

**Journal of the Cork Historical and
Archaeological Society**

www.corkhist.ie



Title: Carrigamuck Castle (contd.)

Author: Gillman, Herbert Webb

Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society, 1892, Vol. 1, No 2,
page(s) 30-37

Published by the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society

Digital file created: June 7, 2013

Your use of the JCHAS digital archive indicates that you accept the Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.corkhist.ie/info/tandc.pdf>

The Cork Historical and Archaeological Society (IE-148166, incorporated 1989) was founded in 1891, for the collection, preservation and diffusion of all available information regarding the past of the City and County of Cork, and South of Ireland generally. This archive of all content of JCHAS (from 1892 up to ten years preceding current publication) continues the original aims of the founders in 1891. For more information visit www.corkhist.ie.

Carrignamuck Castle, County Cork: a Stronghold of the MacCarthys.

BY HERBERT WEBB GILLMAN, J.P., B.L., M.R.S.A.,
COUNCIL MEMBER.

(Concluded).



IN 1542, Teige MacCarthy was one among eight chieftains of this country who made an "indenture of submission" to the Crown, in which they agreed to refer all disputes between themselves to a commission of arbitration appointed for Munster, and consisting of the Bishops of Cork and Waterford, and the Mayors of Cork and Youghal, instead of appealing to their Brehon judges. But this said indenture sat lightly on their consciences. One of the events of this lord's time occurred shortly before his death, when Sir Maurice of Desmond, surnamed Duv, made a predatory incursion into Muskerry. But the lord's son and tanist, Dermod of Carrignamuck, collected some of the "rising out," followed and overtook the Desmonds when carrying off their prey of cows, routed them, and took Maurice Duv prisoner. The victor consigned him to the charge of four horsemen while he himself pursued the remains of the fugitive Desmonds. The horsemen, however, killed Maurice Duv. It is an illustration of the times that Maurice's daughter, Ellen, was wife of Dermod, leader of the conquerors in this fight.

Teige died in the same year, 1565, and was buried at Kilcrea. There is in the Lambeth MSS. an interpolation here of a Callaghan MacCarthy as the twelfth lord. If there was such a lord, he could have held office for but a very short period, for, in a *fiant*⁽¹⁾ (No. 1084), of 28th June, 1568, preserved in the Public Record Office, Dublin, there is mention of "Sir Dermod McTeige MacCarthy of Mus-

kerry," which shows that he was then Lord of Muskerry—the thirteenth lord, according to the Lambeth MSS. This *fiant* is one authorizing a "pardon" to him and to "Cormac McTeige MacCarthy, of Carrignamuck, gent."—the lord's next brother, and his tanist—as also to four horsemen, two "balleffs," and four kerns, all of Muskerry, and all named in full. The crime or offence for which this pardon issued is not stated; indeed, such information is rarely given in documents of this kind and period, and they were issued often more as an excuse for some act of policy than anything else. Whatever the crime was—and it may have been connected with the fight with Maurice Duv, in the face of the Lord of Muskerry's previous undertaking to submit disputes to arbitration—the pardoned men were bound "to appear within six months before the Commissioners in their county and give security to *keep the peace*, and answer at sessions when called upon." This *fiant* shows clearly that Dermod being Lord of Muskerry and at Blarney, his brother Cormac, who was then his tanist, was at Carrignamuck, according to the custom before stated. Dermod died after a rule of five years, in 1570, and was buried at Kilcrea. He left four brothers, to the eldest of whom the lordship now passed as

Sir Cormac McTeige MacCarthy, fourteenth Lord of Muskerry. The next brother, a Owen, had been slain in a fight at Dromanea in Carbery, and so the tanist was his next brother Donal, called "na-Countea," or, "of the county," whom we shall see to have been an active man, and styled in a *fiant* the lord's "attorney in Muskrye;" and there is conclusive proof from another *fiant*, to be presently quoted, that he held post at Carrignamuck. Though tanist then, he did not live to succeed his elder brother, as he died of wounds received in a fight near Carrigadrohid, which caused the lordship to pass in 1583 to the next and youngest brother Callaghan, afterwards known as the ancestor of the

(1) *Fiant*s are so called from the first word of the form "*Fiant litære patentes*"—let letters-patent be made. They are warrants to the Chancery authorizing the issue of letters-patent under the Great Seal, and are preserved in the Public Record Office, Dublin. They have been carefully abstracted and indexed up to the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the abstracts and indexes being published as appendixes to Annual Reports of the Deputy Keeper. On careful study, they disclose a vast amount of historical and family particulars.

