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Abstract

This thesis reassesses the nature and importance of the Scottish Episcopal Church in Edinburgh and more widely. Based on a microstudy of one chapel community over a twenty-four year period, it addresses a series of questions of religion, identity, gender, culture and civic society in late Enlightenment Edinburgh, Scotland, and Britain, combining ecclesiastical, social and economic history. The study examines the congregation of Charlotte Episcopal Chapel, Rose Street, Edinburgh, from its foundation by English clergyman Daniel Sandford in 1794 to its move to the new Gothic chapel of St John’s in 1818. Initially an independent chapel, Daniel Sandford’s congregation joined the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1805 and the following year he was made Bishop of Edinburgh, although he continued to combine this role with that of rector to the chapel until his death in 1830.

Methodologically, the thesis combines a detailed reassessment of Daniel Sandford’s thought and ministry (Chapter Two) with a prosopographical study of 431 individuals connected with the congregation as officials or in the chapel registers (Chapter Three). Biography of the leader and prosopography of the community are brought to illuminate and enrich one another to understand the wealth and business networks of the congregation (Chapter Four) and their attitudes to politics, piety and gender (Chapter Five).

The thesis argues that Daniel Sandford’s Evangelical Episcopalianism was both original in Scotland, and one of the most successful in appealing to educated and influential members of Edinburgh society. The congregation, drawn largely from the newly-built West End of Edinburgh, were bourgeois and British in their composition. The core membership of privileged Scots, rooted in land and law, led, but were also challenged by and forced to adapt to a broad social spread who brought new wealth and influence into the West End through India and the consumer boom. The discussion opens up many avenues for further research including the connections between Scottish Episcopalianism and romanticism, the importance of India and social mobility within the consumer economy in the development of Edinburgh, and Scottish female intellectual culture and its engagement with religion and enlightenment. Understanding the role of enlightened, evangelical Episcopalianism, which is the contribution of this study, will form an important context for these enquiries.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Charlotte Chapel Project

This thesis reassesses the nature and importance of the Scottish Episcopal Church in Edinburgh and more widely, based on a microstudy of one chapel community over a short twenty-four year period. The congregation of Charlotte Episcopal Chapel in the West End of Edinburgh (Map, 8) was founded on 13 April 1794 by Daniel Sandford, a freelance English clergyman, who became Bishop of Edinburgh in 1806, and on 19 March 1818 moved his congregation to the new chapel of St John’s. The chapel registers reveal a large and diverse congregation from dukes to domestic servants, and include nationally influential figures like Walter Scott and Sydney Smith. Edinburgh in this period regarded itself as a British city, and English visitors to Edinburgh found resemblances to the Church of England in Daniel Sandford’s chapel; however, both Edinburgh and the Episcopal Church differed from other cities and other churches in important ways which shaped the experience of the congregation. Originally conceived as local history for the modern St John’s congregation, the wider significance of the questions raised by the material quickly became evident, and the Charlotte Chapel project developed into one which, combining biography and prosopography, sheds light on a series of questions in ecclesiastical, social, economic, cultural and gender history in late Enlightenment Edinburgh, Scotland, and Britain.

The first part of the study explores Daniel Sandford’s ministry. Sandford was a grad-

1Throughout the text, members of the prosopographical group, included in the Biographical Catalogue at the end, are distinguished by underlined sans-serif font. This makes it immediately clear to the reader whether a person is being mentioned as part of the prosopographical study or is providing wider context, without the need for distracting explanations such as ‘whose daughter was baptised in Charlotte Chapel in 1814’. Details of how each individual was connected to the chapel are provided in the catalogue.
uate of Christ Church, Oxford, who had married [Helen Douglas] daughter of a Scottish Jacobite, in 1790, and worked as a curate in London. Helen’s relatives suggested a freelance Scottish career as an alternative to navigating the networks of English patronage, so in 1792, aged 25, [Sandford] arrived in Edinburgh. He took in pupils, and when he began leading worship two years later his congregation grew rapidly. [Sandford] led the reunion of the qualified chapels with the Scottish Episcopal Church, joining it on 20 November 1804, and was consecrated Bishop of Edinburgh on 9 February 1806. The congregation outgrew Charlotte Chapel and built St John’s, Princes Street in 1818 (Map, 5), selling Charlotte Chapel to a Baptist congregation. Although hampered from this time by very poor health, Bishop [Sandford] ministered in St John’s, assisted from 1826 by his curate and successor Edward Bannerman Ramsay, until his death in 1830. Chapter Two reassesses the theology of [Daniel Sandford]. Tracing his intellectual development from the drawing-rooms of the bluestockings to the Edinburgh of Dugald Stewart, it assesses his published writings and use of sources, and makes the case for his Evangelical theology. The final parts of the chapter explore his diocesan ministry in the light of this theological reassessment, and investigates his influence.

The second part is a prosopographical study (collective biography) of 431 members of Sandford’s congregation, based on the baptism, marriage, funeral and official registers of Charlotte Chapel. Chapters Three and Four explore the physical structures and dynamics of the congregation. Chapter Three first identifies the prominent groups in the congregation through a quantified analysis in terms of social rank, nationality, and marriage, then analyses the addresses of members of the congregation and their movement into the developing New Town. Chapter Four examines their financial status, first exploring Daniel Sandford’s teaching on wealth, then the most important economic activities in Charlotte Chapel: military, land, law, salaried officials, India, the colonies, the consumer economy, mercantile activities and literature.

Chapter Five focuses on the congregation’s ideas and attitudes about religion, politics and domestic life. It examines the influence and weighs the importance of intellectual dichotomies and gendering including public and private, Whig and Tory, and Jacobite and Enlightenment to [Daniel Sandford] and his congregation. It finally considers how

---

3 CM, 16 August 1792, 5 April 1794.
4 Daniel Sandford’s Subscription to the Articles of Union, National Records of Scotland (NRS) CH12/12/2138; Consecration of Daniel Sandford as Bishop of Edinburgh, NRS CH12/12/103.
these ideas took shape in civic activity. Throughout the thesis, but in this chapter in particular, the biographical study of Sandford’s theology and the prosopographical one of his congregation provide mutually-enriching insights.

The remainder of this introductory chapter provides the necessary background to this broad-ranging and complex project. The first section outlines the methodology, introducing the prosopographical method and explaining how it was applied to the body of archive evidence available for Charlotte Chapel. The second provides historical background to Edinburgh and the Episcopal church, a city and a denomination which, despite both being strongly attached to their own historical identity and heritage, have remained on the periphery of mainstream British social and religious history. The third section provides a review of the literature pertinent to each chapter.

1.2 Methodology: Prosopography

Prosopography is a group portrait: this is what the word means. Lawrence Stone’s classic definition, ‘the investigation of the common background characteristics of a group of actors in history by means of a collective study of their lives’, remains as servicable as it did forty years ago. In their recent ‘Short Manual’ on prosopography, Koenraad Verboven et al list ‘religious history’ as first amongst suitable groups for application of the method, and this study builds on a growing popularity for the prosopographical method for the study of religious history. Clyde Binfield was one of the first to adopt it for his history of Coventry Baptist Chapel, rejecting the usual ‘chronicle of a succession of pastorates’, but advising his successors to ‘place the church more rigorously in its social and economic context [...] all collective biography is liable to a distortion which the graph and table can sometimes correct’. This more rigorous methodology has found its way into church social history in studies by Allan MacLaren, Peter Hillis, Iain MacIver, Vivienne Barrie-Curien and Mark Smith.

---

7 Clyde Binfield, *Pastors and People: the Biography of a Baptist Church, Queen’s Road, Coventry* (Coventry: Queen’s Road Baptist Church, 1984) p. 6.
According to Cohen et al, prosopography has been slow to adopt the mixed qualitative and quantitative method which Binfield regretting having failed to employ. Writing in 2007, they found that attempts to do so ‘rarely treats both aspects adequately’, and failed to ‘provide local links between the different forms of research’, exacerbating ‘continuing scepticism [...] about the viability of mixing methods’. The Charlotte Chapel study aims to break through such scepticism with a bold attempt to mix qualitative and quantitative methods, in proportions dictated by the nature of the historical questions and available evidence. Chapter Three employs largely quantitative research to explore the social and national origins and kinship networks of the group. In Chapter Four, the nature of the question (the congregation’s wealth) would ideally have been answered quantitatively; however, the nature of the quantitative evidence (tax returns and wills) was limited to the most wealthy members: for a fuller picture, it was necessary to make use of the abundant qualitative evidence such as newspaper reports of new employment or bankruptcy, evidence of economic migration or movement to more affluent addresses, or of social rise or fall in the next generation. In Chapters Two and Five the largely qualitative studies of Bishop Sandford’s and the congregation’s thought are given added insight by quantitative analyses, for example of Sandford’s biblical citations (p. 63) and of the correlation between social rank and party allegiance (p. 182). The aim is to achieve a group portrait of Charlotte Chapel similar to that of Cohen et al in their prosopographical study of the British Communist Party: ‘Placing the findings from the different methods together [...] we were able to develop a much more satisfactory understanding of the phenomenon we were investigating [...] both hard and complex’.

Delineating the Charlotte Chapel ‘Universe’

Stone’s first step in a prosopography is to ‘establish a universe to be studied’. In this case, what Verboven et al. call the ‘common and observable feature’ necessary to ‘demarcate the population’ of this universe is an individual’s appearance in the marriage, baptism or funeral registers of Charlotte Chapel, or the list of chapel officials. Charlotte Episcopal Chapel’s short existence provides convenient limits for the time-period. The congregation was founded on 13 April 1794, forming a firm starting-point, although

---

10Cohen, Flinn and Morgan, “Quantitative and Qualitative Methods”, p. 227.
11Stone, “Prosopography”, p. 46.
it was not until Charlotte Chapel opened on 28 May 1797 and Sandford began a baptism register that names are available. The end-date for the study is the congregation’s removal to St John’s on 19 March 1818, which despite many continuities of personnel marked the start of a new phase in the life of the congregation. The trustees and vestry of St John’s, recruited between 1814 and 1817, have been included on the assumption that they must already have been core members of the congregation, although they anticipate the next phase of chapel life. However, subscribers to St John’s, whose names were listed in the vestry minutes, are not included, because their relationship might be one of detached interest rather than participation: Charles Daubeny, for example, who sent £50 from Bath, was demonstrating his high Anglican support of Scottish Episcopacy from afar; while the artist James Skene of Rubislaw, whom Sandford apparently did not know well at the time of St John’s construction, might have been chiefly interested in the chapel’s architectural merits rather than in personal participation.\footnote{List of Subscriptions in Minutes of St John’s Vestry, NRS CH12/3/3 p.154; Daniel Sandford to Colin MacKenzie, June 1819, NLS Acc.12092/19.}

The result is a group of 431 individuals, whose composition is given in Table 1.1. These form as complete a list of those involved in Charlotte Chapel congregation as is available from the surviving evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of connection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Dates available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baptism Register</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1797-1802, November 1809-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Register</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>November 1813 - 1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Register</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>May 1813 - 1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials and Staff</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(see Table 3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Sources for the study of Charlotte Chapel congregation. The baptism register provided names of parents of candidates, and in two cases of adult candidates. These numbers add up to more than 431 as some individuals appear in more than one source.

This Charlotte Chapel ‘universe’ is somewhat problematic. As an independent and then nonconformist chapel rather than a parish church, its mission was not to those within a defined geographical area. Yet nor was it a clearly defined godly community bound by strong ties of discipline and commitment, as one might expect an independent Evangelical chapel to be: it extended an indiscriminate welcome to all who chose to come. Alternative sources for names of members of the congregation are unavailable. Keeping a list of communicants does not appear to have been part of the chapel’s tradition, and in any case, this would have been a problematic source since it appears communicants were not representative of attenders, being significantly fewer (in 1837 the congregation
reported 900 members and 500 communicants). Communicants represented a gendered sample: Edward Bannerman Ramsay reported that ‘Bishop Sandford told me that when he first came to Edinburgh [...] few gentlemen attended church – very few indeed were seen at the communion – so much so that it was a matter of conversation when a male communicant [...] was observed at the table for the first time’\footnote{First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction, Scotland (London: House of Commons, 1837) pp. 12-13; Edward Bannerman Ramsay, Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character (Edinburgh: T.N. Foulis, 1857) p. 57.} Lists of seat-rents, which would have been a good source, probably did exist, but have been lost. The nature of this ‘universe’ therefore was less like peas contained in a tin, and more like a galaxy of stars attracted by gravity: a core of highly involved and committed members represented by the chapel officials and their relatives, surrounded by increasingly loose participants, down to the passing, sermon-sampling tourist.

The range of ways in which individuals might be connected to Charlotte Chapel were wide. For some, like Martha Elphinstone who remembered Bishop Sandford in her will, or her nephew and chapel trustee Colin MacKenzie who features frequently in this study and emerges as the chapel’s leading lay member, there is evidence of strong attachment based on long-term membership\footnote{Martha Elphinstone’s Will, NRS SC70/1/13/717.} Some, such as Robert Cockburn and Thomas Ramsay whose children were baptised in Charlotte Chapel, lived in Edinburgh for the rest of their lives, and were buried in St John’s graveyard, suggesting lifelong membership of the congregation. Others’ connection was limited by temporary residence: William Arbuthnot was a chapel trustee for many decades, but his brother George whose twin daughters were baptised in the chapel in 1816, had recently returned from India, and would soon settle in Surrey. He might have attended the chapel whenever he visited his family in Edinburgh – he described attending his brother’s funeral in St John’s in 1829 – but he was not a regular member\footnote{S.P. Arbuthnot, Memories of the Arbuthnots of Kincardineshire and Aberdeenshire (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1920) p. 363.} Even if they did settle in Edinburgh, people returning from India like Mary and Robert Downie and Adelaide Falconar’s parents, might only arrive near the end of the period of study: these families arrived in 1811-1812. Some of the most tenuous ‘members’ in this regard are the English grooms of wedding couples, such as Daniel Maude and Spencer Compton who might well be once-only visitors, claiming their bride in her home congregation before taking her away to a new life elsewhere. Finally, there was a tendency for gentry, literati and lawyers to be promiscuous in their church attendance. Robert Cockburn’s brother Henry is an im-
portant source for this study thanks to his detailed memoirs, and had six children listed in its baptism register, more than anyone else except Colin MacKenzie (who had seven). However, Henry also spent enough time listening to the sermons of Archibald Alison (of the Cowgate Episcopal Chapel) and Henry Moncrieff Wellwood (of St Cuthbert’s Presbyterian Church) to review their preaching style in his memoirs, where Daniel Sandford’s is not mentioned; and like five other lawyers in the group (p. 213), he was also an elder in a rural Presbyterian church so as to gain an important political voice as a General Assembly delegate.

All of the examples above come from the higher-rank and better documented minority of the congregation: the pattern of attendance or allegiance of artisan or labouring members is even more obscure. Some, like local grocers John and Helen Hall, appeared twice, as parents in the baptism register in 1811, and at John’s funeral in 1816, suggesting a sustained connection. However, others demonstrate a switching or loose denominational allegiance. Stabler Nicholas Baldock had married Anne Hall in St Andrew’s parish church, but Anne was English, suggesting an explanation for choosing the Episcopal Chapel for their children’s baptism. Why Maxwell Henderson, daughter of a quarrier and baptised in St Cuthbert’s parish church, had her son baptised in Charlotte Chapel is more mysterious. Her husband, William Cairns, was an innkeeper at Haymarket, half a mile west of Edinburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (partner also in study)</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (partner not in study)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Gender and marriage within the group. These categories are useful for analysis, although the figures reflect the nature of the sources rather than the actual composition of the congregation.

The three registers are further problematic in that they are far from equivalent. The baptism register, the most substantial source, became erratic from 1800 and stopped altogether for six years in 1803, after which Sandford noted that ‘it has been my custom to desire parents to register their children in the parish register [...] but as this may sometimes be neglected, I shall henceforward register all children baptised by me’.

18 Charlotte Chapel Baptism Register, December 1809, NRS CH12/3/26.
the register of St Andrew’s parish church distinguishes baptisms performed outwith its walls, there is no way of telling which of these were from Charlotte Chapel.\footnote{Old Parish Registers, St Andrew’s Parish, 685/1 books 37-40, Edinburgh Libraries Microfilm.} Despite this large gap, the baptism register provides better coverage than the marriage and funeral registers, which were not begun until 1813, although a few earlier weddings were identified from newspaper announcements. The sources are limited in other ways, of which the most obvious is the omission of unmarried people (Table \ref{table:1}). They do not feature at all in the baptism or marriage registers; the single people in the funeral register tend to be elderly, while single chapel officials are only men. We might speculate that healthy single women who could afford to live in the New Town might have been amongst the most committed members of the chapel, but their attendance is unrecorded. The three registers do however represent different social groups who engaged with the chapel in different ways, which are explored in detail in Chapter Three (p. 107).

Despite these problems, the individuals known to have a connection with Charlotte Chapel form a viable and interesting prosopographical sample. In recommending prosopography for the study of religious history, Verboven et al. envisaged studies of church leadership groups, such as elders or clergy.\footnote{Verboven, “Manual to Prosopography”, p. 48.} Stone described the development of a ‘mass school’ versus an ‘elitist school’ in prosopography, based on rival narratives of whether history progressed through popular movements or the actions of great men.\footnote{Stone, “Prosopography”, p. 47.} While a conscious choice of ‘grand narratives’ in this way may have become unfashionable, it is important for the historian not to slip back into assuming the validity of one or other approach, as a study of religion that focused only on leadership would seem to do. Just as mixing qualitative and quantitative analysis elicits richer results, so does mixing ‘mass’ and ‘elitist’ data. In this study, the analysis of the theology and ministry of Daniel Sandford, the ‘great man’ in the Charlotte Chapel ‘universe’, begun in Chapter Two, is enriched and developed in later chapters in the context of the portrait of his congregation, for example regarding wealth in Chapter Four (p. 133) and gender in Chapter Five (p. 225). In Chapter Three, the chapel officials are discussed in the context of the predominant social groups which emerge from the social analysis (p. 122), demonstrating how the ‘elite’ are both appointed from above and emergent from the ‘mass’ of the demographic. While it would be desirable to compare Daniel Sandford and Charlotte Chapel to other clergy and other congregations, it is the tight ‘microhistorical’ focus of
the study, a period of only twenty-five years and one congregation, which enables explo-
ration of this diversity of participation within the congregation in more depth and detail
than wider studies could do.

Four individuals gain particular prominence: Colin MacKenzie and Sydney Smith for
their close involvement in Charlotte Chapel and good sources; and Henry Cockburn and
Walter Scott, who although their connection with the Chapel as an institution was cooler,
were closely linked to its social networks and are two of the most important comment-
tators on Edinburgh life at this period. Colin MacKenzie (1770-1830) became a close
personal friend of Bishop Sandford and was generous with his time and professional
skill as a Writer to the Signet (senior Scottish solicitor) in promoting the interests of
the chapel and of the financially and institutionally fragile Scottish Episcopal Church.
Henry Cockburn (1779-1854) was connected to Charlotte Chapel by having six children
listed in its baptism register, more than anyone else except Colin MacKenzie (who had
seven). Cockburn’s Memorials of his Times, written between about 1821 and 1840, forms
the best near-contemporary description of the world of Charlotte Chapel. A Whig lawyer,
he went on to become one of the architects of the 1832 Scottish Reform Act and, notably
with his Letter to the Lord Provost on the Best Ways of Spoiling the Beauty of Edinburgh (1849)
Edinburgh’s first environmental campaigner. Sydney Smith (1771-1845), a young clergy-
man from Essex, was assistant preacher in Charlotte Chapel from 1799 to 1803. In 1802
Smith helped found the Edinburgh Review and later became famous as the Whig party’s
greatest wit. Walter Scott had three children baptised by Sandford although only the
eldest, Sophia, was recorded in the chapel register. While the memory of Scott quite lit-
erally towers over Edinburgh in the shape of his neo-Gothic monument, and over the
histories of Edinburgh institutions such as St John’s whose authors were eager to drop
one name their readers would recognise, his influence has been badly underestimated
in the histories of British culture and society.

Exploring the ‘Universe’

The choice of themes for exploring Charlotte Chapel emerged from three distinct histor-
ical problems which, in a prosopographical microhistory, could be considered together
in a mutually-enriching manner. The first was the neglect of Daniel Sandford by Scottish

Diane M. Watters, St John’s Episcopal Church Edinburgh (Edinburgh: RCAHMS, 2008) p. 8; Thomas Veitch,
The Story of St Paul’s and St George’s Church, York Place, Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1958) pp. 19, 25; Mary E.
Ingram, A Jacobite Stronghold of the Church (Edinburgh: R.M. Grant, 1907).
Episcopal historians, despite his long ministry in a high-profile position during an important transition period in the Scottish Episcopal Church. The second was the lack of social history of Edinburgh during its economic ‘golden age’. The third was the failure of intellectual, political and gender historians to consider the role of Episcopalianism in the developments taking place in Edinburgh in its period of greatest intellectual, political and cultural influence. The historiographical nature of these problems is discussed further in the literature review, below. Sandford’s ministry and theology receive a full discussion in Chapter Two, although as noted below (p. 29) the study also revealed the need for a more nuanced understanding of the theology of other more famous names in Episcopalian hagiography. While valuable for understanding Charlotte Chapel, the social, geographical and economic characteristics of the congregation, discussed in Chapters Three and Four, can only touch on the second problem, since the group was an unrepresentative sample of Edinburgh society. The discussion does, however, highlight possible areas for fruitful further study, such as links between Edinburgh and India, and the development of Edinburgh’s consumer and retail economy. The final problem, discussed in Chapter Five, also does not aim to be conclusive regarding intellectual, political or gender history, but to enable Episcopalianism to be given informed consideration in dedicated studies of these topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of birth and death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and place of marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names and dates of birth of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address in Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth at death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to other members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of connection to Charlotte Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Categories of Prosopographical Information for Biographical Catalogue.

A prosopography should be more than graphs and tables fleshed out with a few examples of real people: all the individuals should be distinguished, and the analysis should explore the connections and common ground between them. The tools for this are the biographical catalogue and kinship network diagrams found at the end of the
study. The biographical catalogue lists all 431 members and provides for each the information given in Table 1.3 so far as it was relevant or available. It also indexes page numbers enabling the reader to refer to fuller discussions of that individual within the text. The database on which the catalogue is based was built partly in a spreadsheet, to enable the statistical analyses in Chapters Three and Four, and partly in an on-line resource, [http://archive.stjohns-edinburgh.org.uk](http://archive.stjohns-edinburgh.org.uk) with the addition of new individuals being celebrated on Twitter as research progressed. This transparent work-in-progress approach proved a valuable tool, raising the profile of the project, earning the gratitude of family historians, and repaying in the form of corrections by these researchers who had often spent far more time on one individual, and who occasionally supplied additional information from archive sources inaccessible to this researcher.

The kinship network diagrams explore the links which wove this diverse congregation into a coherent community. Kinship Network One, ‘Women, Men, Officials’ shows that 120 of the 431 individuals, 28%, are connected in one ‘galaxy’. These include 17 (77%) of the 22 chapel officials. The connections shown do not knit the group as tightly as the constraints of layout make it appear: it is in two main parts, joined by possibly the most tenuous link of the network, that between [Walter Scott](#) and [Williamina Belsches](#). However, there were probably many more links in reality than those which have been identified. More informal ties such as close friendships have been excluded: in particular, many such known links between chapel members and [Walter Scott](#) are discussed below (p. [17](#)). The main core of the congregation, at the lower centre, has [Alexander MacKenzie](#) as its patriarch and seven of the Charlotte Chapel officials in a tight-knit group, from which increasingly distant connections spiral out in ‘galaxy arms’ upwards to the left. A second core, at the top right, centres on Mrs Sandford, [Helen Douglas](#) who connected her husband into high Edinburgh society.

Does the group of 431 names show the shape of Charlotte Chapel? In some respects it is likely to differ from the congregation who assembled regularly each Sunday, including many who were merely passing visitors and omitting many regular members, especially unmarried people. At various points, for example of predominant groups in the chapel (p. [12](#)), or of piety, where ‘promiscuous’ church affiliation is of interest (p. [213](#)), the varying nature of the 431 individuals’ relationship with the chapel forms part of the discussion. However, it is a sample which does include many regular members, and the passing visitors represent an important part of the nature of the chapel and location.
Passing visitors had made the decision to attend it, whether from convenience, family link or theological appeal, as much as the longer-term residents, so are valid representatives of the ‘type of person’ Charlotte Chapel served. While no historical study can claim to be a complete view of its subject, a group portrait from the best angle available may be a rich and insightful one.

1.3 Historical Context: Edinburgh Episcopalianism

Edinburgh at the turn of the Nineteenth Century

By the mid-nineteenth century, Edinburgh’s self-importance as a capital appeared disproportionate to its size or political relevance in Britain. Peter Hillis was able to describe his study of churches in nineteenth-century Glasgow as being set in ‘the second city in the British Empire’; but this was a very recent development, and in 1818 could not have been anticipated. Mary Cosh’s *Edinburgh: The Golden Age* provides a compendious introduction to the characters, institutions and published primary sources of Regency Edinburgh Literature but does not delve beyond the public life of leading figures into social or economic analysis, and while providing a great deal of material, does not analyse Edinburgh’s political or intellectual life. The social and economic history of Edinburgh in this period is particularly underdeveloped, a circumstance which accounts for the almost complete absence of Edinburgh from recent general Scottish histories such as Tom Devine’s *The Scottish Nation*.

This situation is due to change thanks to the recently-launched *Mapping Edinburgh’s Social History* project, led by Richard Rodger, but at present the historian of Edinburgh is largely reliant on Rodger’s work on the Edinburgh property market; and the work of social historian Stana Nenadic who has assessed the impact of Edinburgh on wider Scottish society. Edinburgh’s intellectual culture has received fuller study as part of the Scottish Enlightenment by scholars including Anand Chitnis, Biancamaria Fontana, and more recently Charles Bradford-Bow, although the focus has been heavily weighted towards the Whig party and the *Edinburgh Review*.

---

Fry’s history of the ‘Dundas Despotism’ put Edinburgh on the map of political history, and provided a Tory viewpoint. However, Fry shares with the historians of Whiggism a perspective which might be described as secularised presbyterianism, with little understanding of spiritual values within Edinburgh’s intellectual life, and an almost complete absence of Scottish Episcopalianism, with which many of the city’s leading thinkers were affiliated.

Edinburgh in 1794 was Scotland’s largest city, still, by 1801 when firm population figures become available, 40% larger than Glasgow (Figure 1.1). By 1818 it had grown fast, its share of Scottish population rising from 4.6% to 6%. In 1827 the Scotsman believed Edinburgh’s growth since 1790 was ‘unexampled in the three kingdoms’. Edinburgh stagnated suddenly soon after the period of this study, and by 1841 it was Glasgow that was 40% larger. These figures hint at an economic importance just before the industrial revolution which the political narrative helps to explain. The kingdoms of England and Scotland had been in a state of sporadic civil war since the deposition of the Stuart king James VII and II in favour of William of Orange in 1688. Scotland, with strong allegiances to the Scottish House of Stuart, was the chief theatre of this Jacobite war, a situation which the union of Parliaments of England and Scotland in 1707 did little to ameliorate. It was only after events including the march of a largely Scottish army of Jacobite rebels as far south as Derby in 1745 that the governance of North Britain was taken seriously in Westminster. In the subsequent decades, British investment in institutions of law enforcement like garrisons, excise and sheriffships created hundreds of small but tremendously significant job opportunities for middling-rank Scots. More importantly for a country that was poorer than England but with higher levels of education, after 1745 British institutions such as the army, navy and East India Company were opened fully to competitive Scottish participation. Despite the discontent of Scots at the crackdown on activities like smuggling, and of English at poor, educated Scots flooding their job market, the strategy worked: the economic gap with England narrowed rapidly. Edinburgh lost its royal court and parliament, but remained the seat of the law, Kirk and main Scottish banks, which remained separate from their English counterparts, making it the natural location for legal and civil institutions through which much of the new wealth flowed into Scotland; its port of Leith equipped it for commerce; and it reached the critical mass to develop a diverse consumer economy. Charlotte Chapel, 1794-1818, existed during Edinburgh’s

28 Scotsman, 1827, quoted in Rodger, Transformation of Edinburgh p. 96.
brief economic golden age.

Figure 1.1: Population of Edinburgh and Glasgow, 1801-1841. Figures are not available before 1801. (Vision of Britain. [www.visionofbritain.org](http://www.visionofbritain.org), accessed 13 April 2012.)

As well as reclaiming a role as Scotland’s commercial and political capital after the union, Edinburgh was an intellectual capital of global significance. Some of the most important work of the scientific Enlightenment took place in late eighteenth-century Edinburgh, for example chemist Joseph Black’s discovery of carbon dioxide and geologist James Hutton’s insight into the age of the earth. More importantly, the fact that the flourishing university coexisted with the institutions of law and the Kirk resulted in a city with a higher proportion of professionals than any other in Britain. This, with the city’s status as a provincial capital attracting local elites and English tourists, fitted Edinburgh for the dissemination of the academic Scottish Enlightenment throughout British culture.

The Scottish Enlightenment was widespread, complex and globally significant: Charlotte Chapel was steeped in it, although in particular ways. In the 1790s, as many future members of Charlotte Chapel entered the University (Map, 30), elderly Enlightenment celebrities could still be seen pottering around the Meadows, ‘their academic grove’, nearby (Map, 15). Yet the younger generation inherited more than a sense of inspiration from ‘the last remains of a school so illustrious’\(^{29}\) One legacy was a particular interest in history as an Enlightenment discipline, which formed the basis for nineteenth-century interest in sociology and national identity, a process explored by Colin Kidd.\(^{30}\) Charlotte Chapel members David Hume (nephew of the philosopher), William Fraser Tytler and Walter Scott were particularly influenced by the historical Enlightenment.

However, the most important cultural dissemination of the Scottish Enlightenment

\(^{29}\)Cockburn, Memorials, p. 61.
in Edinburgh, around the time Charlotte Chapel was founded, concerned the ‘philosophy of the mind’. The key philosopher was David Hume (1711-1776), who proposed that an effect could not prove the existence of a metaphysical cause: the most which could be said was that certain events were consistently observed to follow from certain others, a ‘theory of causation’ at the heart of the scholarly methods which characterised the Enlightenment. His ideas were modified by Thomas Reid (1710-1796), who agreed with much of Hume’s philosophy but rejected its radically sceptical implications which cast doubt on, for example, the existence of matter, our own minds or God. Reid proposed that such propositions did not require to be proved: their truth was sufficiently demonstrated by the fact that they were universally believed, perceived by a ‘common sense’. Even Hume had to believe some of them, to make progress in reasoning at all.

While Hume’s philosophy was too radical for most of his contemporaries, Reid’s modification was widely accepted. It was taught in Edinburgh by the inspirational lecturer Dugald Stewart (1753-1828), Professor of Moral Philosophy, who categorised Enlightenment philosophy into separate branches of physical and human science, making its complex ideas sufficiently clear to influence a generation, not merely of philosophers, but also of lawyers, clergy, gentry and politicians. His most famous lectures, in 1800-1802, were on political economy, combining the economics of Adam Smith with the sociological and historical approach of Hume and Robertson, to create a science of the workings of commercial society. While the ideas of Hume, as modified by Reid, interpreted by Stewart and noted by dozens of young Scottish literati might represent a significantly modified version of Hume’s original ideas, the result was a tremendous impetus to put the ideas of the Scottish Enlightenment into practice. Several of Stewart’s students, most famously Lord Palmerston, went on to political careers. More immediately, men inspired by Stewart’s lectures founded the *Edinburgh Review* in 1802 to critique their own society through the lens of what they had learned. One of them, Sydney Smith, was assistant minister in Charlotte Chapel, and other close connections of the *Review* circle appear in Charlotte Chapel registers including Henry Cockburn, Leonard Horner, and Walter Scott, who wrote for the *Review* until 1808.

Edinburgh’s period of economic and intellectual pre-eminence lasted from the late 1760s until 1826 when a stock market crash burst a credit bubble to reveal how far Scotland’s economic forces had rebalanced away from the capital. The 1760-1826 period was when Edinburgh burst out of the walls of its medieval city and the New Town was built.
to the north. Begun in the late 1760s, the New Town was never described as a ‘quarter’ since by 1800 it had already clearly gained the status of a ‘half’. Built on a completely greenfield site, and physically separated from the Old Town by the (drained) Nor’ Loch valley (Map, 10), the New Town represented not merely an architectural but also a social transformation of Edinburgh. ‘It was the rise of the new town that obliterated our old peculiarities with the greatest rapidity and effect’, recalled Henry Cockburn, a resident of Charlotte Square, the last and finest part of the first phase of the New Town (Map, 4). It was beside Charlotte Square that, on 28 May 1797, Daniel Sandford and his congregation judiciously elected to build a chapel, three years after they first gathered.

