



**TIPPERARY HISTORICAL
JOURNAL 1993**

© County Tipperary Historical Society

www.tippstudiesdigital.ie

society@tipperarycoco.ie

ISSN 0791-0655

William Phelps's Census of Eliogarty, 1821¹

By John Logan

During the latter part of the eighteenth century growing interest in political economy and demography was reflected in a number of attempts to compile a national census. All were individual initiatives, and the necessarily limited results which they achieved indicated that the successful completion of a comprehensive nation-wide census would require the administrative and financial resources of central and local government.² Thus the process of national enumeration was revolutionised when parliament assumed responsibility for the conduct of a census of Britain in 1801, and the belief that periodic enumeration was desirable led to its repeat in 1811.³

The following year a bill for the taking of an Irish census proposed that it should follow in "all the practical details" those adopted by the British census.⁴ This, the first statutory census of Ireland, was taken between 1813 and 1815, but its incomplete coverage of the country and the variable quality of the data collected were as disappointing to contemporary administrators as they have been to subsequent historians. Its organiser William Shaw Mason hoped to profit from that experience when he undertook the organisation of the next national enumeration which was planned for the summer of 1821.⁵

Shaw Mason removed the supervision of the census from the grand juries and entrusted it to the local magistrates aided by a special advisor or "coadjutor". Their most important task was the appointment of field enumerators and Shaw Mason suggested that in so doing they were to give preference to those usually employed as local tax collectors "from a conviction that their habits of life give them superior advantages in consequence of their acquaintance with the people and the minute subdivisions of the country."⁶

William Shaw Mason assessed the suitability of those selected by observing how they conducted an enumeration of teachers and clergymen in their districts. The results of this preliminary enumeration were scrutinised and if any was found deficient its organiser was not retained. Those deemed satisfactory were furnished with special notebooks and lists of directions and asked to commence on 28 May, proceeding "from house to house, and from day to day" until the task was complete.⁷

Enumerators were asked to record the name, age, household status and occupation of each person in their district. They were also asked to record the number of houses being built, and the number occupied or unoccupied, and to indicate the number of stories in each. More ambitiously — given the absence of the maps which would only become available with the completion of the Ordnance Survey — they were asked to record the acreage of each land holding and the name and acreage of each townland. For each urban area they were asked to record the names of streets with the number of houses in each and also the location of all public buildings and details of notable ruins.

Contemporary interest in education was reflected in a direction to note the location and enrolment of each school along with the names of their teachers and patrons.⁸ The data thus collected was sent to Shaw Mason at Dublin Castle where it was summarised in townland and street tables. From these a preliminary tabulation of houses, individuals and population density



for the counties and principal towns was drawn and published in a parliamentary paper in 1822.⁹ Shaw Mason had hoped to follow this with a full tabulation of all the data collected, but that would have been too costly and he had to be content with a less detailed abstract which was published as a parliamentary paper in 1824.¹⁰

This abstract used the civil parish as the primary reporting unit, identifying towns and villages separately, or as part of the parish or parishes in which they were located. Data was presented for fourteen variables grouped under four headings. The first, houses and families, gave the number of houses being built, the number inhabited or uninhabited and the number of families. Under the heading of persons, the abstract tabulated the total of males, the total of females and the combined total, while a third section, occupations, tabulated the total employed in agriculture, the total in manufacturing and the total not included in either of those categories.

Under the heading of schools the abstract gave the number of male pupils, the number of female pupils and the total number of pupils. The parochial data thus presented was aggregated upward to barony and county level, and the county summary was completed by tables of the population under twenty divided into five-year cohorts, and of that above twenty divided into ten-year cohorts. An observations column was also printed which gave details, somewhat idiosyncratically, of a variety of topics. In Eliogarty, for example, it gave variations in the spelling of place-names; "... Moyne, called also Mayne and Mathen...", details of exceptionally old people; "...one male upwards of 100 years of age in the manor of Templemore...", and details of school patronage.¹¹

The enumerator selected to conduct the census of Eliogarty barony was William Phelps, and a manuscript "recapitulation" of census data and other information collected by him survives in the archives of the Kildare Place Society held at the Church of Ireland College of Education in Dublin.¹² The recapitulation contains data on nine variables for each parish in the barony and for the towns of Thurles and Templemore. Data on three of the variables — inhabitants, inhabited houses and townlands — were printed in the published abstract of the census. Data on three other variables — the number of townlands, the total acreage and the number of schools — had been collected at Shaw Mason's request, but were not included by him in the published abstract. Data on a further three variables — the number of persons able to read, the number of flax wheels, the amount of flaxseed sown — were collected on Phelps's own initiative, and while he may have forwarded this to Shaw Mason along with what had been requested, there is no reference to it in the published abstract.