MacCarthys of Carrignamuck. The fiant, just referred to, being No. 2264, and dated 6 May, 1573, authorizes a pardon to "Sir Cormac McTeig MacCarthy of Blarney, *Sheriff of Co. Cork*" (this fourteenth lord of Muskerry); and to his brother "Donald McTeig MacCarthy of Carrignamuck" (the lord's tanist and lieutenant there); and to the other brother Callaghan, stated as of Greatcastell (*i.e.* Castlemore), and seven other gentlemen, twenty-five yeomen and thirteen husbandmen, in all forty-eight persons. Though the offence requiring the pardon is not stated, a reason for the grant is assigned here, being "in consideration of their having given "131 cows for the army in Munster, and having "released all debts due them by the Crown, "and all exactions and cesses for the Queen's "service in Munster which had been taken "from them"—a picture of the times. There are nineteen other fiant of about the same date issued for similar reasons. This fiant, besides confirming the family custom so often mentioned, shows that Sir Cormac must have then stood well with the English Government, being named as sheriff of the county. And, that he held this office again appears from another fiant,⁽²⁾ three years later, commissioning him, there styled Sheriff of Co. Cork, to "execute "martial law in that county," with power "to "search out, after the order of martial law, all "disorders committed in the county, and, on "finding any persons to be felons, rebels, "enemies, or notorious evil-doers, to punish "them by death, or otherwise"—a net close enough to catch every fish—but the fiant goes on: "this power not to extend against any having 40/- a year freehold, or £10 in chattels, "or any of honest-name, unless taken in the "act or duly convicted; with power also to treat "with rebels and enemies, &c."—a vast power to be entrusted to one man; but Sir Cormac was a man of ability, and the period was one of savage struggles in the country, and the great Desmond rebellion was at hand. History confirms the information deducible from this document, for Sir Henry Sydney, Lord Deputy of Ireland, writing in 1575 to the Privy Council, calls "Sir Cormac McTeig "Carthy of Muskerry, for obedience to Her "Majesty and her laws, and disposition to "civility, *the rarest man ever born of the Irish*;" and he wished him to be made a viscount.

Sir Cormac was duly rewarded for his services: he not only governed his country with

(2) No. 2772, of 24th April, 1576.

great prudence, and kept it, with his brave tanist at Carrignamuck, unscathed when forfeitures were falling on all sides around him, but added largely to his immense chiefries and other possessions by royal grants of confiscated property. This is shown by fiant 3121, 6th October, 1577, authorizing the grant to him of the whole preceptory of Mourne, and its lands, and several rectories in county Cork, being the "possessions of the said preceptory, "and of the possessions of the late Hospital of "St. John of Jerusalem in Ireland;" as also the manor and demesne lands of Clowghan, in Carbery, confiscated from a MacCarthy there, with many other lands, towns, manors, tithes, weirs, and the like. It is noteworthy to find side by side with this a pardon⁽³⁾ to his brother Callaghan of Castlemore and followers, including a contingent of six kerns from Carrignamuck (perhaps enticed thence to the popular side). This "pardon" is stated to be issued "at the earnest suit of Donell ny "Countey, *alias* Donell McTeige McCormuck, "Sir Cormuck's brother and his attorney in "Muskrye"—the lieutenant at Carrignamuck—the words used proving him to be the lord's right-hand man in Muskerry. It is probably due to this close connection between Blarney and Carrignamuck that the latter scarcely appears in our local histories. It followed, as a matter of course, the fortunes of its great neighbour, but nevertheless was important as the residence of the tanist, who was also the official commander of the "rising out."