The Edinburgh of Charlotte Chapel was a city at war. Henry Cockburn wrote, ‘every thing rung, and was connected, with the Revolution in France; which, for above twenty years, was, or was made, the all in all. Every thing, not this or that thing, but literally every thing, was soaked in this one event’. The political result of the Revolution and subsequent wars was that Henry Dundas, Prime Minister Pitt’s political manager for Scotland, exercised complete control over the nation’s very small and comparatively cheaply bought political elite from 1791 until about 1806. His regime took firm measures against potential Jacobinical or French-style sedition in Edinburgh, in particular condemning the lawyer Thomas Muir to transportation in 1793 in a show-trial designed, as Cockburn bitterly recalled, for the ‘special edification’ of other young lawyers who might favour political reform. The Revolution reconfigured the political landscape in Edinburgh. The main British political parties during the French Revolutionary period were Pittite Whigs, Foxite Whigs, and ‘Church-and-King’ Tories. In England, Pittites believed the British Protestant constitution as established in 1688 was perfectly designed to allow Enlightenment flourishing, so alternatives represented Jacobinical threats. Foxite Whigs believed the constitution required to be updated, since commercial developments had left the structures of political power misaligned with the forces of economic power and political awareness, a dangerous situation which could eventually trigger a French-style revolution. Church-and-King Tories believed in the essential importance of the established Church of England and the monarch as its head, and desired measures to reverse what they regarded as erosion of their power. However, in Scotland, the political landscape was slightly different. Since the established Church of Scotland was Presbyte-

31Cockburn, Memorials, p. 35.
32Cockburn, Memorials, p. 82.
33Cockburn, Memorials, p. 85.
rian, Church-and-King Toryism was not a serious political position, and was held only by a handful of Episcopalian clergy who began to wish that the Scottish Episcopal Church could be established like the Church of England. The arguments of the Foxite Whigs had far more force in Scotland, where rapid political and economic developments over the previous century had created a large politically-aware class but an electorate controlled by one man, Henry Dundas. This difference between the English and Scottish situations meant that the process of re-labelling parties appears to have been more advanced in Scotland. The ‘Tory’ label was re-applied to supporters of Dundas, leaving ‘Whig’ to be reserved exclusively for their opponents, who after 1808 aligned with the Foxite opposition at Westminster, and were identified with the *Edinburgh Review*. The Whig [Cockburn](#) sneered that Toryism in Scotland ‘seldom implies anything with us except a dislike of popular institutions; and even this chiefly on grounds of personal advantage’. This was perhaps true before 1806, when genuine fright at potential French invasion, and Dundas’ command of the distribution of civil, military and imperial patronage, kept Tory rule so secure. Yet from this time, as cracks appeared in Dundas’ power and ideological position, younger Tories were forced to formulate responses to the coalescing Whig position. Members of Charlotte Chapel were highly involved in these developments.

An increasingly important part of the Edinburgh context, especially at the end of the period, was the cultural influence of [Walter Scott](#), whose British literary reputation had been soaring since 1802, and by 1818 was the known author of a series of highly successful Romantic narrative poems, and anonymous author of four record-breaking best-seller Romantic novels. The connections between [Scott](#) and the Charlotte Chapel community were strong. His children were baptised by [Sandford](#), he rented a pew, and his mother was buried at St John’s in 1819. Moreover, he had close connections with many of the Charlotte Chapel officials (listed in Table 3.3). He worked in the Court of Session alongside [Colin MacKenzie](#), writing ‘his absence is a terrible blank’ when [MacKenzie](#) was seriously ill in 1807. ‘I am now writing beside his empty chair & deprived of all the little intercourse & amusement with [which] we used to amuse our hours of official attendance’ [35](#). He spent the summer of 1814 cruising with [Adam Duff](#) on the Northern Lighthouse yacht [36](#). His friend [James Clerk](#)’s Craighall Castle was said to have inspired

---

Tully-Veolan in *Waverley*[^37] Prominent amongst those on his wife Charlotte’s ‘visiting list’ were the wives (Elizabeth Liddell, Anne Alves, and John Cay’s wife Emily) and daughters (of David Hume and William Forbes) of Charlotte Chapel officials. In 1822 Scott collaborated with William Arbuthnot to organise the visit of George IV to Edinburgh; and in 1823 with the Whig Roger Aytoun to come to a cross-party agreement on the first Rector of the Edinburgh Academy[^39] Mary Anne Erskine, the sister of Scott’s best schoolfriend, married Archibald Campbell in 1796[^40] Another chapel official, David Hume, nephew of the philosopher and himself Professor of Law at Edinburgh University, was a close friend and important influence. ‘I cannot admit that his merits are of a nature very superior to mine’, Scott complained when Hume gained a salaried office over his head in 1811; but there were other opportunities, and Scott acquiesced patronisingly: ‘I am far from being offended at the preference given to my friend Mr David Hume, a most excellent & highly accomplished man but of a temper so shy [...] that he [...] would not accept the offer unless with the view of the assistance which I can easily & will cheerfully give him.’[^41] The introvert Hume and extravert Scott developed a teasing relationship. When Henry Dundas was accused of peculation, Scott said he was as capable of it ‘as I am of picking the pocket of my brother in office Mr. David Hume, who is now sitting quietly on his stool beside me and apprehensive of no such matter’[^42] On the appearance of *Waverley*, Scott delighted in hearing Hume guess correctly that, ‘the author must be of a jacobite family and predilections, a yeomanry cavalry man and a Scottish lawyer and desires me to guess in whom these happy attributes are united. I shall not plead guilty’[^43] Scott was defeated in his courtship of Williamina Belsches by the wealthy banker William Forbes, ‘Dot & carry one’ is certainly gone to F[ettercairn]n’, the young and poor advocate Scott wrote when Williamina’s newly-knighted and socially ambitious parents invited Scott to visit[^44] Forbes married Williamina Charlotte Charpentier in January 1797. The following December Scott married Charlotte Charpentier, and his friendship with Forbes survived the incident. In addition to Scott’s connections with Charlotte Chapel officials, mostly lawyers like himself, had many with the wider congregation: examples include his assistant William Carmichael, his patron Charles Scott Duke of Buccleuch, his ward

[^38]: Scott, *Letters*, vol. 10, p. 41.
[^42]: Scott, *Letters*, vol. 4, p. 31.
Margaret Clephane\footnote{M. Neale, The Life and Times of Patrick Torry, D.D., Bishop of Saint Andrew’s, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, with an Appendix on the Scottish Liturgy (London: Joseph Masters, 1856) p. 111.} and his second cousin Alexander Keith Scott’s connections were vastly extensive; but the community of Charlotte Chapel represented his home turf.

The Scottish Episcopal Church

When Daniel Sandford arrived in Edinburgh, the Scottish Episcopal Church appeared very different from the Church of England. The most obvious difference was material. The extreme poverty of the Scottish Episcopal Church meant that there was no separated episcopacy: bishops were also ministers of a local congregation, reliant for their income on what pew-rents they could attract. This was true throughout Sandford’s episcopacy and beyond: until 1879 the Bishop of Edinburgh had no Cathedral or any diocesan staff apart from an unpaid Dean. Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray 1798-1838, lived in a cottage with no resident servant, brewing his own morning tea over a peat fire\footnote{Alex Mitchell to Patrick Torry, 14 December 1812, in Neale, Patrick Torry, p. 82.} In 1812, a deceased English bishop’s robes were begged for Bishop Torry of Dunkeld by laity embarrassed at seeing him still in an old black gown\footnote{Bishop George Gleig to Bishop William Skinner, 19 July 1822, in Neale, Patrick Torry, p. 109.} When the bishops were to be presented to George IV in 1822, symbolically restoring the once-rebellious church into royal favour, Bishop Gleig of Brechin gossiped that ‘Bishop Sandford is distressing himself exceedingly’ about the state of ‘Bishop Jolly’s wig [...] alleging that the king will not be able to stand the sight of it’\footnote{J.M. Neale, The Life and Times of Patrick Torry, D.D., Bishop of Saint Andrew’s, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, with an Appendix on the Scottish Liturgy (London: Joseph Masters, 1856) p. 111.} Although Sandford’s fashionable chapel was able to support him in modest urban elegance, the Scottish episcopate as a whole provided an extraordinary antithesis to the English Georgian prince bishops.

Yet poverty was, if the most striking, also the most superficial difference between the Church of England Sandford had left and the Scottish Episcopal Church he had not yet joined. The reasons he did not automatically join the Scottish Episcopal Church on his arrival in Edinburgh, and (as Chapter Two explores) took thirteen years to do so, were political and theological: the Scottish Episcopal Church had, for the century before 1792, been illegal, and was dominated by two forms of high church theology which, while they existed in the Church of England, were far from universal.

Scottish Episcopalian Politics: Penal Laws and Qualified Chapels

Being episcopalian, Charlotte Chapel was a nonconformist congregation. The position of the Episcopal Church in Scotland was one of the last of the institutional headaches...
left by the series of events – the union of crowns (1603), the Williamite revolution (1688), the union of parliaments (1707) and the suppression of the Jacobites (1746) – which had formed Great Britain. During the seventeenth century theologians had debated whether the Kirk should be governed by bishops (hierarchically superior clergy appointed by the divinely-ordained monarch), presbyteries (clergy equal and independent of the monarch), or various combinations of the two. Successive governments sponsored one or other on political grounds, and suffered rebellion from the losing party. The Stuart kings established the Kirk as Episcopalian to encourage conformity between their kingdoms and to control the church, but those Presbyterians who had ‘covenanted’ to resist monarchical interference in the Kirk played an important role in the War of the Three Kingdoms (1642-1660) which temporarily abolished the monarchy. In 1689, William of Orange, finding the Scottish bishops loyal to the exiled dynasty which had promoted them, re-established the Kirk as Presbyterian, driving Episcopalians committed to the Stuarts as kings by Divine Right to play a leading role in the Jacobite rebellions of 1689-1745.

One of the measures the British government took to exterminate Jacobitism after 1745 was to strengthen and enforce penal laws against the Episcopal Church. Scottish bishops had been in an illegal position since 1689, but since 1712 Episcopalian clergy could (and many did) ‘qualify’ to worship freely as tolerated dissenters by taking an oath of allegiance to the monarch. However, following the Penal Act of 1748, they now had to prove ordination by an English or Irish bishop, so most, having been ordained in Scotland, were automatically disqualified. Moreover, the penalty for leading unqualified worship, which increased from six months’ imprisonment to transportation for life, was for the first time stringently enforced. Finally, penalties were extended to the laity, who were debarred from civic privileges such as voting and office-holding by attending unqualified Episcopalian worship.48

To make matters worse, the eighteenth-century Episcopal church suffered internal divisions, as the bishops, who regarded their natural role as servants of a state church taking direction from a monarch, found themselves attempting to lead an independent church by consensus. The question of whether this leadership should be exercised by the bishops governing the whole Scottish Episcopal Church as a college and appointed by the crown, or federally, by each bishop running his separate diocese and elected by his clergy, was the cause of long-running discord. By the end of the eighteenth century

Figure 1.2: Dioceses of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Dioceses at the beginning of the nineteenth century corresponded approximately to these modern boundaries, although shortages of personnel and funds meant bishops often covered larger areas: for example when Daniel Sandford was Bishop of Edinburgh, Glasgow and Fife were both added to his area of oversight. (Used with permission of the Scottish Episcopal Church, http://scotland.anglican.org/index.php/dioceses/)
the diocesan party had triumphed, for the pragmatic reason that in the absence of crown appointments the Scottish Episcopacy was in serious danger of becoming extinct. Scotland’s seven dioceses (Figure 1.2) elected their own bishops, and from 1743 a set of canons to regulate the church nationally were agreed upon by the bishops acting as a committee under the chair of one of their number, called the Primus (the Archbishopric of St Andrews having been abolished in 1689). The bishops could, and did, refuse to consecrate elected candidates: Primus John Skinner vetoed George Gleig’s election several times before he was appointed coadjutor Bishop of Brechin in 1808.

In 1788 the death of Charles Edward Stuart put an end to any realistic hope of a Stuart restoration. In 1789 the bishops and most of the clergy agreed to abandon the Jacobite cause and pray for the Hanoverian monarch. Soon after, the French Revolution created an external ideological threat which gave British churchmen a strong imperative to bury their quarrels and defend their shared beliefs in God, monarchy and rank. These events paved the way for Primus John Skinner, aided by powerful Scottish Episcopal laymen and clerical allies within the Church of England, to petition parliament for relief from the penal laws. The laws were repealed in 1792, meaning that by the period of this study the Scottish Episcopal Church was no longer illegal. However, the effect of long-term oppression and division on the Episcopal Church over the eighteenth century had been catastrophic. The aptness of the description put in the mouth of his character Pleydell, ‘the shadow of a shade’, has yet to be challenged. Rowan Strong, who provides a more detailed account of this political background in the introduction to his Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland, estimates that decline stabilised in the early nineteenth century at around 2.5% of the population.

Although it became much more difficult for Scottish clergy to ‘qualify’ as tolerated dissenters after 1748, qualified chapels did not die out, but in fact flourished on a small scale as the Scottish Episcopal Church struggled. English or Irish clergy could qualify to open independent chapels in Scotland, praying for the Hanoverian King and using the English Book of Common Prayer. The economic integration of Scotland into Britain described above effectively inflated the penalty of exclusion for high-ranking Episcopal laity, creating a small market force attracting English immigrant clergy to minister to...

---

52 Strong, Episcopalianism, p.1.
Episcopalians wishing to benefit from the new British salaries and opportunities without actually defecting to the Presbyterians. From an ecclesiological point of view the qualified chapels were completely unsatisfactory: they had no connection to the Scottish Episcopal Church, and indeed no Episcopal oversight at all. Their identity rested on the Episcopal ordination of their clergy and their patronage by high-ranking Scottish Episcopal laity. They have suffered at the hands of Episcopalian historians: Marion Lochhead for example described them as ‘intruding clerics from England, who refused canonical obedience to the Diocesan’, ‘wilfully separated brethren’ who lured the faithful away from the the ‘Scottish fold’[53] However, such criticism is based on the luxury of knowing the Scottish Episcopal Church did survive and subsequently revive to develop a purist attitude to its own structures. Scottish Episcopalian worship in the eighteenth century was almost indistinguishable from Presbyterian, and over the century haemorraged members to the Presbyterians.[54] The importance of qualified chapels in providing a pragmatic holding-pool for lay families who would otherwise be likely to have lost their allegiance to Episcopalianism altogether, and who retained an active interest in restoring the Scottish Episcopal Church (demonstrated below, p. 86), should not be underestimated.

Qualified episcopalian chapels flourished in late eighteenth-century Edinburgh. The most prominent was the Cowgate Chapel which opened in 1774 (Map, 37). The first in the New Town was St George’s, founded in 1790 at the east end (Map, 20). Charlotte Chapel, founded in 1794 in West Register Street (Map, 21) and moving in 1797 to the new West End, was the last qualified chapel to be opened in Edinburgh, two years after the penal laws had been repealed.

The negotiations to unite the qualified chapels to the Scottish Episcopal Church took over ten years. Lochhead’s portrayal of the qualified chapels as Scottish Episcopalian schismatics dates back to the view of contemporary observers like English Hutchinsonian William Stevens.[55] However, post-1745 qualified chapels with English rectors, unlike early eighteenth-century ones whose Scottish clergy took oaths of allegiance against Church policy, cannot be regarded as having broken away from the Episcopal church, as they had never been part of it. Their reluctance to unite was not due to any schismatical tendency: once the barriers were overcome, most united willingly. Yet, with the exception of a brief period in the seventeenth century, the English and Scottish churches had

[54]Strong, Episcopalianism, p. 33.
never been united, and there were deep theological and cultural differences, explored in the next section, to be overcome. However, in 1805 the Scottish Episcopal Church at the Synod of Laurencekirk, chaired by the Primus John Skinner, agreed to measures which would enable the qualified chapels to unite, and a few weeks later Charlotte Chapel became the first to do so. **Daniel Sandford**'s role in this important development is explored in Chapter Two.

**Scottish Episcopalian Theology**

The term ‘high church’ remains in current parlance within the Scottish Episcopal Church and is used ubiquitously in Scottish Episcopalian history, yet unless carefully defined it is worse than useless. A full study of Scottish Episcopalian high church theology in the light of better understanding of the British context remains to be done. Until the late-twentieth century, Scottish Episcopal historians such as Marion Lochhead regarded early nineteenth-century Scottish high churchmanship as explicable in terms of Tractarian hindsight: ‘the Oxford Movement was very new, very exciting, startling indeed to most English churchmen: to the Church in Scotland it was only a bringing forth of treasures long hidden [...] the tradition and doctrine that the Faithful Remnant had known and taught’ [56]. Peter Nockles’ examination of Scottish high churchmanship is, as his title quotation ‘Our Brethren in the North’ implies, deliberately viewed from an English perspective.[57] Perhaps the best recent assessments of episcopalian theology are by Gavin White, although his work does not include a survey of high churchmanship as such.[58] However, some attempt to unravel the Scottish ‘high church’ is necessary to understanding the context of Charlotte Chapel. There appear to have been at least four different meanings of ‘high church’ used of the Scottish Episcopal Church in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, of which one is vague, one misleading, and two are important but describe very different and fiercely opposed theological positions.

The term ‘high church’ is sometimes used loosely in Scotland to mean simply Episcopalian as opposed to Presbyterian, deriving from the terminology used of church parties of the seventeenth century. The ‘young Tennis-players’ in James Hogg’s *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*, for example, ‘were all of the Jacobite order; or, at all

---

[56] Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland*, p. 44.
events, leaned to the Episcopal side [...] the Cavalier, or High-Church party. This definition is too broad to be particularly useful in discriminating between Episcopalians, but the historian should be aware of it.

More often, ‘high church’ is currently used within the Episcopal Church, as in the Church of England, to mean a liking for formal ritual reaffirmed from the 1830s by the Oxford Movement and its appeal to Roman Catholic practice. This definition is applied retrospectively to the early nineteenth-century church by the kind of teleological narratives of historians such as Lochhead, but is highly misleading since before the 1830s incense, plainchant and chasubles were just as alien to the Scottish Episcopal Church as data-projectors, t-shirts and guitars. In the late eighteenth century the Episcopal Church was characterised by strong anti-Catholicism. In 1778, Daniel Sandford’s predecessor Bishop William Abernethy Drummond of Edinburgh collaborated with the Evangelical leader John Erskine, minister of Old Greyfriars, to oppose the repeal of penal laws against Roman Catholics. Scottish Episcopal clergy did not retain the surplice after the Reformation as the Church of England did under the Elizabethan settlement. According to Francis Eeles, ‘the black gown was the vesture for all ministrations until the Synod of Aberdeen in 1811 recommended the cautious introduction of the surplice, which was not used in many churches until very much later’; he reported that Sandford believed that his chapel ‘would have been pulled about his ears’ had he worn something so popish as a surplice on his first arrival in Scotland. During the eighteenth century, the Presbyterian and Episcopalian churches were stylistically almost indistinguishable. The only differences between Episcopal and Presbyterian services during the eighteenth century was the doxology at the end of the psalm and the use of the Lord’s Prayer every Sunday, although the use of the English Prayer Book services spread during the century. The reunited Scottish Episcopal Church in the early nineteenth century did see a renewed interest in beautifying worship with elements such as music, architecture and stained-glass. Daniel Sandford was in the forefront of this movement, which is discussed below on p. 78, but far from being a high-church preoccupation it was, as shall be seen, derived
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from his interest in antiquarianism and the Romantic movement, in which high churchmen appear conspicuous by their absence.

High churchmanship in the early nineteenth-century Scottish Episcopal Church was not about liturgy but theology. Unfortunately, the term applied to two distinct positions, Hutchinsonianism and Toryism, which, in Scotland (unlike England) were quite strongly disconnected and fiercely antagonistic. In England, ‘High Church’ and ‘Tory’ were approximately synonymous and represented one of the two main national political positions, within which the Hutchinsonians were a small group with a particular theological interest. In Scotland, however, Church-and-King Toryism was a deeply problematic position since the monarch had disestablished the Episcopal Church. This helps explain why Jacobitism was so strong in Scotland: not because of a sentimental attachment to the House of Stuart, but because the House of Hanover did not, as in England, supply its place as the head of a national Episcopal Church. Abandoning Jacobitism, for high church Episcopalians, meant abandoning Toryism.

It was noted above that the Scottish Episcopal Church did abandon Jacobitism, and therefore Toryism, in 1789. The man who led this movement, persuading his colleagues to pray for King George and seek the ecclesiastical status of tolerated dissenters, was Bishop Abernethy Drummond, building on his efforts to distance Episcopalianism from supposedly disloyal Roman Catholicism. The theology which he and many of his colleagues adopted was Hutchinsonianism. John Hutchinson (1674–1737) was a Hebraist who aimed to demolish the mechanical physics of Newton in favour of a providential alternative through the ambiguities of vowel points in the Hebrew Old Testament: the shared root of ‘glory’ and ‘heavy’, for example, he said suggested that gravity was a phenomenon of the glory of God. In 1788 English Hutchinsonian George Horne explained that fossils proved the universal deluge was possible because the earth had been hollow and filled with water. Hutchinsonianism was important, as Gavin White has shown, not only in extricating the Scottish Episcopal Church from Jacobitism, but also in reinvigorating Episcopalian spirituality, and engaging the support of English Hutchinsonians who were instrumental in repealing the penal laws. However, as Robert Andrews’
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recent reassessment concluded, Hutchinsonianism’s ‘reputation of being eccentric, obscurantist, and highly reactionary […] to a great extent was true’. A hundred years after Newton’s philosophy had become mainstream in Scottish universities, and as the Enlightenment flourished around them, Scottish Episcopal clergy committed themselves to an anti-scientific worldview.

A younger generation of leading Scottish Episcopalians, including Bishop Andrew MacFarlane of Ross, and the energetic Primus John Skinner, continued a Scottish Episcopalian Hutchinsonian tradition into the nineteenth century. Their political position after repeal of the penal laws, as Rowan Strong has observed, was grateful loyalty towards the Hanoverian state for granting toleration to their church. There is nostalgia in John Skinner’s tone, preaching at Daniel Sandford’s ordination, for ‘the venerable remains of the old Episcopal, & once established Church of Scotland’. Yet, introducing his Charge to the Clergy of Aberdeen a few months later, Skinner described the Episcopal Church in nonconformist terminology as ‘the small Ecclesiastical Society to which they [his clergy] belong’. In this Charge he appeared to have abandoned any desire to re-establish the Scottish Episcopal Church, and distanced himself from the arguments of high church Toryism. Skinner criticised ‘the most zealous writers of the church of England’ who make ‘the first […] argument for keeping in the communion of that church that it is the church established by law’, since ‘were the opposite party ever to prevail there, as it did here’, the argument ‘would, with no little triumph, be turned against the church’. Rather, he argued, the ‘firmer and safer ground’ for defending Episcopalian worship is ‘its doctrine, discipline and worship, as conformable to the most pure and primitive standards’. Political establishment had been abandoned by the Scottish Hutchinsonian high church. Like their English Hutchinsonian counterparts they had little interest in politics, but unlike them they could not be considered as ‘Church and King’ Tories by default.

However, there was a second, younger group of Scottish Episcopalians, also described as high church, who rejected Hutchinsonianism and restored a neo-Tory ideology to Scottish Episcopalian theology. This group included George Gleig (1753-1840), Bishop of
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Brechin from 1810, and the younger James Walker (1770-1841), Rector of St Peter’s, Edinburgh (Map, 36). Beginning their careers after fear of Jacobitism and Episcopal persecution had waned, and at a time when possibilities for travel and cosmopolitan education were expanding, these men rejected the anti-Enlightenment beliefs of Hutchinsonianism and were strongly influenced by English Tory conformist ideal of all the subjects of one king worshipping with one liturgy in one church: they sought to make Toryism truly British. Gleig was a corresponding Scottish member of the Hackney Phalanx, which represented a new wave of high churchmanship in the Church of England, a strong social network but with no strongly defined theological position except for rejection of Hutchinsonianism in favour of modern science. Walker was educated at Cambridge University. ‘I wish it was possible to prevent the publication of Bishop Skinner’s sermon’, wrote Gleig, when the Episcopal Church was celebrating Skinner’s achievement at Laurencekirk and Sandford’s union. ‘Bishop Skinner’s style is far from elegant or even correct’. Gleig had discussed the sermon with Walker, and they thought that Sandford should revise it: ‘no Scotchman [...] need be ashamed to confess himself less acquainted with the English idiom, than a native of London and a graduate of the University of Oxford’. This was Gleig at his most tactful. Marion Lochhead quotes his comment on a sermon of Skinner’s twenty years earlier: ‘in unity of subject and perspicacity of thought [...] so miserably deficient that although I have read it again and again [...] I can only hazard a probable conjecture what are the main doctrines its author means to inculcate’. The younger High Church Episcopalians regarded their Hutchinsonian seniors as parochial and ignorant.

However, prose style was the least of the differences between older and younger high churchmen. Whereas the Hutchinsonians, who remembered Episcopal persecution, had concentrated on developing a self-sufficient Episcopal spirituality capable of co-existing peacefully alongside other protestants, the younger and bolder Tory Episcopalians made it clear that they did not regard the established Church of Scotland as a true church. In the preface to his sermon at Daniel Sandford’s consecration in 1806, Walker described his difficult choice between truth and peace, publishing ‘with considerable reluctance’ for fear of ‘giving offence to many whom it is not my intention to offend’, and asserting that ‘from all sort of controversy [...] I am extremely averse’, an apolo-
getic disclaimer which became characteristic of his controversialist outbursts. Walker adopted the Whig narrative of historians like David Hume which celebrated English institutions over Scottish: ‘In England this event [the Reformation] was conducted with distinguished moderation. The leaders [...] rejected with firmness the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome; but they did not absurdly think that they had to form a new Church, or found a new Religion’ – as had occurred in Scotland. The Presbyterians, Walker implied, had broken apostolic succession and left the true church, in ‘passion, and prejudice, and violence’. At this point, Walker or his publisher grew nervous, and inserted a lengthy footnote to justify this strong anti-Presbyterian language, defending his right when ‘called upon by duty, to state to the members of our own Church the nature and grounds of our principles’ and ‘liberty to defend ourselves when we are attacked’, a striking statement only fourteen years after the repeal of the penal laws – but Walker had been at Cambridge University at the time: the generations had moved on.

Although not quite brazen enough to say so in this sermon (and a study of the thought of this ‘most distinguished scholar of his day in the Episcopal church’ remains to be done), it seems fairly clear Walker desired re-establishment, as subsequent Scottish Episcopal high churchmen openly stated. By the 1850s, for example, J.M. Neale’s hagiographical history of Sandford’s contemporary Bishop Patrick Torry followed common high-church practice in referring to the Episcopal Church optimistically as the ‘Church of Scotland’.

Anti-Presbyterianism became the distinguishing feature of George Gleig’s theology, particularly after 1816 when he interpreted evangelicalism within the Church of England as the insidious spread of a form of Presbyterian Calvinism. In 1819 he used his Charge to the Clergy of Brechin to launch an attack on the doctrine of Original Sin, as the basis of Calvinism: ‘That any one can be really guilty of a sin which was committed 6000 years before he was born, I have no hesitation to pronounce impossible [...] Few members of our church, I believe, admit this incomprehensible doctrine’. This was a significant departure from Christian orthodoxy symptomatic of how far Gleig’s perspective had been affected by his fear of encroaching Calvinism. Gleig understood the entire Evangelical movement as a Calvinist ‘torrent, which threatens to overwhelm us’. Meanwhile, Walker warned that ‘the enthusiast dreams of an invisible kingdom made
up of the elect, and dotes upon certain spiritual influences and heavenly impulses, which subsist in the hearts of those favoured individuals. The new Tory Episcopalians felt threatened by their Presbyterian neighbours, and rejected the Hutchinsonians’ view that disestablishment was the purest form of church, and that peaceful co-existence amongst other Protestants could be a stable and happy situation.

Understanding the Hutchinsonian and Tory division helps explain the heated and sometimes baffling debate over the communion office and the surplice which took place amongst Scottish Episcopalians in this period. The Scottish communion office evolved over the eighteenth century, through the attempts of English non-jurors and notably the Scottish Bishop Thomas Rattray to restore a more ‘primitive’ liturgy with a less strongly memorialist theology than Cranmer’s Church of England office. However, like many aspects of the eighteenth-century Scottish Episcopal Church, the liturgy had little formal status other than customary usage. The Hutchinsonians preferred the Scottish office, whereas the younger Tories, interested in British conformity, favoured the English Book of Common Prayer, despite its Calvinist implications. The Hutchinsonians, whose priority was to find the most authentic Episcopalian form of church government and liturgy, thought the Book of Common Prayer too Calvinist, as they thought the surplice too Catholic. It was on the grounds of Gleig’s preference for the English office that Skinner refused to admit him to the Episcopal bench: Gleig was eventually made Bishop of Brechin on signing a declaration of his ‘steady adherence to [...] our excellent Communion office, the use of which I will strenuously recommend’.

Tory support for ‘popish’ surplice and ‘Calvinist’ liturgy showed their commitment to conformity to Church of England practices; Hutchinsonian opposition showed, like Scottish Presbyterian dissenters, their commitment to theological purity. ‘High Church’, in the early nineteenth-century Episcopal Church, therefore described two fiercely opposed theologies. Hutchinsonianism was anti-Enlightenment, anti-Catholic, focused on personal spirituality and (unlike in England) believed in being a church whose superior qualities spoke for themselves within a pluralistic, tolerant Protestant state. Hutchinsonianism characterised the Scottish episcopate at the start of Daniel Sandford’s ministry. Toryism was pro-Enlightenment, anti-Presbyterian, focused on political en-
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gagement and controversy, and longed for a single British-wide Episcopal Church using one liturgy. It formed the predominant voice within Scottish Episcopalianism during Daniel Sandford’s episcopate. Neither Hutchinsonianism nor Toryism were concerned with worship style: arguments about surplices and communion liturgy based on conformity versus purity had no reference to the effect of liturgical changes on the congregation, and the two sides’ preferences did not fit with subsequent ideas of ‘high’ or ‘low’.

One reason it took so long for the qualified chapels to unite with the Scottish Episcopal Church was that the theology of their English rectors tended to differ from either of these high church positions. Clergy such as Archibald Alison (1757-1838), minister of the Cowgate Chapel and Sydney Smith, assistant minister of Charlotte Chapel, were enlightened latitudinarians. They were attracted to Edinburgh by its reputation for science and learning, had close affinities with Dugald Stewart and the Whigs, and for this reason had little affinity with anti-Newtonian Hutchinsonians. Since they had come to Scotland to minister in tolerated, dissenting independent chapels, it was unsurprising that they were not characterised by a high church-and-king Tory ideal of episcopacy, but instead tended to favour religious plurality and toleration. When Edward Bannerman Ramsay recalled the ‘most friendly terms’ on which the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches co-existed in Edinburgh when he first joined it, all the Episcopalian ministers he named as exemplary – ‘Bishop Sandford, Dr. Morehead, Rev. Archibald Alison, Rev. Mr Shannon’ – were formerly ministers of qualified chapels.\(^{85}\) There appears to have been a theological gulf between the high church parties in the Scottish Episcopal Church and the ministers of qualified chapels, which helps to explain their reluctance to unite.

As noted in the introduction to this section, a full study of Scottish Episcopalian theology remains to be done. The picture was more complex than this summary portrays: not all Scottish Episcopalians could be neatly categorised as Hutchinsonian or Tory. For example, Alexander Jolly (1756-1838), the tea-brewing Bishop of Moray, rejected Hutchinsonianism but developed a mystical theology in opposition to his contemporary George Gleig.\(^ {86}\) However, this overview provides the context necessary for understanding Charlotte Chapel and for a detailed study of Daniel Sandford (p. 75). The Presbyterian characterisation of the Episcopal Church as ‘high’ was broadly correct; however, the two varieties of high churchmen, the older Hutchinsonians and the younger Tories, were so different as for it to be misleading to consider them in one bracket. An interest in a more
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beautiful worship style was not a feature of either side. The rectors of Qualified Chapels tended to be latitudinarian. As for Daniel Sandford, Chapter Two argues that while he variously collaborated and disagreed with all three of these groups, he cannot satisfactorily be categorised with any of them.

1.4 Literature Review

While the specific topics of Edinburgh, the Episcopal Church, and Daniel Sandford in particular have suffered from historiographical neglect, the themes of religion, society, wealth, political culture and gender discussed in this thesis represent broad and well-developed strands in British historiography. This overview aims to help set the thesis in this wider thematic context prior to more detailed historiographical discussion at the relevant points in the following chapters.

Daniel Sandford

Historians have not been kind to Daniel Sandford. In 1830 his son published the two-volume posthumous Remains of the late Right Reverend Daniel Sandford, including a biography and a selection of diary extracts, letters and sermons, an apparently comprehensive work which achieved widespread circulation: it was reviewed in the British Critic; Coleridge and memorialist Mrs Grant recorded their reactions to it; and it was referred to forty years later at the funeral sermon of Sandford’s curate in Kent.87 John Sandford’s depiction of his father as a genial, unremarkable, via media Anglican has never been questioned.

Reginald Foskett devoted a monograph to Sandford in 1966, which commended his ‘work of reconciliation’, but concluded that he was ‘not a great scholar or an outstanding bishop’.88 Marion Lochhead’s warmer praise the same year, that when ‘vital religion was at a low ebb […] Sandford valued the Scottish Liturgy and the true Scots Episcopacy’ unlike ‘intruding English clergy and […] anglicising Scots’, has an impressionistic and partisan air.89 Rowan Strong, whose insightful social history of the Episcopal Church suffers from inattention to theology, assumes that ‘Calvinism formed the main paradigm
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for Evangelicalism’ in Scotland, and was therefore the preserve of the Presbyterians. He also misreads George Grub’s confusing account of bishops’ correspondence in 1826, thinking that Sandford (not Bishop Gleig as Grub says) had called Evangelicalism ‘fanaticism’, on which basis Strong labelled Sandford anti-Evangelical. Patricia Meldrum cited evidence from a Calvinist in 1799 and a Tractarian in 1844 (before, and long after, Sandford’s episcopate), to argue for the existence of a ‘rather staid and formalised stance’ in the Episcopal Church, awaiting ‘more vibrant expressions of Christianity’, especially in Sandford’s Edinburgh where her study is focused.

In his social history of Scottish religion Callum Brown mistakenly aligned the Scottish Episcopal Church theologically with the Roman Catholic Church. The subtler understandings of English Regency theology, developed by scholars including Reginald Ward, Peter Nockles, Mark Smith and Stephen Taylor have yet to penetrate Scottish Episcopalian historiography. Mary Cosh’s compendious Edinburgh: The Golden Age (2003) quotes contemporary pen-portraits of Sandford amongst the other preachers of Edinburgh, but religion has not featured largely in general histories of Edinburgh in this period, and a bishop neglected by his own dissenting church has certainly not been regarded as a cultural force worth mentioning.