A further difference between the manuscript and the published abstract exists in the reporting of the two urban parishes, Templemore and Thurles. In the case of Templemore the manuscript presented the data under two sub-headings, "Templemore Town" and "Templemore Parish". The abstract also used "Templemore Town" as a sub-heading, but introduced a further sub-division by dividing the remainder of the parish between "Templemore Parish" and "Templemore Manor". In tabulating the Thurles data the manuscript used the sub-division "Thurles Town" and two sub-divisions of the rural part of the parish, "Thurles Inn warrant" and "Thurles Out warrant", while the published abstract used "Thurles Town", and sub-divided the rural part of the parish between, "Thurles Parish" and "Thurles Commons". The Phelps manuscript thus adds a considerable amount to the data published in the abstract in 1824, meriting its publication here in full in Appendix I.

A comparison of the three variables tabulated in both the manuscript and the published abstract reveals some discrepancies. The manuscript gives a baronial population of 36,107, which is 665 (1.8%) more than the total published in the abstract. The greater part of that discrepancy occurs in the returns for the rural part of Templemore parish: the total published in the abstract is 1,586, but the manuscript total is 555 (34.9%) more than that.



In the case of the enumeration of houses, the manuscript gives a total of 5,615, or 112 (2.0%) more than the total in the published abstract. Here again the bulk of the discrepancy occurs in the case of the rural part of Templemore parish, for which the published population is 243, and the manuscript total is 77 (32%) more.

In the case of the uninhabited houses, the manuscript gives 268, 49 (22.4%) more than that given in the census abstract. In this instance the bulk of the discrepancy occurs in the case of the urban part of the parish of Thurles; the published total is 68, while that in the manuscript is 34 (50%) more. There is no indication in the manuscript, or in any of its associated documents, of why these differences occur. For ease of comparison, the totals of the three variables common to both the manuscript and the published abstract, population, inhabited houses and uninhabited houses, and any discrepancies between them are tabulated below in Appendix II.

Shaw Mason admitted being dispirited by the returns of land measurement. Many enumerators had submitted implausibly low totals derived from fraudulent tax assessments, and in some areas, particularly of mountainous or poor quality, where land had been measured traditionally by its grazing capacity, enumerators were forced to accept local estimates and guesses. Even when measurement was accurate, the use of three different forms of acre, the Cunningham, the English and the Irish compounded the problem.¹³ Without a countrywide standard measure, accurately obtained, returns of variable quality were inevitable and may have influenced Shaw Mason in his decision not to include parochial acreages in the published abstract.

In the manuscript recapitulation Phelps tabulated the acreage of every parish in Eliogarty and, though he did not indicate the form used, in all likelihood he followed the custom prevailing in Tipperary and made his assessment in Irish acres, a unit equivalent to 1.62 English acres.¹⁴ The Ordnance Survey of the 1830s set the acreage at 90,681 English or statute acres, or more than double the 44,247 returned by Phelps, suggesting that his data represented a substantial under-assessment. A direct comparison of the barony total tabulated by Phelps's with that of the Ordnance Survey is inappropriate, however, for in a process of "fixing the landscape", the Survey, unlike Phelps, divided some parishes between adjacent baronies.

Consequently, Eliogarty, as tabulated in the 1821 census report, lost portions of three parishes (Ballycahill, Holycross, Templemore) and received portions of three others (Kilclonagh, Kilcooly, and Templetohy). If these "split" parishes are set aside, a comparison of complete parishes yields an Irish acre to English acre ratio of 1.95, thereby indicating a slightly lower degree of under-assessment. The second territorial assessment requested by Shaw Mason was a tabulation of townlands. Phelps recorded a total of 171 in his manuscript while the Ordnance Survey would tabulate a total of 267, or 56% more.