The power of the family was very considerable at this period, the lord being able to call out a rising of 3,000 men. Sir Cormac now put the finishing touch to his astute policy by consenting to adopt the royal device for putting an end to sept property—namely, a surrender of his country, including Carrignamuck, into the hands of the Sovereign, and to receive the same back by a re-grant; but the tenure for the future to be not by the custom of tanistry, but by English law, the country being either entailed from father to son, or left to be disposed of by the testament of the grantee. This device, though certainly tending to one advantage—*viz.*, the bringing property into private hands, and so leading to its improvement—was undoubtedly at first a direct fraud on the whole body of the clan. The lands of the country did not belong to the chief, and were not his to surrender. They

(3) No. 3031, 20th May, 1577.

belonged to the sept, each member being entitled to the occupancy, during life, of part, subject to some feudal duties to the chief; each member's part, however, falling back at his death into the general possession of the sept. The chief had for himself only his demesne lands and his chiefries and other rights, while he continued chief; and these passed to his tanist at his death, though with power in the clan to set aside the regular tanist. But the temptation to adopt the royal policy was often too much for dishonest chieftains, and Sir Cormac gave way to it. He surrendered the lands to the Queen, and immediately a *fiant*⁽⁴⁾ issued (year 1578) re-granting to himself all the lands, specially named, and forming a very long list, the first item being "The whole country of Muskrie," (surely most of it being the common possession of the clan,) then six "territories," such as Iveleary, etc.; then the manors of Blarney, Carrignamuck, Castlemore, Carrigadrohid, etc., etc., and their lands, with many others, some of them whole parishes, besides the patronage of eight churches. The sting of the re-grant is in its tail, for at the end it gives all the above to the chief "to hold for life, remainder to four gentlemen, who are named, "their heirs and assigns for ever to the use of *the will of Cormuck*" the chief, thus enabling him to dispose by will of all *as his own property*. The Crown rent was "two hawks, or £6 13s. 4d."—a curious alternative; and the re-grant closed by "saving to all subjects of *the English nation* their rights by English law, "and not by Irish tenure"—a provision fixing at least the English tenants on their holdings. It is very remarkable that there appears no protest on the part of the clan against this policy; perhaps each member then in occupancy of a part of the sept lands, thought he saw his way to holding his portion as in fee-farm, and disposing of it to his own sons by will. Fixity of tenure must have been a land question then, as later.

It is true that, as will be presently seen, the country lapsed back for a time to tanist succession; but the policy triumphed in the end; and, at the close of the next century, when all the possessions of the then lord of Muskerry, Earl of Clancarty, were confiscated, they were taken as his absolute property, all trace of community of sept possession having disappeared, though the rights

(4) No. 3373 of 20th July, 1578.

of each occupying tenant, when not himself attainted, were saved harmless.

The clan, however, still followed their chief. Shortly after this re-granting, on 4th August, 1580, Sir James Sussex Fitzgerald, youngest brother of the Earl of Desmond (then in rebellion, having been proclaimed a traitor on 2nd November, 1579,) made one of the usual predatory forays—too common in all previous periods—hoping to carry off cattle from Muskerry. But Donal, of Carrignamuck, the lord's "attorney," assembled the "rising out" and attacked and completely defeated Sir James, with the loss of 150 of his men. Sir James was mortally wounded in the fight, and was captured (Smith says,) by a blacksmith, who hid him in a bush till the fight was ended, and then delivered him to Sir Cormac, who ordered his confinement in Carrigadrohid castle, three miles distant from Carrignamuck. Soon after, the captive was surrendered to Sir Warham St. Leger, Commissioner for Munster, who had him tried for treason, and Sir James, mortally wounded as he lay, was, on his conviction, executed, and his head and limbs were affixed on the gates of Cork. Donal, the brave lieutenant of Carrignamuck, was also mortally wounded in this action, by a dart which struck him under the right ear, and penetrated six inches into his neck, and he died some time after. There is good reason to believe he was regretted by his clansmen. His death raised the next brother, Callaghan, then of Castlemore, to be tanist of the ruling lord, and accordingly we next hear of him as at Carrignamuck.

Sir Cormac, through the devastating course of Desmond's rebellion, supported the royal forces. But his end was approaching. In 1583, he lay on his death-bed, and the time arrived for his making that will indicated in the Queen's re-grant, and disposing, not only of the lands gifted to himself personally, but of all Muskerry, including Carrignamuck, all which by the surrender and re-grant were intended to be freed of tanist entail. How did he dispose of them? Conscience proved too strong. He reverted point-blank to tanistry, thus tearing up, as it were, the surrender and re-grant. His testament⁽⁵⁾ runs thus:—

"My will is, *for conscience sake*, that "Callaghan McTeig, my brother, shall have "and enjoy *the whole lordship of Muskerry*, "together with a'l the manors, towns, and

(5) MacCarthy (Glas.) appendix p. 145.

