

A Case Study of the Primary Phase of Anglo-Norman Settlement: The Lordship of Kells

C. A. Empey

* (Sections of this article have been published in the current issue of the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*).

The historiography of the Anglo-Norman conquest of Ireland has tended inevitably to focus around the activities of the great magnates — Strongbow, de Lacy, de Courcy, de Burgh, and others. Indeed it is hard to see how it could be otherwise, for these men supplied the drive, the military skill, and, above all, the manpower which made the enterprise possible in the first place. Their achievement, however, produced enduring results only because it was followed by a substantial influx of colonial settlers. Certainly the great lords played an important part in this process: their ‘capital’ manors (for example Trim, Carrickfergus, Kilkenny, Carlow) became almost immediately the foci of important urban and agricultural colonization. In such instances the magnates were themselves directly responsible, either in person or by delegation, for setting aside sufficient land to endow their towns and demesnes, for issuing charters, and for recruiting settlers. Nevertheless, their contribution as colonizers was not proportionate to their military role in the initial stages of the conquest, for the greater part of their enormous lordships was settled by their immediate tenants, the honorial barons.

This pattern is clearly demonstrable in the area of central and southern Kilkenny where, with the exception of Kilkenny, Callan, and a few comparatively small manors like Dunfert (Danesfort) and the Newtown of Jerpoint, the entire region was held by men of baronial rank: Thomas FitzAnthony (Ogenty), Griffin FitzWilliam (Knocktopher), Miles FitzDavid (Iverk and Ida), John de Erlee (Erley), Theobald Walter (Oskelan), and Geoffrey FitzRobert (Kells).¹ Thus the organisation of the Anglo-Norman colony in this region was almost entirely the achievement of these men.

We know very little about how they set about the task of ‘planting’ their lordships. We do know, however, from the richly-documented sources of the early modern plantations — for example the Londonderry plantation — that the logistics of colonization called for a high degree of organization, that the process could be very slow, that the shortage of capital was a constant hindrance to progress, and that the recruitment of colonists was enormously difficult. The difficulties which beset medieval colonizers must have been at least as great, and possibly greater. Lacking even the resources of capital available to the London companies, the Anglo-Norman lords had to rely on their own unaided effort and initiative. Their ability to command men, to administer their estates, to co-ordinate the complex elements of an extensive lordship was therefore essential to the success of such an undertaking. A lord had to dispose of his resources carefully, for once he had planted the outline of his demesnes, religious foundations, military tenements, free tenements, burgage lands and unfree tenements, there was no going back. Once he had issued his charters and demarcated

jurisdictions they became established by hereditary right and customary law, and were therefore irreversible.

Compared to the conquest of England, the Norman conquest of Ireland is usually perceived to be a failure, partly because there was no concerted attempt to subdue the whole island, and partly because the population as a whole was never Normanized. The comparison is unjust on two grounds. First, Ireland was conquered piecemeal by a group of men whose objectives were more limited than those of the duke of Normandy. They set out only to establish private lordships, not to conquer a kingdom, which in this instance did not even exist. Secondly, in many of the regions where they did settle, they introduced a substantial colonial population which had the effect ultimately of changing the demographic composition of Ireland in a way that the conquest of England never did. England remained English. Ireland was never again to be Gaelic in the sense that it had been before the coming of the Normans. As a colonial experiment on a small scale the Anglo-Norman settlement was an astonishing achievement.

In this context the lordship of Kells has a particular interest, for most of the men of the rank of Geoffrey FitzRobert, the founding father, remain shadowy figures: their deeds seldom warranted the attention of the annals or the chansons. Their names occur primarily as witnesses to their lords' charters. Sometimes, of course, their personal charters have survived, but never in a sufficient quantity to enable us to put together a composite picture of their lives. In this respect Geoffrey was unusual: we know quite a lot about his career, thanks to his close association with William Marshal, lord of Leinster, and we can trace in some detail his activities as lord of Kells, due mainly to the survival of fragments of the register of the priory of Kells. The nature of the documentation also allows us to operate within a well-defined chronology, so that to some degree we can monitor the progress of the colony during his lifetime. In the circumstances we should not expect the sources to bear too much in the way of hypothetical construction, but they most likely point to a more rapid colonial development than would otherwise have been considered probable. Hitherto we had thought that the process of populating the towns, especially the more remote manorial towns, must have been very gradual — a thing hardly begun in the generation of the conquest, but only gathering momentum in the more settled conditions of the mid-thirteenth century. Now we are inclined to think that the process got off to a remarkably fast start.