Here again the Ordnance Survey's distribution of portions of some parishes between adjacent baronies exaggerated the extent of Phelps's under-enumeration: he tabulated a total of 147 townlands in the twelve complete parishes, while the Survey tabulated 195, or 33% more. Without a listing of townlands by Phelps, it would be difficult to establish the dynamics of townland formation during this period and to show why he recorded a number lower than what the Ordnance Survey would record. One possible explanation is that he overlooked some small less well known townlands. This could easily have happened in the case of units such as Larha North, a townland of 8 acres in Drom parish, or Cottage, a townland of 9 acres in Inch. Such places, familiar and taken for granted by their occupiers and close neighbours, could easily be missed by any enumerator without an intimate knowledge of a place and forced to operate without the benefit of meticulous fieldwork or the support of surveyors and boundary officials.

Omission was even more likely in the case of unpopulated townlands, of which there were seven in 1841 and, in all likelihood, even more in the less crowded 1820s. It is also possible



that the government boundary department, "ruthlessly" pursuing a policy of establishing smaller, more easily valued units, created "new" townlands, as J.H. Andrews has pointed out, by adding suffixes such as "east" or "west", "more" or "beg" to an existing name.¹⁵ In Eliogarty there are twenty-nine townlands so designated. The acreage and the number of townland in each of the twelve complete parishes, as tabulated by Phelps and by the Ordnance Survey, are set out in Appendix III below.

Phelps tabulated the number of domestic spinning wheels and the amount of flax sown in each parish and those data — neither requested nor published by Shaw Mason — add to what is known of domestic linen production in Tipperary at this time. The enumeration shows that one house in five had a spinning wheel, though not surprisingly there were variations around that average. Spinning seems to have been concentrated around Loughmoe East where there was one wheel for every 3.5 houses, and to have been least concentrated in Ballycahill where there was one wheel for every 6.5 houses. Further information on linen production comes from Phelps's tabulation of the flax seed sown in both "foreign" and Irish pottles. Given the contemporary use of the pottle both as a measure of volume (equivalent to half a gallon), and as a measure of area (equivalent to twelve acres), and without any indication as to which sense Phelps intended, the term is potentially confusing.¹⁶

The application of pottle as a land measure would result in implausibly high totals however — in some cases the acreage sown would exceed the total acreage of the parish — and this suggests that it was used to indicate the amount of seed sown. Phelps gives the quantity in both Irish and "foreign" pottles, and the absence of a consistent arithmetical relationship between the two sets of data suggests that they refer not to different forms of the measure, but to the origin of the seed. Irish flax producers had long favoured the use of imported seed, both for its relative cheapness and its superior quality, and official attempts to encourage the use of home-produced seed had been largely unsuccessful.¹⁷ In the eighteenth century Russia and Holland, and towards its latter end, America, had been favoured as the principal sources of seed. The trade was sensitive to the changing currents of international politics and the disruption caused by the Napoleonic and the American wars lead to a greater reliance on Irish seed, which is perhaps evident in the data returned by Phelps.

The volume of seed sown, relative to the number of acres, is better as an indicator of production patterns than a tabulation of the number of spinning wheels. Over the whole barony the average ratio was one pottle to eight acres, and cultivation appeared to be concentrated in a belt stretching across the northern part of the barony, in Drom and in Loughmoe East and West, where the pottle acre ratio was one to five. Flax cultivation was at its lowest in the south-west of the barony where in the parishes of Holycross and Fertiana the pottle acre ratio was one to thirteen and in the parish of Ballycahill, a sharp deviation from the general pattern, the ratio was one to sixty-seven.

Except in the case of the urban part of Templemore parish, Phelps tabulated the number of persons able to read in each parish, and in so doing anticipated the decision to include an assessment of literacy in the national census from 1841 onwards. Apart from what is suggested by the heading "able to read", there is no indication of how he defined literacy, and of whether he conducted the assessment himself, whether he might have consulted individuals such as teachers or clergymen, or whether he depended for an assessment on the heads of individual households.

The data suggests that 28% of the barony's population could read, and not unexpectedly, readers were most numerous in the barony's main town, Thurles, where 38% of the population was reported as being able to read. Unfortunately Phelps did not "enquire" into literacy levels



in the other urban centre, Templemore, but the level recorded in its immediate rural hinterland, 31%, is the same as that recorded in the rural part of Thurles parish. Literacy was much lower in the south-west of the barony where a level of 18% was returned for Fertiana and Holycross and, lowest of all, Ballycahill which was returned at 13%.