"hamlets thereof . . . to have and hold the said lordship unto the said Callaghan during his natural life, remainder after his decease to mynephew, Cormac McDermod" (son of the testator's late elder brother, the thirteenth lord), and so on in *regular tanist descent*. There are other instances in Irish history of the re-grant policy proving unsuccessful at first.

Sir Cormac's period of rule is of much interest, and this must excuse the space given to its description. The fiants illustrate, and add to the history of the contending parties in his time; a careful study of them discloses many historical facts. As an example, it may be stated that, were other materials for history wholly silent, it is deducible from them that the re-grant policy failed; and again, if we did not know the pedigree of the Muskerry family at that time, they would largely supply it.

Callaghan McTeig MacCarthy succeeded as fifteenth lord according to tanistry, and also his brother's will. It may be inferred he felt himself unfitted for the office; for, by arrangement with his nephew, the next in succession by tanistry, and also Sir Cormac's will, he made over the lordship on him, after holding it for one year only; and the nephew then succeeded as—

Cormac Mor McDermod MacCarthy, sixteenth Lord of Muskerry, in 1585. He had been born in 1552. The lieutenant at Carrignamuck was his uncle Callaghan, who remained there, and is stated by O'Hart to be the "ancestor of the Carthys of Carrignamuck"—doubtless, because fixity of tenure finally came to pass in his time—an inference confirmed by a patent of James I. mentioned below. This enables us to understand one mode in which particular branches of native noble families came to be permanently associated henceforward with certain localities.

The fierce struggle of the Earl of Desmond's rebellion was now over, but the country was still very unsettled, and the lieutenant (or "attorney") at Carrignamuck was not backward in foray, or in what passed then for treason or felony. Under date 1584, (6) December 31st—the date showing that he probably remained at Carrignamuck even during his year of lordship—there appears a pardon to him, and nine kerns, two horsemen, one gallowglass, and eight husbandmen, all of that place, together with a surgeon named Donal

(6) Fiant No. 4564.

O'Leyne, on the following conditions, besides the usual surety, viz.—1st, "The Pardon not to extend to any in prison or under bail to appear at sessions; nor to *include intrusion into Crown lands*, or debts due to the Crown; and (2nd) Provided that the pardon shall be effective only to those who are willing to submit and fulfil 'any articles prescribed by the Lord Deputy as to lands then in their possession at the *time of the treasons or felonies committed*.'"—showing the nature of the crime imputed to them. Again, a few months afterwards, a pardon (7) issued to some 84 persons, including an Yrierdan (O'Reardon) of Carrignamuck, on similar conditions, with the additional one "excluding pardon for any *capital offence* since the preceding 1st March" (when the order for pardon had been authorized), as if some such crime had been expected as a matter of course; and one more instance may be quoted as illustrating the times—seventeen months after the preceding—a pardon (8) to an O'Moroghwe (Murphy), of Carrignamuck, and twenty-four others, apparently referring to stolen property—cattle probably; but *excluding* from pardon any "of the parties present at the slaying of Jasper Wager, lately slain." Some unfortunate English settler, whose intrusion the fighting Reardons, and Murphys, and Swynys did not approve of. It would appear as if, at this time, men's hands in Muskerry were almost ever on their swords, though the country was free from the devastation and famine and misery of Desmond after the rebellion there was crushed.

In 1588, Cormac Mor, the sixteenth Lord, attended parliament as Baron of Blarney, and in the following year he surrendered (9) his country and lands to the Crown and obtained a re-grant, going through the same procedure as his uncle, Sir Cormac, eleven years previously—a conclusive proof, even if it stood alone, that the former acts had proved ineffectual. The list of lands and manors, including Carrignamuck, Castlemore, and other property specified in the new re-grant, differs only slightly from the similar list in that to Sir Cormac; but where the latter uses the words "the lands of Blarney, Carrignamuck," etc., the new re-grant particularizes "all lands, *rents and services*, in Blarney," etc.,

(7) Fiant 4752, of 16th July, 1585.

(8) Fiant 4946, of 8th December, 1586.

