which revenue from most other de Clare properties fell. Nothing was received from Grallagh in 1352-3 and the only payment made by Richard de Burgh in the following year was £3-6-8 of his arrears. He made payment in kind, in the form of two debilitated horses, for the profits of the manor in 1354-5. No further payment was received from this manor and it was not listed in the 1360 account. The effects of the plague do not appear to have been of major significance in the decline in its profitability. The most obvious explanation for its decline appears to be its remoteness and the difficulty in extracting payment from its de Burgh farmers in later years.

Tristelaurens was the more profitable and less exposed of Elizabeth de Clare's two Limerick manors.\textsuperscript{174} Its farm rose from £3 in 1335 to £5 in the following year and the combined receipts from this manor for the two years 1341 and 1342 were £23-19-9. By 1343-4 the farm of Tristelaurens was set at £10 per annum. As was the case at Grallagh, the impact of the plague in Tristelaurens is not reflected in the returns, for the farm was

\textsuperscript{173.} For all material derived from receiver generals' accounts relating to Grallagh see Chapter IV: Appendix III. \textsuperscript{174.} For all material derived from receiver generals' accounts relating to Tristelaurens see Appendix III, Chapter IV.
paid in full in 1350-1. This is another example of a manor with a farm well below its actual value being administered for a modest return at minimal cost. The involvement of cadet branches of the de Burgh family is also of considerable significance. Tristelaurens maintained its value in 1360 when a farm of £5 was received for the half year.

Esclon seems to have been less profitable and more exposed than Tristelaurens to the effects of continuous warfare in Thomond. The first surviving receipt for this manor is a payment of 40s. by Geoffrey de Burgh for that year. In 1338-9 Esclon was worth £2-13-4. By 1340 the annual receipt had risen to £3-6-8, but no payment was received for the following two years. No farm was paid in 1348-9, but in 1350-1 £4 was received from the farmer, an indication that whatever adverse effect the first two visitations of the plague had on the profitability of this manor was shortlived. While payments of arrears were made by Geoffrey de Burgh both in 1352-3 and 1354-5, no actual payment of farm was made in either year. No farm was received from Esclon in 1356-7 because of the war in Thomond, though Geoffrey de Burgh paid half of the annual farm of £4 in 1360. Thus, the profitability of this manor seems to have been determined more by the fortunes and effects of the war in Thomond than by the impact of the Black Death.

Thus, the decline in the value of Elizabeth's Munster manors cannot be attributed to any single factor. In the case of Lisronagh, depopulation which probably preceded the Black Death and was exacerbated by the first two visitations of the plague appears to have been of critical importance, while the possible effects of attacks by the Tobins would have been more gradual in nature. The decline of Grallagh seems to have been a consequence of its remoteness and the activities of its de Burgh receivers, while fluctuations in the returns from Esclon were governed in one instance by the effects of the war in Thomond. Nor was this decline uniform, as is shown by the fact that both Typeraght and Tristelaurens retained their value up to 1360.

Meath and Louth

Elizabeth de Clare acquired a considerable amount of land in dower through her brief marriage to Theobald de Verdun, though the value of these dower lands declined in years from the time of their assignment,

175. For all material derived from receiver generals' accounts relating to Esclon see Chapter IV: Appendix III. See also Map.
due to the expansion of the land of war in the vicinity of the manor of Loxeudy. Elizabeth held land in Duleek, the manors of Kells and Coolock, land in La Roche, burgage lands and tenements in Dundalk and land in Loxeudy. Neither the inquisition post mortem taken on the death of Theobald de Verdun nor any extent of the dower lands assigned to Elizabeth have survived. It is thus impossible to estimate what the condition or value of her lands was at the time of assignment. The precise time at which dower was assigned is also unclear, though it is likely that Elizabeth received seisin of her lands before the custody of the remaining lands, less two annuities, one of £100 and the other of £20, was granted to the brothers Nicholas and Miles de Verdun. 176. The caput of Elizabeth's dower lands was the manor of Kells. 177. Though her holdings in Duleek were more valuable, she did not control the manorial caput there and her other manor of Coolock lay effectively on the periphery of her lands in this general area. Despite the fact that no extents have survived for any of Elizabeth's de Verdun dower lands, it is possible to use certain portions of the 1332 extents of the purparties to estimate the probable condition and value in that year of lands held by her which were adjacent to the holdings of one or other of the co-heiresses.

The four extents of land held by the co-parceners in Loxeudy indicate that this manor was closer in structure to the two de Burgh manors in Connacht, Loughrea and Sligo 178. than it was to the standard type of manor found in the land of peace. It formed the caput of an extended lordship, having at least four extensive sub-manors, Athlek, Lyesgaraule, Killinglarrath and Muddy. 179. These sub-manors and the land attached to them lay waste in 1332 and were originally worth £178 in time of peace. 180. Their decline in value probably stems from the death of Theobald de Verdun at the height

177. Ibid., p. 415.
of the Bruce invasion in July, 1316 and the fact that Loxeudy was occupied and burnt by Edward Bruce and his men in the winter of 1315-16. Apart from the depredations of Bruce's men and the local Irish the great famine of 1315-16 would have effectively prevented any swift recovery in profitability in such a situation. By 1332 the castle at Loxeudy had been burnt once again, on this occasion by the Irish and was worthless, even as a site. However, not all of the lordship of Loxeudy was waste and unprofitable. Profits of the external court, the hundred, the tolls and the fair were apportioned between the co-heiresses, as were the profits of the ferry of Portlec and the rents of various lands. The return from these tenements estimated in the extents of 1332 was £55-7-6. No mention is made of burgage rents in any of the co-heiresses' purparties of Loxeudy while it is clear, from the division of the profits of the hundred and the borough tolls, that such a borough existed. The fact that this borough was one of Elizabeth's holdings in Loxeudy is further underscored by the existence of a bailiff rather than a receiver in her portion of Loxeudy in 1348. If dower of a third of the manor had been assigned to Elizabeth in Loxeudy, she would also have held waste lands which had been worth £89 in time of peace and lands which were worth £27-13-9 in 1332.

The only sign of waste at Duleek in 1332 was the fact that the castle there had been burnt by the Irish. All of the lands in the hands of the co-heiresses were profitable, as was the manorial borough which they also held. Duleek was thus an extensive manor with a borough and originally a castle forming its caput. Whether or not there was any home demesne surrounding the borough is unclear. If such demesne lands existed, they formed part of Elizabeth's holdings in 1332. As Elizabeth held most of the land leased at farm in this manor, it is very likely that she held the home demesne. Her dower also included the manorial court and the hundred of the borough at Duleek. A seneschal, whose function

---

it would have been to preside over courts held at Duleek was maintained by Elizabeth for an annual fee of 20s.\[187\]. Elizabeth also held the borough tolls, the mill, 22 acres of meadow and some pasture.\[188\]. When extended in 1332, those portions of Duleek held by the co-heiresses were worth £68-8-9 per annum,\[189\] so that Elizabeth's portion of the manor should then have been worth £34-4-4½. This appears to have been the case, and the profitability of these lands did not begin to decline until well into the 1350's.\[190\].

None of the land in either Coolock or Kells was assigned to any of the co-heiresses, thus Elizabeth de Clare held these manors in their entirety. A record of the re-assignment in 1365 of most of Kells to three of the four interested parties provides a partial extent to the manor.\[191\].

There was a central demesne, comprising at least 1 carucate and 14 acres of arable land, 6 acres of meadow and 3 acres of pasture, which was set at farm or leased ad voluntatem domini. A manorial borough at Kells was worth at least 40s. and therefore, probably, contained at least 40 burgages. Its hundred court was worth 5s. per annum, according to this valuation, while the issues of the borough tolls were extended at £1-6-8 annually. A major proportion of the annual income of Kells manor was derived from free tenants with substantial holdings. Of a total valuation of £15-11-4 in 1365, £7-3-3 was derived from the free tenements, £3-7-9 from the demesne arable, meadow and pasture and £2-13-8 from the borough, its hundred and its tolls. Using the most detailed of the local accounts to have survived for Kells, that of 1352-3,\[192\] it is possible to supplement the information provided by the 1365 re-assignment. While the hundred court is not mentioned in this account, it is clear that the perquisites and profits of the court at which Elizabeth's seneschal presided, were at £1, considerably in excess of the 1365 valuation of the annual revenue of the hundred at 5s. Thus, the income generated by the manorial court in 1352-3 was probably not much less than 15s., if one allows for the inclusion of revenue from the hundred in this return. It is also possible, however, that the revenue of the hundred might have been accounted for by

---

\[188\] ibid. p. 438.
\[190\] See Chapter IV: Appendix IV.
\[192\] P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/10.
a farmer holding the farm of the entire borough, or of a portion of the borough. None of the four betagh tenements of Kennaghstown, Kells, Molaghe and Culemne, which were worth £6-1-0 in 1352-3 were re-assigned in name in 1365. It is possible that the demesne lands of 1365 may have been the betagh lands of Kells. No mention was made either of free tenements worth £1-15-1 in 1352-3 or of the mill at Kells. By 1352-3 the effects of the plague were such that the borough had been brought to nothing and the mill was burnt by the Irish in that year. An allowance of 50s. was made to the farmer of the borough and the mill, John Roche, for this shortfall in revenue. The annual income derived from Kells in 1352-3 exclusive of any allowances or of the payment of the seneschal’s annual fee of 20s. was £20-15-9. Despite the fact that only one of the reeves at Kells appeared in any of the receiver generals’ accounts, it is fairly likely that the manorial borough at Kells was administered in much the same way as any other manorial borough in Meath or Leinster.

Elizabeth’s other manor, Coolock, was slightly more valuable than Kells. It is possible to reconstruct the tenements of this manor, using evidence contained in accounts rendered by local receivers, of which the most useful are those of 1348-9, and 1351-2. Most profit was derived from the demesne lands, which were worth £21-8-0 in 1348-9 when leased at will and were set to farm for £17-16-8 in 1351-2. These lands were located both in Coolock and Kilmore. Not all of the demesne lands of the manor were arable, for wood was sold there in 1350-1 and a custos bosci was among the officials retained on an annual basis. There may also have been tracts of moor and pasture attached to the original demesne. A small meadow and the pasture of the manorial park (parcus) were sold on an annual basis. The annual income from what was apparently an extensive settlement of cottagers was worth 15s.3½d. in 1348-9 and had declined to 13s.5½d. in 1351-2. Fixed rent paid by the free tenants of the manor was worth annually £4-2-1. Income from the manorial court at Coolock fluctuated from 12s.4d. in 1350-1 to £1-3-4 in 1348-9 and £1-9-0 in 1351-2. A seneschal was also retained.

193. Kennaghstown in the parish of Dunboyne, Mullagha in the parish of Rathkenny and Carlanstown in the parish of Kilbeg, Townland Index.
195. See Chapter IV: Appendix IV.
196. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/20. For location see Map IX.
200. Ibid.
201. Ibid.
at Coolock, but here the annual fee was only 13s.4d. The prise of ale at Coolock was worth 5s.6d. in 1348-9 and 1s.10d. in 1351-2. Thus, Coolock was a manor which had an exceptionally large amount of demesne land in proportion to the remainder of the land attached to this manor. It had a substantial settlement of cottagers, a number of free tenants and probably, a fairly large wood. No mention is made in any of the local receivers' accounts of a mill at Coolock. This was probably the result of the geography of north county Dublin, where the land is flat with few hills and there is an absence of fast running rivers suitable for mill races.

By contrast with the four co-heiresses, Elizabeth held very little land in Louth. The inclusion of Kells and Coolock as part of her dower was probably the reason for this small assignment in Louth. Her most extensive holding in that county was probably what was noted in the 1332 extents as £4-13-3½ of the burgage rent of the Newtown of Dundalk. This money was derived both from messuages and burgage land there. The remainder of the rent of this borough was assigned to Thomas de Furnival and his wife, Joan. Elizabeth appears to have held some of the land of the free tenants attached to La Roche. She may also have held a third of the mill and the manorial court of La Roche, neither of which were included in the extent of 1332. These holdings were not extensive and were exposed to attack by the Irish. In 1343-4, the tenants were burnt out by the Irish and the tenements were worthless. John White succeeded in levying £2 from Elizabeth's lands in La Roche in 1348-9, stating in his account that no more could be levied in that year. In 1350-1 the farm of these lands was worth £1 but it was subsequently raised to £2. The remainder of the manor of La Roche, which was worth £10-17-6¼ in 1332 and included the rent of the manorial borough, the issues of its hundred and 221 acres of demesne, was assigned to Thomas de Furnival and his wife Joan in 1332. Elizabeth de Clare also appears to have held some land in Drogheda on a temporary basis, though the reason for this is unclear.

204. See Chapter IV: Appendix IV.
205. See Chapter IV: Appendix IV.
206. Ibid.,
207. Ibid.,
Initially Elizabeth committed most of her de Verdun dower lands in farm to Nicholas de Verdun, brother of her late husband, Theobald. Nicholas probably administered these lands on her behalf from the time of the assignment of dower, for both he and his brother Miles were granted custody of the remaining lands shortly after the death of Theobald de Verdun in July, 1316. In return for an annual farm of £80, Nicholas held lands described in the earliest surviving accounts of receiver generals as the dower of de Verdun. This comprised the manors of Kells and Coolock, together with Elizabeth's lands in Duleek. De Verdun does not seem to have shown any interest in Elizabeth's lands in Louth or her holdings at Loxeudy, all of which were accounted for separately in the earlier general accounts. He was still acting as farmer in 1343-4, but by 1348-9 he no longer held these lands, which were accounted for separately by local officials. His own lands had passed into Elizabeth's hands on foot of a writ of elegit for debt in that year. Thus, at some time between 1343-4 and 1348-9, Nicholas de Verdun lost this farm through indebtedness. In the early 1340's Elizabeth derived a small and temporary income from the lands of Shalwyn and Barfotiston, which passed into her hand by escheat. These would have been lands held by free tenants, possibly only by payment of scutage and assigned to her with her other dower lands. Similar assignments were made to the de Verdun co-heiresses.

The first individual receipts for Elizabeth's land in Duleek and her manors of Kells and Coolock to have survived are those of 1348-9, a year in which revenue would have been affected by two factors connected with the impact of the Black Death: an artificial increase in income due to an usually large number of heriots and entry fines and a decrease in income caused by the abandonment of various tenements. Duleek was worth £37-13-2 in that year, while Kells and Coolock were worth respectively £16-6-0 and £22-0-10 1/2. In the enrolled series of accounts for 1350-1, the total receipts of Duleek amounted to £35-14-1 ½, while those of Kells and Coolock amounted to £16-19-10 1/2 and £32-16-10 1/2 respectively. This seems to indicate that in the case of Duleek and Coolock and to a certain extent in the case of Kells that the annual income of these manors had been maintained from the time when they were held by Nicholas de Verdun. The actual sums accounted for by the receivers at Duleek, Kells and Coolock in 1350-1 was considerably less than this optimum income. Despite a

209. For all Meath receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix IV.
210. Shalwyn and Barfordstown, Townland Index.
brief recovery in 1352-3, the receipts from these lands declined for the remainder of that decade. Duleek was least diminished and was worth £29-18-6 in 1356-7. Kells was worth £16-19-8 in that year and Coolock £20-8-3s. The effects of the first and second outbreaks of the plague appear to have been slightly more severe in Kells,212 than in either Duleek or Coolock. Coolock had a number of impoverished tenants in 1348-9 and the income from its cottagers declined from that date onwards. Allowances were made to all three receivers for vacant tenements during the early 1350's. Thus, the plague lessened perceptibly the value of Elizabeth's major holdings in Meath, though the loss of revenue caused by this decline was not as great as might otherwise have been the case.

The lands held by Elizabeth de Clare as part of her dower in county Louth were never a major source of income.213 Initially, accounts of payments made by Louth receivers were somewhat sparcadic, for some of these lands were in the King's hand for debt. No accounts were rendered for the burgage lands of Dundalk until 1350-1 but thereafter accounts were rendered up to 1356-7. This rent appears to have been collected by the bailiff of the sheriff of Louth. Although the rent of Dundalk fluctuated considerably, these fluctuations might reflect the diligence and efficiency of the bailiffs rather than a series of short term declines and recoveries. Alone amongst Elizabeth's lands, La Roche appears to have increased in value following the first two outbreaks of the plague. A farm of £1 was paid for these lands in 1350-1 and also in the following year. By 1352-3 this farm had been increased to £2. A clue to this increase in value is to be found in their designation as the castle of La Roche in the general account of 1353-4 and in all subsequent accounts. A new castle had probably been built, for the castle of La Roche proper, which formed part of the caput of this manor was assigned to Thomas de Furnivall and his wife Joan in the 1352 partition.214 An exchange of land might have occurred, though this is unlikely. No receipts were delivered by officials in Loxeudy after 1337, though the arrears of a bailiff of the borough in 1348 were paid in 1353-4.215 The reason constantly given for non-receipt of payment from Loxeudy was that Elizabeth's lands there lay in the march inter hibernicos.

212. See above p.171.
213. For all Louth receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix IV.
215. For the Loxeudy receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix IV.
With the exception of her lands in County Louth and her holdings in Loxeudy, Elizabeth de Clare's dower lands from her marriage with Theobald de Verdun seem to have maintained most of their original value well into the late 1350's. What decline is apparent, both in the individual accounts and in the accounts of the receiver generals, probably stemmed from the impact of the first two outbreaks of the Black Death and consequent depopulation and impoverishment. The effects of the plague and of other less apparent crises were probably lessened considerably by the policies of management followed by Elizabeth and her receiver generals. Her use and subsequent abandonment of Nicholas de Verdun, when he proved too costly in terms of debt, is a classic example of such techniques. He represented the same sort of local interest and power in Meath as did the cadet de Burghs in Munster, but in the more stable conditions of Meath control of such interest was not indispensable.

Kilkenny

Elizabeth de Clare's lands in Kilkenny were undoubtedly the most profitable of her Irish lands. Following Gilbert de Clare's death in 1314, the de Clare lordship was partitioned between Elizabeth and her sisters, Margaret and Eleanor. Most of her purparty of the liberty of Kilkenny lay in the north-west of that county. In a late fourteenth or early fifteenth century record of her purparty preserved in the Liber Primus Kilkeniensis, which was drawn up following the reversion of dower in 1319, Elizabeth's lands were listed as the manors of Formayll, Ballycallan, Palmerston, Loughmerans, and Salt, the castle and patria of Fertlan, the boroughs of Callan and Kilmanagh, the

216. See above p. 161.
219. Fermoyle in the parish of Rosconnell, County Laois. Townland Index.
220. The parish of Ballycallan, Co. Kilkenny, Townland Index.
221. Palmerstown in the parish of St. Canice, Co. Kilkenny, Townland Index.
222. Loughmerans, St. John's parish, Co. Kilkenny, Townland Index.
223. An incorrect transcription of Sart. The townland of Sart lay in the parish of Clashacrow, Co. Kilkenny (Townland Index). It is possible that the lands at Sart were only held by knight service, for the only occasion on which any land in this part of the County was noted in the accounts was when Elizabeth's receivers were accounting for the custody of Glasero (P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/24 and 25).
224. The parish of Offerland, Co. Laois, Townland Index, this is given as Offerclan in P.R.O. C47 9/25.
225. The manor of Callan was the parish of Callan, Co. Kilkenny, Townland Index.
226. The parish of Kilmanagh, Co. Kilkenny, Townland Index.
serjeantries of Ogenti and Shillyrhir\textsuperscript{227} and the demesne of Callan. No reference is made in any of Elizabeth's receivers' accounts to the manor of Salt and this extent mentions neither the manor of Damagh nor the manor of Latherdan. Damagh and Latherdan may both have been included in the manor of Ballycallan in the extent of the purparties of Kilkenny. There are a number of minor differences between the contents of this schedule and the lands listed in what may have been the original division of the liberty. The most important of these, from the point of Elizabeth's holdings, is that the manor of Silericher is listed rather than that of Sart.\textsuperscript{227a} The value of these lands quoted in the extent of the purparties was £178-18-6\textsuperscript{3} per annum. It is apparent, from the earlier receivers' general accounts to have survived, that the income derived from Elizabeth's Kilkenny lands in the 1330's was considerably in excess of this valuation. The castle of Fertlan and its patria were listed as unextendable propter gueram and the manor of Formayll was only valued at 37s.3d. per annum,\textsuperscript{228} probably for similar reasons. No receipt from Fertlan was noted in any of the surviving receivers' accounts and it is clear from this source that receivers of Formayll answered for their charge at best on a sporadic basis.\textsuperscript{229} By the early 1350's, this manor was inter hibernicos.\textsuperscript{230}

While the extents of the purparties do not contain any detailed descriptions of Elizabeth's lands, it is possible to estimate their likely condition from extents taken following the death of Joan, countess of Gloucester and Hertford in 1307. Using these extents and accounts rendered by the local receivers and reeves of these manors and boroughs, it is possible to examine changes in land use as well as the effects of the first and second outbreaks of the Black Death on this portion of the liberty of Kilkenny.

The manor of Callan was so large and valuable that it was divided between

\textsuperscript{227} The serjeantry of Ogenti comprised also the serjeantry of Ostcallan, or Oscallan by which name it was more commonly known in the receivers' accounts. It seems to have roughly equalled the modern barony of Gowran. See Map attached to C.A. Egey, 'The Butler Lordship in Ireland', unpublished Ph.D. thesis presented at Trinity College, Dublin in 1970. The serjeantry of Shillyrhir is roughly equivalent to the modern barony of Shilleslogher.

\textsuperscript{227a} Cf. P.R.O. 547 9/25:

\textsuperscript{228} R.I. Prim. Kilk., p. 56.

\textsuperscript{229} See Chapter IV: Appendix V.

\textsuperscript{230} P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/24.
the three co-heiresses following reversion after the death of Maud de Burgh.\textsuperscript{231} Eleanor received the rents of Callan and Margaret the land held ad voluntatem domini, together with the pleas and perquisites of the manorial court, while Elizabeth received the demesne lands, the manorial borough with its hundred and the mill.\textsuperscript{232} No individual fields or plots of land are named in the 1307 extent of Callan with the exception of meadowland at Brodmede.\textsuperscript{233} Apart from a park of oaks and a wood, for which no acreage was given, 500 acres of demesne land were extended in 1307. Receivers of the demesne at Callan accounted for approximately 525 acres, divided into some twenty tenements during the course of the mid fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{234} The largest of these tenements were those of little and great Bendan, which contained 113 acres, 1 stang and 8 perches, and Moycorky, which contained 135 acres, 3 stangs and 8 perches. Some of the other tenements only comprised a few perches. While a difference of 25 acres between the 1307 extent and the later receivers' accounts does not pose a manor problem, it nevertheless raises certain questions about the accuracy of the extent. Land was frequently undervalued in inquisitions post mortem, but, generally, not incorrectly extended. It is thus possible, though not likely, that the jurors of 1307 attempted to conceal land in order to bring down the value of the manor. The most probably explanation is that the figure given in 1307 was the extent of the demesne in round rather than exact terms. The augmentation might, however, have occurred at the assignment of the various portions of Callan to the co-heiresses in order to round off one or other of the portions.

It is apparent from accounts rendered by receivers of the demesne at Callan that there were a number of cottages attached to the demesne lands. These were located at Gottesestre and were probably worth 6d. each per annum, because five cottages for which allowance was made in the account

\textsuperscript{231} cf. P.R.O. C47 9/23, 24, 25. The amount of land, together with the knights' fees held by Maud in dower is clearly laid out. It would not have seemed quite so relevant to the compiler of the Liber Primus. See Map IV for location.


\textsuperscript{233} For all material relating to this extent see P.R.O. C 133 file 130/76 and C.D.I., 1302-7, no. 659.

of Easter term 1350 were valued at 2s.6d.\textsuperscript{235}. A further 2s. was collected in rent from the remaining cottages in that year. It is therefore likely that there were nine cottages attached to the demesne at Callan. The tenants of these cottages owed suit to a special court at Gottestret.\textsuperscript{236} This court was probably established when the manor court was granted to Elizabeth's sister Margaret and was presided over by the custos bosci.\textsuperscript{237}

As a fairly extensive wood also formed part of the demesne land at Callan a custos bosci was retained on an annual basis for a fee of 6s. 8d.\textsuperscript{238}

The subdivision of Callan seems to have led initially to the abandoning of direct cultivation of the demesne. In 1307 154\frac{1}{2} acres of demesne had been sown with wheat and 142 acres with oats. The transition from this form of land use to the leasing of the entire demesne probably stemmed from a combination of two factors. When the manor was divided between the three sisters, the balance was altered between the amount of land under cultivation, from which returns would have been dependent on the excellence of the harvest and the prevailing price of grain and the amount of land from which rent, fixed or otherwise, could have been expected. Leasing the demesne would also have provided Elizabeth with a steady and relatively trouble free source of income. The leasing of outlying or unprofitable demesnes was to become a regular feature in late fourteenth century estate management in England.\textsuperscript{239} The relatively early abandonment of direct cultivation of the demesnes in the case of Elizabeth's Kilkenny manors almost certainly stemmed from the fact that as an absentee lord she found a steady income preferable to the uncertainty and worry of managing the cultivation of land in a lordship, where political stability was continually deteriorating and both the area of march land and the land of war expanding.

It is clear from the extent of 1307 that the demesne at Ballycallan was


\textsuperscript{236} Ibid. p 30-1, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{237} For an account rendered by the custos bosci see P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/19 piece 3.

\textsuperscript{238} P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/8, printed in M.C. Lyons 'Elizabeth de Clare's Purparty of Callan c. 1338-1360', Decies, no. 16 (January 1981), p. 33.

then under cultivation. It contained 3 carucates and 117 acres of arable, meadow and pasture, most of which was probably arable land. This land was then worth £7-15-8 per annum. The annual rent derived from the free tenants of Ballycallan was assessed at £18-3-11½ and their holdings comprised 12 carucates, 13 acres and 1 stang. At least one of these tenements, Damagh, which contained 2 carucates of land and was held by John de Braham for an annual rent of £8-1-6 in 1307, was subsequently detached from Ballycallan and fused with lands which were extended as the manorial centre of Rogerston in 1307 to form the new manor of Damagh.

None of the local accounts which have survived for the manor of Ballycallan treat with its individual tenements in great detail. The earliest surviving accounts of this nature thus only provide one with a broad outline of the structure of this manor during the 1340's. In 1343-4, £5-13-10¾ of fixed rent was received at Ballycallan, while the land leased at farm was worth £16-11-4¾. There was also a turbery on the manor and the revenue from the manorial court was 5s.8d. in this year. By 1347-8, the land held at farm in 1343-4 was held ad voluntatem domini and was worth £16-11-7½. No mill was noted in any of the local receivers' accounts at Ballycallan, so that it seems logical to conclude that the situation which prevailed in 1307 whereby the tenants of Ballycallan owed suit to the mill at Kilmanagh still obtained. There was probably a small settlement of cottagers on this manor throughout the 1340's and the 1350's, because five cottages were noted in a list of abandoned tenements in Easter term 1350 and Michaelmas term 1350-I. The 1307 valuation of Ballycallan was £25-19-7. By 1340-I the income from this manor was £22-6-11½, a net increase when allowance is made for the detachment of Damagh. The effects of the Black Death on this income were fully apparent in 1348-9, when the receiver at Ballycallan only answered for £17-1-9. Despite a partial recovery in the intervening years only £12-6-9½ was received from Ballycallan in 1356-7, the last year for which complete accounts have survived.

The identification of Damagh with the 1307 manor of Rogerston is made

240. For all material relating to this extent see P.R.O. C 133 file 130/77 and C.D.I. 1502-7, no. 664. Damagh is Damma in the parish of Ballycallan, Co. Kilkenny, Townland Index. See Map IV.


243. P.R.O. S.C. 6 1239/22 and 23 respectively.

244. For all receipts listed in general accounts see Chapter IV: Appendix V.
on the basis of two accounts rendered by the receiver there, Thomas son of Hugh for the year 1350-1. Six tenements named in both of these accounts were extended as part of Rogerston. The tenement described in 1307 as Kendirganyston, Arclon and the land which was the priests and comprised 3 carucates is paralleled in these accounts by the tenements of Kendrerganestoun, Arclon and Chircheton, each of which contained a carucate. Acreages of land at Lyssyndam and Tipperkenny both decreased between 1307 and 1350. In 1307 there were 153 acres of demesne at Lyssodam and 2 carucates at Tipperkenny. By 1350 both tenements were deemed each to contain a carucate. In Tipperkenny the land extended in 1307 was stated to have been exhausted by overuse. This surplus land in both tenements may have been waste for such a long period that by 1350 local receivers no longer considered it necessary to mention it in their accounts. It is also possible that amounts of land were rounded up or down in the 1350-1 accounts, though this would not explain the loss of land at Tipperkenny satisfactorily.

In the 1307 extent Rogerston was said to contain 163 acres of arable, meadow and pasture in demesne. By 1350 this tenement was deemed to contain 2 carucates. An additional 263 acres of demesne was also extended in 1307. Damagh, which was originally a sub-tenement of Ballycallan, became the caput of these lands at some point between 1307 and 1315, when Walter de Istelep and Thomas le Botiller, who held the custody of Gilbert de Clare's lands in Ireland accounted for the rent of the demesnes, meadows and pastures of Damagh amongst a number of other manors. Damagh had acquired both a court and a turbary by 1343-4. This court was probably the Rogerston court, noted but not extended in 1307, functioning under a new name. A water mill at Rogerston, which only operated in the winter was noted en passant in the 1307 extent, but was not mentioned in any of the receivers' accounts. The lands and tenements of Rogerston were worth £17-15-0 in 1307. In 1338-9, £33-18-6¼ was received from the manor of Damagh. Its revenues seem to have declined somewhat in the early 1340's but had recovered fully by 1343-4. In 1348-9, its receiver, John Walsh, only delivered £20-5-0 to the receiver general. There was a subsequent recovery and in 1352-3 Damagh was worth £30-7-1¼. Thereafter income from this manor fluctuated considerably but did not fall below £27-0-0 per annum.

245. P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/22 and 23 respectively.
246. For all material relating to the Rogerston extent see P.R.O. C133 file 130/77 and C.D.I. 1302-7 no. 664.
248. For all receipts listed in general accounts see Chapter IV: Appendix V.
Latherdan only had 69 acres of demesne in 1307.249. It was one of Elizabeth de Clare's smallest Kilkenny manors, most of its income in 1307 being derived from tenants holding ad voluntatem domini, whose rents were worth £2-14-8 and free tenants holding land at fixed rents from whom there was an annual income of £3-5-10. The court at Latherdan was only valued at 6d. in this extent and no mention was made by the jurors of a manorial mill. In the account rendered by Reginald Fulber in 1352-3,250, income from rents in Latherdan remained roughly similar to that of 1307, though the type of tenement from which these rents were derived seems to have undergone a considerable alteration. Even assuming that the demesne lands were incorporated into the land leased at will, a number of tenements originally held by fixed rent must have passed into Elizabeth's hand either through escheat or desertion and have been set at will thereafter. Income from fixed rents had fallen to 15s.10d. while income from lands held at will had risen to £5-0-9 in 1352-3. No mill was noted in Latherdan in the 1307 extent and from an entry concerning the farm of the water mill at Kilmanagh which was included with Latherdan in 1352-3 and was described as the mill of parts of Latherdan and Kilmanagh, it would appear that the tenants of Latherdan continually used the mill at Kilmanagh. Latherdan was extended at £6-18-3 in 1307 and does not appear to have risen greatly in value at any later stage. In 1343-4 £8-13-6¼ was received from this manor.251. Its income was not appreciably affected by the first outbreak of the plague, though it began to fall in the early 1350's. In 1352-3 the total receipts from Latherdan, including the farm of the mill at Kilmanagh were £7-19-10½. The income from Latherdan remained at this level up to the end of the decade.

Loughmerans was in a state of considerable decline in 1307 252. and seems from its extent to have been a victim of the intensive cultivation of marginal land of the late thirteenth century which has already been described at Fenmagh in Carlow.253. There were originally 320 acres of demesne at Loughmerans. By 1307, 80 acres of this land was extended at

249. For all material relating to this extent see P.R.O. C133 file 130/77 and C.D.I. 1302-7 no. 664. Latherdan probably survives in the name of the townland of Lates in the parish of Tullaroun, Co. Kilkenny, Townland Index. See map IV.

250. P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/12.

251. For all general receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix V.

252. For all material relating to this extent see P.R.O. C133 file 130/71 and C.D.I. 1302-7 no. 658. See also map IV.

253. See above p.63.
half the normal rate because it was poor and had been overused. The residue lay waste and uncultivated. No tenants could be found for it due to the condition of the land. Thus, the original demesne had probably been decreased in size as land began to give poor returns and such land may have been leased, possibly at will, to tenants who were willing to risk cultivating marginal lands. Meadowland at Loughmerans appears to have been relatively profitable, for 14 acres were extended there at 1s. an acre. The income derived from rents in 1307 was £7-1-0.

When this manor was assigned to Elizabeth it was assessed at £17-11-9, but the two accounts rendered by Robert Hod in 1350-1, show that its potential revenue was considerably greater and also that its tenements had undergone a change in structure comparable with that already noted in Latherdan. The income derived from fixed rents that year was £4-14-6, while land leased at will was worth £14-17-1s. The increase in revenue probably reflects the recovery of the overused land following a long period of its lying fallow. It is likely that land held at fixed rents which came into Elizabeth's hand through escheat or desertion were then leased at will, as was the case in Latherdan. Subsequent leases at will may have produced more economically realistic rents. There was a turbary and a manorial court at Loughmerans, but there does not appear to have been a manorial mill. No mill was extended in 1307 and Robert Hod accounted for a levy on the use of hand mills in his account for Michaelmas term 1350-1. Loughmerans was worth £20-8-0 in 1340-1 and remained this profitable until 1348-9, when revenue slumped to £17-3-7. A decline in income continued in 1350-1 and the manor was set at farm for £15 per annum in 1352-3.

Despite the fact that Palmerston was one of Elizabeth de Clare's smaller manors it was in remarkably good condition in 1307 and seems to have remained in relatively good condition throughout the first half of the fourteenth century. While the buildings and outhouses on the manor could not be leased in 1307, there were then no other signs of decrepitude at Palmerston. There were 270 acres of demesne and 28 acres of meadow on this manor which also had an extensive area of scrubland and moor that

256. For all general receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix V.
257. For all material relating to this extent see P.R.O. C133 file 130/68 and C.D.I. 1302-7 no. 657. See Map IV.
was leased as pasture. The only tenants on this manor in 1307 were a number of betagh cottagers who held 44 acres of land for an annual rent of 46s. and whose works during the harvest and at ploughing were only worth 1s. per annum. There was a manorial court at Palmerston, but no mill was extended in 1307. In its entirety Palmerston was worth £10-17-0 in 1307. By 1343-4 all of the lands and tenements there were set at farm, producing an income of £12-3-02. 258. A turbary and the manorial court were worth 3s. 1½d. and 3s.6d. respectively in that year. In 1347-8 rents were derived from land held at will and were worth £11-18-7½259. The following year saw the reemergence of fixed rent, but by 1350-1 the form of tenure prevalent there had changed again. The local account for the first part of this year does not appear to have survived either as a separate account or as part of an enrolled account for that year. In the account for Michaelmas term 1350-1, 260. £5-10-9½ was derived in rent from the land of Palmerston, some of which was held by betaghs and the residue set at farm. This alteration could well have been a local attempt to ensure that as little as possible land became untenanted following the second visitation of the Black Death. As was the case with Elizabeth's other Kilkenny manors, direct cultivation of the demesne at Palmerston was discontinued at some point after 1307. It is worth noting that despite changes in the form of tenure under which the land of this manor was held during the 1340's and the 1350's, the number of betaghs there appears to have remained sufficiently high to warrant their inclusion in the account for Michaelmas term 1350-1.

No mill was extended at Palmerston in 1307 and no mention was made in this extent as to whether or not the tenants owed suit to the mill at Kilmanagh. The absence of revenue derived from a levy on hand mills in the later accounts coupled with Palmerston's distance from Kilmanagh seems to indicate that whether or not they were under any obligation to do so the tenants there probably did not use the mill at Kilmanagh. Prior to the first outbreak of the Black Death the average annual return from Palmerston was £12. 261. In 1348-9 the receiver only answered for £7-2-10. Despite a recovery in the early 1350's revenue from Palmerston began to decline again in 1352-3. By 1354-5 it had fallen to £8-14-2 and appears to have remained at that level for the remainder of the decade.

261. For all general receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix V.
Elizabeth de Clare was assigned two boroughs in her purparty of Kilkenny, the manorial borough of Callan and the borough of Kilmanagh. The terms under which the burgesses of these boroughs held their tenements was laid down in a charter granted by William Marchal, earl of Pembroke, to the burgesses of Callan between 1219 and 1231. The customs specified closely resemble those granted by John, as dominus hibernie, to the burgesses of Dublin in 1192, though the maximum emercedent to which the burgesses of Callan were liable, 10s., was considerably lower than that specified in the Dublin charter. The annual rent of each burgage was 1s. The survival of two borough rentals, one for Newtown Jerpoint which also included the manor of Old Jerpoint and the other for Coillach, both of which appear to have been drawn up in the late thirteenth century, probably in 1288 and 1289, provides some additional information on the size of a burgage. It also confirms the fact that the annual rent of a burgage given in the Callan charter was that which was subsequently levied throughout the thirteenth century in the boroughs of the liberty of Kilkenny. The burgage plot comprised a frontage and 6 acres. It was frequently split up between a number of tenants if the situation at Newtown Jerpoint and Coillach was typical of the other boroughs in the liberty. Individual burgesses also occasionally held a number of burgages. Unlike the receivers who accounted for Elizabeth's Kilkenny manors and her demesne lands at Callan, who seem to have held office during pleasure, the reeves at Callan and Kilmanagh held office for fixed periods of time and may well have been elected to office. The reeves at Kilmanagh held office for a year, while the reeves at Callan held office for a half year, with the exception of Richard Mothil, who held office for the entire year in 1346-7.


264. P.R.O. S.C. 11 794 and 792 respectively. Both are dated as 17 Ed. but appear to be more in the hand of Edward II's reign. Idists and Indexes note them and consign them to the reign of Edward III. Coillach is Earlstown, Co. Kilkenny, (E. St. John Brooks, Knights Fees in Counties Wexford, Carlow and Kilkenny, Dublin 1950, p. 243.

265. See Chapter IV: Appendix V and also P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/17 piece 4.

266. See Chapter IV: Appendix V and for Richard Mothil's account see P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/19 piece 1.
The portion of the 1307 extent of Callan dealing with burgesses and burgage tenements is so heavily damaged as to be totally illegible. Throughout the 1340's and the 1350's the fixed rent derived from this borough was £12-17-8½ per annum.²⁶⁷ No attempt appears to have been made by any reeve to claim that there were waste burgages in Callan during this period. It is impossible to use this material to find some indication of population density in Callan or even to establish what the effects of the first two visitations of the plague were there due to the practice which has already been noted whereby persons might have held fractions of burgages or a number of burgages together, forming a single consolidated tenement. The revenue from the hundred court at Callan, to which the burgesses owed suit, fluctuated from term to term. It never dropped below the 11s.10d. accounted for in Michaelmas term 1342-3 or rose beyond the 31s.3d. received in Easter term 1350.²⁶⁸ This inflated return may be a reflection of an increase in the number of burgesses making payment to have right of entry to vacant tenements in the wake of the second outbreak of the plague. The value of the prise of ale declined continuously from Easter term 1343 when 58s. was accounted for, to Michaelmas term 1350-1, when it was worth 38s.²⁶⁹ In the following year the prise of ale was fixed at 31s. per annum.²⁷⁰ Receipts from stallage in Callan were more erratic in value than either those of the hundred court or the prise of ale. Their range ran from 3s.4½d. for the year 1346-7 to 2s.0½d. in Easter term 1346 and 2s. in Easter term 1352.²⁷¹ On average the borough of Callan was worth £19 annually prior to 1348,²⁷² which compares well with a valuation of £21-0-3 in the extent made following the assignment of purparties.²⁷³ Only £17 was received from the borough in 1348-9 and despite a brief recovery in 1350-1, this decline continued throughout the decade. In 1356-7 only £13-5-10½ was received from the reeves of Callan.

²⁶⁷ i.e. See accounts for 1351-2, P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/9, printed in M.C. Lyons, 'Elizabeth de Clare's Purparty of Callan 1338-1360', Decies, no. 16, (January 1981), p. 32 and p. 34.
²⁶⁸ P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/16.
²⁶⁹ P.R.O. S.C.6 1239/22.
²⁷⁰ P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/9, printed in M.C. Lyons 'Elizabeth de Clare's Purparty of Callan', Decies, no. 16 (January 1981), p. 32.
²⁷² For all general receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix V.
A complete, if not particularly detailed, extent for the borough of Kilmanagh drawn up in 1307 has survived undamaged. The burgesses there held 6 carucates and 15 acres of land at an annual rent of £6-2-6 and owed suit to the hundred court. No attempt was made to extend the individual burgages as a sub-section of this total, but it is unlikely that all, or even most of this land was divided into burgages. The main portion of this land was probably arable land and meadow held corporately by the burgesses. The amount of fixed rent accounted for in the five surviving accounts of the borough of Kilmanagh was £6-18-0 per annum. This rent is slightly higher than that noted in 1307, but is clearly derived from the same lands. There were also a number of cottagers at Kilmanagh in 1307. Their cottages, together with 3 acres, 1 stang of land of escheat, which they then held, were worth 13s.5d. per annum. This rent is not noted separately in any of the later accounts and was probably absorbed into the category of fixed rent by 1342-3. The borough toll and the issues of the hundred court were extended respectively at 6d. and 10s. per annum. This assessment of borough toll appears to have been a fixed charge in 1307 or to have become so by 1342-3. Receipts from the hundred court at Kilmanagh fluctuated between 8s.7d. in 1342-3 and 13s.4d. in 1346-7. Revenue from the borough of Kilmanagh does not appear to have been seriously affected by the plague and remained at a fairly constant level throughout the 1340's and the 1350's.

The least profitable portion of Elizabeth's purparty in Callan was described in the Liber Primus Kilkenniensis as the mill of Callan. It was valued at £20 per annum. From its value this mill is more likely to have been a double mill or even three or four mills. It is clear from accounts of receivers of the demesne at Callan that there were at least two mills attached to the manor. The second of these mills was called the new mill and might have been built to replace an older mill which had been burnt or overwhelmed by bad weather. The farm of the mill or mills at Callan declined steadily from 1338 onwards. It was never worth the assessment of £20 given in the extent of the purparties.

274. For all material relating to this extent see P.R.O. C133 file 130/66 and C.D.I., 1302-7 no. 663. See also map IV.


277. For all general receipts see Chapter IV: Appendix V.

In both 1338-9 and 1340-1, the farmer there made annual payments of £16.280. By 1350 the issues of the mill formed part of the receiver of the demesne's account, an indication of continuing diminution in its value.281. The annual farm in 1350-1 was £6-13-4.282. By 1356-7 receipts from the mill had plunged to 10s. for the entire year, to rise again to £4-10-0 for the half year of 1360.283. The overall decline in revenue from the mills at Callan must reflect a decline in the amount of grain handled. Cessation of direct cultivation of the demesne would have caused an initial drop in the amount of grain passing through these mills and the partitioning of Callan may have led to a decrease in the number of tenants using the facilities for milling there. The further decline of the 1350's was probably due to depopulation caused by the plague.

The issues of the mill at Kilmanagh were valued at £5 in the 1307 extent, 284. but, as was the case with the mill at Callan the value of this mill declined steadily during both the 1340's and the following decade. In 1340-1, £2-19-6½ was received from William Stryth, farmer of this mill, and David Molgarf on his behalf.285. Stryth's goods were in the hands of Elizabeth's ministers for debt by the following year. When David Molgarf and Henry Cyirters acted as receivers for the issues of the mill in 1342-3 they only accounted for 10s.6d. Following this intervention, the value of the mill at Kilmanagh increased slightly. It was set to farm in Michaelmas term 1343-4 for a rent of £1-6-8. Nothing could be levied from the mill in either 1348-9 or 1350-1 and it was stated in the 1350-1 account that no farm was forthcoming pro defectu firmarii. By 1352-3 the mill at Kilmanagh was merged with the manor of Latherdan and its farm was set at £2 per annum. This farm was only worth £1-6-8 in 1356-7. No further separate accounts have survived for the issues of that mill. Thus, the value of the mill at Kilmanagh declined steadily after 1307, reflecting in turn the abandonment of direct cultivation of the demesne at Ballycallan, Latherdan, Damagh and Palmerston, the impact of the 1315-18 famine and any other local reverses of a demographic or a political nature. It is also possible that a shrinkage in the number of tenements
owing suit to the mill at Kilmanagh occurred with the various changes in forms of local tenure. The possibility must also be entertained that there were never sufficient numbers owing suit to the mill for it to have been worth much more than £2 per annum at any time other than the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, at the height of direct cultivation of the demesne in Ireland.

Overall revenue from Elizabeth de Clare's lands in Kilkenny declined throughout the mid fourteenth century, reaching a nadir at the time of the first outbreak of the Black Death and recovering somewhat in the following decade. The average income from these lands from July 1333 to Easter 1337 was £219-17-2½, which was sustained in 1338-9, when they were worth £219-18-9½. A decline set in during the first years of the following decade reflecting, perhaps, the effects of some of Maurice fitz Thomas' forays and an overspill of the general instability of the growing Tipperary march into north-west Kilkenny. By 1343-4, the income from Elizabeth's purparty had dwindled to £153-14-2. The immediate effects of the first outbreak of the Black Death were reflected in an exceptionally low return of £106-14-6¼ in 1348-9. By 1353-4 income from these lands had risen to £150-6-2½, though it slumped somewhat in the following year, probably due to the unrest noted when a low receipt from Elizabeth's portion of the revenue of the liberty court was excused propter guerram. If the income derived from Elizabeth's Kilkenny lands for the half-year of 1360 is an accurate reflection of their income in the year 1359-60, it would appear that the recovery of the early 1350's was being sustained in time of peace.

Certain distinct patterns emerge when examining the income of the individual manors and boroughs of Elizabeth de Clare's purparty of Kilkenny during the 1340's and the 1350's. In every case but one, that being the borough of Kilmanagh, income slumped to a greater or a lesser extent in 1348-9. The most dramatic incidence of decline was the case of the demesne land at Callan from which the receipts only amounted to £4-19-3¼, as opposed to an average annual income of approximately £20. Immediately after the first two outbreaks of the plague, revenue from most of these manors and boroughs either reached pre-plague levels or recovered significantly. However, a second decline set in during 1352-3. In the case of both Loughmerans and Latherdan, this second decline did not continue and returns were stabilised at this level. An apparent further recovery in Latherdan in the second half of this decade was almost certainly the result of the inclusion of the mill at Kilmanagh in this tenement. The recovery appears to have been well sustained in Damagh.

See above. Do 158-61
Ballycallan and the demesne lands of Callan, while the borough of Callan and the manor of Palmerston continued to decline after 1352-3. It is important to note, however, that the rate of decline was not uniform and that on no occasion in the 1350's did the income from any of these tenements fall to the extent of the 1348-9 decline. Thus, the first two outbreaks of the plague appear to have been major factors in the decrease in income from Elizabeth's Kilkenny lands, though it is important to note that in some cases the roots of this decline were visible in the 1340's. While waste land abounded at Callan in 1350-1, there was also a significant amount of waste on the demesne in 1343-4. The second decline of the 1350's was probably caused by increasing local instability combined with the residual effects of the first two outbreaks of the plague.

Thus, Elizabeth de Clare's purparty of Kilkenny declined in value during the mid-fourteenth century. This decline was not one which manifested itself consistently in all of her lands there. Decreases of almost catastrophic proportions, like that in the value of the mill at Callan over the entire period or the demesne lands at Callan in 1348-9, were, on the whole, short term. These were, in any case, balanced by less severe rates of decline in other more profitable areas. It is fair to say that the general decline was not as severe as might have been expected, given the cumulative impact of the first two visitations of the plague, an increase in lawlessness and the expansion of the march.

Elizabeth de Clare's lands in Ireland were well and capably administered up to the time of her death in 1360. Attempts at intrusion by both the ministers of Edward III and Queen Philippa in Ulster and Connacht were either swiftly ended, or as was the case with Philippa's receivers in Connacht, they were forced to account to Elizabeth's ministers for monies collected by them during the intrusion. With the exception of Loxeyd and of her scattered dower lands in County Louth, Elizabeth's de Verdun lands appear to have remained relatively profitable up to 1360, though the profitability of some of the de Burgh manors held by Elizabeth in Limerick and Tipperary was swiftly eroded. The lands at Kilkenny, which formed the core of her extensive Irish lordship were affected by both the plague and by local instability, but remained relatively profitable.

The question as to how typical Elizabeth de Clare was of the average, in as much as one can use that term in this context, mid-fourteenth century absentee will probably remain unanswered. No equivalent corpus of receivers' accounts has survived for any of the other absentee magnates
of this period, a fact which may point to greater efficiency and administrative acumen on the part of Elizabeth and her ministers, than was the norm. Frequent legislative attempts to force absenteeees to return to Ireland or to make adequate provision for the protection of their lands may also indicate that this sort of efficient management was relatively rare.287. This greater efficiency and interest probably cushioned Elizabeth de Clare's lands from the worst effects of the growth of the march, the activities of men like Maurice fitz Thomas and his many allies and the effects of the first two visitations of the Black Death.