Unfortunately, these levels cannot be directly compared with those derived from the 1841 census report which, in an attempt to minimise the degree of illiteracy, excluded children under five from the enumeration, while Phelps used the total population as a denominator. Phelps's tabulation of education levels is amplified with data on the number of schools in each parish, information which was requested of census enumerators though not subsequently published. He tabulated a total of 48 schools in the barony and three years later, responding to a government enquiry into education provision, the Catholic clergy submitted details of 68 schools and their Protestant counterparts submitted details of 66.¹⁸

This was a period of educational expansion, but a 40% increase in the number of schools within three years seems implausibly high¹⁹ and raises the possibility that Phelps in his enquiry may have overlooked some schools. Many were small, informal and conducted in private dwellings, often by individuals for whom teaching was not a principal occupation. Such schools could easily be overlooked, the teachers themselves unwittingly exacerbating the enumerator's difficulties by declaring only their principal occupation. The practical problems confronting enumerators, including the clerical respondents to the government inquiry in 1824, were compounded by the misrepresentation of educational levels precipitated by the political and the religious controversies of the era. The promoters of rival schools, competing for pupils with a ferocity impelled by a belief that much more than the acquisition of literacy was at stake, were as quick to inflate their numbers as they were prepared to belittle the achievements of their opponents.²⁰

The survival of William Phelps's manuscript is probably due to its inclusion in correspondence between his brother Thomas and the Kildare Place Society. Thomas farmed at Graiguenoe near Holycross and founded a school in 1815 for the children of his labourers, which he hoped would "combine economy of time and money with due attention to morals, cleanliness and discipline."²¹ In 1817 he applied to the Kildare Place Society, the country's largest educational organisation, for funding and from then until 1829 he was in regular contact with it, arguing vigorously for funds and quick to show irritation if it did not respond favourably to his requests.

The manuscript census was included with one such request on 17 November 1821. Thomas stated that the data in it had been collected by William while conducting the recent census; but apart from remarking that he hoped it "would be found satisfactory" there is no hint as to why it was being sent to Kildare Place. The likelihood is that Thomas was following common practice and furnishing a potential benefactor with information on prevailing educational levels and social conditions. It is possible that William, along with other members of the family, helped in the running of the school, for the Kildare Place Society ledgers lists a William Phelps and a J.L. Phelps Esq. as "correspondents" for the Holycross school.²²

Burke's Irish family records and *Burke's landed gentry of Ireland* contain but one record for a family named Phelps and in identical entries relate that its founder was Thomas Phelps, a Cromwellian who was granted "considerable estates" in Tipperary, Kerry and Down. He subsequently settled in Limerick, became a Quaker and had the title to most of his land confirmed at the Restoration. His grandson Thomas Phelps (1711-1787) moved from Limerick to Moyallen in County Down in the early part of the eighteenth century, and is recorded as having been an enthusiastic promoter there of the infant linen industry.²⁴

His son Joseph Phelps (1749-1790) married Mary Chrisy of Moyallen in 1771 and their first and fourth sons, Thomas and William, are the only pair of brothers recorded in Burke whose



names match those of the Phelps brothers who corresponded with the Kildare Place Society. Burke also records that Thomas had a son named Joseph Lloyd, and his initials correspond with those of the man who collaborated with Thomas and William Phelps in the management of the school at Holycross.

These coincidences are, in themselves, insufficient reason for believing that the Thomas, William and Joseph Lloyd Phelps in the Burke genealogy are the same as the Thomas, William and J.L. Phelps listed in the Kildare Place Society records. The link between both sets of names is strengthened, however, by information from an unexpected quarter, the Trinity College register, which records the admission of Joseph Lloyd Phelps to the college on 21 October 1823.²⁵ Both his age, 21, and his father's name, Thomas, coincide with those printed in Burke. His father's occupation, *agricola*, or farmer, and his residence, County Tipperary, link him with the farmer from Graiguenoe who corresponded with the Kildare Place Society throughout the 1820s, while his own name links him with the J.L. Phelps Esq. who supported the Holycross school and the Joseph Lloyd Phelps listed in the Burke genealogy.