(9) Fiants 5330, of 2nd May, 1589; and No. 5333, of 9th May, 1589.

a change of phraseology suggestive of some fixity of tenure in the occupying clansmen subjecting to rent and the lingering feudal services. Nor is there now any mention of the re-grant being for life only, with remainder to trustees for uses, and the like; on the contrary, the grant purports to be an absolute one, "*to hold for ever*, by service of a twentieth part of a knight's fee, rent £5 13s. 4d." Another change consists in its "saving the possessions of religious houses, and the rights of *all* the Queen's subjects." In 1577 it was only "subjects of the English Nation" whose rights were saved—another indication that native as well as English occupiers were acquiring rights as tenants.⁽¹⁰⁾

For some years afterwards Muskerry seems to have grown quieter. Carrignamuck no longer appears as the residence of some pardoned man. ⁽¹¹⁾The *Pacata Hibernia* (p. 171) mentions a slight difference in the year 1600 between the MacCarthys of Carbery and the O'Learys of Muskerry, about some stolen cattle, where O'Leary and ten of his men were slain; and that thereupon the Lord of Muskerry petitioned to be permitted to revenge this loss on the Carbery men, but was prevented by the Lord President—a sign that there was being felt some power able to check these fratricidal fightings.

But O'Neill, the Red-hand of Ulster, was soon in rebellion, and his forces were, in Munster, joined by some under James the fifteenth Earl of Desmond, called "the Sugan Earl," who disliked to see the lands of his ancestors parcelled out to strangers like the new planters. Presently, too, the Spaniards appear as their auxiliaries, and landed at Kinsale on 23rd September, 1601, where they were soon after besieged by the Queen's forces under Lord Deputy Mountjoy. The Lord of Muskerry assisted these latter with his following, Callaghan leading his contingent from Carrignamuck. The *Pacata Hibernia* records his arrival thus:—"Cormac Mac-

(10) It is of interest to note here that the grant gives also "the lands of Carrignavar, Co. Cork, to hold for ever in common socage, rent 10s." The lord's third son, Donal, in the next generation, built there the castle of that name, as stated by Sir William Betham in a MS. in the British Museum—another proof of rights of property becoming settled. O'Hart mentions this Donal as ancestor of the well-known MacCarthys of that place.

(11) Smith, ii. 73, quoting Cox, tells this story as if the Lord of Muskerry wished to attack the O'Learys!

"Dermod, chief lord of Muskerry, coming, with his country's 'rising out' to show them to the Lord Deputie, was on his return directed to march hard by the Spaniards' trenches, which they had made on the hill without the towne for their guards (which he was willed to doe), the rather that the Spaniards might see the Irish serve on our sides." And Smith gives particulars of an attack made on the Spanish trenches by these Irish allies on 21st October. In thus prominently assisting the forces of the Crown, the Lord of Muskerry stood alone among other chiefs of his name. He and his "rising out" accompanied the Lord President in his march to Tipperary to find his nimble foe, O'Donnell, but returned to Kinsale before the battle outside the town, where the relieving army of O'Neill was defeated.

Before these events, "pardons," so called, had been showered on Muskerry and the other districts in Munster, to "divide the rebels," as Lord President Sir George Carewe hoped. Smith states the number of persons pardoned in Muskerry as 542, but there are no less than 582 names in the *fiant*.⁽¹²⁾ After the above events the country was again for a time unsettled, and it appears that the Carrignamuck residents engaged in some of the disturbances; but they secured the usual pardon; one issued in March, 1603, in favour of 389 Muskerry persons, including "Callaghan McTeige McCormuck MacCarthy, of Carrignamuck, and Shilie McTeige McOwen, his wife," (giving here a bit of pedigree), with the condition, among others, that the pardon was not to extend "to any murder committed by any of the parties *since they entered into rebellion*." The Lord of Muskerry, though apparently then a suspected man, is not mentioned in this pardon. He had changed his religion, and perhaps his uncle at Carrignamuck did not approve of this, and presumably was growing less dependent on the lord. Anyhow, Callaghan by this pardon kept his lands and manor, and thus founded, as O'Hart tells, the permanent line of the MacCarthys of Carrignamuck.