The formation and structure of manors and of estates comprising groups of manors during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the lordship of Ireland was largely determined by two factors: the actual location of the manor or group of manors, and the way in which they could most profitably be exploited. Within the land of peace relatively rigid forms of structure and organisation appear to have prevailed, with some local variations. In the marches and the more sparsely populated areas, which marked the frontier of the lordship, but were not necessarily within the land of war, a rather more loosely organised form of manor was to be found. While this development was in part the result of the greater degree of social stratification apparent within tenurial categories in the land of peace, the nature of lordship exercised in the marcher and peripheral areas, together with the aims and expectations of lords holding such lands, would have differed considerably from those of the lord based mainly in Meath or Leinster. To John Fitz Thomas or Richard de Burgh, the strategic maintenance of suzerainty and control over their lands in Connacht would have outweighed considerations of how such lands could have been most profitably exploited. Income from such lands would have been derived mainly, if not exclusively, from rent. Looser internal organisation, a considerable number of large free tenements, together with isolated or multiple demesnes, were structures eminently adaptable to a rentier type of exploitation.

During the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the expansion of the march, the deterioration in the quality of central administration within the lordship of Ireland and the increasing stagnation and decline of the agrarian economy was to put what amounted to an intolerable strain on the type of manorial structure found in Leinster and Meath. There, manors and estates, with one major exception, the royal manors of Dublin and Kildare, though providing their lords with a considerable income from rent, had been developed to take advantage of what had been, up to the end of the thirteenth century, a relatively buoyant market for grain and other provisions. The agrarian crises of the early fourteenth century, together with the Bruce Invasion and the deteriorating military situation within the lordship precipitated the large scale abandonment of direct
cultivation of the manorial demesne by the lord's minister and the emergence of rentier oriented forms of manorial administration and exploitation within the land of peace. This was what might be termed the transition from the dominance of the manorial reeve to that of the receiver and the receiver general. While Elizabeth de Clare's interest in and ability to administer her Irish estates is obvious, the nature of that administration differed sharply from that exercised by Roger Bigod's ministers in Carlow throughout the 1280's. It is precisely this distancing of the lord from the primary administration of his lands, a tendency which emerged for the first time in the administration of the royal demesne in Ireland, which characterises the administration and structural changes found in the organisation of the manorial economy in fourteenth century Ireland.

Despite the destruction of the rolls and files of the medieval Irish Chancery, and therefore, the destruction of most of the inquisitions post mortem compiled in Ireland, sufficient material has survived to permit an examination of the manor in Ireland during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. This material comprises Irish inquisitions post mortem together with other collections of Irish inquisitions, extents, rentals and ministers' accounts preserved in the Public Record Office in London, transcripts and calendars of extents, and printed collections associated with specific lordships such as the Red Book of Ormond or the Red Book of the Earls of Kildare.

The main problem arising from the use of the extent as a source is the fact that its information pertains to one particular instance. A series of extents for any specific manor or estate is extremely rare in the Irish context. This means that the initial development and settlement of manors

4. See below pp 259 - 60.
5. See below pp 247 - 50.
7. A considerable number of extents have been preserved in transcript form in R.C.8, P.R.O.I., a class largely comprising of calendars of the Irish Memoranda Rolls.
8. Both were published by the Irish Manuscripts' Commission. N.B. White edited The Red Book of Ormond, which was published in 1932 and G. Mac Niocaill The Red Book of the Earls of Kildare, which was published in 1964.
in Ireland cannot be examined as the earliest surviving detailed extents date from the 1280's. The surviving Irish inquisitions post mortem of the fourteenth century are, for the most part, useful and significant sources, though a marked diminution, both in their number and quality is visible from the mid fourteenth century. This in itself reflects the changing approach to manorial administration and management, for these later extents are merely lists of placenames and valuations. Although fraud could have been, and most probably was, perpetrated by the jurors compiling the extents which form these inquisitions, such fraud would have related to the actual valuations rather than the description of the manor, its demesne and tenements. Thus, it would not invalidate the use of extents as a source of evidence on the structure of the manor. Demesne land could conceivably have been undervalued and rents from land leased ad voluntatem domini or at farm concealed or misdeclared. However, the size of the demesne, tenements held by burgesses and betaghs, together with land held by charter or by fixed long-term lease could hardly have been concealed from the Escheator's officials.

The fortuitous survival of a number of accounts of bishoprics and archbishoprics returned by the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century Escheators, transcribed for the antiquarian Madden, provides some suitably detailed material from important parts of the lordship against which the evidence of the extents can be tested and with which they can be compared. It should be noted, however, that in one particular instance where these accounts appear to be perfectly adequate and reliable, that of the bishopric of Cloyne, serious inaccuracy can be established in the account when it is compared to the extents in the fourteenth century custumal known as the Pipe Roll of Cloyne. Other accounts in the series, notably those for the archbishoprics of Armagh and Cashel and some of the

---

9. An excellent example of the sort of deterioration in the quality of extent that occurred is to be found in the inquisition post mortem for the lands of Thomas Wogan (P.R.O., C135, file 137 (5) and Cal. Inq. P.M. vol. 10 no. 376). The brief calendar is little amplified by the original.


11. This register was first published by Richard Caulfield, Rotulus Pipae Clonensis, Cork 1859. An edition of the register, a parallel text together with topographical and other footnotes, was serialised by Canon J. O'Riordan and J. Coleman in the Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society, vol. 19-23 (1913-7). Despite certain serious defects which largely stem from the failure of the editors to appreciate the structure of the register, this latter is currently the definitive edition. The original roll perished in the explosion at the P.R.O.I. in 1922.
smaller bishoprics in the province of Tuam are such that they cannot be used to establish the structure of the manors which formed part of the episcopal or archiepiscopal estate in question. Happily, detailed accounts were enrolled and subsequently transcribed for the archbishoprics of Dublin and Tuam together with the bishoprics of Meath, Ferns, Waterford, Lismore and Cork.

It is not my intention to examine all of the surviving extents in this analysis of manorial structures: some of the more important extents have been examined in detail elsewhere in this thesis and it is possible to determine and define the various forms of manorial structure relying on the evidence contained in certain extents and groups of extents. Using Bigod inquisition of 1307, the Kilkenny extents of the same year compiled on the death of Joan de Clare, material relating to the lands of the archbishopric of Dublin, the de Valence inquisitions of 1324 and extents such as that of Cloncurry could hardly be said to present an unrepresentative overview of Leinster. The nature and dispersal of the evidence facilitates a regional rather than a strictly thematic approach, but in effect these two approaches overlap to a considerable extent.

For the most part, the manors of the East and South-east were typical of the manor of the land of peace: what might be termed the Cloncurry prototype. There were, however, certain exceptions to this rule in the marchlands surrounding the Leinster mountains such as the archiepiscopal manors of Ballymore, with its submanor of Holywood and Castlekevin. In the two cases where detailed extents from Cork have survived, the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne and the manor and borough of Inchequin and Youghal, a peculiar form of marchland influence appears to have prevailed. Elements of what may have been pre-Conquest settlement patterns seem to have survived on the Cloyne manors and echoes of such patterns can be traced in the organisation of the manor of Inchequin. Both forms of manorial organisation were to be found in Meath and Tipperary. Considerably more material survives for Meath than for Tipperary, mainly as a result of the Mortimer forfeitures, which led to the extending not only of Mortimer manors, but also of lands and manors held in fee from Mortimer as lord of Trim following the forfeiture or escheat through death of his tenants-in-

14. P.R.O., C 134 file 84 (66-71)
15. See below, pp 197-8
chief. The survival of the partition of the de Verdun lands following the death of Theobald de Verdun, and the accounts of the receivers in Elizabeth de Clare's Verdun dower lands, together with two late thirteenth century accounts of the bishopric of Meath, returned by John of Sandford, has ensured that the area of the old lordship of Meath outside the liberty of Trim may also be examined in depth. This is of considerable importance, as it is mainly from the existing Meath evidence that one can postulate the existence of a third form of manorial prototype, the transitional form of structure, which contained elements associated both with the manor of the land of peace and the marchland manor. Without exception the surviving Connacht extents are of marchland manors, while this form of structure with certain regional alterations and modifications appears to have been predominant in Ulster.

Leinster

As an area of early settlement and apparently heavy population, Leinster had, by the end of the thirteenth century, acquired a strongly stratified manorial infrastructure. Not only had the manor become the basic subdivision of the great lordship, but it had as both a tenurial and productive unit atrophied and become fixed. While the use of Cloncurry as an example of the working manor throughout the lordship of Ireland is extremely unwise, this prototype tended to predominate in Leinster. Of all the forms of manorial structure to be found in Ireland, Cloncurry's would have been closest to the forms found in areas of older settlement in England.

18. This data is to be found in the accounts of her receiver generals and in some separate accounts T.C.D. Ms. 804 pp 191-225.
20. See below, pp 228-37.
extent is easily available,\textsuperscript{23} and was probably edited by O'Loan for this reason. Unfortunately, it is not typical for the entire lordship and O'Loan's edition has many serious defects. His commentary on tenurial categories is, in some cases, highly suspect,\textsuperscript{24} and there are several mistranslations in the text of the extent itself.\textsuperscript{25} This article is still cited uncritically,\textsuperscript{26} but should actually be used with extreme caution.

The demesne on a Leinster manor was of considerable importance as a source of income due to the buoyancy of the grain market. Early settlement, combined with demographic expansion and with demographic pressure, resulted in the emergence of certain small and impoverished forms of tenement. On such a manor the demesne was, in relative terms, substantial and the subtenements clearly stratified. Forms of tenure involving customary labour service, whether betaghry, the cottage or either of these forms of tenement held at farm or \textit{ad voluntatem domini}, were originally of considerable importance. These works were intended to service the demesne and their commutation would have been an important source of incidental revenue, which may, as in the case of Cloncurry, have ultimately been absorbed into the annual rent of the tenement in question. The proportion of free tenements, though considerable, never matched the extremely high proportion of free tenements found on any of the marcher manors.

The position of a manor within a great lordship, as part of a group of manors held by a single lord or, indeed, the large subtenement organised on a quasi-manorial basis underlies many of the local variations on the theme of the Cloncurry prototype. The great lordships of Leinster most

\begin{footnotes}
\item[23.] The Red Book of Ormond, ed. Newport B. White, Dublin 1933 gives a full text of this extent and was one of the earlier publications of the Irish Manuscripts Commission.
\item[24.] His misinterpretation of the status of the gavellor in Ireland has been discussed elsewhere, see Chapter VI, p. 302 and J.J. O'Loan 'The Manor of Cloncurry, Co. Kildare', \textit{Journal of the Department of Agriculture}, vol. 58(1961), pp 26-8.
\item[25.] O'Loan's rendering of relevii, reliefs, as easement is typical of this carelessness, as is the rendering of \textit{cxj\lili, ixs, ixd, ob. as £121-11-11. J.J. O'Loan 'The Manor of Cloncurry, Co. Kildare', Journal of the Department of Agriculture}, vol. 58(1961), p.18 and p. 20 respectively. There are many other errors of this nature.
\item[26.] The most recent instance was in B.J. Graham 'Medieval Irish Settlement: a review', \textit{Historical Geography Research Series, No. 3} (1980).
\end{footnotes}
conveniently examined are the archbishopric of Dublin and the liberties of Carlow, Wexford and Kilkenny. In any extended lordship administrative structures were co-ordinated around a specific caput and the manors of that lordship were, to a considerable degree, subordinate to and dependent on this centralised structure. This is most obvious in the distribution of free tenements and knights' fees in the liberties. Both in the liberties of Carlow and Wexford, tenements of this nature were grouped around a specific centre. Two such caputs existed in the liberty of Carlow: Carlow itself and Old Ross, while in the lordship of Wexford such tenements were primarily associated with the caput of the lordship at Wexford, but also the most important of the Kilkenny manors within this liberty, the manor of Odogh. The free tenements in Carlow were all extended together. Of these, suit of court was owed from three baronies and two other tenements to the county court and from six other tenements to the court at Grangeford. A number of free tenements held by non-military tenure were extended at Grangeford and Ballysax, but it is clear that most of the free tenements in the portion of the lordship lying in Carlow were associated with the caput of the liberty. Bishops' Wexford lands were all based on the honour of Old Ross, and the free tenements held both by military and non-military tenure could only have been administered from that centre. Thus, the profitability of manors like Ballysax, Grangeford and Fennagh, rested on the income derived from their demesne lands rather than from rents.

A similar situation prevailed in the liberty of Wexford. There most of the military and non-military free tenements were listed in the same extent as the castle and borough of Wexford in the 1324 inquisition post mortem. There were fourteen non-military free tenements, excluding the burgages at Wexford, Edirnym and Taghmon, twenty tenements owing royal service and a further twelve or fourteen decayed military tenements. Income from the other Wexford holdings was thus derived either from the demesne or from the rents of semi-free or unfree tenants. At Rossclare, where a substantial income was derived from rent, most of the tenants were either gavellors or owed customary labour service. There were no tenants other than burgesses at Carrick and Hatharch was merely a betagh settlement like the royal manors of Obrun and Othee in origin. While there were four

27. P.R.O., C133 file 127 (32).
28. P.R.O., C133 file 127 (33).
29. P.R.O., C134 file 84 (66).
30. P.R.O., C134 file 84 (68).
31. P.R.O., C134 file 84 (69) and see Chapter I, pp 24-5.
free tenants other than the burgesses at Bannow, most of the land in this manor was held by farmers owing customary service. An interesting comparison can be drawn between the manors of the liberty of Wexford and those of Carlow in that there was no evidence of customary service on any of the Carlow manors other than Old Ross. This is probably a reflection of more competitive and rational organisation at Carlow based upon hired labour and relying on the salaried famuli as a corps of specialist labour. It is possible that the manor of Ferns may, however, have provided the lords of Wexford with a second administrative centre, its massive waste holdings would seem to indicate as much.

The free tenancies on Aymer de Valence's Kilkenny lands were concentrated on the manor of Odogh, where there were four non-military and five military tenements. This was clearly one of the secondary administrative centres in the liberty of Wexford. As such its position is somewhat similar to that of the honour of Old Ross in the liberty of Carlow: an administrative caput for residual lands outside the main area of land comprising the liberty. Only two free tenements other than those held by burgesses were extended on the other Kilkenny manor within the liberty: Old Jerpoint. Similar organisational patterns are to be found in the 1331 extents of the lands and manors of the liberty of Kildare, where the military tenements were extended with the caput of the liberty. Patterns of tenurial stratification on the manors of Maynooth and Adare were not dissimilar to those found in the manors of Rosslare and Bannow.

At first sight the 1307 extent of Joan de Clare's lands in Kilkenny would seem to indicate that the liberty of Kilkenny was organised on a similar basis. Unfortunately, the caput of the lordship was not extended in 1307 and so direct comparison with Carlow, Wexford and Kildare is not possible. There do not appear to have been any tenants owing royal service on her manors, while apart from burgesses, only the lands at Ballycallan and Le Sart appear to have had any non-military free tenants. The actual organisation as opposed to the location of the military tenements of

32. P.R.O., C 134 file 84 (70).
*35. P.R.O., C 134 file 84 (67).
36. P.R.O., C 134 file 84 (71).
37. G. Mac Niocaill, Red Book of the Earls of Kildare, Dublin 1964 Nos. 120, 121, (Maynooth) and 135 (Adare).
38. P.R.O., C 133 file 130 (77), see also C.D.I. 1302-7, no. 664.
*34. See below pp 284-6 and see Chapter II, pp 76-8. 
Kilkenny cannot be determined from the list of the purparties of the de Clare heiresses, but both the 1288 and the 1306 extents of Gowran indicate that a substantial number of knights' fees were attached to this manor. The 1288 extent of the manor of Dunmore lists one knight's fee amongst its free tenements and two substantial military tenements were extended at Knocktopher in 1312. Thus, the caputs and secondary caputs of the Leinster liberties, with the possible exception of Kilkenny, were the administrative centres to which the military, and a substantial proportion of the non-military free tenements were attached. While Kilkenny was undoubtedly the main administrative centre of the de Clare liberty, subsidiary centres within that liberty may well have been smaller than was the case in Carlow or Wexford, but more numerous and more widely distributed. Manorial practices in Kilkenny appear to have represented something of a fusion between the Carlow and Wexford prototype. Both Dunmore and Gowran were heavily dependent on customary labour for the cultivation of demesne land in 1288, thus conforming to the Wexford rather than the Carlow paradigm. By 1312, however, the services owed by the betaghs of Knocktopher had been commuted to a monetary payment, which had also been absorbed into the rent paid by the betaghry there, as was the case on the Carlow manors of Old Ross and also on the manor of Cloncurry.

A variant on the forms of organisation found in the great Leinster liberties was to be found in the most important of the ecclesiastical lordships of Leinster, the archbishopric of Dublin. While there were a number of free tenements attached to all of the manors of the archbishopric, there was a significantly greater number of such tenements on three specific manors, Swords, Ballymore and Castlekevin. Such were the numbers of free tenants on these manors that sometime in the mid thirteenth century lists of feoffees there were drawn up for Fulk of Sandford. The actual administrative

41. N.B. White, Red Book of Ormond, Dublin 1932, p. 128. A number of smaller military tenements were also extended, p. 129, p. 130.
42. See above pp 194-6.
45. C. Mac Neill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, pp 118-9, pp 121-2, pp 123-4 respectively.
caput of the liberty was at St. Sepulchre, but the manor based on St. Sepulchre, Colonia, was in no sense anything other than a centre of local manorial administration. 46.

Swords, Ballymore and Castlekevin were all very extensive manors and both Ballymore and Castlekevin lay in areas of strategic importance in the Leinster mountains. Free tenants enfeoffed by deed in Swords held land not only in Swords and Lusk but also at Clonmethan. 47. There were in 1326, subdemesnes at Lusk, New Haggard, and Clonmethan. This last was originally a manor in its own right, 48 and provided Swords with its third subdemesne. Ballymore and Castlekevin both lay within the march. By 1326, when the temporalities of the archbishopric sequestered from Alexander Bicknor had been formally extended, it was no longer possible to compile an extent for Castlekevin and, at best, Ballymore lay within a strong march. 49 Thus, one can say little of the original structure of Castlekevin other than that there were, in this manor, a large number of extensive free tenements, a fairly common feature of any marcher manor. 50 This is also true of Ballymore, where the parallel with the marcher manor was heightened by the existence of the two submanors of Hollywood and Carrickdonet. As was the case at Swords there was a multiple demesne at Ballymore in the form of an extensive subdemesne at Bally-bough. An interesting contrast is provided by Swords and Ballymore in that both were extremely large manors with multiple demesnes and a large free tenantry but in very different locations and circumstances. Swords was the richest archiepiscopal manor north of the Liffey just as, by 1326, Ballymore was the largest and potentially the richest of the south county archiepiscopal manors. They were the two most important manorial centres within the lordship, and it is possible that in both cases their size can be explained in terms of consolidation and by a late thirteenth century attempt to increase their productivity. Yet Ballymore, like Castlekevin, was a marcher manor, and this factor may have been of equal or even greater importance in determining its structure. Originally Castlekevin, as the manorial expression of the caput of the bishopric of Glendalough would have provided a third manorial and administrative caput.

46. C. Mac Neill, Cal. Archbishop Alen's Register, pp 170-2, The 1326 extent makes this quite clear.
47. Ibid., pp 118-9.
48. Ibid., p. 39. The manor of Glenmethane is heretofore mentioned in a 1216 letter of protection from Innocent III for the archbishop's spiritualites and temporalities.
49. Ibid., pp 189-92, for 1326 extent.
50. Ibid., pp 123-4, from the list of feoffes this can be deduced from size of tenement.
In the case of smaller lordships in Leinster, where the lord would have held no more than three manors, the balance between tenurial categories was more even. Cloncurry, which was held by Ralph Pippard together with Leixlip and Castlewarden in the late thirteenth century, is a case in point.\(^{51}\) There the annual rents of the free tenants and burgesses listed in the 1304 extent amounted to £36-9-8\(^{\frac{1}{2}}\) and £42-1-8\(^{\frac{1}{2}}\) respectively, while the betaghhs owed £28-9-2 and the farmers £28-1-1. Three free tenants, holding between them a knight's fee attached to Cloncurry owed royal service. There were four military tenements at Leixlip comprising between them 2\(^{\frac{2}{3}}\) knights' fees and two such tenements at Castlewarden comprising a single fee.\(^{52}\) These manors, though part of a closely-knit lordship, actually formed self-contained units, with each form of tenure represented and relatively fewer knights' fees than would have been the case on a marchland manor or the caput of a liberty.

A similar balance can be seen between the various tenurial categories on the manor of Knocktopher in the 1312 extent,\(^{53}\) though the demesne there, which only contained 3 carucates and 68 acres, was exceptionally valuable, each acre being extended at 10d. per annum. The free tenements were worth £8-19-4 per annum and the betaghry, the next most valuable group of tenants, generated an annual income of £5-13-4. There was also a borough, a certain amount of land in the hands of farmers and four military tenements rendering a total of £1-8-4 in scutage at Knocktopher.

The manors of both the bishoprics of Ferns and Waterford resembled more closely in structure manors like Cloncurry and Knocktopher than the manors of the liberty of Wexford or the archbishopric of Dublin. Neither bishopric was particularly wealthy, and no attempt seems to have been made to reproduce the type of modified liberty structure found in the Dublin archiepiscopal lands. Each of the five episcopal manors at Ferns\(^{54}\) had a substantial number of free tenants, and with two exceptions, Polregan and Ferns itself, fairly extensive demesnes. Moyglass even had what amounted to a double demesne with a grange at Ballygillane providing the

51. C.D.I.,1302-7, no. 149, For the full effects of this transfer see Chapter I, p. 39 and also pp. 30-1.
52. P.R.O., C47 10/201 (Leixlip - this extent was compiled in 1341) and P.R.O., S.C.12 20/48 (Castlewarden - undated, but from the hand late Edward II - early Edward III).
54. T.C.D. Ms. 804 pp 207-8. Place names in their original form as given in this account: Ferns, Kyneth, Balyengelyn, Clonmore, Maoglass, Ballygillany, Clonard, Polregan.
subdemesne. Some attempt may well have been made to establish a form of administration more suitable to the extended lordship on the manors of the bishopric of Waterford, though unusual distribution of tenurial categories on these lands is more likely to have occurred for reasons similar to those probably underlying the unusual settlement patterns at Cloyne; that of possible pre-conquest survival. Only two of the centres named in the 1276-7 account are likely to have been conventional manorial centres, for while there was demesne land at Kilcaragh and Kilmacleague, no demesne was accounted for at Kilronan, Balidermot and Ballygunner. Income from these vills was derived entirely from rents, though it is possible that the farmers of Balidermot were occupying some land that had originally been demesne there. The only free tenants on the bishop's lands were those at Kilronan, which would seem to indicate that a caput, in as much as such existed, would have been located there. Significantly, one court served the entire tenantry of the bishopric of Waterford, which underlines the fact that the "manors" of the bishopric might more properly be seen as the quasi-manorial centres of the bishopric.

Extents rarely survive of the manor within a manor, the subtenement organised on lines analogous to the manor and occasionally described as such within the extent. Inquisitions post mortem of such tenements were only compiled when there was a vacancy within a vacancy, causing the land in question to escheat to the crown. Any large military tenement, be it a barony, or even a knight's fee was likely to have been organised in this way. Thus, in 1303 the barony of Tullowphelim, held by Theobald Butler from the lord of Carlow had a demesne at Tullowphelim and a subdemesne at Lismacloman. There was a certain number of military tenements, a very much larger number of non-military free tenancies, a borough, some land held by farmers and a small amount of betagh land. It was thus something of a cross between Knocktopher and Old Ross in structural terms.

An isolated non-manorial subtenement separated from the rest of a far greater lordship to which it belonged might well exhibit many of the structural forms of the small manor, without necessarily having all its features. The de Burgh lands at Dunganstown in Carlow, extended in 1333 are an excellent example of this principle. The largest and most

55. See below pp 202-6.
56. T.C.D. Ms. 804 p. 224. Place names in their original form as given in this account: Kylcathrath (demesne), Kylmaclet (demesne), Kylronan, Balidermot, Balygormor.
important feature of this tenement was its demesne of 219 acres, of which 32 acres lay waste and the remainder was held by farmers. There was only one other tenant at Dunganstown, Roger de la Hyde, who held a messuage and its appurtenances as a free tenant. Oddly enough, a court was held at Dunganstown, but the income from it, 2s. per annum, was minimal. Despite its separate court this holding barely merits the title manor. Its designation as such probably stems from the fact that it was an isolated tenement held-in-chief by the Brown Earl on his death.

Despite certain common features, Leinster was a region in which a manor's position within a lordship or a manorial group tended, to a considerable extent, to determine its structure. Exploitation of the demesne on as profitable and efficient a basis as possible was of immense importance in the case of all of these manors and it is only once one moves beyond seeing the manor as merely being a unit of agricultural production that the importance of these distinctions become evident.

South Munster

Although few extents have survived from the most southerly portion of the lordship, those which have indicate that the structure of manors in Cork, parts of Kerry, south-west Waterford and parts of Tipperary held by the bishop of Lismore differed significantly in structure both from those found in the land of peace and in other marches. Manors, or more correctly what were described as manors in extents and accounts, tended to be extremely large, and frequently had multiple or dispersed demesnes. In many cases extremely large betagh settlements were associated both with central and more outlying demesnes. The number of free tenements attached to these manors was considerable. Even the loosest of manorial structures could hardly be deemed to have existed in the case of the estates of the bishopric of Cloyne, with what amounted to quasi-manorial settlements being administered separately from the free tenements held of the bishopric. It seems extremely likely in the case of the Cloyne settlements, and possibly also in the case of the manor of Inchiquin, that the very large number of the betagh tenements and the structure of the settlements may owe much to patterns of land-holding established prior to the conquest.

In a sense, the manors closest to the generic type found in Leinster, of the bishopric of Cork, are the least typical of this region. An account of receipts from these manors for the half-year December 1276 to June
1277 has survived, from which it is possible to determine their structure. The manor of Fayd had an unexceptional demesne of 180 acres, a borough from which £3 would have been derived in annual rent, and a mill worth £2-10-0 during the period of John of Saundford's account. An unusual feature of this manor was the amount of income derived from free tenements. During the period of account £17-10-9 had been collected by the Escheator's agents, which would mean, if all of these tenements produced rent in two moieties, that free rents at Fayd would have been worth in the region of £35 per annum. This is the only structure at Fayd consistent with marcher status.

The other area from which income was derived, Kilbrogan, was not described as a manor in this account. It had a small demesne of 36 acres, some pasture, a fishery and a number of betagh tenements worth £1-3-6 during the half-year in question. Assuming these to be two separate manors, Fayd was close to the type of manorial structure associated with the manorial caput of one of the Leinster liberties. Kilbrogan thus poses a number of interesting problems. Could it be deemed to be an independent manor with a demesne of 36 acres and only betagh tenants? The possibility that it was merely an outgrange of Fayd cannot be discounted, though the existence of separate courts at both centres would seem to point to their mutual independence. Fayd, despite its lack of a substantial group of unfree or semi-free tenants, was not unusual in its structure, while Kilbrogan was closer to the form of quasi-manorial settlement found on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne.

In order to understand the structures of settlement and administration found on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne, one must first appreciate the problems associated with the interpretation of the sources. The more extensive of the two Cloyne accounts preserved in the Madden transcripts was returned by John of Saundford for the year 1274-5. Only one manor, Cloyne, is noted in this account. Its demesne and two of its subdemesnes were noted, as were three localities from which rent was being paid by hibernici, together with one betagh grange. The deficiencies of this account become apparent when compared with evidence relating to the structure of the episcopal estates preserved in the Pipe Roll of Cloyne. Of themselves these deficiencies are of considerable interest in that they

59. T.C.D. Ms. 804, p. 192. Place names in their original form as given in this account: Fayd, Kyllbrogan.

60. Ibid. pp 224-5, Place names in their original form as given in this account: Balycotkyn, Balycanenan, Cul, Balymachynyn, Ballymyn, Donenathmore, Inscar.
indicate that a large portion of the bishopric was beyond the jurisdiction of the Escheator's agents in the late thirteenth century. Other items in the Pipe Roll suggest that considerable tracts of episcopal land lay not only in the march, but also in areas which may never have passed from Gaelic control.

Cloyne and the other episcopal estates were immensely more complex in structure than was suggested by the 1274-5 account. Cloyne itself was a number of betagh granges, each with its own demesne, with a borough at the caput. There was, however, no central demesne and, therefore, no proper manorial caput. Thus, the classification or non-classification of Cloyne as a manor is a nice point. If Cloyne is to be classified as a manor, its immensely complex system of multiple demesnes raised problems. The dispersal of these demesnes and their apparently self-contained nature in my opinion justifies their description as quasi-manorial settlements.

A considerable number of free tenements, most of which were military in form of tenure, owed suit to the court at Cloyne. Only 5 of some 38 listed tenements did not owe royal service. This form of distribution can be compared to patterns found at liberty caputs in Leinster, but more usefully and more closely with tenurial distribution on large marcher manors in Tipperary such as Thurles. At least two of these military tenements were substantial manors in their own right. The manor of Inchiquin, which had seemingly passed into the hands of the bishops of Cloyne by the end of the fourteenth century, was listed as owing service for 6 knights' fees and a consolidated tenement at Mogeely and Crowbally owed service for 5 knights' fees. It is in this context, as an administrative centre for such tenements, that Cloyne resembled any of the major manorial types found either in the marches or in the land of peace. While this is also true of the other main settlements of Cloenor, Donoughmore and Coul-Brewhy, their internal organisational structures were even more unusual than those of Cloyne.

Clenor is referred to in the Pipe Roll as a manor. It had both a court and a church but no central demesne or manorial caput. Such as it was,

63. Ibid., vol. 20 (1914), pp 42-3.
64. Ibid., pp 43-4 (Clenor, itself) pp 44-6 (demesnes) pp 47-50 (tenements).
the Clenor demesne lay both in Dromdeer, where 39 acres of demesne had been leased to tenants, and the submanor of Curraghkerry, where there were 2½ carucates of demesne land. The compiler of the Pipe Roll at this point noted that the carucate contained not 120 acres, but rather 180 acres. A deviation of this sort may either be an indication of the survival of some form of customary measurement or of an area where the standard area measurements of the lordship were so infrequently applied as to be poorly understood by those compiling extents. There were 6 relatively small non-military free tenements in Clenor and Garranachole and two separate knights' fees. The remaining tenements attached to this centre were extremely large and non-military, more than half containing upwards of 2 carucates. Absence of a heavy concentration of military tenements suggests one of two things: either Clenor lay within the land of peace, in which case the looseness of its structures and the unusual situation pertaining in the case of the demesne requires explanation, or it lay within Gaelic controlled lands and the local chieftains had reached some form of modus vivendi with the bishops which obviated the need for an extensive number of military tenements.

Kilmaclenine, though clearly a centre of settlement in its own right and a centre, on the liberty caput basis, for a considerable number of tenements, could hardly be described as a manor, though it had certain elements of the classic manorial structure. The actual centre of settlement there was a borough, whose burgesses were also betaghs. A demesne of 4 carucates was serviced by the customary labour of these burgesses. As was the case with Cloyne and Clenor, a substantial number of large free tenements was attached to Kilmaclenine. These were all non-military free tenements and of 16 such tenements 5 were designated as manors and one was an entire villate containing 8 carucates. The relative absence of military tenements in Clenor and the complete absence of such tenements in Kilmaclenine is a matter of considerable remark, given the preponderance of military tenements in Cloyne. If the parallel with other marcher areas holds good, the heavy density of large military holdings indicates an area of insecure settlement in a strong

66. Ibid., pp 47-50.
67. See below p. 205.
70. Ibid., pp 83-4, the villate of Ballyhea.
march. This absence may well denote some division within the lands of the bishopric itself between areas which were, however tenuously, inter Anglicos and lands which were inter Hibernicos.

In the case of Donoughmore, one has clearly passed into the predominantly Gaelic lands of the bishopric. Donoughmore was similar in structure to Cloyne, with the exception that there was a large demesne of 6 carucates attached to the caput. In the case of Donoughmore, Ballycunningham, Corbally, Iniscarra and Kildorrey served the demesne, while there was also a settlement of burgess-betaghs similar to but smaller than that at Kilmacelene.

Most of the free tenements at Donoughmore were exceptionally large and non-military in nature. A significant proportion of the land was held by a local chieftain, Dermot McCarthy. At the time of the compilation of this extent he held 5 carucates at Aghabulloge, another tenement of similar size in Clondroyt and a further 5 carucates together with 1,000 acres of wood at Dromin. Considerable areas were also held at farm by various unspecified Irish tenants of the bishopric at Aghabulloge and Clondroyt, while one suspects that a substantial proportion of the gavellors holding 7 carucates of land and 6 acres of wood at Ballyvourney ad voluntatem domini were in fact Irish. Indeed, a substantial portion of the episcopal lands at Aglishdrinagh and Iniscarra, comprising some 20 carucates of arable land, 1,000 acres of pasture and 1,000 acres of wood, was merely listed in the Pipe Roll and did not produce any income at the time of the extent, either in rent or in rent in kind such as wax rents.

One of the 3 military tenements attached to Donoughmore, Akedsanny, which contained 1 carucate, was held by an Oholghy, paying an annual rent and owing scutage (reale servitium). Thus, in Donoughmore one has a more extreme example of the form of administrative and organisational structures already noted in Clenor and Kilmacelene, with a core settlement, in this case rather closer to the standard manorial prototype than any other centre on the Cloyne episcopal estates in as much as a central demesne was served by a number of betagh granges rather than the betagh granges functioning as self-contained units.

72. Ibid., p. 139, p. 183.
73. Ibid., p. 139.
74. Ibid., p. 184.
75. Ibid., p. 184.
Coul-Brewhy was the other tenurial and administrative centre on the estates of the bishopric of Cloyne. There was a double demesne of 2 carucates each at Coul and Brewhy, which was served by a large number of betagh smallholders. Coul also had a borough of manorial type. No other tenants, free, semi-free or unfree were associated with this centre. It is, therefore, very difficult to classify Coul-Brewhy. While it had clearly defined demesne land, nucleated settlement centred on the borough and an extensive betagh population, it can hardly be termed a manor, but is perhaps best seen as a quasi-manorial settlement, similar in character to any one of the betagh settlements at Cloyne.

Something of the problems posed to the escheatory by the unusual form of estate organisation found in the south is reflected in the surviving account of the revenues of the bishopric of Lismore from June 1278 to November 1280. The term manor (manerium) was only used twice in the course of this account, in respect of Lismore itself and Moorhill, the other lands being designated as demesnes or merely by location. In one sense this form of description would have been eminently suitable in the Cloyne context, but is, perhaps, less in accord with the actual structures found on the Lismore estates, where marcher patterns rather than proto-Cloyne patterns emerge and do not present any major structural problems.

Although only Lismore and Moorhill were described as manors, the other episcopal lands in Waterford, with the exception of Kilbarrymaiden were also effectively manors. Lismore was the caput of the lordship, and as such had two boroughs, together with a heavy concentration of free tenements. The designation of Ardmore and Kilmacomma as demesnes would seem to imply that they were members of the manor of Lismore, but while Kilmacomma had no court, a manorial court was functioning at Ardmore, which also had a free tenant population almost commensurate with that of Lismore. A striking feature of all three centres is that while all had demesne, only Ardmore can definitely be said to have had an indigenous betagh population servicing its demesne. Kilmacomma, where the demesne only contained 1 carucate, as opposed to demesnes of 2 carucates found at both Ardmore and Lismore, had a substantial number of cottagers who owed labour service, together with a number of gavellors. The second

The relationship between Moorhill, Kilbarrymaiden and the three Tipperary centres remains unclear. Kilbarrymaiden did not, in the eyes of John of Saundford, merit the designation of manor or demesne. In fact it merely comprised an acre of meadow, an unspecified amount of pasture and a mill, together with fairly extensive lands held both by farmers and free tenants. It did have its own court, and would thus appear to have been independent of Moorhill. Despite this, a cursory reading of the account would seem to indicate that Kilbarrymaiden and the three Tipperary centres were members of the manor of Moorhill. This seems unlikely as it would have been an extremely cumbersome way of administering lands so widely dispersed and Moorhill, as described, exhibits none of the characteristics of a major administrative caput. It is more likely that the three Tipperary centres either formed a single administrative unit or that they would have been administered on the same basis as some of the smaller settlements on the episcopal estates of Cloyne.

Of the Tipperary lands, only Dovenathmor had a court. With the exception of William Ofolan, it had no free tenants, but had an extensive betagh settlement, together with a number of cottages. Moortown and Ardfinnan, while having no courts, had a large area of land in the hands of free tenants, and there was a major borough at Ardfinnan. Thus, the most likely form of administrative structure on the Tipperary lands would be that of the single manor, with its caput at Dovenathmor, a triple demesne and heavy concentrations of free tenants at both Moortown and Ardfinnan. No distinction between military and non-military free tenements can be made on the basis of these accounts. This is unfortunate, as comparison with the distribution patterns found on the Butler manors of Nenagh and Thurles would be of immense value in determining the relationship between the Tipperary marcher manor and the three Tipperary centres that appear to have represented the marcher fringe of the bishopric of Lismore.

While the manor of Inchiquin was listed amongst the episcopal possessions
in the Pipe Roll of Cloyne, it is unlikely that it was acquired by the bishopric before the late fourteenth century and was, at the time of its two surviving extents, those of 1288 and 1320, in the hands of the de Clares of Thomond. The two most dominant features of this manor were the exceptionally large demesne and commensurately extensive betagh holdings. In the extent of 1288 the jurors stated that there were 6 carucates in demesne. Either this estimate was inaccurate, for whatever reason, or additional land had been added through reclamation, for in 1320 7 carucates and 32 acres were extended in demesne. The amount of land in the hands of betagh tenants was also considerable: which is as was to be expected given the size of the demesne. It is unfortunate that the detail in which betagh holdings were recorded in both extents is insufficient to permit comparison with the Cloyne data, though one interesting development should be noted en passant. A potential of 18½ carucates of betagh land, 12 of which were waste, were extended in 1288. By 1320 only 16 carucates and 71 acres of betagh land were extended, none of which were noted in the extent as waste or vacant. It is likely that some of the waste land noted in 1288 had passed into the hands of gavellors or farmers under obligation to render the customary services. The less careful juror might have been inclined to classify such tenants as betaghs and in practical terms this would not have been an invalid classification. The sheer size of both the demesne and the betagh holdings at Inchiquin is of itself suggestive of structures analogous to those found at Cloyne, while the number and mix of substantial free tenements both of a military and a non-military character confirm the fact that Inchiquin was probably, from its establishment, a marcher manor. There were also two extensive boroughs attached to this manor, one at Inchiquin itself and one at Youghal, a factor which further strengthens the Cloyne parallel, indicating that Inchiquin may have been a manor comprised of a number of self-contained units, though whether these could be described in quite the same terms as the Cloyne quasi-manorial settlements is a question which will never be fully resolved due to the disparity in the nature of the surviving evidence for both Inchiquin and the Cloyne episcopal estates.

79. P.R.O., C 133 file 52 (1), C.D.I. 1285-92, pp 202-4 (1288), P.R.O., C 134 file 67 (15) (1320). The main problem with the 1320 extent is that the jurors were less thorough and that some of the movement of land from category to category between the two dates is now untraceable.
Tipperary and Limerick

Any examination of manorial organisation and structure in Tipperary and Limerick is, of necessity, undertaken through the distorting medium of the mid-fourteenth century extent: for most of the surviving manorial extents in both counties post-date the rise of Maurice fitz Thomas and the rapid growth of the march which followed the Bruce Invasion. The fact that both counties formed part of a very fluid frontier in the course of the thirteenth century had a critical bearing on manorial structures in what might be termed areas of bridgehead settlement. Manors like Thurles, Nenagh, Dunkerrin and Any, though not liberty caputs, had an extraordinarily high number of extensive military tenements. Where manors were screened from the march, structures similar to those in Leinster appear to have been prevalent, though the de Burgh manors of Terryglass and Lorrha provide an interesting exception to both of these rules and will be examined in greater detail. By the 1320's and 1330's, manors which had seen their structures formed in the land of peace in the course of the thirteenth century, had come under increasing pressure. This is why major sources such as the Ormond extents of 1338 and the earl of Kildare's holdings as extended in 1331, together with the de Clare extents of 1320 must be approached with a degree of circumspection.

It is on the Butler estates in Tipperary that the division between the south-western manors of the land of peace and the more northerly marcher manors can best be seen. There were originally three major concentrations of military settlement based on the manors of Thurles, Nenagh and Dunkerrin. Two extents have survived for Thurles, one an internal extent compiled for the lord of the manor in 1303 and the other an inquisition post mortem extent of 1338. Apart from decay resulting from the expansion of the march, the basic structure of the manor had changed little by 1338. The 1303 demesne had 400 acres but by 1338 this had shrunk to 290 acres with an additional 100 acres, probably originally part of the demesne, being held ad voluntatem domini. No indication of the presence of unfree tenants was given in the 1303 extent, though the 1338 extent specifies a tenement of 60 acres which was then held by five betaghs. Whether or not this betagh settlement had existed in 1303, it is clear from both extents

80. See above, Chapter IV, pp 153-61, and for the career of Maurice fitz Thomas see G.O. Sayles, 'The Legal Proceedings against the First Earl of Desmond', Analecta Hibernica, vol. 23 (1966)
82. P.R.O., C 135 file 55 (2).
that most if not all of the tenements of the manor were in the hands either of free tenants or of burgesses. A majority of the tenements were held either by knight service and rent or by knight service alone. Although it is clear from the 1303 extent that the 28 military tenements then noted had originally formed part of larger tenements, and that consolidation had involved a certain amount of contraction, 21 of these tenements were extended in 1338, though 6 of these were then described as in decay. It is interesting to note the alternative means of assessing the military capacity of a tenement used in the 1303 extent. The equivalent of knight service in terms of armed or armed and mounted men was either given in lieu of scutage or with scutage. This seems to indicate a direct obligation on the part of the military tenants of Thurles to serve locally in cases of emergency as well as when royal service was proclaimed. Distinctions between tenements owing the service of two mounted and three armed men as opposed to five armed men would have been irrelevant to the Exchequer.

There were also two boroughs attached to the manor of Thurles. The smaller of the two, Ballyhathill, \(^{83}\) was in serious decline by 1338. An annual rent from its burgesses of £5-6-8 had dwindled to £1 only in time of peace. The burgesses of Thurles held their lands for an annual rent of £22-17-2 and the service of two knights or ten armed men. Its survival, relatively unscathed, into the 1330's and the decline of Ballyhathill were explained in the 1338 extent in terms of the proximity of the Irish. Despite this reverse, the military and strategic purpose of both boroughs is clear. Thurles owed knight service while both provided areas of relatively stable nucleated settlement in a strong march.

Neither Nenagh nor Dunkerrin has both the early fourteenth century extent and the 1338 extent. Either Nenagh was not extended in the major series of early fourteenth century extents or that extent was not included in the compilation of the Red Book. No attempt was made to extend Dunkerrin in 1338 and no indication of even the existence of that manor is given in the 1338 inquisition post mortem. Thus, the changes that can be glimpsed in the case of Thurles cannot at all be charted in either of these manors. That Nenagh would have been affected by the spread of the march cannot be doubted and it is equally obvious that this deterioration in local conditions probably led to the elimination of the manor of Dunkerrin.

Nenagh resembled Thurles in structure. In 1338 it had a demesne of 300 acres with a considerable amount of appurtenant pastureland. \(^{84}\) A number

---

\(^{83}\) Unidentifiable.

\(^{84}\) P.R.O., C 135 file 55 (7).
of holdings which had been in the hands of farmers and were by then in decay, containing $2\frac{1}{2}$ carucates, were also noted in the extent. It is very probable that a certain amount of this land may either have been annexed to the central demesne or formed subsidiary demesnes earlier in the century, though land set to farm could as easily have come into the lord's hands through escheat and default of heirs. Like Thurles, all of the tenements at Nenagh were in the hands of free tenants or burgesses, though the balance between military and non-military was more even. But in Thurles, military tenements had predominated, while in Nenagh a total of 15 military and 24 non-military tenements were extended. More of the military tenements at Nenagh owed rent as well as scutage than was the case at either Thurles or Dunkerrin, and in proportional terms the number of military tenements in decay at Nenagh in 1338 was significantly greater than that at Thurles. A substantial number of these decayed tenements lay in an area referred to in the extent as 'the wastes of Hum' and were originally held by Irish tenants. Four such tenements, comprising $10\frac{1}{2}$ carucates, were held by various members of the Okennedy sept, while both an Omathi and an Ohogan held tenements containing 3 carucates. This seems to imply that a policy of integrating local Irish magnates into the manorial system similar to that undertaken on the manor of Donoughmore on the estates of the bishopric of Cloyne was implemented on this particular manor. It would appear to have been less effective in practical terms at protecting Nenagh in the turbulent 1320's and 30's than the more systematic establishment of military tenements.

Dunkerrin was extended in 1305, but had passed into the land of war by 1338. To refer to it as a manor is, perhaps, misleading, for while it was certainly a manor in its own right, it was also used by the jurors as a convenient administrative caput for two other holdings: the lands acquired at Colabrenan from some local lord, probably the bishop of Killaloe, in exchange for the submanor of Inish, and the borough of Roscrea. Dunkerrin resembled both Thurles and Nenagh in its structure. There were 300 acres of demesne, 12 military and 3 non-military free

85. See above, p. 205.
87. This exchange is noted in the extent, although the original lord of Inish is not, Ibid., p. 153 and Colabrenan is extended on p. 151.
88. The bishop of Killaloe had already exchanged substantial areas of land with the King in order that the royal castle at Roscrea might be built in return for which the bishopric acquired a substantial tenement in the royal manor of Newcastle Lyons.
tenements attached to this manor, and unlike Thurles and Nenagh it had a large betagh settlement. At least 8 carucates 41\frac{1}{2} acres were in betagh hands, while a further carucate held by Thomas Marshall on a 10 year lease had been held by gavellors before his tenancy and may have been in origin, betagh land. No customary works were listed: it was merely stated that the betaghs paid rent pro operibus consuetis.

Colabrennan appears to have fulfilled a function similar to that of Inish, in as much as it was effectively a submanor of Dunkerrin. It had one military and 4 non-military free tenancies. Like Dunkerrin, it had a substantial betagh settlement where 233\frac{1}{2} acres were in the hands of 23 tenants. The demesne land at Colabrennan was unusual in that it was a military holding owing 12s. scutage and suggests that this land may originally have formed part of an ordinary military tenement which was transformed into demesne at the time of the exchange. The third element in this administrative unit was the borough of Roscrea, for which a borough extent, together with an extent of lands external to but associated with the borough, was compiled. Unlike Moyaliff and the Leinster boroughs, where the existence of a standard size of burgage tenement can be established, the subdivision and rents noted in Roscrea would seem to indicate that the burgesses held land at the flat rate of 8d. per acre rather than at the Leinster norm of 1s. per burgage. As a corporate entity the borough held 12\frac{1}{2} carucates of land and 2 carucates of royal demesne, from the adjoining royal lands acquired by exchange from the bishop of Killaloe, was also attached to the borough. Effectively, Roscrea appears to have functioned as a borough with considerable manorial appendages, for apart from a considerable number of external free tenements, a certain amount of land was also in the hands of cottagers and farmers. It is unfortunate that the Roscrea element of the extent dealing with courts did not value the income of the hundred and the external court (curia forinsecis) separately, for if the income from the external court was considerable it might imply that the court had jurisdiction over all of the non-burgess tenants of Roscrea. In any event its mere existence suggests that Roscrea was a manorial centre in its own right.

The other Tipperary manors on the Butler estates extended in 1338 were variants on the manor of the land of peace similar to the de Burgh manor.

of Lisronagh. 91. Ardmayle, Moyaliff and Carrickmagriffin 92. were all rather small manors with demesnes ranging from 80 acres in Moyaliff to 216 acres in Carrickmagriffin. Each had a manorial borough, the largest being that at Ardmayle, where 8 carucates of land were in the hands of the burgesses. The boroughs at Moyaliff and Carrickmagriffin comprised respectively 200 acres and 1 carucate. No parallel to the concentration of military tenements found on manors such as Thurles and Nenagh occurred in the case of any of these manors. There were no military tenements at Carrickmagriffin, and only two such tenements in Ardmayle and Moyaliff. With the exception of some land held by farmers in Ardmayle and one non-military free tenement in Moyaliff, no other type of tenant noted in these extents. It is unlikely that the size of the demesne on these manors would ever have needed the services of a substantial body of tenants holding by customary works. Thus, in all three cases, the manor organisational and demographic centre would have been the manorial borough. Indications of the spread of the march are to be found in both the extents of Ardmayle and Moyaliff - indications which ultimately reflect a lack of compatibility between the worsening political situation and the form of manorial structure found in both manors. All of the Ardmayle valuations were dependent on whether or not the land was at peace, while Moyaliff, though extended, was largely worthless due to the proximity of Irish felons. Carrickmagriffin, on the border with Waterford, was unaffected by this deterioration in stability, and a decline in the value of its demesne, 20 acres of which were leased and the remainder uncultivated, was attributed to defectum tenencium. In short, this manor was a casualty of the repeated agrarian crises of the early fourteenth century as opposed to the growth of the Tipperary march.