Geoffrey FitzRobert, Lord of Kells 1192-1211

Geoffrey's status can best be measured by the marriages which he contracted. He first married Basilia, sister of Strongbow and widow of Raymund le Gros. She was therefore aunt of Isabel, the wife of William Marshal. Such a connection naturally tied him closely to William's household, so it is not surprising that his career was bound up with the wide-ranging interests of his lord. Basilia died shortly after 1199. Geoffrey subsequently married Eva de Bermingham, widow of Gerald FitzMaurice, soon after the latter's death c. 1203; she appears as Geoffrey's wife in the foundation character of the priory of Kells, c. 1204-6. Since her marriage was in the gift of William, we can gauge Geoffrey's relative importance within the circle of William's most trusted barons.²

In this capacity Geoffrey was appointed seneschal of Leinster sometime between 1204 and 1208,³ which means in effect that he was William's deputy in Ireland at the time when his relations with the king were severely strained. The fact that he was instrumental in fixing the annual rent from

burgage tenures in Leinster at 12d. a year suggests that he may have been seneschal sometime in the 1190 s.⁴ A policy decision of this kind, which seems to have applied generally to all the earl's towns in Leinster, affords an interesting example of the kind of detailed planning which the settlement called forth. The inclusion of Geoffrey's name in this connection in a number of Leinster charters does not mean that he was responsible in person for drafting them or that he was involved in some special capacity as a town-builder: he merely laid down a general guide-line.⁵

His association with Marshal inevitably drew him into the conflict with the king, which reached a climax in the events of 1207-8. He remained steadfast to his lord throughout the crisis, for which he received favourable notice in the *Histoire de Guillaume le Mareschal*.⁶ He was important enough to catch the attention of John, who had him confined in Hereford castle as a hostage. The king apparently did not release Geoffrey even when things quietened down, if we are to believe the *Histoire*, and so he died while still serving as a hostage.⁷ The register of Kells gives 1211 as the date of his death, which is probably correct.

Geoffrey was an important landholder, as befitted a man of his status. In addition to the lordship of Kells, he was lord of Grean, Co. Limerick (where he probably founded another town),⁸ and Dysart, Co. Kilkenny.⁹ Altogether his lands incorporated about 40,000 acres. Although he did rank as a tenant-in-chief in respect of his lands in Limerick, his status really depended on his position as an important honorial baron. What we know about his career is therefore sufficient to show that he was a man of wide administrative experience and some political stature. As such he commanded the kind of resources in men, material, and experience to enable him to establish a successful colony in his lordship of Kells.

The Growth of a Colony: the Lordship of Kells

Since attention has already been drawn to the non-military considerations involved in the construction of the motte at Kells, we will focus our attention on the growth and development of the lordship of Kells as a colonial enterprise. To establish military authority over the area was one thing; to exploit its economic potential to the full was quite another: That required careful planning. It involved the recruitment of non-military social elements: small freeholders, cottiers to provide labour on the demesnes, burgesses to channel trade within the lordship and provide a pool of necessary skills, regular and secular clergy to operate new religious foundations and to man a rapidly evolving parochial system. To accomplish this in an area comprising more than 17,000 acres was no mean task.¹⁰

In order to appreciate fully the measure of success which Geoffrey achieved, it is salutary to bear in mind the kind of difficulties encountered by Anglo-Norman monastic patrons in Ireland. It was easy to write a charter, however generous; it was less so to find monks who were willing to brave the rugged conditions of the Irish frontier, or to enlist the support of a mother house in England. Not every monk sought martyrdom: fewer still sought it in Ireland. Take the case of Brother Alan of Buildwas who was dispatched to Dunbrody by his abbot in order to make a full report on the prospects of establishing a daughter house there, the land having already been provided by Harvey de Montmorency. To begin with, the facilities were not up to standard, even for a Cistercian. Alan was forced to live in a hole in an oak tree, in the direst straits (*in penuria et erumpna*). His survey completed, he returned *cum festinacione* (we may be sure) to make his report. He came straight to the point: the place was a wilderness, the land was worthless, and the natives were quite ferocious.¹¹ His point was taken:

after a respectable interval (*diutina hesitacione*) the abbot decided that such an undertaking was beyond his resources,¹² and so it was resolved to make over his rights in Dunbrody to St Mary's Abbey, Dublin. Harvey, who seems to have been trying to get his foundation off the ground since c.1171-2, was back where he had started. Even Strongbow failed to establish a house at Bannow, when Reginald, prior of Walden, gave up the attempt having failed to find monks willing to accompany him to Ireland.¹³