Sandford emerges from the literature as a grey figure: highish or via media, with a knack for reconciliation that derived from a weak commitment to any particular theology. It is hardly surprising that during the twentieth century the congregation of St John’s moved the memorial to their founder out of sight during refurbishments, a forgotten worthy. Relying on John Sandford’s memoir, the literature has failed to engage with Sandford’s own published writings, unpublished letters, and contemporary reports of his ministry for example in newspapers. This reassessment uses all these sources to suggest that Sandford has been misunderstood and underestimated, and deserves greater recognition for originality and development within the Scottish Episcopal Church.
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The Congregation

All the prosopographical studies of religion mentioned above explored the social origins of their subjects. Barrie-Curien found the clergy in eighteenth-century London to be far less connected to the gentry than might have been expected. MacIver found 80 per cent of elders in the 1820 Church of Scotland General Assembly formed a connected landed/legal interest. MacLaren observed in 1850s Aberdeen a breakdown in the old eighteenth-century alliance between landed and merchant families, who were being replaced by a new emergent, socially mobile and Free Church middle class as the leaders of the church. Thanks to studies like these, religious activity forms a window into changes in British society which Charlotte Chapel can open further. In terms of the social composition of Episcopal congregations, the prevailing portrait is one of elitism: Callum Brown argued that in the nineteenth-century Episcopal church, ‘identification with the landed and middle classes made its relations with other social groups more difficult’; while MacLaren noted that contemporary observers’ opinion of the Episcopal church in 1850s Aberdeen was that, ‘the gospel is not preached to the poor, the congregation being select and upish [sic]’

Nationality is as important in understanding the congregation of Charlotte Chapel as social rank. John Sandford’s remark that his father’s ‘congregation was at first chiefly composed of English families residing in Edinburgh’ has been quoted by St John’s historians as if, taken together with Sandford’s Englishness, this was all that required to be said about the national identity of the congregation. The evidence of the chapel registers provides a far deeper understanding of the congregation’s complex national identity.

A thorough Scottish population history is still awaited, and statistics before 1850 are rare, although Helen Dingwall’s study of the 1694 Edinburgh Poll Tax shows, for an earlier period, that demographic studies are possible. In 1985 Tranter’s survey remarked that for this period ‘so few data exist on marital ages in Scotland that it is impossible even to guess at their trend’, and subsequent work has done little to fill in the picture.
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a small and selective group like Charlotte Chapel can provide a basis for challenging some of the received assumptions about early nineteenth-century Edinburgh society.

**Wealth and Economy**

The most detailed studies of Regency Edinburgh’s society and economy have been those focusing on its most striking feature: the built environment of the Old and New Towns. Richard Rodger’s exploration of land, property and trusts identifies the huge impact of the 1826 crash on Edinburgh’s development. George Gordon’s study of the status areas of Edinburgh, although beginning in 1855, brings to light the higher level of integration in the first New Town compared with subsequent developments: although ‘dominated socially by the large terraced mansions’, it ‘incorporated blocks of flatted dwellings [...] from houses spanning two floors to tiny garret rooms [...] located in both the main and minor thoroughfares so that classification of status is particularly difficult’. While the difference between Old and New Town forms an important theme of this study, the New Town was not an exercise in segregation: its defiance of statistical analysis is in itself telling evidence of its social integration.

Edinburgh’s prominence in Scottish economic history has, if anything, declined in recent decades. In 1969 T.C. Smout acknowledged the importance of Edinburgh’s consumer boom in the later eighteenth century and the example it set in other towns. More recently, Chris Whatley concluded Edinburgh was too small to act as a London-style engine of growth, but his comparison in 1700 was long before Scottish economic take-off. Richard Sher’s study of the book trade, and Bob Harris’ of the Scottish ‘urban renaissance’, are largely focused on other burghs, although they acknowledge Edinburgh’s importance as a centre, conduit and source for a commodity-based Enlightenment. For a pre-statistical era, exploring the economic activity of networks of individuals is the most fruitful method for getting beyond national generalisations. Such detailed study was the methodology Tom Devine used in his study of Glasgow tobacco merchants in the 1770s, but similar studies have not been undertaken for Edinburgh, resulting in an extraordi-
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nary blind spot for the capital in Devine’s wider surveys. While a balance of material in favour of the city of Devine’s primary research and a rebalancing of scholarly Scottish history away from the centre of its heritage industry was certainly justified, his assertion of Glasgow’s economic primacy over Edinburgh as early as the union is a distortion. Devine may plead a lack of support from his colleagues, in the absence of dedicated analyses of Edinburgh’s economy other than those already mentioned. Clive Lee, writing on the social aspects of economic growth, cited Stana Nenadic’s study of Glasgow to argue that Scotland was hampered by lack of a ‘middle class’ in the later eighteenth century, without looking for one in Edinburgh.

While the economic impact of the French wars received considerable attention in the 1980s from historians of Britain including Patrick O’Brien, François Crouzet and Larry Neal, this tended to remain at a macro-economic level and left their impact on Scottish society largely unexplored. Subsequently, more detailed local studies have examined the relationship between war, wealth and society in Scotland, in particular Andrew MacKillop’s exploration of military recruitment in the Hebrides, and Bob Harris’ assessment on the effect of wartime food crises on Scottish society. Roland Thorne’s account of the free-trade Whig Francis Horner, brother of Charlotte Chapel member Leonard, and Finlay McKichan’s of the clash between the Tory Lord Seaforth’s high-minded, short-sighted paternalism, and his agent Colin MacKenzie’s hard-nosed realism (p. 193), hint that Whigs and Tories who came from Dugald Stewart’s Edinburgh had more in common with one another in their ‘scientific’ approach to economic policy than they did with other members of their own parties. Yet the picture remains patchy, with a gulf between individual biography and broad generalisation – and Edinburgh remains absent.

The abundance of East Indian connections in Charlotte Chapel congregation and their striking wealth, discussed on p. 157, suggest that Edinburgh might be a fruitful location.
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for reassessing India’s impact on the Scottish economy. Peter Marshall’s impressive description of wealth flowing from India ends with its melancholy disappearance into the sand of gentleman-nabobs who rarely ‘regarded their fortunes as capital for further investing’, a conclusion repeated by Martin Daunton in his authoritative analysis of British economic development. In a Scottish context, Chris Whatley challenged this assumption by suggesting nabob estate development might in itself have been economically important. Andrew MacKillop is currently undertaking significant research in this area, arguing in a recent article that while it is difficult to estimate, and easy to exaggerate, the amount Scotland took from India, Asian wealth undoubtedly contributed to Scotland’s remarkable development between the 1750s and the 1820s. The Charlotte Chapel biographies provide an opportunity to contribute to this ongoing discussion in terms of Edinburgh’s role. Was it true, for example, as Devine suggests, that nabobs were from largely privileged backgrounds meaning that while their wealth might have more economic significance than has been recognised, it

**Politics, Piety and Gender**

Understanding of the connections between politics and religion in Regency Edinburgh has been slow to develop, because the political intelligentsia have been regarded as highly secularised. [Henry Cockburn](#) maintained that in 1805, when Tory moderates attacked the academic John Leslie on the grounds of his endorsement of Hume’s potentially atheist philosophy, ‘metaphysics had nothing to do with the matter […] Clerical domination over seats of learning was the real subject’. For historians of the Leslie affair, John Morrell, Michael Fry, and more recently Charles Bradford-Bow, this is confirmation that, even where the church was involved, political activity in Edinburgh had secular motivations. [Walter Scott](#) is described by David Hewitt as a man who ‘had no religious beliefs’; while Iain MacIver thought [Cockburn](#) was ‘certainly out of sympathy with the prevailing ecclesiastical ethos of his age’, although found no evidence that he
was an unbeliever.¹¹⁹ (Neither MacIver nor Cockburn’s biographer Miller, in their long discussions of Cockburn’s relationship with the established church, raise the possibility that he might have been Episcopalian.¹²⁰) Dugald Stewart and the Edinburgh Reviewers are often represented as being, if not positively sceptical, simply uninterested in religion. Fontana notes that Stewart’s Elements of the Philosophy of Human Mind (1792) agreed that religious questions were beyond the bounds of metaphysical enquiry, but that the import of this was not anti-religious, but rather a fruitful one for experimental science, to which his students’ attention was turned.¹²¹

However, the confidence of contemporary historians that Edinburgh politics can be discussed with little reference to religion is based largely on the censures of later churchmen. ‘Church life in Scotland to-day is very different from what it was when [...] Sandford left his English curacy and came to Edinburgh [...] Religion was at a very low ebb’, wrote St John’s Rector George Terry, introducing his centenary history of the church in 1918.¹²² Terry was repeating a received wisdom which dated back to temptingly near-contemporary accounts such as those of John Sandford, who authoritatively declared that ‘sceptical opinions dressed in an attractive style, and recommended by the virtues, as well as by the genius of their authors, at that time prevailed to an alarming extent’, although John was too young to have a personal recollection of this ‘extremely questionable’ era.¹²³ This sweeping accusation of scepticism had shaky foundation in contemporary partisan Tory accusations, such as in the Leslie affair or in the equation of Whig campaigns for political reform with French Jacobinism (p.¹¹⁷). The work of ecclesiastical historians to exonerate the laity of the Georgian Church of England from the charge of religious indifference¹²⁴ has failed to desecularise the reputation of the Edinburgh literati. Henry Cockburn described a sharp vertical distinction between Whigs and Tories in Edinburgh: ‘Even in private society, a Whig was viewed somewhat as a Papist was in the
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days of Titus Oates [...] Whigs had to associate solely with Whigs.\textsuperscript{125} Political historians of Regency Edinburgh have tended to assume and confirm this division by studying one side or other, for example Michael Fry’s study of the Dundas Despotism, or Trent Orme’s forthcoming study of Whig Fox dinners.\textsuperscript{126} While political historians might have neglected religion, ecclesiastical historians have been alert to the importance of politics. Gavin White’s study of the importance of Hutchinsonian theology in reorientating the Episcopal Church away from Jacobitism was noted above (p. 26). In Rowan Strong’s account, the need to demonstrate political loyalty was the chief obsession of the fragile and recently-proscribed Scottish Episcopal Church throughout the French Revolutionary period and beyond.\textsuperscript{127}

British gender history has been dominated by a narrative of women’s long struggle out of the ‘domestic sphere’ in which a patriarchal society imprisoned them.\textsuperscript{128} Much useful research has resulted from this ideological approach, which remains a strong thread in the literature.\textsuperscript{129} However, it results in a skewed historiography with sometimes paradoxical conclusions: Cohen presents the 1790s trend for silent listening as demonstrating depth of mind as, for the man, a neutral change in fashion, whereas it ‘disempowered’ the woman.\textsuperscript{130} The revisionist picture, pioneered by Amanda Vickery and developed in subsequent studies, argues for continuity of experience of women and men, based on a shared understanding of the different roles and relationships of genders, as of ranks, persisting through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with considerable space for choice and self-expression within this framework.\textsuperscript{131} Using the economic and intellectual resources at their command – persuasion, purchasing power, the press – women were influential in shaping the physical and ideological world around them.\textsuperscript{132} Marriage, social-
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ising or consumption continued to be informed by a mixture of economic, sentimental and social considerations. While maintaining specified roles, and preserving certain exclusive spaces, women and men crossed paths and exchanged ideas in public and private throughout the two centuries. Most of the perceived ‘revolutions’ in domestic and gender attitudes, such as the supposed shift from ‘patriarchal’ to ‘companionate’ marriage during the late eighteenth century, or the imprisonment of women within a ‘domestic sphere’, have been challenged by new research.

In Scotland, Rosalind Marshall provided an optimistic account of highly-educated and emotionally sophisticated women of fashion in late eighteenth century Edinburgh. The 1990s saw a spate of scholarly and popular publications about Scottish women’s history characterised by an energetic outrage against ‘the blindness of historians to the significance of women’s experience, not to say on occasion to the fact of women’s existence’. Since then, the Whiggish narrative of Marshall and the marxist-feminist outrage of the 1990s have begun to be subjected to revision by detailed studies such as Stana Nenadic’s on the worldview of Highland gentry women and Jane Rendall’s on the participation of wives and daughters of Scottish academics in the enlightenment.

Religion and gender have a long association in Scottish history, the traditional narrative linking women’s liberation with the declining social control of the Kirk. More recently historians have regarded the role of the Kirk as changing rather than declining: Lindy Moore argues that the Enlightenment transformed Presbyterian attitudes on the
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education of women from hostility to a stronger encouragement than in England: ‘the idea that girls were being educated for the “women’s sphere” was no less prevalent in Scotland but academic instruction was deemed a necessary part of the process’ on the basis of a theology of making full use of God-given abilities. Religious issues are put firmly at the centre of modern British gender history in Davidoff and Hall’s *Family Fortunes*, which argues that the middle classes appropriated a strong ideology of domesticity and gendered ‘spheres’, based on Evangelical religion, to assert cultural primacy over an aristocracy perceived as degenerate. Callum Brown explores the consequences of their thesis for religious history, arguing that the feminisation and privatisation of religion during the nineteenth century meant that, while society remained ostensibly religious, it was on a feminised basis which crumbled when, in the 1960s, women rejected the role assigned to them. The narrative has been challenged in a recent collection of essays edited by Sue Morgan and Jacqueline de Vries. Sarah Williams, for example, notes that whereas gender historians have a sophisticated understanding of gender identity, assessment of spirituality still tends to rely on crude measures such as church attendance.

Carmen Magnon’s study of Anglican sisterhoods as self-managed female institutions, Susan Mumm’s of how middle-class women engaging in charitable enterprises were changed by the experience, Pamela Walker’s on female preachers and Rhonda Semple’s on female missionaries all demonstrate the importance of nineteenth-century religion in liberating women from the ‘domestic sphere’. The ‘spheres’ narrative remains strong for post-1830 studies, such as Leslie Orr MacDonald’s which found that Scottish Presbyterianism ‘remained committed to a conservative domestic ideology, acting [...] to hinder the full and egalitarian recognition of personhood which has often been proclaimed as a distinctive feature of presbyterianism.
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Jane Rendall explored how Whig women in Regency Edinburgh collaborated with Evangelical ones to participate actively in the social and political issues of the day. This thesis builds on an increasingly sophisticated and integrated historiography of issues of gender and religion.

Between the mediocre bishop and Edinburgh the economic backwater with a secularised intelligentsia, the literature suggests that a study of the congregation of Charlotte Chapel might be a fairly bleak experience. However, the strongest impression to come from this survey is the underdeveloped nature of research in all these areas. The insightful and detailed studies of communities such as Vickery’s of Lancashire, Gordon and Nair’s of Glasgow, and the Morgan and de Vries essays highlight these historiographical deficiencies without addressing them. While this study can reassess in detail only Bishop Sandford, it can also contribute to and suggest the direction of further exploration of the wider questions.

Chapter 2

Daniel Sandford, 1766-1830

Daniel Sandford, founder and Rector of Charlotte Chapel, and Bishop of Edinburgh from 1806 until his death in 1830, is a largely forgotten figure both in Edinburgh and in the Scottish Episcopal Church. He has been assumed to represent a staid, high-and-dry Episcopalianism, a grey bulwark of the existing social order, safely anglicised away from any dangerous Scottish Jacobitism of the previous era, and vociferously opposed to anything which might tend to Jacobinical democratisation. This reputation is based on the recollections of a younger generation who lived in very different ideological circumstances and were frequently unperceptive commentators on their immediate predecessors. This re-examination of the thought and ministry of Daniel Sandford through his own published writings and contemporary reports of his own actions presents a very different picture. Far from being a bulwark of the late eighteenth-century social order, Daniel Sandford proves to be a Regency theologian who absorbed the ideas at the cutting-edge of early nineteenth-century Edinburgh, and who, thanks to the unique circumstances of his ministry, transformed them into an original and influential Christian message.

2.1 From the Bluestockings to Dugald Stewart

Daniel Sandford, born 1 July 1766, was the second son of Daniel Sandford of Sandford Hall, Shropshire, a clergyman in the Church of Ireland. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford, from 1781 to 1787, where he was tutored by Cyril Jackson (1746-1819), who became Dean in 1783. Sandford’s son and biographer John, who had a taste for royal connection, made much of his father’s love of Christ Church and friendship with Jack-
Figure 2.1: Daniel Sandford, 1766-1830 (Engraving based on a portrait in St John’s, reproduced in George F. Terry, Memorials of the Church of St John the Evangelist, Princes Street, Edinburgh, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Robert Grant, 1918) p. 75.)
son, who had been tutor to George III’s sons. Jackson, chiefly famous as an important ‘backstairs’ political manipulator on behalf of William Pitt, seems an unlikely influence on the high-minded, unworldly Sandford. However, his ethic of hard work made Christ Church a college which produced scholars and statesmen: ‘work […] like a Tigur, or like a Dragon, if Dragons work more & harder than Tygurs’, he wrote to the young Robert Peel. Sandford embraced this approach and Oxford’s Classical curriculum, winning the prize for Latin composition in 1787: ‘this accomplishment’, he taught John, was ‘the surest test of scholarship’. Sandford’s knowledge of Greek and Hebrew won him respect and, more importantly, marketability as a teacher when he first arrived in Edinburgh in 1792. In Christ Church Cathedral, Sandford also experienced the kind of worship he later aspired to recreate in St John’s, with the words of the liturgy enlivened by the sense of history created by a perpendicular Gothic building, and music sufficiently good to tempt connoisseurs into church.

On his father’s death in Daniel’s infancy the family moved from Dublin to Bath. Sandford was brought up by his mother, than whom, her grandson wrote, ‘few women were ever better qualified to supply the absence of paternal care’ as she was ‘well qualified to shine in the republic of letters’, that is, the aristocratic bluestocking circle of intellectual women around the wealthy and deeply religious Elizabeth Montague (1718–1800), Hester Chapone (1727–1801), one of the leading lights of the bluestockings and author of conduct books for women, was Mrs Sandford’s sister-in-law. Mrs Sandford’s closest friends were the ladies of the Bowdler family, amongst whom ‘Daniel found a friend who for nearly sixty years, displayed towards him a maternal affection’ in the pious spinster Frances. Sandford’s bluestocking mentors multiplied when he was ‘admitted, when still a boy, to the drawing rooms of the Duchess of Portland, and of the celebrated Mrs Delany’, and the influence of these women, particularly Mrs Delany, continued throughout his education as he spent his university vacations at their houses. Mrs Delany’s husband, the Dean of Down, had been the ecclesiastical superior of Sandford’s
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father in Dublin. In widowhood her particular distinction was as a talented and innovative botanical artist. At her house mingled with other bluestockings: ‘The portrait of Mrs E[izabeth] Carter reminds me of days long past, when I was admitted to Mrs Delany’s drawing room. The name of the engraver brought back […] many a pleasant and instructive evening passed with Caroline Watson’, he wrote in his diary in 1825, when Frances Bowdler sent him Watson’s engraving of the poet and classicist Carter. He also met Queen Charlotte who was sufficiently impressed with his talents to commission a French translation from him. He dedicated one of his first publications, Lectures on the Epistles for Passion-Week (1802), to this royal patron, before he joined the Scottish Episcopal Church and when preferment in England still seemed his most likely career path, but, as his son said rather bitterly, ‘hopes of future professional advancement’ were disappointed. Possibly, so soon after the French Revolution when only the very safest political men gained promotion, Sandford’s injunction in these lectures against ‘invidious distinctions’ between ‘those who are all equally sinners in the sight of that God who “hath no respect of persons”’ was too egalitarian in its emphasis for royal recommendation. Sandford dedicated his last book, Lectures on the History of the Week of the Passion, to his old still-surviving bluestocking friend, Frances Bowdler, no longer seeking patronage but acknowledging ‘days which can never be forgotten by me, and […] with no common feelings of affection and regard’. The detailed reminiscences recorded by his son and in his diary, the importance Sandford laid on the bluestocking network early in his career, and the strong emotional attachment he retained through his career in Edinburgh, all suggest the bluestockings were a significant influence.

What might this influence have meant for Sandford’s theology? Norma Clarke argued it was bluestockings like Hester Chapone who articulated a doctrine of social conservatism which persisted into the Victorian era, sustaining the social order of squire, parson and tenants, and cultivating the woman’s intellect at the expense of sexual or political liberation. Yet her example of the frustrated Becky Sharp flinging Chapone’s Letters on the Improvement of the Mind from the carriage as she escapes the school at the start of Thackeray’s Vanity Fair was a Victorian satire on the pretentious and ill-run girls’ schools of the
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1810s (and in fact it was Johnson’s *Dictionary* which Becky flung). For Mary Hilton, on the contrary, the bluestockings’ feminine latitudinarianism represented liberation, epitomised by Chapone’s recommendations that girls study subjects including Latin, history and theology for their own sake, developing their thought into the early Romantic movement in writers like Mary Wollstonecraft and Catherine Macaulay, and fading into a counter-Enlightenment reaction characterised by religious writers including the Evangelical Hannah More and high Anglican Sarah Trimmer. If bluestockingism simply meant women engaging in and influencing the developing national intellectual discourse, it is a tradition which, as Elizabeth Eger argues, includes Clarke’s Johnsonians, Hilton’s early Romantics, and the nineteenth-century religionists, and it is a mistake to try to identify an ‘end point’, as if women were silenced or lost their intellectual nerve. Contemporary usage, however, identified it particularly with female participation in the latitudinarian worldview which characterised progressive late eighteenth-century thought before the French Revolution. In this context, Anna Letitia Barbauld’s question to a younger woman, ‘pray, Madam, what is your opinion of causation? Do you agree with Dugald Stewart, Hume, and Mr Leslie, because if you do, I think you may as well throw Paley’s last work into the fire’, forms, as Hilton suggests, a suitable epitaph for the movement.

William Paley’s *Natural Theology* (1802) reasserted the ‘evidences of the existence and attributes of the Deity, collected from the appearances of nature’ against Hume’s scepticism that such ‘evidences’, the basis of latitudinarian theology, were logically demonstrable. If Sandford’s thought was fully formed by the bluestockings one might expect him to agree with Barbauld’s latitudinarianism, were it not that his closest associate in the circle was Frances Bowdler, who came from a family famous for challenging scholarly latitudinarianism with a warmer religion of the heart, and producing both high and Evangelical theologians.

Sandford was only twenty-five when he moved to Scotland in 1792, where he was exposed to the full force of the influence of Dugald Stewart. His son wrote that it was a shock to find that in the literary circles of Edinburgh ‘the drawing-room was more of an
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arena where a speaker might hazard any thing which he had abilities to defend’. This recollection is substantiated by Sydney Smith, arriving in Edinburgh six years later, in his caricature of Scots arguing about metaphysics even while lovemaking on the dance-floor: he heard a young lady ‘exclaim, in a sudden pause of the music, “What you say, my Lord, is very true of love in the abstract, but—” Here the fiddlers began fiddling furiously, and the rest was lost’. Smith also wrote in a more serious vein on why Edinburgh was buzzing with philosophy: ‘There is a professor here Dugald Stewart who beats every speaker I ever heard in manner & acting’. It would seem surprising if young and with scholarly pretensions, did not go to hear the celebrated lecturer on philosophy.

When defended Christian doctrines, he regarded the threat not as ‘Dugald Stewart, Hume, and Mr Leslie’, although Stewart was publicly endorsing Hume’s theory of causation from a nearby lectern. Stewart, following the Common Sense philosophy of Reid, made it clear that Hume’s theory applied to scientific research, and had no bearing on revelation and theology. The arguments were debated in detail in the context of the controversial appointment of John Leslie as Professor of Mathematics at Edinburgh University in 1805. Leslie was opposed by Moderate clergy on the basis that his endorsement of Hume was dangerously atheistical. Stewart said it meant no such thing, and was supported by the minister of St Cuthbert’s (Map, 6), Sir Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, leader of the Evangelical party in the Kirk. Bradford-Bow regards the opposition of the Moderates in terms of a ‘reversal of traditional ideological beliefs’ in which ‘tolerance of secular thought’ passed from the Moderates to the Evangelicals. This view goes back to Henry Cockburn’s analysis of the affair: ‘The two proper Church parties were reversed. The Moderate clergy, more indifferent about skepticism [sic] than their opponents, yet liking power above all things, were nearly unanimous against Leslie. The Wild, cordial in their horror of heresy, almost all supported the supposed disciple of Hume.’ However, this was at his least impartial or reliable: his view of Tory motivations (the Moderates were Tory) was highly cynical; while theology was a subject in which he consistently demonstrated little interest or understanding. The similarity of Anna Letitia
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Barbauld’s view ‘Do you agree with Dugald Stewart, Hume, and Mr Leslie?’ to the Moderate challenge to Leslie suggests that the affair was not merely a matter of Scottish Kirk politics, nor a shift in bluestocking thought, but a wider change in religious worldview. Sandford was certainly not ‘indifferent about skepticism’, but there is no evidence that he thought Hume’s theory of causation, as explained by Stewart, to be ‘heresy’: had he done so, it is unlikely he would have failed to address it in his publications, in which apologetic was a regular theme. The ‘hope’ of which Sandford said ‘vain modern philosophy’ had attempted to ‘rob us’ was not the existence of God, but ‘the precious doctrine of his atonement’. The Trinity, similarly, was under threat from a ‘presumptuous mode of dealing with sacred truth’ which ‘under pretence of making the system more rational’ was prone to ‘neglecting or explaining away the peculiar and distinguishing doctrines of revelation’. Sandford was not attacking the arguments of Hume or Stewart, but latitudinarian deists, closer to the Moderate tradition. A strong theme in Sandford’s 1819 sermons was the doctrine of original sin, the subject of the first two sermons and frequently addressed thereafter. Sandford’s assertion that ‘by whatever mode the corruption of human nature, consequent to Adam’s sin, was transmitted to his descendants, the fact is indisputable’ took issue not with Edinburgh philosophers, but with his Episcopal colleague George Gleig, who in 1819 cavalierly dispensed with original sin as a Calvinist heresy (p. 29). Sandford sometimes defended his interpretation of Christianity against other opponents. In 1802 he cautioned, ‘it is much to be lamented that there is such an inclination among many serious and truly pious persons, to examine and perplex themselves with questions of such subtlety and difficulty as the disputes about original sin, and predestination, and election’, a critique not so much of Presbyterian Calvinism per se as of the tendency for Calvinists to prioritise correct doctrine beyond what it was possible to know, and at the expense of charity and unity. After 1816 he defended baptismal regeneration against schismatic Anglicans (p. 55), and when his curate Charles Lane moved to London he was concerned at the influence the atheistic philosophy of Tom Paine might be having. Once Sandford did caution against ‘those who tell us, that we may trust to our own reason, and to what they vainly call philosophy’ for the ‘supply of our moral deficiencies’, implying a caution against a complete adoption of Humean philosophy, although it might also be a critique of latitudinarian rationalism.
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and ‘moral’ sermons. However, it is significant that his chief critique of this position was that it was insufficiently enlightened, not being available to all but only to scholarly initiates.\[28\] The Common Sense philosophy of Stewart, on the other hand, posed no threat to the Trinity, original sin or the atonement: indeed, by placing them in a different category to the physical world of cause and effect, it did away with the latitudinarian inclination to rationalise or explain them in a scientific context. The adoption of Stewartite ideas and support of John Leslie by the most pious clergy in Edinburgh was not a ‘tolerance of secular thought’, but part of a renewed commitment to the Enlightenment as a spiritual project.

Sandford’s publications contain no footnote like Leslie’s endorsing Hume’s theory of causation, but his endorsement of the Stewartite worldview was evident in many aspects of his ministry, such as his demonstrative friendship towards the Presbyterian ‘Wild’ in defiance of his more exclusively episcopalian colleagues Gleig and Walker (p. 88) and his championing of popular education (p. 195). His use of early latitudinarians like Whitby, Clerk, Cudworth and Warburton in preference to natural theologians, explored below (p. 68), suggests an affinity with the Platonic thread in Enlightenment Christian thought characteristic of the Common Sense approach. In one of his sermons for young persons, he sought to identify a ‘rule and guide of life’ which his audience might take away:

The characters requisite in such a rule and guide of life will appear, upon reflection, to be the following.

I. That it be level to every man’s capacity, and suited to every man’s circumstances and condition of life.

II. That it comprehend the whole scheme and system of moral duty and virtue, deterring from evil and urging to good.

III. That it regulate and strengthen every other subordinate principle which can be of service to the cause of virtue.

Such a rule will be of easy and general application– it [...] is always at hand [...] for the regulation of our conduct at all times and in all places. And such a rule, the wise man in the text tells us, we shall find in the fear of God.\[29\]

These were Enlightenment, egalitarian criteria. Against them Sandford tested three alternative ‘rules’ which aimed at moral progress: fashion or politeness, law, and ‘phi-
losophy’. These might be regarded as characteristic of the eighteenth-century English, Scottish and French Enlightenments, but they failed Sandford’s test. The laws of fashion ‘fail in comprehensiveness’, applying only to the public behaviour of the wealthy. Civil laws were only effective insofar as they were supported by religious principle, which, so recently after the French Terror, Sandford considered ‘we need not have recourse to argument to shew’. Finally, ‘godless philosophy’ was available only to the educated, and led to a subjective self-regulation which could not ‘correct the wanderings of depraved appetite’.\(^{30}\) Sandford rejected the conclusions of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment on its own terms.

The last in the series of Sandford’s Sermons for Young Persons, on ‘the Precept of Perfection, a Divine Commandment’, was particularly close in its priorities to those of Dugald Stewart, whose ‘philosophy of the mind’ was based on the idea of ‘perfectibility’ through education.\(^{31}\) The crucial difference between Sandford’s theology and Stewart’s philosophy was that Stewart asserted the Humean view that moral progress was not dependent on religious faith, whereas Sandford insisted that it was, and that apparent moral progress without faith was an illusion. However, Stewart was convincing in his assurance that his philosophy posed no challenge to religious faith: he had, after all, considered becoming an Episcopalian minister,\(^{32}\) and for both Sandford and the Presbyterian ‘Wild’, the close practical affinity between the two worldviews was sufficient to ensure their collaboration rather than conflict in early nineteenth-century Edinburgh. It was noted in the literature review (p. 37) that historians of Edinburgh’s intellectual life continue to perceive a gulf between enlightenment and religion in this period. Yet this affinity between enlightenment and evangelicalism in Edinburgh has been noted before, by gender historian Jane Rendall, who identified a similar collaboration between Whig and evangelical women 1790 and 1830 based on shared belief in civic engagement, albeit with different motivations.\(^{33}\) By attending Stewart’s lectures at the university and Sandford’s sermons in Charlotte Chapel, people growing up in Edinburgh in the early nineteenth century would hear the same message reinforced: ‘let us make it our most serious duty, as it is our greatest glory, to endeavour to “be perfect even as our Father which is in

\(^{30}\)Sandford, Sermons for Young Persons, pp. 72, 77, 79.


heaven” is perfect’. Sandford’s theology was not that of the bluestocking drawing-room, although this feminine influence may well have been important in other respects (p. 229). Like Walter Scott, he did come to critique the Stewartite Whigs, but it was in the context of the new Romantic movement, not a retreat to a Tory Moderate position. Rather, Charlotte Chapel owed its success to the preaching of a post-Revolution theology largely consistent with Stewartite philosophy, the most progressive thought in Edinburgh at the time.

2.2 Episcopalian Evangelicalism

Daniel Sandford was Evangelical: surprisingly, given that no other Evangelical episcopal clergy are known in Scotland before about 1815, and given that neither his son’s memoir nor later generations of Evangelicals described him as such. Sandford has been assumed to have shared the theology of his first patron, Bishop Beilby Porteus, a Church-and-State Anglicanism enlightened by William Paley’s natural and political theology; or else the non-Hutchinsonian Tory high churchmanship of the Hackney Phalanx, shared by his Scottish colleagues George Gleig and James Walker. Yet his theology differs significantly from theirs, and exhibits all four of the emphases which David Bebbington identified as characterising Evangelicalism: scripture, atonement, activism and conversion. Whereas the sermons of Porteus, Gleig and Walker demonstrated what Nockles described as ‘a certain declension towards chilliness’, Sandford’s Evangelical preaching retained the spiritual warmth of the Hutchinsonians, but transformed by an outward-focused confidence in the Enlightenment.

Scripture dominates Sandford’s sermons: the 199 specific quotations analysed below (p. 63) were accompanied by many more unreferenced short quotations and phrases. Such scripture-infused writing was characteristic of Evangelicals like Bishop Ryder of Gloucester, but in sharp contrast to Sandford’s Edinburgh colleagues Archibald Alison and Sydney Smith, who began with a scriptural text but then largely spoke in their own words. It was not, however, unique to Evangelicals: high churchmen, such as Richard

34Sandford, *Sermons for Young Persons*, p. 305.
Mant refuting Evangelical views of baptism, would also pile up scriptural proofs and adopt biblical language. Sandford’s use of scripture is a necessary but not a sufficient component of the case for his Evangelicalism.

Two of the four sets of sermons published were for Passion Week: the atonement was the doctrine he considered of prime importance. ‘We come not hither, to recount and to lament the sufferings of an earthly benefactor, [...] but to ponder over the atonement made for us by the SON OF GOD,’ he began his 1802 lectures. In the 1821 History of the Week of the Passion, perhaps inspired by the romantic storytelling of Walter Scott, employs emotive historical narrative to draw the listener into emotional participation in the story. His second lecture ended on a cliffhanger in the action. His third began by painting a picture of the scene: ‘The sun arose on the fifth morning of the Passion-week [...]’ and proceeds to invite the congregation to consider that ‘the intense, energetic, powerful love of Christ towards man, is become the measure that must regulate our own’.

The lecture for Good Friday has a passionate spiritual tone unexpected in an Oxford linguist, mingling biblical quotations with his own exclamations: ‘For “there is none other name under Heaven given to man, whereby we must be saved,” but thy name, O gracious and adorable Jesus, THE MESSIAH! To THEE the heavens gave a sign, and the earth acknowledged her Lord, and her Creator. “And the sun was darkened, and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent.” And the dead gave witness unto THEE, that thou hadst paid the debt, and that in THEE is justification and eternal life’.

In the seventh lecture, for Holy Saturday, he took the listeners back once again over the journey of the week, at the end of which it is themselves who are at the foot of the cross: ‘the Christian penitent, “weary and heavy laden” with the acknowledged corruption of his nature, and the burden of his transgressions, prostrates himself before the cross of Jesus Christ, and looking upwards, beholds in characters traced by the hand of Almighty Compassion, “HE HATH LOVED US, AND WASHED US FROM OUR SINS IN HIS OWN BLOOD”.