Lisronagh was considerably larger than any of these three manors, with greater diversity of tenurial types and an extensive demesne. It had large settlements of both betaghs and gavellors. By 1333 its 358 acre demesne was entirely leased out and no loss of income due either to the ravages of the Irish or lack of tenants was noted in the extent of that year. Its borough was slightly larger than that at Carrickmagriffin, but it is in its free tenements that its similarity to the southern Butler manors is most apparent. There were at Lisronagh two military tenements and a single non-military free tenement. Thus, one could say that with

91. The 1333 extent of the manor of Lisronagh was edited by E. Curtis in "Rental of the manor of Lisronagh, 1333 and Notes on Betagh Tenure in Medieval Ireland", R.I.A. proc., vol. 43 (1935-7).
92. P.R.O., C 135 file 55 (3), (5) and (6) respectively.
the exception of the extensive unfree and semi-free holdings at Lisronagh, the structure of the manor was basically that found at Ardmayle, Moyaliff and Carrickmagriffin.

The de Burgh manors of Terryglass and Lorrha present something of an enigma. Neither could have been said to have been within the land of peace, and yet the structure if not the state revealed in the 1333 extent is consistent with peaceful rather than with marcher conditions. Terryglass had a relatively small demesne of 1½ carucates, while the demesne at Lorrha comprised 3 carucates. Both manors would originally have had a substantial number of unfree or semi-free tenants. At Lorrha 110 acres of land was extended as being in the hands of gavellors. The position of this entry in the extent, immediately after the valuation of demesne, is the usual position in an extent for an entry dealing with tenants holding by customary service. As these particular tenants were gavellors rather than farmers it is possible this land may have been the original betagh grange at Lorrha. Although tenurial designations were not given in the Terryglass extent, it is likely that a number of tenements, merely listed by name in 1333, were originally betagh granges. All of the tenements listed together after the description of the demesne and associated with Clonbetage probably comprised the betagh holdings of this manor.

As was to be expected in a frontier area where settlement was being encouraged, both manors had manorial boroughs. No indication of the size of these boroughs has survived other than the original rents of £4 in the case of Terryglass and £4-16-0 in the case of Lorrha. The unusual feature of both manors is the complete absence of any mention of military tenements in the surviving extent. Lisronagh, which lay in far less exposed territory on the border with Waterford, had two such tenements. The severe decrease in rent noted in the 1333 extent, indeed the two decreases in rent noted in the case of one particular Terryglass tenement, were all attributed to the war. All rents noted in the extent could only be levied in time of peace. Two possible explanations suggest themselves: one is that free tenants and burgesses of both manors had some form of defensive obligations which were not mentioned in the extent. The other is that some arrangement based on the power, prestige and capacity for reprisal of the de Burghs in their Tipperary and Limerick lands, which had deterred the local Irish from attacking these manors in the course of the thirteenth century, had become unworkable by 1333.

The form and structure of manors in Limerick appears, from the surviving evidence, to have been similar to that found in Tipperary. Proximity to the march at the time of settlement gave rise to a form of marcher manor, close in structure to manors like Thurles and Nenagh. Some of the less exposed manors like Adare, Carrickittle and Corcomahide appear to have resembled manors like Ardmayle and Carrickmagriffin, but their actual structure is harder to determine as they were extended on the death of Thomas fitz John, second earl of Kildare, and by the time of the compilation of these extents in 1331, 5/9 of all these manors had been assigned in dower. Standards applied by the jurors compiling these extents appear to have been far from uniform. Thus, one is unsure as to whether or not certain portions of the manors were extended in their entirety or as they stood after dower had been assigned first to John fitz Thomas' widow and then to his son's widow. Indeed, as the criteria under which dower had been assigned have never been examined in any great depth, it would even be extremely unwise to assume that equal portions of all manorial assets were assigned to women to be dowered. If, as is more likely, such assignments were made on a purely financial basis, having regard to the total annual income and therefore to the amount of income due in dower, extents of this nature must be treated with the greatest circumspection.

The two most fully documented of the Limerick manors, Caherconlish and Any (Knockainy), were very similar in lay-out to Thurles and Nenagh, and, fortuitously, in both cases a late thirteenth or early fourteenth century extent has survived together with an extent of the 1320's or 1330's. Caherconlish was remarkably close in structural terms to Thurles, as is apparent from both the 1300 and 1338 extents. The demesne underwent little change between the compilation of the extents, save that usage had declined considerably by 1338. In 1300, 330 acres of demesne were extended. The jurors stated that there were 340 acres in demesne in 1338, but that only 50 acres were under cultivation. As was the case at Thurles, the majority of the free tenements at Caherconlish were military in character and due either to redistribution or reorganisation their number rose from five in 1300 to six in 1338, with what was originally the knight's fee of Rathjordan and Catherigothir becoming two separate fees. Caherconlish

94. The first earl's wife survived her husband, as did the second earl's wife, p. 106. The form in the extents is therefore that of extendas de duabus partibus duarum parcelum (extent of Corcomhade, p.110).

had a substantial borough. In both extents the burgesses were listed as holding 20 carucates, the only apparent decline being that the 3 carucates held by them at farm at the old castle were not noted in 1338.

Unlike Thurles, Caherconlish had originally an extensive number of tenants holding by customary service. In this the Limerick marcher manor tended to follow the Dunkerrin-Roscrea model rather than that of Thurles and Nenagh. The tenants of Le Brittache and the cottagers of the manor were noted in the 1300 extent as owing certain unspecified customary works, worth respectively 5s.6d. and 1s.4d. per annum. Betaghs holding 1 carucate at Clonmallin and Clonbrethan paid £1 in annual rent, owed carrying services when the lord was present and various other unspecified services. In 1300 their work was worth 6s.8d. but no acknowledgement of these works was made in the 1338 extent, nor was this betagh settlement mentioned. Potential income from the cottagers in time of peace was listed but not valued. This loss of income stemmed from steadily worsening local conditions. A considerable number of the rents in the 1338 extent could only be levied in time of peace, and certain specified tenements lay waste due to the proximity of the Irish.

Knockainy is not so well served as Caherconlish in its surviving extents, for while the 1288 extent is very detailed, the extent of 1320 is unsatisfactory on a number of points.96. The jurors of 1320 were more concerned with the monetary values of particular categories of tenement and the disposition of dower assignments within the manor than with individual tenements. In structural terms there is a clear resemblance between Knockainy and Nenagh, for, as was the case with Nenagh, Knockainy had a more even distribution of military and non-military free tenements. Changes in the distribution of military tenements can be seen in the 1320 extent. By then a total of 12 military tenements comprising almost 8 knights' fees had been reduced to 6 fees. The knight's fee of villata de mora, together with a number of smaller, scattered military tenements, had ceased to exist by 1320. No direct comparison is possible between the 16 non-military tenements of the 1288 extent and the data noted in the 1320 extent. Income from these tenements was noted in 1320, but they themselves were not specified by the jurors. The movement of rent in this category of tenement between 1288 and 1320 is, however, of considerable interest. In 1288, income from these tenements was in the region of £3-8-9, allowing for the payment of 5 marks to the bishop of Emly, or a gross annual income of £6-15-5. By 1320 income from the non-

military tenements was £9-9-7 per annum. In the case of Joan and Blanche's non-military tenements held in dower, loss of value through the war, presumably the fringe effects of the Bruce Invasion and the trouble in Thomond, was cited as an excuse by the jurors compiling the extent for the low income derived from this land. This seems to imply that, presumably at some point prior to 1315, tenements with relatively uneconomic rents, such as the carucate at Corbalydaly, held at an annual rent of 2s. had passed back into the lord's hands, probably through escheat, and had subsequently been granted to new tenants at more economic rents.

Although a considerable decline occurred in the area of demesne land extended in both instance, with demesne acreage falling from 505 acres to 419 acres, even the 1320 demesne was respectable in size by the standards of large Leinster manors and the manors of the Tipperary march. Like the Tipperary manors Knockainy also had a manorial borough, comprising 4 carucates, and was worth £6-8-10 in 1288. By 1320, income from the borough had fallen to £5-9-4 per annum, once again as a result of local warfare, the impact of the Thomond dynastic struggle and the Bruce Invasion. On the evidence of both extents, Knockainy, like Nenagh, does not appear to have had any unfree or semi-free tenants holding by customary service as well as rent.

The contrast between these two great marcher manors of Limerick and the Geraldine manors in that county is similar to that between the northern marcher manors of Tipperary and the smaller manors in the south of that county. While the 1331 extents must be treated with extreme care because of the dower complication and the fact that no other extents exist for the manors in question, it is nevertheless possible to deduce the presence of certain forms of structure. Caution is essential, as the policy of the jurors compiling the various extents is unclear, as is the degree of likelihood with which any particular portion of a manor was prone to be ceded in dower.

The largest of these Geraldine manors was Adare, which had a substantial demesne of 279 acres as extended, 8 non-military free tenements, a certain amount of land at farm, a borough and at least two substantial betagh granges, each containing 266½ acres. Similarly, Croom had an extended demesne of 120 acres, at least 7 non-military free tenements and a fairly small borough. There was also a betagh grange at Croom with 9 tenants holding 120 acres and a further 113½ acres was in the hands of farmers.

98. Ibid., no. 127.
In neither case was there any indication of the existence of military tenements, though it should be borne in mind that the 1331 extents could have omitted entire categories of tenement if that category had been assigned in dower.

Serious problems of structure arise in both the case of CorcomhIDE and Carrickittle. Only 72 acres were extended in demesne at CorcomhIDE, where there was no caput manerii of any sort. This was relatively unusual, as however dilapidated such buildings were, most manors tended to have some sort of caput. Normally, the absence of a caput would imply that one was dealing with a small submanor or even a well-developed grange with demesne such as that established at Dunleckney in the mid 1280's. The existence of a borough and the holding of both hundred and manorial courts at CorcomhIDE precludes that particular explanation. Further problems are posed by the fact that apart from the 4/9 of burgage tenements extended, the other free tenements mentioned in the extent were only specified in terms of location. In the only two instances where any information about the actual tenant was given, Kepachorby and Concholy, the land was merely stated to be in the hands of certain Irish. In the absence of more extensive evidence, one can only point the likelihood that tenurial structures at CorcomhIDE may have been similar to some of the structures associated with Donoughmore on the episcopal estates of Cloyne, reflecting a certain absorption of pre-conquest Gaelic tenurial arrangements. There is nothing in the extent of CorcomhIDE to indicate that its hibernici were anything other than free tenants. The extent of Carrickittle can hardly have been anything other than an extent of lands there which were not assigned in dower. Only 25½ acres of demesne land, 2 cottages and 2 military tenements were extended. It had no caput and no meadow or pasture was attached to its demesne. Were it not for the fact that Carrickittle had a court of its own, one would be inclined to classify it, on the basis of the 1331 extent, as either a grange or a submanor.

Thus, in the case of both Tipperary and Limerick, two different manorial archetypes appear to have proliferated. Their distribution and location appears to have been governed by the location of the march in the late
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100. See above, Chapter II, pp 64-5.
101. See above, p. 205.
thirteenth century and actual marcher manors such as Thurles, Nenagh, Dunkerrin, Caherconlish and Knockainy were all large and defensible. The smaller manors in the south of both counties were in structure closer to the Leinster manorial prototype and the strain on such structures caused by the spread of the march in the first third of the fourteenth century is clear in the extents of the 1320's and 1330's.

Meath

An examination of manorial structures in the liberty of Trim, the bishopric of Meath and the de Verdun lands reveals the nature of the transition from the manorial structures of the land of peace to those of the "extreme" march or land of war. The survival of documentation generated by the Mortimer forfeitures, the transcription of two extremely detailed late thirteenth century accounts of the lands of the bishopric of Meath, certain de Burgh extents and the terms of the partition of the de Verdun lands enable one to trace the alterations and the evolution of transitional structures. As is to be expected, the closer to the march, the larger the manor, the more loosely structured and the greater the number of its sub-manors. My reason for including Loxeudy in this particular section rather than in that dealing with the manors of the extreme march in Connacht and the midlands is that in structural terms it can be seen as the culmination of the various forms of transitional structures. The survival of a considerable body of evidence on the transitional stages between the extremes of manors like Kells and Loxeudy in these extents and accounts is, however, what makes the surviving material for Meath outstandingly valuable.

The small manor associated with the land of peace in Meath is perhaps best typified by Elizabeth de Clare's manors of Kells and Coolock and the form of organisation associated with the Leinster liberties also appears to have been prevalent in the eastern portion of the de Verdun lands in Meath. Duleek fulfilled the function of liberty caput in the Meath lands, while both Kells and Coolock can validly be compared to manors such as Ballysax and Fennagh in terms of their position within the organisational infrastructure of the liberty. Both Kells and Coolock had relatively compact demesnes. Neither appears to have had any military tenants. Kells had a borough, and at some point prior to 1352-3, a substantial betagh settlement, while Coolock had a number of cottage tenements and a certain proportion of its demesne land was, by then, leased at farm. Both manors had a substantial number of non-military free tenants.

103. See Chapter IV, pp 168-70.
Thus, it is not surprising to find Duleek fulfilling most of the functions of Old Ross or any other subordinate liberty caput.\textsuperscript{104} The actual disposition and structure of the demesne at Duleek is unclear, mainly because no detailed extent of Elizabeth de Clare's dower lands in that manor now survives, and the information on her lands preserved in her receivers' accounts is not such that much can be determined of their nature. From the 1332 partition at least 13 carucates and 41 acres of land were valued in such a way as either to have been demesne land or land held \textit{ad voluntatem domini}, in which case a certain portion of it would probably have been demesne. The residue of this land might have been accounted for as defunct betagh holdings that had, by the 1330's, been leased out on short term leases for so long that any association with original betagh granges might have been forgotten. The existence of servile forms of tenure on the Duleek lands of the priory of Llanthony Secunda in the late fourteenth century\textsuperscript{105} increases the likelihood that originally some of the tenantry of the de Verdun manor would have held by both rent and customary service. As the central or home demesne was not listed in the 1332 partition it is likely that this land was assigned to Elizabeth de Clare, though it is possible, due to the distribution of the lands of the priory of Llanthony Secunda, that this central demesne would have been rather confined.

With the exception of a small settlement of cottagers and a manorial borough containing 100 burgages, the tenements listed in the 1332 partition at Duleek were held by free tenants holding either by military or non-military tenure. The smallness of both forms of free tenement there can be seen as an indication of relative stability and firm, early settlement. Only 10 of the 28 non-military tenements exceeded 1 carucate, most of these being tenements containing a single carucate. Similarly, with a number of exceptions, the 30 military tenements at Duleek contained on average between 1 and 3 carucates. Scutage was assessed on the basis of acreage rather than directly upon what proportion of a fee was contained within the tenement. Thus, the scutage at Duleek averaged at between 1d. for 6½ acres at Lynamestown to the more general 1d. from every 5 acres or 2s. per carucate.


Thus, it would seem that in the case of the de Verdun holdings in east Meath, the Leinster paradigm held good. A number of smaller manors, with relatively few free tenements functioning primarily as units of agricultural production, were grouped around a larger central manor and borough. This would have been associated with a large number of military tenements. Structures, tenurial disposition and dispersal were, therefore, as was to be expected within the land of peace. The exception to this rule was the lack of customary services, noted in either the accounts of Elizabeth de Clare's lands or the 1332 partition. Yet, it is clear from the labour services owed by cottagers on the land of Llanthony Secunda at Duleek at the end of the fourteenth century, that such forms of tenure had survived and would originally have been prevalent in that region. The most likely explanation is probably that labour services were commuted to monetary payments in the mid to late thirteenth century, the origin of which had been forgotten by the mid-fourteenth century.

Although the location of the western and Offaly marches had critical bearing on the structure of many of the episcopal, Mortimer and de Burgh manors, a further tenurial undercurrent in the form of increasing numbers of tenements held by customary services either by betaghs or gavellors becomes apparent in the more westerly manors of Meath. There was one other basic difference between the structure of the episcopal manors and that of the manors of the great lay magnates, even in the case of marcher manors, but this may stem from the structure of the episcopal accounts. Any manor within the liberty of Trim in an area of marchland had a considerable number of tenants holding by military service. Even in the case of manors such as Killeagh, which lay on the border with Westmeath, and Clonard, which was relatively close to the Offaly march, no indication of substantial numbers of free tenants, whether military or non-military, has survived in either of the two late thirteenth century accounts of the episcopal estates. A comparison between this, the situation prevailing in Cloyne and possibly in the marchlands controlled by the archbishops of Dublin prior to the long vacancies of the late thirteenth century is inescapable. The likelihood is that ecclesiastical lords were able to come more readily to an understanding with both their Gaelic and their over-mighty Anglo-Irish neighbours than were most of the great lay magnates.

Although the two surviving escheators' accounts of the lands of the bishopric of Meath only supply acreages in the case of demesne land and its appurtenances, such as meadow and pasture, and do not delineate individual tenements, it is nevertheless possible to establish the basic
infrastructure of the various manors without difficulty. Newtown Trim was, in structural terms, closest to the manors of the de Verdun lands of east Meath, but certain significant differences can be seen within tenurial balance which would be more in keeping with patterns found in more extreme forms on manors such as Rathfeigh and Killallon. There was an extensive demesne of 309½ acres at Newtown Trim, together with an extremely large manorial borough. In terms of income, the borough, from which a rent of £8 per annum was derived, was the most valuable portion of the manor apart from the demesne lands. The income from land in the hands of free tenants was £3-11-1 per annum, but in this context it is worth noting that the income from cottagers, 3s.7d. per annum, and that from gavellors, £2-19-4, was not insignificant in comparison.

The importance of unfree and semi-free tenants is very much more apparent in the case of the episcopal manors of Ardbreccan, Clonard and Killeagh. While the demesne of 320 acres at Ardbreccan was significantly larger than that of either Clonard or Killeagh, the tenurial composition of all three manors was remarkably similar. There were farmers, gavellors and cottagers at Ardbreccan itself, and gavellors and free tenants owing customary service at its members, Newtown and Richardstown, respectively. In terms of income and rent, the most substantial landholders at Ardbreccan were the gavellors of Newtown, whose rents amounted to £9-6-8 per annum, the farmers of Ardbreccan, whose annual rent was £9-5-6 and the gavellors there who owed £4-1-3- per annum. The only settlement of free tenants, that of Richardstown produced an annual rent of £3, together with a payment of 8d. for commuted works. There was also a substantial settlement of cottagers at Ardbreccan. As both the farmers and gavellors owed what appear to have been extensive labour services, it is likely that the land held by them was originally betagh land. It is worth noting that the labour services owed by the cottagers were also high, something relatively unusual where heavy service was owed by other semi-free or unfree tenants.

Clonard and Killeagh had demesnes of 191 and 173¼ acres respectively. With the exception of a settlement of cottagers at Killeagh, all of the tenants of that manor were gavellors owing labour service. None of the cottagers appear to have been burdened in this way. There was greater diversification of tenurial type at Clonard, though once again the most

important tenurial groups were the farmers, whose rent amounted to £10-5-0 per annum and the gavellors, whose annual rent was £5-18-5½. The free tenants and burgesses were together a less lucrative source of income than the manor's gavellors. Land in the hands of gavellors was almost certainly originally held in betaghry, but one cannot, however, be quite so categoric in the matter of land held by farmers, because of the essential difference between those who held land ad voluntatem domini and those whose leases ran on a fixed term. Works might well have been commuted into a monetary payment which formed part of the annual rent of land held in this way, but one must also consider the fact that the labour service noted by the farmers of Ardbreccan was separately noted and valued.

The actual disposition of betagh and gavellor lands is unclear from the accounts of the episcopal manors. Two secular extents of Mortimer manors, one that of Rathfeigh, an extremely detailed extent of 1322 and the second that of Killallon, a 1351 extent provide a good body of information on this aspect of manorial organisation and would seem, in as much as the surviving evidence is able to confirm, archetypal in form. There is considerable similarity between the dispersal of betagh lands listed in the Rathfeigh extent and what were almost certainly betagh lands listed in the Killallon extent. This land was organised on the basis of granges, with each grange containing 100 to 150 acres, the tenants of the grange in question each having specific holdings. From the division between the 13 granges named in the Killallon extent and the land there held by free tenants it is clear that while no betaghs are mentioned in the 1351 extent, the farmers holding land in these granges were holding what was originally betagh land. Much of this land was, in any case, waste pro defectu tenencium.

While there is undoubtedly a structural comparison between these two manors, the extent to which this can be applied to other manors where less data is available is problematic. In both cases the amount of customary land serving the demesne was exceptionally high. At Rathfeigh a demesne of 300 acres was originally served by 1,065 acres of betagh land. The proportions at Killallon, if the 1351 extent can be followed with regard to the size of the demesne, would have been 180 acres of demesne served by 969 acres of betagh land. It is, possible that some of the 100 acres of pasture listed in the 1351 extent might originally have formed part of the demesne, but in structural terms this would not warrant any major modification in the basic model. In as far as can be established, this basic pattern seems to have been prevalent in the other secular

107. P.R.O. C 47 10/18/3 and see also Chapter VI pp 271-3.
transitional manors, but whether or not one can argue back from this data to the material preserved in the episcopal accounts is another matter entirely. There was, however, one significant difference between these manors. Rathfeigh had no free tenants, while Killallon had both military and non-military free tenants, together with a small manorial borough. This difference can be explained in terms of location. Although Rathfeigh was within the march by 1322, this would not have been the case for much of the thirteenth century, which is when the manorial infrastructure would still have been fairly flexible. Killallon was very much more exposed and had been held by Richard Tuit, originally of Roger Mortimer merely by payment of 10s. scutage. This particular liability was covered in as much as 10 military tenants there paid a total of 11s.3d. in scutage whenever royal service was proclaimed.

The last of the Meath episcopal manors, Drumard, appears to have been quite similar in structural terms to Killallon. Its demesne of 210 acres would have been served by the land held by gavellors at Drumard itself, Clathar and Corbally and possibly also by the manor's cottager tenants. The annual income from gavellors there was £20-5-4, which may indicate that Drumard had granges that were not specifically listed in this account, a plausible enough assumption, in view of the amount of information which does not appear in the Cloyne accounts. There were also a considerable number of free tenants at Drumard, whose rent amounted to £14-6-8 per annum. Due to the nature of these accounts, it is, however, impossible to determine what proportion, if any, of these tenants held by military service. If only because of the importance of its free tenants, whether military or non-military, Drumard thus provides an interesting contrast to Clonard, the other episcopal manor lying within the Meath/Offaly march.

The de Burgh manor of Le Wastyn, which was probably co-terminous with Vastina in the deanery of Loxeudy and appears from place-names in the 1333 extent to have been within the civil parishes of Castlekindalen and Churchtown, and in a more westerly portion of the county than Drumard, may provide some further indication of the likely internal structure of manors like Drumard. Containing 360 acres, the demesne was rather more extensive than that of Drumard. Although no land was specifically designated as being in the hands of betaghs or gavellors in the 1333 extent, there are strong indications in the structure of the extent itself that such land existed. Some 480 acres of waste land were extended in 18 separately named tenements. This land was separately valued and preceded the sections

listing non-military and military free tenements. The former valuation of 10d. an acre in time of peace was identical to the valuation given for the demesne lands. Thus, these named tenements were probably the betagh granges of Le Wastyn. The balance between the two types of free tenant was, however, closer to that found in the marcher manors of Tipperary.  

Only 8 relatively small free tenements were held by rent and suit of court, while 14 tenements, 9 of which contained at least 1 carucate, were held by military service. Although the size of these military tenements was small by Tipperary standards, the scutage was assessed at 3s.4d. per carucate, a rate considerably heavier than that levied on the de Verdun manor of Duleek. 

The transitional phase in which the customary land of the Meath manor passed from betagh hands to the hands of gavellors and farmers is clearly illustrated in the 1324 extent of Moylagh. There a demesne of 317½ acres was then serviced by 184 acres in the hands of betaghs, 10 cottagers and 386½ acres of land in 11 separate granges, which were then in the hands of farmers. Thus, as the local betagh population was either dispersed through the effects of the extension of the march or the famines of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, replacement by farmers or by gavellors appears to have offered some initial measure of tenurial stability. Like Le Wastyn, Moylagh was a marcher manor and 8 of its 17 free tenants owed scutage at varying rates.

The only great military fee of the liberty of Trim for which an extent has survived is the barony and manor of Ratoath, held by William de Burgh of the lord of Trim and extended with his other lands following his murder in 1333. Its primary function was defensive. Ratoath lay close to the Kildare/Offaly march and is the only Mortimer/de Genville holding for which an extent has survived that fulfilled the same function as the caput or sub-caput of any of the Leinster liberties. Despite its proximity to the eastern de Verdun caput at Duleek, and the similarity of its original function, there were certain fundamental structural differences. Apart from its free tenements and borough, the manor of Ratoath was not extensive. By 1333 it had what were extended as two demesnes, the main demesne of 340 acres at Ratoath itself and a subsidiary demesne of 150 acres at Betagesland. Both demesnes were by then in the hands of farmers.

110. See above pp 210-11.  
111. See above p. 220.  
and a further 40 acres of wasteland were leased to Henry Podelee. The sub-demesne and possibly also the 40 acres of wasteland would have serviced the main demesne. Free tenants holding by non-military tenure held between them at least 21 carucates 32 acres of land, one cannot be exact as some of the tenements were unspecified, for an annual rent of £16-3-10 and the borough was worth £6-16-4 per annum. Thus, the proportion of land in the hand of free tenants without military obligations was far greater at Ratoath than at Duleek and the relationship between the demesne land and what was originally customary land rather unusual in terms of the Meath marcher manors.

A slight problem in definition is raised by the 15 military tenements. These covered 53 carucates 60 acres and must, for the most part, be seen as part of the barony rather than the manor. There is a direct parallel here with the military tenements at Old Ross, which really formed part of the honour or barony of Old Ross, rather than part of the actual manor itself. Scutage accruing from these tenements amounted to £5-7-0, whereas William de Burgh's own obligations in relation to the manor and barony were to pay £8 whenever royal service was proclaimed. De Burgh was clearly expected to make up this deficit from other sources of income arising within the manor and barony, an unusual situation, for military tenements were generally such that the income from scutage either covered such obligations or left the mesne lord with a profit in hand.

All of the Meath manors already examined, whether within the land of peace or within the march, had, despite certain variations, a clearly definable manorial structure. When one examines the manor of Loxeudy, the caput of the old de Verdun liberty, one is not dealing with a single manor, but with a number of large submanors and disparate settlements, together with an exceptionally large number of military tenements, that were all attached, presumably for administrative convenience, to this particular centre. Something of its size can be explained in terms of the fact that it was

115. See above, p.223-5. The situation prevailing on marcher manors in the hands of the bishopric of Meath was, in some ways, comparable to that at Rathfeigh, which is discussed in Chapter VI, pp.
116. See above, p.195.
a liberty caput, but the fact remains that in structural terms Loxeudy can only be compared to such de Burgh manors as Loughrea or Sligo, or the Mortimer manor of Dunamase, all of which were manors of the land of war or of the more lawless marches.

Apart from any unextended central demesne land, which would have been assigned in dower to Elizabeth de Clare, Loxeudy had extensive demesnes in five of its submanors or quasi-manorial settlements. Thus, there were 16 carucates of demesne in Moydon, 14 carucates of demesne in Lissardowlan, 8 carucates each in Kyllynle and Athleague and 2 carucates in Killinglarrath. The same element of dispersal is to be seen in the location of the non-military free tenements listed in the extent of the partition, which appear to have been spread over at least three counties. All but one of these tenements was unspecified in terms of acreage, this being a tenement of 18 carucates at Ballilegge. Vagueness such as that found in the designation of the lands and tenements of Monterhawyl, which were worth £40 per annum, can be explained in terms of size, isolated location and the fact that the compiler of this extent might not have had first-hand knowledge of the lands in question. It is in precisely such terms that large free tenements on Elizabeth de Clare's Connacht lands, the other de Burgh Connacht manors and the Mortimer manor of Dunamase in 1320 are cited in accounts and extents. 118.

It would be unwise to make any proportional comparisons between the non-military and military free tenements extended at Loxeudy in 1332, because the tenements of this nature assigned in dower to Elizabeth de Clare are not listed and the assignment of dower might not have been made on a strictly proportional basis. In any case, the appropriate comparison in this instance would be with the other Meath liberty caput, Trim, for which no extent has survived. The exceptionally high number of military tenements attached to Loxeudy listed in 1332 may well have been balanced by a similar number of military tenements dependent on Trim. Any manor with at 56 military tenements, all of which were described in terms of location and scutage due, with no attempt being made to quantify them in terms of acreage, or as multiples or proportions of knights' fees, can only have had the loosest possible form of central administrative structure. Further indications of the marcher nature of Loxeudy can be seen in the customary render of cows, linen and squirrel's pelts from Clanarwy, which

118. See below pp 237-45. Loxeudy really posed somewhat of a problem in classification as it could just as correctly, but not in my opinion as usefully, have been dealt with as a midland manor of the land of war.
was divided equally between the four co-heiresses. This seems to have been a survival of some form of pre-conquest render in kind.

In practice the contrast between the structures associated with the eastern de Verdun manors of Coolacock, Kells and Duleek and those of Loxeudy could hardly have been greater. An examination of the episcopal, de Burgh and Mortimer manors does, however, go some way towards bridging the gap. Manors like Rathfeigh and Killallon can be seen to be mid-points on a scale of transition, with manors like Le Wastyn and Maylough representing points slightly closer to the extreme marcher end of that particular scale.

Ulster and Louth

In structural terms the differences between the various de Burgh manors in Ulster and Louth and the de Verdun lands in Louth, for which extents have survived, can be explained in terms both of proximity or otherwise of the march and the peculiarly close relationship between the earls of Ulster and their major Gaelic tenants. Once again an overall looseness of structure and abnormally large demesnes were the hallmark of the marcher manor, but unlike the marcher manors of Meath and Tipperary, no attempt was made to protect the integrity of the Ulster manors by ensuring that military tenements provided the necessary cover or protection. In fact one of the peculiar features of the earldom of Ulster is the fact that unlike any other liberty, no attempt was made to provide either an extensive core of heavily militarised manors or even to provide focal points for the military tenements as was done in Leinster. All that can be said of the military tenements of the liberty is that in theory all five Ulster counties were served by 21 tenements containing 16 6/20 fees. 119.

These were evenly distributed throughout the liberty and were not associated in clusters with any specific manorial or county caputs - hence the separate extent of knights' fees in 1333. The obligation for eight of the Gaelic sub-kings of Ulster including the O'Neil of Tyrone, to maintain, on an annual basis, a force of some 345 satellites may explain this under-provision of military tenements within the liberty. 120.

119. All of the Ulster 1333 extents have been edited by G.H.Orpen in 'The Earldom of Ulster', R.S.A.O. jn. col. 43 (1913) pp 133-43, vol. 44 (1914) pp 51-66 and vol. 45 (1915) pp 123-42. As these are readily accessible I give instead references to the original, the Reeve transcript, and the Cal.I.P.M. And for fees see P.R.O., C135 file 36(25), T.C.D. Ms. 1060, pp 194-5.

Thus, the major difference between the various Ulster manors lay in the size of the manor and looseness of internal structure. That this flexibility was of use to the earls cannot be doubted, for the desolation recorded in the 1333 extents can be traced back to one or a number of specific incidents. Firstly, the liberty was in a state of internal upheaval following the murder of the Brown Earl, which would have given local over-mighty magnates a chance to expand individual and highly localised personal empires. Secondly, it is clear from many of the 1333 extents, that the liberty was still suffering from the effects of the Bruce Invasion, the wet years and the turmoil that accompanied these particular crises. Finally, the surviving receivers' accounts for Elizabeth de Clare's Ulster jointure seem to point to a considerable recovery from the situation outlined in the 1333 extents. Flexibility in both structure and organisation would ultimately have facilitated this sort of recovery.

With the exception of the question of military tenements, close parallels can be drawn between the manorial structures prevalent in Meath and those in Ulster. Size and structure were both closely related to the position of the march, and in certain instances echoes of the form of tenurial patterns found at Donoughmore in the bishopric of Cloyne, where Gaelic chieftains' lands were incorporated into what might be termed the quasi-manorial infrastructure, were duplicated in Ulster.

Greencastle and Drumaliss may be seen as representing the relatively small Ulster manor within the land of peace. In both cases the demesnes were not unduly large: 3 carucates 60 acres at Greencastle and 2 carucates at Drumaliss. A considerable amount of land, 4 quarters and other unspecified lands were in the hands of Irish tenants at Greencastle, and with the exception of the manorial borough, which cannot have been large, as it was only worth £2 per annum, prior to the compilation of the extent, were the only tenements attached to this manor. There is no indication that the hibernici of Greencastle were anything other than personally free. Even less tenurial diversity was to be found at Drumaliss, where, with the exception of two tenements containing respectively 1 carucate and 2 carucates, the greater part of the manor's land, 800 acres, lay within the manorial borough. A comparison can be drawn between these two manors and Elizabeth de Clare's manor of Bushmills. The demesne in Bushmills was divided between two centres, with a main demesne at the caput containing 1 carucate and a subdemesne at Ballyclough containing 80 acres. No attempt

[See references at the bottom of the page]
was made in the receivers' accounts to differentiate between the tenantry of either centre, but the term *assisa*, which usually implies free tenements with fixed rents, was used in both instances. The only nucleated settlement at Bushmills was a group of cottages. The structural strain, the problems caused by depopulation and the effects of the Bruce Invasion are clear in the 1333 extents of both Greencastle and Drumaliss, but it is equally clear from their structures that neither manor was conceived of as a defensive unit. In the case of Greencastle, there should have been little need to take such considerations into account, given the strength of the castle at that particular caput. It should, however, be noted that there were no known major fortified buildings at either Bushmills or Drumaliss.

The management of the Irish tenantry on the lands of the earldom is best approached through a comparison of the manors of Le Ford (Belfast) and Dundrem, which were extended in 1333,\(^\text{123}\), and the manors of Antrim and Dunseverick, which were settled jointly on Elizabeth de Clare and her husband, John, in 1308.\(^\text{124}\). Each, in its own way, reveals an aspect of the whole. Dundrem was one of the middly-ranking manors of the liberty. It has a triple demesne of 2 carucates at the caput itself, 3 carucates at Ballydugan, and 1 carucate at Kingsfield. Listed with the demesne lands were 18 carucates which had been in the hands of John McCartan and other Irishmen. One's immediate instinct would be to regard this as land that had originally serviced the demesne, but the fact remains that its tenants were described as Irishmen, not as betaghs and that no services from the land in question were noted in the extent. Had such services been due, the procedure followed at Le Ford is that which one would expect to have seen enforced. There a double demesne of 7 carucates at the caput and 2 carucates at Imany were effectively serviced by 8 carucates at Legolghtorp. Although the tenant, David O'Coltran, held this land in fee at an annual rent of £1-6-8, 24 days' reaping or a payment of 1d. per diem in commutation was also owed to the earl.

Indications of the presence of customary tenants at Dunseverick are confined to references to specific payments made in the manor court in 1358-9.\(^\text{125}\). Two men, Thomas fitz William and Alan Olorkan each made fine of 10s. for the death of one of Elizabeth de Clare's Irishmen, while the heriot of an Irish widow was also recorded. There is no indication of the

---
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pattern of landholding in the accounts, and these may, in any case, have been *hibernici* rather than *betagi*. There was, a clear betagh presence on the most important of Elizabeth de Clare's Ulster manors, Antrim, where 4 carucates of demesne land were serviced by 2 carucates 16 2 acres of betagh land. The value of the commutation of these tenants' customary works was quite considerable; in 1353-4 10s. was received from this source, and in 1358-9 this had risen to 13s.4d.

Perhaps the most unusual aspect of the tenurial composition of the Ulster manors, in view of the size of many of the larger manors like Coleraine and Carrickfergus, is the limited number of references to unfree tenure in the extents. A possible explanation may have been that the customary tenants were, for the most part, bound to land in the hands of free tenants on the various manors. Thus, the situation prevailing at Dundry may have reflected the general practice. There a demesne of 4 carucates appears to have been unprovided with customary land. It is clear, however, from the record of the escheat of William de Rydale's land at Ballyeaston, 126. that these were semi-free tenants on the manor of Dundry who did not service the demesne lands. This escheat was valued at £4-10-0 per annum, together with an additional 4s. for the harvest service of its tenants.

O'Coltran's lands at Le Ford provided such services for the demesne rather than for the benefit of the holder of the tenement and one might possibly compare his position and that of John McCartan of Dundrum127. with that of the McCarthy tenants on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne.128. Thus, one could say that the Irish tenantry in the earldom of Ulster represented between them most of the forms of status accorded to the Irish in the lordship of Ireland.

The three Ulster manors most closely resembling the more extreme form of marcher manor were the manors of Dundonald, Le Roe and Camus and Carrickfergus. While there are obvious objections to categorising Carrickfergus129. as a marcher manor in view of the strength and importance of the castle there, the overall structure is marcher in type, bearing a close resemblance to that of manors on the western march in Meath such as Killallon and Le Wastyn, but also to the less exposed manor of Rathfeigh. In contrast, the

127. P.R.O., C135 file 36(18), T.C.D. Ms. 1060, p. 184, P.R.O. C135 file 36(19) and T.C.D. Ms. 1060, p. 186 respectively.
128. See above, p. 205.
marcher status of Le Roo and Camus can hardly be doubted. The fact that all three were county caputs within the liberty would be cause for caution were it not for their contrast in basic structure with that of Greencastle and Antrim.

The closest structural resemblance between the marcher manors of Meath and the two larger Ulster manors is to be seen in the case of Carrickfergus: Le Roo and Camus and DunDonald were basically variations on this theme. Carrickfergus had a central demesne of 3 carucates and 40 acres, together with a sub-demesne of 1 carucate at Kiogkogh. There were eleven outgranges, which corresponded to the granges of Rathfeigh and Killallon, with a sub-caput at Island Magee, containing 12 carucates, 20 acres. By 1333 this land was entirely in the hand of farmers, together with the subsidiary demesne. No indication has survived of the nature of tenant preceding these farmers or, indeed, of the length of their respective leases.

Excluding the two manorial boroughs of Carrickfergus and Carnmoney, there were 21 free tenements attached to this manor, most of which owed fortnightly suit to the manorial court at Killyglen, but four of which owed suit on a monthly basis only. The descriptions of these tenements vary, some being delineated in terms of acreage, others merely being extended as the lands at a given location.

The extent of DunDonald reflects a situation without parallel either in Ulster or elsewhere in the lordship of Ireland, which may, however, shed some light on the basic structure at Dunseverick. Land at DunDonald either lay within the demesne, the two boroughs or was held by one of the 12 free tenants. Thus, some 32 carucates 50 acres of land in 17 separate granges made up the demesne of this manor. It is unlikely that direct cultivation of a demesne of this size would ever have been attempted and one is obliged to consider various alternatives. Some of the land designated as demesne may originally have been in the hands of betaghs or semi-free tenants. Demesne might also have been used as a convenient term to describe land which was not in the hands of free tenants and burgesses and could therefore be leased either at farm or ad voluntatem domini. In this context it is worth noting that 80 acres originally in the hands of the burgesses of Holywood, which passed into the hands of the Red Earl ob defectu sanguinis was described as demesne in the 1333 extent. With one exception, none of the free tenements at DunDonald was

---

described in terms of acreage, and in some instances, notably Ardkeen, Ballyfrenis and Ardclenan, the land was in the hands of a number of tenants. The borough at Newtown Blathewyc does not appear to have been extensive and while at its most prosperous and populous, Holywood, the other borough attached to this manor, only contained 160 acres.

Major problems are posed by the form of the extent of the county of Coleraine, which seems to indicate that Le Roo and Camus were part of the same manor, probably an extended manor of Coleraine, the borough and caput of which had been detached and settled on Elizabeth de Clare and her husband. It is clear from the 1333 extent that there were at least two manors in the county, Northburgh, which with its castle formed a self-contained unit and the demesnes of Le Roo and Camus. If, as Orpen has suggested, these formed separate manors, the fact that both are described as demesnes and not manors, that they shared an external court and a court at Armoy and that, if anything, the 1333 extent leaves one with the impression that Camus, with its small central demesne, was in some way subordinate to or a member of Le Roo, must be explained. The most plausible model in this context would therefore be that of the fullblown marcher manor with submanors, a species of a scaled-down Loxeudy. Seen in that context, the demesnes of Le Roo and Camus, together with Elizabeth de Clare's borough of Coleraine, fall into place, with certain elements of the structures found at Dundonald and Carrickfergus being of importance in a comparative context.

There were 34 carucates of demesne land at Le Roo, which was in the hands of tenants holding at farm, a situation roughly similar to that at Dundonald, while a further 17 carucates were originally in the hands of various free tenants. A small centralised demesne of 2 carucates at Camus was followed in the extent by a series of tenements in the hands of farmers, only one of which, a carucate at Ballylegan, was described in terms of acreage. A further 17 villates were in the hands of farmers in 1333, while 6 villates which had also been held at farm were waste. Six free tenements owing suit to the county court of Coleraine were also extended.

132. G.H. Orpen, 'The Earldom of Ulster', *R.S.A.I.* j.n. vol. 45 (1915) p. 26. Orpen does not seem to have attempted to relate Elizabeth de Clare's jointure to the extents as they stand - herein, I am sure, lies his mistake.
When these lands are set beside Elizabeth de Clare's Coleraine holdings, the pattern is further clarified.

Thus, Le Roo would have been a substantial submanor, while the caput of the original holding would have been the county caput, the borough of Coleraine. The 2 carucates at Camus would have been the home demesne. Such an extremely large number of substantial tenements, in this instance full villates, in the hands of farmers, is probably an adaptation and survival of something akin to the grange structure found on manors like Rathfeigh and Le Wastyn, albeit on a grander scale.133.

The basic problem posed by any examination of manorial structures in Louth is the lack of surviving extent material, for with the exception of the 1332 de Verdun partition and the 1333 extent of the de Burgh manor of Carlingford, nothing of any great detail has survived. Moreover, caution must be employed in any examination of the de Verdun lands in Louth, as the unknown factor represented by lands assigned to Elizabeth de Clare in dower, may well have distorted the balance of local manorial structures. The actual mechanics of partitioning the Louth lands between the four co-heiresses may also have detached free tenements from what was their original caput in order to balance one purparty against another. Despite these problems, a considerable amount of information can, nevertheless, be gleaned from the 1332 partition.

There were two major manors on the de Verdun lands in Louth, La Roche and Haggardstown,134 with the borough of Dundalk providing an important non-manorial centre of nucleated settlement.135 In the partition 220½ acres of demesne were extended at La Roche, with a further 33½ acres at Edynkill. The burgesses of the manorial borough held 80 acres of fairly useful land valued at 6½d. an acre per annum and an additional 80 acres of very much poorer land. Apart from the abbot of SS Peter and Paul in Armagh, who held a carucate of land at le Curragh, no other tenants were noted at La Roche in the partition extent. Less can be said of Haggardstown. Its demesne appears to have been divided into two main blocks, one at Haggardstown itself containing approximately 3 carucates and a carucate

133. See above, p. 233 and pp 223-5.
135. Ibid., p. 421 (Dundalk), p. 430 (Castletown).
at Slaghnmahera, The manorial borough also seems to have formed part of the central demesne. The other tenements were listed in the extents of the co-heiresses' purparties. Scattered pockets of demesne land were associated with other centres, notably Ballybarrack, where not only were there 3 carucates 40 acres of demesne, but there were also at least two free tenements in the hands of Laurence Goodman which were held by rent and military service. There was also a local court at Ballybarrack, an indication that this was probably a full manorial centre.

The common denominator is, the absence of free tenants at any of these centres in large numbers. While it could be argued that a certain portion of the rents from such tenements may have been assigned to Elizabeth de Clare in dower, it is unlikely that this would explain the near absence of this particular category of tenant from these extents. The total absence of betaghs and gavellors is also worthy of comment. Forms of unfree and semi-free tenure are to be found in the manor of Carlingford. 136 Elizabeth de Clare's dower assignment might provide a convenient explanation, but once again it is almost inconceivable that such assignments would have wiped out entire categories of tenant. Abandonment of demesne cultivation, commutation of customary services and even the depopulation of betagh granges may have played some part in the situation prevailing on the Louth de Verdun manors. 137 The Carlow paradigm as exemplified by manors like Ballysax and Grangeford, where work was either done by stipendiary members of the famuli or ad taschem when the need arose, may also be of relevance in this context. 138 The absence of the non-military free tenant is also a feature of the 1332 de Verdun extents in Louth. An examination of the list of military tenants and a comparison between this and the separately noted free tenements provides some indication of what may have transpired. All of the free tenements separately noted as a source of rent, William de Burgh's land at Newtown Cooley, 139 the abbot of SS Peter and Pauls' land at La Roche, Laurence Goodman's land and the joint tenement at


137. The fact that the de Verdun heiresses and their husbands were absentee holders of fragments of a lordship without any other interest in Ireland, unlike Elizabeth de Clare, may have affected their attitude in this matter.

138. See above, pp 76–8


140. Ibid., p. 421.
Ballymacles, reappear on the list of military tenements. Thus, it may have been that all free tenements on the de Verdun lands in Louth owed military service, and that some, though not all, of these tenements also owed an annual rent. While it is somewhat dangerous to speculate in the absence of any list of Elizabeth de Clare's Louth lands, it would appear that as was the case in the earldom of Ulster, the Louth knights' fees were evenly distributed throughout the lordship rather than concentrated in clusters around specific centres.

Although little can be said about the two boroughs at Dundalk, their size is such that they might have played an important stabilising role in the administration of the de Verdun lands in Louth, conceivably providing some form of administrative caput. Rent from the burgesses of Newtown Dundalk extended in the petition amounted to £2-5-8 per annum, while a further £4-14-3½ of this rent had been assigned to Elizabeth de Clare. The burgesses of Castletown held 3 carucates of land and a further 80 messuages.

Rents from various Gaelic septs were noted in the Louth partition extents, but no attempt appears to have been made to attach these rents to any of the manorial centres. Thus, the rent of Erthir, which was held by the O'Hanlons, and the rent of Eryl, which was held by the McMahons, together with the service of Othega, McLoirch and McColgyn terra infra silvas appear to have occupied a somewhat anomalous position in as much as their existence was recognised, as was their potential as a source of income, while they were hardly integrated within the de Verdun lordship. It is tempting to see a parallel between this situation and that obtaining between successive earls of Ulster and Gaelic subkings within the liberty, with rent taking the place of maintenance payment for the standing force of satellites.

An extent has survived for the de Burgh manor of Carlingford in 1333. In structural terms Carlingford was essentially a variant on the Meath

142. See above, p.166, p.170.
144. Ibid., p. 430.
145. Ibid., p. 433.
marcher, with certain elements already noted in the case of the de Burgh manors in Ulster also evident. There was a central demesne of 4 carucates in the English Grange. Originally this would probably have been served by the 468 acres of land held ad voluntatem domini in 1333. The cottagers of the English Grange also owed labour service and carrying service was owed by two named tenants of betagh land in Lauerdogheston and the Irish Grange. There was, originally, considerably more betagh land in the Irish Grange at the disposal of the lord of Carlingford, but following the acquisition of 130 acres by the abbot of Newry, the customary services of that land were lost to the lord of the manor. There were also unspecified betagh holdings at terra de Eynagh and terra de Dermogh. Rent from the manorial borough amounted to £5-19-0 per annum and 12 carucates, 103 acres of land were held by 14 free tenants without any obligation to pay scutage.

Thus, both in size and construction, the parallel between Carlingford and the marcher manors of Meath are clear. The organisation of customary land servicing the demesne on a grange basis is almost archetypal, with the added local refinement of an English Grange, in which the tenants were semi-free cottagers, and an Irish Grange, in which the tenants were of betagh status. Irish and English granges were also to be found on the manor of Antrim. The manorial borough at Carlingford would have fulfilled the normal function of providing a stable and nucleated centre of settlement, while, as was the case with the manors of the earldom, none of the free tenants had any specific military obligations as tenants of that manor. The strength of the castle at Carlingford, combined with the undoubted skill of the de Burghs in handling their potentially troublesome Gaelic neighbours may well have been sufficient protection in itself for a manor such as Carlingford prior to the upheaval of the Bruce Invasion and the murder of the Brown Earl.

Connacht and the Midlands: the Manor of the Land of War

The most significant feature of the manor of the strong march or land of war was the looseness of its overall structure. This was a response to the unstable political conditions where the "manor" was effectively more of a strategic and military bridgehead than a profitable and fully functional economic unit. The finest examples of this form of manorial structure or, perhaps, non-structure are the de Burgh manors of Connacht,

147. See Chapter IV, p.146.
the Geraldine manor of Sligo, elements within the lands of the archbishopric of Tuam and the Mortimer manor of Dunamase. In fact in the case of Dunamase it is possible to follow the degeneration of a marcher manor into a manor of the land of war through comparing its 1283 extent with the extent compiled in 1324. This, in turn, points to the fluidity of marcher politics, which is at one with these looser structures.

In all of these cases, only certain rudimentary elements of manorial structure were maintained. The manor of the land of war had a demesne or demesnes, and, depending on the number of its sub-manors, a court or courts. Apart from those common factors, the structural variations within this class are immense. De Burgh lands in Connacht were, after all, part of a large and relatively well-integrated lordship, whereas the lands of the archbishopric of Tuam were part of a very much smaller lordship. Dunamase was a single, isolated manor which had come into Mortimer hands together with other scattered portions of the old Marchall lordship as part of a fifth, and rather poorly integrated purparty of that liberty.