Geoffrey wasted no time in setting about the establishment of his priory, which he began in 1193 although at that time he cannot have been in Ireland for more than a year.¹⁴ At first he could only secure the services of four priests to serve in the church of St Kieran in Kells. They had to content with living in cabins (*habitacula*) beside the church. Eventually his persistence paid off: after paying a visit to the Austin priory of Bodmin he managed either to induce or to drag four canons back to Ireland with him.¹⁵ He was fortunate in his choice of men: Alured was dispatched to the priory of Inistioge at the request of Thomas FitzAntony, where he became prior; Hugh le Rous was consecrated bishop of Ossory c.1202. In his capacity as bishop Hugh continued to take an active interest in the priory by placing some of the resources of the bishopric at its disposal.¹⁶ We may be sure that the charter which Geoffrey issued to the priory c.1204-6 represents an extension of an earlier grant, and that Bishop Hugh, a witness, had not a little to do with it. The same charter also provided indirect evidence that the building of the priory church had already commenced.¹⁷ No doubt the building took many years to complete but a beginning had been made, and the community of canons had plainly established a reputation.

The year 1193 gives us a firm *tempus a quo* for the commencement of the settlement generally, for we may reasonably assume that in making territorial provision for his priory Geoffrey was simultaneously engaged in the business of assigning lands to his knights, free tenants, and burgesses. In 1346 the rent from the burgages of Kells was estimated at £3-11s-8p.¹⁸ Since these rents, like the rents and services of the tenements, were fixed at the time of the initial settlement and were not subject to change, it is clear that Geoffrey intended this new town to have a capacity of about seventy-two burgages. Given the reluctance of churchmen to settle among natives of the ferocious brand reported by Brother Alan of Buildwas, one might reasonably conclude that members of the burgess class would be even less motivated to risk their hides than the spiritually disciplined Cistercians. Perhaps the attractions of the *civitas terrena* were more readily apprehended than those of the *civitas Dei*, but in any event the charter of Kells issued by Geoffrey's heir, William, in c.1211-12, leaves little doubt that the urban settlement took root rapidly.¹⁹ First of all, the burgesses were in a position to offer an appreciable lump sum — twenty-three marks — for securing the charter. For a community which had arisen out of the wilderness in less than twenty years this was no mean achievement. Secondly, it is clear that the townsmen were suing for an extension of the liberties they already enjoyed under the terms of Geoffrey's original charter. This in itself is a measure of their progress: why pay for privileges unless you are successful enough to benefit from them? One very curious clause in the new charter permitted the burgesses to lease the street front of their burgage lots to free tenants, which suggests that not only had all the burgages been occupied but that they needed to be subdivided in order to accommodate a growing population. This must mean that even in the first generation of the conquest non-military colonists were pouring into the new manors and towns. One can only presume that they were less impressionable than Brother Alan.

The allocation of the principal tenements, which occupied about three-quarters of the area of the lordship of Kells, must have been one of Geoffrey's earliest actions, but as no manorial extent has survived it is impossible to reconstruct them in detail. Since he held the lordship by the service of one and a half knights, his principal concern must have been the allocation of military tenements. Dunnamaggan, the largest of them, was almost certainly a fief in origin: alone among the tenements it was big enough to support a town.²⁰ Presumably the remaining major holdings were formed around the parish churches of Kilree, Shortallstown, and Kilmoganny. The tenements noted in an inquisition in 1621 probably represented subdivisions of larger thirteenth century holdings: Kilmoganny, Gortcoller (? Shortallstown), Rossenarra, Kilree, Grovebeg (Chapelizod), Danganbeg, Baysrath, Tuitestown, and Dunnamaggan (in demesne).²¹ Usually the larger holdings on such manors carried the obligation of military service and suit of court, while the smaller ones owed only rent and suit of court. In both types of holding the services would have been appointed by Geoffrey.

The Castle

We can scarcely doubt that Geoffrey's first action was the construction of the motte at Kells, so that we can confidently assign it to 1192 or 1193.²² Two questions in particular require our attention: why did he build it where he did, and what can we glean from the documentary sources about the castle?