The abstracts and index of the *fiant*s, as yet printed by the Deputy Keeper of the Irish Records, end with Queen Elizabeth's reign. Possibly when the compiler of such a history as this has the advantage of similar documents in print for later reigns, many interesting

(12) 6539 of 29th May, 1601; 6764 of 8th March, 1602-3.—Smith i. 210.

particulars can be extracted from them for the present and similar subjects. Searching through the original records themselves for the purpose is very laborious. However, a few of these have been found; and there are other records also which have been abstracted and printed belonging to the seventeenth century, and from these it is clear that the residents at Carrignamuck took part in the great wars of that century, and felt, we may be sure, the throes of the long struggle for toleration.

In 1616, Cormac, the sixteenth lord, died, and was buried at Kilcrea, the last lord of his family there buried. If his younger brother Teig⁽¹³⁾ were then alive, the fact would show that the policy of surrender and re-grant had defeated tanistry, for the deceased lord was succeeded by his eldest son, Cormac Oge McCormac MacCarthy, seventeenth lord of Muskerry, who was born in 1564, and was then fifty-two years of age at his accession. He had been educated at Oxford; and probably his English training secured him interest sufficient to lighten the burden of intolerance on his people. He also conformed to the policy of surrender—perhaps as an extra precaution against a revival of tanist succession. In the Public Record Office is the Patent Roll of the eighteenth year of James II. (1620) containing the surrender and re-grant to him, therein styled “Charles, otherwise Cormac MacCarthy, of Muckrumphe (Macroom), Knt.,” of very “many lands, manors, &c., and chiefries.” The surrender mentions “the castle, town, and lands of Carrignamuck,” with ten carucates of land, showing that the fee and overlordship were still claimed by the Lord of Muskerry. The re-grant, however, omits this item—an omission scarcely accidental, and therefore showing that the lieutenant there, a son or grandson of Callaghan, “held a grip” of the place, and managed to get his grip recognized. However this may be, the place must have reverted afterwards to partial subjection to the chief, for it followed his fortunes in the troubles of the Cromwellian period, and also in the final confiscation after the defeat of James II.

It is worth noting here, in illustration of the times, how the lord, in his surrender, specifies, and seeks thus to perpetuate, his claims as a feudal lord—a new feature in such

(13) Ancestor of the MacCarthys of Inshirahell, afterwards obtained by the Crookes, and called Crookes-town.

documents, indicative of a tendency of tenants to resist him in this respect. The surrender claims, *inter alia*, “the following rents, *services*, “or *hereditary profits*,” out of certain named lands, viz.—“16 cows on the marriage of any daughter or sister of MacCarthy, *his heirs* or “assigns”—these last words being directly opposed to tanist law; and it claims also “a complete number of labourers and garrons from the tenants, who are also to answer and attend risings out and musters in the company of MacCarthy whenever he shall be called out by the Crown, or on any other legal course”—the legality apparently being at the discretion of the lord. There is a special clause, too, directed towards the warrior MacSwineys, claim being made for “a service custom or rent out of Mashanaglas of like attendance on risings out and musters, with the half of an ayrie of great hawks, and free ingress and egress for himself and his wife into the castle of Mashanaglas, with continuance of residence there during pleasure”—a remnant of the “coigny and livery”⁽¹⁴⁾ of former days. There is also a curious claim for entertainment of the lord and his attendants for twenty-four hours at the “late house of lepers” in Cork city “whenever the said MacCarthy or his assigns, being lords or proprietors of Blarney castle, rode into Cork,” in return for which the said hospital “had the right of house-bote and fire-bote for the fuel, maintenance and repairs of the place.” It will be seen also from this document that the Lord of Muskerry had now changed his residence to Macroom castle.

After this, in 1628, Cormac Oge was created Viscount Muskerry and Baron of Blarney. No record has yet been traced by the writer thence of this lord and his relative at Carrignamuck, till his death, which took place in London, on 20th February, 1640. He was thus spared the anxieties of the following painful years. His lordship and property (as it may now be regarded) descended to his eldest son, though he had two younger brothers—Teige of Aglish, and Donal of Carrignavar, who should have succeeded, one after the other, under the old, but then clearly obsolete, law of tanistry.

(14) Explained by Spenser (“View”) to mean mans-food and horse-food. Morley, editing, suggests “coigny” derived from Irish *coic*, a cook (*coquus*), or *cucenn*, a kitchen. “Livery” is same as *livrée* a delivery.