The de Burgh lordship of Connacht was originally organised around two manors, Loughrea, and following the Geraldine withdrawal from Connacht and Ulster in 1295, \(148^2\) Sligo. All of the de Burgh lands extended in detail were attached to the manor of Loughrea, but a 1289 extent has survived for some of the Geraldine lands at Sligo which permits one to examine late thirteenth century structures there. Apart from the central manor at Loughrea and the submanors of Meelick, Kywarban and Toberbride, a number of cantreds with no pretensions to being central manors or even sub-manors were also described in the 1333 extent as members of the manor of Loughrea. Although no detailed extent has survived for Sligo in 1333, the brief description of the manor of Sligagh, Coran and Lune with Carbury and their appurtenances, \(149^2\) would seem to indicate that at some point between 1289 and 1333, Sligo had begun to fulfil this function as an administrative centre and a convenient peg upon which to hang


\(149^{2}\) All of the Connacht 1333 extents have been edited by H.T.Knox in 'The Occupation of Connacht by the Anglo-Normans', R.S.A.S. in. vol. 32 (1902) pp 132-8, pp 393-406 and vol. 33 (1903) pp 58-74. As with the Ulster extents I give the original, Reeves and Cal.I.P.M. references throughout. For Sligo et al. see P.R.O. file 36 (22), T.C.D. Ms. 1060, p. 208 and Cal.I.P.M. vol. VII, p. 376.
scattered de Burgh lands in the north-west. Loughrea and each of its three recognisable sub-manors was actually a self-contained manor of the strong march or land of war in its own right. Their function would have been analogous to that of the manorial borough, in that they would have provided areas of relatively dense settlement which could either have formed a bridgehead for expansion or a focal point in any defensive action. This would have been of critical importance in an area such as Connacht, which had both a low density of population and was typical of the worst of the strong marches or the land of war.

The central manor at Loughrea had a substantial double demesne: 4 carucates, 90 acres at Tulloghban and 3 carucates at Camclon. Additional land at both centres was in the hands of tenants ad voluntatem domini. Apart from the "detached demesne" in the hands of gavellors, there were other more substantial gavellor holdings, comprising 1½ villates at least in various specified locations and an unspecified holding worth 40s. at Dirdoghyr. Labour service was owed from some, if not all, of this land, but whether or not the original tenancy were betaghs or not is unclear, but if a direct parallel can be drawn between the central manor at Loughrea and the manor of Meelick, in this particular instance, it is very likely that a certain proportion of this land was held by betaghs.

The free tenements in Loughrea were very much as one would expect in such a manor. Burgesses held 3 villates of land, which would have comprised the borough itself, an extensive corporately held demesne and holdings in meadow and pasture. Most of the land attached to the manor was in the hands of 12 free tenants. Between them they held at least 15 villates and an extensive composite tenement at Binmore worth £9-13-4 per annum, which was described as containing various vills held by divers tenants. The size of the holdings in the hands of free tenants, the amount of land involved and the inclusion of very extensive unmeasured tenements such as those at Binmore closely resemble the types of free tenement prevalent in the manor of Loxeudy.

Meelick, Kywarban and Toberbride, conformed to similar patterns with certain local variations. Greater diversity of tenurial type was to be found at Meelick than at either of the other two centres, though it is possible that the original structures at Kywarban were not dissimilar to those at Meelick. The demesne of 4 carucates at Meelick was served by

betaghs holding 5 villates of land in Meelick itself, and a further 7 villates in Moyfyn. A further 5½ villates of land at Meelick was in the hands of gavellors. While the Kywarban extent does not specifically mention betaghs or other semi-free tenants, a clear demarcation was maintained between the land of free tenants and land listed on foot of the demesne, which had been leased, either for a fixed term or ad
voluntatem domini to various tenants. There, a smaller demesne of 3
carucates, 25 acres may thus have been served by the 2½ villates, 214 acres
in the hands of either gavellors or farmers, and the 88 acres in the
hands of gavellors. There was a manorial borough at Meelick, and Portumna
served Kywarban in this capacity. More of the land at Kywarban was in
the hands of free tenants than was the case at Meelick: there at least
5½ villates, 1 carucate and a number of unspecified large holdings were
extended in 8 separate tenements, whereas only 3½ villates and two
unspecified holdings extended in 6 tenements were noted at Meelick.

Toberbride in Sil Maelruin was somewhat unusual in that while in size it
was clearly a manor of the land of war, in actual structure it was quite
close to the Tipperary marcher manor, with one exception: it had no formally
extended military tenements. Perhaps the fact that the demesne there of
2 carucates, 60 acres was considerably smaller than any of those of the
central manor of Loughrea or its submanors may have had some bearing on
this difference. In any case, the more common division of manorial land
between demesne, tenurial lands associated with the demesne, owing labour
service, and free tenements was apparently abandoned. Thus, 9½ villates
of land there were held in 7 tenements, but the entire manor was, in any
case, worthless because of war. While both Meelick and Kywarban had
declined in value by 1333, neither had effectively been wiped out as had
Toberbride. This would seem to indicate that Toberbride was, and may
always have been, in a more vulnerable and precarious position than the
other two submanors of Loughrea and could, in turn, explain the
difference in structure in terms of defensive needs.

A number of cantreds were loosely affiliated to the manor of Loughrea and
described as its members in the 1333 inquisition. None of these cantreds
had a manorial centre and all were subdivided into free tenements.
Where there was a multiple cantred, such as the cantreds of Tirawly, Allymas,
Tireagh and Castleconor, the actual term cantred itself had a double
meaning. It was at once the administrative unit, but also a tenurial unit.

152. P.R.O., C 135 file 36 (22), T.C.D. Ms 1060, p. 207, Cal.I.P.M.
In this particular cantred there were a number of composite tenements. These ranged in size from the cantred, of which there were four, possibly corresponding to four subcaputs, through the theodum, its multiples and subdivisions, to the villate and its multiples and subdivisions. All of the cantreds separately extended would have been caputs in their own right and may have performed the same function on a local basis as Loughrea and its submanors. Tenurial structures in the other administrative cantreds were similar, with the exception that in each there was only one tenement, clearly the actual caput, containing a cantred.

The de Clare manor of Ardaghan, held of the earl of Ulster and extended in 1320, provides some indication of the likely organisation of tenements within the non-manorial Connacht cantreds. It is likely that Ardaghan would have been classified as a half-cantred, for it appears to have contained a little over 15 villates of land, though in this context it is worth noting that the caput of the administrative cantred of Clantayg merely contained a half cantred. Ardaghan was one of the more tightly organised Connacht marcher manors. Its demesne of 3 carucates does not appear to have been served by any betagh land, but 7 villates of land there were held by four Irish tenants ad voluntatem domini. The interposition of the borough extent between the demesne and these lands held ad voluntatem domini, together with the use of the term hibernicus mean that this is likely to have been an attempt similar to that found on some of the Ulster de Burgh manors and the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne to accommodate Gaelic septal holdings within the manorial framework.

The relationship between military and non-military tenements at Ardaghan is hard to determine due to the defective nature of the 1320 extent, but serves to indicate the sort of problem faced by the jurors compiling the 1333 inquisitions. It also provides a potential model for the defensive function of the big free tenements only loosely associated with the manor of Loughrea. While the rents of five free tenants were listed, together with their obligations of suit of court, no attempt was made to specify their tenements. Three of these tenants, Thomas Joyce, William Haket and Fromanus son of William, were also listed as holding fees. Scutage was assessed at the rate of between 2s. and 2s.6d. per villate. Two of the other military tenants, Gilbert le Waleis and Geoffrey Purcell, had no holdings other than the lands they held by military service. In numerical terms there was

153. P.R.O., C 134 file 67 (14)
thus an exact balance between the military and non-military tenements at Ardaghan. This is reminiscent of the type of ratio found on the great marcher manors of north Tipperary.\(^\text{154}\). It is possible, however, that the balance in the remainder of Connacht was weighted in favour of the military tenant, for most of the free tenements extended in the 1333 inquisition were described as being held in fee, the term used in the Ardaghan extent to denote military tenure. In this case the form of assessment for scutage found there may have been more general.

A late thirteenth century extent has survived for the manor of Sligo,\(^\text{155}\), but not for the manor itself or the submanors associated with it in the 1333 extents. In size and scope it was clearly a manor of the land of war, but its internal structure was closer to some of the manors of the Ulster portion of the de Burgh lordship than to the manor of Loughrea or any of its submanors, with the possible exception of Toberbride. Its demesne was exceptionally large, comprising 7½ villates, while the burgesses held 5 villates and their appurtenances and 15¼ villates of land were in the hands of other free tenants. There is no indication in the 1289 extent of any betagh or gavelor holdings, though, as has been seen in the case of some of the Ulster extents, such lands could be concealed under other headings. Demesne land was, however, merely listed and not valued, implying that income derived from this source, despite its size is more likely to have come from direct cultivation than from leasing. None of the free tenements of Sligo appear to have had any military obligations. Sligo was thus half-way between the manor of Loughrea and one of the non-manorial cantreds attached to that manor in terms of structure in 1289. Undoubtedly the de Burghs would have modified and changed the internal structure of Sligo following their acquisition of this manor in 1295 in order to integrate the new possessions with their other Connacht holdings.

It would be wrong to think of marcher and land of war structures as fixed entities. Changes in political alliances amongst the local Anglo-Irish and Gaelic inhabitants were an essential characteristic of marcher life. Manorial structures were adapted to this situation. This is most clearly seen in the instance of the Mortimer marcher manor of Dunamase, for which two very different extents, one of 1283 and one of 1324,\(^\text{156}\), have survived.

---

154. See above, pp 209-12.
156. P.R.O., C133 file 52 (7) (16) and C.D.I. 1252-84, pp 466-8, P.R.O., C 47 10/18 (17) (1324).
In the former, Dunamase was a marcher manor not unlike those found in Meath and in the latter it had made the transition to being a manor of the land of war.

The 1283 extent of Dunamase is that of an ordinary marcher manor, with a relatively small demesne of 2 carucates, 73 acres, served by 54 cottagers and betagh holding 7 carucates 49\(\frac{3}{4}\) acres of arable land and 1 carucate, 77\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres of uncultivated land. The number of betagh tenants and their services were not specified, but it is unlikely that such services would have been any heavier than those at Rathfeigh.\(^{157}\) A further 6 carucates 5 acres were in the hands of farmers.

It is impossible to determine the balance between military and non-military free tenants at Dunamase in 1283. The exact number of non-military tenants other than burgesses, cannot be determined because of damage to that particular portion of the extent, but from the size of the damaged section, it is likely that there was at least a one-to-one relationship between the military and the non-military tenements. This in turn would imply a comparison with the manors of the north Tipperary march. Some 16\(\frac{1}{4}\) knights' fees were in the hands of eight named tenants and there was a borough at Newtown Leix containing 127 burgages. A certain amount of waste land, 6 carucates, 34\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres, was also extended, evidence however, of depopulation rather than any local Gaelic turbulence.

By 1324 the entire structure of Dunamase had undergone a radical change. The demesne, which was now extended not only in terms of the actual demesne land under the lord's plough, but also in terms of land in the hands of betaghs, comprised 29 carucates. In point of fact the jurors must also have included the farmers' tenements of 1283 in this estimate. All of this land was described as being waste and uncultivated due to the war. The borough at Newtown Leix was extended as having formerly contained 60 burgages. By 1324 this had fallen to 40 burgages. It is clear that local conditions had been such within the memory of the jurors, probably from the early years of the century, that the original size of the borough, as extended in 1283 had long since been forgotten. None of the military tenements were extended in 1324 and all of the free tenements were described in terms of location rather than acreage.

Thus, Dunamase had passed from the march to the land of war between the compilation of these two extents and its internal structures had adapted

\(^{157}\) See above, Chapter VI, pp271-3 for a full discussion of labour services at Rathfeigh.
or degenerated accordingly. The 1324 extent pinpointed the war of the Irish as the reason for this decline, but under such circumstances the fact that the extent was compiled at all is highly significant. It shows that the manor had not, by then, passed outside the area within which the Escheator’s officials were prepared to act, like Elizabeth de Clare’s Offaly manor of Fermail, which would have been subject to the same pressures.

An account for the lands of the archbishopric of Tuam from 1279-82 provides some indication of the nature of the internal organisation of those estates. It is primarily of interest because of the apparent fusion of structural characteristics found in both the land of war and the episcopal estates at Cloyne, but may be subject to the same interpretative problems as the Cloyne account. All of the lands noted were members of Tuam manor, which seems to have fulfilled the same function in administration and co-ordination as the manors of Loughrea and Sligo. The parallel with Cloyne lies in the apparent existence of quasi-manorial settlements, similar to those found on the lands of the bishopric. The caput of the lordship lay at Tuam, where an extremely small demesne of 13 acres, from which no income was derived for the period of account was both the manorial caput and the only area of demesne noted. Tuam was probably more rentier in its orientation than many manors even at this early stage. Income from rent was always relatively secure and the cost of transporting grain from Tuam to any of the major ports would probably have made any major venture into demesne cultivation unprofitable. There were no betagh tenements and only a small number of cottages. The cottagers may not have owed any services, for no works were listed in the account. Farmers held land worth £2-8-5 per annum, while tenements whose annual value was £2-16-4, were in the hands of burgesses. The remainder of the land at Tuam itself, from which annual rents of £11-13-4 were derived, was in the hands of free tenants, the strength of which tenurial category being one of the classic characteristics of the land of war and the extreme march. There were three other areas of settlement organised on what was almost a manorial basis at Kilmain and Cong, Mayo and Annaghdown. Each had its

158. See above Chapter IV, p. 174.

159. T.C.D. Ms 804 p. 204. Place-names in their original form as given in this account: Tuam, Morrebath, Oloman, Montirmolina, Shylannde, Monbashin, Taxax propre Anethry, Killmakerell propre Anethry, Kilmethan, Conga, Mayho.
own court and there were boroughs at both Kilmain and Mayo. In all three
cases, however, the income from land held by free tenants other than
burgesses was the primary source of revenue. There were also substantial
numbers of free tenants at Morrebatch and its granges, Monbashin and
two other granges close to Athenry.

Thus, the structure of the manor of the land of war was loose and
essentially flexible. While the emphasis varied from lordship to lordship,
with some manors like Loxeudy and elements of the Loughrea conglomerate
having considerable potential demesne capacity, the main, if unreliable,
source of income would have been from rents, especially those of the free
tenantry. Subtenements were large and the overall impression gained
from an examination of these manors is of a holding operation, with a
skeletal manorial and feudal superstructure imposed as a veneer over
immense tracts of land. They formed both an excellent potential base
for expansion and for consolidation, in as far as this was possible, in
the teeth of the contraction forced by the vicissitudes of the first half
of the fourteenth century. Indeed, even the demographic contraction
caused by the Black Death would have been mitigated to some degree,
given the fact that the original structures had taken account of an
extremely weak demographic base.160.

Diversity within a given basic structure, the manor, was thus considerable.
No major regional study of this has been undertaken on the extents of
Cumbrian, Lowland Scottish or Welsh manors. As these would be the most
appropriate regions to compare with the lordship of Ireland, the scope
of any examination of the manor in Ireland is limited. However, from
what has been written on tenurial conditions in these areas, there is
a strong likelihood that detailed regional work on manorial structure
would reveal considerable similarities to the structures found in
thirteenth and fourteenth century Ireland.

Administration

A significant transition in manorial administrative practices occurred in
the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: it was symbolised
by the replacement of the reeve by the receiver, reflecting the movement
away from the direct cultivation of the demesne to the exploitation of the

150. The resilience of Elizabeth de Clare's Connacht lands, in view of
the impact of the plague, would have stemmed in part from clever
management, in part from structures, see Chapter IV, pp 155-6.
manor or manorial group on a rentier basis. This progression is clearly illustrated in the differences between the ministers' accounts for the Bigod manors and the receivers' accounts of Elizabeth de Clare's lands. It is, unfortunately, impossible to chart the course of this radical change in the case of any single estate: the Bigod accounts effectively cover the zenith and end of the prosperity of the thirteenth century, while detailed accounts of Elizabeth de Clare's lands only begin once the process had run its course. Data from the archbishopric of Dublin is limited in scope, for while a good overview of the administration of the manors and liberty is preserved, this is only the case for the closing years of the thirteenth century and first quarter of the fourteenth century, and, in this instance, predates the transition.

The only continuous series of data for the period is that provided by the royal manors. This can hardly be taken as typical, as the demesne manors in Ireland were administered on a rentier basis from an early stage, from the Exchequer's point of view, whether through the agency of farmers or reeves and receivers. On another level, the very atypical nature of the administration of the royal manors is in itself of significance in that they were the first of the important manorial conglomerates to be administered in this way and could be seen as the precursor of the form of management found on the Irish estates of Elizabeth de Clare.

The scope of any examination of manorial administration and estate management in Ireland during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is further limited through the lack of certain types of source material. The earliest extant court rolls date from the fifteenth century, are scrappy in nature and do not relate to any of the four groups of manors that have already been used as case studies. With the exception of what has already been said concerning manorial and hundred courts, it is impossible to examine the position of the court within the overall administrative framework of the manor or the manorial group. It is also clear from the Bigod accounts that other more minor ancillary accounts were produced. Individual accounts from the master shepherd at Old Ross and the structure of the reeve's accounts would seem to indicate that accounts were also produced by other members of the _familia_, notably the reap-reeve, who would presumably have compiled the more detailed material on which the _comptus grangie_ would have been based.

Certain problems in methodology are therefore presented by the surviving evidence. No single group amongst the four case studies examined in this thesis can be seen to be representative of anything more than a confined
period and or form of administration, yet taken together, the four provide a limited but valuable overview of trends and developments within the lordship of Ireland. The temptation to stretch the evidence beyond reasonable limits, is something of which one is particularly conscious in this case, and the possibility that the material in the case sources is unrepresentative, though extremely unlikely, must, nevertheless, be borne in mind. The most effective approach is to examine the forms of management prevalent in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries using data from the lordship of Carlow and the lands of the archbishopric of Dublin and then to examine the forms of administration associated with rentier management through the medium of the royal manors of Dublin and Kildare and Elizabeth de Clare's Irish estates. These are the only groups for which administrative records have survived. An extent provides a description of what a manor contained and was worth at a specific point in time. The actual management of that manor is only reflected in a continuous series of accounts, and in the case of the royal manors, also in writs and memoranda.

With the exception of the shepherds' accounts at Old Ross, the surviving Carlow accounts were rendered by reeves of manors and boroughs. In form these accounts were relatively uncomplicated, being compiled on an income and expenditure basis. Within the administrative hierarchy of the liberty, the reeve was answerable for the revenue of either his manor or his borough, but the status and function of both of these reeves was very different in essence, for while the borough reeve was elected on an annual basis and was a free burgess accounting for revenue arising from rents, market tolls, the fair and the hundred court, far more of the actual administrative work would have devolved on the manorial reeve, who was a *famulus* and accountable not only for manorial revenue, but also for the day-to-day manorial expenditure. This latter frequently included anything from the routine repair of the iron fittings on the manorial ploughs to the payment of the *famuli* and the hire of labourers ad *tascham* at harvest time.

Thus, the reeve was ultimately answerable not only for the revenue derived from fixed rents and land at farm or leased at will, but also for the sale of stock and grain. The magnitude of this responsibility can be seen from the account rendered by David de Bonham, reeve of Ballysax, in 1285-6. Stock sales, wool sales and the produce of the

orchard realised £9-11-1, while £57-2-9 worth of grain was sold in that year. Similarly, the reeve accounted for expenditure on iron, wood, agricultural implements and even the hire of extra horses for harrowing. A subsection of this account was devoted to the stipends and monetary payments in lieu of food allowances of the famuli. In effect the reeve was not only one of the famuli but also manager of the manor itself. It is also a reasonable assumption that the reeve presided at the manorial court, acting in this instance in much the same capacity, albeit on a local level, as the Seneschal of the Royal Demesne.\textsuperscript{162} Income from the courts, together with occasional entries of income from entry-fines and heriots are to be found in the manorial accounts. This forms an interesting contrast with the situation prevailing both on the lands of the archbishopric of Dublin and the royal manors. In both cases the Seneschal presided at manor courts,\textsuperscript{163} but the frequency with which such courts were held may have been less in both of these cases than would have been the case in the lordship of Carlow. The importance of the liberty court of Carlow, over which the seneschal of the liberty would have presided, cannot be assessed. No indication is given in any of the surviving accounts or extents, of the frequency with which it met, and as no rolls have survived either for the manor and hundred courts or for the liberty court, the interaction between these various courts cannot be charted.

The function and responsibility of the reeve's subordinates within the manorial administrative hierarchy of the lordship of Carlow was probably more extensive than is indicated in the actual survival of accounts. While the reeve's role as an administrative co-ordinator cannot be doubted, the structure of his accounts suggests that other members of the famuli, notably the reap-reeve and the master shepherd of a manor on which wool growing was of importance, also rendered accounts. The enrollment of the grange and stock accounts on the dorse of the reeve's account presupposes other less formal records from which such data would have been compiled. In the case of sheep, and possibly also of stock, there is evidence in Old Ross that formal accounts were produced by the reeve's subordinates.

The most important of the surviving subordinates' accounts is that rendered

\textsuperscript{162} The appearance of court issues on the reeves' accounts would seem to argue as much; \textit{See the Ballyrose accounts, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/1-6 and, indeed, any of the other Carlow manorial accounts.}

\textsuperscript{163} \textit{See below pp 257-8 See also Chapter I, pp 48-9 for the evidence of the Seneschal of the Demesne's presidency and see Chapter III, pp 127-8}
by Richard Callan, the master shepherd at Old Ross in 1280-1. Here, the basic structure of the reeve's account is also to be found. Callan accounted for receipts from the sale of animals, their wool and their fells and offset these issues against necessary expenditure on the upkeep and maintenance of the sheepfold and the construction of a protective fosse on the direct order of the Seneschal of the liberty. Additional payments made in connection with the hire of a boy to watch the lambs and extra hands to work on an ad tascham basis during the washing and shearing were also noted in this account. Most of the surplus was paid to two reeves of Old Ross, William Vicar and Simon Fullan, indicating direct accountability to the reeve of the manor. The final item was an account of the ovine stock on Old Ross in the course of that year.

A single membrane stock account compiled in the autumn of 1289 also survives for Old Ross. This account follows the same format as stock accounts enrolled on the dorse of the reeve's account and deals not only with sheep but also with cattle and affers. As this account does not form part of a reeve's account, two possible explanations of its provenance must be examined. It is conceivable that the account was a draft produced by the reeve prior to the compilation of the main account, but its polished and finished form would appear to rule out this possibility. No member of the famuli was named or associated with the account, and its title merely refers to the date of compilation. Under these circumstances it would be unwise to assign it categorically to any member of the famuli, but the likelihood is that it was compiled by the master shepherd, possibly acting with one of the cowmen.

In the light of this evidence, the compoti grangie of the reeve's accounts may well have had similar antecedents. Negative evidence to support this proposition can be found in accounting procedures prevalent at Fennagh. There, the officer rendering account was the bailiff and not the reeve. Reeves at Fennagh were merely members of the famuli, with the additional responsibility of acting as grangiar, or keepers of the grange, for which they received an annual salary of 6s.8d. and a weekly food allowance of 6d. The fact that the reeve was not the chief accountant for this manor, coupled with his high food allowance, all of the other famuli at Fennagh received 4d. each a week, and the specification of his function

164. P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/42.
165. P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/55.
168. Ibid.
as grangiarius, would seem to indicate that this was a somewhat unusual situation. Fennagh had a reap-reeve, who also acted as a watchman, and received both salary and food allowance for only half the year, from spring to Michaelmas. 169. This situation did not prevail on any of the other manors where the reap-reeve received both salary and food allowance for the entire year. Thus, there is a strong likelihood that some form of preliminary forms of compotus grangie was produced by the reap-reeves on all of the Carlow manors other than Fennagh.

A feature of the Carlow famuli not found, for instance, on the manors of the bishopric of Winchester, was the fact that there was no indication of servility of status. The famulus on the lands of the lordship of Carlow was retained by wages and food allowance, as opposed to base serjeantry and food allowance. 170. The function of the Carlow famulus was to provide a corps of specialist labourers, whose number could be augmented at harvest time or at the time of sheep-shearing, through casual hire. There seems to have been a far greater dependence on wage-labour of this sort throughout Leinster in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries than appears to have been the case in England. 171. This undoubtedly reflects a more ruthlessly professional and exploitive attitude to manorial management than prevalent in England. Betagh labour was being dispensed with, hence the spread of conditions similar to those found on Cloncurry in 1304, where services were commuted and the manorial demesne was clearly tilled by hired labour. 172. This form of management reflects the zenith of the agrarian boom in late thirteenth century Ireland, when the supply trade to the King's wars in Wales and later in Scotland contrived to provide a continually expanding market for Irish grain and other victuals.

The administrative function of the borough reeve underwent no major change in the period intervening between the time covered by the Carlow accounts and that covered by the accounts of Elizabeth de Clare's various Irish ministers. This apparent stagnation can be explained in purely practical and functional terms: a lord's interest in his boroughs, whether they

170. The base serjeantry was of considerable importance in the retention of famuli on the lands of the bishopric of Winchester. For a discussion of the position of the famulus based on evidence from these estates see M.M. Postan, 'The Famulus, The Estate Labourer in the XIIIth century', Econ.Hist.Rev. Supplement, No. 2(1954).
171. Ibid., p. 22.
manorial boroughs such as Old Ross, Kilmanagh, Callan and Grangeford, or non-manorial, such Carlow or New Ross, lay in receipts of rent, the issues of the hundred, the issues of fairs and markets and other incidentals like the prise of ale. It was not, nor could it ever have been a more direct interest, except, possibly, in the case of unusual boroughs like Kilmaclenine. Hence, the form of accountancy procedure found in any one such borough account is universal in its application.

This can most clearly be seen in a comparison between two disparate borough accounts such as that for the borough of Old Ross in 1288-9 and that of Kilmanagh in 1346-7. Apart from arrears carried over from the previous year, Henry son of Griffin, the reeve of Old Ross, accounted for revenue derived from the fixed rent of borough plots, the prise of ale, toll and the pleas and perquisites of the hundred. Similarly, David Pers, reeve of Kilmanagh, accounted for the burgage rents, toll and the pleas and perquisites of the hundred court there in 1346-7. In both cases, the accounts were compiled on the basis that income received was to be accounted for either in terms of expenditure on items such as parchment for rolls and accounts or monies delivered to other, usually superior officials active within the respective lordships. The only significant difference between the procedures adopted in the case of boroughs like these and larger boroughs like New Ross and Callan is the frequency with which accounts were rendered and, therefore, reeves elected. Twice yearly accounts were rendered by the reeves of New Ross on a regular basis and this procedure was followed in Callan on a slightly more sporadic basis. The size of such boroughs the amount of revenue generated and the fact that a reeve was answerable for all debts accruing in his term of office would have meant that burgesses would have been unwilling to undertake the office for more than a half-year in the case of a large borough like New Ross.

Evidence of administrative practices on the lands of the archbishopric of Dublin is very much sparser than that available for any of the other


174. For the exceptional position of this betagh borough see above p. 294 and Chapter IV, pp 280-2.

175. P.R.O., S.C.6 1238/54.


177. See Chapter II, p. 92.

manorial groups used as case studies. Manorial accounts and court rolls would never have been included in a compilation such as Alen's Register. Such registers were concerned with actual possessions, rights and privileges and, therefore, while extents charters and rent rolls would have been recorded, material generated by the day-to-day administration of the archiepiscopal manors would have been of little interest to John Alen in this context. Most of the surviving evidence thus occurs *sede vacante*. In using evidence of this type one is forced to accept one basic presupposition: that the actual administration of the archiepiscopal lands was carried on as it would have been during an actual archiepiscopate, with the exception that a royal official or officials would have been superimposed on an existing administrative hierarchy. This would have been a perfectly sensible procedure, but minor adjustments could well have been made with regard to terminology. Royal officials accounting for these lands might have been more likely to have used terms known to the Exchequer in connection with the royal manors. It is also conceivable that the military importance of the manors in the Dublin mountains would have received greater emphasis from royal keepers than from the archbishop's own officials, who would have been more apt to arrive at a *modus vivendi* with the local Irish.\(^\text{179}\). Perhaps the most significant aspect of the surviving evidence is that it reflects a certain fusion between some administrative practices on the royal manors, which were by the late thirteenth century run on a rentier basis and manors that were clearly being managed on a more direct basis, in line with the practices followed on the Carlow manors.

That the archiepiscopal manors were being run as functioning manorial units rather than exploited on a rentier basis is clear from the documentation generated by the first forfeiture of Alexander Bicknor's temporalities. Both the extents of 1326\(^\text{180}\) and the accounts of the issues of the demesne and of manorial stock in 1323\(^\text{181}\) clearly indicate that the demesnes were still *sub carucis domini*. This being the case, it is inconceivable that there would not have been a manorial official accounting on a basis similar to that of the manorial reeve in the lordship of Carlow. Whether or not this official was a *famulus* or whether there were *famuli* on these manors cannot, however, be deduced from any of the surviving records.

\(^{179}\) See Chapter III p. 97.


The account rendered by Thomas de Chaddesworth for the temporalities between 1272 and 1277 provides some indication of the likely administrative practices on the manors of the archbishopric. De Chaddesworth claimed, amongst his allowances, for the fees of the bailiffs and repair of houses, mills and other expenses on the manors of Swords, Finglas, Clondalkin, Shankill, Colonia, Tallaght, Rathcoole and Ballymore. The common administrative denominator would appear to be the bailiff, in as much as one was based in each of the major manorial centres of the archbishopric. The connection between the bailiffs' fees and routine expenditure on maintenance would seem to indicate that the fees were classified in a similar category, which in turn would imply that these bailiffs were retained on a regular basis for a fixed salary. Although in Exchequer terms bailiff had certain military connotations, this cannot have been the case in the archbishopric, for Finglas, Clondalkin, Tallaght and Rathcoole were never of any significant military importance. It would, therefore, be logical to assume that these bailiffs fulfilled the same role, on a roughly similar basis, as the Carlow reeve, but whether or not the actual term bailiff remained in use must be questioned in view of a series of accounts between Walter de Shakenhurth and John de Bretton and certain archiepiscopal officials. It transpires from this account that there were reeves in Clondalkin, Finglas, Swords, Rathcoole and Ballymore, together with a keeper of the haggard at Swords, during the vacancy following John de Leek's death. These accounts were actually recognizances of the amount of grain in store on these manors at the end of de Shakenhurth's and de Bretton's own period of account and show that, in this particular instance, reeves, or officials here described as reeves, were fulfilling some of the functions of the Carlow reeves. Indeed, there is even a possibility that the custos haggardi of Swords may have been acting in a similar capacity to the officer acting as both reeve and custos grangie of Fennagh. Reeves were also active on the manors of the archbishopric following the death of Richard de Haverings in November 1310, but in 1315 John de Ufford claimed allowances in his account of the issues of the archbishopric for the fee of the bailiff of Clondalkin. A 1419 commission of appointment for a bailiff of the manor of Dalkey has survived in Alen's Register.

184. See above p. 249.
Thus, there is a certain amount of ambiguity with regard to the designation of the official actually managing and, presumably, accounting for the issues of the various manors of the archbishopric. In all likelihood the bailiff performed the same functions as the manorial reeve in Carlow, though the possibility that the Fennagh relationship between the bailiff and reeve as joint but not equal accountants, cannot be entirely excluded. 188.

The use of the term reeve in the early fourteenth century accounts probably reflects the use of a familiar term by officials more accustomed to the titles and designations in the royal manors, or, perhaps, a short-term borrowing on the part of the archbishopric of designations from the administrative hierarchy of the royal manors, which was in turn reinforced by recurring vacancies and the practices of royal administrators.

One particular borrowing taken from the administrative structure of the royal manors is that receivers were active on the lands of the archbishopric both during the reign of specific prelates and during vacancies. Royal receivers had first appeared in the counties in 1310 and receivers were also appointed to the royal manors at approximately the same time. 189.

This was a refinement of debt collection procedures: in the case of the counties it provided a check on the sheriff and in the royal demesne manors it provided a similar check on the activities of the reeve. In both cases there was a certain suggestion of roll and counter-roll as reeve and receiver and sheriff and receiver were generally summoned to account in tandem at the Exchequer. Where the royal manors were concerned, this was one of a number of innovations designed to eliminate the massive debts that had mounted up during the closing years of the thirteenth century. It is hard to conceive of a similar need on the archiepiscopal manors, for, despite certain signs of contraction and the increasingly precarious position of Castlekevin, and, to a lesser extent, Ballymore, no evidence of debt on the scale of that found on the royal manors has survived for the lands of the archbishopric. Had there been a problem of this nature, it would almost certainly have surfaced during vacancies, either in officials accounts or in the form of petitions for relief from the tenantry seeking deferrals in terms for the payment of rents and release from debts similar to the requests made in petitions submitted on a regular basis by the tenants of Newcastle Lyons and Saggard to the Exchequer. 190. Despite this disparity in conditions, receivers were active during John Leek's archbishopric and also during the vacancy

188. See above n. 184.
189. See Chapter III p. 132.
190. See Chapter I pp 18-20.
prior to the provision of Alexander Bicknor. 191.

The major difference between local manorial administration on the manors of the archbishopric and on the manors of the lordship of Carlow was the integration of the court system in the Dublin manors with the general court structures of the archiepiscopal liberty. Unlike Carlow, courts held on the archiepiscopal manors were presided over by the Seneschal of the liberty. 192. This is another instance of practice within the royal demesne influencing administrative practices in the archiepiscopal lands as the Seneschal of the royal demesne was the presiding officer at the courts of the royal demesne manors.

Thus, in the early fourteenth century, the archiepiscopal manors could be said to have straddled some form of middle ground between the administrative structures found on the lordship of Carlow in the late 1280’s and the formalised structures found on the royal manors from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The demesne land was still under direct cultivation in the 1320’s, though from evidence of deteriorating soil quality both in Clondalkin and Colonia, 193 it is more than likely that in those manors, at any rate, the administration would eventually have been organised on more of a rentier basis. It is unfortunate that no further detailed account data has survived for these manors as the transition from one form of management to the other could, reasonably, have been expected to have become visible either by the end of the 1320’s due to the effects of earlier famines and crises such as the wet years, and possibly sparked off by the agrarian crisis of the mid 1320’s or by the mid 1330’s as a result of the cumulative impact of all of these crises together with the greater Dublin famine of 1330-2. Yet it should also be remembered that there may have been a certain degree of reluctance on the part of ecclesiastical landlords to abandon direct cultivation of their demesnes. There is firm evidence of direct cultivation of Ossory demesne land in 1330-1 194 and of continuous cultivation of the demesne land of the priory of Holy Trinity in the 1340’s. 195.

Administrative structures and the function of the officials on the royal demesne lands of Dublin and Kildare were determined by two factors in the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. These were royal

193. See Chapter III, pp 109-11
patronage and attempts from the late thirteenth century onwards to restore the profitability of the most valuable of these manors, Saggard and Newcastle Lyons, both of which had become increasingly burdened by debt. Of these two, the question of profitability was undoubtedly the more important, and many of the solutions attempted were closely related to attempts to increase the efficiency of shire administration. Profitability would have been crucial and the lack of it all the more obvious in that direct cultivation of the demesnes of royal manors in the vale of Dublin had ceased by the mid-thirteenth century, and thereafter these manors were exploited on a purely rentier basis. 196.

This exploitation initially took the form of leasing the royal manors at an annual fixed farm, for which the farmer of each manor was liable, and obliged to account. 197. Had the manors and their farmers not become increasingly burdened by debt by the end of the thirteenth century, this would have been the cheapest and, from the Exchequer's point of view, the easiest way of administering these manors. Exchequer involvement was minimal: the farmers accounted and paid up and there were no local officials in need of pay, patronage and supervision.

A serious deterioration in the military situation in the last quarter of the thirteenth century meant that the most valuable of the royal manors, Saggard and Newcastle Lyons, became increasingly vulnerable to raids from the Irish of the Leinster mountains. Marginal land may also have begun to deteriorate in this period due to worsening climatic conditions. 198. First the farmers of Saggard, and then those of Newcastle Lyons, fell into serious, continuous and cumulative debt, so that by the early years of the fourteenth century, the compound debt in both manors was five and six times the annual fixed farm. 199. In short, farms which had been fixed when profits from the royal manors would have been at their highest, with virgin land coming under cultivation and the prospect of further expansion, represented a hopelessly optimistic estimate of the potential revenue of these manors, given the conditions of the late thirteenth century. 200.

Reorganisation of the shire of Dublin, which had begun in 1297 and was
only completed in 1302, together with the acquisition of Ralph Pippard's manors of Leixlip and Castlewarden, with its borough of Ughterard probably interacted and to a certain extent may have forced administrative reform. The transition from the leasing of royal manors by farmers to their management by reeves took place in 1306, and two of the new appointees, William Kissok of Esker and John Clement of Bray, were subsequently summoned to appear at the Exchequer in Hilary term, 1307. While, superficially, this transition could be seen as a determination on the part of the Exchequer to re-assert direct royal control in the administration of the demesne manors, in practical terms little was changed. No attempt was made to place the demesne lands sub carucis domini. Such lands had probably been leased out piecemeal during the time these manors were held at farm and the overall lack of profitability of the existing manorial structure would probably have discouraged any form of innovative change in which was involved a certain amount of risk. Reeves on the royal manors were obliged to account for the original fixed farm, rather than for the issues of the manor, which meant that they simply inherited, on a smaller scale, the problems faced by their predecessors the farmers, with one exception. The large arrears dating from the late thirteenth century in both Saggard and Newcastle Lyons became the responsibility of the tenantry, rather than the reeve, and this, in a sense, gave the reeves of royal demesne manors a false respite.

A further aspect of this reform appears to have been the institution of the office of Seneschal of the Royal Demesne in 1307. This official had responsibility for holding the courts of the royal manors and for all matters relating to the courts such as the taking of fealty, the delivery of land to the rightful heir or person to whom it had been granted, and, following the plague visitations of the 1360's administering and implementing the modifications and reductions in rent.

201. For a full account of the reshiring see M.C. Lyons 'Shire Administration in Dublin and Meath 1297-1302' unpublished Moderatorship thesis, presented T.C.D. 1978, Chapter I.


204. See Chapter I pp 18-20, p. 41. The temporary nature of the respite is borne out in the new accumulation of debt apparent by the 1330's.

205. See Chapter I, pp 46-7.
He accounted for the issues of the courts, a function which was thus never in the hands of the manorial reeve, and appears to have acted in all of the royal manors with the exception of Bray, Newcastle McKynegan and possibly Leixlip, which may have had its own seneschal. Specific military problems at Newcastle McKynegan necessitated the appointment of a constable, who may well have also acted as seneschal, and there would have been no need for the seneschal to act at Chapelizod, the only one of the original core of manors to have remained at farm.

The last potentially constructive step in the reorganisation of the royal manors was taken in 1310, with the appointment of individual receivers for the various manors. This was in line with the administrative policy being pursued within the shires, where receivers were appointed in the same year. The purpose of this appointment was similar to that of the shire receiver, and meant that both the manorial reeve and the sheriff came more closely under Exchequer control. Speculation on the part of individual reeves would thus have become more difficult and debt collection more efficient as a result of these appointments. By 1350, however, the offices of manorial reeve and receiver had been merged: possibly an indication that the Exchequer had by then abandoned all hope of restoring the royal manors to their former profitability, but also, perhaps, as one of the results of the Black Death. People were rarely willing to accept this sort of office, and any lessening of the pool from which reeves and receivers could be drawn may have necessitated this form of rationalisation.

The importance of patronage in the administration of the royal manors is to be seen in two specific areas, the spasmodic farming out of certain manors after 1306 and the appointments and perquisites of Seneschals of Demesne beginning with Thomas de Dent in 1332. Farmers of Chapelizod, from Richard Woodhouse's time onwards, were without exception, men of importance, and this manor was ultimately leased at farm to the priors of Kilmainham in return for a substantial loan from the Hospitallers to the Exchequer. Esker, Crumlin and Newcastle Lyons were also leased at

206. See Thomas de Warilow's account as Seneschal, Pipe Roll 6 Ed. III, D.K.R. vol. 43, p. 66. The Seneschal did not act in either of these manors, or in any manor at farm.


208. See Chapter I, pp 43-4

209. See Chapter I, p. 40
farm for short periods of time to men who had distinguished themselves in the King's service during the reign of Edward III.\textsuperscript{210}. Thomas de Dent was the first of a long series of Seneschals of Demesne with either Exchequer or Chancery associations,\textsuperscript{211} and ultimately the office was to become a sinecure for some royal minister for whose service a relatively minor reward of this nature was deemed appropriate.\textsuperscript{212} Mary Seneschals also held good and relatively profitable tenements on one or other of the royal manors, usually the mill tenement at Kilmactawley in Newcastle Lyons.\textsuperscript{213}

Rentier exploitation in its purest form was, however, apparent in the case of Elizabeth de Clare's Irish lands.\textsuperscript{214} She herself was ruthlessly practical in relation to these holdings. Her persistence in bringing to court officials who had failed to account\textsuperscript{215} and the thoroughness with which accounts were compiled are compelling proofs of her interest in the profitability of her Irish lands.\textsuperscript{216} Her preparedness to sanction the expenditure of local revenue on paying off potential raiders and marauders and also protecting her messengers in Connacht indicates that, while interested in maximising profits, hers was not a short sighted policy. Her officials were not unprepared to reinvest sufficient money to maintain a basic level of profitability and to protect an immensely extended lordship.

That this form of administration should have been adopted by Elizabeth de Clare as the most profitable and sensible option is, in a sense, symptomatic of the prevailing economic conditions. Grain was no longer

\textsuperscript{210} See Chapter I, pp 41-2.

\textsuperscript{211} Ibid., pp 50-1.

\textsuperscript{212} Ibid., p. 51.

\textsuperscript{213} Ibid. p. 28, n. 73.

\textsuperscript{214} See Chapter IV, pp 134-8.

\textsuperscript{215} cf. Pl.R.9-10 Ed. III, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/20 p. 104, p. 123. In Easter term 1336 Elizabeth de Clare had distraints levied from Robert le Blount of Callan and three of her receivers in Meath for failing to render adequate accounts.

\textsuperscript{216} Although only receivers' accounts, the thoroughness with which the Ulster accounts of 1353-4 and 1357-8 were compiled is unusual. See P.R.O., S.C.6 1239/32 and 33 and for rather careless abstracts of these accounts, T.E. MacNeill, Anglo-Norman Ulster, Edinburgh, 1980, pp 137-47.
a high profit crop. It was vulnerable to attack both from man and from
the elements. Some argument might have been made for maintaining
unprofitable demesne land in the case of a resident lord, and this may
be why the demesnes of the bishopric of Ossory were under cultivation in
1330-1, but such arguments would have had little relevance in the case
of an absentee lord such as Elizabeth de Clare. When there was no need
to administer and maintain demesne cultivation, administration by receiver
was the only logical approach to estate management.

Despite the fact that a considerable series of local accounts have survived
for all of Elizabeth's Kilkenny possessions, and on a more sporadic
basis, for her other lands, with the exception of the Limerick and
Tipperary manors, little can be said about actual manorial administration
as a result of these survivals. Their structure is identical: all were
simply income and expenditure accounts, something closely akin to the
borough account. Local receivers listed income from rents, farms and
courts, which was then either spent locally on essentials such as parchment
for court rolls or delivered to regional sub-receivers or to the receiver
general of Elizabeth's lands in Ireland. Manorial structures and
profitability can be determined from such accounts, but little can be said
about the administration, probably because there would have been relatively
little to say in any case. Leasing demesne lands would have eliminated
the need to retain famuli or to hire labour unless the manor in question
were more heavily involved in stock rearing than in grain production.
It is not without significance that the agrarian revival of the mid-
fifteenth century was in fact based on cattle rearing. A measure of the
successfulness of the rentier form of administration on Elizabeth de Clare's
lands is the way in which these lands managed to withstand the demographic
crisis arising as a result of the cumulative mortality of successive
outbreaks of the Black Death with minimised loss of revenue.

It is fortunate that the four case studies undertaken in this thesis
portray the likely evolution of Irish manorial administration over this

218. See Chapter IV: Appendix V.
219. See Chapter IV: Appendices I (Ulster), II (Connacht), III (Tipperary:
     and Limerick) and IV (de Verdun dower lands).
220. See Chapter IV pp 135-6.
221. See Chapter IV p. 142 and also Chapter I pp 37-8 for possible belated impact of the plague.
period, all the more so in that they are the only four groups of manors for which the sources are sufficiently rich to sustain an examination of this nature. Underlying the transition from reeve to receiver can be seen the impact of the recurring agrarian crises of the late thirteenth and first half of the fourteenth centuries, as can the effect of the expansion of the march and the general deterioration in the military situation confronting the Dublin administration. The impact of these factors can also be seen both on tenurial relationships and on the basic structure of the manor itself in the lordship of Ireland. In conclusion, it is clear that pressure on the manorial system was ultimately such that recovery was only possible in terms of a movement away from grain based agriculture to stock rearing and that in a sense the transitional element symbolised by the rentier administration of estates in mid fourteenth century Ireland paralleled the attempt on the part of the central administration to come to terms with the military and strategic problems facing the lordship. Acceptance of the new status quo of the local dominance of the over-mighty subject be he Gaelic or Anglo-Irish and the transition from tillage to stock rearing were little less than the essential preconditions for the economic revival of the fifteenth century.
CHAPTER VI

Having defined and categorised the various forms of manorial structure current in the lordship of Ireland in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it is now necessary to examine the component parts of that structure, the basic forms of tenurial relationship then current. This is of considerable importance, because of the diversity of conditions within any given category. In some cases the size of the holding and the terms under which it was held can be seen to be governed by the location of the manor. Cases in point would be military tenure on the two great Butler manors of Thurles and Nenagh \(^1\) and the forms of tenure found on marcher manors such as Loxeudy and Dunnamase \(^2\). At the other end of the scale, the difference in the tenurial conditions of betaghs at Cloncurry and Lisronagh can be seen to reflect two separate stages in the use of that form of tenure. In Cloncurry, where demesne cultivation had been streamlined by 1304, \(^3\) no customary services or commutations were owed by the betaghs, while at Lisronagh, a manor further from any major centre of the grain trade, betagh services were very thoroughly listed in the 1333 extent. \(^4\). Forms of burgess tenure also varied from area to area, but this may have stemmed as much from the needs and preferences of the original grantor of the charter as the borough's proximity to the march.

There has, to date, been no comprehensive examination of these categories. While Curtis used the 1333 extent as a vehicle to publish his notes on betagh status, these were far from comprehensive \(^5\). Although he included some material relating to the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne, and other charters, his examination of source material was by no means exhaustive. It was important pioneering work, but ultimately it is a limited treatment of a very important subject. O'Loan's tenurial notes in his edition of the 1304 Cloncurry extent are both brief and unsatisfactory \(^6\). Mac Niocaill's intention in *Na Buirgeisi* was to examine corporate structures and the urban economy in Ireland from the thirteenth to the

---

1. See below, pp 317-8.
2. See below, pp 243-4, p 227.
4. See below, pp 284-5 and Table III.
fifteenth century. This was really too broad a canvas on which to provide the sort of definition necessary to place the manorial borough in its proper context. Thus, in order to provide as comprehensive an examination as possible of manorial structures and the manorial economy in Ireland, it is necessary to examine, define and categorise the forms of tenurial relationships current in the lordship throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Tenurial status and lord/tenant relationships in the lordship of Ireland were heavily influenced by the fact that Ireland was a colony in which it was important to encourage settlement. For this reason all forms of tenure, even those which were more servile in nature, were burdened with less onerous obligations than was the case in the more heavily manorialised areas of England. Free tenements in more settled parts of the lordship were relatively unencumbered. Those held by military tenure, owing scutage when royal service was proclaimed, were frequently held by an extremely low annual rent or by this obligation alone. Not all would have owed suit to the lord's court. By and large the rents derived from non-military free tenements were higher, and thus closer to the economic value of the land. The rural boroughs, together with the liberties and customs enjoyed by their burgesses were another aspect of attempts made by individual lords to consolidate settlement within their lordships. Even in the case of less attractive forms of tenure, obligations appear to have been lighter than those in areas of well-established settlement in England. However, rent derived from such tenements, especially from land held at farm and from land held ad voluntatem domini appears to have been extremely close to the actual value of the land. Betaghry, the tenurial condition in the lordship most closely corresponding to villeinage in England was but a pale shadow of its English counterpart. If a comparison is to be drawn between tenurial conditions and status prevalent in the lordship of Ireland and those in England, a strong similarity between conditions found in the Welsh march or the extensive marchlands on the Scottish border becomes apparent. Thus, in Ireland the military security of the colony and the density and quality of settlement were closely related. This relationship underlies the extremely light rents, obligations and forms of customary service found in the lordship

7. G. MacNiocaill, Na Buirgeisi, vol. II, Dublin 1964. The compilation of borough charters in volume one has, however, made my task immeasurably easier.

of Ireland throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

While conditions of tenure were more favourable to the tenant in Ireland than was the case in many parts of England, this did not obliterate the fundamental distinction between the free and the unfree. Certain factors did, however, tend to blur this distinction and one in particular, that of nationality, gave rise to a certain degree of confusion based on the standing of both the free hibernicus and the betagh vis à vis the royal courts and the operation of the common law. Although an Irishman might be personally free, his position at law was essentially that of the English villein. He could not initiate proceedings in the King's courts and was personally outside the protection of the common law.

The phrase used by a defendant alleging that the plaintiff was Irish was of the general form that X was an hibernicus et non de libero sanguine. While this statement appears to indicate a degree of personal servility analogous to that of the English villein, even seeming to equate the term hibernicus with those of nativus and betagius, such was not the case. Irishry was merely a legal disability, used to block legal redress in cases where Irish men might have been assaulted, robbed or murdered or where a widow of Irish race was unacceptably attempting to claim dower from her Anglo-Irish husband's lands. The plea of Irishry could also be used to block proceedings in cases of novel disseisin.