Of one thing we may be sure: his choice of site was not governed exclusively by considerations of defence. It is clear from what we have already said that Geoffrey intended his castle to be his *caput* and the focus of a considerable non-military settlement. There may well have been a pre-Norman settlement of some kind in Kells, as the dedication of the pre-monastic church suggests, but there are no grounds whatsoever for believing that it had formerly been the principal seat of the kings of Ossory.²³ In any case, the choice of pre-Norman sites would have been governed by the same criteria as any other: the availability of suitable and sufficient arable land for demesne lands, the proximity of a river for the manorial mill, seignorial fishing rights, and communications (particularly when the foundation of a town was being considered). The latter considerations must have weighed heavily with Geoffrey, for his motte can hardly be said to occupy a commanding position, being dominated to a degree by high ground on either side. This is not to say that military considerations were altogether neglected. That the motte was situated on an island (now largely silted up) is evident from a clause in the town charter which refers to the right of the burgesses to common pasture *de illa parva insula que est circa castellum meum de Kenelis*.²⁴ At the same time the question of defence should not be divorced from the defensive needs of the population of the lordship as a whole, yet here we are faced with an apparent anomaly: there are no traces of twelfth or thirteenth century earthworks on the sites of the tenements, some of which were fairly substantial manors in their own right (as, for example, Dunnamaggan). In this respect the pattern of early anglo-Norman settlement in the cantred of Kells closely resembles that of the adjacent cantred of Knocktopher.²⁵ Since we can hardly suppose that the knights and hereditary free tenants were less conscious of the need to protect their own manors than their lord's, we may well ask whether the need for defence was a matter of primary concern in the conditions of the early settlement? Perhaps conditions in central Kilkenny were much more pacific than we might suppose. In any case it is

not unreasonable to suggest that the construction of the seignorial castle was as much a matter of prestige as a requirement of defence. Castles of the motte type were not infrequently built on tenements in border areas — for example in the tenements of Thurles and Dunkerrin — but in central Ossory they seem to have been built on the sites of the *capita* only (Callan, Kells, Knocktopher, Gowran).²⁶

In regard to the castle itself the records have little to say. The most positive evidence relates to the position of the gate. In his charter to the priory c.1204-6 Geoffrey granted to the canons all the fisheries *inter molendinum meum quod est ante portam castelli mei de Kenles et inter terram de Hinisnach* (Ennisnag).²⁷ There can be little doubt that the castle mill occupied the site of the present mill about 100 meters north-east of the motte.²⁸ The gate therefore stood on the eastern or north-eastern side of the motte, where it commanded the road leading to the bridge. It presumably stood on the outer edge of a fosse (now destroyed by the passage of the modern road), exactly like the gate at Dinant portrayed in the Bayeux Tapestry.

The absence of any visible traces of a moat may be explained by two circumstances: either it has been levelled by repeated annual flooding, or else it was considered unnecessary since the castle was situated on an island. Reference is made in the charter of Kells c.1211-12 to the *fossatum gardini mei et castelli mei* which bounded the pasture on the western side of the castle.²⁹ Here we are presented with a problem of translation: does *fossatum* signify the missing moat, or does it refer to the embankment which still exists on the south-western side of the motte? Unless we have good reason to believe that the embankment, which is skirted by a late medieval wall, did not exist in the early thirteenth century, we must suspect that the *fossatum* refers to it. If this is so, we can scarcely doubt that the function of the embankment was to support a bailey.

Apart from a passing reference to the castle chapel in the charter to the priory, we have no documentary evidence relating to the buildings on the site. Presumably they were similar to those described in dozens of thirteenth and fourteenth century extents: hall, kitchen, chapel, stables, storehouses, and farm buildings of various descriptions.³⁰ The motte was almost certainly crowned by a wooden tower, which seems never to have been succeeded by a stone structure. This impression is strengthened by the fact that when O'Donovan inspected the motte in its undamaged state in 1839, he noted only the top was about thirty-two feet in diameter: had there been any evidence of masonry he was bound to have remarked upon it.³¹ This must mean that the *fortilagium* of Kells, mentioned in an inquisition taken on 30 October 1621, refers not to any building on top of the motte but to the medieval wall noted in connection with the bailey.³² That the twelfth century castle seems never to have been replaced by any substantial stone structure probably had little to do with the damage inflicted on Kells by the occupation of the Scots in 1316 or by a destructive baronial war waged in 1327.³³ The FitzRobert line died out sometime between 1308 and 1312. Thereafter the lordship passed to successive absentee lords: in the fourteenth century to the le Poers, Berminghams, and Prestons; in the fifteenth to Thomas Butler, prior of Kilmainham, and his heirs; in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the Viscounts Mountgarret. Such lords would have had little interest in maintaining the castle; preferring instead to farm out the demesnes. No doubt it was their lack of interest which was indirectly responsible for the construction by the late medieval priors of the massive fortification, the *villa prioris*, on the southern side of

the priory.³⁴ In the absence of resident lords, the priors assumed the responsibility for providing their own defence.