Another piece of information in the Trinity register, Joseph's designation as *dissentiens*, the term used in the college at that time to indicate a Protestant dissenter, would support the likelihood that he was a descendant of Thomas Phelps the Cromwellian, who "turned his sword into ploughshare and became a disciple of George Fox," the first Quaker.²⁶ A search through the "Tipperary Register" of births, marriages and deaths of the Religious Society of Friends, adds substance to this. It lists a William Phelps of the townland of Noan in Gray's Parish, or Graystown, in County Tipperary, the son of Joseph Phelps and Mary Christy of Moyallen. It also lists their eldest son, Thomas, and his son Joseph Lloyd Phelps.²⁷

Thus three independent sources, the Kildare Place Society school records, the Burke genealogy and the Quaker registers, list three similarly named members of the Phelps family contemporaneous with each other, and additional information in each source converges and provides substantial support for the possibility that the individuals referred to are in each instance one and the same. If so, it is now possible to identify William Phelps the enumerator of the census of Eliogarty in 1821 as having been born at Moyallen county Down in 1780 into a prominent and prosperous Quaker family which originated in Limerick. Sometime later, along with other members of his family he moved to Tipperary and he was resident there at least from the early 1820s when he was employed as an enumerator for the national census.

Another source, the tithe applotment book, which assessed the size and quality of land holdings, lists a William Phelps farming about ninety acres at Noan in Graystown parish in 1830.²⁸ Both the Burke genealogy and the Quaker registers record that he did not marry and that he died without issue in 1837 at the age of 57, and though no longer a member of a Quaker meeting, was buried in the Quaker burial ground at Ballybrada near Cahir.²⁹

Very little is now known about those who took the 1821 census. No list of enumerators, except those employed in Donegal, has hitherto come to light; but a national list of the 1,308 enumerators engaged in 1831 does survive and an analysis of it has prompted Professor J.J. Lee to suggest that a very high proportion of those may have belonged to the lower or "lumpen" strata of the ascendancy, and prompted him to wonder if they had the confidence and trust of the populace at large.³⁰ The founding members of the Phelps family had done well as a result of the political upheavals of the seventeenth century, and their children had consolidated their economic capacity through farming and trade in the eighteenth century. They did so as Quakers, however, and if they lived comfortably on and by the land, they were not members of the landed gentry. As dissenters they were debarred from full participation in some of the most powerful institutions of state and from the local corporations, and their own intellectual disposition reinforced that



tendency towards separateness and isolation. If they were quietly supportive of the established order of things, they did not share all its privileges: as David Dickson has suggested, their involvement in establishment social culture was "at one remove."³¹

William Phelps was part of a network of Quaker families immersed in the farming, commercial and educational life of early nineteenth century Tipperary. His background and education had given him the interests and accomplishments necessary in an efficient enumerator, and at a time of increasing sectarian and political bitterness the common perception of the Quaker as being fair-minded and somewhat removed from the political establishment may have further enhanced his effectiveness. On the other hand, if his religion debarred Phelps from membership of the ascendancy, it may also have served to keep him at a distance from the majority of those whom he sought to enumerate. It may not now be possible to establish the degree to which his background and social role lessened his effectiveness as an enumerator, but quite possibly they were less a handicap than the lack of the surveys and the maps which would provide invaluable guidance to his successors. In the absence of such resources the achievement of William Phelps and that of his fellow enumerators, was substantial.

APPENDIX I

Transcript of MS 850: 937/2, Kildare Place Society papers, Church of Ireland College of Education³²

Recapitulation of the Population returns for the barony of Eliogarty taken Summer 1821

Names of parishes	Townlands	Houses		Number of inhabitants	Number of persons able to read	Number of acres	Flax Wheels	Flaxseed Sown		Number of schools
		uninhabited	inhabited					foreign pottles	Irish pottles	
1 Ballycahill	6	3	215	1,269	170	1,288	33	8	11	3
2 Ballymurteen	6	7	203	1,248	331	1,547	43	166	141	2
3 Burris	16	13	491	3,120	901	5,430	96	181	397	6
4 Drum	9	4	300	1,882	630	2,312	69	209	174	2
5 Fartiana	6	6	167	1,053	198	2,057	36	75	94	1
6 Holycross	12	6	306	2,004	355	3,614	51	212	71	3
7 Inch	15	8	299	1,988	549	2,145	73	185	126	3
8 Killitmoen	5	5	106	655	189	879	22	46	45	—
9 Loughmore East	8	4	201	1,330	353	1,699	58	110	259	} 5
10 Loughmore West	14	22	418	2,697	725	4,054	76	214	401	
11 Mickarky	5	8	168	1,068	230	2,158	39	156	160	1
12 Moyne	13	22	386	2,420	729	4,718	67	210	304	3
13 Rathelthy	12	5	244	1,463	376	2,525	57	144	348	1
14 Templemore Town	—	29	317	2,970	—	574	—	—	—	2
"Templemore Parish	6	9	320	2,141	671	4,358	34	87	141	2
** 15 Thurles Town	—	102	1,064	6,044	2,322	1,194	—	—	—	12
"Thurles Parish Inn warrant	19	9	137	852	271	105	17	2	5	2
Ditto Out warrant	19	6	273	1,963	453	3,581	76	144	214	—
	171	268	5,615	3,6107	9,453	44,246	835	2,152	2,896	48