Means of legal redress were, however, available to persons of Irish race at the royal courts under two conditions. An Irishman might be joint plaintiff with the King in a legal action, the nearest parallel to this in English law being the joint action initiated by the King on behalf of a villein or number of villeins on foot of the writ monstraverunt in cases pertaining to ancient demesne. The second option open to the Irishman seeking legal redress in the royal courts was to become of the avowry of a certain Anglo-Irish magnate who would, as a result of this connection, treat all offences perpetrated against that particular Irishman as offences against his own dignity and property.

10. Ibid., pp 105-6, p. 108.
interesting corollary to this concept is that in cases of theft where an Englishman was alleging that one of the hibernici of his avowry had been robbed, the goods or animals which formed the basis of the action, were, in the eyes of the law, the property of the Englishman. Cases also survive of men claiming as of right goods belonging to one of the hibernici of their avowry following his death. The basic difference between the hibernicus and the betagh is to be seen in their relative positions in manorial society.

Irishmen might hold free and heritable tenements without the taint of betaghry. An instance of this nature occurred on the estates of the bishopric of Cloyne and the difference is thrown into even sharper relief in the 1322 extent of the de Lacy manor of Rathfeigh. The hibernici of Rathfeigh held a tenement of 20 acres in return for an annual render of a hen, while the betaghs of that manor owed both monetary rent and specified labour services. The relative freedom of the hibernicus is also demonstrated by the fact that an Irishman dissatisfied with the protection extended to him by the lord to whose avowry he belonged might go, if he so chose, to another lord more capable of protecting his interests. Thus, the situation might best be summed up in saying that while all betaghs were hibernici, not all Irishmen were betaghs.

The extremely light labour services exacted in Ireland and the nature of their exaction also tended to obscure social distinctions. Certain standard tests could be applied to determine a man’s social condition in most parts of England. The obligation to perform any form of unspecified or uncertain work such as week work, coupled with liability to render a heriot and pay either merchet or childwite have been identified as the

13. Calendar of Justiciary Rolls 1295-1303, p. 93. Edmunda, wife of William le Poer, claimed the goods of one Sadona, who had been murdered, by virtue of the fact that she was her hibernica.


15. P.R.O. C 47 10/18 (3).

16. C.J.R. 1308-1314 p. 54. In the course of an extremely complicated damages case heard in April 1308, it transpired that one of Guido Cokerel’s hibernici, William Gillnengill who thought his interest in a share cropping operation with John Tyrel had been lost approached Richard Tuyt and became his man. Tuyt and his retinue then intervened on Gillnengill's behalf, rescuing what he alleged were his goods.
classic signs of villeinage.\textsuperscript{17} Such a test would be impossible in the Irish context. If the surviving custumals and extents are typical of the general situation in the lordship, week work does not appear to have been exacted in Ireland. The similarity both in the nature and the amount of labour services exacted from certain groups of betaghs and cottars poses serious questions on the form of social stratification in the lordship of Ireland, indicating that in all likelihood the cottar and not the betagh formed the base of the rural economic pyramid.\textsuperscript{18} The existence of burgess-betaghs on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne also poses a serious question about the nature of social stratification. A separate and thorough examination of the condition of both the betagh and the cottar is necessary if any form of classification is to be produced.

The Betagh

Much has already been written concerning the origin of the term \textit{betarius} or betagh and its subsequent application. Two alternative derivations of the term were given as possible roots by Curtis, the legal terms bothach and biadhtach.\textsuperscript{19} The most recent work on this aspect of betaghry, that of Hand and Mac Niocaill, diverges sharply on this issue. To Mac Niocaill, the most important element in the term betagh is its phonetic relationship to the Irish word \textit{biatach}, a provider of food.\textsuperscript{20} The major problem posed by this identification is the fact that under Brehon law the biadhtach was a person of considerable importance and social standing, who had an obligation either to maintain a guest house or to provide hospitality.\textsuperscript{21} The alternative approach, that favoured by Hand and originated by Binchy, is to examine the status of the betagh and to contrast it with one of its Brehon near equivalents, the bothach.\textsuperscript{22}

The bothach was a tenant at will whose right to leave the land might be forfeited through residence there for more than nine generations. By this time the bothach was deemed to have become one of the sen-cleithe, an hereditary serf bound to the land. The term bothach also has the connotation of cottar, which may be of considerable significance when

\textsuperscript{17} P. Vinogradoff, Villeinage in England, Oxford 1892, pp 82-3, pp 153-4, pp 159-60.
\textsuperscript{18} See below, pp 294-5.
\textsuperscript{19} R.I.A.\textit{proc.}, vol. 43 (1935-7) hereafter referred to as Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, pp 63-4.
\textsuperscript{21} Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, p. 63 and Hand, Status of the Native Irish, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{22} Hand, Status of the Native Irish, p. 99.
one considers the close relationship between the labour services exacted
from certain groups of cottars, such as those of Colpe, Duleek, Dunmore
and the lands of the Friary of Holy Trinity, with what might be termed
standard betagh services. It should be noted, however, that a clear
distinction was drawn between the works owed by betaghs and cottars on
the manor of Lisronagh, where the burden of work borne by the cottar
was substantially lighter than that borne by the betagh.

It is in the period immediately following the conquest that the first
signs of the emergence of betaghry, as it seems to have existed in the
thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, are to be found. There is also a
strong possibility that betagh status or something closely akin to it
had begun to emerge, together, perhaps, with an embryonic and primitive
form of feudalism in Leinster prior to the conquest. In an undated
charter drawn up while he was King of Leinster conveying certain lands
at Baldoyle to the bishop of Louth, Dermot Mac Murrough specified that
the land was granted cum hominibus suis scilicet Melicu Macfeilegan cum
fillie et nepotibus suis. The actual status of these men is not
mentioned in the charter, though it is clear that they are of some group
akin both to the sen-cleithe and the feudal villein. In a subsequent
quit-claim Richard de Feypo granted to the prior and convent of All Hallows
Richard MacKelegan, Christian MacKilegan, Murdach MacKilegan and Gillesman
MacKilegan cum tota nacione sua de BalyduTy cum serviciis suis cum exitu
suo et progenie ab ea nacione processa et processura. While both of
these grants are of considerable significance in that they show the
existence of a class of tenant which was more or less bound to the land,
it is important to note that in neither is given an exact designation of
this form of tenant. Curtis has, in my opinion, misconstrued part of
the de Feypo quit claim when he refers to the MacKilegans as servi
because of a somewhat misleading heading in the register. The cum
serviciis of the grant refers only to the customary service due from these
men while the title to the grant in the register concessio et donacio
quorundam servorum is almost certainly based on the fifteenth century
compiler's interpretation of the contents of the document. A similar
problem is posed by Curtis' interpretation of part of the Treaty of Windsor.

23. See below pp 290-1, M 293-4.
25. R. Butler, Register of All Hallows, Dublin 1845, No. 49.
26. Ibid., no. 53.
27. Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, p. 65
28. R. Butler, Register of All Hallows, no. 53 and for the origin of
the register p. xxxiiij.
There is nothing to indicate that the *Hibernenses* of the Treaty of Windsor were anything other than refugees. 29. Although it was agreed that the Irish who had fled might return to their former lands if they paid to the new lords the services that they had been wont to render, this is not necessarily an indication of instant depression into villeinage. 30. Nor should the clause obliging Rory O'Connor to return to the area under Anglo-Norman Control those Irish who were unwilling to return of their won accord be seen in this light. In the confusion which followed the conquest both free and unfree Irish would have fled from lands which were either in Norman hands or whose possession was contested. The Treaty of Windsor should rather be seen in this context as an attempt to restore the status quo ante, with the superimposition of a new caste of rulers in the area under Norman control, than the first step in the depression of the free Irish into serfdom. Thus, the reading of the Treaty of Windsor advanced by Curtis depends on the acceptance that the terms *hibernicus* and *betagh* were identical, which was not the case.

There is, however, a clear connection between the terms *nativus* and *betagh*, *nativus* being a term used in English law to denote villein. The writ which initiated legal action in the case of securing the return of betaghs who had fled from their lord's land was that of *de nativo habendo*. This writ, together with that of *de libertate probenda*, was contained in a register of writs sent to Ireland in 1227. 31. The use of the term *nativus* in English law had meant that the extension of its use to the lordship of Ireland was purely a matter of course. The co-existence of the terms *hibernicus* and *nativus* at law is of itself an indication of separate and unrelated legal meanings.

The first appearance of persons similar in status to the betagh in official records after the conquest is in 1204, when an agreement was made between the King of Connacht and King John, in which Cathal Crovderg ceded two-thirds of Connacht to the King. 32. On completion of this transaction the Justiciar was ordered to ensure that no villeins or fugitives remained in Gaelic lands with their progeny or chattels. A similar order followed the quit-claim of Dungarvan to the King. 33. Unfortunately, these references cannot be taken as proof positive that there were villeins in either Dungarvan or Connacht. They merely indicate

32. *Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland* 1169-1251, No. 222.
33. Ibid. No. 223.
that the King wished the Justiciar to ensure that the value of these quit-claims was not diminished through a policy of deliberate depopulation. The use of the term *villanus*, which was never really current in Ireland and the fact that these writs originated in England seems to point to the insertion of this clause in the Justiciar's orders as being a matter of form rather than on order relating to a known set of circumstances. A writ issued during John's reign on behalf of St. Mary's Abbey in Dublin requested the Justiciars (sic) of Ireland to take similar action in returning *nativi* and *fugitivi* who had fled from abbey lands and were anywhere in County Dublin other than on the King's demesnes. The use of the terms *nativi* and *fugitivi* may either indicate a desire on the part of the Abbey to return to the situation which prevailed prior to the conquest, similar to that expressed in the Treaty of Windsor or the existence of both servile and free Irish who had fled from abbey lands thereby diminishing their value.

One of the earliest uses of the term *betagiun* occurred in 1219 in relation to the King's lands at Othee and Obrun in the Dublin mountains where settlements of betaghs owed both a monetary rent and a customary render in kind. The term betagh passed into common usage in the course of the first half of the thirteenth century and became the universally accepted designation of an unfree Irish customary tenant by the end of that century. In examining the status and condition of the betagh in Ireland reference to the *raison d'être* of villeinage and of customary service in general is of the utmost importance. Such service was originally seen as essential to ensure the cultivation of the lord's demesne. In Ireland manorial infrastructure and its associated agricultural practices were superimposed on the social structures of a society whose previous agricultural endeavours were not directed towards the production of grain in saleable quantities. In this context attempts to ensure the production of a saleable grain surplus may be seen as the origin of the customary services associated both with betaghry in Ireland and villeinage in England. Such, however, were the nature and inadequacies of labour services in Ireland that those manors specialising in grain production tended to rely on casual hired labour and the permanent corps of the *famuli* rather than upon customary services. The practice on the Bigod estates in the late thirteenth century, where the manorial economy was largely geared towards the production of grain and supplies for both the Welsh and Scottish wars, was to rely as far as possible on the *famuli*, using hired labour to provide back-up services at harvest time. 35.

---

which also specialised in grain production was entirely dependent on hired labour by 1304. In its extent of that year the expenses of the various stages of cultivation were minutely costed and it is highly significant that the sixty-three betaghs of that manor did not owe any customary services but rather paid an extremely high rent on an acreage basis for their land. It is worth noting that this reliance on hired labour and the *famuli* was also a common feature of the Welsh march, where, by and large, labour services were extremely light as was also the case with northern march areas such as the lands of Bolton Priory. Thus, areas of recent conquest, such as Ireland and Wales or manors which lay within the march close to the Scottish raiding routes such as the Cumbrian manors examined by J.E. Jolliffe, and Bolton Priory were joined by this common link: labour services there were light in comparison with those exacted on estates in more settled areas of England, such as the lands of the Abbeys of Westminster, Peterborough and Crowland.

Betagh Services in Ireland

The study of the customary obligations of the betagh in Ireland is hampered by the lack of surviving custumals and extents which incorporate elements of the custumal. Despite this somewhat limited pool of source material, it is, nevertheless, possible to draw certain general conclusions from the material which has survived. The major extant custumals are to be found in a 1322 extent of the manor of Rathfeigh in County Meath, the enrolled register known as the Pipe Roll of Cloyne and the 1333 extent of the manor of Lisronagh. There are certain common features

40. B.Harvey, Westminster Abbey and its Estates in the Middle Ages, Oxford 1977, pp 216-223. It is clear that week work occasionally of the order of three to four days a week was owed by the villeins on some of the Abbey lands, though in many places week work was commutable. F.M.Page, The Estates of Crowland Abbey, Cambridge 1934, pp 101-3. The incidence of work varied on the Abbey's manors, but in all cases apart from that of Elmington, where the villeins only owed 15 works per annum, week work of between a day a week and three days a week was undertaken. E.King, Peterborough Abbey 1086-1310, Cambridge 1973, pp 142-3. Week work on these estates varied between one and three days a week.
41. P.R.O., C47 10/18 (3). As this is a single membrane more detailed reference is impossible. See also Chapter VI: Table I.
42. This was first published by Richard Caulfield in 1859. The definitive edition is that of J.O'Riordan and J.Coleman, which is a parallel annotated text and was published in volumes 19-23 of J.Hist.Arch.Soc.(1913-17).
43. The text of this extent is given in Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, pp 41-51.
in all of these lists of services. The main services are those of assisting at the lord's harvest, weeding the lord's crops and on both the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne and the manor of Lisronagh, ploughing the lord's demesne at the time of the winter and spring sowings. This establishes a clear if almost indefinable relationship between the amount of land held in betaghry, the amount of land in the lord's demesne and the nature of the works specified in the custumal. There is scattered evidence of another relationship which is even less susceptible to definition. This is the relationship between rent paid by betaghs together with the payments made by them for the commutation of customary services and the size of the demesne coupled with the extent to which it was under direct cultivation. The overall impression conveyed by the extant evidence is that the labour services rendered by the betagh in Ireland were light. As a corollary, the main work of cultivation in many places was either carried out by the *famuli* or by casually hired labour. This also appears to have been the case in many parts of the Welsh march, where the employment of hired labour was of major significance in the cultivation of the manorial demesne. 44. In dealing with the question of labour services I shall first examine the three main sources of information to which I have already alluded and shall then turn to the evidence contained in some of the less detailed extents.

(i) Rathfeigh

The services rendered by the betaghs of Rathfeigh are the least onerous of those of which detailed evidence has survived. There were 300 acres of demesne land on this manor and 922 acres of land in the hands of the local betaghs. It is worth noting that a further 143 acres of betagh land lay waste at Rathfeigh in 1322. Had this been fully tenanted the relationship between the demesne acreage and the land in betagh hands would have been of the ratio of 300:1065. The betagh land at Rathfeigh was divided into eight granges of varying sizes, the largest being Karyngistoun, which contained 311 acres, and the smallest being Galingallstoun, which contained 48 acres and was in the hands of one tenant. One of the smaller granges, Hamstoun, which contained 52 acres, was completely waste in 1322. An average rent of 1s. per acre for betagh lands prevailed at Rathfeigh.

Certain significant patterns in landholding are obvious in the various granges, as is a clear division between the betagh holding a substantial

tenement and the smallholder. In the largest of the granges, Karyngistoun, where there were twelve tenants holding in betaghry, five held tenements of at least 40 acres, while of the remainder only one tenant held a tenement of 20 acres, two held tenements of 10 acres and the others each held less than 10 acres. There was only one major tenant in Salvystoun who held almost half of the area of the grange with a tenement of 61 acres. The other six tenants held considerably smaller tenements with three each holding tenements of 12 acres and the remaining three each holding tenements of 5 acres, which was little more than a large cottar's holding. Differences in the size of holdings on the other five granges were, however, less extreme.

While the labour services demanded from the Rathfeigh betaghs could be said to have had a central core, that of carrying service at harvest time, a majority of the tenants also owed more extensive carrying service which was imposed *ad voluntatem domini*. Clearly, the frequency with which such a service was exacted depended on the presence of either the lord or his chief minister at the manor and could, in practice, have been extremely onerous.\(^{45}\) A number of betaghs also owed weeding service. The harvest works were valued at 1\(\frac{1}{2}\)d each and a day's weeding at \(\frac{3}{4}\)d, an indication that it was probably possible to purchase the commutation of these services. No mention is made in this extent of uncertain works such as week work, which was one of the classic distinguishing marks of villeinage in England. The only other service demanded from the betaghs of Rathfeigh was the render of pannage. This was levied at the rate of a pig for the first seven pigs kept by any tenant, though those who kept more than seven pigs did not pay any additional render. No attempt was made in the extent to determine a monetary valuation for the likely annual yield of pannage.

An interesting feature of the Rathfeigh extent is the fact that no attempt appears to have been made to co-relate the size of a man's holding with the variable labour services of weeding and reaping in harvest time.\(^{46}\) Three of the tenants at Staristoun owed a day's weeding and worked at harvest apart from their carrying services. Of these tenants one held 32\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres, another 20 acres and the third 14 acres. While the tenant at Mcberchinston owed three days' weeding and three harvest works for a holding of 62 acres, the tenant at Salvystoun holding 61 acres owed

\(^{45}\) See Chapter VI: Table I for abstract of betagh holding section - 1322 extent of Rathfeigh.

\(^{46}\) See Chapter VI: Table I.
neither form of service. These differences were not compensated for by a higher basic rent or other payment. In fact a farmer at Karyngistoun holding 40 acres at farm paid an annual rent of 2 marks for all services or 8d. an acre, which was considerably lower than that paid by his betagh neighbours from whom services were demanded. This could be a reflection of the quality of the land in question, or the demand for land at the time when the farm was agreed or even the competence and honesty of the official who assessed the farm. It is probably a fair conclusion, on the basis of the works listed in this extent, that either famuli or hired labourers were retained to plough the demesne and carry out the routine work of cultivation during the year. Nor can one rule out the possibility that extra labourers were hired at harvest time. It is clear that the demesne at Rathfeigh could not have been cultivated by the customary services of its indigenous betaghs, which is, perhaps, an ironic commentary on the extremely large amount of land in the hands of its betaghs and the light labour services of that manor.

(ii) Lisronagh, County Tipperary

The demesne at Lisronagh was somewhat larger than that at Rathfeigh, containing 358 acres. Despite the size of the demesne, the betaghs intended to service it held only 560 acres. Labour services were considerably heavier at Lisronagh than Rathfeigh, possibly because of this particular balance between demesne and betagh land. The land held by betaghs at Lisronagh was divided into seven granges, though by 1333 one of these granges, Shenganath, was a free tenement in the hands of Isabella Plemyng, who rendered none of the customary services. In none of the remaining six granges was the land extended in terms of the individual tenements within the grange, as was the case both at Rathfeigh and on the betagh granges of the bishopric of Cloyne. This form of extent therefore raises the question as to whether certain betaghs held their lands as family septs rather than as individual servile tenements. This, however, would have been impossible in Lisronagh for the following reason. Were the land held by sept the subdivision of the grange would have been effected on the basis of average holdings. Both the total acreage of the individual granges and the number of betagh tenants within each grange is known, with the largest possible average holding being that of 14.45 acres per betagh on the grange of Grahynery.

47. Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, p. 43.
48. Ibid., p. 46.
49. Ibid., p. 45.
50. Ibid., p. 61.
51. See Chapter VI: Table II.
differentiation noted in the customary portion of the extent between the harvest services owed by tenants holding between 27 and 33 acres of land and those with smaller holdings would appear to rule out the possibility of landholding by sept. Such a difference would not have been noted were there not a number of tenements comprising over 27 acres, which in turn implies the existence of a considerable number of smallholders.52. The surnames of the betaghs listed in the various granges provides a further indication that landholding in betaghry by sept was not practised at Lisronagh.53. Only in one instance, the case of the O'Russhyns at Gragecurry, were there three tenants with the same surname on any grange. There were five tenants who were not of that surname farming on the grange in question.

The customary services exacted from the betaghs at Lisronagh were considerably heavier than those exacted at Rathfeigh and were, on the whole, even more closely concerned with the working of the demesne throughout the year, possibly obviating the need for famili on that manor.54. The ploughing services were common on English estates and were also imposed on the betaghs of the bishopric of Cloyne. At each sowing (seíomna), the customary ploughmen at Lisronagh were given 2s., an indication that this service was once performed ad cibum domini, the payment being the most convenient way of providing such meals. Like the ploughing services, the liability to render service during the harvest was linked to the size of the individual tenant's holding at Lisronagh, and carting services were only owed by those possessing an affer. Haymaking was a communal responsibility. Other minor services were owed by the betaghs of Lisronagh and both the lord and his chief minister had first refusal of certain goods and provisions in their possession.

It is impossible to evaluate in monetary terms the worth of either the ploughing services or the harvest works to the lord of Lisronagh because of the nature of the 1333 extent in which the frequency of these services was linked to the size of the individual tenement held by the betagh in question. Because of this uncertainty, those who made this extent recommended that the value of these works,55. and therefore, by implication that the size of the various betagh tenements be established. It is possible that at some date following the 1320's direct cultivation of

52. Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, p. 47.
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the demesne at Lisronagh was abandoned. This would account for both the
detail with which the customary obligations of the betaghs were recorded
in the custumal section of the extent and the uncertainty regarding the
value of the commutation or sale on an annual basis of these works.

The rent demanded from the betaghs of Lisronagh was extremely high. It
was fixed at 14d. an acre, the same rate as the annual value of demesne
land. This is considerably higher than the levels of rent found either
at Rathfeigh or on the estates of the bishopric of Cloyne and is also
higher than the rent paid by the betaghs of the manor of Nyncheaunlef
and the settlements of Louath, Grace Williamse and Balyhark, which also
lay in county Tipperary, in the early fourteenth century. Works owed
by all of these betaghs had been commuted by 1304 and absorbed into the
rent, which was 1s. per acre in every case. It should also be remembered
in this context that the value of both land and customary services, land
because of the extension of the march, and customary services because of
the contraction of the grain market, and the leasing of parts of demesnes
and entire demesnes, would have been more likely to have declined than
risen in Tipperary between 1304 and 1333. The betaghs of Cloncurry, for
whom no works are listed in the 1304 extent of that manor, paid an annual
rent of 20d. per acre much of which may have reflected indirectly the
value of commuted works. Thus the possibility that the betaghs of
Lisronagh were no longer working the demesne, either because the land
was no longer under the lord's plough, through leasing, or because hired
labour was being used to cultivate the demesne, cannot be discounted. A
situation of this nature might also provide the explanation for the
uncertainty in the valuation of the customary works and the inability
of those extending Lisronagh to co-relate the tenant, his holding and
the works owed by him as was done by the jurors extending Rathfeigh in 1322.

(iii) The Estates of the Bishopric of Cloyne

The betaghs on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne fall into three
distinct categories, those who were truly adscripti glebae, those who
were of betagh status but were not so firmly bound to the land and the
betagh burgesses of Kyelmacleyn. The major problem posed by the Cloyne
material is essentially one of dating rather than one of interpretation.
While the date of the compilation of this enrolled register can be

See below p. 285.
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narrowed to the bishopric of John of Swainham (1363-76) both by tradition and by paleographical evidence, it is impossible to date many of the extents and rentals registered. One would be mistaken to assume that most of the material dates from the mid-fourteenth century as the Pipe Roll is almost certainly a transcription of an earlier register or registers. While one might suspect that many of the more detailed extents are of late thirteenth or early fourteenth century provenance, there is no solid evidence which would either prove or disprove such an assumption.

The basic difference between the more disadvantaged of the betaghs of Cloyne and their fellows lay in personal disabilities rather than in more severe forms of labour service. They were described as the puri homines Sancti Colmani, a phrase which is reminiscent of the Mac Murrough grant of Baldoyle to the bishop of Louth. While Curtis associated these men with the bishop's demesne land at Ballyonan, the statement of their condition indicates a servility of blood and person which was unaffected by the land. Thirteen particular septs fell into this category.

Members of these families could be placed anywhere in the episcopal estates and could be detached from the land and sold as chattels at the will of the bishop. The bishop also had the right to seize their goods with no obligation to compensate or pay to the betagh any portion of the value of the goods thus seized. Despite the fact that these families were singled out as being of a particularly unfree condition, it is clear from the rentals of the betagh granges of the bishopric of Cloyne that they did not hold their land as septs, but rather as tenements held by individual betaghs on various granges. One of the septs listed, the O'Gevenys had members holding land in two different granges in the manorial settlement of Ballycotton-Cloyne. Two members of this sept held 15 acres and 20 acres on the grange of Agundur and one held 15 acres on the grange of Balycanan.

The manorial infrastructure of the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne was somewhat loose. Essentially, there were settlements of betaghs with pockets of demesne land in close proximity to these settlements, while most of the remaining lands of the bishopric were tenanted by free tenants.

60. Ibid., pp 165-6.
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63. Ibid., p. 164, p. 163.
The traditional manor, with its centralised demesne and specified groups of tenants both free and unfree on surrounding and adjacent lands, does not seem to have existed on the lands of the bishopric. This may reflect more archaic patterns of land management and a fusion of older Gaelic practices with newer forms of settlement, for the Cloyne estates lay in a part of Munster which could be described as march land. Thus, as opposed to manors, there were a number of quasi-manorial settlements in the bishopric, which may have developed from the same basic root as the royal manors of Othee and Obrun in the Dublin mountains, which were merely betagh settlements in the early thirteenth century. The Cloyne settlements can be divided into three major groups, those of Ballycottin-Cloyne, Coul-Brewhy and Kylmaclennyn, this latter being a settlement of betagh-burgesses adjacent to substantial episcopal demesne land. One of the major features distinguishing the settlement at Ballycottin-Cloyne from that of Coul-Brewhy was the average size of the holdings in betaghry. Holdings on the four granges comprising the settlement at Ballycottin-Cloyne, Balycanan, Balyqanlay, Agnudur and Accaryn were on average considerably larger than those at Coul-Brewhy, despite the fact that many of the tenants at Coul and Brewhy had entry to smallish pieces of extra land either every second or third year. There was also a clear difference between the services rendered by the Ballycottin-Cloyne betaghs and those of Coul-Brewhy, the services of the former being somewhat lighter and less stringent than those of the latter. Despite this difference the average rent per acre of land held in betaghry at both settlements was 8d. per annum.

The bishop held 1½ carucates of land in demesne at Ballycottin and 370 acres in the other granges associated with the Ballycottin-Cloyne settlement, together with a certain amount of stoney land classified as rubble, moor and turbary which also formed part of the bishop's demesne. With the exception of the turbary, none of the other poor land was in any

64. See above Chapter I, pp 24-5.
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way connected with the labour services rendered by the betagh tenants. The arable demesne and turbary was served by betaghs in the granges of Balycanan, Agnudur and Accaryn holding a total of 377 acres, together with two Ballycottin betaghs holding 105 acres and one free farmer there who also owed limited services for his 14 acre tenement. Thus, the combined demesne at Ballycottin-Cloyne was served by 496 acres. A series of standardised services, most of which were communal obligations, were exacted from these betaghs. They were obliged to cart and rick the lord's hay and to cart and stack the lord's grain at Cloyne and Ballycottin. An unspecified portion of the lord's crops was to be weeded by these tenants and they were to cart for the lord to Coul or Youghil. The extensive episcopal turbary attached to this settlement gave rise to two of the customary services listed in the register for the betaghs of the area. For each acre held an annual render of a kish of turf containing 72 sods was to be made and the betaghs were collectively obliged to cart the lord's turf and stack it with their own.

Both ploughing services and pannage were linked to the means of the individual tenant. Those with plough-teams were to plough an acre in both the winter and spring sowings. It is worth noting, however, that the betaghs were not expected to join inadequate numbers of oxen together to form combined plough-teams as was the case at Lisronagh. Pannage was levied in two ways: those betaghs with five or six pigs were expected to render their third best pig to the lord and those with less pigs were to pay 2d. for each yearling and ½d. for each half-year old pig. The almost universal render of a hen at Christmas was also exacted here.

Because of the structure of the Pipe Roll of Cloyne and the difficulties of differentiating and dating material recorded in it, certain problems posed by its evidence must remain unanswered. Payments made by the Ballycottin-Cloyne betaghs pro messione and pro molendino are classic examples of such problems. These payments were made at the rate of ½d. for each acre held. In view of the detailed custumal of betagh

---

69. Curtis only associated these services with the grange of Balyonan, misreading the register which clearly indicates that they were to be rendered by all of the betaghs associated with this settlement. Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, p. 67.

70. For this custumal see 'The Pipe Roll of Cloyne', J.C. Hist. Arch. Soc. vol. 19 (1913), p. 156.

71. See Chapter VI: Table III.
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services which follows the individual grange extents in which the payments are listed, can one assume that both payments and services were rendered together? Could the pro messione payment be a permanent commutation of reaping service, which is not mentioned in the custumal? Less likely is the explanation that the custumal and the grange extents reflect the practice of two separate periods. The pro molendino payment was probably made in respect of hand mills owned by the betaghs of this settlement. The absence of normal manorial infrastructures together with the fact that no mill was mentioned in any of the grange rentals for Ballycottin-Cloyne and that none of the services and obligations associated with mills such as suit, cleaning the pond and carrying out routine repairs were noted in the custumal would tend to confirm this interpretation. A definition of the heriot as either the best beast or the best piece of cloth in the possession of a tenant at the time of death was also noted in the Ballycottin-Cloyne custumal. The services rendered by the tenant holding land in free farm at Ballycottin were considerably lighter than those of the betaghs. He was merely to plough an acre of land for the bishop in summer and to weed the crop of the demesne for two days in autumn.

The second betagh settlement on the episcopal lands at Cloyne was that of Coul-Brewhy, where, as has already been noted, the holdings were on average rather smaller than those of betagh tenants at Ballycottin-Cloyne. An examination of evidence relating to betagh tenure on this settlement must be carried out with circumspection, however, for the rental of 1365 probably post-dates the custumal which is appended to it in the roll. The services in the rental are considerably lighter than those of the custumal, possibly reflecting an apparent contraction in the amount of demesne land in the bishop's hand in this area. By 1365, the bishop held only 2 carucates of demesne land at Coul, the demesne at Brewhy having been leased to John Pye and the bishop's vicar, each of whom held a carucate in betaghry without rendering any specified services. The extra land, to which the tenants of Coul-Brewhy had access may have been land left waste through depopulation caused by the crises of the

---
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first quarter of the fourteenth century and the Black Death, which would indicate that conditions were even harsher in relative terms at Coul-Brewhy prior to the first visitations of the plague. Customary services, listed in the rental were closer to those of Ballycottin-Cloyne than those described in the custumal appended to the rental. According to the rental all tenants at Coul-Brewhy were obliged to do two days' weeding of the lord's crops in summer, with a day's reaping and a day's carting at harvest time. They were also obliged to grind their grain at the lord's mill and to cart for the lord to Kylmaclenyn, Cloyne and Kylenon. Those with plough-teams were to plough 2 acres for the lord. Suit of court, the render of a hen at Christmas and the render of heriot when the occasion arose were the other obligations of the betagh at Coul-Brewhy in 1365.

In the custumal, the betagh's summer weeding obligation was given as three days, their service in harvesting and gathering the lord's grain another three days and their harvest carrying services as four days. According to the custumal none of the tenants at Coul-Brewhy was to possess a handmill and they were furthermore obliged to clean the mill-pool whenever this was deemed necessary. The mill in question was probably the mill at Coul which was extended at 4s. in 1365. It is of interest that the services listed in the custumal were all given with a monetary equivalent, thus raising the possibility that commutation may have been encouraged when the demesne was under intensive cultivation in order to finance the hire of casual labour. When both the demesnes at Coul and Brewhy were under the lord's plough 4 carucates would have been served by 71 acres at Coul and 96½ acres at Brewhy. The ratio between demesne land and land held by betaghs is sufficient explanation for the heavier incidence of labour service at Coul-Brewhy and would also have added to the attractiveness of encouraging the tenantry, who could never have serviced the demesne adequately, to commute their services while intensive demesne cultivation was being practised.

The most unusual betaghs on the Cloyne episcopal estates were the betagh-
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burgesses at Killmaclenine who serviced 4 carucates of demesne land. 79.
The structure of the register at this point is somewhat unusual. Two
custumals are interspersed with a charter of 1251 granting to the burgesses
of Kylmaclenyn the law of Breteuil. 80. If the documents follow a
chronological sequence, which seems likely, it would appear that the
burgesses gained freedom from the taint of betaghry in 1251 and were at
some subsequent point, depressed once more into betaghry. Such prominence
would hardly have been given to recording the betagh status of the
burgesses in a compilation intended to serve as a working register had
they not been depressed into betaghry by the 1360's. The difference
between the two Kylmaclenyn custumals is similar to that between the
services noted in the custumal and the later rental of Coul-Brewhy, with
those in the custumal preceding the charter being the more onerous. 81.
In the earlier custumal it was stated that the burgesses of Kylmaclenyn
owed an individual rent of 12d. for their tenements and a collective
annual rent of 44s.6d. 82. Those with plough-teams were to plough for
two days at both the winter and spring sowings. They also owed
unspecified summer and autumn weeding services together with two days'
carting services at harvest time. Throughout the year they were obliged
to carry iron, wine and salt for the lord's use.

According to the 1251 charter, the borough was founded in either 1237
or 1238, presumably as a nucleated settlement. Under the terms of this
charter the burgesses were to pay an annual rent of 10 marks, in two
moietyes, for all services. This was a substantial increase on the
44s.6d. with a burgage plot rent already noted. Such a large increase
in the annual rent was probably occasioned by the commutation or abolition
of these services implied in the charter. The most likely explanation
for the subsequent depression of the burgesses of Kylmaclenyn to their
former status would have been inability to pay this rent and possibly
chronic indebtedness. By the time of the compilation of both the rental
and the half-rental of Kylmaclenyn, which were also enrolled on the
register, the burgesses had relapsed into betaghry. Most of the
tenements noted in both of these rentals appear to have been small and
almost all were not adequately specified in terms of acreage to permit
a comparison with demesne acreage on the basis of those possible in
the case of both the Ballycottin-Cloyne and Coul-Brewhy settlements.
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The full rental, which was, however, somewhat damaged, recorded an annual rent for the borough of 43s.5d. Some of the tenanted holdings were described in this rental as vacua, possibly indicating that they had lain waste for some considerable period before being re-leased. A second rental, which follows the rental already described, gave the value of the borough and its tenements for a half-year. On an annual basis the value of the borough would have fallen to 31s.4½d. at the time of its compilation. It is likely that both rentals were compiled after some major demographic set-back, possibly the 1315-18 famine but more probably, given the time at which the register itself was compiled, the Black Death. In the second custumal, which follows these two rentals, the ploughing services of the burgesses were reduced to a day's work at each sowing, the summer weeding confined to a day's work and the harvest carrying service was similarly limited to a single day. A new, but not particularly onerous obligation to work, presumably to reap, at the lord's harvest was included in this second custumal. An entitlement of those engaged in customary ploughing to a repast or ½d in lieu of this repast was also noted in this custumal. Suit to the hundred court at Kylmaclenyn also seems to have acquired a servile gloss. The terms in which this obligation were stated were that omnes manentes in burgagio were to respond to the hundred at Michaelmas and Easter. No maximum amercement was fixed, the lord being able to amerce such tenants at will.

While the status of the burgesses of Kylmaclenyn is somewhat unusual in that their betaghry was firmly emphasised in the Pipe Roll of Cloyne, it is worth noting that burgesses on the lands of the archbishopric of Dublin also owed customary services, though in no instance were these services as onerous or as fully specified as was the case at Kylmaclenyn. There does not seem to be any substantive difference in social standing between the burgesses of Swords, Lucan and Shankill who owed customary service and those who did not. While there is no definite evidence in surviving Escheators' accounts of episcopal and archiepiscopal estates during vacancies that burgesses of other diocesan boroughs owed limited customary services, this possibility cannot be ruled out. Such services might have been concealed or suppressed by the Escheator's clerks or might have been due at times of the year other than those in which the vacancy occurred. Whatever the general situation on diocesan land,
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however, the dual status of the betagh burgesses of Kylmaclenyn both before and after the 1251 charter appears to have been unique.

(iv) Meelick, Sil Armchadha

A single example of betagh services in the lordship of Connacht was preserved in the 1333 inquisition post mortem of the lands of the earldom of Ulster. This is a brief description of services owed by betaghs at Meelick in Sil Armchadha, one of the sub-manors of Loughrea. Its primary importance lies in the fact that the survival of earlier Celtic patterns of settlement may have had an impact similar to that discernible in the estates of the bishopric of Cloyne. Such influence is apparent in the absence of the standard manorial structures at Meelick, for it had much in common with the betagh settlements of Cloyne, its principal features being the Earl's demesne and the betagh settlement. There were 4 carucates of demesne land attached to Meelick. The local betaghs held 19 cottages with 6½ acres, which had been worth 15s.6d. at sometime prior to the taking of this extent, and a further 5 villates of land, originally worth £15-13-4. No attempt was made in the extent to quantify individual betagh holdings, but one thing is perfectly clear, which is that the amount of betagh land servicing this demesne is immense. The closest known parallel would be with the situation in Rathfeigh, where a relatively small demesne was serviced by a large amount of betagh land. Both the scale of the settlement and the ratio between the demesne and the betagh holdings at Meelick are quite unlike any of the cases previously examined. If one accepts the minimum estimate of the size of a villate in Connacht as 8 carucates, then 40 carucates of land besides the cottages and their appurtenant plots were in betagh hands which would mean that every carucate of demesne land was served by 10 carucates of betagh land.

Unlike the pattern of betagh services at Cloyne, the customary services at Meelick were extremely light. The betaghs there were accustomed to pay 20s. for 200 harvesters in autumn and 15s. for 120 beasts carrying corn at harvest time. These are similar to the customary services exacted from the betaghs of Rathfeigh. A collective render of 4 cows, 4 pigs and 4 crannocs of grain was also owed by the betaghs of Meelick. All of these dues were worth nothing in 1333, because they had been granted to an Irish magnate, O'Maden, by the late earl. Scanty as the description of these services may be, it is nevertheless of considerable importance. Meelick lay outside the systematically feudalised portion of the lordship of Ireland and was part of an abnormally large manor in eastern Ireland.
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It was in an area which was certainly within the march and possibly the land of war, whereas the majority of the manors in Leinster and in other heavily settled areas were relatively secure. Thus it reflects both the situation of the marchland betagh and that of the betagh on a manor where the amount of land held in betaghry far exceeded that of the demesne. Although it would be unwise to infer that the services specified reflect some form of primitive Celtic betaghry, the food render may be some type of pre-conquest survival. The other customary services of Meelick could be seen as the base line of betagh services in the lordship of Ireland from which more elaborate structures of customary services could develop.

In practical terms it was impossible to rely on the labour services of local betaghs to cultivate the demesnes of the lordship of Ireland. While services were exacted throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, most of the work would have been done by hired labourers working ad taschum or by the famuli attached to the manor. The intensive cultivation of the late thirteenth century, directed as it was towards the supply of the wars in Wales and Scotland, was better served by this more cost-effective and efficient approach. So prevalent was this approach that in many instances betagh services were noted in extents in terms of a monetary render. Such payments, when made, were usually listed in extents, rentals or accounts as being pro operibus. This form of commutation payment is to be found in some of the surviving Escheatorts' accounts for episcopal and archiepiscopal estates and by no means confined to ecclesiastical estates. Betaghs on Butler land at Brun owed 7s.8d. pro operibus eorum et domibus gallinarum per annum. Similarly, the betaghs of both the royal and the Butler manors of Bray owed payments in lieu of their works. Occasionally, payment for such services was directly absorbed into the betagh's rent. The betagh tenants at Cloncurry held 340 acres for an annual rent of £28-9-2 in 1304, or 20d. per acre. No betagh works were listed in the 1304 extent of this manor, but such a heavy rent probably contains and conceals a payment of commutation. It is worth noting that the minute expenses of demesne cultivation were closely costed in this extent, indicating that cultivation of the demesne

90. T.C.D. Ms 804 for instance in the transcript of John of Saunford's account for the archbishopric of Dublin in 1279 these commutations are referred to as increment from the betaghry (pp 195-199 ) and his account for the bishopric of Ferns in 1282 in which a compound sum was rendered for the rent and works of the betaghs of Macglass (p.207 ).
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lands at Cloncurry was probably undertaken by hired labour.\textsuperscript{94} An absorption of commutation payments is specifically stated to have occurred on three of the Tipperary betagh granges in Butler hands. In 1304 the betaghs of Lanath, Grage Willame and Balyherk all owed annual rents of 1s. an acre with the following explanation \textit{opera nulla quia cartantur magno redditu pro operibus} being noted in the extent.\textsuperscript{95} It is impossible to determine in such cases what portion of the rent would express the commutation payment.

In many cases there is even no indication that the betagh tenants of certain manors ever owed customary services. None of the betagh tenants of Maynooth in 1328-9 owed any services, nor was any statement recorded indicating that a portion of their rent was being paid \textit{pro operibus}.\textsuperscript{96} The betaghs of Leixlip paid an annual rent of 10d. per acre in 1341, with no customary services being listed in the extent of that date.\textsuperscript{97} Ultimately, however, the abandonment of betagh services or their commutation may have been as much the result of the gradual decline of demesne farming in Ireland and the expansion of the march in the period following the Bruce Invasion as of the greater efficiency of hired labour or the use of a permanently retained group of labourers such as the \textit{famuli}. In 1331 the rent of the betaghs at Kenry on the manor of Adare declined considerably, as did the value of their works. The extent blamed this decline on the fact that the land was destroyed \textit{per hibernicos et felones}.

Evidence on the use of hired labour and the \textit{famuli} on manors with an extensive betagh population is confined to the Bigod manors of Fennagh and Old Ross. In numerical terms the settlements at Old Ross were greater than those at Fennagh. Old Ross was the larger of the two manors with several separate betagh settlements while there only appears to have been the one betagh settlement at Fennagh.\textsuperscript{99} No systematic attempt appears to have been made to utilise customary services in the cultivation of the demesne at either manor in the late thirteenth century. The only reference to betaghs in the context of routine manorial work occurring in any of the Bigod manorial accounts is to be found in the Fennagh account of 1288-9 when the wheat and oats were reaped, gathered and stacked in the field.

\textsuperscript{94} Newport B. White, Red Book of Ormond, Dublin 1932, pp 28-9
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., p. 50.
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\textsuperscript{98} G. Mac Niocaill, Red Book of Kildare, Dublin 1964, p. 123.
\textsuperscript{99} See above Chapter II, p. 30. and p. 63.
de exitis betagii, at a cost of 44s.8\text{d}.^{100} This may refer to the use of commutation payments to finance harvest expenses. In any case it would appear that on both of these manors the use of the famuli and of hired labour had entirely supplanted the use of betagh labour by the late thirteenth century.

In my previous examination of the holdings of betaghs both at Rathfeigh and on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne an interesting dichotomy emerged between a substantial number of betaghs who held comparatively large tenements and the betagh smallholder. The smallholder can perhaps be most usefully compared to the cottar in terms of prosperity while many of the betaghs with larger holdings must have been men of consequence in their localities. One of the most spectacular instances of betagh prosperity was that of John Okarny, an hibernicus and nativus of the bishop of Cloyne.\textsuperscript{102} On his death in 1348 he was found to have held 13 messuages, 14 acres and 3 plots in turbaries in or around Cloyne. While the actual land in Okarny's hand at the time of his death was not valued, for it escheated directly to the bishop, 11 messuages and 2 acres had been leased prior to his death and realised an annual income of 44s.7d. A royal betagh, whose goods were valued following his death in Michaelmas term 1303 and who dwelt in county Dublin also appears to have been prosperous.\textsuperscript{103} Clement Ocathyl had at his death 4 cows with calves, an ox, 3 affers, 30 sheep, a young pig, 3 small stacks of oats containing 5 crannocs of grain, a small stack of wheat, beans and barley, a stack of turf and a brass pot. The grain was not valued but the other goods were assessed at £2-9-0. It is to be assumed that Ocathyl either held or had access to a substantial amount of land on which his livestock were pastured and his grain cultivated. Sight must not be lost of the exceptional nature of these two cases. It is unlikely that schedules of the goods of impoverished betaghs would either have been drawn up or would have been of sufficient importance to ensure their survival.

It is of significance, however, that in as far as can be ascertained from the Gaelic and Anglo-Irish annals, there was no great peasant upheaval in Ireland of the nature of the 1381 revolt or the unrest of the 1290's and 1339-40 in England. Prosperity could provide a certain amount of the explanation for this apparent docility, as would the fact that an oppressed betagh could, by making for the nearest area of marchland

\textsuperscript{100} P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/39
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\textsuperscript{103} P.R.O.I., Calendar of Memoranda Rolls Ex. 2/1 p. 60.
or land of war, put himself beyond the reach of the law. On the basis of surviving legal records, the writ de nativo habendo appears to have been infrequently used. The three surviving cases in which this procedure may have been used all occurred in 1290. The sheriff of Kerry was ordered to attach William Obothethan whom Richard Laundry claimed to have been ipsum nativum et fugitivum suum. The other two cases may have been the result of attempts by Thomas fitz Maurice to impose new obligations on the betaghs of his Limerick lands. John and Adam Odomethy attempted to force Thomas fitz Maurice to acknowledge their liberty and had to this end procured a writ of de libertate probenda. Judgement went against them in their absence. A similar action initiated by other members of this sept against Thomas fitz Maurice who claimed them to be nativos et fugitivos suorum also failed. Occasions on which de nativo habendo would have been most likely to have been used would have tended to occur in the marches, where flight might have been relatively easy. However, with the worsening conditions in the lordship, and the steady decline in the quality of local government mirrored in the parliamentary statutes of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the jurisdiction of royal courts in areas where such cases were likely to have arisen would have been considerably curtailed. It is also possible that the effects of raids either by the local Irish or the Anglo-Irish rebels might have forced betaghs to flee their lord's lands. This appears to have been the case when certain Leixlip betaghs fled their lands in 1310. One of the most unusual cases concerning betagh flight in Ireland was that of Maurice Dongan, betagus Regis apud Athgo, who, in the summer of 1322 admitted in the court of the Exchequer to having fled from Leixlip, where he was first Ralph Pippard's betagh and subsequently the King's betagh. Dongan surrendered himself, having spent time on the grange of Athgoe, a part of the royal manor of Newcastle Lyons and Arnald le Poer's lands on the manorial borough of Ughterard. This extraordinary declaration appears to have been volunteered by Dongan, as there is no mention of either his apprehension by royal officials or his surrender to the King by Arnald le Poer. Use of the standard legal procedures against the fleeing betagh and independent evidence of such flight is rare in surviving legal and administrative records. The only possible conclusion is that
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neither the economic situation nor the social condition of the betagh in Ireland were such as to cause either unrest or wholesale flight from their lords' lands throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

**The Cottar or Cottager**

The major feature distinguishing the cottager from most other tenants was the smallness of his holding. This was not an exclusive feature of the cottar, for some tenants at will and farmers might also have held tenements containing some few perches of land. The designation implies the existence of a dwelling place, the cottage, possibly with a surrounding yard (curtilagium) on a tenement held in this manner. In many rentals and extents the acreage held by any individual cottar was rarely given, either as a cottage, a cottage with a croft or a messuage with courtyard. Descriptions of this nature are a further indication of the small size of such tenements. Effectively there were three basic types of cottar found on the manors of the lordship of Ireland in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The first of these was the cottar who held a tenement unencumbered with labour services, while the second was the cottager who owed relatively light forms of labour service and possibly customary renders peculiar to the locality. A third group of cottars existed who owed labour services as heavy as those exacted from the betaghs at Lisronagh or the betaghs of the bishopric of Cloyne. This last category underlines the frequent overlapping of the functions if not the status of the various strata of tenant, as also does the existence of farmers and gavellors owing labour service. It is worth noting that the cottager rendering heavy labour services does not appear to have had the same taint of unfreedom in his blood as the betagh. Such tenants were generally to be found on estates where there was no resident betagh population from which demesne labourers might have been drawn. Most, if not all cottagers would have been obliged to supplement their income by hiring themselves out as labourers at harvest time or at the time of winter and spring sowings and sheep shearing. They would probably have formed the majority of those working ad taschem on the manors engaged in intensive wool growing or grain production.

One of the clearest examples of the cottars who owed no labour services for their holdings were the cottars of Cloncurry. Their holdings

109. cf. Rathfeigh, P.R.O. C47 10/18 (3) and Dmmore, county Kilkenny, P.R.O. S.C. 11 793.

ranged in size from a cottage with a stang and 3 perches to a cottage and 5 perches. The rents for these cottages ranged from 6d. to 2d. per annum. It was specified in the case of three of the forty-two cottars whose names were listed that they were widows. The practice of settling widows in small tenements may thus have been known and utilised in the lordship of Ireland. Although the nineteen cottars at Rathfeigh owed no specific labour services, they made a customary render of 60 hens at Christmas. While the actual size of their holdings was not specified in the extent of 1322, it is possible to make certain deductions as to size on the basis of variations in rent paid for the various tenements. There were two types of cottar at Rathfeigh: the tenant holding a cottage and the tenant holding a croft. The highest rent for a croft was 3s. while the lowest was 8d. All of the cottages, with the exception of one for which a rent of 5d. was paid, generated an annual rent of 6d. each. It is impossible to ascertain the acreage covered by either the croft or the cottage tenement at Rathfeigh. Were the rent fixed on the same basis as the rent for betagh land every 1s. of rent would represent an acre of land, but there is no evidence in the extent to either confirm or rebut this supposition. Demand and the quality of the soil might also have either depressed or raised the rent of the cottage or croft above or below that of betagh land. In relative terms the Rathfeigh croft must have been considerably larger than the cottage tenement. This may be an indication of divisions within the general class formed by the cottars similar to that seen within the ranks of the betaghs based both on the size of holdings and general prosperity. The range within which fluctuations in prosperity could occur would have been significantly smaller in the case of cottars as opposed to that of betaghs.