Sandford’s emphasis on the personal experience of the atonement, with the penitent picturing themself at the foot of the cross on which hangs the loving Christ, is in contrast to Anglicans with whom he might have been expected to share common ground.
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Whereas the atonement provided the subject-matter for over half of Sandford’s published output, it is difficult to find a sermon by Beilby Porteus on the subject, who when he did address it, maintained a scholarly detachment quite different in tone: ‘We embrace, with gratitude and thankfulness, the great salvation offered to us by the death of Christ,’ he concludes, after forty pages addressing intellectual objections, ‘and exert our utmost endeavours to […] live soberly, righteously, and godly.’

Porteus made an intellectual case for responding to the atonement with a moral life, whereas Sandford made an emotive case for responding with a transformed heart: ‘While we weep at the story of his sufferings, we are unworthy, utterly unworthy, of offering to his exalted nature the tribute of our sympathy. But it is the lowly sacrifice of our hearts, penetrated with a sense of the malignity of sin, that called for such an atonement’. Only half the published sermons which Sandford’s Edinburgh colleague Archibald Alison published in 1820 were on what Alison described as ‘religious’ (as opposed to philosophical or aesthetic) topics: some of these were on repentance. These demonstrate that he certainly accepted the doctrine of the atonement: ‘We have abjured our errors, and bewailed our sins before the altar of our Saviour. With that blood which was shed for us, we have sealed our acceptance of the merciful conditions of salvation’.

Yet the words ‘atonement’ or ‘cross’, which are the central to Sandford’s work, never appear in Alison’s published sermons, and his Lenten sermons on repentance quoted above suggest a preference for the depersonalised imagery of the Classical ‘altar’ to the Gothic ‘cross’. There is no place, in Alison’s account, for a personal encounter with the atoning Christ, so central to Sandford’s rhetoric. Advising his clergy on preaching, Sandford warned against such sermons that founded moral living on ‘our endeavours’: ‘while […] the preacher] enforces the topics of religion by the aid of moral reasoning, let him above all remember, that “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, namely Jesus Christ”’.

Belief that the doctrine of the atonement was true was universal amongst Anglican and Episcopalian clergy: Sandford’s belief that it was a transformative personal experience was an evangelical position.

Bebbington’s third component of evangelical thought, activism, is evident in the contrast between Sandford’s ministry and that of other English incumbents of qualified chapels in Edinburgh. Alexander Cleeve’s St George’s chapel remained small and elitist whereas, as we shall see in the next chapter, Charlotte Chapel grew large, with high proportions.
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of artisans, domestic servants, and English immigrants to Edinburgh’s developing economy. This reflected Sandford’s theology of equality around the communion table (p. 46). Alison hesitated to join an Episcopal Church with no written basis of faith and a Hutchinsonian Episcopate, whereas Sandford took the risk, acting, his son said, against the advice of ‘many of his friends’ and especially his Oxford mentor Cyril Jackson. Sandford was practising what he preached: ‘by your conduct [...] you are to prove your adherence to the conditions upon which [...] promises are made to you [...] You are thus warned, that Christianity is an active profession,’ he told the young people he had just confirmed. Mission for Sandford was linked with religious toleration: it was in collaborative activities like the Lancastrian Schools (p. 195) that Christians had the opportunity to ‘instruct their fellow creatures in the things which may “make them wise unto salvation” ’. Tolerance was characteristic of the diocese of Edinburgh during his tenure: Edward Bannerman Ramsay, regretting in 1857 that things had changed, recalled that in this earlier period, ‘There was always service in the Episcopal chapels on the National Church communion fast-days. No opposition or dislike to Episcopalian clergymen occupying Presbyterian pulpits was ever avowed as a great principle’. Sandford here shares the pluralistic attitude of the latitudinarian Alison, but distinct from high church theologians such as James Walker in Scotland and Samuel Horsley in England, who regarded apostolic succession through bishops as essential to a true church.

The most important theological challenge by Evangelicals to mainstream British Protestantism regarded the fourth point in Bebbington’s evangelical ‘quadrilateral’, conversion. A group of clergy left the Church of England in objection to its doctrine of baptismal regeneration, that is, that a person is made a Christian by the act of being baptised (usually as an infant), rather than becoming a Christian at the point of their own, conscious, conversion. The question was debated all over Britain, and in the process it became clear that Sandford’s theology was distinct from that of his high church contemporaries.

The idea of living a converted life was central to Sandford’s theology: ‘to reap the
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fruits of [...] baptism, we must be careful to shew that our conversion is not merely external and formal’, he preached in 1802. Yet he found himself in opposition to Anglican Evangelicals experiencing, as he respectfully put it, ‘the difficulty they feel to believe that Regeneration is the effect of Baptism’. How could this episcopal doctrine square with the Evangelical requirement for personal conversion? Richard Mant supplied the statement of Anglican orthodoxy recommended it as such), stressing the uncertainty of knowing when regeneration took place if not at baptism. Mant defined ‘conversion’ as the ‘rational conviction of sin [...] sincere penitence and sorrow [...] real change of heart and life [...] and a resolute perseverance in well-doing’. Henry Ryder, Evangelical Bishop of Gloucester, took a different view. Ryder also distinguished regeneration and conversion, and agreed that baptism conferred some kind of benefit termed regeneration, but he denied that to be regenerate was to have ‘entered upon the right path’. Conversion was the moment for Ryder in which the journey began, essential in the life of every Christian: ‘I would solemnly protest against that most serious error [...] of contemplating all the individuals of a baptised congregation as converted [...] Ministerial addresses founded upon it soothe and delude the people into a false peace.’ Ryder clung to Anglican orthodoxy, but only by reducing baptismal regeneration to a preliminary formality.

rejected Ryder’s enervated concept of regeneration and, like Mant, affirmed baptism as the moment of full entry to Christianity. Even in stating his orthodoxy, however, Sandford’s emphasis on participation in the atonement sounds more Evangelical than Mant’s intellectual demonstration: ‘Instead of “children of wrath,” ’ proclaimed, ‘we are made children of that dispensation which assures us of grace and mercy through the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ’ Yet equally rejected Mant’s downgrading of conversion to a rehabilitation process for the seriously reprobate: ‘as Methodists err’, Mant said, ‘by multiplying the subjects, of conversion: they err no less in respect of the rapidity, with which it is to be effected’ On the contrary, Sandford said, although ‘in some happy cases [...] ”the child of light” may have proceeded without
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deviation from the straight path’, living a ‘converted life’ without an adult conversion, for ‘by far the greatest number, the conversion from sin to holiness [...] may have been as distinguishable and evident as it is indispensible’ 61 Whereas Mant scorned, Sandford admired Evangelical accounts of conversion, ‘of which it is not to be doubted that there are many examples’, and which he described in terms consistent with his belief that ‘in all it is the same spirit which accompanied “the washing of regeneration” at the commencement’ 62 A person was converted, according to Sandford not by Mant’s ‘resolute perseverance’, but when ‘in humiliation and contrition he seeks for pardon and grace, through that name to which he was dedicated in baptism; his prayer is heard; the flame which was not utterly stifled [...] is again kindled by the breath of Heaven, and he arises from his fall, with increased diffidence in himself, and more abundant desire to trust in the Hand that has mercifully renewed him’ 63 In asserting the correctness of the Anglican doctrine of baptismal regeneration, Sandford was careful also to ensure that his congregation expect, and understand the importance of, adult conversion.

Sandford was not the first to elaborate this position. He shared it with a younger Anglican Evangelical, John Bird Sumner, who would become the first Evangelical Archbishop of Canterbury in 1848. Sandford recommended Sumner’s Apostolic Preaching Considered as ‘one of the most useful treatises that have lately been given to the public’ 64 In his first edition in 1815, Sumner treated regeneration only in a brief and vague footnote which David Bebbington interpreted as ‘a shaky answer, a sign that Evangelicals found this apparent discrepancy between their doctrine [of personal conversion] and their liturgy [of infant baptism] embarrassing’ 65 This charge could well be levelled at Ryder’s compromise. However, in later editions from 1817, Sumner added a new chapter dealing specifically with regeneration. Sumner argued that ‘those who are devoted to Christ as infants by baptism, are regenerate, i.e. are “accepted of God in the Beloved” ‘ – as Sandford 66 Sumner gave conversion far more prominence than Mant: ‘many who have once been pronounced regenerate, have afterwards entirely apostatized [...] till they are brought back [...] by some strong conviction of sin [...] which may be definitively fixed and exactly traced’ – as Sandford did 67 Sumner disagreed with Ryder that a conversion
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experience was invariably necessary: ‘surely it will not be denied that some [...] have never thrown off that yoke [...] laid upon them at their baptism’, and he cautioned that ‘they who have really too much reason to rejoice, would be alarmed with unnecessary fears’ by an insistence that ‘some new creation, must take place in every heart’ – as did Sandford and Sumner’s positions on baptism were almost identical.

Sandford and Sumner were both conscious of treading a fine line on a controversial issue. ‘I know and lament them deeply’, Sandford said of the polarised opinions being aired, fearing they produced ‘unwarrantable dejection’ or ‘spiritual pride’ 69. He acknowledged it was difficult to understand the Bible’s apparently contradictory demands: ‘We refuse not to admit infants to this holy rite, because we dare not disobey the Lord, “who hath commanded the little children to be brought unto him” ’, he said defending Episcopalian custom: ‘we believe firmly, that Almighty God doth in mercy impute to them the qualifications,’ and in confirmation, ‘provide them with an opportunity of making the profession in the most solemn and public manner’ 70. Both Sandford and Sumner give the impression of reconciling a challenging question to their own satisfaction, not of struggling to patch up an awkward discrepancy, as Ryder appears to do. While their arguments might not satisfy Evangelicals who did deny baptismal regeneration, they were rare amongst Regency theologians in successfully having their episcopalian cake and Evangelically eating it.

Two events in Sandford’s ministry appear to cast doubt on his Evangelical credentials. In 1816, he was the first Scottish bishop to raise the alarm about ‘unsound doctrines, which under the assumed disguise of Evangelical principles, are spreading Error through the Church of England’; and in 1826, when an Evangelical minister in his diocese accused a senior clergyman of ‘unsound and dangerous doctrine’, Sandford said, ‘That such accusations cannot be silently submitted to by [...] the Episcopal College, appears undeniable’ 71. This latter incident in particular has caused historians to regard Sandford as anti-Evangelical 72. Yet Sandford does not demonstrate any hostility to Evangelical theology as such.
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The 1816 incident was the ‘Western Schism’ in which, Sandford reported, ‘four Clergymen of the Church of England [...] have withdrawn from her Communion’^73. Whereas many clergy might think this a good riddance, it was loyal Anglican Evangelicals, such as Henry Ryder, who were the fiercest critics of the seceders, so Sandford’s alarm tends rather to confirm his Evangelical sympathies than otherwise.^74 One issue was predestinarian Calvinism which caused, as Sandford said, ‘offence at some parts of the Burial office’^75. Ryder and Sumner both wrote at length against a Calvinist understanding of predestination, while Sandford suggested Scottish bishops’ understanding of Presbyterianism might help them to refute it intelligently^76. Ramsay suggested Sandford’s sympathetic understanding of Presbyterianism characterised his diocese (p. 55). Sandford’s thoughtful and carefully-articulated views on regeneration are in contrast to Gleig and Walker’s blanket high-church condemnation of all Presbyterian and Evangelical theology (p. 29).

The 1826 Edinburgh controversy was the culmination of events which began in the winter of 1817-18, when an Evangelical English clergyman, Gerard Noel, preached in Sandford’s chapel. Noel’s sermons did not contradict Sandford’s theology. He must have been preaching with Sandford’s permission, and it might have been a homecoming. He had received some education in Edinburgh where it is probable Sandford was amongst his teachers: Sydney Smith wrote to his pupil’s mother that there were few alternatives for tutoring, and Sandford’s catechism class was the best option for a fashionable English youth of Evangelical inclinations.^78 Noel was a friend, approved by Smith of Smith’s pupil William Hicks-Beach. Noel introduced Edward Craig, the recently-ordained son of a London watercolour painter, to the Scottish Episcopal Church. Craig became Rector of Old St Paul’s (Map, 29) in 1818 before moving his congregation in 1821 (as Archibald Alison had done a few years earlier) to a chapel in the New Town, St James Broughton Place (Map, 23), where the congregation also established a school: a move of
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which Sandford would have approved. Far from the younger generation of Evangelicals in Edinburgh having to ‘brave the hostility’ of Sandford, it seems more likely that he invited and fostered them.

Sandford’s guileless generosity left him poorly armed against the disingenuousness or violence of others. His achievements depended on his own willingness to make personal, even sacrificial commitments. As a young clergyman his pupils misbehaved ‘out of doors’, and as an old bishop he retained a scandalous and lazy organist for ten years, hoping he would reform. It is perhaps no surprise he created a situation which a less naïve bishop might have guessed would cause controversy: Craig began preaching against baptismal regeneration. In June 1825 James Walker published his indignation in a visitation sermon, preached in St John’s, lamenting how ‘all who maintain baptismal regeneration are denounced as mere formalists, as pestilent heretics, as absolute Papists’.

Craig took his response into print to correct Walker’s ‘fearfully unsound and delusive [...] doctrine respecting Baptism’ and the debate degenerated into personal insults. Sandford did not censure Craig’s doctrine, an error he considered dangerous rather than fatal: ‘I am very far from supposing, or insinuating, that all who deny the regeneration of baptism desire to support the cause of fanaticism’, he had once preached. Rather, Sandford’s concern was Craig’s accusation of ‘a ruinous dearth of Evangelical teaching’ in the diocese, an ‘injury [...] in the sight and opinion of the world’ which could not be overlooked. Against the advice of Bishops Torry, Low and Gleig, Sandford refused to discipline Craig, instead sending all the clergy a reminder of the orthodox doctrine on regeneration, and complaining privately to his daughter about Walker’s ‘furious philippic against all fanatics and bigots [...] Alas! we are always accusing one another’. In October 1827, following the controversy, Craig preached at one of Bishop Sandford’s ordination services in St John’s, suggesting the Bishop was eager to ensure Craig was not left feeling marginalised or silenced.
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points he did not believe should be opposed: the debate festered beyond his death until eventual schism in the 1840s. However, Sandford had kept the church united, no mean feat given the rest of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scottish ecclesiastical record.

2.3 Sandford’s Writings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td><em>Lectures on the Epistles appointed for the service of the Church of England: on the days of Passion-Week, Easter-Even, and Easter-Sunday</em></td>
<td>Queen Charlotte</td>
<td>British Critic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td><em>Sermons, Chiefly Designed for Young Persons</em></td>
<td>Baroness Abercromby of Aboukir &amp; Tullibody</td>
<td>Anti-Jacobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Pamphlet on Union (printed without title page)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td><em>Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Edinburgh on Thursday the 15th January 1807</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Jacobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td><em>Address to young persons after confirmation: delivered at a confirmation helden in Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh</em></td>
<td>The young persons for whose use it was composed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td><em>Sermon, preached in the Episcopal Chapel in the Cowgate, Edinburgh, on the 2d of March 1813; for the benefit of the schools under the direction of the Lancastrian School Society</em></td>
<td>The Directors of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td><em>Sermons preached in St John’s Chapel, Edinburgh</em></td>
<td>The vestry and congregation of St John’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td><em>Lectures on the history of the week of the Passion of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ</em></td>
<td>Mrs Frances Bowdler of Bath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td><em>A brief explanation of the church catechism (an edition by Bishops Sandford and Gleig of a work by Basil Woodd)</em></td>
<td>The clergy of Edinburgh and Brechin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td><em>A form of Spiritual Communion, or Commemoration of the Death of Christ, in private</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td><em>Remains of the late Right Reverend Daniel Sandford, D.D. Oxon. Bishop of Edinburgh in the Scottish Episcopal Church; including extracts from his diary and correspondence, and a selection from his unpublished sermons. With a memoir, by the Rev. John Sandford</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>British Critic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Sandford’s Publications

Sandford published ten works over the course of his ministry, and John Sandford’s *Remains* included additional writings (Table 2.1). The nature of these works reveals that
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his ministerial and episcopal focus was inward and pastoral rather than outward and controversial. All are addressed to his own flock: as a priest, to the young people and adults of Charlotte Chapel; as bishop, to the young people, adult laity and clergy of his diocese. Six of his publications are sermons or lectures, two contain specific advice and two are pastoral resources. Five focus chiefly on education, three on the Christian’s participation in the passion, two on church unity and one (Sermons in St John’s) covers a wide range of topics. Sandford hinted at grander ambitions when he first launched into print, introducing the Epistles for Passion Week as ‘only a part of a greater work which I am preparing for the press’, but commentaries or treatises never materialised.

The dedications of Sandford’s first two publications, to the Queen and Baroness Abercromby, suggest a young man concerned with future possibilities for patronage. Both claimed the prior favour of the dedicatee: the one to Queen Charlotte was ‘with permission’, while that to Baroness Abercromby was as her chaplain. However, once his acceptance of election to a Scottish Bishopric had excluded the possibility of English patronage even had it been available, the focus of his dedications changes to the people for whom the work was written. His last dedication, in History of the Passion, was to an old friend, although his prefatory address to her explains the pastoral purpose common to all his publications: ‘It will at once be evident to you, that this publication is not intended as a work of deep theology [... The lectures] were composed for the use of the congregation to which they were delivered’, made available through print to those whom he was charged with teaching, but who were unable to attend in person. It is striking that all three of Sandford’s individual dedicatees – two whom he hoped would be influential, and one whom he had found inspirational – were women, supporting the evidence of the Remains regarding the deep influence of the bluestocking circle on his thought and attitudes.

Sandford obtained not only impressive dedicatees for his early works, but also favourable reviews in the high church press. The British Critic described Epistles for Passion Week as, ‘plain, perspicuous, and yet sufficiently argumentative’, picking out the lecture for Maundy Thursday as one which ‘in particular gave us great satisfaction; and cannot be read by any well-disposed person without edification’. This lecture addressed one of the high church’s priorities, encouraging more frequent reception of communion amongst the laity. The Sermons for Young Persons received a fuller review in the Anti-Jacobin, which
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described them as ‘excellent, pious and practical’, to be ‘perused with pleasure and advantage by all ages, and by all ranks’. The reviewer praised Sandford’s authenticity: ‘when we perceive that a man is in earnest himself [...] we feel that he is in possession of a complete avenue to the heart’. It also commended ‘some ingenious specimens of Biblical criticism’, and hoped he would pursue ‘a line of study [for which] we consider Mr Sandford as admirably qualified’. ‘Ingenious’ biblical criticism continued to enliven Sandford’s sermons, as for example in his argument that liturgy was a feature of the apostolic church (p. 83); after his death another female friend, Mrs Grant of Laggan, reported he had the reputation of being ‘an elegant and, I believe, as far as languages go, a profound scholar’. However, as he was drawn into involvement with the Episcopal Church, the work of practical ministry, and later poor health, overtook his early plans for academic theology.

The work which gained the widest national interest was Sandford’s Charge to the Clergy (1807), in a manner which suggests that his practical ministry was more original and influential than a work of biblical criticism would probably have been. For the Anti-Jacobin reviewers, this volume contributed to a theme which, they reminded readers, had interested them ‘ever since we discovered that an Episcopal Church still exists in Scotland’. They felt that, ‘in contemplating this humble but respectable society, we feel that we are in effect contemplating our own church merely as a church, divested of every thing foreign and adventitious, as a society entirely spiritual’, and having never seen a similar work from Scotland before, ‘took up the present Charge with more than ordinary interest’. They commended Sandford’s style in a torrent of restrained Regency praise: ‘chaste and elegant’, ‘mild and persuasive’, ‘dignified [...] warm and energetic’, ‘manly, modest, and interesting’; and found the example of ‘primitive’ episcopacy they were looking for: ‘ties entirely spiritual’ between a bishop who enjoyed no temporal advantage from his position, and clergy who had elected him by ‘unanimous suffrages’.

Sandford’s preaching was steeped in scripture. In his Charge to the Clergy of Edinburgh he urged clergy to devote to biblical scholarship ‘a great, a solid portion of our time and labour: we must diligently apply to it all the force of our understandings, and all the aids which a liberal and learned education places within our reach’. Sandford’s 1802
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publications, cite a wide range of biblical sources. The thirteen *Sermons for Young Persons* were a special series of lectures not based on the lectionary readings, although some took a framing text like the Prodigal Son or the 109th Psalm. The eight *Lectures on the Epistles for Passion Week* were based on the lectionary passages, but these, too, cite far more widely than their set text. There were 199 different biblical citations in the twenty-one fairly short sermons. Figure 2.2 shows that in common with many Evangelical preachers Sandford favoured the New Testament, particularly the epistles. The more detailed analysis of his use of the Bible in Figure 2.3 shows that the book he used most was the letter to the Hebrews, with its emphasis on the atonement. The prominence of the gospels reflects Sandford’s emphasis on the person and passion of Christ.

Sandford attached great importance to the calendar and liturgy of the Prayer Book which he cited as often as the Epistle to the Romans. The prayer-book shaping of his biblicism is also apparent in the large number of citations from the Psalms, for which he used the Book of Common Prayer translation although referring to the Hebrew original to explain queries about the text. One of the examples of ‘ingenious’ biblical criticism which impressed the *British Critic* was Sandford’s analysis of the difficult 109th Psalm as...
an example for young people on how to interpret the Psalms. This skill was important, Sandford said, because they were ‘a part of our daily service, and they who would pray “with the understanding,” as well as “with the spirit,” ought to be well informed of the meaning of the words they here repeat’. Sandford did not afford the Prayer Book equal status with scripture, but regarded it as a tool to help people understand and internalise scripture. In urging people to observe liturgical seasons, he preached, ‘I am confident, that a pious use of the season of Lent [...] [might open] the eyes of many to those important truths, which, in the bustle of the world, we are all too much inclined to neglect’. Anglican paraphernalia were, for Sandford, the tool-shed for the garden of religion of the heart.

Sandford’s wide-ranging learning is demonstrated by the authors he cited (Table 2.2). In private, Sandford weighed up authors, finding some in error and others worthless. In a letter of 1826, for example, he discussed Doddridge and Gilpin’s opinions on whether the doctrine of a ‘sin unto death’ was confined to apostolic times or was still applicable, and mentioned Voltaire as a modern philosopher whose infidelity resembled the ‘incurable malignity of heart’ of the Pharisees. Sandford concluded that Doddridge, an Independent of Evangelical leanings, was right that the doctrine must still apply, emphasising his comment that ‘charity would incline to the milder extreme, and conditional prayer may, however, be offered’, even, as the Prayer Book said, for ‘Turks, infidels and heretics’, because what had changed since apostolic times was not human capacity to sin, but Christian capacity to judge. This example, however, in which Sandford admitted an Anglican, Gilpin, could be in error, and discusses the ‘malignant’ writer Voltaire, came from a private letter and was never Sandford’s mode of using authors to a general audience. In sermons, Sandford invariably cited authors positively, either to make use of a piece of information or to commend an opinion. Gilpin’s Exposition of the New Testament (1790) was one of the works he cited most frequently in his sermons, and it seems likely he thought that to demonstrate the error of an author he respected might confuse a lay audience. He certainly believed in avoiding any exposure to heretical authors like Voltaire. ‘I think great care should be taken in the distribution’, he wrote to his daughter Frances of Bishop Richard Watson’s answer to Tom Paine. ‘It is better to keep from the uneducated the knowledge of objections’, since ‘the objection is always
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1766-1818</td>
<td>al-Abbasi, Ali Bey</td>
<td>1766-1831</td>
<td>Magee, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498-1563</td>
<td>Alexius, Simon</td>
<td>1776-1848</td>
<td>Mant, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734-1826</td>
<td>Barrington, Shute</td>
<td>1586-1638</td>
<td>Mede, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750-1818</td>
<td>Bernard, Thomas</td>
<td>1765-1836</td>
<td>Mildert, William van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773-1859</td>
<td>Bethell, Christopher</td>
<td>1787-1858</td>
<td>Miller, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756-1837</td>
<td>Burgess, Thomas</td>
<td>1608-1674</td>
<td>Milton, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643-1715</td>
<td>Burnet, Gilbert</td>
<td>1750-1830</td>
<td>Moncrieff Wellwood, H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612-1686</td>
<td>Calovius, Abraham</td>
<td>1745-1833</td>
<td>More, Hannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347-407</td>
<td>Chrysostom, John</td>
<td>1785-1850</td>
<td>Morgan, Hector Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675-1729</td>
<td>Clarke, Samuel</td>
<td>1693-1755</td>
<td>Mosheim, Johann L. von</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742-1815</td>
<td>Cleaver, William</td>
<td>1738-1817</td>
<td>Napleton, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489-1556</td>
<td>Cranmer, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617-1688</td>
<td>Cudworth, Ralph</td>
<td>1716-1778</td>
<td>Ogden, Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702-1771</td>
<td>Doddridge, Philip</td>
<td>1743-1805</td>
<td>Paley, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689-1764</td>
<td>Ellis, John</td>
<td>1674-1747</td>
<td>Potter, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662-1725</td>
<td>Gastrell, Francis</td>
<td>1750-1827</td>
<td>Pretyman Tomline, G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724-1804</td>
<td>Gilpin, William</td>
<td>1749-1813</td>
<td>Randolphie, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753-1840</td>
<td>Gleig, George</td>
<td>1723-1790</td>
<td>Smith, Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762-1834</td>
<td>Grey, Robert</td>
<td>1660-1728</td>
<td>Stanhope, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747-1831</td>
<td>Hales, William</td>
<td>1732-1807</td>
<td>Stevens, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605-1660</td>
<td>Hammond, Henry</td>
<td>1780-1828</td>
<td>Sumner, John Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-1792</td>
<td>Horne, George</td>
<td>1749-1818</td>
<td>Taylor, Thomas Grimwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733-1806</td>
<td>Horsley, Samuel</td>
<td>1705-1774</td>
<td>Tottie, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748-1832</td>
<td>Huntingford, George I.</td>
<td>1693-1723</td>
<td>Vitrina, Campegius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720-1808</td>
<td>Hurd, Richard</td>
<td>1698-1779</td>
<td>Warburton, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761-1842</td>
<td>Ireland, John</td>
<td>1683-1740</td>
<td>Waterland, Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726-1800</td>
<td>Jones, William</td>
<td>1737-1816</td>
<td>Watson, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760-1838</td>
<td>Laurence, Richard</td>
<td>1686-1742</td>
<td>Wheatly, Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-1785</td>
<td>Leland, Thomas</td>
<td>1637-1726</td>
<td>Whitby, Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602-1675</td>
<td>Lightfoot, John</td>
<td>1746-1814</td>
<td>White, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710-1787</td>
<td>Lowth, Robert</td>
<td>1774-1849</td>
<td>Wintle, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1800</td>
<td>MacKnight, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Non-biblical authors cited by Sandford in all his published writings (Table 2.1) with the number of times he cited them.
more plain and intelligible than the answer. For this reason I have made it a rule in my sermons never to introduce an objection, which cannot be disposed of in as few words, or nearly as few, as it is stated. While this selectivity suggests a conservative limitation on Sandford as an educationalist, it is tempered by his optimism that in time everyone could be educated and able to participate fully in doctrinal debates. The most striking aspect of Table 2.2 is its range. The Laudian Hammond, Erastian Lightfoot and semi-Puritan Mede represent the breadth of seventeenth-century thinking. In the eighteenth, Oxford Hutchinsonians like Jones of Nayland mingle with Cambridge Church-and-State men like Samuel Horsley and Scottish Presbyterian MacKnight. These authors were not represented in Sandford’s works as partisan antagonists, but as a broad inheritance of Protestant Christian wisdom.

The only Church Father Sandford cited was Chrysostom. Peter Nockles identifies a continued interest in the fathers as characteristic of high churchmen, at a period when latitudinarians like Richard Watson disparaged them and Evangelicals were passively favourable, so Sandford’s lack of interest argues against his high churchmanship. Early Protestant Reformers and Puritans were honourably mentioned, all Episcopalian except Milton. There are also occasional references to secular texts: Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments* argued that the human sense of need for atonement was innate; while the 1816 *Travels of Ali Bey* provided a recent and vivid description of thirst in arid countries. The vast majority, however, were Anglicans from the Caroline period onwards.

Some writers were cited in clusters, on discussion of a particular topic. For his first sermon in the new St John’s Chapel, Sandford preached on church polity, a subject he rarely addressed, recommending Morgan, Jones, Stevens, T.G. Taylor and Niven to members of his congregation who were interested in learning more about the topic. These stand out from the majority of Sandford’s sources in two ways. The first is their distinctively high churchmanship: Jones and Stevens were leaders of the English Hutchinsonians. The second is that, although all were Anglican except Niven, who was Scottish Episcopalian, they owed very little to Church of England patronage. Morgan and Jones were curates, Taylor held a locally-funded and originally Puritan lectureship, while Stevens and Niven were laymen. The majority of the sixty-four writers Sandford cited were bishops or held cathedral or university preferment. While these might be valuable for doc-
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trinal or exegetical writing, for his vindication of a free Episcopal Church, Sandford used authors whose anti-erastianism had not been compromised by preferment in an Established Church.

Another group of theologians were cited in Sandford’s careful discussion of the vexed debate on baptismal regeneration: Waterland, Mant, Bethell, Morgan and Sumner. These, too, skewed the sources in a high church direction. Waterland, who had defended baptismal regeneration against the early Methodist movement in the 1740s, was reappropriated in 1816 against the Evangelical Anglican secessionists (p. 58). Contemporary writers Mant, Bethell and Morgan who responded to the 1816 secession with similar doctrinal defences were all high church. Sumner, whom Sandford particularly commended, was the only writer who by 1819 had successfully defended an Anglican doctrine of regeneration from an Evangelical point of view (p. 57).

The close affinity between High and Evangelical theologians in this period, uniting in a critique of deism and erastianism, is well understood. Yet Sandford also drew considerable inspiration from the earlier eighteenth-century latitudinarian tradition of writers like Whitby, whose commentary Sandford used regularly in *Epistles for Passion Week*; Warburton, whom he called ‘one of the able and learned writers of the Church of England’; the barely-Trinitarian Clarke, ‘a learned writer’; and the philosopher Ralph Cudworth, also ‘one of the most able and learned writers of the Church of England’. Warburton’s *Divine Legation* came back into favour amongst early nineteenth-century Evangelicals following his inclusion in Joseph Milner’s history of Evangelical Christianity. This reliance of Evangelicals on latitudinarian theologians is unsurprising when Evangelicalism is seen in its Enlightenment context. The supposed unorthodoxy of these early latitudinarians lay in their scepticism about the possibility that revealed religious knowledge could be treated in the same manner as scientific knowledge. Cudworth, for example, was a Platonist, seeking to sift spiritual truth from worldly dross. This gave them a similar epistemological worldview to that of the Edinburgh Stewartites, a worldview with which Evangelicals found such strong affinities. Once regarded as the slippery slope towards David Hume, and supplanted by apologists such as Paley and Butler, in
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the light of Scottish Common Sense philosophy Whitby, Clerk, Cudworth and Warburton appeared ahead of their time.

Unlike many Evangelical writers, these authors had Episcopalian, scholarly credentials. Equality under the gospel, in Sandford’s view, certainly did not mean equal qualification to teach theology. In old age, he wrote bitterly in his diary,

I am taking some pains to instruct others, and have long been instructing myself in the Hebrew language, under a vain notion that a knowledge of the original language of Holy Scripture is necessary to enable a man to expound it – but I am mistaken; a young man, apparently of mean rank, called on me to enquire how he might obtain orders [...] I ventured to suggest the necessity of some learning to enable him to do his duty [...] He answered with somewhat of contempt, [...] “Where the Spirit instructs we want no Greek and Latin.” – He gave me to understand he was all but actually inspired. Such is an enthusiast.

Sandford maintained the view that Enlightenment religion should inspire scholarship: the contempt of the ‘enthusiast’ for Greek was in Sandford’s view contempt for the gospels themselves, his charismatic religion founded not on the Evangelical pillar of scripture, but on his own opinions. Sandford’s admiration for the ‘good and learned Doddridge’ showed he was far from considering non-Anglican evangelicalism bereft of scholarship.

In 1821 he recommended Robert Southey’s *Life of Wesley* to Frances as ‘one of the most interesting books that I have seen for a great while. The account of some of Wesley’s preachers is very interesting’. Southey’s romantic *Life* portrayed Wesley and his preachers as launching a warm rather than scholarly, but very necessary effort to reform a corrupt Hanoverian church: ‘had he been less enthusiastic, of a humbler spirit, or a quieter heart, or a maturer judgement, he would never have commenced his undertaking’.

Sandford’s admiration for Southey’s account suggests he regarded the Methodists rather as he appears to have done the Hutchinsonians, with a spiritual warmth which was of far greater value than their supposed lack of scholarship. The mistake of the young ‘enthusiast’ was to have elevated their unavoidable ignorance into a virtue.
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Sandford also believed enlightened religion tended to unity. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries radical Protestantism and Anglicanism had been closely associated, and Sandford was happy to refer to Puritans like Simon Alexius and Gilbert Burnet. In the eighteenth century, however, Methodism was associated with schism, which even if considered it the result of misunderstanding rather than malice (p. 196) he regarded as a grave sin (p. 87) from which he would wish to protect his congregation. Lacking an Evangelical tradition in their own communion, Sandford's generation of Anglicans found a similar epistemology in these latitudinarian authors, unshackled from scholastic logic, but on the firm basis of university theological training.