*No enquiry made respecting the ability to read or Flax Wheels in this town

**No enquiry made respecting Flax Wheels in this town.

William Phelps
Enumerator



APPENDIX II

A comparison of population and housing aggregates as tabulated in the abstract of census returns and in the Phelps manuscript

(1) Population			
	Census abstract	Phelps manuscript	Census minus manuscript
Ballycahill	1269	1269	0
Ballymurneen	1248	1248	0
Burris	3122	3120	2
Drom	1882	1882	0
Fartiana	2057	2057	0
Holycross	2004	2004	0
Inch	1988	1988	0
Killfitmoen	655	655	0
Loghmore East	1330	1330	0
Loghmore West	2692	2697	-5
Mickarky	1068	1068	0
Moyne	2419	2420	-1
Rathealty	1463	1463	0
Templemore town	2970	2970	0
Templemore parish	412	2141	-1729
Templemore manor	1174	not used	1174
Thurles town	6040	6044	-4
Thurles parish	2563	not used	2563
Thurles commons	90	not used	90
Thurles parish Inn-warrant	not used	852	-852
Thurles parish Out-warrant	not used	1903	-1903
Totals	35,442	36,107	-665

(2) Inhabited houses			
Ballycahill	214	215	-1
Ballymurneen	203	203	0
Burris	487	491	-4
Drom	299	300	-1
Fartiana	166	167	-1
Holycross	301	306	-5
Inch	298	299	-1
Killfitmoen	106	106	0
Loghmore East	203	201	+2
Loughmore West	415	418	-3
Mickarky	167	168	-1
Moyne	385	386	-1
Rathealty	244	244	0
Templemore town	294	317	-23
Templemore parish	68	320	-252
Templemore manor	175	not used	175
Thurles town	1068	1064	4
Thurles parish	394	not used	394
Thurles commons	16	not used	16
Thurles parish Inn-warrant	not used	137	137
Thurles parish Out-warrant	not used	273	273
Totals	5,503	5,615	112



(3) Uninhabited houses

Ballycahill	4	3	1
Ballymurteen	7	7	0
Burris	11	13	-2
Drom	4	4	0
Fartiana	7	6	1
Holycross	10	6	4
Inch	5	8	-3
Killfitmoen	4	5	-1
Loghmore East	3	4	-1
Loghmore West	19	22	-3
Mickarky	8	8	0
Moyne	20	22	-2
Rathealty	3	5	-2
Templemore town	27	29	-2
Templemore manor	2	not used	+2
Templemore parish	6	9	-3
Thurles town	68	102	-34
Thurles parish	10	not used	10
Thurles commons	1	not used	+1
Thurles parish Inn warrant	not used	9	-9
Thurles parish Out-warrant	not used	6	-6
Totals	219	268	49

APPENDIX III

A comparison of total acreage and number of townlands of "complete" parishes as returned in the Phelps manuscript and by the Ordnance Survey

Parish	ACREAGE			TOWNLANDS	
	Ordnance Survey	Phelps	ratio	Phelps	Ordnance Survey
Ballymurteen	3,846	1,547	2.48	6	7
Burris	11,939	5,430	2.19	16	19
Drum,	4,480	2,312	1.93	9	14
Fartiana,	3,607	2,057	1.75	6	7
Inch	4,889	2,145	2.27	15	19
Kilfitmoen	1,330	879	1.51	5	4
Loughmore East	6,014	1,699	3.53	8	23
Loughmore West	4,850	4,054	1.19	14	10
Micarky	3,836	2,158	1.77	5	16
Moyne	9,502	4,718	2.01	13	12
Rathealty	4,875	2,525	1.93	12	18
Thurles	7,948	4,880	1.62	38	46
Totals	67,116	34,404	1.95	147	195