NOTES

1. Although Theobald Walter was a magnate in his own right, he held Gowran as a fief of the lordship of Leinster. For the location of these place-names see my article 'The cantreds of the medieval county of Kilkenny', in *R.S.A.I. Jn.*, ci (1971), 28-34.
2. For Geoffrey's marriages see E. St J. Brooks, *Knights' Fees*, 247.
3. See *Reg. St Thomas, Dublin*, nos 125-6, 154-6, 355-6, 398; *Ormond deeds, 1172-1350*, no.37. The fact that the last of the deeds cited above is witnessed by John Marshal enables us to place Geoffrey's seneschalship sometime between John's arrival in Ireland in 1204 and the end of Meiler's justiciarship in 1208.
4. See the charters of Kilkenny (*Liber primus Kilkenn.*, 73); Somerton, Co. Kilkenny (*Ormond deeds, 1350-1413*, no.92); Callan (*ibid.*, no. 441); Wexford (*ibid.*, 1419-1509, no.1). Since this was a policy decision, it was probably made in the early stages of urban planning, presumably early in the 1190s.
5. This has been suggested by A. J. Otway-Ruthven in relation to the town of Kilkenny in her translation of the *Liber primus Kilkenniensis* (Kilkenny, 1961), 2.
6. '... Gaufrei le filz Robert
Qui bien et lealment me sert' (*Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. P. Meyer (Paris, 1891-1901), 11. 13505-6.) For details of the conflict with the king see A. J. Otway-Ruthven, *Med. Ire.*, 77-9.
7. 'Guifrei le filz Robert fu mort
Qui en ostage fut livrez
Quant il dut estre delivrez'. (11. 14484-6). See also 1.14459.
8. See my article, 'The settlement of the kingdom of Limerick', in J. Lydon (ed.), *England and Ireland in the later middle ages*, (Dublin, 1981) See also *Red Bk Kildare*, no.133. The town of Grean granted an aid to the king in 1300 (*Cal. justic. rolls, Ire.*, 1295-1303, 304). Geoffrey was very probably the founder.
9. 'Terra de Distermoholmoc', mentioned in the same charter, is Dysart near Thomastown.
10. Except for the episcopal manors of Ennisnag and Stonecarthy, the lordship corresponded to the cantred of Kells (see my article, 'The cantreds of the medieval county of Kilkenny', loc. cit., 31.)
11. 'Quibus rite peractis, ad nos rediit cum festinacione, nos ad plenum certificando super loci vastitate, terrarum sterilitate, vicinorum barbaricorum feritate et ferocitate' (*Chartul. St Mary's, Dublin*, i, 355).
12. *Ibid.*, 355. 'Nos igitur ex verisimilibus conjecturis dampnum et jacturam non modica nostros posse incurrere, si quos ad partes illas causa ibidem inhabitandi et conversandi curaremus'.
13. See J. C. Ward, 'Fashions in monastic endowment: the foundations of the Clare family, 1066-1314', in *Jn. Eccles. Hist.*, xxxii (1981), 445-6.
14. Although the register of Kells states that the priory was founded in 1183, it also states that Geoffrey died fourteen or eighteen years after the foundation, which leaves us with the choice of 1183, 1193, and 1197. The first is clearly incorrect since Marshal did not have seisin of Leinster until 1192. One of Marshal's first actions on obtaining seisin was to make a number of important enfeoffments in central Ossory