Some of the contemporary writers Sandford cited held views sufficiently similar to his own to suggest he was one of a 'Celtic fringe' of creative Anglican thought. Sandford cited Bishop Thomas Burgess of St David's at a key point in his pamphlet persuading his congregation to join the Episcopal Church. A scholarly Hebraist, Burgess was a promoter of education, an abolitionist, and learned Welsh to help him restore diocesan administration. Burgess' more decisive high churchmanship than Sandford's might have derived partly from context: within the Church of England he was able, as in Presbyterian Scotland was not, to regard Anglicanism, Establishment and Protestant Constitution as inextricably associated and foundational to society. Yet the priority he, like Sandford, gave to warm spirituality caused him to encourage and win the respect of Evangelicals to a remarkable degree. William Magee, Dean of Cork, combined Evangelical theology with high churchmanship and defended Christianity against Tom Paine. Sandford's doctrinal affinity with the younger John Bird Sumner, Bishop of Chester, who brought Evangelicalism into the Anglican mainstream, is discussed below (p. 57). A study exploring this group of scholarly, unificatory theologians, with roots in an anti-erastian high Episcopacy and Enlightenment philosophy, could prove valuable in understanding nineteenth-century religion.

Sandford made such extensive use of 'Church-and-State' theologians that it might seem to cast doubt on the argument that he rejected their theology in favour of an evangelical religion of the heart. It is important, however, to see how he used them. Robert
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Lowth, Bishop of London, was an aggressive critic of Warburton’s *Devine Legation*. Yet it was not Lowth’s controversialist position which appealed to Sandford, but his translation of Isaiah, in the forefront of a movement to revise the English Old Testament on the basis of advanced Hebrew scholarship. Sandford cited it five times in *Epistles for Passion Week*. Richard Hurd, Bishop of Lichfield, was another writer whose sermons and discourses Sandford cited both in 1802 and 1819. Although remembered as a staunch Church-and-State man and unoriginal theologian, Hurd edited Warburton’s works, was considered too Whig by Dr Johnson, and was best known in literary circles as a champion of the Gothic and the power of the imagination. This suggests a theologian who, for all his support of Pitt, was rejecting old-fashioned ‘Moderate’ philosophy for views closer to those of Sandford. The third of this group of much-cited authors, James MacKnight, was an Edinburgh Moderate, minister of the Old Kirk (Map, 22) and author of *A Harmony of the Gospels* which Sandford used extensively in his *Epistles for Passion Week*. MacKnight, too, was part of the movement to produce more scholarly translations of the Bible, and Sandford’s use of him is evidence for the ‘Caledonisation’ of his theological knowledge following his arrival in Scotland. Sandford cited other Church-and-State theologians occasionally on points of doctrine, for example the Pittite bishops Shute Barrington, William Cleaver, Samuel Horsley and George Pretyman Tomline. As with all Sandford’s citations, these authors provided building material for his own thought, rather than complete worldviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Paley</td>
<td><em>Natural Theology</em></td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Leslie</td>
<td><em>A Short and Easy Method with the Deists</em></td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Paley</td>
<td><em>View of the Evidences of Christianity</em></td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Paley</td>
<td><em>Truth of the Scriptural History of St Paul</em></td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Butler</td>
<td><em>The Analogy of Religion [...] to the [...] Course of Nature</em></td>
<td>1736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: ‘My course of theological study’: books Sandford recommended to his daughters. (John Sandford, *Remains of the late Right Reverend Daniel Sandford*, vol. 1, (Edinburgh: Waugh and Innes, 1830) pp. 357-8.)

The strongest evidence that Sandford was really a Church-and-State theologian, emphasising reason, moderation and good order above religion of the heart, comes from John Sandford’s *Remains*. In a letter to his daughter Frances Sandford wrote that her sister ‘Wilhelmina] is just gone upstairs with Leslie’s “Short Method with the Deists.” She

---

116 Scott Mandelbrote, ‘Lowth, Robert (1710-1787)’, in ODNB.
is reading what I call my course of theological study’, a bibliography given in Table 2.3. Charles Leslie, a nonjuring theologian who argued for the truth of Christian doctrines on the historical basis that societies and individuals had testified to its truth in their words and deeds continuously since the time of the actual events, seems a natural choice of apologist in a society excited about the scholarly possibilities of history (p. 14). Paley and Butler, however, were precisely those theologians whose moderate worldview was being rejected by the Stewartite Enlightenment of which Sandford was a part (p. 48). Should not Sandford, as the bluestocking Barbauld said, have thrown Paley into the fire?

Figure 2.4: Modern Moderation, Strikingly Displayed, or A Ministerial Visitation of a Sabbath Evening School. William Moodie, who has brought a lady to share the work, is waving his stick aggressively and saying, ‘Dismiss, I order every one of you to go home and desire your parents to teach you. I have a right to be heard. I say, go home’. Behind him, some of the sea of little faces look reluctant to go, while others take their chance to hurry out of the door. The teacher is saying, ‘Sir, some of them have no parents’. (John Kay, A Series of Original Portraits and Character Etchings, vol. 8 (Edinburgh: Hugh Paton, 1838) p. 336.)

Sandford recommended his daughters read each book ‘at least twice, before proceed-
ing to the next, in order that its contents may be well digested, – the management of the [...] digestive organs of the understanding, being as important to the mental health and improvement, as Mr Abernethy’s management of the physical organs.” This methodology gives a clue as to the rationale behind Sandford’s ‘course’. Few British intellectuals disagreed that the French Revolution was caused by the misuse of the most advanced doctrines of Enlightenment by uneducated people. Tory Moderates reacted by opposing initiatives to educate the poor: John Kay the cartoonist depicted William Moodie, Moderate minister of the New Town parish church St Andrew’s (Map, 14), closing down a Sunday school, in a cartoon of 1799 entitled Modern Moderation, Strikingly Displayed (Figure 2.4). Moodie, Professor of Hebrew at Edinburgh University, is shown restricting the Enlightenment to a chosen few, while ordinary people are left in benighted ignorance. To the Moderates, shielding people from a smattering of education, like strong measures against sedition (p. 187), was necessary to uphold the Enlightenment principle of the rule of law. Sandford, however, rejected the view that therefore the uneducated should be shielded from education, and instead agreed with the Stewartite and initially Whig-gish view that there should be wholesale education of everybody. Yet this did not mean that education should be unstructured. People who, like his daughters, expressed a serious interest in developing their theological knowledge (as a clergyman’s wife possibly to teach children) should proceed in the same manner as he had done, beginning with apologetic arguments which were easier to grasp before proceeding to the next stage, which was ‘the systematic reading of the Holy Bible’.

Were it not for the necessity of reconciling his ‘course’ with the thoroughly Stewartite and Evangelical resonance of his own theology, this explanation would appear tenuous, or one might agree with Bishop Gleig (p. 84) that Sandford flirted with Evangelicalism before retreating into moderatism. Yet despite his apparent emphasis on these authors, Sandford in his own writings cited Paley only once, Leslie and Butler never. This might suggest a retreat from an early radicalism to a more moderate position in later life; however, his late work History of the Week of the Passion, with its use of absorbing narrative to make an emotional appeal for a personal response to the atonement, is the least ‘Moderate’ and most evangelical of all his writings. Of the books listed in his course he particularly commended Paley’s Horae Paulinae as ‘the most invaluable work Paley ever
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Having previously demonstrated creation’s ‘design’ in other books, Paley here demonstrated revelation’s ‘undesign’, adopting a methodology close to the ‘internal evidences’ of Warburton, Sandford and the Common Sense philosophers. Students on Sandford’s course would be guided carefully past the dangers of David Hume’s sceptical atheism to the Enlightened Christianity beyond it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1634-1710</td>
<td>George Bull</td>
<td>1612-1686</td>
<td>John Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643-1715</td>
<td>Gilbert Burnet</td>
<td>1587-1663</td>
<td>Robert Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692-1752</td>
<td>Joseph Butler</td>
<td>1693-1768</td>
<td>Thomas Secker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554-1600</td>
<td>Richard Hooker</td>
<td>1641-1707</td>
<td>William Sherlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1729</td>
<td>Joseph Hall</td>
<td>1678-1761</td>
<td>Thomas Sherlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William King</td>
<td>1613-1667</td>
<td>Jeremy Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Non-biblical authors cited by James Walker in his sermon at Daniel Sandford’s consecration as Bishop. (James Walker, *The Condition and Duties of a Tolerated Church: a Sermon, Preached in Bishop Strachan’s Chapel, Dundee, on Sunday the 9th February 1806; at the Consecration of the Right Rev Daniel Sandford* (Edinburgh: Stuart Cheyne, 1806) p. 40.)

Sandford’s sources are largely Anglican. It is striking, however, that they do not overlap at all with the swathe of Anglican writers cited by his colleague James Walker, in the sermon he preached at Sandford’s consecration on 9 February 1806 (Table 2.4). Some of this difference may have been due to context: a consecration sermon was delivered to a more clerical audience than Sandford’s published sermons, and one of Walker’s authors, Burnet, was cited by the new Bishop Sandford in his charge to the clergy the following year. Sandford did recommend Butler privately, and according to his son Hooker was ‘his favourite exemplar’, although his name does not appear in the course of Sandford’s own writings. Most of the authors Walker cited were, through contests with Catholics and Puritans, identifying what was distinctive about Episcopalianism, which was the subject of Walker’s sermon: ‘Our principles are exclusive. But is not every judgement the same, which men form decisively on any subject. Truth is one; and it is exclusive’. There is no reason to suppose Sandford would have objected to these authors. George Bull, for example, whom Walker eagerly described as ‘the greatest Divine who ever graced the Church of England’, was chiefly a defender of Trinitarian orthodoxy, a priority Sandford shared (p. 49). Bull, however, wrote highly academic theology in Latin, and Sandford preferred to cite more accessible works which could be of use to
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lay auditors who wished to follow them up. Sandford drew on a broad Anglican inheritance to warm and enrich his theological worldview. He appears to have followed the precept of his admired predecessor Cudworth, believing that gems of truth could be sifted out of all kinds of sources. His caution about how opinions were presented to the ‘uneducated’ suggests that he regarded this sifting as one of the most important roles of the preacher. Yet his strong advocacy of education, emphasised again in its prominence as a subject for his published works, and his regular recommendation of selected reading material to his congregation, suggests a strong belief that the ‘uneducated’ would not, and should not, remain in need of such sheltering for longer than was required to implement the progress of education and knowledge.

2.4 Daniel Sandford and the High Church

Rowan Strong’s recent history of nineteenth-century Episcopalianism describes Sandford as a ‘High Church Englishman’, articulating an impression which emerges from other histories based on Sandford’s collaboration with, and praise from, prominent high churchmen such as John Skinner, James Allen Park and Charles Daubeny at the time of Episcopal union. Sandford did indeed regard himself as ‘high’ in the sense of firmly committed to Episcopalian government in a way that was less necessarily the case in the majority Church of England. However, what being ‘high’ meant for Sandford requires to be teased out carefully, and historians’ categorisations tend to be suspect. Strong also describes Charles Hughes Terrot as ‘high church’, yet it was in contrasting himself with Terrot that Sandford provided the only evidence that he considered himself ‘high’, or rather, ‘not low’. In 1817 William Forbes and Colin MacKenzie suggested Charles Lane be encouraged to move on from his curacy and be replaced by the young clergyman Terrot, on the basis of a sense of congregational opinion greatly in his favour. Comparison of Terrot and Lane’s published sermons suggests this might have been due to Edinburgh society’s love of the intellectual: Terrot revelled in the latest techniques of biblical exposition, whereas Lane, who settled in a wealthy corner of rural Kent, was satisfied with assuring his listeners that atheists were in error. However, was forcefully opposed to the

suggestion. ‘Upon some very important points of religious doctrine I have strong reasons to think that Mr Terrot and I differ toto coelo,’ he wrote to Forbes. He is a very low Churchman. He was at Cambridge a Simeonite, and I never knew a false bias in this matter corrected; and if he is to have a share in the duty of my Chapel, the congregation will hear, I apprehend, “Canterbury at one time of the day, and Geneva at another”.

The doctrines were not, as it might ostensibly seem from the reference to Charles Simeon, those of evangelical theology. Sandford’s theology was far more evangelical than Terrot’s, who (unless he experienced a fundamental theological transformation between 1817 and 1834 when he set out his understanding of basic Christian doctrine) espoused a late latitudinarian or early broad church theology rooted in ‘reason’ and ‘usefulness’.

While Sandford stood by toleration and collaboration between protestants in the face of ‘high’ Episcopalians who took a harder line (pp. 28, 195), within the Episcopalian church itself he deplored the ‘lukewarm Episcopalian’ Terrot’s ‘irreverence of his mode of doing duty’.

However, Sandford can not be categorised with either of the high church positions described in the introduction. While he found the disestablished episcopalian ecclesiology and warm spirituality of the Hutchinsonians extremely appealing, he did not share their anti-Enlightenment view of nature, and laid an emphasis on engagement, activism and conversion alien to their contemplative, quietist theology. This section addresses two other ways in which Sandford might qualify for the high church label. It seems ostensibly likely that Sandford shared the enlightened, anglicised high churchmanship of George Gleig, James Walker and the Hackney Phalanx, but as has been already hinted in the discussion of Sandford’s writings above (p. 61), this appears not to have been the case. Finally, Sandford’s interest in matters such as liturgy, architecture and music is suggestive to the modern reader of a high-church bias; however, it will be argued that as these were neither characteristic of the high church in this period, nor high church in their motivation, they cannot be labelled as such.

The key element of the high churchmanship of James Walker, George Gleig and the Hackney Phalanx was a belief in Episcopalianism as the one true church, in need of defence from external threats – hence the unlikely title ‘Phalanx’ for this nebulous network, alluding not to tight formation, but to defensive attitude. The prime threat was the...
French Revolution, but latitudinarianism, evangelicalism and Presbyterianism were all regarded as insidious tentacles of the same ‘liberal’ monster: ‘The Reformation of religion freed us’, preached James Walker, on the day of a national fast to pray for deliverance from French invasion, but ‘it has introduced much evil. For the principles [...] have often been extended so far as to sap the foundations of all ecclesiastical authority. [...] The principles of civil liberty [...] too, have been often carried so far by some misguided or wicked men, as to destroy some of the fairest virtues of the human character’.[30] The Hutchinsonians, for example Skinner downplaying the importance of legal establishment compared with the purity of ‘doctrine, discipline and worship’ as the ground for valuing the Episcopal Church (p. 27), did not share this tone of fear: their formative experience was the removal of the threat of persecution and the restoration of freedom to worship. However, James Walker picked up on the tinge of regret in Skinner’s tone, when at [Sandford’s] consecration Skinner had spoken of how Episcopalians were ‘reduced’ to the point where ‘the Bishop’s Authority takes hold of the Conscience only’, with no ‘worldly fortune or influence to support it’.[31] In Walker’s high church interpretation, this acceptance of disestablishment was no more than making a virtue of unfortunate present necessity, enabling Scottish Episcopalians to ‘stress [...] those spiritual powers, which, for the purposes of religion, are of greater importance than the civil powers which may be combined with them’, although as argued on p. 29 Walker implies that re-establishment was the ultimate goal.[32] Conversely, picked up Skinner’s analogy with the early, pre-establishment church and restated it in celebratory terms: ‘It has often afforded me great satisfaction the resemblance that the Christian Society of which we are members, bears, in its external condition, to the Church [...] before the Conversion of the Emperor Constantine’. Whereas Skinner had talked of ‘regret’ and ‘reduction’, Sandford talked of ‘great satisfaction’, and observed that ‘our case is the same with that of our forefathers in the Christian Faith in ages which we are accustomed to consider with peculiar veneration’.[33] Sandford and Walker both adopted Skinner’s interpretation of the ‘primitive’ Episcopal Church, but developed it in different directions: Sandford’s attitude to Episcopalian disestablishment was not regretful acquiescence but eager welcome: and this, combined with his friendly attitude towards Presbyterians, put
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him at variance with his high church contemporaries.

In December 1814 the congregation of Charlotte Chapel resolved to build a new, larger chapel. The result, St John’s, completed in March 1818, was striking in its ambitious attempt to deploy architecture, light and music in the service of the chapel liturgy. Daniel Sandford chaired the general meeting of the congregation of Charlotte Chapel and subscribers to St John’s on 6 July 1815, at which Colin MacKenzie presented two architectural plans. The one by William Burn, ‘considered as eminently beautiful’, was chosen. St John’s was one of the very first British Protestant churches to be built with a ‘basilica’ interior, rejecting the practical auditorium which still characterised most neo-Gothic churches in favour of high nave, long aisle, slender piers, and fan-vaulted ceiling not adopted elsewhere, such as the more famous St Luke’s, Chelsea, until the 1820s. This was not merely a preference for antiquarian authenticity over acoustics. St John’s also incorporated an innovative arrangement of the chancel, suggesting that the motivation was liturgical. Nigel Yates describes various arrangements adopted in the early nineteenth century which gave prominence to the pulpit: one ‘particularly popular in the Episcopal Church of Scotland before 1820’ was a central pulpit in front of the communion table. This arrangement was adopted, amongst other places, at the otherwise-gothic St Paul’s York Place (Map, 26), the new building for the Cowgate Chapel congregation, opened a few weeks before St John’s. However, according to Yates, ‘from about 1800 a growing number of churches […] began to […] place the pulpit and reading desk on opposite sides of the nave so as to permit a clear view of the altar. In some churches this was linked with raising the altar several steps above the rest of the church’. This appears to have been the arrangement adopted by Sandford (Figure 2.3) with the word (pulpit and desk) flanking the sacraments (table and font).

The move to St John’s was the chance to realise various visions which had either not been possible or perhaps simply not given priority in Charlotte Chapel, such as a choir. Evidence of choirs is rare amongst early nineteenth-century Episcopal chapels although the relatively wealthy latitudinarian Cowgate Chapel apparently did have one, their organist William Clarke publishing a collection of their music in 1816. However, at St John’s the Choir was central to the new foundation. One of the four committees set up
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Figure 2.5: Interior of St John’s in 1855, from a painting in St John’s. While some changes may have been made since Sandford’s time, major reordering of the chancel did not take place until 1879.

when the Vestry was appointed in 1817 was dedicated to it, consisting of Daniel Sandford, James Clerk, William Forbes and John Cay. Colin MacKenzie travelled to Exeter to purchase ‘an organ of great power, and in every respect a desirable acquisition’. The choir was to consist of six trebles and six men, the boys were paid 1s6d for each day’s attendance, the men £5/5 per annum, and the choir were to sing on Sunday mornings and afternoons and at festivals. The choir was under the direction of Charlotte Chapel’s organist John Mather, whose proven talents as a choir director raised high hopes for the new choir. St John’s original vision also included a great stained-glass East Window, for which a separate subscription of over £800 was raised, largely through handsome contributions of the vestry but also a collection at the Charlotte Chapel door of £72/15/8.

Unfortunately, the state of both stained-glass technology and Scottish church music was so poor that both choir and window were initially failures (Mather’s story is told below, p. 170), but the vision was retained and made St John’s a major contributor to the revival of both arts in Edinburgh, founding a choir school in 1838, and converting most of the large area of window provided by its perpendicular style to stained glass between 1857
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The foundation of a choir looks ‘high church’ to later observers; however, it is unlikely that this is how it was regarded at the time. Hutchinsonians had indeed worked to revive music in their churches, in particular providing organs: the industrious Primus John Skinner wrote to Patrick Torry in 1795 about the possible acquisition of a second-hand chamber organ, and again in 1812 about a barrel organ from London, which for an extra 4 guineas could have a barrel with the correct Scottish psalm chants. However, Skinner’s musical activism represented part of a general movement to revive church music in Scotland. There was an air of competitiveness amongst the established Edinburgh Presbyterian churches regarding the quality of their precentors: Thomas Lees, a bass from Lancashire, was Precentor at the High Kirk and a regular soloist in John Mather’s concerts, and was paid a guinea to sing at the consecration of St John’s.

Edinburgh Institution for Sacred Music (1816-1818) was an interdenominational choral society whose directors included the Presbyterian minister Henry Moncrieff Wellwood and the latitudinarian Episcopal Rector Archibald Alison, and whose musical director was Charlotte Chapel organist John Mather. The Institution aimed to enhance the quality of music in Edinburgh churches and performed new music by local composers. At the same time, the Edinburgh Church Music Society, which rehearsed in St Andrew’s Church, pursued similar aims on a specifically Presbyterian basis.

Also in 1816, reported the Caledonian Mercury, ‘St Cuthbert’s Church Music Society held their first public practice in Mr Lothian’s meeting-house [...] with the intention of introducing in the parish church, a more modern, as well as a more regular performance of sacred music’. All these projects were in the wake of Edinburgh’s first Musical Festival of 1815, a major national event which included all of the future St John’s choir committee amongst its directors and which represented the start of Edinburgh’s belated participation in a British sacred music revival which had been spreading northwards since the late eighteenth century. The newspaper report on the St Cuthbert’s society locates it firmly in the context of this British revival: ‘Although in the first essay of this infant society it may be supposed that many omissions were made, yet a very fine selection of
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sacred music was performed; among which the Messiah, Portuguese Hymn, and several other pieces, were sung with good effect’. The established St Cuthbert’s, with its evangelical minister Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, drew much of its congregation from the poor suburbs around the West Port, while Mr Lothian’s chapel was a United Secessionist Presbyterian congregation in the same area, so this church music project appears to have been missionary, presbyterian and collaborative. Edinburgh’s most prominent High Churchman, James Walker of St Peter’s, is conspicuous for his absence from this movement to improve church music. The philosophy behind the movement had been articulated by Charlotte Chapel’s assistant minister Sydney Smith in his preface to *Sermons Preached in Charlotte Chapel* in 1801: ‘Good music has a prodigious effect in filling a church [...] Of what value, it may be asked, are auditors, who come there from such motives? But our first business seems to be, to bring them there from any motive [...] those who come for pleasure, may remain for prayer’. This might suggest a trend towards a ‘performance’ liturgy, but Sandford’s policies encouraged the opposite, using the move to St John’s as the occasion to institute congregational participation in the liturgy: ‘as the gentlemen of the vestry engage to make the responses, and as it is to be hoped that the congregation will soon follow their example, the Clerk’s services are to be dispensed with on Sundays’, noted the vestry minutes. This had nothing to do with maintaining traditions, and everything to do with the desire, shared by latitudinarian Whigs and Evangelicals in Edinburgh and deplored by the High Church (see the Lancastrian Schools project below, p. 195), to make religion more attractive, elevating, participative and relevant.

James White, writing on ecclesiastical architecture in 1962, regarded changes in church interior design as merely antiquarian until the Oxford Movement burst into physical manifestation at Littlemore Chapel in 1835. Yates, echoing the work of scholars like Peter Nockles, portrays a more gradual development of high church ideas towards Tractarianism. Yates regards the arrangement of the chancel adopted in St John’s as foremost among the ‘significant developments [...] during the two or three decades before the Oxford Movement’. For Yates, high church liturgical developments were distinct from ‘antiquarian churches’ which had become popular among clergy since about 1750, but
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which ‘made little direct contribution to Anglican liturgical attitudes’ however, did not make this distinction between ‘dry’ antiquarianism and ‘warm’ liturgical attitudes. It would have been extraordinary had he done so: a member of his congregation, Walter Scott was both a highly respected antiquarian and one of the leading writers of the Romantic movement, and used antiquarianism as the raw material for emotional storytelling. White regards Scott’s novels as key texts in the transition from antiquarianism to true gothic revival. For Sandford, the contemplation of a composite Gothic pillar with fan vaulting, such as those adorning St John’s, was not dry scholarship but an encounter with beauty that touched the heart: ‘extremely beautiful’, as he wrote of one in Wells Cathedral chapter house. The one outside Christ Church hall, he said, ‘dwells upon my recollection as an object of especial beauty’ (Figure 2.6). Antiquarian reconstruction of a modern chapel that would touch worshippers’ hearts as ancient cathedrals could do was not a dry, but a Romantic act, aiming for an emotional response.

St John’s was a collaborative effort, and precisely what input each individual put into William Burn’s final design is unknown. Yet Daniel Sandford must be considered as shaping its vision: he chaired the committees, he would be required to lead worship in this unusual new worship space, and for the past twenty-five years he had been a
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The revival of old Anglican practices in St John’s fits with Sandford’s preaching on Anglican liturgy and sacraments. In his symbolic first sermon in St John’s he applied his linguistic expertise to demonstrate that in the original Greek, the definite article ‘the prayers’ of Acts 2 v. 42 suggested that liturgy, ‘prescribed devotions, [...] offered up “with one accord”’, was scriptural. His Passion Week lectures show how he regarded the Episcopal year as focused on the atonement, with Wednesday and Friday services during Lent and every day in Passion Week forming a liturgical crescendo to the crucifixion. The same was true of the sacraments: communion was ‘to commemorate a sacrifice of the atonement’, while baptism ‘is a figure of our resemblance to our blessed Lord: as he was buried, and rose again’. Such activities were designed to precipitate the crisis of a conversion: ‘May the duties of this holy week, the contemplations in which it has engaged us [...] awaken us if we have been betrayed into the slumber of carnal affections, and of carnal lives!’ It was not high-church defence of Anglicanism, but evangelical priorities of scripture, atonement, conversion and activism which motivated Sandford to introduce these liturgical innovations to Edinburgh. While this association was extraordinary in Edinburgh, where evangelicalism was closely associated with Presbyterianism, it was unremarkable within British theology: Grayson Carter noted the tendency for Anglican Evangelicals, such as Henry Venn whom Sandford admired, to celebrate Episcopalian practices in a way later observers found surprising, and in the resurgent Episcopal Church Sandford had the opportunity, rare in the Church of England, to try out the new ideas in the construction of a new place of worship.

High churchmen, such as those who characterised the Scottish Episcopal Church, tended to be conservative in their liturgical practices, as shown by their reluctance to adopt the surplice (p. 25). Sandford’s chapel, on the other hand, was ahead of a new movement not to inherit, but to revive traditions: the architectural textbook considered a key text in the development of Gothic revival, Thomas Rickman’s *Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England* (1819) postdated St John’s. Stained-glass, long naves, choirs and fan vaults were not the safe, conservative traditions of high-church Anglicanism, but innovatory and cutting-edge. While research has advanced considerably
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into pre-Oxford Movement theology on the one hand, and liturgy, music and architecture on the other, understanding the intersection between the two would benefit from dedicated research, and Edinburgh, an influential British city with an unusual ecclesiastical configuration, would form an important part of such research. The parallel with the cultural revival of Sandford’s contemporary Bishop Burgess in Wales (p. 70) would form another. From the available evidence, however, to describe Sandford as ‘high church’ on the basis of his interest in elevated liturgy appears anachronistic.

When lines were drawn between evangelical and high after 1816, Sandford refused to play: ‘I have nothing to do with party. I shall ever love and reverence true piety, whether I find it in the pages of the Christian Observer or the British Critic’ – the Church of England’s Evangelical and high church periodicals. His theological position, as he trod the careful and conciliatory line described above (p. 58), appeared beyond the comprehension of his high church colleagues: ‘he certainly gave too much countenance to the follies of evangelism; but he has [...] seen his errors,’ was the closest Bishop Gleig came to understanding it. Sandford would have preferred not to be categorised at all. Yet to understand how he fitted into the ecclesiastical landscape of Britain and Edinburgh in his own lifetime, he is best regarded as an Episcopalian evangelical. For Sandford, missionary religion involved collaboration between all Protestants, but was best achieved through Episcopalian forms, elevated with artistic creativity rooted in the best antiquarian scholarship. Fan vaulting, filtered sunlight and counterpoint, along with sacrament, preaching and liturgy, opened the heart to Christ. Unlike his high church colleagues, who regarded Episcopalianism as the only true form of Christianity, Sandford regarded the Episcopal Church as the church best suited for mission. Sandford’s interest in liturgical worship in a recreated gothic interior to the best standard of scholarly authenticity, with a fine choir and stained glass, represented not reactionary high churchmanship, but a short-lived but influential movement of progressive evangelical antiquarianism.

2.5 Ministry of Reconciliation

In October 1804, the Synod of Laurencekirk paved the way for qualified chapels to join the Scottish Episcopal Church, and only a month later, Sandford’s congregation became the first to do so. At Sandford’s consecration, by which time most qualified chapels had
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united, Bishop Skinner read from a letter from Sir William Forbes congratulating him on ‘the happy Election this day of a Bishop of Edinburgh […] to whose steady perseverance in what he believed to be the conduct he ought to pursue, I do verily believe we owe the happy Union that has taken place among all those who are attached to Episcopal Principles.’ \[164\] Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo in Aberdeenshire, who died in 1806, was on the vestry of the Cowgate Episcopal Chapel \[165\]; however, it was he who recognised the potential usefulness of Sandford to the Episcopal Church, and provided crucial encouragement and support, and a role model of enlightened Episcopalianism, to him at the beginning of his ministry. His son, also William Forbes, was a member of Charlotte Chapel. By Sandford’s death in 1830 Skinner and Forbes were long gone, but Archibald Alison, minister of the Cowgate Chapel, reminded his congregation, ‘if it is grateful to us to see those prejudices dispelled which once marred all our usefulness and respectability; if the established church of the country receives us as fellow-servants of the same Lord […] if we can behold with gratitude the towers of our churches rising amidst the splendid improvements of this city […] Let it be remembered that it is […] to […] Bishop Sandford that the success of that great measure of the union of our churches is justly to be ascribed, and in the calendar of that united church let his name from henceforth be first and foremost enrolled!’ \[166\] Eulogists who were too young to remember the schism, including Sandford’s curate Edward Bannerman Ramsay, son John and Caledonian Mercury obituarist, took a different line. They were less interested in Sandford’s achievements than in the didactic capital to be made from an exemplary character who ‘despised the call of worldly policy and prudence, and listened only to the voice of duty’, giving up ‘good prospects in the more prosperous branch of the episcopal church’ to accept a bishopric in a ‘church struggling with difficulties’ \[167\].

The assessments of Skinner, Forbes and Alison were forgotten. Histories of St John’s have been concerned only with Sandford’s decision to unite his own chapel to the Episcopal Church \[168\]. Foskett says Sandford ‘used all his influence’ to facilitate union, but did not elaborate on this remark \[169\].
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who refused canonical obedience to the Diocesan’ by signing the Thirty-Nine Articles at Laurencekirk to ‘bring those wilfully separated brethren into the Scottish fold’: Sandford is mentioned along with Archibald Alison and Henry Lloyd of Leith as one of the first batch to ‘submit’[170] Far from his name being ‘first and foremost enrolled’, in more recent accounts of the union of the Episcopal Church Sandford’s name has disappeared altogether.[171] Ted Luscombe’s account of the final chapter in the story, by which the Synod of Laurencekirk in 1804 paved the way for union, gives Sandford credit for uniting first, but without analysing the barriers to qualified chapels’ unions which made Sandford’s act a bold achievement.[172] However, while the union of 1804 is remembered as an important event in Scottish Episcopalian history, and while many letters pertaining to it survive, no detailed account of the negotiations which led to it has yet been given.

Charlotte Chapel was the last qualified chapel to be founded in Edinburgh and the first to unite with the Scottish Episcopal Church, and Sandford’s involvement was decisive for the process of union. The influential laymen promoting the union, including banker Sir William Forbes; judge Alexander Fraser Tytler; and Thomas Hay-Drummond, Earl of Kinnoull, were part of a cross-border circle of high church clergy and laity including Scottish Primus John Skinner; English playwright Richard Cumberland; Sandford’s friends from Bath, the Bowdlers; Bishop Samuel Horsley; and English Hutchinsonians in the circle of William Stevens. Their work for repeal of the penal laws in 1792 has been well documented[173] However, their plan to reunite the church by making English Hutchinsonian Jonathan Boucher a Scottish bishop collapsed in April 1794 for a variety of reasons including lack of English support and Boucher’s reluctance to risk his English livings.[174] By the time the Boucher plan failed, the Edinburgh laity were already employing the young Oxford stylist Sandford to edit their writings[175] In July 1800 Tytler and Sandford attempted to clarify the doubtful canon law status of English clergy who joined the Scottish Episcopal Church; and in August Kinnoull, too, ‘had a full conversation with our respectable and worthy friend Mr Sandford on the subject of English &
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Scotch Episcopalians’. These conversations suggest that by 1800 Sandford had been identified as a possible alternative to Boucher. However, in Sandford’s mind, the biggest barrier to union was not temporal but spiritual: the Scottish Episcopal Church had no written statement of faith, and so English clergy had no guarantee of its orthodoxy. During the Synod of Laurencekirk, convened by Skinner on 24 October 1804, Sandford acted as consultant to ensure that the remedial measure, adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles, was taken correctly. At a late stage, clergy who thought the Articles too Calvinist proposed adding a high-church preface. Skinner turned to Sandford for assistance, who just in time sent a letter, ‘very pertinent, & at great length [...] reconciling us all [...] to the propriety of subscribing the articles, just as the clergy of the Church of England do.’ Sandford immediately addressed his congregation in a pamphlet explaining why union was now not only desirable but required, since ‘CAUSELESS SEPARATION FROM A PURE CHURCH, is the sin of SCHISM, an offence, of which it is impossible that any pious and enlightened Christian can think lightly.’ His pamphlet was clear, forceful and effective: ‘my little paper has been received with the greatest good will. Not a dissenting voice have I heard’, he wrote to Skinner on 19 November, announcing just three weeks after Laurencekirk that Charlotte Chapel had joined the Scottish Episcopal Church.

William Forbes received congratulations from Charles Daubeny, Archdeacon of Sarum, calling Sandford ‘the Harbinger to the Peace of the Church’; while Bishop Skinner received congratulations from Bishop Porteus of London on the ‘great acquisition’ of his protégé Daubeny, a high church English champion of Scottish Episcopalianism, was hostile to the Church-and-State Porteus: they had recently crossed swords over Sunday schools. Sandford’s union, for a moment at least, genuinely reconciled antagonists, not only in Scotland, but across Britain.