Both the cottager owing labour service and the holder of the unencumbered cottage tenement were to be found on the lands of the Priory of Holy Trinity. The cottagers unencumbered by labour services on the estates of the Priory do not appear either to have been more prosperous, to have paid heavier rents or to have held larger holdings than the tenants of a similar status on these lands who owed customary labour. Twenty of cottars at Glasnevin owed no services and paid a rent of 1s. an acre for the land in their holdings. This was not an appreciably greater
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rent than that demanded from tenants holding large crofts or combined tenements and owing services on the same grange. The situation at Grangegorman was, however, somewhat different. There, five cottars each held a cottage tenement paying an annual rent of 2s. while owing no services. Eleven other cottars each held single cottage tenements paying an annual rent of 12d. and owing specified customary labour worth 4d. per annum together with the render of a hen worth 1d. at Christmas.

All of the cottagers at Clonkeen owed labour services together with their rent. Thus, the juxtaposition of the cottage tenement encumbered and unencumbered with labour service on the Priory's lands is only to be seen in the granges of Glasnevin and Grangegorman. In numerical terms the majority of the Priory's cottars were to be found at Clonkeen, rather than at either Glasnevin or Grangegorman. The services rendered by the encumbered cottagers on this estate were similar in nature to those rendered by the less encumbered betagh and related to the cultivation of demesne lands.

While the cottagers on the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne owed service as well as rent for their holdings, this service was of a particular nature and could not be called typically betagh in its content. The cottagers at Cloyne paid varying rents for their tenements. As a communal body they were to guard the bishop's gaol and to work in the lord's meadow and park. They were said to hold their tenements per servicia facient ad voluntatem domini. This phrase seems to be the Cloyne counterpart to the phrase in the custumal of betagh services at Lisronagh that the betagh tenants there servicia facient ad voluntatem domini. Neither implies the uncertain service analogous to the form of service categorised as week work in England, which was one of the primary tests of villeinage in that country. Rather is it likely that this phrase implies that the commutation of the services mentioned was conditional and depended on whether or not the lord wished to avail of them. The element of choice or option in commutation would thus have rested with the lord rather than with the tenant. The value of the cottages and messuages at Cloyne fluctuated considerably. The highest rent from a cottage was 40d. with the lowest 1d. while the rent derived from a messuage ranged between 12d and 1d. Between cottages and messuages there were eighteen tenements at Cloyne.

On the lands of the bishopric of Cloyne there was a settlement of eighteen cottages at Ballycottin, eight of which realised an annual rent of 6d. each, while the other two realised respectively 12d. and 3d. All of these cottars were fishermen, the most important of their customary obligations being to provide the bishop with fish at a price cheaper than that asked on the open market. Thus, a fish worth 12d. was to be sold to the bishop's household for 8d. A customary caveat limiting the scope of this service was recorded to the effect that the bishop ought not to take more fish than sufficed for his own use and for that of his household. It is possible that this is a detailed description of the prise of fish or one of the forms which a prise of fish might take. These cottagers were also obliged to make hay on the demesne meadow, weed the lord's corn and save the lord's turf or pay 3d. for the commutation of this last service. They were also to make a payment of 3d. for each cow and every 6 sheep kept. This payment was probably related to the capacity of the animals in question to produce milk despite the use of the term oves rather than oves matrices and may be a customary payment for pasturage rights.

The smallest of the Cloyne settlements of cottagers was that at Coul, where only seven tenants fall into this category. Five of the Coul cottagers held their tenements in return for annual rents ranging from 16d. to 6d. and services in carrying the lord's letters, making and saving his hay and making the render of a hen at Christmas. They also owed suit of court. The two remaining cottagers merely held their tenements in return for carrying the lord's letters, a form of tenure almost analogous to the base serjeanties held by many of the famuli on the estates of the bishopric of Winchester in the thirteenth century. None of these services, with the exception of haymaking and the saving of hay resemble the services exacted from the betaghs at Ballycottin-Cloyne, Coul-Brewhy and the borough of Kyimaclenyn.

When discussing the cottagers who owed quasi-betagh services it is important to distinguish between those who owed scaled-down versions of these services and those who owed the full gamut of betagh services. In general the cottars owing the more severe forms of service were found on manors and estates where there was no indigenous betagh population. These should therefore be seen as standing in the same relationship to the servicing of the demesne as the betaghs of Cloyne, Lisronagh or

Rathfeigh. The one factor separating them from betaghry was the absence of the taint of hereditary unfreedom and servility associated with betaghry. It is perhaps significant that all of the settlements of cottagers owing this sort of service appear to have been located in relatively well settled and secure parts of the lordship such as Meath, Kilkenny and Dublin. This may reflect the ability of lords in the land of peace to impose heavier services on their tenants than the services exacted from tenants of similar status in the march. An earlier abandonment of betagh land, possibly through local demographic reverses, might also lie at the root of this phenomenon, with impoverished settlers and local free Irish smallholders filling the vacuum. It may also have been a response engendered by the need to provide extra labour for the initial thrust of commercial farming in mid-thirteenth century Ireland.

The incidence of cottars doing scaled-down versions of betagh services may not have been as common as either that of cottars doing full betagh services or holding unencumbered tenements. It can only be assessed in an instance where there were both cottagers and betaghs on the same manor owing similar services but with different frequency. Were it not for the fact that cottagers had ceased to hold land on the Butler manor of Brun, county Wicklow, by 1311, it would have been possible to compare their situation with that of the local betaghry. Such a comparison is, however, possible on the neighbouring Butler manor at Bray from an extent made in the same year as that of Brun. There, three betaghs held 22 acres of land and the annual value of their works was assessed at 16d. Seven cottagers held tenements with unspecified acreage, their works being assessed at 10½d. per annum. Thus, while the works of a betagh at Bray were worth 6d. on an annual basis, those of the cottage were only worth 1½d. It is impossible to determine the exact value of the works owed by the main group of cottagers on the royal manor at Bray. Both the rents and the autumnal works of these tenants were unfortunately extended together in 1284. While no betaghs are mentioned in this extent, it is unlikely that the autumnal services rendered by the cottars were anything more than a scaled-down version of betagh harvest works. A group of cottagers at Derrach in the royal half of Bray owed rent but no form of labour service for their tenements. The clearest example of cottars rendering reduced versions of betagh services occurred on the manor of Lisronagh. There, fourteen cottagers holding tenements
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ranging in size from 1 stang and 14 perches to 5 perches owed harvest services and work associated with haymaking. Each cottager was to spend a day working with one man reaping the lord's wheat and another day with a man reaping the lord's oats together with two days' work in stacking the lord's hay in the haggard. A proportional comparison of 13s. to 7s. in the value of the rents and works of the cottars of Lisronagh was noted in the extent. Thus, the following principle may be expounded tentatively: that where both betagh and cottager settlements were to be found together, the latter will either be unencumbered with any form of labour service, will owe customary service unassociated with those rendered by the local betaghry or a scaled-down version of the local betagh services.

The earliest example of cottagers owing customary services of a severity equaling those rendered by betaghs is to be found in a 1288 extent of the Kilkenny manor of Dunmore. Unfortunately the extent, while containing an excellent rental element is defective and does not record the acreage of the demesne. It is thus impossible to relate the numbers of cottagers and their customary obligations to the size of the demesne. The designation of some of the tenants owing labour service at Dunmore is unusual and underlines the fact that tenurial categories could and did overlap. A majority of the tenants owing services on this manor, seventeen cottars, each held a messuage and courtyard (curtilagium). Whether these tenants were true cottagers or gavellors holding cottage tenements ad voluntatem domini is unclear from the extent. Nine other tenants specifically held their land ad voluntatem domini, owing the same services as the cottars. Two of these tenants, Thomas Alisaundre and John Stachole held tenements of 27½ acres and 17½ acres respectively. The remainder of the tenants-at-will held small holdings, five of which were messuage and courtyard holdings. Thus, in terms of tenurial status, there was a clear overlap between the gavellor and cottager at Dunmore in 1288. Echoes of this form of overlap are also to be found both at Duleek and Colpe in the closing years of the fourteenth and early years of the fifteenth century.
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Tenants-at-will at Dunmore with relatively large holdings paid an annual rent of almost 8d. per acre, while those with messuage and curtilage tenements appear to have paid at a similar rate. The messuage and curtilage tenements thus held ranged in size from 6 acres and 1 stang to 3 acres. Three tenements of uncertain status each comprised a messuage and courtyard with 2 acres; the annual rent in two of these cases being 16d. and in the third 2s. A much lighter rent was paid by the cottagers. Three holdings comprising a messuage and courtyard with a \( \frac{1}{2} \) acre were worth 6d. per annum, while two holdings each with a messuage and 1 acre and 1 stang of land realised the same rent. A tenement comprising a messuage and courtyard with a stang was held for 4d. per annum as were nine tenements specified as containing only a messuage and courtyard. Two other messuage and courtyard tenements were worth respectively 6d. and 2d.

Despite differences in size and rent between the various tenements, both the gavellor and the cottager of Dunmore owed the same basic labour services with one exception. The gavellors' harvest service was slightly heavier than that of the cottar. Those owning plough-teams were to plough for a day at both winter and spring sowings ad cibum domini, which was worth 12d. after the deduction of the expense of the repast. An allowance of 1d. was made for the expense of the repast consumed by each pair of ploughmen. Those who did not own complete plough-teams were to combine with their neighbours to perform this service. Each tenant also owed a day's weeding ad cibum domini, which was worth \( \frac{1}{4} \)d. to the lord after the deduction of the repast. They were each also obliged to provide a man to gather the lord's hay after which those tenants owning wagons (crokella) and carts (carra) were to spend a day carting the lord's hay ad cibum domini. After the deduction of the expense of the repast this cartage was worth 2d. if done by wagon and 1d. if done by cart. Harvest services of reaping and binding were, however, linked to the status of the tenant. The gavellors of Dunmore were each obliged to undertake three works while the cottagers pledged two. Both the gavellors and the cottagers were obliged to carry the lord's grain to the haggard, but the exact terms under which this service was discharged remain unclear, the manuscript of the extent being damaged at this point.

The cottagers' place in the manor would have been determined by the size of his holding, whether or not he owed customary service and at what rate and occasionally by the services of those who held the land in question previously. These conditions thus varied from that of the free
man to that of the semi-free, as was the case at Lisronagh. It is important to remember that whatever the individual cottars services, the taint of unfreedom in the blood implicit in the term betagh, could never have been associated with his person. While freer in legal terms than the betagh, it is unlikely that many cottagers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries ever reached the heights of prosperity of some of the more considerable betagh landholders. Tenements of either a few acres or perches could never be cultivated as efficiently as some of the larger betagh tenements or be expected to produce any major saleable crop surplus. Above all else the cottager would thus have been dependent on the availability of casual seasonal labour and was thus in an extremely vulnerable position. A short term contraction of the area of land under intensive tillage or a series of bad harvests might thus have temporarily have eroded the economic base on which the cottager was dependent. The gradual abandonment of demesne cultivation in the fourteenth century may have increased considerably the poverty of this particular class. Thus, while it is tempting, because of the comparison between the betagh and the villanus, to see the betagh as the man at the base of the rural economic pyramid in medieval Ireland, it seems more likely that this position was occupied by the impoverished cottager.

Farmers and Gavellors

The designations of farmer and gavellor relate to the form of tenurial contract between lord and tenant rather than to the social condition of the tenant. While both the betagh and the burgess could be said to have had a specific social status and condition, the status of the farmer or gavellor would have been determined by the nature of the tenement held either at farm or at will. Although generalisations are virtually impossible to maintain, the supposition that the amount of land held either by farmers or gavellors increased steadily throughout the fourteenth century is probably justifiable. Both the abandonment of direct cultivation of the demesne together with the leasing of demesne land and the leasing of land left vacant through depopulation and the ravages of the Black Death whenever possible would have reinforced this trend.

Demesnes were leased piece-meal, usually ad voluntatem domini, and with the leasing of demesnes would have come the abandonment of the manorial caput and of plant associated with that caput such as the

126. See below p. 300-1.
memorial mill or dovecote. Lords of manors were more likely to attempt to ensure a modest continuous income, while safeguarding their overall rights to suit to the mill through leasing it at farm. The increase in the amount of land or in pieces of manorial plant leased is impossible to quantify due to the lack of surviving account and extent material. Lest it be thought that both forms of tenure were purely fourteenth century phenomena, it should be noted that they were relatively common in the lordship throughout the late thirteenth century.

The farmer held his tenement on contract for a fixed rent over a fixed number of years. This form of tenure could and did embrace any size of tenement from a mill to an entire manor. Throughout the thirteenth century, the royal manors of county Dublin were held at farm. This arrangement was only abandoned when the indebtedness of the farmers and overall arrears of farm had reached what the Exchequer considered to be an unacceptable level in the early fourteenth century. Thereafter, the administration of the royal manors was undertaken by reeves answerable and accountable to the Exchequer. None of the larger royal manors, with the exception of Leixlip, were held at farm on a regular basis throughout the fourteenth century. One of the royal manors, however, remained almost continually at farm. This was Chapelizod, one of the smaller manors, where the accumulated debt was never particularly great. By 1338 Roger Outlaw, prior of the Hospitallers and noted royal servant, acquired the farm of both Chapelizod and Leixlip. Through him the farm of Leixlip passed to his Order and the arrangement between the Hospitallers and the Exchequer with regard to both manors was then placed on a permanent footing. The granting of royal manors at farm was also a means of rewarding outstanding military service either in Scotland, Ireland itself or France. Nicholas de Verdun was granted a payment of 100 marks from the revenue of Newcastle Lyons in return for his service against the Irish and the Scotch. and subsequently, in September 1338, was granted the manor itself to hold at pleasure, paying to the Exchequer the balance of its farm. This interesting combination of tenure at will and farm was to become a model in a subsequent grant of Esker to Reginald Lovel in return for military services rendered in July 1368. Lovel was to be paid a daily pension of 12d. which was to be offset against the farm of the manor.
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Occasionally the grant of a royal manor was associated with improvements and repairs to be made by the farmer to its defences within a specific period of time. When the manor of Bray was granted at farm to Geoffrey Cromp for twenty years in 1332, he was obliged to repair the castle at Roguescourt and to maintain the defences of the manor. In return for such maintenance and defence, the annual farm of the manor was waived for the first sixteen years of the farm. Arrangements of this nature were not uncommon. Repairs to mills were undertaken by farmers for similar waivings or reductions in farm. Another occasion on which manors, or large portions of manors might be held at farm was when the Escheator was prepared to lease off portions of or entire estates which were likely to be in the King's hand either indefinitely, through forfeiture, or during a long minority.

At a less spectacular level, mills and other tenements were also set at farm, though the leasing of land on manors was more usually done on an ad voluntatem basis than at farm. A notable exception appears to have been the practice on the manor of Maynooth in 1328-9. In a rental of Joan de Burgh's dower lands there, no mention was made of tenants-at-will, while a group of twenty farmers constituted the largest single group of tenants on this land. The question must arise as to whether these were true farmers. In the 1333 extent of the manor of Lisronagh, tenements held at will were described as terre gavelariorum posite ad firmam ad voluntatem domini. Could this have been similar to the relationship between Nicholas de Verdun and the King in relation to the farm of Newcastle Lyons? It might imply that, while the tenement in question was held at will, the rent of the tenement was fixed and could not be arbitrarily increased by the lord. This may have led to a certain blurring in the distinction between the farmer and the gavellor as landholders at a local level.

One of the most commonly held forms of small local farms was the manorial mill. As a self-contained unit of plant with a certain amount of regular local business the mill would have offered many opportunities for profit to the enterprising farmer. Its administration in this way would not only have safeguarded the lord's interest in suit to the mill, for this would have been exacted by the farmer but would also have rationalised the accounts of the reeve. Grain received in multure had to be reconciled either with the overall grain sales or the account of grain in store in the granary. Mill tenements held at farm varied considerably in size and profitability. A farm such as that of the five water mills at New Ross, which realised £33-6-8 in the first half of the 1280's might be seen as the top of this particular scale. In contrast, some very small units were set to farm on the royal manors of county Dublin. The mill at Saggard was leased at farm from the early 1290's for a fixed annual rent of just under 24s. While the mill at Newcastle Lyons was also set to farm in this period, it did not reach its optimum value until the mid-fourteenth century. The only record of its farm as a mill in its own right and not joined with the farm of the mill at Saggard in this period is a payment of 40s. made by Thomas the miller in 1296. By 1348 the farm of this mill was 100s. per annum. As most of its fourteenth century leases include 60 acres of land at Kilmactaley, the addition of this land to the tenement may explain its sudden increase in value. It was frequently held by Exchequer officials in the mid fourteenth century, a further sign of its desirability, while the value of the mill at Saggard remained static and its farmers undistinguished. Large mills, such as that at Callan, dependent on extended manorial hinterlands and intensive grain production, declined in value from the 1330's onwards.

A frequent feature of the grant of a mill at farm was the obligation of the farmer to carry out repairs or even to rebuild a mill. In 1327 the Hospitallers granted the site of a mill at Ardry, which was an appurtenance
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of their land at Kyllergi to David de la Launde and his heirs for the
term of twenty years. Under the terms of this grant a mill was to
be constructed on this site in return for which de la Launde was to pay
a farm of 10s for the first ten years and 20s a year thereafter. A
somewhat similar arrangement appears to have been made between Elizabeth
de Clare's ministers and Adam fitz William in respect of the mill at
Tiberdornan, which appears to have lain waste since the intrusion of
Queen Phillipa's ministers in her Ulster lands throughout the late 1340's
and early 1350's. Although this mill had been repaired it was not
generating any income in 1357-8. It was in the hand of its farmer, Adam
fitz William, for the second year of a three year period of rent
remission. The terms of the 1335 grant by the Hospitalers of the
molendinum de mora to Walter, son of Henry, clearly underlined the
obligation of the farmer to repair the mill, which would have been a
common but not universal feature of such grants. The mill was to
be held for a term of ten years during which time all repairs to the
stonework and wood of the mill were Walter's responsibility. Revenue
arising from the mill toll was retained by the order, but all other profits
of the mill were granted to the farmer in return for effecting these
repairs during the specified period.

The farmer's tenement was protected by law for the period of the farm
and any attempt by the lessor to eject him before the end of his term
was effectively a breach of contract. A civil case heard at Drogheda
in 1317 illustrates this point. Stephen Roche had leased half a burgage
in the Meath half of Drogheda to Walter Bartoun for a term of eighteen
years at a fixed rent of 8d. per annum. When Walter was seised of
the tenement, Stephen ejected him and granted it to another party. The
case was proven and damages, which were not then assessed, awarded to
Bartoun. Legal protection was also extended to the interests of the
lessor in the tenement. The closest legal parallel would be with the
protection of the interests of a person to whom dower lands or land
farmed out during a minority would ultimately revert. Any despoiling
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action which would have permanently lowered the value of the tenement to the detriment of the lessor, such as damage to woodlands, buildings or a mill on the tenement held at farm, would thus have been tried under this principle of law. In an extremely complex case of Michaelmas term 1300 concerning an extensive Tipperary tenement, which had been leased to John Keating for the term of Johanna Brian's life, Geoffrey le Bret, to whom the tenement at Moybrenan was to revert, took action against Keating for waste. The jury found that despite the fact that Keating had no interest in the tenement nisi ad vitam Johanna de Brian, he wasted the caput of the manor, 25 houses of betaghs, the wood attached to the manor and imposed a new rent of 100s. thereby impoverishing its tenants. Damages of 240 marks less minor costs were awarded to Geoffrey le Bret. Thus, the relationship between the farmer and the lessor of a tenement set to farm was clearly defined at law, with what might be termed mutual protection of the interests of both parties.

The gavellor's relationship with the lord from whom his tenement was held ad voluntatem was beyond the protection afforded to the farmer through the law of contract. A tenant-at-will might be ejected from his tenement at the lord's pleasure. In practice most of the tenements held in this manner were small or relatively small holdings, although a number of fairly substantial tenements were leased in this manner in both the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. With the abandonment of the cultivation of the manorial demesne, demesne lands were usually leased out in small parcels on this basis. The description of the demesne in the 1333 extent of Lisronagh as a number of individually named parcels of land, each acre being valued at 14d. per annum is almost certainly an indication that these units were leased to tenants-at-will.

These divisions were repeated without alteration in the 1350-1 accounts, in which they were held by tenants-at-will and so one may assume that this situation also prevailed in 1333. Lands other than those in the demesne were held by gavellors in Lisronagh in 1333, and the description of these tenements followed the same form in the extent as that adopted in the description of the demesne. These holdings varied in size from 50 acres to 2 acres and 3 stangs. A similar situation is to be found
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in the pattern of demesne leasing at Callan where the demesne formed part of Elizabeth de Clare's purparty of Kilkenny. The demesne at this manor was under direct cultivation in 1307 but by 1343-4 was leased out in a number of parcels ad voluntatem. These tenements varied in size from 136 acres, 1 stang and 1 perch in Moycorky to a tenement of some 6 perches near the site of the new mill at Callan. A further trend may be discerned from an examination of these gavellor tenements at Callan. Many of the larger tenements had substantial areas of waste land which was unprofitable pro defectu tenencium throughout the 1340's and 1350's. This raises the possibility that some of the larger holdings of this nature were joint tenancies, with a number of gavellors combining to pay the annual rent. It is not possible to substantiate this supposition as none of the Callan demesne accounts note the tenants of the land and merely mention the tenement, the rent derived from it, its acreage and the amount, if any, of waste land included in the original computation of its acreage. By contrast, the gavellors noted in the 1304 extent of Cloncurry were all smallholders on the verge of subsistence, the two largest tenements held ad voluntatem there containing each a cottage with \( \frac{1}{2} \) acre of land and the smallest containing a cottage and 7 perches. The leasing of land at will in the late thirteenth century was probably a response to land hunger, hence the size of these tenements at Cloncurry.

As was the case with tenements held at farm, services attached to land held at will were the responsibility of the gavellor. The gavellor-cottars of both Llanthony Secunda's lands at Duleek and Llanthony Prima's lands at Colpe rendered the services owed from their tenements. Two examples of valuations of gavellors' works are preserved in a collection of accounts of bishoprics and archbishoprics in the hands of the Escheator during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. John of Saunford's late thirteenth century accounts of episcopal lands in Meath record valuations of such services at Killethan and Le Nenagh in both 1282-3 and 1285. Services of tenants described by Mills as free tenants at Kildovan in Finglas, noted in the 1326 extent of the lands of the
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archbishop of Dublin may have been attached to land originally in the
hand of betaghs, which had passed, through the decline of the betagh
community, into the hands of gavellors. These tenants were not described
as betaghs and a differentiation was made between them and a single
farmer on the same grange.

While it has been suggested that the gavellor in Ireland was similar to
the continental gavellor, whose allodial holding was partitioned between
his sons on his death, there is no indication that this was the case. In
every instance where the term gavellor is used in Irish rentals and
extents it is interchangeable with that of tenant-at-will. The partition
of tenements would not have been practical in the case of most small-
holdings and in any event the precarious nature of this form of tenure
would have precluded any form of hereditary descent. The uncertainty
of this form of tenure would have placed the gavellor on a slightly lower
rung on the social ladder than that occupied by the farmer, though in
essential terms the social standing of both the gavellor and the farmer
would have been determined by the extent and the nature of their tenements.

The Burgess

The rural borough and the privileges implicit in burgage tenure were
instruments of considerable importance in consolidating settlement
throughout the lordship of Ireland. Such settlements and inducements
to settlers are part of a pattern usually found either following conquest
or the exploration of hitherto unsettled lands. The most useful parallel
to the situation in Ireland would thus, perhaps, be the attempts to
settle eastern Germany and parts of Poland in the wake of the Wendish
 crusade. The actual pattern of burgage settlement in Ireland is
remarkably uncomplicated. Larger boroughs and cities in the King's hand
such as Dublin and Waterford were given privileges modelled on those
enjoyed by the city and burgesses of Bristol. In the case of rural
boroughs, the customs and privileges enjoyed by the burgesses largely
depended on the location of the borough and the discretion of the original
lord of that land. The effectual division of the early colony into two
great lordships, that of de Lacy in Meath and the Marshal liberty of
Leinster tended to limit the forms of borough custom. Extant charters
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of boroughs, which were originally in these lordships reflect this uniformity. Boroughs erected on de Lacy land tended to have provisions in their charters granting to the burgesses the law of Brteuil, while boroughs in the old Marshal lordship like Wexford and New Ross were granted uniform privileges based on a fusion between the law of Brteuil, the customs of Bristol and possibly some other standard exemplar of borough custom which cannot now be identified. Where charters have survived for rural boroughs on land outside both of these lordships, such as in episcopal or archiepiscopal boroughs, the law of Brteuil rather than the custom of Leinster appears to have been predominant. Thus, an examination of the forms of tenurial conditions associated with the proliferation of rural boroughs in the lordship of Ireland is essentially an examination of tenurial conditions associated with the Irish usage of the law of Brteuil and the extended variation of this law found in the custom of Leinster.

Attempts to delineate the law of Brteuil have varied from Mary Bateson's complex reconstruction of an entire body of custom to Ballard's assertion that the laws (leges) of Brteuil, were in fact the law (lex) of Brteuil, a relatively simple basis for more elaborate charters relating to a local maximum amercement of 12d. and a fixed annual rent of 12d. for a burgage. While Bateson's over-elaborate attempts to reconstruct the laws of Brteuil are unconvincing, it would be unwise to deny that she made two important discoveries in relation to burgage tenure in Ireland. In this context her discovery of the law of Brteuil itself is of primary importance. Many of the boroughs which had been thought to have enjoyed the customs of Bristol were thus shown to have enjoyed the law of Brteuil. Her isolation of the Leinster boroughs from the other rural boroughs of Ireland and her discovery of the custom of Leinster is borne out by the similarities between the earliest portions of charters granted to boroughs in this lordship. Variations in the fundamental customs of the boroughs which Bateson identified as enjoying

the laws of Breteuil led Ballard, correctly in my opinion, to reject her systematised re-construction of these laws. However, it is important to make allowance for some local variation in the evaluation of custom.

Of the two archetypical features associated by Bateson with the law of Breteuil, the standardised rent of 12d. per annum and the maximum amercement of 12d., even the maximum amercement, which Ballard considered to be the more essential of the two, were not universal. The borough of Newport on the Isle of Wight enjoyed the law of Breteuil, but while the rent of an individual burgage there was 12d. per annum, the maximum amercement was 30d.. This raises the question as to what extent our own perception of the law of Breteuil has been conditioned by the surviving charters.

Although it is a safe assumption that there was uniformity of custom in grants made within a particular great lordship, the number of potential variations on a basic theme in the case of smaller lordships is beyond reckoning. An unfortunate deficiency in the extant Irish charters granting the law of Breteuil to individual boroughs is the fact that the fundamental customs were never listed in detail, as were the customs and privileges granted to the Leinster boroughs. This probably reflects an essential difference between settlement under the law of Breteuil, which was widespread in rural Ireland, and settlement under the custom of Leinster, which was more confined in area, but appears to have been undertaken on a rather more systematic basis.

The most distinctive features of charters incorporating grants of the law of Breteuil in Ireland are their brevity and the fact that most of these charters date either from the late twelfth or early thirteenth centuries. Two of the earliest identifiable grants of the law of Breteuil in Ireland were made by Walter de Lacy to his burgesses in Kells and in Drogheda ex parte Midie. Both charters contain the specific grant of the law of Breteuil and are extremely brief. Particular grants were made to the burgesses of Drogheda in relation to fishing rights on the Boyne, the use of boats, the erection of weirs and the building of ponds. The Kells charter specifically mentioned two privileges: That of being quit of tolls throughout the lordship of Meath and that of being justifiable only in the hundred court in all cases except those which affected de Lacy's person and rights. Both the size, 3 acres, and the annual rent of a burgage plot, 12d., were mentioned in the Drogheda


grant, while only the size of the tenement, again 3 acres, was specified in the Kells charter. A third charter, that issued to the burgesses of Trim by de Lacy was also probably a grant of the law of Breteuil. This was a charter confirming to the burgesses omnes libertates quas habuerunt et quibus usi fuerunt secundum legem Bristoll antequam chartam meam presentam de dono meo obtinuerunt. The original grant no longer survives, but it is likely, given the construction of this charter with its extreme brevity and the use of the term law rather than custom or customs, that it was a grant of the law of Breteuil rather than the customs of Bristol. It is worth noting that as Drogheda grew in the course of the thirteenth century, the inadequacy of this charter became apparent, and in three additional royal grants to Drogheda ex parte Midie of 1247, 1318 and 1331 many of the customs of Bristol were granted to this borough.

Thus, it is likely that the burgesses of Drogheda in Meath had the advantages of the law of Breteuil with regard to rent and amercement, together with certain provisions of the custom of Bristol defining clearly the liberties of the borough, the extent of the jurisdiction of its hundred court, the exemption of its burgesses from distraint for debt under certain circumstances and the limitations placed on the activities of merchants from other towns who were not members of the Drogheda guild. This is an indirect indication of one of the attractions of the law of Breteuil to lords establishing settlements immediately after the conquest. The law of Breteuil was adaptable, not particularly complex and could be modified to cope with virtually any situation, even to the extent of assimilating large portions of the customs of Bristol.

Apart from episcopal or archiepiscopal grants of the law of Breteuil, charters from lay lords other than de Lacy appear to have extended these privileges to the burgesses of Rathmore and Siddan in county Meath. The c. 1220 charter issued by Maurice fitz Gerald to the burgesses of Rathmore is almost certainly a grant of the law of Breteuil. Under the terms of this charter the rights of the burgesses to extensive common pasture was confirmed. They were to hold their tenements secundum legem de Brytoylle, each paying an annual rent of 12d. An unusual feature of this charter is that two forms of burgage tenure appear to have co-existed in Rathmore. The majority of the burgesses held some 95 burgage tenements with appurtenances, each burgage containing 7 acres and a frontage, while eleven burgages were also held, each of which only contained ½ acre
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and frontage. No differentiation appears to have been made on the basis of the physical size of the burgage in determining its rent. Philip Telynges' early fourteenth century grant to the burgesses of Siddan confirmed them in the possession of their tenements together with the arable land and common pasture assigned to them and the grant to them of the law of Breteuil cum omnibus libertatibus et liberis consuetudinebus ad dictam legem pertinentibus.\footnote{G. Mac Niocaill, \textit{Na Buirgeisi}, vol. 1 Dublin 1964, pp 319-20.} This style is somewhat unusual and seems to imply that, as far as Telynge was concerned, there was a body of custom associated with the law of Breteuil. As the confirmation dates from the early fourteenth century, a certain amount of local custom had probably evolved. These are probably the liberties and free customs associated with the law of Breteuil in this charter. As was the case at Rathmore, two different types of burgage were noted in the Siddan grant, but unlike Rathmore, the rent at Siddan was linked to the size of the tenement. Each burgage with 3 acres of land was to realise an annual rent of 12d., while the \textit{placea sine acris}, a small plot, probably little more than a frontage, was to realise an annual rent of 6d.

The surviving episcopal and archiepiscopal charters provide little information on the nature of the law or customs granted to the borough in question and pose certain serious interpretative problems. The earliest of these charters to survive are those granted to boroughs within the archbishopric of Dublin. As the earliest source for these charters is Allen's Register, a cautious approach to possible misreadings and sixteenth century glosses on words incorporated into the texts given of certain charters, is essential. A confirmation issued by John Comyn to the burgesses of Swords either in the closing years of the twelfth century or the early years of the thirteenth century, as transcribed in the register, stated that these burgesses enjoyed all the liberties and free customs of the citizens of Dublin, which is to say that they enjoyed the customs of Bristol.\footnote{G. Mac Niocaill, \textit{Na Buirgeisi}, vol. 1 Dublin 1964, p. 321 and C. McNeill, \textit{Calendar of Archbishop Allen's Register}, Dublin 1950, p. 32.} In view of the fact that these burgesses were liable to certain labour services such as reaping, carting the archbishop's hay and corn and repairing the mill pond, and also taking into account the rural nature of the borough, it is extremely unlikely that the customs of Bristol would have been enjoyed by its burgesses, or, indeed, that such customs would have been necessary in a borough of that size. The rent noted for each burgage, 12d. per annum, would have

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
been consistent with a grant of the law of Breteuil to the borough of Swords. It is possible that either Archbishop Alen or one of his predecessors misread the original of this confirmation, mistaking Breteuil for Bristol, glossing Bristol as Dublin and then incorporating Dublin as the more familiar form of the grant in their transcript. A transcript of a charter of confirmation issued by Archbishop Luke to the burgesses of Rathcoole is also preserved in Alen's register. It places the customs under which the burgesses held their tenements beyond cavil. Although the confirmation refers to the laws and customs de Bristollo, the actual terms point clearly to the law of Breteuil. Each burgage tenement contained 4 acres and was held at an annual rent of 12d. on terms similar to those granted to de Lacy's burgesses in Kells and Drogheda, and Telynge's burgesses in Siddan. It is unlikely that two separate forms of custom would have been granted to rural boroughs within the estates of the archbishopric of Dublin.

Charters conferring customs survive for two of the boroughs on the estates of the bishopric of Cloyne, the borough of Cloyne itself and the peculiar betagh-borough of Kylmaclenyn. Both were issued by the same bishop, that for Kylmaclenyn in 1251 and that for Cloyne, which is undated, shortly before or after the issue of the charter to Kylmaclenyn. Although the Kylmaclenyn charter contained a specific grant of the law of Breteuil, no attempt was made to delineate the size of a single burgage, nor was the rent demanded from the borough related to its tenements at the rate of 12d. per burgage. It was a communal rent of 10 marks per annum. The peculiarities in this grant may stem from the fact that Kylmaclenyn had merely been a betagh settlement and that the charter may have been little more than a formal recognition of a purchase of commutation. The Cloyne charter was more typical of the surviving Breteuil charters. This charter contained a delineation of the size of the burgage plot, 8 acres and the statement that the burgesses were to hold, presumably as a corporate body, the plains, roads, paths, meadows, pastures, moors, marches and waters within a certain determined area. They were also granted the turbary to the south of Cloyne as a source of fuel. Once again, however, the rent was stated in communal rather than in individual terms and the burgesses were obliged to pay an annual rent of a mark
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for their borough. The formula used in the Kylmaclenyn charter whereby
the relationship between the bishop and his burgesses was to be governed
by the law of Breteuil was also used in the Cloyne charter.

The only other surviving episcopal or archiepiscopal borough charter is
that issued by Maurianus, archbishop of Cashel, to the burgesses of
Cashel in 1230. While it detailed certain privileges which were
granted to the burgesses, it did not specify the form of the fundamental
local borough custom. A mention was made of the use of the archiepiscopal
city of the vill of Cashel, but the charter contains no indication as to
the nature of this use or custom. It is clear from the body of the
charter that there was a reeve and some twelve burgesses in the borough.
A grant of free pasture for their animals outside the archbishop's
fields and manors, together with control of the hundred and all court
baron pleas, which might arise in relation to the borough, was made to
the burgesses. The archbishop was to retain control over both the oven
and the shambles. An annual rent of 9 marks with a composition of 1 mark
in lieu of revenue from the hundred and the court baron was to be paid
to the archbishop. Certain similarities between this and the Cloyne
charter, together with both the adaptability and brevity of the law of
Breteuil, indicate that the custom at Cashel may have been none other
than that particular law.

Borough customs and conditions of tenure were standardised throughout
the Marshal lordship of Leinster, with certain specific customs and
privileges being granted to all of the Leinster boroughs. This custom
represented a grafting of many of the elements of the custom of Bristol
onto the basic stem of the law of Breteuil. While the Leinster maximum
amercement of 10s. was somewhat higher than the Breteuil maximum, it
was lower that the Bristol maximum of 40s. In the case of one of the
Leinster boroughs, Wexford, the maximum amercement noted in the 1317
charter was 12d. The fixed rent of 12d. for a burgage associated
with the law of Breteuil was a standard feature of the custom of Leinster.
Elements of the custom of Bristol, comparable with many of the privileges
granted to the citizens of Dublin in the 1192 charter are also to be
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found in extant Leinster charters. No killing within the bounds of the borough was to be construed as *murdram* and therefore as a royal plea. None of the burgesses were to be obliged to answer by ordeal of battle any case unless it was such that trial by battle might reasonably be sought as in cases of homicide or robbery. As was the case in cities enjoying the custom of Bristol, the frequency with which the hundred court was to be held was specified at once a week. A system of guilds similar to that of Dublin, which would have limited trading opportunities to merchants who were not native to the borough, existed in all of these Leinster boroughs. Of the other major privileges granted to the Leinster burgesses, a direct parallel is to be found in the 1192 Dublin charter. No burgess was obliged to seek a licence in the matter of marriages of sons, daughters or widows unless they held land from the lord of the liberty outside the borough limits. No other lords of whom the burgesses might have held land could exercise any custody of land held within the borough or with regard to the disposal of their widows or minor heirs in marriage. Burgesses from all of the Leinster boroughs enjoyed passage quit of tolls throughout the liberty.

Even when a charter was issued after the division of the liberty of Leinster, it followed the same format as the earlier charters. The first charter to have been granted to the borough of New Ross was that of 1283-6, which was granted by the lord of Carlow, Roger Bigod. The customs granted were identical to those granted in the Marshal charters and a comparison with those early charters was even written into the first article of this charter. The burgesses of New Ross were to pass freely through Bigod's lands quit of tolls *sicut burgenses de Banna vel Kylkennie vel Weysefordie sive aliqui burgenses Lagenie sunt (sic) libereiores*. This implies the survival of an area which transcended the boundaries of the Marshal purparties in which the basic custom of Leinster had survived. The fusion of the law of Breteuil and the custom of Bristol in the custom of Leinster is probably best explained by necessity. As has already been noted, Drogheda *ex parte Midie*, which initially received a grant of the law of Breteuil from Walter de Lacy, acquired many of the customs of Bristol in the course of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The need to expand and modify the customs used in this half of the city was a consequence of the city's growth as an entrepôt in the bulk commodities trade in the course of the thirteenth century associated with the provisioning of both the Welsh and Scottish
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wars. It was to be expected that the Leinster boroughs would be large as they would have formed important centres of trade in their respective liberties. Even in the early thirteenth century many had attained considerable growth. This fusion of the law of Breteuil and the custom of Bristol was probably an attempt to cope with this fact and to provide leeway for subsequent likely expansion.

No borough extents have survived for any of the boroughs enjoying the law of Breteuil with the single exception of the betagh-borough of Kylmaclenyn, and so nothing can be said about the implications of this custom for the local tenantry and the way in which tenements were held, combined or sub-leased in Breteuil boroughs. Three detailed late thirteenth century extents have, however, survived for the boroughs of Old Coillach, Thomastown and Newtown Jerpoint, all of which enjoyed the custom of Leinster. The standard size of a burgage tenement was stated at the beginning of the 1289 extent of Newtown Jerpoint to have been a burgage with an appurtenance of 6 acres. While this standard is confirmed in both the 1288 extents of Old Coillach and Thomastown, all three extents show certain significant patterns both in the consolidation of large holdings and the sub-letting of tenements. The largest of these boroughs as extended was Old Coillach with 78 burgages. Some 25 5/12 burgages were extended at Thomastown, of which only a little over a fifth was in de Clare’s hands and 22 burgages were extended at Newtown Jerpoint. The Newtown Jerpoint extent appears to be slightly defective, for while it states twice that there were 22 2汉堡ages in the borough which realised an annual rent of 22s.6d., a summation of the tenements and rents listed gives a total of 22 burgages held at an annual rent of 21s.3d.. In other words 1s.3d. in rent and a half burgage were not listed in this extent. There is a sharp distinction in this extent of Newtown Jerpoint between the burgage lands and additional land held by burgesses which is not seen in either of the other extents.
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There appears to be a relationship between the incidence of consolidated holdings containing more than one burgage and the incidence of the sub-leasing of other burgage tenements. Of 41 separate tenements listed at Old Coillach, 21 were consolidated tenements. Of some 13 tenements sublet, ten were consolidated burgage holdings, one was a tenement of 20 acres and the other two contained respectively, a burgage and $\frac{3}{4}$ of a burgage. The most common form of sublet tenement at Old Coillach contained 4 burgages with 24 acres in appurtenances. There were five such tenements with the number of persons on any particular tenement as sub-tenants ranging from five to thirteen named persons excluding the principal tenant named in the extent. It was not uncommon for the principal tenant to hold little or nothing in the tenement. A single consolidated tenement of 6 burgages had seven subtenants, while four tenements each containing two burgages had on them numbers ranging from nine sub-tenants to a single sub-tenant. The eleventh consolidated holding contained two burgages and was divided through dower. Of the remaining ten consolidated tenements of Old Coillach held by single tenants seven contained two burgages, two contained three burgages and one contained six burgages. Certain factors concerning the development of Old Coillach may be deduced from this pattern of landholding. An initial settlement of 78 burgages appears either to have been too large for the original number of settlers or to have declined demographically, possibly through desertion, in the first half of the thirteenth century. Because of this, tenements were consolidated by the more prosperous burgesses. By the 1280's some of the holders of consolidated tenements may either have seized the opportunity created by the increase in local population and therefore in the demand for land and sub-leased their tenements or may have been too poor to retain control of their land.

The proportion of consolidated tenements at Newtown Jerpoint was considerably lower than that at Old Coillach. Of a total of 21 separate tenements six were consolidated and none of these were sub-leased. There were three tenements containing $1\frac{1}{2}$ burgages, two containing 2 burgages and a single tenement containing 3 burgages. Thus, the scope of consolidation was far less there than at Old Coillach. Sub-leasing occurred on three single burgage tenements and a fourth tenement containing $\frac{3}{4}$ of a burgage. In all of these instances most of the appurtenant land was sub-leased. This would seem to indicate that no great alteration in the pattern of
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land holding occurred in the borough of Newtown Jerpoint in the course of the thirteenth century. Thomastown had the least proportion of consolidated tenements in relation to its total number of separate tenements of any of these boroughs. Of a total of 41 separate tenements, only eight were consolidated, of which four contained less than 2 burgages, two contained 2 burgages and one contained 3½ burgages. No tenement in Thomastown was sublet. The fifteen single tenements there consisting of a half burgage was abnormally high in comparison with both Old Coillach and Newtown Jerpoint. This large number of fragmented holdings seems to indicate that there was fairly consistent demographic expansion and pressure on land resources in the de Clare portion of Thomastown throughout the thirteenth century.

A single undated extent, has survived for the manor of Moyaliff. This was probably compiled in the early fourteenth century. This extent contains a detailed rental of the manorial borough which does not appear to have been organised either along the lines of one of the Leinster boroughs or of a borough enjoying the law of Breteuil. Moyaliff lay within the Tipperary march and had by 1338 passed into the land of war. The pattern of tenurial organisation within the borough was totally unlike that in the de Clare boroughs for which extents have survived. There were 59 tenements in the borough of Moyaliff. In as much as there was a basic unit common to most tenements it was the frontage which was coupled with a separate holding of land. The size of this holding varied considerably. One of the burgesses held a frontage and 40 acres and the holder of one of the two consolidated holdings held 3 frontages and 65 acres. In contrast, five tenants merely held frontages, six held tenements consisting of a frontage and 1 acre to 1 stang. The only occasion on which the term burgage was used in this rental was to describe a tenement containing 9 acres which was in the lord's hands as an escheat. There is no indication as to whether or not this was the size of a standard Moyaliff burgage or even if such a standard had ever existed. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the irregularities in the size of holdings in this borough is in some way connected with the political instability of the march in which it lay. It is also interesting to note that the burgesses of Moyaliff, like the betagh-burgesses of Kylmaclenyn, owed carrying services. Whenever the bailiff
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of the manor so requested, the burgesses of Moyaliff were obliged to carry both iron and salt from Cashel. Unlike the tenants of Kylmacleny, however, they were to be paid for this service. The existence of this carrying service, albeit in different forms, at both Moyaliff and Kylmacleny, may have been a result of the evolution of a form of marcher borough custom or may have developed from the adoption of some form of local pre-conquest custom and its fusion into local borough custom.

As can be seen from the variations in tenurial patterns within the four boroughs for which detailed extents have survived it would be unwise to base any conclusions of a demographic or economic nature on such information as the original number of burgage tenements in such settlements or on the rent derived from the entire borough. Even in cases where borough accounts have survived such as Bigod's boroughs of Fothered, Old Ross, New Ross, Carlow and Insula or Elizabeth de Clare's boroughs of Kilmanagh and Callan, the sort of information on which such conjecture could be based was not noted in these accounts. Although the farm or fixed rent for which the reeve was accounting was always noted in these accounts, the only occasions on which individual tenements might have been mentioned were during minorities, in the event of a tenement lying waste or if a tenement had escheated to the lord through felony or debt. Another factor which must be taken into account when examining the revenue generated in the course of a year by boroughs for which accounts have survived, is the fact that burgesses may have held land other than that contained in their burgages and paid for it along with their burgages. A payment for the right of pasturage might also have been included in their fixed rent. Both the burgesses and the other tenants of Newtown Jerpoint held 120 acres apart from the land attached to burgage tenements and in one of the sublet consolidated holdings in Old Coillach, which contained 4 burgages, the tenants paid 9d. per annum for their pasture. Much of the land held in large boroughs such as New Ross was probably arable land leased to the local burgesses along with their own burgage.
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185. For an example of tenements accounted for while in the lord's hand see P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/29-31, accounts of New Ross 1283-6.

186. P.R.O. S.C. 11 794.

187. P.R.O. S.C. 11 792 and see Chapter VI: Table VI.
Hundred Courts, Prises and other Customary Levies

As is also the case with the manorial court in the lordship of Ireland, few of the proceedings of hundred courts have survived. For the most part references to the hundred both in extents and accounts are concerned with its profitability and nothing else. Thus, the annual revenue generated by the court and the frequency with which it met, generally once a week or a fortnight, might be the only pieces of information to survive about any particular hundred. Much of the court's time was probably taken up with routine civil cases between the burgesses. In a roll which survives for the borough of New Ross in 1403-4, the cases are all of a civil nature, being either actions in relation to debt or trespass.\(^{189}\). It is clear from a case of frisca forcia between Christine Arlone, on the one part and Matthew Shirwod and his wife Isabella, on the other, heard in 1376 at the hundred of New Ross that this court had cognisance of a plea very similar to that of novel disseisin.\(^{190}\). The officer presiding at the hundred court would have been the reeve of the borough and the burgesses would have owed suit as a matter of course to their hundred. While no surviving records cast further light on the power and jurisdiction of the hundred, it is likely that such matters as reliefs paid following the inheritance of a burgage or payments made in relation to the conveyancing of property within the borough would also have been recorded in the hundred court. It would thus have had a function parallel to that of the manorial court in similar circumstances.

The rural borough provided its lord with other potential sources of revenue such as the *cense*, the prise of ale and tolls. Little can be established with any degree of certainty in relation to the operation of such levies and tolls at a local level. It is therefore impossible to produce any national synthesis or average on their effectiveness, their severity and the manner in which they were gathered.

Only one list of *cense* paying burgesses has survived. This was compiled
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188. The burgesses of New Ross held 5 carucates of land in 1307. Part of this land would have provided burgage tenements, the remainder must either have been arable or pasture. C.D.I. 1302-7, p. 176, P.R.O. C 135 file 127/53.
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at Cloyne in 1346 and was merely a list of names of those liable to pay cense together with the relevant amounts. The mechanics of the tax were not stated in any preamble to the list. Of some thirty-eight persons listed, only three were women. It is thus unlikely that the cense was some form of poll-tax, and it is more likely to have been some form of hearth-tax or payment made by the head of a household or the principal tenant on any given holding. Whether or not the rate of tax paid was related to the size of the holding or the number of persons dwelling on that holding cannot be determined from this list. Payments due ranged from 2d. to 3s.. A record of the amount due has only survived in twenty-six cases and of these twelve persons paid 2d. each, eleven paid 4d., one paid 3d., one paid 20d and the highest payment of 3s. was also made by an individual tenant. This may be an indication that the levy of cense was determined by the size of the tenement, the probability being that the tenants paying 20d. and 3s. respectively held abnormally large holdings with whatever the normal holding was generating from 2d. to 4d. in cense.

The prise of ale was a levy in kind on commercial brewing of ale. This particular levy was not confined to the boroughs and was also to be found at certain manorial centres such as Colpe and Llanthony Secunda's lands at Logher in Meath. Although little data has survived on this subject, it is clear that the prise of ale was not levied at a uniform rate throughout the lordship of Ireland, and that the amount levied could vary considerably from place to place. In two important cases of disseisin brought by the abbot of St. Mary's in Cashel in 1313 against the burgesses of Cashel, the prise of ale at that borough was defined as a levy of 2 gallons of ale from every commercial brewing. The bishop of Kildare attempted in 1335 to assert his right to a levy of 1 gallon from each commercial brewing of the burgesses in Clane together with an annual payment of 10s. from each brewer. In the Newtown Jerpoint extent the prise of ale was defined as a levy of 12 gallons from each commercial brewing, while at Colpe and Logher it stood at

192. See above, p.293 n. 125.
193. Pleas before the Justiciar, 26th July 6 Ed. II, P.R.O.I., R.C. 8/8 p. 467, K.B. 1/1 m 75d.
4 and 2 gallons respectively from each commercial brewing. Thus, it would be extremely misleading to attempt to produce any overall average in the payment in kind levied in this particular prize. Regional conditions and charters or individual arrangements with the lord of the borough may all have been of equal importance in determining the rate at which it was levied.