- (see Orpen, *Normans*, ii, 225-6). FitzRobert almost certainly was enfeoffed about this time, so that on the balance 1193 is to be preferred to 1197 (*Ir. mon. deeds, 1200-1600*, 313).
15. *Ir. mon. deeds, 1200-1600*, 311. 'Ecclesiam S. Kevani' should read 'ecclesiam S. Kerani'.
 16. See J. Graves and J. G. Prim, *The history . . . of the cathedral church of St Canice* (Kilkenny/Dublin, 1857), 32, foot-note b.
 17. *Ir. mon. deeds, 1200-1600*, 2. The charter refers to the construction of mills 'desubtus ecclesiam Sancti (sic) Marie'. Apparently the church of St Kieran had been superseded.
 18. *Gormanston reg.*, 128; *Rot. pat. Hib.*, 52.
 19. Charter of William FitzGeoffrey (*Chart. privil. immun.*, 16-17). This charter may be dated between 1211, when William succeeded his father, and 1216 when Adam de Hereford, one of the witnesses, was dead. William would have confirmed his father's charter automatically on his succession, so the burgesses probably used this occasion to secure an extension of their liberties in return for the tempting offer of a lump sum.
 20. In 1346 the burgage rent of Dunnamaggan amounted to £2-3-0, representing the annual rent of forty-three burgages (*Gormanston reg.*, 128; *Rot. pat. Hib.*, 52).
 21. *Inq. cancell. Hib. repert.*, i, 31 Jac.; also cited in W. Carrigan, *The history and antiquities of the diocese of Ossory*, iv, (Dublin, 1905), 54-5.
 22. See foot-note 14.
 23. See Carrigan, *op. cit.*, iv, 51-2. Carrigan, following O'Donovan, bases his speculations on the etymology of the word *Ceannanus* (Kells), which may be translated 'head seat' or 'residence'. He takes the motte to be a pre-Norman *dún*, which he was predisposed to find in consequence of his etymological speculations. The fact that there were similar earthworks in Callan, Knocktopher, and elsewhere in the county does not seem to have crossed his mind. John O'Donovan likewise misunderstood the nature of the motte, as appears from his letter dated 16 Sept. 1839 (R.I.A. Letters containing information relative to the antiquities of the county of Kilkenny during the progress of the Ordnance Survey in 1839, ii, 23-4).
 24. *Chart. privileg. immun.*, 16-17.
 25. See my article, 'Medieval Knocktopher: a study in manorial settlement', in *Old Kilkenny Rev.*, ii (1982), 332-3.
 26. There are two possible, though improbable, exceptions to this rule: Ballyconway in the cantred of Knocktopher, and Powerstown in the *modern* barony of Gowran. I have given my reasons for believing Ballyconway not to be a genuine motte in my article cited in the previous foot-note, p.333. Powerstown lies in the deanery, and therefore almost certainly in the cantred, of Idrone in the medieval county of Carlow. It does not figure in the extents of the manor of Gowran, although these are detailed. It was probably held ultimately as a tenement of Dunleckny, the *caput* of Idrone.
 27. *Ir. mon. deeds, 1200-1600*, 2.
 28. That the sites of mills tend to remain fixed is clear from the fact that two on either side of the castle mill can be positively identified as belonging to the priory (Killinny and Kellsgrange: see *Extents Ir. mon. possessions*, 189). Since exclusive seignorial rights attached to mills in the middle ages, their number was restricted by the force of law and custom from a very early stage in the settlement. Moreover, the sites have remained permanent throughout the centuries since the best sites were chosen at the outset. In the case of the castle mill the prevalence of boggy ground virtually precluded the building of a mill

- on any other site adjacent to the castle.
29. *Chart. privil. immun.*, 16-17. The pasture in question must be the field on the island just west of the castle.
 30. An early fourteenth century extent of the manor of Nyncheaunlef (Inch), a tenement of Thurles, provides an exceptionally comprehensive inventory of buildings that surrounded the motte there (which is still partially in evidence). The jurors stated that there was a *castrum* standing on the motte, surrounded by a largely ruinous palisade (*palicium*). The buildings included a hall, an old wooden chapel, a kitchen, a larder, a *piscina* (a building rather than a fish-pond seems to be intended), a stable, barns or granaries (*horea*), a sheepcote (*bercaria*: probably not a sheepfold in this case), a bull-house or bull-pen (*torale*), a byre *infra fossam*, a grange, a garden, a curtilage, a dovecote, and a mill (*Red Bk Ormond*, 52-3).
 31. See foot-note 23.
 32. See foot-note 21.
 33. *Chartul. St Mary's, Dublin*, ii, 353; Clynn, *Annales Hiberniae, anno 1327*.
 34. I have discussed the function of this late medieval fortification more fully in my preface to the archaeological report on the priory of kells due to appear in the *R.I.A. Jn.*