Other English clergy, however, retained serious doubts. The legal position regarding cross-border pluralism and ordinations remained hazy and Sandford sought to clarify the matter, for example receiving advice from the high church lawyer James Park that a deacon ordained in Scotland would not be disqualified from receiving a priest’s orders and
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preferment in England. Furthermore, spiritual difficulties also persisted. Skinner said Archibald Alison of the Cowgate Chapel ‘still feels some difficulty’ about union a year after Laurencekirk, and it seems likely that the prospect of submitting to a Hutchinsonian, anti-Enlightenment college of bishops was the reason: Alison was one of Edinburgh’s enlightened literati. In changing his mind and joining the Episcopal Church in December 1804, Alison was (Skinner reported) ‘recommending [...] the intended promotion of Dr [Sandford].’ Skinner had in fact proposed Sandford as Bishop of Edinburgh as soon as he united, but there followed delicate negotiations to persuade the elderly Hutchinsonian Bishop Drummond to retire. Alison’s decision coincided with the issuing of a mandate to elect Drummond’s successor, and he admired Sandford for having taken the lead (p. 85). Sandford was no less committed to the Enlightenment than Alison: Alison’s hesitancy demonstrates Sandford’s courage in joining a church of dubious legality and theology; Alison’s union demonstrates how, in two years, Sandford transformed its relationship to the Church of England, secured its endorsement from English bishops and ensured a viable career path for its clergy.

Sandford’s first act as bishop was to reach out another hand of friendship, to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. In his widely-read Charge to the Clergy of Edinburgh: he used very different language to that of James Walker in his sermon at Sandford’s recent consecration (p. 28) Sandford wrote, ‘with regard [...] to our Christian brethren of the Established Church [...] if we cannot always “hold the faith in the unity of the spirit,” (such is the imperfection of our nature,) we are not thereby entitled to break that “bond of peace”, which should be acknowledged by all who acknowledge Jesus Christ. Not only does Sandford twice emphasise in this sentence that Presbyterians are fellow Christians, but in blaming the schism on ‘the imperfection of our nature’ he suggests blame lies on both sides. Near the conclusion of his charge he chose a remark about integrity made by Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, minister of the neighbouring parish church St Cuthbert’s, as one which ‘deserves our particular consideration.’ In this instance his son’s memoir rings true: ‘his politeness was [...] the expression of benevolence, as well as of refinement.’

183 Daniel Sandford to George Winn, 9 January 1805, NRS CH12/14/70.
184 John Skinner to William Forbes, 14 November 1805, NLS Acc.4796/32.
185 John Skinner to William Forbes, 18 December 1805, NLS Acc.4796/32.
186 See, for example, Daniel Sandford to John Skinner, 16 December 1805, NRS CH12/12/2141.
189 Sandford, Charge, p. 21.
190 Sandford, Remains, vol.1, p. 78.
commitments to the cause of reconciliation.

2.6 Influence

While his importance as a unifier has been acknowledged, Sandford has not been regarded as a strong theological influence on his own Episcopal Church, but to argue that therefore he was uninfluential altogether is to fail to recognise his outward focus. Sandford's influence was as an educator. ‘There is no office [...] by which you may [...] do more real and lasting good,’ he told his clergy regarding catechising. ‘I speak from long experience, that there is no duty required of us, which is more delightful [...] We must [...] ascertain that [children] understand what they say [...] advancing in the nurture and admonition of the Lord’. Sandford remembered the children he catechised, stayed in touch with many, and addressed several of his published works to young people.

Sandford's influence in fostering Evangelical theology in Edinburgh diocese has been argued above (p. 59). While it is possible Sandford was an early formative influence on Craig and Noel, their mature Evangelical theology owed more to English Evangelicalism. Sandford may have encouraged them in a general belief that a theology based on ‘light’ rather than logic was consistent with Episcopalianism, but he certainly failed to convince them that baptismal regeneration, diocesan unity and liturgical conformity were essential to that theology. Another young clergyman in the diocese was Charles Terrot. On the basis of a comment by George Gleig, Meldrum argues that Terrot was a member of the High rather than Evangelical ‘party’, but Gleig’s ecclesiastical categorisations are dubious (p. 84). Despite beginning his career as assistant to the high church James Walker in 1817, Terrot appears closer to the Evangelicals: he was secretary of the Edinburgh branch of the Church Missionary Society, in which Craig and Noel were leading members.

Meldrum is right to argue that by the 1830s his theological position appeared far removed from the Evangelical ‘party’. As Bishop of Edinburgh in 1842 Terrot reluctantly enforced a new canon law on the leading Evangelical David Drummond, forbidding him from holding non-liturgical prayer meetings, precipitating a new schism in the Episcopal Church. However, understanding Sandford’s Evangelicalism helps explain how, rather than being a High-Churchman influenced by Evangelicals, Terrot was an Evangel-

---

191 Sandford, Charge, p. 20.
193 Meldrum, Conscience and Compromise, p. 55.
194 Missionary Register 6, 1818, p.228; 8, 1820, p.233; 10, 1822 p.146.
195 Strong, Episcopalianism, p. 216.
ical who emerged from the debates of the late 1820s and 1830s in a divergent position.

The two most obvious candidates for Sandford’s influence were his youngest son John, born 1801, who followed him into ministry, and his curate Charles Lane. John was given the living of Chillingham in 1827 by Sandford’s old friend from Oxford, William van Mildert, Bishop of Durham. In 1845 John published Parochialia, which in its preface clearly states his opinion of the previous generation of clergy. While he celebrated the fact that ‘never, since the Reformation’ had religion ‘taken such hold on men’s minds’, he deplored the ‘indiscretion and extravagance; nay, even in some instances, by a grievous departure from sound doctrine’ which had often resulted from this revival. This explains his eagerness to shield his father from suspicion of Evangelicalism. Bishop Sandford’s generation of clergy were ‘men to whom the Church owes a debt of the deepest gratitude’, because they inherited the eighteenth-century church, and ‘anything is preferable to what characterised her then: – an effete theology; a lax and licentious tone of morals; an ignorant and secular priesthood [...]’ (the list goes on). John Sandford then buried this brief acknowledgement of gratitude under a long list of qualifications: these men were ‘only pioneers’, their work ‘necessarily introductory’, and ‘only laid the foundation, on which other men should build’. Their theology was ‘partial and faulty’, leaving ‘not only much to do, but also something to repair’: they ‘coalesced with dissenters’ having ‘found, in some of them, a knowledge of Scripture, and a practical godliness’, and ‘their reading was all of one sort, and rather addressed to the affections than to the understanding. They were not men of learning’. In his own generation, John argued, it was time to eschew the ‘false kindness’ of ‘slurring over points of disagreement’, and time ‘to win [...]’ by commanding respect. Despite the controversial tone of the preface, the remainder of the book, based on ‘the experience of a ministry of twenty years’, is constructive: a clear, comprehensive and beautifully illustrated manual describing how to refurbish a church, establish a parish school, improve liturgy, institute parish visiting and so on, encompassing details from the volunteers’ rota, to the most entertaining design of a swing for the playground.

John was the author of what, until now, was Sandford’s only biography, which most subsequent historians have taken on trust, but poorly represents Sandford’s theology.

The contemporary review in the British Critic, while delighted with the collection of
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Sandford’s letters to his children, was dismissive of the ‘eulogy’, considering John ‘not the most competent judge’ of his father’s official life, although ‘we have no reason to imagine that the facts are uncandidly stated’. They were particularly critical of the ‘canting language’ with which John asserted his father’s unworldliness on slender evidence: ‘What [...] were the professional prospects with which he entered life? He continued to do the duties of a small chapel and to instruct a few young men, at least twelve years after he retired to Scotland’.

John was educated in England and was only fifteen when the Western Schism (p. 58) caused a breach amongst Evangelical Anglicans. He failed to grasp the importance of Sandford’s reconciliation of the Episcopal Church or work with Evangelical Presbyterians; and if he was aware that his father’s progressive theology at the turn of the century was responsible for his lack of promotion, as argued above (p. 46), he was certainly not going to say so. John, Daniel’s youngest son, born in 1801 when he was thirty-five, presumably was influenced by his father, but the religious landscape of Chillingham in 1845 was so far removed from Episcopalian Edinburgh in 1800 that John was a very different theologian. For this study, the clearer influence is of John on his father, in obscuring the most interesting aspects of his thought in subsequent accounts.

Charles Lane was the son of a London businessman whose family, like Sandford’s, took great pride in their Norman ancestry. He became Sandford’s curate in 1816 but probably knew him previously, perhaps through family connections in Shropshire, since he married Sandford’s daughter Frances the same year. This ensured a close ongoing relationship even after Charles and Frances left Edinburgh in 1818, when the chapel vestry wrote him a warm letter expressing the ‘regrets & best wishes of a numerous congregation for their respected minister; and still more of a large circle’ who would more keenly appreciate ‘the loss they have sustained by a separation from their amiable and esteemed friend’. After various appointments around London, Lane obtained the rectory of Wrotham, Kent, in 1845, where he ministered for thirty-five years until his death in 1879. His death occasioned a gossipy paragraph in several newspapers entitled ‘A Fat Living’, noting that in occupying the second most valuable living in Kent, Lane over his long ministry had received over £40,000 from it. The Rev J.H. Jaquet, preaching the funeral sermon, found a copy of Sandford’s Remains and was re-inspired by John Sandford’s eulogy: ‘I never remember having read an account of such a pure and holy life, and if the
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Figure 2.7: Pulpit finial and choir screen in the medieval Wrotham Church, part of the restorations by Charles Lane completed in 1860. (Photo: Rob Hague, 2012.)
reading only of this life produces such impressions, what must have been the influence from the daily contact of such a character upon the life of a young man’.

Jaquet summarised Lane's ministry: Lane gave a much-needed restoration to the medieval Wrotham church (Figure 2.7) and took ‘deep interest [...] in building new schools in two different parts of the parish’.

This suggests similar priorities to Sandford's, but whereas the Lancastrian Schools and St John's had an air of avant-garde in Regency Edinburgh, Lane's ministry appears unremarkable alongside those of innumerable other Victorian clergy: he might have been following the advice of John Sandford’s *Parochialia*. Finally, Jaquet described Lane’s theology, noting that ‘his life proved that religion can give a man intense happiness’. Lane's favourite theological subject was the Holy Spirit. Jaquet said, ‘I need hardly tell you, because you know his favourite theme so well. Oh! how much, how very much, he has written about it. I mean our Lord’s Prayer, and especially that clause of it where we are taught to pray for God’s Holy Spirit in the words, “Give us this day our daily bread”.

Lane shared Sandford’s warm spirituality and commitment to education, but, as with John Sandford and Terrot, it diverged from its early Evangelical roots.

Sandford was likely to have been an important influence in the lives of two significant lay theologians, William Stroud and Thomas Erskine. Stroud was baptised by Sandford in 1817 while a medical student in Edinburgh, an event Sandford recalled in 1825 which demonstrates the casual Regency attitude to Protestant denomination which sometimes surprised later commentators: ‘I once baptised a young Baptist at twenty-five years of age. He became a very pious and serious man’. Stroud remained in Edinburgh for some time after he qualified, before travelling in Europe and settling in London in 1828, becoming a member of the Countess of Huntingdon’s Connexion. Although a professional doctor, it was for his theological work, *Treatise on the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ* (1847) that he was later best known. Stroud was the first scholar to apply modern science to understanding the precise historical events of the crucifixion. His introduction resonates with the confidence of the generation taught by Dugald Stewart: his treatise provided ‘proof of the value of inductive reasoning; which, like a sounding-line let down into the ocean of time, has thus, from the depth of 1800 years, brought up to the sur-
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face a pearl of great price’. Twenty years later James Young Simpson agreed with Stroud’s conclusion that Christ’s rapid death on the cross was caused by ‘agony of the mind, producing rupture of the heart’ was ‘fundamentally correct’, and an internet search for ‘How did Jesus die?’ reveals that his explanation is still preferred by many Christians today, although recent medical research concluded that the evidence was insufficient to demonstrate the exact cause.

However, whereas twentieth-century commentators like Arthur Cunstance used Stroud’s arguments as scientific proof that Jesus really did die and therefore was raised, Stroud’s own theological focus was not on the truth of resurrection, but the significance of atonement. He argued that the facts of Christ’s death ‘admit of no other explanation, than that it was the death of an atoning victim vicariously enduring the divine malediction, for which purpose no other mode of death would have been adapted’. Had Christ died from normal physical causes, no scientist committed to Hume’s theory of causation could have inferred any divine intervention beyond the laws of physics: ‘An incompetent or sinful being would have perished by some of the remote consequences of this malediction’. However, a psychological cause, ‘agony of the mind’, suggested ‘an adequate and innocent victim [who] must have been destroyed by the malediction itself’, operating in the non-physical, spiritual sphere of the Common Sense philosophy of the mind. Stroud’s conclusion is the same as Sandford’s in his narrative of the history of the passion (p. 73): this encounter with, rather than intellectual demonstration of, the truth of the atonement, ‘is worthy of universal acceptance, demanding alike the homage of the understanding, and the adoration of the heart’.

As a final word, Stroud, with his Baptist and Episcopalian affinities, reasserted the importance of Christian unity in words reminiscent of Sandford and Moncrieff (p. 196), hoping his treatise would ‘suggest to Christians of different denominations additional motives to unity and brotherly kindness; by reminding them that [...] the points wherein they agree are far more numerous and important than those on which they differ.’ Stroud said that he had been working on the ideas for ‘more than a quarter of a century’, making them contemporary with Sandford’s 1821 Lectures on the History of the Week of the Passion.
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Stroud’s ideas had their origin in Sandford’s Edinburgh lectures, in which science and history provided the fuel for spiritual warmth.

Whereas Stroud’s medical developments enabled a creative application of Sandford’s Regency theology, another layman, Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, developed the theological ideas themselves at the forefront of Victorian thought. James Erskine of Linlathen had children baptised in Charlotte Chapel, and the writings of his brother Thomas suggest close intellectual ties with the world of Charlotte Chapel, although there are no records of his church affiliation during this period. Thomas trained as an advocate, and was in the circle of the other young advocates of the West End, many of whom were members of Charlotte Chapel (p. 153). When in 1823 he travelled in Europe with Gerard Noel and encountered Henry Cockburn also on tour in Geneva, he wrote, ‘Harry looked so like home, that I could scarce help thinking myself in Charlotte Square’\textsuperscript{211} In 1830 Cockburn wrote to Erskine of ‘the affection which I have ever received from you, and which I can truly say I have always been delighted to return. We have been more separated throughout life, by distance and by pursuits, than at earlier periods I thought likely, but this has never cooled my regard, nor yours’\textsuperscript{212} When James died prematurely in 1816 Thomas inherited his Angus estate. The brothers were close: Thomas wrote that James was his inspiration, ‘like what I can suppose glorified humanity will be’\textsuperscript{213}

Thomas Erskine’s influences have always remained something of a mystery, his ideas radically original compared with his own Edinburgh culture. Recent extensive and insightful studies of his life and theology by Trevor Hart, Nicholas Needham and Don Horrocks have emphasised this maverick nature\textsuperscript{214} None of the influences Horrocks identifies, Kant, Hume, Coleridge, Irenaeus and Athanasius, and the English eighteenth-century writer William Law, came from Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{215} Erskine’s biographers have acknowledged his Episcopalian influence, but denied he was Episcopalian himself. His mother’s family were Jacobite, and during his childhood his grandmother held nonjuring Episcopal services in Airth castle.\textsuperscript{216} Whether she ever worshipped in Charlotte Chapel is uncertain, but there were certainly old ladies very like her amongst Sandford’s flock.

\textsuperscript{212}Hanna, \textit{Erskine’s Letters}, p. 53.  
\textsuperscript{215}Horrocks, \textit{Soteriology of Thomas Erskine} pp. 168, 180, 231.  
\textsuperscript{216}Hart, \textit{Erskine} p. 8.
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Thomas’ father died in 1791 and his Episcopalian mother had a house in the New Town, Thomas living with her in Northumberland Street while he studied for the bar. When he was dying in 1870, Thomas received communion from Daniel’s grandson, Daniel Fox Sandford, assistant to Sandford’s successor Edward Bannerman Ramsay, and shortly to succeed him as the third rector of St John’s. However, Erskine also had very strong Church of Scotland connections: his uncle was John Erskine, leader of the Evangelicals in the Kirk until 1803. On the basis that all Episcopalians at this period were ‘High’, historians have assumed Erskine’s Evangelicalism must have been nurtured in a Presbyterian context, and that his rejection of Calvinism and connections with the Episcopal church were later developments. With the Evangelical Sandford in the picture, however, it seems far more likely to have been the other way around: that as a young lawyer in Edinburgh he attended Charlotte Chapel with his Episcopalian mother, starting from a position of non-Calvinist Evangelicalism, but, like Sandford, regarding the Presbyterian church as a true church.

Unless Erskine was Episcopalian, his close involvement in early Episcopalian missionary work would be surprising. The Society for the Support of Gaelic Schools was largely a Presbyterian venture, but with Episcopalian involvement: in 1813 his brother James Erskine was a governor and Thomas was on the committee, and Bishop Sandford subscribed 10s 6d to the project. By 1818, Episcopalian Evangelicals were founding missionary projects of their own, and Thomas was one of their chief supporters. He was a founder vice-president of Gerard Noel’s Edinburgh branch of the Church Missionary Society and still actively involved in 1822 when it was based at Edward Craig’s new chapel of St James.

Thomas Erskine went on to become an important influence on British liberal theology. His admission, ‘I believe the Bible because of the things I find in it rather than that I believe them because they are in the Bible’, and his doctrine of universal salvation were more radical than Sandford’s, and moving far from mainstream Evangelicalism. However, a caricaturing of Episcopalianism as staid and ‘high’ has underestimated the potential of Sandford’s enlightened, Evangelical Episcopalianism in allowing the Enlightenment to shape the thought of a younger generation of influential Edinburgh thinkers without losing their Scottish Episcopalian influences.
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217 Missionary Register 6, (1818) p.229; 10 (1822) p.146.
Sandford’s union of the Episcopal Church and appointment as Bishop of Edinburgh enabled members of the qualified chapels to receive confirmation at the hands of a bishop for the first time: the main impact of the union for Episcopalian laity. Over the course of his episcopate he confirmed 1904 people in Edinburgh, 908 of them in Charlotte Chapel. Figure 2.8 shows the clearing of an initial backlog of confirmands followed by slow but steady growth in the diocese, with an average of 83 per year in the 1810s rising to 92 per year in the 1820s. Sandford presented confirmation as a solemn and important rite of passage. He personally prepared children for it: his ‘catechetical course embraced a period of several years,’ recalled his son, ‘and conducted the catechumens through a graduated system of instruction, until they publicly renewed their baptismal engagement, and received from his hands the rite of confirmation’ 219. It was one of his favourite tasks: ‘he had always great enjoyment in the society of the young; and they were, in general, greatly attached to him’, and said himself that, ‘there is no duty required of us, which is more delightful in itself, or more affectionately and gratefully received’ 220. ‘There is no office of your profession by which you may reasonably expect to do more real and lasting good’, he told his clergy, than ‘frequent, zealous and laborious catechism of the young persons of your congregations’, which must mean taking ‘such pains as good sense and discre-

219 Sandford, Remains, vol. 1, p. 100.
220 Sandford, Remains, vol.1, p. 99; Sandford, Charge, p. 20.
tion will suggest, to ascertain that they understand what they say, and that they are not merely exercising their memories, but advancing in the nurture and admonition of the Lord’. In his own congregation, this involved ‘examination and explanatory remarks’ for a ‘junior class’, and ‘short addresses, and [...] prescribed written exercises, which he carefully examined at home’ for the seniors. The life-long links of affection and admiration which this process forged are evident in a letter to his grown-up daughter in 1821: ‘pray give my kindest regards to your amiable guest [...] I am proud of her remembrance, and much flattered by the value which she is pleased to place on my scrawls. She was the flower of the flock which at that time assembled at my rails.’ In 1809 published an address he gave at confirmation. Based on the ‘armour of God’ passage in Ephesians, it echoed Christ’s commission to the disciples, but reconfigured as a Romantic, chivalric quest. The confirmands would face, ‘enemies to be countered and subdued; trials to be undergone; and services to be performed’, and would be required to demonstrate ‘fidelity and obedience to the “Captain of your salvation,” under whose banners you are enlisted’. ‘With these resolutions, and with these hopes, now advance,’ concluded, like a lord speaking to his knights: ‘You go forth, attended by the blessing of God’s minister, and the prayers of your friends and fellow Christians now gathered round you.’ Given that had just published the chivalric romances and, Sandford’s talk of enemies, trials, services, banners, and going forth caught the tone of popular culture perfectly, and the teenage boys and girls who listened had worked hard for the spiritual qualification they had just received from this dedicated teacher.

Sandford’s influence is to be sought in many Edinburgh-educated and globally-influential Victorians, such as lay theologians and Thomas Erskine, or MP William Forbes MacKenzie (p. 216) and first Bishop of Central Africa Charles MacKenzie (1825-1862), sons of whose close friendship with is discussed on p. 213. Another MP taught by was George Winn. Winn was the London correspondent through whom, in 1805, sought legal advice regarding the position of English clergy in the Scottish Episcopal Church (p. 87n.). At Winn’s death in 1827 wrote that he, ‘became my pupil in October 1801, then in the seventeenth year

221 Sandford, Charge, pp. 20-21.
224 Daniel Sandford, An Address to Young Persons after Confirmation (Edinburgh: Manners and Miller, 1809) pp. 5-6, 14.
of his age, – one of the most promising and delightful youths whom it was ever my hap-
iness to know [...] In September 1826 he put himself to the expense and trouble of a 
journey hither to pass a week under my roof [...] His continual engagements interfered 
with our correspondance; but I believe he loved me as I ever loved him; and no tears 
were ever more sincere than I have shed at his premature removal from a station which 
he was calculated to adorn’. Since little of Sandford’s correspondence has survived, ev-
idence for these examples came to light by chance, and are likely to be a sample of a far 
larger number.

2.7 Conclusion

Charlotte Chapel was a success because the theology of its rector was in tune with the 
liveliest ideas in Edinburgh at the time. While Oxford made Sandford an elegant Latin-ist 
and an authority on biblical languages, bluestockings appear to have taught him the 
value of a religion of the heart, and of a mind open to new ideas. By the time of his first 
publication in 1802, after ten years in Edinburgh, he had, in common with the majority 
of the young literati of the city, been deeply influenced by the Scottish Enlightenment 
worldview taught by Dugald Stewart. Sandford’s commitment to Enlightenment prin-
ciples in the years following the French Revolution, to an egalitarian Evangelical theology, 
and to friendship with the Presbyterian Kirk following Episcopal union showed him to 
be a courageous and independent-minded theologian. He regarded the greatest threat 
to Christianity as coming not from Enlightenment philosophy or wrongheaded popular 
movements, but from what he regarded as narrow-minded, cold-hearted or controver-
sialist attitudes within his own church. His published works posed a robust challenge 
to such attitudes, although the coherence and originality of his position within the Scot-
tish Episcopal Church has been obscured by his other great commitment to reconciliation 
within the Episcopal Church. This earned Sandford praise from his colleagues when it 
was a matter of uniting the qualified chapels, and censure when he worked to resolve par-
tisan quarrels in which they were involved: in 1819, soon after his attack on the doctrine 
of original sin, Bishop Gleig wrote to Bishop Torry that the Edinburgh clergy kept their 
‘gentle brother in Edinburgh in leading strings’; and in 1826 James Walker grumbled that 
‘our Bishop is timid’ for failing to discipline his Evangelical antagonist Edward Craig.

---

225 George Gleig to Patrick Torry, 24 August 1819, NRS CH12/12/2362; James Walker, 22 May 1826, in 
Neale, Patrick Torry, p. 144.
Yet Sandford's most important influence was not on the Scottish Episcopal Church. Despite his high regard for its polity and his restorative role as a diocesan administrator, he was out of tune with other stronger theological currents which persisted through his life and beyond. Rather, his influence may be looked for in Edinburgh, amongst the young laity towards whom his work and writing was chiefly directed. Sandford's theology should be seen in the context of the gathered congregation who chose to listen to this freelance preacher, and enabled a man who never gained a preferment to become a bishop.
Chapter 3

The Congregation of Charlotte Chapel

Between 1794 and 1818 Daniel Sandford’s congregation built and outgrew Charlotte Chapel, and moved into the new 700-seat St John’s, a testimony to the popularity of Sandford’s ministry. Who were all these people? This chapter describes the congregation of Charlotte Chapel, exploring the social rank, national identity, marriage patterns and kinship links amongst its members. The first two of these explorations begin with assumptions to be tested. The literature review suggested Scottish Episcopalian congregations, in addition to being small, had a reputation for being elitist\(^1\) while Charlotte Chapel itself was known as a congregation for ‘English families residing in Edinburgh’\(^2\). The portrait of the congregation in this chapter, based on identification of 431 individual members, throws both these assumptions into question.

3.1 Social rank

Figure 3.2 shows the social rank of members of Charlotte Chapel. While the categories have clear definitions they contained a wide range of finely delineated ranks, and while there was a strong understanding of the deference and obligations owed from one rank to another, individuals could (and did) move between categories. The ‘Aristocracy’ and
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Figure 3.1: Charlotte Chapel (Reproduced from Terry, *Memorials*, p. 24).

Figure 3.2: Social rank of members of Charlotte Chapel. The category divisions should be regarded as points inserted on a spectrum for comparative purposes, rather than self-conscious and conflicting classes: the use of complementary rather than contrasting colours in these graphs is intended to suggest this.
‘Baronetcy’ includes those with hereditary titles and their children. The ‘Landed Gentry’ category includes only gentlemen who inherited an estate, or who were immediate heir to an estate. ‘Privileged’ includes all daughters and younger sons of landed gentry. They populated the professions, particularly the Faculty of Advocates, and often crowned their career with the purchase of an estate of their own, although not one large enough to enable them to retire from their profession. Many of what Bob Harris describes as ‘pseudo-gentry’ and ‘professionals’ are included in this group but ‘privileged’ has been chosen as better reflecting the rank of their birth, rather than the achievements of their life which are the subject of Chapter Four. A few people did succeed in overcoming the disadvantages of their birth to the extent of rising from a non-privileged background to the status of landed gentry, like Jane Austen’s Mr Bingley in *Pride and Prejudice*[^3]. These, and their children, are in the ‘Self-made’ category. Thus Henry Cockburn and Walter Scott were both sons of lawyers and successful professionals who bought estates with their earnings, but Cockburn, whose father was the hereditary laird of Cockpen, is categorised as privileged, whereas Scott, whose father was the landless son of a farmer, is categorised as self-made. The ‘Petty-bourgeois’ are a diverse category of urban professionals and artisans with no connection to the land: at one end advocates mingling with their privileged colleagues; at the other, entrepreneurial shopkeepers such as William Vallance, glover. Finally, the ‘Labour’ category includes all who worked as low-skilled employees, primarily in domestic service. These were more difficult to identify: Sandford tended to note land-ownership and professional qualifications in the registers but not more humble occupations, so their occupation is known only if they could be identified from other sources, primarily the Old Parish Registers (if they married in a parish church) or censuses (if they lived beyond 1841). Strict Episcopalians, temporary English migrants, and people with common names are all unidentifiable from these sources, but the fact that those in the ‘unknown’ category identified through these sources were overwhelmingly in the labour or the lower end of the petty-bourgeois categories suggests that the majority of the remaining ‘unknown’ are also of low rank.

Land-based rank, unchallenged by concepts of class, was still sufficiently embedded in social consciousness to make it the most useful way to explore the structure of the congregation of Charlotte Chapel, but, as Amanda Vickery observed regarding land and trade in Lancashire, ‘if a cultural war was being waged, then half the county was shame-[^3]

lessly fraternising with the enemy". Rank was far from static: a continuous snakes-and-ladders game was being played out as new wealth was fed in and laundered by inheritance. All children other than the eldest son lost status relative to their father, which in a culture of large families meant the gentry ‘leaked’ into lower ranks at a rapid rate. Daniel Sandford’s father was ‘gentry’, Daniel himself was ‘privileged’, but his daughter Frances was ‘petty-bourgeois’, an urban professional’s daughter. She gained rank again by marrying Charles Lane a gentleman’s son, but their children were becoming far removed from the land. Professionals could climb up again by purchasing land, a climb consolidated only when their eldest son inherited it: Alexander MacKenzie was only privileged, but bought Portmore in Peebleshire, and so his son Colin inheriting Portmore, was ‘landed gentry’. Those who had never owned land could, by purchase, set their foot on the lowest rung of the landowning ranks, whereupon, like captains in the Navy List, they apparently only required the luck of survival to begin to rise in seniority. Yet this apparent stability was an illusion: staying on the ladder required as much effort as getting on to it. The most senior gentry families could be threatened either, like Georgina Lamont’s father, by financial pressure from the new wealth, or, like Sir Thomas Livingstone by failing to produce a male heir. At the lower end of the social scale, employed ‘labour’ like the gentleman’s servant Samuel Hopporton rose into the ‘petty-bourgeoisie’ (p. 168). John Nourse too, was a gentleman servant when he married a gardener’s daughter, Elizabeth Burn in 1793. Elizabeth developed their flourishing catering business after his premature death, and ‘John B. Nourse, cook, pastry cook and ornamentalist’, who cooked for Queen Victoria at the Douglas Hotel, Aberdeen, in 1851 was probably a descendant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristocracy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baronetcy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landed Gentry</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileged</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Made</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Bourgeois</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>431</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Social Rank of members of Charlotte Chapel, by gender and type of connection.
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The crude proportions in figure 3.2 may be understood more fully by analysing them by gender, time and chapel involvement. Table 3.1 shows figures for men and women in each category. In themselves these tell us little since women interacted with the ranking system in a different way, deriving their status from their fathers or husbands. This did not mean they were less active in the snakes-and-ladders game: the luck of heiresses and the graft of businesswomen played an important role. Anna Underwood, widowed with four children under ten, carried on her husband’s hairdressing business and launched two of her children into the medical and legal professions: a rise from the lower to the upper end of the broad ‘petty-bourgeois’ category to a position where they would be mingling with, and could easily cross into, the privileged. Heiresses Sarah and Maria Morley, daughters of the ‘self-made’ James Morley who purchased Kempshott in Hampshire with his East Indian fortune, helped their husbands William Ogilvy and Donald Ogilvy to sustain the family’s historic landed presence in Angus, despite the depredations of Jacobite attainders in the previous generation. Of the 214 married couples in the study, sixty-nine were categorised as of the same social rank as each other, twenty-eight women were of higher rank than their husbands, fifty-nine men were higher than their wives, and in fifty-eight couples the rank of one or both individuals was uncertain. However, twenty-four of the higher ranked men were ‘landed gentry’ (the only exclusively male category) marrying ‘privileged’ wives, like James Russell of Woodside and Mary Stirling of Kippendavie. This was a maintenance of social status for both parties: as Elizabeth Bennet said, ‘He is a gentleman; I am a gentleman’s daughter; so far we are equal’.[5] When these cases are removed, no noticeable imbalance in social rank is discernable between the men and women in Charlotte Chapel. It is significant, however, that in the Stirlingshire scenario, Russell was also a colonel in the militia while Mary’s father was also a partner in the West-India cotton merchants Stirling, Gordon and Co. A Scottish estate seldom yielded sufficient income to maintain status. Yet this put the non-landed privileged gentleman at an advantage: he could maintain his status in other ways and marry where he liked. James Grahame, son of Robert Grahame of Whitehill, left off gentlemanly intellectual pursuits in Cambridge and settled down to a career as an advocate so that he could marry the ‘beautiful, amiable and accomplished’ Matilda Robley, daughter of a successful West Indian adventurer.[6] Men and women played different but equally important roles

---

Austen, Pride and Prejudice p. 395.

in establishing social status in Charlotte Chapel.

Figure 3.3 shows how the social composition of the baptism families (318 individuals) at Charlotte Chapel changed over time. The nature of the sources makes it impossible to analyse rank by age: although dates of birth (between 1723 and 1814) are known for 201 members of the group, it was usually their high status which has ensured their birthday was recorded. However, status can be analysed not according to age but according to first involvement with the chapel. Because of the gap in the register the group naturally falls into two periods, 64 people attending the chapel before 1800 when it was a Qualified Chapel with a young unknown preacher, and 254 when it was a fashionable bishop’s seat in the 1810s. The social composition in the earlier period, with around 20 per cent landed or titled and an overall ‘landed interest’ approaching half of the congregation, appears fairly typical of an Episcopal chapel. Yet in the 1810s the elite represented only ten per cent, and the landed interest had shrunk to a third. It was noted above (p. 103) that estate owners and professionals were usually distinguished as such in the registers, and most ‘unknowns’ identified from other sources turned out to come from the serving, rather than the serviced, orders of society. If, which there seems little reason to doubt, this sample is representative of the remaining ‘unknowns’, lower-rank members appear to have composed almost half the congregation. A further argument that the ‘unknowns’ are likely to be of a similar social profile to the ‘labour’ group comes from the similarity in their national origins, noted below (p. 123). This popularisation of the Edinburgh chapel took place at a time when the Scottish Episcopal Church is regarded as losing popular
support in its traditional Highland and north-east heartlands. Charlotte Chapel was certainly still high in status compared with Scottish society as a whole, but this reflects its location: within that location, it succeeded in attracting members from all ranks.

![Figure 3.4: Social rank of members of Charlotte Chapel by type of involvement: baptism, marriage and funeral registers and office bearers.](image)

The different roles played by various social groups in Charlotte Chapel become evident if we measure rank by type of involvement (Figure 3.4). Only around 40 per cent of the wedding couples, funerals and chapel officials came from a non-privileged background, compared with over two thirds of the baptisms; and only baptisms have a significant proportion – almost half – in the labour or unknown groups. **Sandford** was a freelance clergyman: even when Charlotte Chapel ceased to be an independent chapel, the parlous state of Scottish Episcopal finances meant that each congregation had to be self-supporting. Therefore, like other fashionable freelance preachers, **Sandford** was balancing his divine vocation with the need to charge for his services. Baptism was a sacrament of great importance in **Sandford**’s understanding of the Christian journey, freely available to all (p. 55). Weddings and funerals, on the other hand, were services he offered for which he could charge a market rate: his English gentry origins, Oxford education, bishopric, and location at the West End all provided lucrative added value. **Sandford** funded his egalitarian mission by providing an exclusive service to the fashionable elite. The purchase of a graveyard by **Colin MacKenzie**, **James Clerk**, and **William Forbes** in 1817 as a private enterprise developed this tactic, and in 1828 they conveyed the ground to the chapel once enough grave plots had been sold to pay back their capital. It would be possible to regard this inequality as an early flaw in the church’s mission that had led, by
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1863, to a social segregation in which an elite St John’s funded a working-class daughter church in Tollcross. Yet this was unforeseeable at the time: in the 1810s, in contrast to the conservative and introverted elitism regarded as characteristic of Episcopal churches, the social structure of Charlotte Chapel demonstrated the progressive, Enlightenment paternalism that also informed projects such as Lancastrian education (p. 195).