This eldest son was Donogh MacCarthy, eighteenth Lord of Muskerry, a title, however, then merged in his English one of Viscount Muskerry. He was born in 1594, being, therefore, 46 years old at his accession. He and his "rising out" were destined to play an important part in what is called the rebellion of 1641, but which ended in the so-called rebels fighting for the king against his rebellious subjects. And the public records of the attainder that followed, and of the subsequent restoration, afford mention of Carrigamuck. This civil war broke out on 23rd October, 1641, and Viscount Muskerry was one of the first to take up arms, and we read of his "rising out" mustering several thousand Irish. The whole war was mixed up with the distractions between Charles I. and the Parliamentary party in England, and ran its weary course, till at last Lord Inchiquin, who had been the Parliamentary general in Munster, changed sides, and in 1648, declared for the king; and in January, 1649, peace was signed at Kilkenny between the Irish belligerents, and Charles II. was even proclaimed at Youghal then, just eleven years before he was restored. However, Oliver Cromwell now appeared in Ireland, and after many sanguinary scenes, his troops took most places in the South of Ireland—many, indeed, revolting to the Parliamentary party.

In 1650, 10th May, Lord Broghill, commanding 2,000 foot, and 1,600 horse of the Cromwellian troops, defeated the Irish at Macroom, and took the castle of Carrigadrohid, within three miles of Carrigamuck, all being castles of the Lord of Muskerry. It must have been at this time⁽¹⁵⁾ that the siege and capture of Carrigamuck (as preserved by tradition) took place. The besiegers planted their cannon on a low hill—there still remain traces of the shelter trench there—at the opposite side of the Dripsey, and made a breach in the east face of the castle in the outer of the double walls on that side, still noticeable, though afterwards built up. They evidently knew where the walls were weakest. After the capture Cromwell's soldiers occupied the castle for some time, as tradition tells; doubtless there was a chain of such garrisons then posted in the country. The last effort of Lord Muskerry and his Irish following was near the Blackwater, in the same year, when he was totally defeated by

⁽¹⁵⁾ Comp. Archall's Lodge. Ed. 1789. Vol. i. 182.

Broghill with great slaughter. He retired then in exile to the Continent. What became of the Carrigamuck family between this and the Restoration in 1660, is still untraced, but the family of Lord Muskerry did not lose immediately all the property. By the Act passed in 1652 "for the settling of Ireland," it was provided that, "those who had borne command in Ireland against the English Parliament should be banished during the pleasure of Parliament, and forfeit two-thirds of their estates, and that lands to the value of the other third should be assigned to their wives and issue where Parliament should appoint." Smith (ii. 171) asserts that the Parliamentary Commissioners respected an agreement made by Ludlow with Lord Muskerry, and conferred his estate on his wife;⁽¹⁶⁾ which must be incorrect, though it is probable that Lady Muskerry was allowed to remain on some of the lands in Muskerry, and was not one of those transplanted into Connaught; and, if so, Carrigamuck was probably among the lands retained by the family.

But things changed again. Lord Broghill in 1657 began to treat for the restoration of King Charles II., and before long all Ireland was secured for the king. Lord Muskerry returned with him in 1660, having in 1658 received the further title of Earl of Clancarty. Presently, an Act of Parliament, embodied in the famous Act of Settlement of 1661, was passed for "restoring Donagh E. of Clancarty, and Charles Viscount Muskerry (his son), to their blood and honours, and for investing and settling them in their several estates." In pursuance of this a patent⁽¹⁷⁾ passed granting him very many lands, specifically named, and among them "the castle, town and lands of Carrigamuck," with many neighbouring lands such as Derreen, Peake, Clonteadmore, Kilgobinet, etc., and more distant lands like Mashanaglas, the home of the Swyneys; in all, 80,895 acres in Muskerry, at a total rent of £758, "to hold to him and the heirs male of his body, remainder to the heirs male of Donagh, late E. of Clancarty," (for the grant was dated after the eighteenth lord's death,) "remainder in fee to the right heirs of the said late earl, and to the uses mentioned in his last will dated 29th July, 1665, at Moor-

⁽¹⁶⁾ Really his second wife, Ellen, a sister of the first Duke of Ormond.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Abstracted in the fifteenth report (dated 1825) of the Record Commissioners, p. 240.