Less can be said about the various tolls levied in the rural boroughs of thirteenth and fourteenth century Ireland. Definitions are uncommon. The ubiquitous tolnetum, found in many of the extant borough accounts could have been one of a number of things. It might have been in some way connected with suit owed by the burgesses to the lord's mill, though this is extremely unlikely for no account, rental or extent has preserved a schedule of the proportion of burgesses' grain taken in mill tolls. It might have been a levy on goods of a certain type or on the goods of merchants coming into the borough to trade similar in nature to the levies in cases where pannage or murage had been granted to any particular community. It is also clear from both the accounts of the borough of Callan in the 1340's and 1350's and the 1280's accounts of New Ross that markets and the annual fair were also sources of considerable revenue to the lord of the borough. Regular payments of stallage were recorded at Callan and the revenue derived from short-term leases of houses and stalls together with the profits of justice from the fair court at New Ross were quite considerable.

The Free Tenant (i) Military Tenure

As was the case with both the farmer and the gavellor, the actual social standing of the free tenant in the lordship of Ireland would have been determined by the size of his tenement and the manner in which it was held. Apart from burgage tenure there were two basic forms of free tenure: military and non-military tenure. The military tenant paid scutage when royal service was proclaimed, owed the usual feudal incidents

197. i.e. P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/41, account of Old Ross 1280-1.
199. i.e. P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/25, Account for New Ross, 1280-1.
to his lord, occasionally owed suit to the manorial court and very occasionally owed a rent for his tenement. The main source of revenue accruing from such tenants to their lords other than the feudal incidents, wardship and the marriage of heirs would have been a surplus in scutage. Lordships generally contained more knights' fees than was apparent from their Exchequer assessments and payments. Thus, the entire liberty of Leinster, which was assessed at 100 fees, contained approximately 180 while the lordship of Meath, which was assessed at 50 fees, contained almost 120 fees.

It is clear from the surviving evidence that there was no standard form of military tenure. Some tenants merely paid scutage when military service was proclaimed, while others might also have owed suit of court and in some cases an annual rent. Tenants listed on the Butler manor of Nenagh in the 1338 inquisition post mortem extent clearly owed both scutage and rent. A half theodum at Choys was held by John Bermingham for an annual rent of 31s.8d. He also owed suit of court on a fortnightly basis and £4 scutage whenever royal service was proclaimed. In the same manor 3 carucates of land were held by Thomas, son of Robert at Crunagh for which he paid 12s. in scutage, an annual rent of £10 and also owed suit of court. There is a significant difference between both of these tenements and the structure of the rent and other obligations owed by those holding them. The tenement at Choys was considerably larger than that at Crunagh, but owed a small annual rent in relation to its size. The obverse is true of the burden of scutage, while both tenements owed suit of court. This is probably an indication that Choys, though a large tenement, lay either in a march or a portion of the land of war bordering on a march, whereas Crunagh would have been less exposed to the instability of the march. The difference between the two levels of rent and scutage would thus have reflected the local political conditions.

A similar situation to that at Nenagh pertained on the manor of Thurles, though it is worth noting that some of the tenants there held their tenements merely by rendering suit of court and paying scutage when royal...
service was proclaimed. While a knight's fee was held by William Broun at Screan in that manor for an annual rent of 20s., rendering suit of court and paying 10s. when royal service was proclaimed, five knights' fees were held at Drummacbarron by Edmund, son of John Stapilton for 40s. scutage when royal service was proclaimed and suit of court. Thus, a substantial portion of the scutage surplus has already been mentioned, would appear to have remained in the hands of the tenants at Thurles, rather than falling into the hands of the earl. A more normal response to this situation would have been that found in Edmund le Botiller's handling of his scutage surplus within his sub-lordship in Tullowphelim prior to 1303. It is clear from the 1307 extent of the lordship of Carlow that Edmund held this tenement as a unit containing four knights' fees from the lord of Carlow. Eleven military sub-tenants paid him a total of 228s. whenever scutage was proclaimed which more than covered their lord's military and only obligation to Roger Bigod. The retention of the surplus in the hands of the military tenants at Thurles is probably another reflection of the general instability of the area in which this manor was situated.

Although three of the military tenants on the manor of Cloncurry listed in the 1304 extent paid rent, two of these tenements may originally have owed a render in kind rather than a monetary rent. Thomas, son of Alfred, who held a knight's fee in Donothda was liable to pay 40s. in scutage when royal service was proclaimed together with an annual rent of 6d.. Robert Platebury also held a knight's fee, paying 40s. when scutage ran and either making an annual render of a pair of gloves or paying 6d. Both men owed suit of court. By contrast Hugo Possewyk held a fee attached to the manor of Cloncurry which lay in one of the less stable areas of the Kildare/Offaly/Meath march for which he paid an annual rent of 1 mark and only 20s. in scutage when royal service was proclaimed.

It was, on the whole, more usual for the military tenant not to pay an annual rent even if holding what amounted to a sub-manor. In this sense the military tenants of Leixlip listed in the 1341 extent of that manor may serve as a paradigm. Some 2½ knights' fees were held there by

204. Ibid., p. 29.
205. Ibid., p. 29.
206. Ibid., p. 31.
207. P.R.O. C 47 10/20 (1).
four tenants, and in one case the size of a particular half fee was specified. John de Bermingham and Simon Flattesbury each held a half fee paying 20s. when scutage ran. Hugh le Blund held a half fee at Drommayghull and a separate tenement of 2 carucates at Clonagheles, paying 20s. in scutage from each of these tenements. The fifth of the half fees attached to Leixlip was the sub-manor of Lyons (manerium de Lyons) which is likely to have contained considerably more than 2 carucates of land. Even on an extended manor, such as Loxeudy, where military tenements were almost lordships, the military tenant merely paid scutage when royal service was proclaimed and no further monetary rent. It is also clear from the 1332 partition of the de Verdun lands and the extents of two-thirds of Loxeudy, which form part of the series drawn up in connection with this partition, that the surplus in scutage at Loxeudy remained in the hands of the military tenants there. A knight's fee at Firkyl, which was attached to that manor, was listed in the extent of the first of the purparties as owing only 20s.6d. when royal service was proclaimed. The fact that Loxeudy lay well within the marchland of the western portion of the old lordship of Meath may well provide the explanation for this retention as it did in the case of the surplus retained in the hands of the military tenants of Thurles.

While the earl of Ulster's military tenants in Ulster were not listed in the 1333 extent as being liable to pay rent, the jurors appear to have confused the scutage levied from a knight's fee with the value of the land during a minority in stating that each fee while in the hand of the earl through minority was worth 40s. per annum.

Although many military tenants also owed suit of court, this obligation was by no means universal. All of the military tenants on Butler land in 1338 owed suit of court, as did the military tenants of Kilkea in the 1311 extent of that manor and the four military tenants of Cloncurry. The situation on the de Verdun lands in 1332 is, however, unclear. Both the military tenants of the manor of Loxeudy and the military tenants in Meath and in Louth had obligations which were defined broadly in terms of feudal service and scutage.


of the payment of scutage and attendencia. This latter may include suit of court but might also merely have referred to the fact that their lord was entitled to attendant occasional profits from these lands such as wardship and the custody and marriage of heirs or heiresses. Two different practices appear to have obtained in separate parts of the lordship of Carlow in 1307. Military tenants within the Carlow portion of the lordship all owed suit of court, while no obligation of this nature was listed for the military tenants on Bigod's Wexford lands. None of the military tenements at Leixlip appear to have been burdened with suit of court. An interesting contrast occurs between the situation on the earl of Kildare's lands in Kildare, where military tenants again do not appear to have owed suit of court and those outside Kildare. The military tenants at Carnekeityll in Limerick one of the earl's manors outside Kildare, were all noted in the 1331 extent of two-thirds of that manor as owing suit of court. While it can be argued that failure to mention an obligation such as suit of court might have resulted from different standards and practices among the compilers of extents, it is unlikely that such a potential source of revenue would either have remained untapped or unrecorded.

The value of wardships depended largely on the actual value of the individual knight's fee, and also on the age of the next heir. Fees were extended on the death of the military tenant. One such extent has survived for the Butler lands at Tullowphelim in Carlow, drawn up in 1303. Edmund le Botiller's only obligation to Roger Bigod as tenant of four knights' fees at Tullowphelim was the payment of £8 in scutage when royal service was proclaimed and suit to the court at Carlow. This tenement contained two manorial centres, one at Tullowphelim itself with a demesne of 288 acres and 1 stang, together with approximately 120 acres of pasture, and the other at Lismacloman, with a demesne of 164 acres and 140 acres of pasture and moor. There were eleven military and
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thirty-one non-military tenants at Tullowphelim excluding burgesses, who held 15 carucates of land on their own account. Various tenements and mills were also in the hands of farmers. The annual value of this tenement was assessed at £107-6-9. A somewhat less dramatic manifestation of the same phenomenon is to be seen in the military tenements described in the Gowran extent of 1306. In this extent fifteen military tenements were extended, varying in size from a half fee to two knights' fees, with both their holders and the main sub-tenants on these tenements being listed.

Thus, the main profits accruing to most lords from their military tenants were occasional in nature, whether they were derived from scutage surpluses, amercement for non-attendance at the court baron or wardships and marriages. Such tenements served a military rather than an economic function in any extensive lordship, strengthening the lord's defensive capacity. Occasional revenue derived from such tenements might, in certain instances and usually over a limited period of time, prove a lucrative source of revenue, but because of its uncertain nature could never be integrated into any lord's financial expectations on a regular basis.

The Free Tenant (ii) Non-Military Tenure

Relations between the non-military free tenant and his lord were controlled by the terms under which the land was originally granted, and thus varied considerably. In most cases such tenants owed suit to the manorial court and occasionally owed suit to the manorial mill. Where exemptions from suit of court are noted in extents, it is possible that some payment was made in lieu of this obligation. These payments were probably absorbed into the rent of the tenement by the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. As no detailed extents have survived from the early or mid thirteenth century it is impossible to identify these payments. Whether the rent - the main source of revenue accruing to the lord - from the non-military tenant, was an economic reflection of the value and productivity of the land in question can, if at all, only be established in the most general terms. Certain trends in rent levels are apparent if one examines a cross-section of late thirteenth and early fourteenth century extents. As is to be expected, the highest rents for individual tenements were to be found in the land of peace and the lowest in the land of war or the march. A further factor, the time at which the original grant was made, occasionally had a significant effect on rent levels.

In the relatively well protected areas such as Cloncurry, extended in 1304, and Corduff, extended in 1311, overall rents were high. The value of the demesne at Corduff was assessed at 12d. an acre, and rents in non-military free tenements there ranged from 8d. to 1s. an acre. While the demesne land at Cloncurry was even more highly valued at 20d. an acre, there was a much greater variation in the range of acreage rent paid by the non-military free tenants, with one smallholder paying as much as 15d. per acre, while Thomas Ledwiche, who held 2 carucates, paid an annual rent of 6d. or 0.025d. per acre. Although the proximity of some of the Cloncurry tenements to the Kildare/Meath/Offaly march may have affected their rent, it is more likely that many of the variations in rent at Cloncurry reflect the time at which the original grant was made together with both demographic pressure and the demand for land at that time.

The difference between rent levels on both of these manors and rent levels on two marcher manors, Kilkea and Imaal, for which early fourteenth century extents survive, is considerable. Although the demesnes at Kilkea and Imaal were valued respectively at 8d. and 12d. per acre, the rent paid by non-military free tenants of both manors rarely exceeded 1d. per acre. The possibility that this low rent on manors such as Kilkea and Imaal concealed certain local military and defensive responsibilities cannot be ruled out. Of a total of twenty-three tenants at Imaal, only one held by military tenure, though there were six military tenants at Kilkea, accounting for a total of 105s. in scutage between them. It might be argued, in the case of manors like Imaal, which lay well within the march by the end of the thirteenth century, that they had been unaffected by Gaelic disturbances at the time of their initial settlement and that the provision of large numbers of military tenancies may not have been considered necessary. The balance between the non-military and the military tenantry on the manors of the Tipperary march was, however, much closer, with military
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tenants occasionally outnumbering the non-military. Even at the time of its settlement Tipperary was an extremely unstable area and this instability probably underlies this particular form of tenurial structure.\textsuperscript{227}. Extents made of James Butler's manors of Thurles and Nenagh following his death in 1338, show a much closer relationship between the number of military and non-military tenancies than was the case in Leinster manors.\textsuperscript{228}. There were 15 military and 5 non-military tenancies extended at Thurles together with a further 5 military and 2 non-military tenancies, which were noted as waste land. A similar situation would have prevailed at Nenagh in the early fourteenth century, but by 1338 the number of waste tenancies had grown to such an extent that most of the military tenements were vacant. Of a potential 17 military tenements at Nenagh in 1338 13 were vacant, while only nine of a potential 22 non-military tenements were vacant. Thus, one might say that the balance between the military and the non-military tenements more typical of the land of peace had re-emerged in Nenagh of the 1330's as a result of wastage and the extension of the land of war. The original preponderance of military tenements in these Tipperary manors probably reflects the fact that the settlement of these areas was still under way well into the thirteenth century and that their frontier nature was apparent and thought to be permanent at the time of their settlement.

The other two major marcher lordships with which the situation in Tipperary might be compared are the de Burgh lordship in Connacht and the de Verdun manor of Loxeudy. In 1333 the Connacht jurors found it impossible to compile a separate list of military tenements,\textsuperscript{229}, but it is likely that specification in individual Connacht extents that a tenant held land \textit{in feodo} may signify a military tenement. On the manor of Loughrea, apart from the demesne lands at Tolleghowban and Camcon, there were 17 free tenements, including one of 3 villates held by burgesses,

\textsuperscript{227}. G.H.Orpen, Normans II, pp 295-6. The death of Theobald Walter in 1206 and his son's minority, which ended in 1221 would have delayed the settlement of extensive parts of north Tipperary. The presence of centres potential of Irish resistance and the activity of both the O'Briens of Slieve Bloom and the O'Carrolls would have also interfered with this settlement.

\textsuperscript{228}. See respectively Cal Ing. Post-Mortem, vol. 8, pp 117-9 and 121-3 and P.R.O. C 135 file 55 pieces 3 and 8.

\textsuperscript{229}. T.C.D. Ms. 1060, p. 209 and P.R.O. C 135 file 36 piece 22.
directly attached to the manor. Of these some 10 tenements were held in feodo. Of ten listed free tenements of the sub-manor of Meelick, only 3 tenements were held in feodo, while on the sub-manor of Muintermaillfinn, which incorporated the borough of Portumna, only one of 19 listed free tenements was held in feodo. No tenements were held in this manner at Silmaelruin. Thus, while the situation at Loughrea itself conformed to the Tipperary model, its sub-manors had a surprisingly low number of military tenancies for what was essentially a marcher lordship. It is impossible to determine what situation prevailed on the de Burgh lands at Sligo, Corlan, Lune and Carbery, though it should be noted that none of the tenements listed in the 1289 extent of the then Fitzgerald manor of Sligo together with the land of Tycorcomyll included any military tenement.

In the case of the de Verdun manor at Loxeudy, of which two-thirds were extended and sub-divided between the de Verdun co-heiresses in 1332, there were some 8 free non-military tenements together with 49 military tenements. While the balance between the military and the non-military tenancies at Loughrea itself and Loxeudy was similar to that found on the Butler manors of Thurles and Nenagh, this was not the case on the sub-manors of Loughrea.

Another feature of non-military tenure on the marcher manor was the fact that tenements on manors such as Loxeudy and Dunamase were described in extents as mini-lordships, for which no acreage was given. Rents paid by the holders of such tenements cannot be co-related to the acreage of land held and were probably uneconomic. A clear parallel could thus be drawn between these tenements and many of the large Connacht tenements for which extremely low rents were demanded. The level of these
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rents probably represents both an inducement to settle on the land in question and a certain understood and unstated local military responsibility.

Apart from the obvious and self-explanatory difference between rent levels in the land of peace or the land of war, the rate at which rent was paid by non-military free tenants varied considerably on most manors. These variations reflected a number of factors which could not now be established with any accuracy such as the soil type or the probability of flooding. One of the major reasons for these differences in rent may, however, have been the time at which land was granted to the sub-tenant and whether this grant was made in the early phase of settlement, or at a stage when, in relative terms, land had become scarce. It is unfortunate that no series of extents with a detailed rental section has survived for any particular manor. Thus, speculation can only be based on surviving late thirteenth and early fourteenth century extents, which would have reflected a number of phases of settlement rather than the actual development of that settlement. The main indications that a tenement was granted to its tenant in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century would be in the size of the tenement, which would have been considerably smaller than those involved in earlier grants and the acreage rent yielded by the tenement in question. Demand for land was probably stimulated by two inter-related factors, a general growth in the population and the expansion of the agrarian market economy in Ireland because of this demographic expansion and the growing demand for grain and other supplies generated by the Welsh and Scottish wars.239.

In the case of the manor of Cloncurry, the two largest tenements, that of 2 carucates at Le Kappagh held by Thomas Ledwiche and that of 180 acres at Illiston held by Bedwin Blund, were probably the earliest grants to have survived in 1304.240. Ledwiche paid rent at the rate of 0.025d. per acre while Blund paid at the rate of 0.033d. per acre. A later phase of grants and leases is reflected in the group of tenements comprising 4 tenements, each containing 60 acres, one tenement of 150 acres and another of 15 acres, where the rents varied from 7½d. to 10d. per acre. In terms of acreage, the most expensive tenements at Cloncurry were those containing 5 or 6 acres. One tenement containing 5 acres, which was held by Nicholas de Frenes, generated an annual rent of 15d. per acre, while six other tenements each containing the same acreage

239. See Chapter 71, pp 34-36.
generated an annual rent of 12s. 4d. per acre. These rents were closer to the acreage valuation of 20d. for the demesne at Cloncurry than any of the other rents derived from free tenements, and that, together with the size of these tenements is probably an indication that the tenurial contract is of the late thirteenth century.

It is possible that the need filled by the leasing of small non-military free tenements on manors such as Cloncurry was filled in other areas through leasing land either at farm or at will. In the absence of more comprehensive source material it would be unwise to claim that the small non-military free tenement was either more or less common than the leasing of land at farm or at will. Suffice it that probable late thirteenth century increases in the amount of land held by any of these means reflect both the buoyancy of the grain market and the increasing demand for land resulting from demographic expansion.

The Manorial Court

Relatively few manorial court rolls have survived for the lordship of Ireland, the earliest of these being the early fifteenth century court roll of Kilcrone. It is thus difficult to be specific about the practices common in or the powers of the manorial court during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as one is in essence arguing from later material, which may not have been entirely typical of early practices. With the declining power of the Dublin administration and the contraction of the area in which the king's writ ran by the fifteenth century, the powers of local courts, whether manorial courts or borough hundreds and their jurisdiction may have expanded to fill this vacuum. While it is clear from both the Bygod accounts and from the allowances in many of Elizabeth de Clare's local receivers' accounts that manorial court rolls were being kept in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the fact that none of these local rolls have survived is in itself a reflection of their function. It is likely, that apart from their local significance, the main importance of these rolls in both the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was as a particular of the local receiver's account. In this
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241. i.e. See P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/48 account of the manor of Old Ross 1284-5 and references to the purchase of parchment for Duleek in 1350-1, P.R.O. S.C.6 1237/23 (printed in Otway-Ruthven, De Verdun Partition, pp 437-9) and also the Callan borough clerk's fee together with the purchase of parchment in 1351-2, P.R.O. S.C. 6 1237/9 given in M.C. Lyons, 'Elizabeth de Clare's Purparty of Callan', Decies, no. 16 (January) pp 31, 33.

context it is important to remember that revenue from the manorial court was a small and fluctuating part of the overall income from any manor. The rise in importance of locally as opposed to centrally administered justice may have led to slightly greater care being taken of such records in the fifteenth century.

The functions and powers of the manorial court are best examined in the context of the double role played by the court as both a court leet and a court baron. It was in its guise as court leet that the unfree and semi-free tenants of the manor came into contact with the manorial court. In their History of English Law, Pollock and Maitland suggest that a twice-yearly view of frankpledge was the general practice. This certainly appears to have been the case on the manors of the archbishopric of Dublin in John Alen's time and was probably the practice in these manors in preceding centuries. This may not reflect a general pattern, for it would appear from the 1333 extent of the manor of Lisronagh that the leet and baron characters of the court were fused, with the court being held at fortnightly intervals. The free tenants were to attend the court themselves and were obliged to make all their own tenants attend by fortnightly summons. It is unfortunate, in view of the paucity of surviving court roll material that none of the other extant extents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were as specific as the 1333 extent of Lisronagh in delineating the frequency of suit of court and the obligations of free tenants vis-à-vis the attendance of their tenants at the manor court.

The practice and scope of the court leet is well exemplified in both the structure and contents of the early fifteenth century court roll of the manor of Kilcrone. An initial list of names on the roll, which Curtis considered to be a list of suitors, is more likely to have been a record of a view of frankpledge. This is followed by a list of suitors and their tenements. The form followed by the court is that of presentment by jury of a series of offences and other matters which came within the cognisance of the court. There is a clear parallel between this form of presentment and that of royal pleas, which underlines the purpose.

243. Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, p. 49.
244. E. Curtis, Calendar of Ormond Deeds, vol. 2, Dublin 1934, No. 439. a &
245. i.e. C.J.R. 1295-1303, pp 167-89, pleas of the crown in the 1297 eyre of Kildare.
of the record. Even minor cases and transgressions listed on the Kilcrone roll would have been of profit to the lord of the manor in the same way as the crown pleas would have generated royal income. Minor cases of bloodshed and debt would have been presented in manorial courts as a matter of course, as would boundary disputes between unfree or semi-free tenants. For many tenants this would have been the only judicial forum at which they could plead, being disbarred either through economic circumstances, Irishry, or betaghry from taking their cases to the royal courts. Monies or animals accruing to the lord, either in the form of entry fines or heriots, through the transfer of property between the unfree and the semi-free would have been noted on the manorial court rolls, as would the election and the oath-taking of manorial officials at the beginning of their term of office. The other major, if uncommon, function of the court leet was that of determining of custom pertaining either to practices or customary services on the manor. A declaration of this nature with regard to the services owed by the tenants of Baliknochane is recorded at the foot of the Kilcrone roll.

Free tenants holding both military and non-military tenements were catered for by the manorial court in its aspect as court baron. The actual scope of the court in this context is unclear, though it is possible that many Irish manorial courts had cognisance of the plea of vetitum namium, which should more correctly have been heard in royal courts. In 1297 a number of Kildare/Offaly magnates were claiming cognisance of this plea in their courts, while it was stated bluntly in the 1333 extent of Lisronagh that the manorial court there had cognisance of this plea. The court baron would have mirrored some of the functions of the court leet. Reliefs and some matters pertaining to wardship would have come within the ambit of this court. This would explain some of the large sums of money accruing to Roger Bigod from his honour court at Old Ross. Initially many civil cases between free tenants in possessory matters, such as cases of novel disseisin,

247. E. Curtis, 'The Court Book of Esker and Crumlin', R.S.A.I. jn, vol. 59 (1929), p. 47, at the sitting of 6th July 1592 the election of a receiver-general, a serjeant, two constables and two assessors for Esker was noted as were the oaths taken by these men.
250. Curtis, Lisronagh and Betagh Status, p. 49.
251. cf. noting of reliefs in 1283-4, account of the manor of Old Ross P.R.O. S.C.6 1238/45 with income from the pleas and perquisites of the court.
would have been heard in the royal courts but with the contraction of
the authority of the Dublin administration, pleas of this nature were
probably heard by manorial courts. There is evidence that this had begun
to happen in the lands of the earl of Ormond by the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{252}.

Thus, the manorial court performed a double role in acting as both the
local court for the free and unfree or semi-free tenants of the manor.
Its survival and apparently increasing importance throughout the fifteenth
and sixteenth centuries is probably a reflection more of a growth in
relative than actual importance in the wake of the contraction of the
area in which the royal courts were active.

The overall significance in the colonial nature of tenure in the lordship
of Ireland is inescapable. Servile tenure in Ireland was less harsh
than that of settled and prosperous areas of England and was closer to
that found in England's own marches, both in Wales and in the areas
threatened by Scottish raiding parties. Use of the privileges of
various forms of borough custom to attract settlers and strengthen
settlement was perhaps as effective as castellation at a local level
in preserving settlement. Despite the fact that the lordship of Ireland
was a colony, there was considerable blurring between many of the
tenurial categories and an absence of rigid stratification. Predictably,
the most widespread disability would have been that of Irishry rather
than that of villeinage, while many of the larger military and non-
military free tenements in the marchlands conformed to what might have
been considered the norm of settlement in an unstable area of the colony
in that they were exceptionally large and offered their tenants a
potentially vast return for their management and their defence of the
locality. Thus, the entire infrastructure of tenurial relationships
in the lordship of Ireland could be said to have been colonial in
essence, geared as it was towards the defence of the lordship and the
maintenance of settlement.

\textsuperscript{252} E. Curtis, \textit{Calendar of Ormond Deeds}, vol. 3 Dublin 1934, No. 78.
This case, which was heard at Knocktopher in 1428 before Walter
Shirlak the Seneschal, concerned a plea by Emma Flete that she
had been dispossessed of 4 acres of arable land with appurtenances
by Richard Fyll.
As was the case in many parts of England, the worsening climatic conditions of the early years of the fourteenth century, culminating in the great northern European disaster of 1315-18 had an impact of great importance on the agrarian sector of the economy of the Lordship of Ireland.¹ Both the Bruce Invasion and the problems created by the expansion of the march were to exacerbate the effects of this reverse and were thus to add to the instability of an economy already in decline. Agrarian prosperity appears to have reached its zenith in Ireland in the course of the 1280's under the impetus of demand for provisions stimulated by the Welsh wars of Edward I. Signs of decline were, however, evident even in the early years of the fourteenth century. This decline was caused by the increasingly disruptive effect of purveyance on the grain market - a fact reflected in increased obstruction and resistance to royal purveyance in the lordship during the early years of that century.

An overburdened Treasury in Dublin had long since ceased to be able to bear the cost of purveyance for the war in Scotland to the extent that sale to the purveyors would have involved a double loss on the part of the vendor.² This loss stemmed both from delay in payment and the fact that the valuation of goods purveyed was frequently well below the price available on the open market. The disruptive effects of purveyance were on a number of occasions combined with the incidence of famine, which, in turn, led to the refinement of a form of illicit purveyance already used by magnates, their indentured retinues and any armed individuals who felt that profit or sustenance might be derived from the prevailing situation. It is against this backdrop that one must view the increasing number of raids mounted by the Irish of the Leinster mountains against the royal and archiepiscopal manors of the vale of Dublin and by Anglo-Irish marcher magnates and petty lords against poorer neighbours, unable to maintain kerns to defend their land, livestock and crops.³

While no dramatic fluctuations other than those caused by the more obvious

---

² See below, p. 348, pp 349-50.
³ See below, pp 352-7.
meteorological and military reverses are discernible in the price of basic agrarian products throughout the fourteenth century, it is clear that the buoyancy and prosperity of the 1280's was, by the 1330's, essentially a thing of the past. It is not without reason that the decade following the wet years and the Bruce Invasion provides evidence of increasing amounts of leased demesne land. Leases of this nature were common even on the manors of Elizabeth de Clare, whose record as a careful and conscientious landlord is beyond question. They reflect an abandonment of direct cultivation in the face of diminishing profitability and increasing local turbulence and are thus symptomatic of the overall contraction of the Irish agrarian economy.

An effective examination of this decline is best conducted through the separate examination of the climatic deterioration and of all of the other factors affecting the stability of the market and the availability of certain basic products. All of these factors are closely related as causative agents of decline. Nevertheless any attempt to produce an integrated chronological account of this decline would inevitably be superficial and could not deal adequately with many of the more significant problems which were continuous and cumulative in effect. It is for this reason that I shall examine the effects of climatic change and worsening weather conditions, purveyance, both royal and illicit, and the spread of the marchland before treating of price movements on the grain and livestock markets.

Before turning to the specific question of weather in thirteenth and fourteenth century Ireland, it is necessary to examine the nature of the sources from which both weather and price data have been drawn. The fortunate survival of the accounts of the Bigod manors in the lordship of Carlow during the 1280's, provides extremely useful weather and price data for the period in question - data similar both in quality and provenance, though not in quantity, to that exploited by Titow in his examination of weather and prices on the manors of the bishopric of Winchester in the course of the thirteenth and first half of the fourteenth centuries. Thereafter the sources for both forms of data are more diverse and less satisfactory in nature. None of the surviving

4. See above, Chapter IV, p. 176
accounts of Elizabeth de Clare's Irish manors and estates provide any agrarian price data or note the weather conditions prevailing in the year of account.

Demesne cultivation by the lord's reeve and famuli had long since been abandoned on these estates. Demesne cultivation by the lord's reeve and famuli had long since been abandoned on these estates. No stock or grain was sold by the local receivers, and the effect of the weather on local agrarian productivity was of little importance to Elizabeth, whose interest in the land was essentially that of a rentier. Thus, only visitations of the plague or incursions by the neighbouring Irish or Anglo-Irish, events likely to explain sudden decreases in the income derived from the rents and issues of these lands, were noted by her receivers in their accounts.

Both the Gaelic and the Anglo-Irish annals are the major source of pre and post-1280's weather data. Major meteorological disasters and crop failures were always recorded in these annals, but, as sources, they are flawed by the fact that local famines and crop failures and disasters such as serious flooding caused by a river in spate were rarely recorded by the annalist. Further data drawn from dendrochronological researches undertaken by Baillie involving samples of oak wood from various sites in Ulster and Dublin can only be used in conjunction with other evidence. Baillie's tables point to certain probabilities, but his data does not provide independent confirmation of prevailing weather conditions. While it is possible to use the Winchester data published by Titow in conjunction with data from the Anglo-Irish annals, covering conditions in the east and south of Ireland, the lack of any work of a substantive nature on weather in the border counties or in Scotland deprives one of a similar control for independent data found only in the Annals of Ulster.

See above, Chapter IV.

See Chapter VII: Table I.


This data relates to the annual rate of growth of the oak or oaks from which samples were taken. As varying conditions can produce both poor and good years of growth such evidence would be highly unreliable if examined in isolation.
The material used in the price tables accompanying this chapter is, with the exception of the Carlow data, exclusively derived from central administrative records such as memoranda rolls, pipe rolls, transcripts of cases heard before the Justiciar, the King's Bench or the Justices in Eyre and lists of goods either escheated or forfeit. I have, wherever possible, avoided the inclusion of valuations arising from distraint as these were for the most part the valuation of the pledge rather than the actual article distrained and were generally undervaluations. My original intention of producing a split-level index of prices and of the valuations of distrains was abandoned because the distraint material neither enhanced nor detracted from the other data available to any significant degree. Prices quoted in the Anglo-Irish annals in time of famine, while reflecting either the expectation that the famine would continue, or that some improvement in the situation was imminent, cannot be treated on the same basis as known prices of goods sold, bought or forfeit. As is the case with much annalistic evidence, they reflect a mixture of the annalist's personal experience and impressions, together with contemporary rumour. Nevertheless, such entries provide valuable indications of the severity and duration of any given famine.

Price material drawn from the pipe rolls relates almost exclusively to the price of goods purveyed for the Scottish wars. Many purveyors' accounts are less detailed than is desirable from the economic historian's point of view and both the calendars and the manuscript collections of extracts from these rolls frequently omit important price data. Material relating to prices drawn from the memoranda rolls is fuller, comprising, together with additional purveyance data, valuations of the goods of royal betaghs, royal debtors and debtors in certain civil cases and goods forfeit to the King. Data derived from both of these sources is relatively reliable, and major problems only arise when one attempts to evaluate data derived from the legal records of the lordship.

The accuracy of distraint valuations is highly questionable. Any degree of local resistance to distraint would have been manifest in the unwillingness of neighbours to purchase the goods in question were they offered for sale, thereby depressing their value. While the statement that no buyers could be found for such goods may reflect a lack of

[All such data has been distinguished in the various tables accompanying this chapter by the placing of a "p" in the margin opposite the relevant piece of data, together with a indication of whether the grain was being bought or sold by the purveyors.]
interest in the sale, or local poverty, it might also, particularly in areas which lay within the march, reflect resistance to distraint. Corruption on the part of a sheriff or one of his serjeants might have led either to the undervaluation of the distraint or the concealment of large portions of the distrainee's property. It is also possible that any grain or an animal conveniently to hand, would have been distraint at something less than the market value, the amount by which the person was to be distraint being the determining factor in a valuation of this nature. It is for these reasons that I have avoided using distraint valuations.

The converse is true of valuations noted in cases where theft or some form of malicious injury was alleged. There, the plaintiff would naturally tend to pitch the value of the goods in question as high as he thought plausible or acceptable. Occasional revaluations of stolen goods by jurors, together with the fact that many plaintiffs subsequently convicted of false claim submitted exceptionally high valuations of the goods or animals in question would appear to substantiate this theory. Thus, data relating to prices, other than that derived from the Carlow accounts must be treated with a considerable degree of circumspection and caution.

Weather, Famines and Murrain

In examining the effects of the climatic changes of the early fourteenth century and the impact of weather conditions generally in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries on the manorial economy of the lordship, one must distinguish between spectacular bad weather which was unlikely to damage crops and stock and the circumstances under which crops could fail and murrain become prevalent among livestock. Freak thunderstorms could only damage crops if they occurred in high summer or prior to the harvest,\(^{11}\), while hard winters were unlikely to cause any damage to the grain crop.\(^{12}\). By comparison, a wet summer and autumn could and did cause general crop failure.\(^{13}\). Although the spread of murrain is generally

\(^{11}\) For all statistics and data relating to weather, famine, crop failure and noted occurrences of illness including the Black Death, See Chapter VII: Table I. A specific example of damage caused by a summer thunderstorm can be seen in the accounts of the crop failure of 1294.

\(^{12}\) 1326 might be considered a case in point when a hard winter was followed by a very dry summer.

\(^{13}\) The most spectacular incidence of such crop failure being the crisis of 1315-18.
associated with wet weather, it would appear that the seasonal context was of immense importance and that different animals might be vulnerable to murrain under different circumstances.14.

In general the lordship of Ireland appears to have enjoyed mild weather for most of the thirteenth century with the exception of the mid 1220's and the closing decade of the century.15. The first of these periods of bad weather in the mid 1220's appears to have been a preview of the great 1315-18 famine. Entries for the years 1224 and 1227 were remarkably similar in both the Annals of Loch Cé and the Annals of Connacht. There was a serious crop failure and late harvest in the winter of 1224-5, together with a serious outbreak of murrain in the preceding year. The crisis appears to have continued until 1228. Data from the Winchester manors indicates that this crop failure was of considerable severity. In each of the three years in question, 1224, 1225 and 1227 there was an extremely wet autumn. In contrast to this early crisis there is evidence of exceptionally good weather in Ireland in the mid 1250's and of sustained expansion and development of the royal manors in the course of the 1220's and 1230's.16.

This sustained increase in value probably reflects a combination of two factors. New land, fertile and untired from over-cropping would have been brought into cultivation at a time when there were no major meteorological reverses. With the exception of the murrain of 1251 and the great drought of the following year, there is little evidence in any of the Gaelic or Anglo-Irish annals of weather conducive to crop failure or murrain until the last quarter of the century.

The frequency with which conditions conducive to famine prevailed in Ireland seems to have increased sharply after 1270, culminating in the great famine of 1294-6. It should, however, be noted that none of the annals, not even the Anglo-Irish annals adverted to the peculiar weather conditions and extreme drought mentioned in the Carlow accounts for 1285 and 1286.17. A virulent murrain, which had a particularly devastating effect on the flock occurred during these years. It is very likely that other local catastrophes of this nature and magnitude occurred but were discarded by the annalists. Whether such crises became more or less

15. See Chapter VII: Table 1.
16. See above, Chapter I, pp 33-4.
17. See above, Chapter II, p. 60, p. 70, p. 75, p. 90.
common towards the end of the century is, however, a nice question. The wetter weather at the end of the century would certainly lead one to believe that incidences of damage caused by flooding may have been a frequent occurrence. Thus, the destruction of the mill at Chapelizod in 1293 because of inundation by the Liffey\textsuperscript{18} may not have been an isolated incident.

While there is little surviving evidence of the causes of the great famine of 1294-6, it seems likely that the initial reason for the famine was a crop failure in the first of these three years. Clyn's account of 1294 mentions a severe storm in the August of that year which destroyed the grain. This account is repeated in the Annals of New Ross\textsuperscript{19}. No other data on Irish weather in these years has survived and, due to an unfortunate lacuna in the series of Winchester accounts, no use can be made of Titow's weather table.

A number of other factors combined to exacerbate the situation. The lordship was in a state of near civil war for a considerable part of the famine as the result of the capture and imprisonment of the Red Earl by John fitz Thomas\textsuperscript{20}. It is clear that the liberty of Kildare and the O'Connors Faly were in a state of ferment\textsuperscript{21}. Under such circumstances raids and counter-raids would have been both frequent and destructive. These years saw extensive purveyance for the war in Scotland, a factor which almost certainly exacerbated the famine of 1308-10, and to which I shall return. The assertion in the account of the famine given in the Annals of St. Mary's Abbey that the three year famine was also a time of pestilence may either indicate the prevalence of deficiency diseases or of diseases associated with wet weather.

It is likely that some degree of political stability returned to the lordship following the settlement of 1295 between John fitz Thomas and the Red Earl. Thus, the severity of the famine is underlined by a stark entry in the fragmentary marginal annals of the Liber Niger of Christ Church\textsuperscript{22}. In it the annalist stated that the famine was so great in Ireland that paupers in that year ate the corpses of those hanged at the cross-roads.

\textsuperscript{18.} P.R. 21 Ed. I, D.K.R. vol. 37, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{19.} See Chapter VII: Table I.
\textsuperscript{20.} J.Otway-Ruthven, Medieval Ireland, London 1968, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{21.} Ibid., p. 212.
\textsuperscript{22.} A. Gwynn, 'The Black Book of Christ Church', Analecta Hibernica, 16 (1946), p. 337.
The worsening conditions of the early fourteenth century apparent in the surviving data from the bishopric of Winchester were also prevalent in Ireland but cannot, unfortunately, be examined in such satisfactory depth. A murrain similar to that which occurred on the Carlow manors in 1284-6, one which was associated with a dry summer, occurred in Connacht and elsewhere in 1302. The three year famine of 1308-10, which had such far reaching demographic effects on the Winchester manors appears to have had a very similar impact in Ireland. Initially the situation passed unnoticed in the Anglo-Irish annals, but stormy weather and a great murrain of cattle were noted in both the 1308 entries of the Annals of Loch Cé and the Annals of Connacht. Thus, the effects of the famine in its first phase may have been more severe in western regions either because of greater dependence on animal husbandry in those areas or because the eastern part of the country had simply escaped the worst of the bad weather.

On the Winchester manors the autumn had been wet and long, and the wheat yield only just above average. No mention of the crisis appeared in any of the annalistic entries for the following year, but by 1310 the effects of the shortage were being felt in Dublin. The entry in the Annals of St. Mary’s Abbey referred to a great shortage of grain, while that in Grace's annals quoted the astonishingly high price of 20s. for a bushel of wheat. Considerable amounts of grain were purveyed for the war in Scotland during these years and the combination of crop failures, murrains and heavy purveyance would certainly have produced both severe shortages and high prices, though probably not of the order of 20s. for a bushel of wheat.23.

The sequence of annalistic entries would seem to indicate that the famine may have followed a course almost identical to that found in the data from the Winchester manors. Widespread crop failure and murrain in 1308 would thus have been followed by a year in which there was a relatively good harvest. This was in turn followed in 1310 by a year of exceptional scarcity - the harvest of 1309 having failed to compensate for the shortage created by the famine of the previous year.24.

23. It is likely that Grace mistranscribed bushel for crannoc - while the 1308-10 famine was severe, no other source reports wheat being sold at £8 a crannoc.

24. See Chapter VII: Table I.
It is also significant that the early years of the fourteenth century saw a considerable increase in the frequency of raids on manors in the vale of Dublin.\(^{25}\). A vacancy of a little under a year after the death of archbishop Richard de Ferings in October 1306 was to combine with the de facto vacancy occurring during the brief reign of his successor, Richard de Havering. Though placed in possession of the temporalities of the see, de Havering was never consecrated, did not come to Dublin and resigned the see late in 1310. Like the bishops of Cloyne, and possibly other bishops in the lordship and marcher areas, the archbishops of Dublin probably had special, or, at any rate, more cordial relations with their Gaelic neighbours than would royal officials functioning in the archbishopric during a vacancy. Instability caused by this series of vacancies and absentee prelates would have seriously undermined this sort of arrangement.\(^{26}\). The archiepiscopal manors of Ballymore and Castlekevin were critical points in the defence of the south county. It is in this context that the economic rationale of Gaveston's campaigns in O'Byrne and O'Toole country becomes clear. In the short term his tactical advances must have won a respite from raiding for the more vulnerable royal manors. Worsening climatic conditions would have made the option of raiding these manors all the more attractive to the Irish, who were dependent on the more marginal mountain land.

Thus, the great northern famine of 1315-18 followed two significant famines, those of 1294-6 and 1308-10. The sequence of events is well-known - there were three exceptionally wet years, during which heavy summer and autumn rains caused massive crop failure throughout Northern Europe.\(^{27}\). In the final extant fourteenth century entry, that of 1315, the annalist of Loch Óe mentioned that the year saw diseases, famine, murders and intolerable bad weather. Similar references are to be found in the 1315 entries of both the Annals of Connacht and the Annals of Clonmacnoise.\(^{28}\). Purveyance for the Scottish wars had absorbed the

\(^{25}\) See above, Chapter I pp 13-20, where the defensive potential of both royal and archiepiscopal manors is discussed in this context.

\(^{26}\) See above, Chapter III, p.97.

\(^{27}\) An adequate general, if somewhat dated, account of the famine is to be found in H.S. Lucas, 'The Great European Famine of 1315, 1316 and 1317', Speculum, V (1930).

\(^{28}\) See Chapter VII: Table I.
available surplus grain in the years preceding the famine and had continued into 1315. Thus, there were few reserves from which the effects of the crop failure of that autumn could have been mitigated. While the weather caused the famine, the Bruce Invasion, which began in the summer of 1315 and lasted for the duration of the famine, greatly aggravated the situation.

It has been asserted that Edward Bruce followed a conscious policy of destruction in the lordship. His winter campaign of 1315-6 in Meath and Kildare certainly bore the hallmarks of a scorched earth policy - but it should be noted that any large body of men would have created similar havoc through living off the land and that considerable damage was caused to archiepiscopal property at Swords by the passage of the Red Earl's army on its way to engage the Scots. In any event the dislocation caused by the invasion, coupled with local Gaelic attempts to capitalise on the situation, such as local risings and the raids on exposed manors by the Irish of the Leinster mountains, must have ensured that the effects of the famine were at least as severe, if not more so, than was the case in England and on the continent.

The course of the famine in Ireland can best be charted from the price data noted in the Annals of St. Mary's Abbey, for the Gaelic annalists tend to devote little time to describing its effects other than to mention that it and the invasion were co-terminous. Their interest lay rather in the ramifications of the local dynastic wars such as those of Connacht and Thomond, which received a fresh impetus as a result of the invasion. According to the St. Mary's annalist, by the spring wheat was fetching 8s. a crannoc. After Easter the price of wheat had risen to 11s. a crannoc. By this time many people were clearly expecting another crop failure in the coming autumn. The entry for the following year quoted the price of wheat at 23s. a crannoc and the price of oats at 16s. a crannoc, reporting also that men of substance had become beggars, corpses were being eaten and that women were even eating their own children.

31. See above pp 335-6.
32. See above, Chapter I, p 18-20. It is clear from various petitions emanating from the tenantry of Saggard and Newcastle Lyons that the pressure was severe.
Famine conditions prevailed until well into the summer of 1318, though the price reported by the annalist of 16s. a crannoc for wheat may indicate some expectation of a relatively good harvest. In fact the harvest was early and good, the annalist reporting that because of it the price of wheat fell to 7s. and the price of oats to 5s. a crannoc. This progression is remarkably similar to that documented for the bishopric of Winchester. 33.

While there is no annalistic evidence of the murrain of sheep prevalent in England in the years 1315-17, it should be noted that the annals most likely to report such a catastrophe, the Gaelic annals, were more concerned with the outcome of the invasion and the various dynastic wars. 34. It is highly unlikely that Ireland escaped from this murrain. A noticeable drop in the price of sheep in Ireland occurred in that year, followed by the characteristic rise in prices which follows murrains. 35.

The effects of the great crisis of 1315-18 cannot be divorced from the cumulative effects of the crop failures of the 1320's and 1330's and the great cattle murrains of the 1320's. As with visitations of the plague in the mid-fourteenth century, the cumulative effect of these crises effects in precipitating decline. Although it is likely that the immediate would, in the long term, have been as important as its immediate and more extended effects of the 1315-18 crisis would in themselves have been sufficient to ensure that the systematic cultivation of demesne lands was either abandoned or severely restricted through leasing; these subsequent crises would have served to reinforce this particular trend.

While the great cattle murrain occurred in England in 1319-20, 36 it had a more delayed impact in Ireland. Its effects were widespread, meriting a mention in the two western annals and in the Annals of Inisfallen. None of the annalistic sources refer to the cause of this murrain, though it is likely, from certain evidence concerning crop failure in England in 1321, that it was accompanied by a summer drought. Barley, a crop which needs a certain amount of moisture to mature, was severely hit in that year and evidence from the Winchester manor also indicates

33. See Chapter VII: Table I.
34. While there are exhaustive accounts of the dynastic wars raging between Felim and Rory O'Connor in the Annals of Connacht, the report of the famine is confined to the initial 1315 entry and a general statement in the 1318 entry that a famine of three and a half years' duration had taken place. No mention of murrain occurs in either entry.
35. See below, pp 342-3.
a long dry summer in 1321. This murrain was to recur in Ireland in 1324 and again in 1325 under very similar circumstances.

A crop failure reported in the western annals and in the Annals of Ulster in 1328 may only have been regional in its effects, for it was not mentioned in any of the Anglo-Irish annals. It appears to have been caused by a long and extremely hard winter. The Connacht annalist stated that the crop grew up 'white and blind' while the entry in the Annals of Ulster described crops and fruit withered by thunder and lightening. Although the famine of 1330-2 seems to have been particularly severe, it should be noted that it was not mentioned in any of the Gaelic annals. Massive spring floods in 1330 caused spectacular damage in Trim and Drogheda, while the harvest was delayed by an extremely wet summer. Grace wrote of the famine as continuing into 1333 and evidence in the Annals of St. Mary's Abbey indicates that wheat was scarce and possibly diseased in 1332. Indeed, if the price data for the years in question can be taken as an indication of severity, this famine must have been almost as severe in the areas affected as the great famine of 1315-18, and may possibly have been worse than that of 1308-10. With the exception of the crop failure and murrain of 1339 recorded by Clyn, the western annalists and the Annals of Ulster, no other major meteorological disasters preceded the first visitation of the Black Death. Thereafter the weather was either better, or, at any rate, less remarkable for the rest of the century.

The Effects of Murrain

The effects of a crop failure are relatively easy to determine, but those of murrain less so. Ultimately the nature of the flock might well have determined the extent of the damage caused by the murrain in question. Detailed data on the local effects of murrain survive only in the case of the Bygod manors of Ballysax, Fothered and Old Ross in the mid 1280's and this scarcity of local material limits the scope of any examination of this type.

The flock at Fothered was only being built up in the early years of the 1280's. It may for this reason have been more vulnerable to diseases

38. See Chapter VII: Table I.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. See above, Chapter II, p. 62. and also pp 69-70 (for Ballysax) and pp 74-5 (for Old Ross).
and to other reverses than the more established flocks at Ballysax and Old Ross. In 1283-4 and in the two following years this flock was severely hit by murrain, with a cumulative loss of 214 sheep and lambs during that period. Thereafter the Fothered flock declined in size up to 1287-8, the last year for which statistics survive. Extremely high losses were also sustained at Ballysax in these years, while losses through murrain at Old Ross were only exceptionally high in 1285-6 and 1286-7. It is possible that the murrain at Ballysax continued into 1286-7, for while accounts for that year have not survived, the recovery was not well in hand until 1287-8. The potential for recovery at Ballysax and Old Ross was greater than that at Fothered, because of the greater breeding capacity of both of these flocks. At the end of the murrain in Fothered there were 59 ewes in a total flock of 309 sheep, while the corresponding ratios at Ballysax and Old Ross were, respectively, 200:614 and 629:2,221. It would appear from the increase of the Old Ross flock from that size to a flock of 2,423 sheep in 1289 that the potential for recovery and replacement were attained and that some measure of expansion was initiated. Thus, the local effects of murrain would probably have been governed by the structure of the flock or herd and its breeding capacity.

Less satisfactory data on the overall effects of murrain can be culled from the accounts of collectors of the Great Custom. This data cannot be used independently to establish the incidence of murrain but merely to confirm the occurrence of murrain and to express its effects in general terms. One cannot establish the relative portions of the returns representing payments on fleeces and wool and payment on hides. Thus, Mac Niocaill's expression of the returns in terms of fleeces is probably the least unsatisfactory way of collating this data. 42.

There are a number of possible relationships between figures derived from customs returns and known years of murrain. It would appear that either an increase or a slight decline in the number of hides or fleeces exported was to be expected in the actual year or years of murrain. A plateau of this nature would be followed by a fairly sharp decline in the value of the custom, reflecting the contraction of herds and flocks in the aftermath of the murrain. This relationship is clearly visible.

