



1841 Census HO107/557 f 15 p 11 : 3 Don King's Place No 1, Liverpool

PLUCK	James	30	labourer	Ireland
PLUCK	Bridget	40		Ireland
PLUCK	John	19	labourer	Ireland
PLUCK	Timothy	12		Ireland
PLUCK	Mary Ann	7		Ireland

Some comments on the 1841 census record

- The 1841 census does not provide "relationship" information. At the moment one can only speculate about the relationship between James and Bridget (but see the Notes on the 1851 census).
- The ages are "rounded down n" in 5 year intervals, so James could have been 30-34 and Bridget 40-44.
- John is almost certainly too old to be a son of James.
- The parentship of Timothy and Mary Ann is debatable - they are probably the children of Garrett and Bridget.

1851 Census HO107/2177 f 498 p 57 : Haigh Place, Hornby St, St Martin, Liverpool

PLUNKETT	James	1806	head	m	45	labourer	Ireland
PLUNKETT	Margaret	1821	wife	m	30		Ireland
PLUNKETT	Timothy	1832	son	s	19	cooper's apprentice	Ireland
PLUNKETT	Mary Ann	1834	daur	s	17	labourer's daughter	Ireland
PLUNKETT	Andrew	1850	son	s	1		Liverpool
MCDONALD	Ann	1796	m in law	wid	55		Ireland
MCDONALD	Maria	1835	sis in law	s	16		Ireland
MCDONALD	Jno	1836	bro in law	s	15		Ireland
MCDONALD	Rodger	1791	lodger	wid	60		Ireland
MCDONALD	Mary	1811	lodger	s	40		Ireland

Some comments on the 1851 census record

- The surname is w rongly recorded.
- Timothy and Mary Ann are recorded as the children of James
- Margaret w as recorded as McDonnell at her marriage to James; here, her family are recorded as McDonald. This is not significant, how ever.
- I do not know w ho Rodger and Mary are, they are probably siblings of Margaret's father.

The evidence for connecting Michael, Catherine, Lawrence and Hugh to James and Margaret is circumstantial since they were born and died between censuses and the only way of confirming their parenthood is to buy the birth certificates, or find baptisms. As far as I can ascertain there were no other feasible parents in the Liverpool RD during this period.

There is another child, Peter, who was born Q2 1865 and died Q1 1866, who could be fitted into either family (James or Lawrence).

Lawrence Pluck (PL3005) and James Pluck (PL2911) - are they brothers and do they belong to Tree1009 - sons of Hugh Pluck and Mary Brien?

In order to fit Tree1009, Lawrence needs to have been born in 1841, and James in 1828. These baptismal dates are well established, with both parents identified.

The information for establishing Lawrences birth year is minimal, but probably correct. We have:

- his age in the 1871 census - age 30, i.e. born in 1841, and
- his age in the GRO death index - aged 39 in 1880, which also works out at 1841.

This date is exactly as required. His marriage at the age of 19 to a woman aged about 24 is perfectly feasible.

With James the position is much less clear.

C1851 aged 45 therefore born in 1806	
C1861	50
C1871	48
C1881	70
d1883	60
	1811
	1823
	1811
	1823

For what it is worth, this averages out at 1815, i.e 13 years too old.

Ages recorded in censuses are notoriously unreliable. People usually underestimate rather than overestimate their ages, but perhaps James had an aversion to the enquiries of officialdom? The "round" numbers in 1861 and 1881 suggest that someone - perhaps the enumerator, made a bad guess. Almost certainly, he could neither read nor write, and probably never needed to count much past ten, so if we take his recorded age when he died, and add five years, we end up spot on.

In the 1841 census his age was recorded as 40, i.e he could have been anywhere between 40 and 45.