FOOTNOTES

1. The help given during the writing of this article by Jonathan Bell, John Coakley, Bill Crawford, Mary Guinan-Darmody, Aideen Ireland, Ken Hannigan, D.G. Marnane, John McHugh, Thomas Power, Mary Shackleton, W.J. Smyth, Bernadette Whelan, Kevin Whelan, Charlie Wilson and Noel Young, is gratefully acknowledged.
2. W.E. Vaughan and A.J. Fitzpatrick: *Irish population statistics: population, 1821-1971* (Dublin, 1978), pp xi-xii.
3. Michael Drake, 'The census, 1801-1891', in E.A. Wrigley (ed) *Nineteenth century society: essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data* (Cambridge, 1972), pp 8-10.
4. *Abstract of answers and returns, pursuant to act 55 Geo. 3, for taking an account of the population of Ireland in 1821*, H.C. 1824 (577), xxii, 411. (henceforth cited as *Census of Ireland 1821*).
5. Joseph Lee, 'On the accuracy of the pre-famine Irish censuses', in J.M. Goldstrom and L.A. Clarkson, (ed) *Irish population, economy and society: essays in honour of the late K.H. Connell* (Oxford, 1981), p. 39.
6. *Census of Ireland 1821*, p. ix.
7. *Census of Ireland, 1821*, p. xi.
8. *Census of Ireland, 1821*, p. xiv-xvi.
9. *Abstract of the population of Ireland, with a comparative view of the number of houses and inhabitants*, H.C. 1822 (36), xiv, 737.
10. *Census of Ireland, 1821*.
11. The abstract of returns for the barony of Eliogarty is in *Census of Ireland 1821*, pp 202-5.
12. Church of Ireland College of Education (C.I.C.E.), Dublin, Kildare Place Society (K.P.S.) papers MS 850: 937/ 2. The manuscript is transcribed and published with the permission of the trustees of the college.
13. *Census of Ireland, 1821*.
14. P.M. Austin Bourke, 'Notes on some agricultural units of measurement in use in pre-famine Ireland' in *Irish Historical Studies*, xiv, 55, (1965), p. 239.
15. J.H. Andrews: *A paper landscape: the Ordnance Survey in nineteenth-century Ireland* (Oxford, 1975), p. 119.
16. An entry in *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1933) vii, pp 1195-6, indicates that pottle was used principally as a measure of grains and liquids. It gives Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana* (1689-90) as the source for its use as a measure of area. Shaw Mason, in an introduction to the census abstract, includes pottle, an equivalent to twelve acres, in a list of obsolete terms 'formerly used to designate the smaller sub-divisions of land in Ireland.'; *Census of Ireland, 1821*, p. x.
17. Conrad Gill: *The rise of the Irish linen industry* (Oxford, 1925), pp 34-5, 205-6 and 224.
18. *Second report of the commissioners of the Irish education inquiry*, H.C. 1826-7 (12), xii, pp 1108-15.
19. Cormac Ó Gráda: *Ireland before and after the famine* (Manchester, 1988), pp 18-20.
20. Thomas G. McGrath: 'Interdenominational relations in pre-famine Tipperary' in William Nolan and Thomas G. McGrath, (ed) *Tipperary: history and society* (Dublin, 1985), pp 258-59.
21. C.I.C.E., K.P.S. papers, MS 838/91/3.
22. C.I.C.E., K.P.S. papers, MS 353-4.
23. *Burke's Irish Family Records* (London, 1976), pp 956-8 and Bernard Burke: *Burke's Landed Gentry of Ireland*, 4th ed., (London, 1958), pp 516-577.
24. *Burke's Irish Family Records*, p. 956.
25. G.D. Burtchaell and T.U. Sadlier (ed) *Alumni Dublinenses* (Dublin, 1935), p. 666.
26. *Burke's Irish Family Records*, p. 956.
27. Religious Society of Friends Historical Library, Morehampton Road, Dublin, "Tipperary Register".
28. National Archives, Tithe Applotment Book, TAB 27/S/74, holding number 206.
29. Friends Historical Library, "Tipperary Register".
30. Lee, 'On the accuracy of the pre-Famine Irish censuses', p. 41.
31. David Dickson: *New foundations; Ireland 1660-1800* (Dublin, 1987), p. 121.
32. Phelps's spelling is adhered to in this and the following appendices. He used the form Burris, the 1821 census abstract used Borris and the Ordnance Survey used the form Twomileborris.