"parke" (near London, where he died in that year). It is noticeable how completely all trace of tanistry has at this point disappeared from the property. The resident at Carrignamuck must have been a descendant of Callaghan, and held subject to some head rent to the earl.

The *pax Britannica* was now restored, and comparative material prosperity followed for a time. The late earl was succeeded by his second son, who was third earl, the first son, Cormac or Charles, having been killed in a sea fight with the Dutch off Harwich. The third earl was succeeded by Donogh fourth earl, his eldest son, born in 1669, in whose time the vast property, including Carrignamuck, was destined to pass away finally from the MacCarthy name. He was educated at Oxford and was a Protestant, but became a Catholic on King James II. coming to the throne. The quiet that had prevailed in Munster was now again disturbed. Robberies and burnings were frequent, and many English settlers had to flee into towns for safety. Finally, when King James landed at Cork on 12th May, 1688, he was received by the Earl of Clancarty and other local lords; and the war began which ended practically at the Boyne. The Earl of Clancarty and his regiment (not now called a "a rising out") were taken prisoners in September, 1690, when Cork city was captured by the army under the Earl of Marlborough. He was confined in the Tower of London, but escaped to France in 1694. His "estates," valued then at £200,000 a year, were among those confiscated, and all, including Carrignamuck, were sold by public auction in Dublin in 1702-3. The "Book of Postings and Sales" is still extant. In it occurs the following entry, the last record to be quoted on the subject of this paper, viz.—"The forfeited estate of Donagh Earl of Clancarthy in the Barony of Muskerry, and County of Cork, being a *fee-simple* estate, "consisting of the farms and lands following," (several were sold that day,) "exposed for sale at Chichester House, Dublin, 6th Nov., 1702. By cant to the highest bidder." In this list appears—"Folio 57, No 5. Carrignamuck, 223a. or 6p., Irish acres (whereof 5 make about 8 English); Real value per annum, £22 7s. 8d.; Yearly rent in 1702, £20; Present tenant's name, Henry Bennett; Quality of the land, etc., very good arable and pasture, fit for stock and tillage,

"with 6 cabbins, a castle, and a corn mill, worth £8 per an.; Purchaser's name and abode, George Rogers, of Corke, Esq.;⁽¹³⁾ Sold for £300; Tyme of sale, Nov. 13, 1702; Paid for, one-fifth in money, rest in debentures."

From this it appears that Callaghan's descendants had disappeared from their ancestral home, exiled with others of the name. It was a case of *via victis*. They had been once too often on the losing side. The castle and lands passed after some years into the possession of the Colthurst family, in which they have continued; and came, a few years ago, to a lady, whose husband took that name with his own. The elder branch of this family reside at Blarney, curiously enough, thus following the MacCarthy custom. Smith (i., 180.) says that, at date of his writing, 1750, the castle was inhabited by a Mr. Beer, and, perhaps, some of the small alterations in the structure were made about that time.

It is hoped that this history has conveyed some idea of the mode of life, and the struggles of the dwellers in Carrignamuck, closely bound up as they were with the lords of their clan. It is impossible not to regret the disappearance, from their lordship, of the princely house of MacCarthy with its unrivalled length of ancestry. But did the people under the lords suffer by the change? On this point there is the unimpeachable evidence of Mr. Daniel MacCarthy (Glas), the historian of one branch of the family—the MacCarthys of Gleannacroim. He says: (p. 126) "It is probable that, with the exception of the chieftains, whom in the nature of things it was impossible to conciliate, the great body of the dispossessed sept were in no worse condition—nay, probably in some respects they were better off under the new owner than the old; they certainly might deal with him as they would not have dared to deal with their own chieftain. Hence we find their descendants to this day in the occupation of the old homes and lands; and life proceeding as to its ordinary course with them much as in other days"—saving, however, the present writer ventures to add, the cattle forays and the ceaseless strife.

(13) The name in the Abstract to the 15th Report before mentioned. That in the copy, partly printed, partly written, of the Book of Postings and Sales preserved in the British Museum MS. room—the copy consulted by the present writer—is Thomas Brocklesby of Cork, probably an agent of Rogers.

THE END.