42. G. Mac Niocaill, Na Buirgeisi, vol. 2, Dublin 1963, pp 523-528 gives, in tabular form the monetary value and fleece equivalent of the custom in the ports of Ireland from 1275 to the mid fourteenth century. The Dublin table is on p. 523.
if one examines the Dublin customs returns for 1281-2, and compares them with the returns for 1286-7 and 1287-8, when the effects of the sheep murrain of 1284-6 would be apparent. In 1281-2 the equivalent of 163,691 fleeces were shipped from Dublin. By 1286-7 and 1287-8 this figure had declined to 105,510 and 142,041 fleeces respectively. Similarly the decline from a slight plateau is visible in the returns for Dublin in 1301-2 and 1302-3. A peak in the export of fleeces occurred in 1311-12, following the murrain which accompanied the 1308-10 famine. Customs returns from other Irish ports over the same period reflect similar trends. No customs data has survived from the great famine of 1315-18, and while data has survived for the first half of the 1320's, the lack of such material for the second half of the decade precludes any examination of the murrains of 1321 and 1324-5.

The deterioration in weather conditions which occurred at the end of the thirteenth century thus played a critical role in inaugurating the decline of demesne cultivation in Ireland. It would be a mistake, however, to see it as the sole or even the major factor underpinning this decline, for while the effects of the meteorological reverses were extremely serious in certain areas, this severity was by no means uniform in England. While conditions were probably worse on an overall basis in the lordship both during and after the 1315-18 famine, such variations must also have occurred.

**Purveyance**

The importance of purveyance and supply from Ireland to the various wars of Edward I as a factor in both the development and destruction of the grain market in Ireland at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries cannot be overstressed. Initial buoyancy and expanding demand associated with the supply of the Welsh wars may have induced landholders to cultivate marginal land and expand their demesnes through reclamation. This buoyancy and optimism was dependent in the first instance on the ability of the Dublin Exchequer to underwrite the cost of purveyance. It was also dependent on the ability and willingness of crown officials, specifically the receivers for the Scottish wars at Skinburness, the supply depot for western Scotland, to reimburse private merchants from Ireland involved in supply as a mercantile venture. As crown demands on both the resources of the English and Irish Exchequers mounted towards the end of the century, the guarantees for private merchants involved in supply became increasingly tenuous. The continuous series of extensive remittances from the Dublin Exchequer was to lead
to increasing delay in the reimbursement of purveyors and of those from whom grain and other victuals had been purveyed.

By the reign of Edward II, private supply had ceased to be a source of any importance, while the strains created by extensive purveyance were becoming obvious. These took the form of growing resistance, concealment and other forms of corrupt practice. The situation was exacerbated by the concurrence of extensive purveyance with two major famines, those of 1294-6 and 1308-10. Such was the immensity of the amounts of grain involved in purveyance that once all available grain had been dispatched to Scotland, most if not all grain reserves would have been dispersed. A dispersal of this nature might have had little effect in years of plenty other than to shore up a flagging market, but in years of famine such depletion of reserves could only have added to the severity of the crisis. It is also likely that the amounts of grain involved in purveyance would, once the disruption of the system through lack of adequate Exchequer backing had begun, have themselves caused serious dislocation in production and marketing. Expectations of buoyant and profitable grain market created during the Welsh wars could not be sustained in the face of lower than average prices being paid for wheat and oats purveyed. There were also inordinately long delays in payment. Thus, both the creation and destruction of this lucrative market were inextricably linked to the development of the purveyance system in Ireland in the late thirteenth century and its ultimate decline in the course of the early fourteenth century.

Initial Irish involvement in the supply of Edward I's forces in Wales is almost impossible to gauge, but that both this private and public involvement was extensive cannot be doubted. By comparison with later purveyance both for the Gascon campaigns and for the Scottish wars, the involvement of and reliance upon the private merchant as a primary source of supply appears to have been of much greater importance in the Welsh wars.43. Most of the surviving records of central expenditure on victuals for the wars between 1282-4 detail the purchase of wine and

coarse salt for contingents serving in Wales, though considerable amounts of grain were also dispatched.\textsuperscript{44} While there is evidence that magnates with Irish lands serving in Wales used their Irish grain to supply their troops,\textsuperscript{45} the Irish merchant acting on his own behalf would have been supplying most of the Irish grain reaching those troops suppressing the revolt.

Yet even in 1282 there was evidence of attempts in Dublin to frustrate the aims of purveyors acting on the King's behalf in order to secure artificially high prices. Stephen de Fulbourne was to complain in June 1282 that because rumours had reached the merchants in Ireland of an impending purveyance they deliberately bought up all available grain . . . Involvement of the private sector in supply, merchants from England, Ireland and Chester coupled with attempts to control the market such as that encountered by de Fulbourne to create an artificial grain shortage point to the fact that both the private merchant and the merchant selling to a royal purveyor were securing a quick and adequate return. Supply was thus both profitable and well-financed.

Nor did the defeat of the Welsh revolts cause any contraction in this lucrative area of trade. Edward I's programme of castellation and of garrisoning in Wales was such that it guaranteed a constant demand for victuals of all sorts.\textsuperscript{47} The eastern and south-eastern Irish ports


\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., no. 2009, supplies sent from Bigod's Irish estates to Wales.


\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., Such munitioning was even occurring in the 1290's, p. 175, pp 184-5.
were those most conveniently located to supply this new demand. This may well explain the amount of effort devoted to the improvement of the demesne lands at Old Ross and the creation and attempted creation of the manors of Fennagh and Dunleckny.48. Bigod himself had used grain from his Irish manors to supply his troops in Wales.49. The value of this potential new outlet for a saleable grain surplus would thus have been clear both to him and to his Irish officials.

Both in the supply of the Welsh castles and in the course of the Gascon and Scottish wars, the importance of the private merchant declined, while that of the centrally commissioned purveyors increased. This growing systematisation of purveyance in Ireland stemmed from a realisation on the part of Edward that these resources were available and their maximum exploitation essential to his aims.50. It was also during these later campaigns that both the royal demands became increasingly less realistic and that immense amounts of grain began to leave the lordship of Ireland. In supplying the Gascon campaign between September 1295 and August 1297 some 4,858 quarters of wheat, 1,774 quarters of oats and 162 quarters of beans were dispatched from various Irish ports. Further amounts of grain were purveyed between then and Michaelmas 1297, so that 6,560 quarters of wheat and 1,855 quarters of oats were purveyed in Ireland for the war in Gascony in the course of the year up to that date.51. It is also clear that considerable profits were still being made by Irish merchants engaged in private ventures supplying the troops in Gascony, with one particular merchant selling grain, purchased in Ireland at 5s. the crannoc, for 20s. in Gascony.52.

This campaign also saw the emergence of organised local resistance to purveyance. Both the bishops of Cork and Cloyne are alleged to have obstructed purveyors in Cork through excommunication.53. Such obstruction was not unusual in the early years of the fourteenth century, a classic incident of this sort having taken place at Scurlagstown in 1309, but was uncommon in late thirteenth century Ireland. Neither Cork nor Youghal

48. See above, Chapter II, pp 63-5.
51. Ibid., p. 195 and Appendix VI.
52. Ibid., p. 197.
53. Ibid., p. 195.
had played a central role in either the supply of troops in Wales or the provisioning of Welsh castles. Thus, this may have been resistance to the unfamiliar rather than the unprofitable. The sheer strain imposed by such intensive purveyance may also have been the reason that William of Estdene was ordered in August 1296 to find provisions outside Ireland.\(^{54}\). It must also be remembered that the first two years of the Gascon purveyance coincided with the second and third years of the famine of 1294-6. This may have added a certain edge to local resistance of the sort imputed to the bishops of Cork and Cloyne. However, when compared to the intense local unrest and resistance provoked by taxation in England at the same time, the Cork incidents pale into insignificance.\(^{55}\)

Extensive Irish involvement in provisioning the Scottish wars was not to occur until 1298, but signs of this new focus of supply were apparent from the autumn of the previous year. In October 1297, a report on the state of the lordship’s resources was sought, and was subsequently delivered by John Barrett.\(^{56}\) An order was then issued in December to the effect that any Irish merchant near the coast with victuals to sell should bring these victuals to Carlisle. If necessary, Wogan was to coerce recalcitrant merchants. Thus, it would seem that a certain degree of resistance was anticipated on the part of Irish merchants to involvement in private provisioning ventures such as had occurred in the course of both the Welsh and Gascon campaigns.

Provisioning of the Scottish wars was, for the most part, thereafter in the nature of centrally administered purveyance. In the early years of the fourteenth century, those Irish merchants still involved in the supply trade with the receiver of Carlisle faced delays in payment, sequestration of their goods without payment, and losses incurred through deterioration of goods in the receiver's hand pending payment. Geoffrey de Morton, a Dublin merchant, lost a considerable amount of money through his involvement in military supply both in Scotland and Gascony. Two royal letters sent to the Justiciar, John Wogan, in relation to these cases illustrate amply the problems involved in this sort of venture. A royal command had been issued to Wogan to invite Irish merchants to

---


bring their goods to Carlisle or Newcastle. Through long delays the 
freight of two ships worth £267-8-0, brought by Morton to Newcastle, 
was lost through putrefaction.57. The second letter instructed Wogan to 
remunerate Morton for supplies sent to the war in Gascony.58. Thus, 
the private merchant was at the mercy of delays such as that experienced 
by Geoffrey de Morton at Newcastle and extensively deferred payment for 
victuals thus supplied. Worse was to follow in that the Carlisle receiver, 
James de Dalilegh began to seize the goods of Irish merchants there without 
any pretence of making payment.59. Such was the situation at the end of 
Edward I's reign that rumours were beginning to proliferate of Irish 
merchants supplying the King's enemies in Scotland.60.

An attempt made in 1308 to induce the private merchant to trade with the 
receiver in Carlisle probably met with little success, but some of the 
terms listed in the royal letter are worth noting.61. A fair price was 
to be guaranteed to all Irish merchants and the King undertook to prevent 
the seizure of their victuals without their receiving due satisfaction. 
This is an indication that the reverses and problems encountered earlier 
by Geoffrey de Morton and his colleagues were still active deterrents 
in that area of trade.

The changing focus of war from Wales and Gascony to Scotland was to affect 
the nature of purveyance in Ireland. During the campaigns in Wales and 
Gascony supplies were drawn from most of the ports of the lordship, with 
the southern ports like Waterford, New Ross, Cork and Youghal handling 
a substantial amount of the grain dispatched. While it is impossible, 
due to lack of data, to quantify the price of overland grain transport 
in Ireland, it is unlikely that grain would have been moved over extremely 
long distances to facilitate purveyance. Drogheda and Dublin were to 
come into their own as centres of supply in the course of the Scottish 
wars of Edward I and were virtually the only centres of purveyance of 
any importance under Edward II.62. When purveyance for Scotland took 
place in any of the southern ports the commodity involved tended to 
be wine rather than grain.63.

58. Ibid., pp 293-4. 
59. J.F. Lydon, 'Ireland's Participation in the Military Activities of the 
English Kings in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', unpublished 
60. Ibid., p. 272. 
61. Ibid., p. 281. 
63. c.f. J.F. Lydon, 'The Enrolled Account of Alexander Bicknor, Treasurer 
of Ireland, 1308-14', Analecta Hibernica, vol. 30 (1982), p. 38, an 
extensive purchase of wine in 1307 at Youghal.
This change in the commercial focus may well have caused a local depression in the south-east in the early years of the fourteenth century. The evidence of decline on the manor of Old Ross in terms of the contraction of its demesne, together with the complete disappearance of the manor of Fennagh and the grange of Dunleekney found in the 1307 Bigod inquisition post mortem is probably a reflection of this decline.64. Certainly the one Bigod manor to retain its profitability in the early years of the fourteenth century, Ballysax, lay within the catchment area of Dublin rather than that of New Ross. It may thus have escaped the worst effects of this localised decline.

Purveyance for the Scottish wars was heaviest in Ireland in 1299 and the following years, but while the quantity of grain dispatched lessened, the regularity with which purveyance occurred up to the time of the Bruce Invasion would have destabilised the market. In 1299 alone 3,113 quarters of wheat, 6,964 quarters $2\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of oats and 1,408 quarters $1\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of malted oats were dispatched to Skinburness.65. Similarly, in both 1300 and 1301, large amounts of grain were sent to Scotland.66. It is important to remember in this context that extensive as was the scale of this purveyance, it did not approach the amounts specified in the royal demands.67. A further survey of royal resources in Ireland was undertaken early in 1302, to prepare for further purveyance.68. The purveyance of 1303 was not extensive by earlier standards, while that of 1306-7, though extensive and probably damaging in the Irish context, must have fallen far short of Edward I's needs.69.

By the end of Edward I's reign, the financial embarrassment of the Irish Exchequer could no longer be hidden. Resistance to purveyance was first to surface amongst shipowners, whose vessels were commandeered and whose

64. See above, Chapter II, p. 63, p. 65.
66. Ibid., pp 233-6.
68. Ibid., p. 248.
69. Ibid., p. 270.
70. For a full account of the state of the Irish Exchequer at the end of Edward I's reign and the extent to which the revenues of the lordship had been diverted to sustain Edward I's wars see J.F.Lydon, 'Edward II and the revenues of Ireland in 1311-12', I.H.S., vol. 14 (1964-5), pp 39-57.
prospects of payment and compensation for their troubles must have seemed at best uncertain. Cases abound of masters refusing to convert their ships for transport and one master even ran his ship aground on Lambay Island to avoid involvement in the supplying of Scotland. 71.

Geoffrey de Morton temporarily succeeded in frustrating purveyance in Dublin itself in 1303-4, when he refused to permit a royal official to act on foot of a writ containing the non omitas propter libertatem clause. 72. Major instances of local resistance to purveyance seem to have surfaced in Meath following the purveyances of 1308-9. During this purveyance even the grain of major monastic centres such as Mellifont was seized and the Seneschal of Trim was unusually active on the King's behalf within his liberty. 73. Such purveyance would have coincided with the famine of 1308-10 - possibly part of the motivation behind this surge of resistance. The three surviving cases concern attempts by ecclesiastics with land in Meath to frustrate the efforts of both Edmund de la Mere and Geoffrey Teleng, his deputy, to purvey in that area. If, as is likely, the procedure followed by the purveyors in 1308 was similar to that laid down in the commissions issued to purveyors in 1310, the reason for this resistance was obvious. Those commissioned in 1310 were to take into the King's hand . . . 'all corn for sale . . . saving only reasonable sustenance' to the owners. 74. William Burgeis conducted a mock excommunication in order to protect the Archdeacon of Meath's grain; 75 while the local functionaries on the Dunshaughlin lands of St. Thomas' Abbey 76 and a friar of the Holy Trinity on the convent's land at Gormanstown resorted to less exotic devices.

Other than the extensive delays in payment, it is likely that the relatively lower prices paid by the purveyors for any grain they acquired caused a

72. J.T. Gilbert, Hist. and Mun. Docs. London 1870 pp 5-3-7 provides a complete transcript of the writ and process enrolled on M.R. 32 Ed. I.
74. Ibid., p. 283.
76. Ibid., p. 514.
77. Ibid., pp 515-7.
certain amount of this resistance. Although purveyors were in theory obliged to pay a reasonable price for grain purveyed, many of the surviving accounts indicate that the prices allowed were considerably lower than those available on the open market. When Nicholas Golding and Hugh of Castleknock purveyed grain to garrison the castles of Carrickfergus, Northburgh and Dublin, together with the vill of Dundalk against the Bruce advance, they were active between May 1315 and March 1316, the average price per crannoc of wheat purveyed was 4s.10d., while that of oats was 5s.5d.. Considering the severity of the famine both in 1315 and in the following year, the valuations of goods mentioned as damaged or stolen in contemporary Irish court cases and the evidence of both the Titow and Rogers price indexes, these are astonishingly low prices.

After the major purveyance of 1308-10, purveyances of small amounts continued to be made on a sporadic basis up to the time of the Bruce Invasion to supply the Scottish castles and Edward II's various expeditions. The scale and scope of these purveyances was extremely limited in comparison with the great purveyances of the late thirteenth century. It would be tempting to see in this restraint the practical implementation of the policy change outlined in Edward II's letter of 1311 to John Wogan, in which a clear undertaking was given to devote the resources of Ireland to the defence of the lordship. The cumulative effects of both the famine and the Bruce Invasion on purveyance can be seen in the fact that after Edward II's purveyance of 1322-4, no further grain was purveyed from Ireland. Both the depletion of the resources of the lordship and what was probably the increasingly swift tempo of the abandonment of large scale direct cultivation of the demesne, together with the realisation that Ireland was, in economic terms, both an English dependency and liability may be seen in this cessation of purveyance.

Thus, the importance of both supply and purveyance in the formation of the grain market in Ireland in the late thirteenth century cannot be overstressed. Interaction between the market, the changing focus of purveyance and the solvency or lack of solvency of the Irish Exchequer

78. Mem. Roll 13-4 Ed. II, P.R.O.I. Ex. 1/2, mm 33-33d.
79. J.F.Lydon, 'Ireland's Participation in the Military Activities of the English Kings in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', unpublished Ph.D. thesis London (1955), in which a complete transcript of this letter is given in Appendix XIV.
80. Ibid., p. 312.
underscores the continuing importance of this aspect of the market in
the early fourteenth century. Its absence, with the exception of the
1322-4 purveyance, following the great famine, combined with the relative
stability of the market can only indicate that the contraction of the
area of land under cultivation was such that it equalled whatever market
contraction had occurred as a result of the demographic losses stemming
from the famine.

Illicit Purveyance, Bastard Feudalism and the Manorial Economy

The expansion of the march and the emergence of bastard feudalism in
the lordship of Ireland was to have a disruptive, if unquantifiable,
effect on the stability of the manorial economy. In a society where
the magnate commanding the most kerns and idlemen was virtually
unassailable, weaker neighbours would either have been forced to recognise
this supremacy by paying black rent or would have been destroyed - indeed
recognition may not have entirely precluded destruction. Numbers of
kern such as were retained in late thirteenth and early fourteenth century
Ireland had to be fed. This was frequently done at the expense of their
lord's tenants and that of their lord's neighbours' tenants. That the
situation was critical in the 1290's cannot be doubted: that it was to
worsen, in the face of the 1308-10 famine, the great famine of 1315-18
and the Bruce Invasion, inevitable. The cultivation of grain in certain
areas of marchland on any major scale became a hazardous and unprofitable
venture. In a countryside beset by raids and counter-raids, livestock,
being moveable, were to that extent less vulnerable, while a field of
wheat could not be hidden or defended with any great ease. Thus, the
unstable conditions of the march would have tended to reinforce trends
such as the abandonment of demesne cultivation and the desire to be self-
sufficient rather than the producer of a saleable surplus in grain.

Growing concern about the effects of retaining large numbers of kerns
was first expressed in the 1297 statutes. A complaint was made to the
effect that the commonality had ' . . . on many occasions been aggrieved
by magnates and others having kerns continually living at other people's
expense, as well in the marches as in the land of peace, whereby the
people is excessively impoverished'. 81 Although one must be prepared
to accept that parliamentary petitions and complaints, like petitions
seeking remission or terms of payment of debts at the Exchequer, have
concealed within them a certain degree of self-interest, the tone of many

81. H. Berry, Early Statutes, p. 203.
of the other statutes enacted in 1297, together with contemporary court roll evidence, is such that these complaints do not appear to have been ill-founded. The famine of 1294-6 and the involvement of men like John fitz Thomas and Peter Bermingham in the conflicts which followed the capture of the Red Earl may well have sharpened the effect and the memory of such incidents.

As is evident from a series of cases decided in the 1306 eyre of Tipperary, a considerable deterioration had taken place in areas of relatively uncontrollable marchland. The le Poer family, their friends and retainers were able to establish themselves as petty local tyrants. When Richard son of Philip Clement was forced to stand to right as a common thief he pleaded successfully that he was in the retinue of Eustace le Poer in Scotland and had secured a royal pardon for his transgressions.82. This is evidence that a le Poer retinue was probably in existence in the late 1290's. A presentment made by the jurors of the cantred of Iffowyn revealed that Philip son of Matthew le Poer, Richard son of Benedict le Poer, various other le Poers, assorted O'Foulyths and two Deyncourts were notorious malefactors.83. They were alleged to have kept kerns who robbed boatmen, merchants and fishermen and others going through the country with their merchandise. It was also alleged that they and their kerns robbed granges, ricks and houses, taking provender for their horses at their will. Evidence was offered that Benedict son of Benedict le Poer, together with Robert son of Henry le Poer and two St. Albins were accustomed to take rents from several country people.84. Benedict, together with a number of other le Poers, St. Albins, Deyncourts and O'Kurks was involved in a number of important robberies of beasts.85. It was also alleged that he and his associates took food and drink from the local people against their will. Thus, the le Poers had succeeded in establishing the form of local control envisaged and feared in the 1297 statutes.

The famines of 1308-10 and 1315-18 were to heighten the impact of bastard feudalism in Ireland on the manorial economy at a local level. Theft of food in time of famine was to be expected. The large number of cases relating to such theft dealt with by the keepers of the peace in

82. Ibid., p. 126.
83. Ibid., p. 135.
84. Ibid., p. 136.
85. Ibid., p. 136.
Kent in 1316-7 were, however, the result of famine rather than endemic lawlessness combined with famine.\(^86\). Both Roger Jacob and Richard Bonde, when charged with the theft of grain and an affar in Meath in October 1310 were to plead successfully in mitigation that their action was the result of '... excessive poverty and hunger which ... they had in the summer last past, when there was a great dearth in the land'.\(^87\).

Of greater importance, however, is the evidence contained in the 1310 statutes that the problems created by kerns and idlemen were rapidly becoming more acute.

Those present at the 1310 parliament had clearly been asked to consider the effects of the famine and made the most of the opportunity to castigate both the over-mighty magnate and the petty local lordling indulging in oppression. High prices and scarcity were the result of 'merchants, strangers and others passing through the country' being robbed by 'those of great lineage against whom they have frequently heretofore had small means of recovery'. Men and goods were being held to ransom, while merchants were robbed of '... bread, wine, beer, flesh and other victuals and things saleable'.\(^88\). A separate statute which reiterated the parliament's anger at the practice of certain magnates in purveying their goods without making adequate recompense was enacted and an attempt was made to regulate and limit the quartering of kerns. Those who kept kerns were to do so at their own expense '... so that their free tenants nor farmers nor other tenants be not charged with them'.\(^89\).

Considerable resentment could be generated by quartering a retinue in a town or even by the passage of a retinue through a particular area. In this context both the 1301 riot in Drogheda, which was caused by the presence of Peter Bermingham, his wife and retinue en route to Scotland, and the resentment of the citizens of Dublin towards the Red Earl and his men in 1317 may be said to constitute classic cases.\(^90\) On a more prosaic level, the illicit purveyance undertaken by David Maunsel and his associates at Fethered in 1310 would appear to have been condoned by the Red Earl.

\(^87\)  C.J.R. 1308-14, p. 152.
\(^88\)  H. Berry, Early Statutes, p. 265.
\(^89\)  Ibid., p. 269.
\(^90\)  C.J.R., 1305-7, pp 31-2.
\(^92\)  C.J.R., 1308-14, p. 146.
As conditions in the Anglo-Irish portions of the marchlands deteriorated steadily in the early years of the fourteenth century, the number, severity and effect of Gaelic raids on royal manors and on any other exposed manors, increased. The campaigns mounted by Gaveston during his time in Ireland and the extensive watch and ward operation undertaken by Elias Lawless and Reginald de Bernevall in May 1315 were intended to protect the royal manors and in particular the two most valuable of these, Saggard and Newcastle Lyons, from attack from the Leinster mountains. The necessity of such operations is clear when one considers the effects of raids mounted by the McMurroughs on the de Caunteton lands in the Wexford foothills of the mountains. When the goods of Maurice de Caunteton were taken into the King's hand in February 1311, as a result of his slaying Richard Taloun, those involved in valuing his lands and goods were at great pains to explain their extremely low valuations. Lands at Glasscarlig were virtually worthless '... because they lie uncultivated nor does anybody dare put hands to them on account of the said Macmurghs, who ... preyed upon and devastated that land'. What little grain had been sown there, whether wheat or oats, was valued at only 20d. an acre.

By the time of the great famine and the Bruce Invasion, conditions in the ever-expanding marchlands had deteriorated to such an extent that many of the guidelines laid down in both the 1297 and the 1310 statutes had clearly been abandoned. Kerns and idlemen, in some cases the retinues of local lords, were the first and possibly only defence against local Gaelic uprisings. It is for this reason that attempts by local lords and their retinues to purvey began to be condoned.

In February 1318 John Mautravers was to charge Maurice fitz Thomas, later created first earl of Desmond, and a number of other persons, with the theft of approximately 100 crannocs of wheat and oats from his Limerick manor of Rathgel. He also alleged that fitz Thomas received Mathew Odongan cum sequela sua, Bren Obren cum sequela sua and felons, arsonists together with public and notorious depopulators of fields. The

95. C.J.R., 1308-14, pp 159-61.
defence offered by fitz Thomas was that on hearing of the proximity of Edward Bruce certain Odenegans rose up and perpetrated various crimes. In order to sustain his men, who were fighting these rebels, fitz Thomas claimed to have authorised the purveyance of Mau travers' grain, making payment by tally. The jury found that Maurice's actions could not be considered felonious because he was fighting the Irish, and that like other great magnates he could treat with the Irish. Given his subsequent this verdict could be seen as an ominous prophecy. His pressure on de Grandison career, culminating in his purchase of Clonmel, his Dungarvan and Clonmel based retinues, his reaction to being deprived of the Butler wardship and his campaigns of localised terror and assassination, could be said to have been foreshadowed in this case.

A case of a similar nature against Maurice Carreu was heard in November 1317. Maurice, unable to sustain himself and his household, called on certain of his tenants to give him what he considered surplus grain, offering them deferred payment with rents and other of his possessions as surety. His tenants did not accede to these demands and on his order the grain was taken and threshed. The jurors also stated that when one of Maurice's men took a horse to cart the grain, he did so according to the ordinance made by the magnates of Ireland.

Thus, by the time of the Bruce Invasion, and in part because of it, a certain ambiguity had arisen in many people's minds concerning the right of the magnate to purvey, maintain korns and treat with the Irish. What had been relatively clearly defined in the 1297 and 1310 statutes - the fact that no magnate had such rights at law - was now in question. Indeed, the situation had deteriorated to such an extent that pardons were offered to heads of religious houses for entering into negotiations with the Irish to secure the restitution of goods, grain and beasts stolen from their granges, thereby undermining provisions against "private" arrangements with the Irish. Any such talks and dealings cut across the concept of one war and one peace enshrined in the 1297 statutes, but was more in line with the realpolitik of life in the marchland.

While statutes similar both in tone and in nature to those enacted in 1310 were also enacted in 1320, it is clear that here was no remedy.

97. See above, Chapter IV, pp 158-61.
100. H. Berry, Early Statutes, pp 282-5.
Indeed, the re-enactment of these statutes is in itself an indication of desperation and sterility. Not only had the Bruce Invasion strengthened the dependence of the Dublin administration on men like Maurice fitz Thomas and John Bermingham for the defence of the marches, it had also strengthened the local position and power of such men. This was also the period in which certain members of the minor Anglo-Irish gentry, such as the Cauntetons, the Purcells and the St. Albins, finally passed from the category of extremely unruly marcher tenant to that of English rebel. Such constant instability, coupled with the expansion of the march and the effects of the famine can only have reinforced the trend towards abandoning large scale demesne cultivation in many parts of the lordship.

Prices

It is in the context of the initial stimulus of purveyance for the Welsh wars and the subsequent economic and political reverses that one must examine the movement of prices in late thirteenth and fourteenth century Ireland. Certain problems are posed by the nature of the surviving thirteenth century evidence. The first adequate series of statistics is provided by the accounts of the manorial reeves of the Bigod manors of Carlow and Wexford.\textsuperscript{101} It relates to one decade only, the 1280's. This is the only extant Irish evidence that is directly comparable with the evidence used by Titow in his examination of the Winchester estates. The decade in question saw the expansion of the Irish agrarian economy to supply the demand created by the Welsh wars and there is, unfortunately, little earlier data with which such prices can be compared. Thus, the chronology of this expansion cannot be charted with any degree of satisfaction.

Certain other serious problems are raised by the nature of the evidence derived from late thirteenth and fourteenth century administrative records.\textsuperscript{102} Occurrences such as the sequestration of the property of the Knights Templar in 1308, vacancies in the archbishopric of Dublin and the seizure of the temporalities of that archbishopric on foot of the Bicknor affair are not recurring factors. Thus, evidence relating to prices in February 1308 abounds, while evidence of price levels in 1310, the last of three years of famine, is much less comprehensive in nature. The

\textsuperscript{101} For a discussion of these accounts see above, Chapter II, the Bigod estate price data cited hereafter is given in Chapter VII: Tables II and III.

\textsuperscript{102} See above, pp 333-4 and for data from these sources see Chapter VII: Tables IV and V.
survival of an eyre roll such as that for Tipperary in January 1306 means that certain years in any table will have a strong regional bias, though until such time as more detailed work on local manorial history is undertaken, no attempt can be made to quantify or adjust to compensate for such a bias. Such are the lacunae in both the plea rolls and the memoranda rolls that evidence in any great quantity is unobtainable for years of critical importance such as 1315, 1319 and the mid 1320's. Imperfections of this nature are, however, not so serious as to invalidate the use of the data in question but do mean that one must proceed with caution and avoid the temptation to argue beyond the limitations imposed by the known facts.

Further problems are presented by seasonal fluctuations in price. Such fluctuations would be of particular importance in the case of grain prices, and might also be significant in the case of milch cows and sheep. Grain was cheap at harvest time. In a normal year, its price could be expected to peak in late winter or early spring, with, perhaps, a second peak in summertime before the new grain became available. Famine would disrupt this cycle, as would the expectation of a poor harvest. Under such conditions, the price of any grain in short supply could be expected to remain high throughout the summer, to drop slightly and briefly at harvest time and, subsequent to the harvest, to begin to rise again. Thus, the month in which grain was either sold or valued could have had a considerable effect on its price. It was for this reason that I decided, wherever possible, to record the month of the sale, valuation or court case in my own tables.

This cannot be done in the case of the Carlow data, for while the amount and value of the grain sold is recorded in the manorial accounts, the time of year at which the sale took place is not. It would be tempting to assume that such sales were noted in chronological order, as the sequence of prices in the 1280-1 Ballysax account would seem to suggest.

A number of factors could alter the potential value of a sheep. If it were a ewe and were being sold at the end of spring, it could, unless extremely old or diseased, be expected to produce milk throughout the summer. Its price, as, indeed, would the price of a wether or ram, have been considerably higher if the animal were sold before the shearing. Similarly, a milch cow sold at the end of spring could reasonably be expected to fetch more than a comparable beast sold in late autumn.

One further element must be taken into account when considering the
price of either grain or livestock. The quality of the article for sale would almost certainly have affected the price obtained in the market place. An enquiry into excessively high prices being charged for basic foodstuffs in Carlow in 1373, the Exchequer had for some time been located in Carlow, points clearly to this fact.103 The prices of the various types and qualities of grain and of cows, hens and straw were noted and enrolled on the memoranda roll for that year. Recorded instances of differentiation with respect to quality are rare, tending to occur only when a price was considered abnormally low, and then being used to excuse the price.104.

Fluctuations in Irish grain prices in the course of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century reflect closely the impact of the worsening climate and the numerous political crises, both of an immediate and of a chronic nature. The effects of these crises is perhaps more apparent in the movement of grain prices than in corresponding movements of livestock prices. While the great famine of 1315-18 certainly affected livestock prices, as did the various murrains of the early fourteenth century, the fact remains that on the whole these prices were more stable and less liable to fluctuation than grain prices. Under the prevailing conditions, given the expansion of the march and the increase in lawlessness within the lordship, stock rearing was undoubtedly more viable and less vulnerable than tillage.

A close comparison can be made between grain prices recorded in the Carlow group accounts and corresponding data from the manors of the bishopric of Winchester. It would seem that the reverses of the mid 1280's, which were caused by excessively dry summers, had a similar effect on grain prices on both groups of manors, but that the crisis was of longer duration on the Winchester manors due to the poor harvest in 1283. No Winchester data has survived for 1280-1.105 Thus, it is not possible to ascertain if the run of high grain prices recorded at Ballysax, Fothered and Old Ross were symptomatic of some more widespread crisis in that year.

The movement of grain prices in the 1290's and in the first decades of the fourteenth century in Ireland is directly in line with what could be expected from an examination of the annals. Famine, in particular the famines of 1294-6 and 1315-18 and the sharp increase in grain prices

104. cf. Chapter VII: Table IV.
105. See Chapter VII: Table I.
caused by such crises are all apparent in the central administrative price table. Evidence of the impact of the 1308-10 famine on prices is not quite so extensive, data for 1309 being particularly scanty, but the height ultimately reached by prices in the winter of 1309-10 and the spring of 1310, together with some of the autumnal prices of that year, reflect in part the severity of that famine. It would appear from the surviving data that the famine of 1330-2, mentioned in the Anglo-Irish annals, may have been at least as severe as some of the earlier famines. The fact that some of the highest prices recorded in 1331 came from Limerick is an indication that the area affected by this famine was considerably greater than could have been suspected from examination of annalistic sources. No mention of this famine occurs in any of the Gaelic annals and the Limerick prices were such that a considerable portion of the west and south west of the country must have been affected. One would therefore have expected some mention of the famine in either the Annals of Connacht or the Annals of Clonmacnoise.

Further problems are posed by the impact of the unknown and undetectable local famines which might have affected one particular series of surviving statistics. A famine of this type would only have affected a limited area and would not have been of sufficient general interest to have been included in any of the major annals. The relatively high prices revealed in the course of the Tipperary Eyre of January 1306 may have been the result of such a local catastrophe. Similarly, shortages might have resulted from local movement of kerns, outbreaks of marcher warfare or raids from local Gaelic or Anglo-Irish magnates.

It would be unwise to attempt to argue that average grain prices either rose or fell in the lordship during the course of the fourteenth century. While the increases at the end of the thirteenth century and the impact of the famines and reverses of the early fourteenth century are clear, the data for the second quarter of the fourteenth century is not sufficiently extensive to permit speculation of that nature. One might, however, note that the prices set in Carlow in October 1373 are slightly higher than the average prices for the same grains in the late thirteenth century. It is generally held that on average grain prices fell in England in the course of the fourteenth century, a slackening off in demand for grain seen as the result of demographic decline accentuated by visitations of the Black Death. If grain prices in Ireland were to remain static, or even increase slightly in the course of that century,

106. See Chapter VII: Table I
107. See above, pp 354-6.
the factors behind this development were presumably the swifter and more total abandonment of direct cultivation of demesne lands in order to produce a saleable surplus of grain and the growing unprofitability and impracticality of tillage in an increasingly unstable society. In other words demographic contraction would have been matched by market contraction - the result being what was in relative terms an extremely stable market.

Fluctuations in livestock prices during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though less obvious than those in grain prices, nevertheless followed clearly delineated and predictable lines. In stock rearing terms, the worst possible sort of disaster would have been a prolonged murrain affecting either sheep or cattle or possibly both. Such a murrain would initially bring down prices, as diseased animals could be sold for slaughter, for their hides in the case of cattle and for their wool in the case of sheep. Following the murrain, prices would rise slightly for a year or possibly two years, until such time as sufficient replacement had occurred to stabilise the supply of animals and the rate of breeding to pre-murrain levels. It should, however, be borne in mind that any generalisations based on the figures in either the Carlow or the central livestock price tables cannot take account of differences in the quality of animals unless exceptional qualities of a negative or positive nature are noted in the sources.

The effects of the sheep murrain of the mid 1280's on the Bigod manors were such that prices dropped slightly in 1284 and 1285, though some sheep sold from Ballysax, which apparently escaped the worst effects of the murrain, fetched 9d. each. Subsequently, both flock numbers and prices appear to have stabilised. However, the lack of any price material from these manors later than that for 1287 means that one cannot speculate on the long-term impact of this murrain or the subsequent rate of stock replacement.

Interaction between both adverse weather conditions and the deteriorating political situation can be seen in some of the more extreme price rises of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Prices for cattle, sheep and affers rose sharply in 1295, the year marking the mid-point of the first serious famine of that period. This increase would therefore reflect a rise in the value of these animals due to a shortage of food.

108. See above, pp 341-3.
109. See Chapter VII: Table III.
If the crop failure of these years was due to wet weather, then it would seem likely that a contemporaneous murrain also occurred. The unstable condition of the lordship both during and after the great Geraldine/de Burgh conflict would also have tended to force up stock prices. In this context it is instructive to examine the price data for 1297, the year of the Kildare Eyre.\textsuperscript{110} Evidence of serious political instability, marcher warfare and general banditry surfaced frequently in the course of this eyre. It is surely significant that livestock prices in that year were considerably higher in Leinster than in any of the Munster counties, with the exception of Cork, for which data has survived. Similarly, when examining the great murrain that coincided with part of the famine of 1315-13, the impact of the Bruce Invasion, Gaelic unrest and the insecurity of marcher life must also be kept under scrutiny.

As was the case in many parts of England,\textsuperscript{111} the murrain lingered on in Ireland after the famine. Its after effects can be seen in the relatively high valuations of sheep taken into the King's hand and sold in order to repay the debts of former officials on some of the royal manors in the autumn of 1319.

While no great fluctuation in prices appears to have resulted from the murrains of the mid 1320's, the same cannot be said of the murrains of 1302 and 1309-10. Both in 1303 and 1311 the price of sheep rose, presumably reflecting depleted stocks and, in some cases, a desire to aid re-stocking through purchase. The exceptionally high prices fetched by cows in 1329 and 1332 are probably a reflection of famine and crop failure rather than murrain. Annalist evidence is of crop failure in 1328 and again in 1330-2, with no mention being made of murrain. While this need not preclude the possibility of murrain, it would not be in character for annals such as the Annals of Connacht to fail to mention an outbreak of that nature.

As was the case with grain prices in the lordship in the second quarter of the fourteenth century, the data relating to livestock prices is not sufficiently comprehensive to warrant any major speculation on overall price trends in that period. The graded prices for sheep and cows set in the Carlow area in the autumn of 1373 are not significantly higher

\textsuperscript{110} See Chapter VII: Tables IV and V.

or lower than the prices generally obtained for sheep and cows in the late thirteenth century. As with grain, an apparent stability in prices might be seen to indicate that the stock market was also contracting in line with demographic contraction, though the demand for livestock would never have been as readily affected as that for grain by demographic reverses. There are, however, other reasons for the likely relative resilience of stock rearing despite the political and economic reverses experienced within the lordship. It was easier to defend stock from raids and the effects of warfare than to protect a crop in the field.

Thus, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries saw the emergence and decline of a grain-centred manorial economy in Ireland and, in a sense, ushered in the trends which were to underlie the fifteenth century rise of an economy centred upon stock-rearing. The exploitation of new land hitherto uncropped in the early thirteenth century gave place to the systematic exploitation of even somewhat marginal land in order to capitalise on the demand for grain and for other provisions created by the Welsh campaigns of Edward I. Increasing insolvency on the part of the Irish Exchequer, a growth in political instability and worsening climatic conditions were to curtail expansion and initiate decline. Both the famine of 1315-18 and the Bruce Invasion were to intensify this decline, and although it is likely that demesne cultivation was being abandoned or at any rate wound down in certain areas prior to these events, their ultimate impact in reinforcing these trends cannot be doubted. Demographic reverses, together with a contraction in the market for agricultural products, were, in the second half of the fourteenth century, to cloak this decline with an appearance of continuity and stability.
CONCLUSION

Manorial structure, administrative techniques and the manorial economy in the lordship were heavily influenced by the fact that Ireland was peripheral to a greater and more centralised lordship. This vulnerability, though present in the early years of the lordship, was latent until the late thirteenth century, surfacing at a time when the lordship was under increasing pressure. Although the manorial economy in Ireland was to survive these crises, it did so in a form very different to that of the buoyant decades of the mid-thirteenth century. Contraction, decline, loss through war and the adoption of new management techniques went hand in hand with the contraction of the market, leading ultimately to stability on a lower base line rather than to the total collapse of the manorial economy.

Following the conquest Ireland, like Wales and the Scottish marches, was in need of extensive settlement to ensure military stability. This was the only practical way to ensure that the problem posed to Henry II by Richard de Clare's speculative intervention in Gaelic dynastic warfare would not recur at some future date. This settlement, and the development of the agrarian economy on which it was to be based was therefore, of critical importance. The conditions in which it took place determined the initial nature of manorial structures. Thus, the location of marchland and the Gaelic response to settlement in the first half of the thirteenth century would have played a major formative role in this process. Unfortunately this was a period for which no accounts or detailed extents have survived. Marcher conditions and the need for settlement also influenced the forms and conditions of tenure found within the lordship of Ireland. Subsequently, both economic conditions and the growth of the march were to determine profitability, administrative techniques and the viability of some of the earlier forms of manorial structure. Adaptability to local conditions, such as Elizabeth de Clare's willingness to make use of cadet branches of the de Burgh and de Verdun families in the administration, may well have represented the difference between the defunct manor engulfed by the march and survival.

Like both the Welsh and the Northumbrian marches and areas of comparatively

2. See above, p. 4
3. See above, Chapter IV, p. 160 p. 171
late settlement in England, particularly those of the unfree and semi-free categories, were very much better than those enjoyed by corresponding groups in areas of early settlement in England. Even the most onerous of the betagh and unfree cottagers' services were very much less severe than villein services on well-established English estates such as those of Westminster and Peterborough abbeys. The severity or otherwise of the services in Ireland was determined by a number of factors, the most important being the extent to which a lord could impose his will and retain a viable lordship. Had conditions for either the betagh or the cottager become intolerable, flight, had it occurred on any large scale, into the march, or into an area completely under the control of a Gaelic sept, could have severely prejudiced the lord's income from rent or commutation payments. Cases of flight were extremely rare.

The importance of settlement and control was clearly demonstrated in the use made of burgage tenure to strengthen rural settlement. Many manors had their own boroughs both to provide areas of nucleated settlement and as local centres of trade. Conditions of burgage tenure varied from lordship to lordship, but were nearly always attractive in order to encourage settlers. For the most part, boroughs outside the great Leinster liberties of the old Marshal lordship were granted charters based on the law of Breteuil, suitably adapted to the local situation. Within this category the size of the burgage could and did vary. Burgessess might also owe certain customary services, mainly carrying services, but there were instances of more extreme forms of obligation, like the services rendered from many of the boroughs on the lands of the archbishop of Dublin. Boroughs within the Leinster liberties were granted charters bestowing a custom which was effectively a fusion of the law of Breteuil, from which the very attractive rent element was retained, and the customs of Bristol. Their burgages were of a uniform size: 6 acres and a frontage. This was slightly larger than

---

4. See above, Chapter VI, p 270.
5. See above, Chapter VI, pp 270–84 and pp 292–5.
7. See above, Chapter VI, pp 286–8.
8. See above, Chapter VI, pp 302–8.
9. See above, Chapter VI, pp 306–7, n 313.
10. See above, Chapter III: Table VI.
11. See above, Chapter VI, pp 308–12.
many of the Breteuil burgages and would have, perhaps, been intended to compensate for the higher amercement threshold associated with the modified Bristol elements of the charters.

Manorial structures within the lordship of Ireland were largely dictated by the proximity of the march, and also by the expansion of the march in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The distinctive nature of the manor of the land of peace, the tight structural organisation, the importance of the demesne and the diversity of tenurial types, was the antithesis of that of the manor of the extreme march or land of war. Non-marcher Leinster manors, typified by places like Cloncurry, Ballysax or Gowran, were very different to manors like Loxeudy and Dunamase, and to the conditions prevailing in the de Burgh lands in Connacht. Indeed, the structures of manors in both Meath and Tipperary can be seen to represent a transition from the land of peace to the fringes of the land of war, through a progression of increasingly precarious marchlands.

Conditions within the lordship deteriorated considerably in the last quarter of the thirteenth century and first half of the fourteenth century. Because of the exploitive policies of Edward I, the financial problems faced by the Dublin administration were reflected in various ways throughout the lordship at a local level. Despite the re-shiring of Dublin, Meath and Kildare between 1297 and 1302, attempted reforms in the statutes of 1297 and 1322, and other measures of reform, local administration was not particularly effective. The most effective reforms, in practical terms, were those that increased the efficiency of the Exchequer and its agents in debt collection, such as the introduction of the county receiver in 1310. Little was done to stem the growth of the over-mighty magnate. Financial stringency threw the responsibility

12. See above, Chapter V, pp 143-201
13. See above, Chapter V, pp 227-8
14. See above, Chapter V, pp 243-4
15. See above, Chapter V, pp 237-45 and Chapter IV, pp 149-57.
17. See above, Chapter V, pp 209-19.
20. For the text of these statutes see H. Berry, Early Statutes, p. 203 et passim and 265 et passim.
for local defence onto the local magnates, men who also tended to be the major offenders against the statutes designed to control the keeping of kerns and the activities of indentured retinues. The problem grew from the scale of the activities of men like Peter Bermingham of Tethmoy and John fitz Thomas, to those of Maurice fitz Thomas, the notorious first earl of Desmond.

Meanwhile, the Gaelic septs in areas bordering on relatively rich lands were forced, largely by economic circumstances, to engage in raiding. Thus, the deterioration in climatic conditions in the late thirteenth century was to expose both the south county manors of the archbishopric of Dublin and the royal manors of Saggard, Bray, Othee, Obrun, Newcastle McKynegan, and, to a lesser extent, Newcastle Lyons, to this threat. While attempts were made to subdue the septs in question in the Leinster mountains, the long-term financial commitment involved in dominating areas like Glenmalure and controlling effectively the hinterlands of manors like Newcastle McKynegan, Ballymore and Castlekevin simply did not exist. To this must be added the chaos and dislocation resulting from the Bruce Invasion and the great famine of 1315-18.

At the same time, the manorially based economy had begun to contract. Initially, the market for agrarian products had been buoyant through servicing the Welsh campaigns of Edward I. Once the damage of Edward's exploitive policies in Ireland became apparent and reimbursement for goods purveyed or supplied privately to the armies in Scotland was delayed or simply did not occur, the base of that economy and the foundation of its buoyancy was severely eroded. If only for that reason, large scale grain production and stock rearing would have become increasingly unprofitable in the early fourteenth century. This would ultimately have been reflected in the abandonment of direct control of the demesne lands and their cultivation throughout the lordship, though

25. See above, Chapter I, pp 13-20.
26. See above, Chapter I, p. 13 and also Chapter III, p. 98.
27. See above, Chapter VII, pp 338-40 and pp 355-6.
28. See above, Chapter VII, pp 346-51.
possibly spread over a longer time-scale than was actually the case.

Catastrophic climatic changes in northern Europe during the closing years of the thirteenth century and the first three decades of the fourteenth century further weakened the economy. The famine of 1294-6 coincided with limited civil war and a period of heavy purveyance. Harvest failures in the early fourteenth century, culminating in the famines of 1306-10 and 1315-18 lessened the return from most land under cultivation. Taken together in terms of cumulative effect, the demographic contractions resulting from these famines would ultimately have led to a concomitant slackening in the demand for basic agrarian products. Thus, contracting production serviced what was then a contracting and unstable market.

The combined effects of these crises were reflected in manorial structure, the manorial economy and estate management. Some manors which had, in the thirteenth century, been well within the land of peace, were to become marcher manors. This decline is particularly clear in the case of some of the manors of the archbishopric of Dublin like Shankill, Ballymore and Tallaght. Some manors, which originally lay within the marches, passed into the land of war. Between the 1280's and 1322, Dunamase County Laois, was transformed from a relatively prosperous marcher manor with an extensive borough, to an unprofitable manor well within the land of war. In some cases, where structural modification neither occurred nor was necessary, manors simply became increasingly less profitable. Even in a group of profitable and well-organised manors well within the land of peace, like those of the liberty of Carlow, decline resulting from purely economic factors was visible, in this case in the difference in the conditions reflected in the accounts of the 1280's and the 1307 inquisition post mortem. The short-term effects of the 1315-18 crisis and the crises of the early 1320's can be traced on the manors of the archbishopric of Dublin. Ultimately, however, the crises of those years led to a spread of the rentier type of estate management seen on the lands of Elizabeth de Clare. Rentier administration was not an essential part of absentee lordship, as can be seen from the Bigod lordship in the 1280's, and efficiency rather than form would have been what commended any form of administration to Elizabeth de Clare. Further demographic contraction resulting from local crises such as the

29. See above, Chapter VII, pp 335-41 and Table I.
31. See above, Chapter V, pp 248-4.
32. See above, Chapter II, pp 70-3 for Old Ross, a classic example of this decline.
1330-2 famine in Leinster, but primarily from the recurring visitations of the Black Death after 1348, reinforced these trends.

The lordship of Ireland was a marcher lordship, with regions and areas which constituted, at best, a march within a march. In structural terms its manors and many of the conditions of tenure found there were the direct result of this situation. Its manorially based economy enjoyed a brief, and somewhat artificial, prosperity in the mid-thirteenth century, relying on the exploitation of newly settled lands and a market made particularly buoyant by the purveyance and supply trade with Wales. This prosperity was effectively shattered by the political and economic crisis of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. However, in real terms, market contraction and contraction in production appear to have been similar in extent. Thus, with certain adjustments, mainly in the leasing of demesne land and the adoption of rentier management, some measure of economic equilibrium would seem to have been preserved.

33. See above, Chapter VII, p. 360 and also Table IV.
34. See above, Chapter I, pp 37-8 and Chapter IV, pp 186-7.
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