Supporting evidence that Bishop Sandford’s congregation was less elitist than other Episcopalian congregations comes from a comparison between the social profile of churches in Edinburgh made in 1837 when the Commissioners of Religious Instruction (Scotland) published their first report. However, the use of later statistics to understand Regency society is fraught with dangers: the rapid growth of the population and economy, the reforms of 1828-32, the arrival of the canal in 1822 and cholera in 1832, and the extent to which the statisticians reshaped society by the act of quantifying it, all make it difficult to generalise from later to earlier decades. Apart from social changes, the pressures that faced St John’s well-established congregation in 1837 were different from those that faced the emergent Charlotte Chapel in the first two decades of the century. St John’s cost around £18,000 to build, and in 1837 still had a debt of £6,596 7s 11d, over twice as much as any other church in Edinburgh (and with banker William Forbes keeping the books, the only one stated down to the last farthing). This meant its required income was no longer determined by what its rector was prepared to survive on: it had to charge high seat rents, up to 42s and none lower than 5s per annum. When Edward Bannerman Ramsay came in 1827 as curate and in 1830 succeeded Sandford as rector, he found a church in decline as the old bishop’s health failed. He revived the church music and attracted so many new members that income from seat rents shot up and a gallery was built. Charlotte Chapel’s scale of pew rents is unknown, but when the aristocratic Margaret Hope who lived at 1 Charlotte Square, took sitting no.1 in Charlotte Chapel in 1811 she paid 24 shillings for it. Her liking for being first and her other personal expenses suggest she was not a woman to make do with a second-best seat. This suggests that the top rate of pew rent in Charlotte Chapel in 1811 was only half that of St John’s in 1837. Nonetheless, the 1837 figures are still far more useful for drawing inferences about the pre-1818 situation than the more famous religious census of 1851. Of the 224 members
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of Charlotte Chapel whose date of death is known, 97 (43 per cent) were still alive in 1837: half of these had died by 1851. In 1837 more powerful forces of social change such as the railway (which reached Edinburgh in 1848) and the economic crisis of the mid-1840s were still in the future. Collected only seven years after the death of its founder, these figures should give at least supportive information as to the social structure of Charlotte Chapel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Map Ref</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Communicants</th>
<th>Poor Com’ts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Cuthbert’s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>over 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old St Paul’s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Scottish Episcopal</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>25-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scottish Episcopal</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Scottish Episcopal</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Scottish Episcopal</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>very few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Scottish Episcopal</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Size and social composition of Edinburgh churches in 1837, by proportion of poor communicants. These should be considered broad indications: the commissioners warned that ‘the answers which we obtained on this head were frequently very vague, and the different opinions as to the application of the term “poor and working classes” led to much difficulty’. (Religious Instruction Report, p.14-18.)

Table 3.2 shows the numbers in 1837 of ‘poor and working class’ in eight congregations. To describe any of the churches as conducting ‘urban missions’ to the poor before 1818 would be anachronistic. St Cuthbert’s served a large, populous, deprived parish and struggled to meet its pastoral demands. Faced with an ineffective incumbent in its chapel of ease in Newington, the minister Henry Moncrieff Wellwood and his assistant undertook the preaching themselves between 1806 and 1812, building up ‘a full congregation [...] until at last the entire debt was discharged’. The diligent Evangelical Sir Harry was not conducting a mission to the poor but working to keep church finances afloat. Old St Paul’s was in a similar situation, surrounded by slum housing. In the 1820s it was widely regarded as a failure and was saved by John Leslie (the supposed atheist, p.48) from amalgamation with the genteel St Peter’s, a transfer which, from the social gulf suggested by the 1837 report, might well have resulted in the loss of the poorer members. The sermons Archibald Alison preached in the Cowgate Chapel were delivered to an audience ‘composed almost entirely of persons in the higher ranks, or [...] the young, who, in the course of academical education, are preparing themselves for the important
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stations or the liberal professions. Successful preachers attracted discerning listeners.

Surprisingly, given its later reputation as ‘God’s Drawing Room’, St John’s appears in 1837 to have been the most socially diverse of the New Town churches. ‘Poor and working class’ formed a significant part of the congregation, up to one in five of the people at the communion rail, enough to be visible and to influence the culture of the congregation; and this when St John’s was in debt and being run on strict business lines. The evidence of the 1837 Commission does not challenge the generalisation that the Scottish Episcopal Church was a church of the elite. However, together with the evidence from the registers that the chapel’s social base broadened over time, and that the baptism register represents a far broader social base than the marriages or funerals, the Commission evidence suggests that in the first four decades of the nineteenth century Bishop Sandford’s chapel did challenge that elitism.

3.2 Nationality

![Pie chart showing nationality of members of Charlotte Chapel.]

Figure 3.5: Nationality of members of Charlotte Chapel.

One of the starting-points of this study was the striking contrast between the repeated historiographical assumption that Charlotte Chapel was ‘chiefly composed of English families’ and the evident predominance of Scottish surnames in the baptism register. Figure 3.5 shows the nationality of the 431 members of Charlotte Chapel discussed in this study. 58% were Scottish and only 26% English, Irish or Welsh: there were over

---

18 Sandford, Remains, vol.1, p. 28.
twice as many Scots as English in Charlotte Chapel (The identity of 14% is unknown, and five individuals were American, French or Swedish). John Sandford’s statement does not appear to fit with this evidence. It is possible that he was referring only to what he had heard about the very first gathering of the congregation, before Charlotte Chapel was built in 1797 or he was born in 1801, or perhaps the presence of English families, while a minority, made Charlotte Chapel distinctive amongst churches in the city.

Figure 3.6: British influence on the 431 members of Charlotte Chapel. Individuals are deemed to have a British influence if they were known to have an English, Irish or Welsh parent, were born or lived in England, Ireland, Wales or India, or had an English, Irish or Welsh spouse.

A more useful way to understand the congregation’s national identity from an ecclesiastical point of view is to look, not at nationality, but at British influence. The English and Welsh, Irish and Indian Episcopal Churches were all provinces of the Church of England, whereas the Scottish Episcopal Church was a separate church, still out of communion with the Church of England at the beginning of Sandford’s ministry and regarded by many Anglicans with considerable suspicion. To understand members of the congregation’s sense of religious identity, the question is not, were they Scottish or English? but, did they consider themselves to be attending a Scottish Episcopalian or an Anglican church? Figure 3.6, which shows what proportion of the congregation can be identified as being influenced by wider British culture as opposed to having a purely Scottish background, suggests the answer was likely to be both.

One might argue that even the Scottish members of the congregation might be part of an anglicising movement, rejecting indigenous Scottish cultural forms in favour of
Figure 3.7: Scottish connections outside Edinburgh of members of Charlotte Chapel: 27 in the north-west, 21 in the south-west, 46 in the north-east and 65 in the Forth valley. These 159 connections are of four types. ‘Place of origin’, influential on an individual’s formation but connections may or may not have been retained into adulthood. ‘Inherited estate’, places of lifelong connection, as heir-presumptive or owner. ‘Acquired connection’, where individuals had no childhood connections but which they purchased through their own choices. ‘Surname connection’ shows likely origins of lower-ranking individuals whose surnames have strong geographical connections. (Based on the census data made available at the Great Britain Family Names Profiling Website, gb-names.publicprofiler.org.)
fashionable English ones. Exploring this group in more detail, however, suggests otherwise. Figure 3.7 shows Charlotte Chapel members’ associations with other parts of Scotland. It is no surprise to find that the majority of connections outside Edinburgh were with conveniently-situated estates: the numerous magenta markers typically represent lawyers’ weekend country retreats. Nor is the low figure for the north-west unexpected, since it was at the far end of a difficult journey and with fewer inhabitants rich enough to make it. More intriguing is that there were over twice as many connections with the north-east of Scotland as with the south-west, despite the fact that Daniel Sandford had become Bishop of Glasgow as well as Edinburgh in 1810. The north-east of Scotland was the traditional heartland of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and it was from here that a large contingent of Duffs, Forbes, MacKenzies and Rattrays found their way to Daniel Sandford’s chapel: all of these names, in fact, were amongst the chapel officials. English influence was noticeably lower amongst those buried by Sandford compared with other types of chapel involvement (Figure 3.8). Funerals represented a considerably older group, including all but 5 of the 28 people born before 1752 and all 13 born before 1740. Many of these people were indeed Scottish Episcopalians, often with Jacobite associations (explored below, p. 219).

Figure 3.8: British influence in Charlotte Chapel by type of involvement: baptism, marriage and funeral registers and office bearers.

Support for the argument that Sandford’s chapel attracted ‘English families’ in its earliest stages but quickly gained wider appeal amongst indigenous Scots comes from Figure 3.9, which compares the period before 1800 with the period after 1810. In between these dates was Daniel Sandford’s pioneering union with the Scottish Episcopal Church,
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19 Register of the Diocese of Edinburgh, NRS CH12/82/1, p.12.
in which, despite his English nationality and English liturgy, he declared his public commitment to and approval of Scottish Episcopalism. For his son, the reputed Jacobites in the congregation seemed like an alien species. By 1830 when his memoir was written, Walter Scott’s novels had transformed Scottish national consciousness. While John Sandford understood the cultural gulf between an elderly Scottish Jacobite and a young Oxford Evangelical, he failed to balance his account with the desire at the turn of the century to bridge that gulf, seen in Sandford’s readiness to unite with the Episcopal Church, and in the elderly Jacobites’ attendance at his chapel.

However, to regard this impulse of union as aiming to create a ‘British identity’ would be to foist an anachronistic obsession with ‘identities’ onto a culture prioritising reconciliation and progress. That the ‘sin of SCHISM’ was ‘an offence, of which it is impossible that any pious and enlightened Christian can think lightly’, was Sandford’s clinching argument for union in 1805. William Forbes deliberately renounced his Jacobite identity, but not so as to internalise a new British one. The Britishness of Charlotte Chapel was not so much about a new identity, as about the possibility of collaboration between old identities. Old identities were retained. Sandford asked permission to ‘wear the Surplice and my Hood as a Doctor of Divinity’ as he united with a church which did not share that practice. He had no expectation that this would be controversial, adding, ‘I presume you will not object to my continuing to do so. It is a thing indifferent’.
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20 Sandford, Remains, vol.1, p. 45.
21 Daniel Sandford, Pamphlet on Union, 7 November 1804, NRS CH12/13/64, p. 5.
22 Daniel Sandford to John Skinner, 19 November 1804, NAS CH12/12/2136.
these private identities were made subservient to the opportunity for public healing and
collaboration. Forbes ‘partiality’ would not affect his political activity. Sandford had
already signed the articles of union before he mentioned vestments, and Scottish Epis-
copalians had no theological objections: the difference in dress only became problematic
when fashion-conscious Episcopal laity began to regard black gowns, only retained for
reasons of cost, as shabby in comparison (p. 19). Members of Charlotte Chapel appear to
have been eagerly British, but Britishness was not internalised into meaning as Jacobitism
had been.

3.3 Marriage and Romance

A study based largely on baptism registers gives a strange impression of a congregation
comprised almost entirely of young nuclear families. This study cannot tell us about
the proportion of households that were nuclear or extended families, or headed by men
or women, as Helen Dingwall’s survey does23 The prosopographical approach can,
however, give an insight into patterns and experiences of marriage, a subject which has
proved elusive in Scottish history. Knowing the birth and marriage years of 157 members
of Charlotte Chapel allows us to shed some light at least on one group within Scotland
(Figure 3.10).

Figure 3.10: Age at marriage of 69 women (orange) and 88 men (green) for whom birth
and marriage years are known. The lines plot the mean age for each decade, that is, the
mean value of all the other data points in the decade, although note that in the 1770s and
1780s numbers are small.

Figure 3.10 shows how the age at which members of Charlotte Chapel married changed over time. The scatter graph is used as more suitable for the prosopographical approach: each point represents a member of the group. The line, representing the average over each decade, should not be regarded as giving more than a general indication of changing fashions, as the sample size is small and the variation large. One trend, however, appears marked: whereas the average age at which the women married remained almost constant around 24, that for the men fell from the 40s in the later eighteenth century, to 34 in the 1790s, and to just over 30 in the early nineteenth century.

Figure 3.11: Age difference between 68 couples where both partners’ birth years are known. This was found by subtracting the wife’s birth year from the husband’s, giving a negative value when the wife is older than the husband. Seven wives (10 per cent) were the elder partner.

The converging values over time in Figure 3.10 suggest a trend to more equal couples, and this is confirmed in Figure 3.11 which shows the difference in age between partners. This fell from an average of 21 in the 1770s to 8 in the 1810s, and there is a marked appearance of marriages between couples of almost equal age from the 1790s: in earlier marriages the husband was always at least a decade older than his wife. This is the time when Cockburn dated ‘the change from ancient to modern manners’ amongst the Edinburgh elite, and suggested that marriage patterns were a factor in the process.

No man married under twenty-one, and while many did so in their twenties, marriage in their 30s or early 40s was still unremarkable. In contrast, most women were mar-

ried before they were twenty-seven, and while women certainly did marry over thirty, it was a more noteworthy event. Sometimes there were particular circumstances surrounding older marriages: Marianne Cheape and Thomas Bowes were both widowed when they married in their mid-forties, as was Charles Gordon, Earl of Aboyne, aged 48, when he married 37 year-old Mary Douglas. At all social levels there are older couples who may have cautiously delayed marriage until their careers were established, like stablers Nicholas Baldock (age unknown) and Anne Hall (31); and Writer to the Signet Roger Aytoun (40) and Joan Keir (36). Sir Thomas Livingstone recovered and extended his indebted estate before marrying Janet Stirling when he was 39 and she 34, financial prudence which resulted in biological disaster: the marriage was childless and the baronetcy extinguished.

The Charlotte Chapel biographies are not bereft of the kind of tales of romance which Marshall thought heralded a shift to a more companionate ideal of marriage in the late eighteenth century.25 John Inglis, despite ‘no literary or artistic tastes, [...] an irritable temper, and an exaggerated idea of his position of Laird of Redhall’, was beloved by young people ‘because he was a kind, almost soft-hearted man’, with a keen interest in ‘any love-affair or other romance.’26 Mary MacLeod’s father, whom one witness considered ‘absolutely the ugliest chiel I ever saw’ but whose fiancée, who apparently considered herself too ugly to be painted, was seen at a ball looking at ‘her intended spouse not only with liking but with absolute rapture’27 Augusta and Georgina Forbes’ mother was said to have fallen in love with their father, the Earl of Granard, proposed to him, and they eloped.28 Literary men wrote their own lives as romances. When the child John Ruskin met the middle-aged Mary Duff she bore a golden aura of romance, for, ‘she had been Lord Byron’s first of first loves; she was the Mary Duff of Lachin-y-Gair’29 Mary had shared a dancing master with Byron when they were eight, and Byron recalled her as the object of his first, purest, love:

Untutored by science, a stranger to fear,
And rude as the rocks, where my infancy grew,
No feeling, save one, to my bosom was dear,  
Need I say, my sweet Mary, ’twas centred in you.

Yet, it could not be Love, for I knew not the name,  
what passion can dwell in the heart of a child?  
But, still, I perceive an emotion the same  
As I felt, when a boy, on the crag-covered wild. 

However, Charlotte Chapel members appear to have had a clear sense that while past events were the proper subject of romance, in present life, domestic happiness was founded upon practical action based on rational decision-making. ‘I was cleeket to a decent, well-behaved, thickish woman about a fortnight ago, and as yet have no reason to repent of my choice’, was how Colin MacKenzie wryly announced his marriage to Elizabeth MacDowall. Colin MacKenzie was similarly laconic describing his honeymoon with Elizabeth Forbes in the Lake District: ‘Our excursion has been most fortunate in point of weather, & as our health has been uniformly good, nothing else was wanting under our Circumstances to make the whole delightful’. When James Grahame fell in love with Matilda Robley he gave up his literary studies at Cambridge to train for the Scottish bar, since until he had a profession to support a wife he was not in a position to marry. This sacrifice made a romantic story in retrospect, but at the time required several years of tedious work and delayed gratification: a very different kind of romance from that of Georgina Forbes eloping Irish mother. Walter Scott’s reaction to his disappointment with Williamina Belsches was sufficiently practical to lead revisionist biographers to dismiss early accounts of its depth. Scott proffered renewed friendship to his successful rival William Forbes after the wedding, and within the year married Charlotte Charpentier, who quietly performed her role as mistress of Abbotsford and mother of their four children. Yet this was an undemonstrative culture, sharing the attitudes of Jane Austen’s 1811 heroine Elinor, whose ability to speak ‘with a composure of voice, under which was concealed an emotion and distress beyond any thing she had ever felt before’ sustains her through whatever Austen chooses to throw at her. It is as dangerous for historians to argue that words

31 Alan Bell, Lord Cockburn: Selected Letters (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2005) p. 41.
33 Quincey, “Memoir of James Grahame”, p. 4.
and behaviour signify lack of feeling, as they have argued that reticence regarding religion equated to lack of belief (p. 37). ‘You do not suppose that I have ever felt much’, Elinor accused her reprehensibly demonstrative sister.

As the example of James Grahame training for the bar suggests, there was no sense in these marriages that men enjoyed a leisurely patriarchy while women bore the drudgery of childbearing. Biological function dictated that men would provide the household with income while women would fill it with children, but it would be difficult to argue that one of these roles was regarded as more onerous, more important, or more privileged than the other. ‘I never liked it and progressively like it less & less, insomuch that if the office had not some comfortable etceteras in the shape of a monthly revenue I should certainly unrobe myself of the dignity & turn farmer at once’, wrote Colin MacKenzie, developing a taste for country life over his unedifying business as Principal Clerk of the Court of Session. A few years later he wrote, ‘you find me here doing penance in the form of attendance at the Register office to sign my name 500 times a day’. Financial success without children; or children without financial support, both failed to create the conditions for domestic happiness. If inequality can be discerned, the shame and stress of bankruptcy appear to have been more catastrophic for a man than the failure of a woman to produce children. The only two childless wives in the group, Elizabeth Erskine and Janet Stirling, nevertheless remained married for over 20 years to their husbands, both landed gentlemen who might have considered the need for an heir particularly pressing. Yet husbands including George Arbuthnot’s father, James Cooper, Walter Scott and possibly Jesse Ness, all appear to have been driven to a premature grave following financial failure.

A further indication of the depth of feeling within Charlotte Chapel families comes from the reactions to domestic tragedy. ‘Christ what a calamity’, wrote Walter Scott when David Hume’s only son died suddenly in 1819, three years after his wife Jane Alder. ‘Full of talent the heir of an old & considerable family – a fine career before him [...] engaged to a daughter of Sir John Hay [...] It is a complete smash to poor David who [had] just begun to hold his head up after his wives death but he bears it stoutly & goes about his business as usual. A woeful case.’

35 Austen, Sense and Sensibility, p. 298.
36 Colin MacKenzie to James Skene, 15 September 1807, NLS MS.20471.6.
37 Colin MacKenzie to James Skene, 28 August 1812, NLS MS.20471.38.
brother Tom’s wife,’ wrote John Tod when his sister-in-law Susan Carnegie died a month after giving birth to a healthy daughter. ‘Her loss is irreparable to him’. Three years after his bereavement, Tod, a judge in the Commissary Court which dealt with family affairs, granted the abused wife Maria Frost separation and aliment. Leah Leneman in her survey of such cases was struck by the strength with which the judge expressed ‘personal disgust’ in this way: Maria’s husband John Mather had ‘most brutally and disgracefully abused and beaten his wife the pursur atho’ her conduct to him and her family was unexceptionable and exemplary, and from no other cause […] but […] the undisguised and extreme profligacy of his own conduct as a husband and father’.

Mather was abusing the domestic privilege which Thomas Tod had been denied. After Williamina Belsches died in 1810, Colin MacKenzie wrote that her husband William Forbes ‘does not get at all fast on in his recovery. The cloud very often overcasts him. Colinton is the worst place in the world for him but I fear he will not soon pluck up energy to leave it’. Their youngest son James was a year old: he became a distinguished geologist whose conservative, aloof, but high-minded character was ascribed to the isolated and over-protective upbringing he received from his bereaved father.

Despite the cultural preference for ‘sense’ over ‘sensibility’, the evidence suggests that domestic attachments were deep and long-lasting. Eliza Fraser died in 1834 after twenty-four years of marriage to George Arbuthnot whom she married in India when she was eighteen and to whom she bore thirteen children. ‘I have lost more than half of myself,’ he wrote on her death; ‘she was my oracle, – she was the staff on which I leant’. On her deathbed, Elizabeth MacDowall broke off her list of bequests of keepsakes to interject, ‘Oh how I love you all,’ a few years after her husband Henry Cockburn had written that ‘human nature is incapable of enjoying more happiness’ than he had enjoyed in their family home. Helen Duff and her husband John Tod bequeathed heirlooms so that their ‘children will kindly value them as remembrances […] associated with their early, or home recollections’, after their 48 years of marriage. John gave ‘my superior gold watch with its seals (but not the chains) to my son John Robert’, and ‘the said chain

39 John Tod to the Earl of Minto, 5 July 1815, NLS. MS.11918.65.
41 Colin MacKenzie to James Skene, 4 February 1811, NLS MS.20471.30.
44 Elizabeth MacDowall’s Will, NRS SC70/4/56/201; Cockburn, Memorials p. 243.
45 Helen Duff’s Will, National Archives of Scotland SC70/4/147/159.
[...] to my daughter Charlotte MacDonachie thinking she will like to have it, as having
been worn by her father. Colin MacKenzie and Elizabeth Forbes had 14 children in
their 27 years of marriage. Robert Hodshon Cay was married 21 years to ‘my dearly
beloved wife’, Daniel Sandford 40 years to ‘my dear and excellent wife’, Leonard Horner
and Anne Susan Lloyd 56 years. When Marten Dalrymple died in 1809 his obituary
stressed his domestic qualities before his public ones: ‘a warm friend, a tender parent, an
affectionate husband, an indulgent master, an able man of business, and a most excellent
country gentleman’.

The marital culture of polite society in Charlotte Chapel appears to have been characterised by some taste for literary romance, but in reality more often by
undemonstrative, practical life-choices; some domestic tragedy, but more often by long
and affectionate marriages.

3.4 Predominant Groups

![Figure 3.12: British influence in Charlotte Chapel by social rank.](image)

Discussion of the meaning of Britishness tends to favour the higher, more articulate
ranks in society; however, Figure 3.12 provides a clue to unspoken attitudes by show-
ing British influence in different social ranks within Charlotte Chapel. The aristocracy
were most British with 88% known to have an influence from outside Scotland, while the
landed gentry most Scottish: only 37% were known to have a British influence. These re-

![Figure 3.12: British influence in Charlotte Chapel by social rank.](image)

fect far longer trends than the circumstances of the early nineteenth century. With small
numbers and grand ambitions, the aristocracy had long sought beyond their immediate

46 John Tod’s Will, National Archives of Scotland SC70/4/50/717.
47 Robert Hodshon Cay’s Will, National Archives of Scotland SC70/1/4/199; Daniel Sandford’s Will, Na-
tional Archives of Scotland SC70/1/44/817.
48 CM, 4 December 1809.
locality to find marriage partners and new landholdings. The gentry, on the other hand, tended to be deeply rooted in a locality: Mary Congalton, for example, came from a family which had lived on the same East Lothian estate for eighteen generations. The aristocracy and gentry formed only a minor group within Charlotte Chapel, but these striking differences provide a caution against treating the landed ranks as a homogeneous group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Dates held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Sandford</td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>1794-1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lane</td>
<td>Curate</td>
<td>1810-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Smith</td>
<td>Visiting preacher</td>
<td>1800-1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mather</td>
<td>Organist</td>
<td>1815-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Watson</td>
<td>Charlotte Chapel Trustee</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander MacKenzie</td>
<td>Charlotte Chapel Trustee</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Stirling</td>
<td>Charlotte Chapel Trustee</td>
<td>1805-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archibald Campbell</td>
<td>Charlotte Chapel Trustee</td>
<td>1805-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Clerk</td>
<td>Charlotte Chapel Trustee</td>
<td>1805-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hume</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hodshon Cay</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1805-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Keith</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1805-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachlan Duff Gordon</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1805-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin MacKenzie</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1805-1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Arbuthnot</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Aytoun</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Forbes</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Young</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>March 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Downie</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>November 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Robertson</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>November 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Duff</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>November 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cay</td>
<td>St John’s Vestry</td>
<td>November 1817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Chapel staff and officials. Although the trustees had probably been in post since Charlotte Chapel opened in 1797, the conveyance deed in which they were named dates from 1805 when the congregation joined the Scottish Episcopal Church. St John’s vestry members’ involvement is dated from the first occasion on which they sat on one of the series of ad hoc committees which met from 1814 onwards to build the new chapel.

Of more importance for this study is that Figure 3.12 identifies the predominant groups in Charlotte Chapel: the Scottish privileged and British petty-bourgeois formed over a quarter of the congregation. This hint of a society in which members of the local elite were engaging wider talent in their service is borne out in an examination of the chapel’s officials. While Figure 3.8 suggests the chapel officials were evenly divided between those with and without British influence, all four of the employed staff listed in Table 3.3 were English, while of the trustees and vestry members all except Robert

---

and John Cay were Scottish. Callum Brown wrote that ‘In Greenock in the 1840s the Anglican hatters from Lancaster, earthenware workers from the Potteries, glass-blowers from Newcastle, chain-makers from Liverpool and Lutheran sugar-boilers from Germany were all reportedly excluded from membership of the upper-middle-class Episcopal chapel. While this evidence does not challenge his conclusion that ‘in the Lowland industrial districts recruitment of immigrant working-class episcopalian was very low’, it does challenge wider conclusions of Episcopalian exclusivity: in this Regency commercial city, James William Tydeman, hairdresser from Suffolk; Elizabeth Burn, gardener’s daughter from Hawick; Elizabeth Chandler, butcher’s daughter from Morpeth, William Hodgson, painter from Cumberland; Jesse Ness, chemist from Newcastle; Anne Seward, sculptor’s daughter from Hampshire; Mary Tapling, shopkeeper’s daughter from Oxfordshire; Williamina Helen Baker, farmer’s daughter from Wiltshire; and Michael Fell, failed cloth merchant from Leicestershire were amongst the many non-elite immigrants who were not excluded from Charlotte Chapel. The fact that the proportions of British influence (mostly based on surname) are exactly the same in the ‘Labour’ and ‘Unknown’ groups (60% identifiably of only Scottish origins, 40% more widely British) provides additional evidence that the ‘Unknown’ group is demographically similar to the identified ‘Labour’ group: this suggests that the largest social group of all in this elite English chapel were low-ranking Scots.

Predominance in a community comes not merely from sheer numbers but from connectedness to the community leaders. Kinship Network Two colours the network according to rank, demonstrating that the closely-connected group is largely drawn from the higher ranks. This may partly be because their connections are better documented: much of the evidence for these links came from sources like Burke’s Landed Gentry for Scotland (2001), or nineteenth-century clan histories. It is also a function of the smaller size of the higher ranks, resulting in repeated intermarriage between local families seeking a suitable partner. However, while the social distinctions are evident, so too is the social mobility: 23% of the network are petty-bourgeois or self-made. Kinship Network Three showing nationality, demonstrates that the ruling core of the congregation, closely-knit around Alexander MacKenzie the ‘patriarch’ and with seven chapel officials, was overwhelmingly Scottish. Figure 3.12 shows that the Scottish privileged formed a numerically dominant group within the congregation, and the kinship network shows that this

---

35Brown, Religion and Society, p. 35.
was also the most tightly-connected and influential sector of the congregation. There was, however, a striking change in the social composition of the chapel officials listed in Figure 3.3. Whereas all ten of the Charlotte Chapel trustees were from privileged backgrounds, with the exception of James Watson, Writer to the Signet, three (Roger Aytoun, Robert Downie, and Alexander Young) of the eight new appointments to St John’s Vestry were of self-made men, all of them Whigs. While the core of Charlotte Chapel congregation was a traditional elite, rooted in the locality and in the land, this group was not immune to the peaceful yet deep social changes taking place within Edinburgh and the Episcopal Church.

3.5 Edinburgh Addresses

Figure 3.13: Edinburgh addresses of Charlotte Chapel members in 1795. For the higher ranks this address might be a townhouse in addition to a country estate (discussed below, p. 145); for professionals and lower ranks it was the main or only residence. (Edinburgh Post Office Directory 1795, NLS on-line resource, [http://bit.ly/13LGR85](http://bit.ly/13LGR85))

Figures 3.13-3.17 show the movement of members of Charlotte Chapel into the developing New Town over the period of this study. Many members of Charlotte Chapel were the first inhabitants of their houses, and to a greater or lesser extent influenced their construction. The domesticated Daniel Sandford and Helen Douglas were at the forefront of Edinburgh’s development westwards (p. 170). Although the outward appearance of
Figure 3.14: Edinburgh addresses of Charlotte Chapel members in 1800. (*Edinburgh Post Office Directory* 1800.)

Figure 3.15: Edinburgh addresses of Charlotte Chapel members in 1805. (*Edinburgh Post Office Directory* 1805.)
Figure 3.16: Edinburgh addresses of Charlotte Chapel members in 1810. (Edinburgh Post Office Directory 1810.)

Figure 3.17: Edinburgh addresses of Charlotte Chapel members in 1815. (Edinburgh Post Office Directory 1815.)
one of Bishop Sandford’s residences, Heriot Row, was carefully controlled by the conditions of feu, the internal arrangements were flexible, and a tasteful and elegant first occupant provided a future selling point: ‘the house was built by Bishop Sandford for his own occupation, and is most substantially finished’, proclaimed the advertisement when the house came on the market again in 1814.\(^{51}\) The result of all this movement was that, instead of an idyllic leafy suburb, Charlotte Chapel members lived in a constant building site: the new streets were not built as continuous terraces, but as individual houses, as purchasers chose what they considered to be the best lots.\(^{52}\)

By the end of the eighteenth century (Figure 3.13), Charlotte Square was not yet built. Titled members of the congregation in Figure 3.13 (shown in pink and puce) are found in the older Georgian developments: George Square (Map, 25), home of John Pringle’s father Sir James; and Nicholson Square (Map, 33), of Williamina Belsches’ father Sir John. Charlotte Barclay, dowager Baroness of Tillyquhoun, lived in South St James Street, east of the main New Town, not far from Mary Douglas, Dowager Countess of Aboyne, in its easternmost, oldest corner, 2 St Andrew’s Square (Map, 17). The new streets to the west were occupied by landed gentry (in purple) such as Alexander Keith at 43 Queen Street; younger privileged professionals (blue) like advocate Archibald Campbell at 116 George Street; and self-made (turquoise) like Alexander Young, a son of the manse whose marriage to a merchant’s daughter in 1789 may have assisted his rapidly rising fortunes as factor to the Duke of Hamilton. The bustling, businesslike terrace of Princes Street was occupied by ‘petty bourgeoisie’ urban professionals (green) like James Watson WS, one of the trustees of Charlotte Chapel, at no. 77. The highest ranks appear to have been conservative adopters of the New Town.

Already by 1800 (Figure 3.14) there had been a migration away from the south side and into George, Princes and Queen Streets, and even (by Georgina and Helen Lamont) into one of the six houses built on the north side of Charlotte Square, before war with France delayed its progress. One of the early occupiers of West End houses, in north Castle Street, was Bishop Sandford conveniently close to his new chapel. By 1805 (Figure 3.15) this trend had only made slow progress, reflecting the delayed pace of Edinburgh’s development during the war years. However, two pioneers had led the way into the ‘second New Town’, north of Queen Street, occupying some of the first houses\(^{51}\)\(^{52}\).

---


\(^{52}\)Rodger, *Transformation of Edinburgh*, p. 81.
in Heriot Row: these were two Englishmen, Robert Hodshon Cay and Daniel Sandford. They were a sign of things to come: by 1810 (Figure 3.16) development had been rapid both in Charlotte Square itself, in the second New Town, and even in the new western development of Queensferry Street, Shandwick Place and Melville Street, where Bishop Sandford finally settled (Map, 1). None of the high-ranking members of Charlotte Chapel remained in the Old Town. By 1815 (figure 3.17) the concentration west of Frederick Street, especially of the higher ranks, had become tighter, and titled members’ addresses suggest they are just as enthusiastic about the New Town as the self-made (Figure 3.17), so perhaps their apparent conservatism stemmed more from the fact that they were already settled in good town houses and had no need to move until there was clearly something better on offer, whereas men like Campbell, Young and Watson were new entrants to the housing market.

The sometimes reluctant, but ultimately inevitable, migration of the Scottish elite from the south side to the New Town is a trope of memoirs of the period. ‘In my youth the [...] fashionable dancing, as indeed the fashionable every thing, clung to George Square’, wrote Henry Cockburn, which ‘threw the New Town piece of presumption entirely into the shade’. But Cockburn’s own generation, the generation of the Charlotte Chapel baptism register, preferred the public balls at the New Town Assembly Rooms (Map, 11) and ‘the aristocracy of a few predominating individuals and families came to an end; and the unreasonable old had nothing for it but to sigh over the recollections of the select and elegant parties of their youth’. One lady buried by Bishop Sandford, Mary Stewart, was the widow of Lt General John Douglas, mentioned in Old and New Edinburgh (1880) as one of the last ‘people of position’ who ‘continued to linger in the Old Town’ after the creation of the New. They lived in Baron Maule’s Close at the foot of the High Street (Map, 34), but Mrs Douglas moved to Frederick Street in the heart of the New Town soon after her husband’s death in 1790, where she remained until her death in 1816. As a sample of Edinburgh society, the migration of Charlotte Chapel’s ‘people of position’ is a visual demonstration of that trend.

The construction of the New Town is often regarded as the introduction of social segregation to Edinburgh, with the Nor’ Loch valley dividing the rich north from the poor south. A hundred years after this study, Patrick Geddes moved back into the High Street and refurbished its eighteenth-century properties as desirable houses, in a deliberate re-

---

53Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 36-7.
versal of what by then appeared to be a destructive flight of quality, leaving the Old Town as a slum. In fact, as George Gordon has shown, most New Town housing consisted of modest flats with rents below £45, so while the property boom continued, it relieved pressure on the Old.\footnote{Gordon, “The Status Areas of Edinburgh: a historical analysis”, PhD thesis, Edinburgh University, 1979, p. 34.} Richard Rodger argues that it was the crash of 1826, which halted building in Edinburgh for over thirty years, that caused the Old Town slum situation to develop as population increase was unsupported by property increase\footnote{Rodger, Transformation of Edinburgh, p. 82.} The decline of the Old Town was not caused by the success of the New Town but by its stagnation.

A better understanding of the New Town mentality, supported by the evidence of Charlotte Chapel, is as an architectural expression of the paternalistic ideal: an example on the scale of town planning of what Thomas Markus has described in relation to Edinburgh’s individual public buildings.\footnote{T.A. Markus, ‘Class and Classification in the Buildings of the Late Scottish Enlightenment’, in Improvement and Enlightenment, ed. T.M. Devine (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1989) pp. 78-107.} Rich and poor lived in close proximity as they had done in the Old Town, distinguished, as George Gordon’s analysis of status areas shows, by social rank rather than physical distance, although thanks to the increase in wealth everyone enjoyed more space.\footnote{Gordon, “Status Areas”, p. 23.} The higher ranks on Princes Street, George Street, Queen Street and the Squares surrounded and protected the lower ranks on the narrower Rose and Thistle Streets, who formed the beating heart of civic life. They shared the same entrances and exits to the city, lawyers and cooks alike crossing the ‘Earthen Mound’ (Map, 13) and the North Bridge (Map, 24) to reach the courts (Map, 19) and markets of the Old Town. This pattern is hinted at in the Charlotte Chapel data: Figure\footnote{Daniel Sandford, Lectures on the Epistles appointed for the service of the Church of England: on the days of Passion-Week, Easter-Even, and Easter-Sunday (Edinburgh: Manners and Miller, 1802) p. 110.} shows several Rose Street grocers and spirit dealers with English surnames, whose children Sandford baptised: Michael Magan and Hannah Huitson, George and Helen Searcy, John and Helen Hall. Such data can add little to the more comprehensive studies of this subject by Gordon and Rodger. However, it does show that the New Town’s paternalistic ideal of an integrated community, and Bishop Sandford’s ‘God who “hath no respect of persons”’ did have real expression in inclusive religious practice.\footnote{Daniel Sandford, Lectures on the Epistles appointed for the service of the Church of England: on the days of Passion-Week, Easter-Even, and Easter-Sunday (Edinburgh: Manners and Miller, 1802) p. 110.}

How far Episcopalian and Presbyterian churchgoers in Edinburgh chose their place of worship from geographical convenience, family association, or theological and liturgical preference; and how far they were loyal in attending one church or sought variety, would form an interesting wider study. In his social history of Scottish religion, Callum
Brown makes the general comment that denominational affiliation tended to be lax, especially amongst the most religious laity who enjoyed ‘sermon tasting’, although frowned upon by clergy. However, his examples referred to people attending both established and seceding Presbyterian churches. Barrie-Curien’s study of churches in London and the surrounding rural parishes in this period found that laity prioritised good sermons over the loyalty to the parish church which clergy desired. The data from Charlotte Chapel alone can only hint that in Edinburgh, various patterns of lay affiliation were possible. William Forbes had his daughter baptised in Charlotte Chapel in 1798 and was appointed to the vestry of the new St John’s in 1818, although his father, despite promoting Sandford (p. 86) was a trustee at Archibald Alison’s Cowgate Chapel. An elderly member of St George’s York Place recalled that in childhood she had seen Walter Scott hobbling down from a gallery pew, a piece of evidence which has been regarded as firm evidence of his membership, but this could be interpreted in many ways. He might have switched allegiance from St John’s after the death of his wife, after the decline in worship standards as St John’s struggled with debt and clerical illness, or after fame made attending a large chapel inconvenient. Having no permanent residence in Edinburgh after 1826, he might have had no sense of church affiliation in the city at all, and have been occupying the pew of a relative or friend. Alternatively, it might be that despite his strong connections to Charlotte Chapel (p. 17) he preferred Mr Shannon’s preaching to Bishop Sandford’s and had been attending St George’s throughout the 1810s. It was noted above (p. 6) that Henry Cockburn had more to say about Archibald Alison and the Presbyterian Henry Moncrieff’s sermons than Sandford’s, despite calling on his services so frequently for baptisms. On the other hand, examples like Thomas Ramsay and Robert Cockburn who along with their descendents came to rest in St John’s many years after the period of this study, suggest families also put down deep roots in the church. Little can be concluded from such anecdotal examples: the interesting question of patterns of lay church affiliation in Edinburgh would require a dedicated study.

The trend from the addresses, however, suggests that as people who moved into the immediate vicinity of Charlotte Chapel, they forged connections with the nearest place of worship. Until St George’s Kirk opened in 1815, Charlotte Chapel was the most convenient place of worship for people living west of Frederick Street. Chapter Two discussed

60 Brown, Religion and Society, p. 44.
how Charlotte Chapel was an unusual Scottish Episcopalian expression of ‘the outpouring of undenominational religion at the end of the eighteenth century’, described by W.R. Ward with its concentration at the West End, suggests that it acted in this period partly as an extra parish church for this new housing estate.

3.6 Conclusion

The congregation of Charlotte Chapel was large and diverse, completely unlike the closed, elitist club supposedly characteristic of Scottish Episcopalian congregations. While it reflected the high level of wealth and privilege of the New Town community, it attracted members from the full social spectrum of that community, and was possibly the most socially diverse congregation in the New Town. The aristocracy and gentry formed only a minor group within Charlotte Chapel, but the striking differences in their national identity, the aristocracy having the highest level of connection to other parts of Britain and gentry the least, provide a caution against treating the landed ranks as a homogeneous group. The ‘landed interest’ formed less than a third of its members, entrepreneurs and self-made around a fifth, with the serving, rather than the serviced, ranks of society approaching half the congregation. In terms of national identity, Charlotte Chapel attracted English residents in Edinburgh, who formed around a quarter of the congregation, but the majority of its members were Scottish. In terms of ecclesiastical influence, there is evidence for both Church of England and Scottish Episcopal affiliation. If Church of England affiliation corresponded to English parentage, marriage or residence, this might account for around half the congregation, with the rest being Scottish Episcopalians or possibly just attending the nearest convenient church. While the congregation’s diversity means there was no such thing as a ‘typical’ member, a substantial and particularly characteristic group within the congregation were the mobile, British petty-bourgeoisie, making the most of the new opportunities Edinburgh offered as a rising city of commercial Britain. The leaders of the congregation were drawn from a largely Scottish, closely knit group, initially from the privileged ranks with connections to the land, but by 1818 increasingly drawing in less well-connected men from self-made commercial and colonial backgrounds. Far from providing a bulwark to the traditional Scottish social order, the successful Charlotte Chapel was active in undermining it, by giving its blessing to the vibrant, mobile, commercial society of the Edinburgh New Town.

Chapter 4

Wealth and Economy

The growing representation of commercial interests in Charlotte Chapel suggests that behind the general impression of New Town wealth, an economic shift was taking place. The economic history of Edinburgh, Scotland’s biggest and richest city in this period, remains underexplored. The literature survey in the introduction raises many important questions. Has Edinburgh’s relative decline after 1826 caused it to be misinterpreted as an economic backwater in the earlier period? Could Edinburgh in 1800 have been playing a similar role within the Scottish economy that London had in England in 1700? How important was India to the Edinburgh economy, and how did this importance affect Scotland as a whole? Was incoming wealth really a bulwark to the existing social order? Did Scottish Episcopalian dissent play a special role in the economy, as it has been argued non-Episcopalian English dissent did? This chapter can only begin to answer these questions, although it highlights the need for more dedicated study. Beginning with a discussion of attitudes to wealth in Bishop Sandford’s preaching, it then attempts to weigh the wealth of the congregation, before investigating each of the chief sources of income.

4.1 Ideology of Wealth

Calvinism is sometimes cited as a factor in Scottish economic activity. Whatley thought it resulted in ‘ascetic economic action rather than the creative arts’. Nenadic assumed almost the opposite: that it caused a drive to curb ‘bad luxury’ (whisky) in favour of ‘beneficial luxury’ (the arts). Scots overseas are generally assumed to have been Presbyterian. All these assumptions are clearly inapplicable to the economic activity of Charlotte
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Bob Harris suggested that the Kirk’s annual fast-days in response to good or bad harvests helped reduce civil unrest through an encultured assumption that scarcity was divinely imposed, although adds, ‘It would be foolish to exaggerate its [Calvinism’s] importance’. However, this hesitant suggestion is the one which finds most support from the Charlotte Chapel evidence. These fast-days were noted and had spiritual significance for Daniel Sandford: ‘I pray to God to make me truly fast in spirit, and to submit myself with humility to the correction of his holy hand’, he noted in his diary on the fast of 30 October 1828. For his colleagues John Skinner, James Walker and Archibald Alison fast days when invasion threatened were the opportunity for political sermons, a practice which, as noted on p. 55, Edward Bannerman Ramsay recalled as part of a culture of friendly solidarity between episcopalian and Presbyterian in the Edinburgh of this period. Thanks to the participation of the high-status Episcopalian chapels, the Presbyterian fast days were truly national religious and political events.

Daniel Sandford endorsed his congregation’s enjoyment of the good things in life, appealing to ‘Him who maketh glad the heart of man’ to deny any scriptural basis for ‘morosely’ shunning ‘the pleasures which the present life affords’. Yet he cautioned against ‘the dissipated, luxurious, and sensual course of the votary of perpetual amusement, which distracts the mind with vanity’. Other preachers in Edinburgh taught similar messages, yet whereas their normal focus was suggested actions, Sandford concentrated more on attitude. Archibald Alison and Henry Moncrieff Wellwood, for example, campaigned against the slave trade; while Sydney Smith advised his listeners to ‘go into the poor man’s cottage to hear his tedious narrative, and to come close at hand with poverty, and its dismal, disgusting attendants’. For Sandford, the danger of Mammon was internal: ‘The moment we find the desires of wealth, of the honours and advantages of this world, predominate in our hearts over the love of God […] the moment that we find the love of pleasure stealing upon us, and enticing us into the thraldom of levity and folly,
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7Daniel Sandford, Sermons, Chiefly Designed for Young Persons (Edinburgh: Manners and Miller, 1802) p. 141.
8Sydney Smith, Six Sermons, Preached in Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Manners and Miller, 1800) pp. 139-140.
we must pluck up all our resolution, we must cast aside the accursed thing, we must flee as it were for our lives.\footnote{Sandford, Sermons for Young Persons pp. 143-4.} Sandford invited his listeners to consider their relationship to wealth in a characteristic scholarly, precise manner. Whereas the Evangelical preacher Gerard Noel painted a dramatic picture of ‘the man who unites all that is valued in society; all that flatters, and soothes, and deludes’, before consigning him to damnation (‘his wealth, his worldly advantages were his idols’), Sandford had no interest in titillating his listeners with awful prospects for a straw man they could complacently dismiss as unlike themselves.\footnote{Gerard T. Noel, The Counsel of God the only True Wisdom (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Waugh and Innes, 1818) p. 15.} Instead, his method of awakening them from complacency was to do the ‘rich man’ all possible justice, finding hints in the text that he was charitable and respected for his benevolence: a man whom they would all admire if he moved into a Charlotte Square townhouse. Whereas riches are given, said Sandford, to instil ‘a devout sense of the mercy to which we are so much indebted, and a humble acknowledgement of our own unworthiness’, the ‘rich man’ has slipped into a ‘habit of dependence on the world, encouraged by [...] flattery [...] and [...] self-trust’.\footnote{Daniel Sandford, Sermons Preached in St John’s Chapel, Edinburgh (Edinburgh: Constable, 1819) pp. 131-137.} Those listening to Sandford’s teaching might be distinguished by a self-awareness, a desire for the right attitude in the ordinary transactions of life, rather than a sense that they ought to add some charity on to their other activity. This awareness might translate into a higher than average dose of the quality of ‘alertness’, which McCloskey suggests was essential for turning economic growth into ‘miracle’.\footnote{Donald McCloskey, ‘1780-1860: a Survey’, in The Economic History of Britain since 1700, Volume 1: 1700-1860, ed. Roderick Floud and Donald McCloskey, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: CUP, 1994) pp. 242-270, p. 268.}

### 4.2 The Congregation’s Wealth

The economic activity of this group was complex: individuals might be engaged in a whole range of activities and investments, and sources are patchy. This analysis therefore steers away from quantification in favour first of assessing relative importance – the biggest employers, the most spectacular fortunes, the most vibrant areas of activity; and secondly of identifying dynamics – how did wealth flow around this community? The main types of evidence available are summarised in Table 4.1. Figure 4.1 shows the chief income-generating activities of members of Charlotte Chapel: the colonies (largely the West Indies but also Canada), Edinburgh’s consumer economy, India, land, law, mer-
Table 4.1: Wealth sources overview. Occupation (men’s own, widows’ husbands’, other women’s fathers’) is known for 62% of the 431 members of the congregation. The wealth of married women (from the baptism and marriage registers) is assessed in terms of their father rather than their husband because the latter would simply duplicate the men in the baptism and marriage registers, whereas the former enables comparison between brides and grooms and shows how dowry wealth came into Edinburgh (particularly through sugar, p. 165). Wealth at death from probate inventories is the individual’s own for men and women. A full record of assessed taxes is available for Edinburgh in 1811: these figures include unmarried women in their fathers’ houses. (Assessed taxes for the Burgh of Edinburgh year ending at Whitsunday 1811-1812, NRS E327/51 and E327/54.) ‘Financial difficulties’ includes evidence from a range of sources, at various periods in an individual’s life, such as bankruptcy announcements, forced sale of land, and creditors’ trusts set up at death.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth at death</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811 tax records</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 gives an indication of the wealth of men in each occupational category on the basis of the 1811 tax assessment and wealth at death. While a fully quantified assessment of the group’s wealth is not possible, these partial figures provide a starting-point which, combined with textual evidence of individuals’ prosperity, enables the relative importance of different sources of wealth to be weighed in the sections below. For a picture of

chambers, military, political office, other professional occupations (including doctor, clergyman and schoolmaster), and domestic or industrial servant. ‘Professionals’ are a diverse group largely of women’s fathers, and only a very small number of servants have been identified, and so little evidence is available from Charlotte Chapel for the part these groups played in the local economy. The other groups are each discussed in further detail below. Almost half the men in the chapel whose occupations were known were either in military occupations or landed gentry. Amongst women, the proportion of daughters of gentry was considerably higher, while another large group were the daughters of ‘merchants’, which includes bankers and industrialists. This difference suggests two opposite social trends: the daughters of gentry, such as Mary Anne Ran and Mary Finlay, both from Ireland, sought marriage amongst Edinburgh lawyers and officials who could guarantee them a secure income; while daughters of industrialists such as Helen Yuille from a Glasgow tobacco family, or Mary Carnegie, daughter of a Jacobite turned Swedish merchant, brought Britain’s industrial wealth into the landed and professional circles of Edinburgh.

Table 4.2 gives an indication of the wealth of men in each occupational category on the basis of the 1811 tax assessment and wealth at death. While a fully quantified assessment of the group’s wealth is not possible, these partial figures provide a starting-point which, combined with textual evidence of individuals’ prosperity, enables the relative importance of different sources of wealth to be weighed in the sections below. For a picture of
Figure 4.1: Sources of Charlotte Chapel members’ wealth. For men, the man’s own occupation is shown. For women, the occupation of their father or (for widows) their husband is shown. In some cases widows continued the business after their husband’s death.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tax Record</th>
<th>Avg. Value of House</th>
<th>Probate Inventories</th>
<th>Avg. Wealth at Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Measures of Wealth of Adult Men in Charlotte Chapel. The columns show: 1. Occupational categories, sorted accorded to house value (column 4). 2. Total number of adult men in that category. 3. Number of men with that occupation whose tax assessment was recorded in 1811–1812. 4. Average value of houses owned by men in that category. 5. Number of men with that occupation for whom probate inventories are available. 6. Average wealth at death in probate inventories. (Assessed taxes for the Burgh of Edinburgh year ending at Whitsunday 1811, NRS E327/51 and 1812, E327/54; NRS Wills and Testaments Database.)
the Charlotte Chapel community the 1811 tax is more useful, since individuals often lived many decades after 1818, and through very different economic circumstances. The small sample size means these figures on their own should be treated with caution. The fact that India appears as the wealthiest occupational category is striking, although this represents only one man, retired East Indiaman captain Alexander Tod. More significant are the officials, a high proportion of whom were assessed for tax and left a probate inventory, and who had a very high average wealth by both these measures. This represents the weight of wealth the Dundas Regime brought to Edinburgh. Although military occupations were the most common amongst men in Charlotte Chapel, none was assessed for tax and only four left a probate inventory. This is indicative partly of their wider range of social rank and partly of their transience: soldiers of an age to marry and have children tended to be pursuing highly mobile careers, not settling in houses. The ‘professional’ category represents just one man, Daniel Sandford himself. Sandford owned no land, and his house was of lower value than that of any of his officials. Although 17 Melville Street was more valuable than the premises of the shopkeepers in his congregation, they might amass greater moveable wealth. William Vallance, glover in West Register Street, died in 1822 worth £1553. By the time of her death in 1872, Anna Underwood, hairdresser, was worth almost £4000. Edinburgh’s bishop, with £895, was significantly poorer than the polite society to whom he ministered.

4.3 Military

The period of this study coincides almost exactly with the wars against Revolutionary and Napoleonic France, 1793-1815. It is unsurprising, therefore, that almost a quarter of the men (a third of those whose occupation is known) had military occupations. War affected the whole of society: the forty-nine men with military occupations in Charlotte Chapel represent all social ranks, and while a higher proportion had a British connection (see Figure 3.6) than the wider congregation, the balance of national origins was similar to that of the wider group. The figures do not include those who were in the volunteer forces, which, according to Henry Cockburn’s vivid description, brought almost everybody under arms:

After the war broke out again in 1803, Edinburgh, like every other place, be-
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13 William Vallance’s inventory, NRS SC70/1/27/567.
14 Anna Underwood’s Inventory, NRS SC70/1/160/845.
came a camp, and continued so till the peace in 1814. We were all soldiers, one way or other. Professors wheeled in the college area; the side-arms and the uniform peeped from behind the gown at the Bar, and even on the Bench [...] I, a gallant captain, commanded ninety-two of my fellow-creatures from 1804 to 1814 [...] When we first began, being resolved that we townsmen should outshine the rustics, we [with John Murray, like Cockburn a future Whig judge] actually drilled our two companies almost every night during the four winter months of 1804 and 1805, by torch-light, in the ground flat of the George-street Assembly Rooms [...] Any able-bodied man, of whatever rank, who was not a volunteer, or a local militiaman, had to explain or apologize for his singularity

While to his younger Victorian readers this Edinburgh at arms seemed extraordinary, for older members of Charlotte Chapel this militarisation must have recalled the Jacobite occupation of 1745 (p. 219).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Women’s Fathers</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Captain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Military Ranks in Charlotte Chapel based on 68 individuals. The figures represent 67 people, but but 4 of the 18 women are omitted as overlaps: sisters Christina and Isabella Tytler shared a Lieutenant-Colonel father; Mary Stewart’s husband and Margaret and Mary Douglas was the same Lieutenant-General, and Susan Tod was Naval Captain Alexander Tod’s daughter.

In Jacobite families, the militarism of civil war evolved directly into a culture of armed service overseas amongst the Highland gentry, as men born to lead and trained in arms were forced into exile, on to their own resources, and eager to win back the favour of the British government. However, not all Episcopalian gentry were Jacobite, and it was not
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only the Jacobites who flocked into the army: loyal gentry’s estates were often under a
desperate threat of debt. In 1772 Emilia MacLeod’s father Lieutenant-General Norman
Macleod of Macleod had inherited an estate with an income of £3,235 and interest re-
payments of £3,178 per year. A combination of over ten years’ armed service (rising to
second-in-command of the army in India), a voluntary rent increase by his tacksman, and
the reluctant sale of Harris to Emmeline MacLeod’s father, successfully re-established the
estate’s affairs. Thomas Livingstone, eldest son of an insolvent Stirlingshire baronet,
joined the navy in 1782 aged 12. His adventures included conveying Russian forces to
England in preparation for the invasion of Holland in 1799, commanding the Diadem
in the expedition against Quiberon Bay in 1800, and capturing the 18-gun Vigilante off
Egypt in 1806, before retiring to marry Janet Stirling in Charlotte Chapel in 1809. His
prize money must have been vital in rescuing Westquarter from its crippling debts, and
extending its estates. Livingstone’s Stirlingshire neighbour James Russell of Woodside,
and Sir John Pringle of Stickell in Ayrshire also prefaced their gentlemanly careers with
military service. Charles Fraser served in the Peninsular War before succeeding to Castle
Fraser in Aberdeenshire, and marrying Janet Hay in Charlotte Chapel in 1817. Some
landowners, like Alexander Dyce of Rosebank in Aberdeenshire, made a longer career
from soldiering: perhaps his estate would never be very profitable, perhaps his prizes
came more slowly, or perhaps he needed more money than, say, Livingstone as he had
four sons, all of whom he established in prestigious careers in the army, church or bar.
While he was raising native infantry battalions and suppressing rebellions in India, his
wife Frederica Campbell, whose life began in desperate gentry poverty in Argyll, en-
joyed the comfort and elegance of 23 Charlotte Square. Military service was extremely
common amongst the landed gentry of Charlotte Chapel.

Younger sons were more likely to make a permanent career in the army, often moving
into administration. Charles Fraser’s younger brother Frederick was captain in the 78th
Foot, and later Assistant Quartermaster General to the forces in Canada.

a third son, raised the Aberdeen Fencibles, rose to Lieutenant-General fighting in the Peninsula, and in 1814 became Governor of the Leeward Islands.\footnote{23}{H.M. Chichester, ‘Leith, Sir James (1763-1816)’, in ODNB, (Oxford: OUP, 2004).} Frederick Maitland, a grandson of the Earl of Lauderdale, served in the West Indies and Europe and was remembered as the competent Lieutenant-Governor of Grenada from 1805 to 1810, before he retired to an estate in Sussex.\footnote{24}{H.M. Chichester, ‘Hunter, Sir Martin (1757-1846)’, in ODNB.} Many, like Maitland, bought landed estates with their profits, rising to rival their elder siblings in rank. Adam and Jane Duff’s father, an admiral, purchased Fetteresso Castle in 1782, having begun as the youngest of a huge family.\footnote{25}{Alistair Taylor and Henrietta Taylor, The Book of the Duffs (Edinburgh: Constable, 1914) p. 309.} It was not unusual for a younger brother or nephew to inherit the family estates after all. This happened to Magdalene Murray’s father, a colonel. In a younger generation, William Ogilvy’s glittering naval career culminated in the capture of the ‘very beautiful’ 400-ton \textit{Le Huron}, laden, he reported, with ‘ivory, cochineal, indigo, tea, sugar, pepper, cinnamon, ebony etc’.\footnote{26}{William Ogilvy to Earl St Vincent, Plymouth Sound, 31 January 1801, CM 7 February 1801.} In 1802 he retired and married, and following the deaths of his two elder brothers became Baronet of Inverquharity in 1819, his prizes strengthening the historic connection between land and family. Others, like Christina and Isabella Tytler’s father, a Lieutenant-Colonel, enjoyed a stylish urban life with plenty of opportunity to visit country relatives: along with Bishop Sandford he was one of the first people to buy a house in the West End development of Melville Street. Isabella met her English husband George Terry while enjoying the beautiful garden of her Uncle Carr, and the intellectual conversation of her literary aunt, at their country house near Leeds.\footnote{27}{John Claudius Loudon, \textit{An Encyclopedia of Gardening} (London: Longman, 1822) pp. 805, 1290; Gentleman’s Magazine vol.120 (1816) p.380.} While income from military service, its commission structure reflecting civilian ranks, did tend to strengthen the existing social order, its availability to both elder and younger sons diluted the significance of primogeniture for these generations of Scottish gentry.

Yet the glorious military leaders and prestigious landowners, while the most fully documented, were not the only, and perhaps not the most important, group bringing wealth into Edinburgh as a result of their military careers. Soldiers whose more modest livings enabled them and their families to live in the New Town helped underpin the Edinburgh economy. The largest groups were the eighteen army captains and ten
Some on a path to higher rank but mostly modestly genteel. Eight of these were English or Irish, either (in the case of five) marrying Scottish wives, or simply stationed with their family in Edinburgh. Two women, Jane Demorgan and Amelia Luthman, were daughters of foreign mercenary soldiers who made successful careers in the British army. Jane's father was a French Hugenot who fled to England in 1685, distinguished himself as a sergeant in the East India Company Service and was commissioned ensign before retiring to private life in Madras. Jane married a Scottish surgeon, who brought her to Edinburgh to live in a four-storey townhouse in George Street and see her grandchildren baptised in Charlotte Chapel before she was buried by Sandford in 1818. Amelia, who married the Greenock merchant James Stewart in Charlotte Chapel, was the daughter of a Swedish captain in the Westmorland Regiment. The eleven sergeants, privates and soldiers of unknown rank (several from the Scotch Brigade, garrisoned in Edinburgh during 1812) are probably representative of a larger group amongst the 159 individuals whose occupation is not known. Whatever the economic impact of their military service on their places of origin, their place in the economy of Edinburgh was as immigrants with spending power.

War was still dangerous. Miss Robert Brown owed her masculine name to being the posthumous only child of Captain Robert Johnstone, killed in 1796 in the attack on St Lucia. In 1801 Daniel Sandford wrote to Christian Erskine when her brother Charles perished in the defeat of the French in Egypt, a year after her other brother James died when the Queen Charlotte caught fire and sank off Leghorn. In 1814 Sandford conducted the funeral of Colonel Duncan MacDonald, residing with his brother Coll after being reluctantly invalided home from France. Duncan committed suicide after unexpectedly reading his name in the London Gazette as one of two officers ‘dismissed from service’, the other being a notorious coward. Charlotte Barclay was twenty-eight when she married seventy-year-old, heirless Sir George Colquhoun, and gave him three healthy sons, James, George and Robert. Yet while he might have died happy, she received news of James’ death at Seringapatam in 1799 and George’s at Salamanca in 1812 before she was
buried by Sandford in 1816, and when Robert died at sea on the passage to India in 1838, the baronetcy of Tullyquhoun became extinct after all. A military career certainly did not always mean success.

Death in war might be unmitigated disaster for the individual, and a tragedy with widespread resonance in this close-knit community, but it was not so for the society. While demographic data for this period is almost non-existent, anecdotal evidence suggests childhood death rates in polite society fell in the later eighteenth century thanks to considerable improvements in housing and diet. In the face of a potential Malthusian crisis amongst the Scottish gentry, Britain’s wars provided tremendous employment opportunities in the wake of the ’45 until 1815, and each casualty represented a new opportunity. This was particularly obvious in the Navy List, in which ‘luck’ meant the death of senior colleagues, because promotion was based on simple survival: captains Brian Hodgson, Alexander Christie and William Ogilvy all lived long enough to become admirals in retirement. The opportunities were not limited to the elite, and while evidence for the lower ranks is sparse, individuals such as George Thorpe, a weaver from Leeds who became an officer’s servant, suggest that war provided new opportunities for groups struggling economically at all social levels. The numerous stories of economic dynamism amongst Charlotte Chapel’s soldiers, of crippled estates flourishing again and younger sons’ social rise, could occur only because the war continually extracted unfortunate individuals from the picture. The Charlotte Chapel biographies suggest considerable wealth was brought into Edinburgh as a result of war, but economic growth came at a human cost.

Soldiers could suffer financial disaster. Englishman Michael Fell appears to have been a reluctant soldier, going into the cotton business after a short stint as ensign in the Volunteers, but after various short-lived business partnerships he was declared bankrupt in 1809. He re-enlisted in the Leicestershire Militia, but his best career move was to marry the whisky heiress Janet Haig of Charles Cogan of the Foot Guards married a Scottish general’s daughter Mary Douglas in 1801 and took her to live at fashionable addresses in the Strand and Hampstead before being imprisoned for debt in 1805. Mary returned to Edinburgh to give birth to their daughter in 1810, and in 1811 Charles was released.

Cokayne, Baronetage, vol. 2 p. 296.
Dublin Gazette; 6 May 1797, Trewnan’s Exeter Flying Post 1805 Dec 19; London Gazette, 28 May 1803 p.5, 16 April 1805, 28 December 1805, 3 June 1809 p.18.
insolvent, and joined her, but died in 1816.\textsuperscript{38} Their daughter Mary was the main legatee of various childless aunts, and in 1848 still lived with her mother and aunt in the modestly genteel Maitland Street.\textsuperscript{39} Examples of economic disaster amongst Charlotte Chapel soldiers were, however, very few.

The Charlotte Chapel sample is undoubtedly a skewed portion of Scottish society. That those who died prematurely are under-represented is almost inevitable in any history. More importantly, those who suffered economic disaster are under-represented. At all social ranks, the West End was, largely, a place for people on the rise, and marriage a reward for thrift, diligence and luck in the early stages of a man’s career: there were women, like Mary Douglas, who made unfortunate marriages but there was strong social pressure against imprudence. It is perhaps significant that Mary was the daughter of the eccentric general who refused to move to the New Town (p. 128), with no other known male kin or friends to help assess suitors. Mothers of soldiers’ natural children, far from being over-represented as in, for example, the registers of George Gleig’s Episcopal chapel near the Stirling garrison, were probably absent for the same reason as economically unsuccessful men.\textsuperscript{40} A maid who had been seduced by a soldier would lose her position and therefore find her residence in the West End curtailed as surely as the indebted landowner faced with selling his townhouse or his ancestral estate. The West End was a place for the successful.

Military service was not always a primarily economic activity. Sir Gilbert Stirling followed a similar career to his brother-in-law Thomas Livingstone, but whereas Livingstone sought financial security, Stirling sought social validity: his family’s money came from banking, his baronetcy created only in 1792. Stirling served at the Helder and in Egypt under Abercrombie, and in the Peninsula under Wellington, retiring in 1812 as a Lieutenant-Colonel. To his family lands in Ayrshire he added Larbert, convenient for Edinburgh, where he built a fine mansion.\textsuperscript{41} He was a trustee of Charlotte Chapel, probably thanks to his financial clout: he died with the second largest moveable estate in the group including £31,700 in bank shares.\textsuperscript{42} Stirling’s military service was probably not necessary so much to fund his rank, as to legitimise it.

\textsuperscript{38} London Gazette 27 July 1811 p.35.
\textsuperscript{39} Mary Anne Cogan’s Inventory, NRS SC70/1/69/503; Jane Duncombe’s Inventory, NRS SC70/1/35/37; Anne Boyd’s Inventory, NRS SC70/4/7/853.
\textsuperscript{40} Private communication from Rev. Alison Peden.
\textsuperscript{41} John C. Gibson, Lands and Lairds of Larbert and Dunipace Parishes (Glasgow: Hugh Hopkins, 1908) p. 10.
\textsuperscript{42} Gilbert Stirling’s Inventory, NRS SC67/36/22/521.
Nathaniel Cameron of Erracht’s father began his military service in necessary exile after killing his kinsman in a duel in 1772, but in later life it was an ideological activity. While most Camerons of Lochiel were fiercely Jacobite, Erracht’s feud with the family made him a staunch Hanoverian. Marrying a wife with West Indian interests gave him the financial backing to raise a regiment in the British Army in demonstration of his loyalty, which became the Queen’s Own Cameron Highlanders in 1794. However, for the Charlotte Chapel generation Hanoverian and Jacobite ideologies had paled into insignificance compared with the immediate urgency of the war with France. Thanks to the practice of listing donors’ names in newspapers it has been possible to identify the contributions of Charlotte Chapel members to various causes over the period (summarised and further discussed below in Figure 5.5), and these provide a striking insight into the value they placed on military defence. Between 1793 and 1803 their combined donations only exceeded £50 in one collection, the ‘Voluntary Contribution for the Defence of the Country’ in 1798, to which they gave £685. Cockburn’s recollection, ‘thinking men were in a great and genuine fright, which increased in proportion as they thought’, is demonstrated by this donation. It was an enormous sum given that this is at the beginning of the period, when most of the group were at the outset of their careers or too young to donate at all: Daniel Sandford and Colin MacKenzie for example, both gave £42, a large proportion of annual income for men aged only thirty-two and twenty-eight and barely established in their professions. While the war’s effect on Edinburgh may have been economic growth, the contemporary priority was the need to defend the country at all costs.

Participation in volunteer forces might have been from economic motives amongst the lower ranks, who received a small payment and exemption from the militia ballot, but certainly not for the officers. For them, real ideological motives overlapped with social pressure and hobbyism. In 1797 William Forbes and Walter Scott helped found the Royal Corps of Edinburgh Volunteer Light Dragoons, ‘mounted on horses worth 30 to 60 guineas a piece, armed equipped &c at our own expence’. For Scott it was therapy for having been beaten by Forbes to the hand of Williamina Belsches and an early opportunity to try out his skills as a songsmith:

44 CM 15 February 1798. Donors were Alexander Christie (£180), Archibald Campbell Colquhoun (£105), David Hume (£105), Robert Hodshon Cay (£100), James Clerk (£100), Colin MacKenzie (£42), Daniel Sandford (£42), Mary Douglas (£11).
45 Cockburn, Memorials p. 182.
From high Dunedin’s towers we come,
A band of brothers true [...]
Resolved, we mingle in the tide,
Where charging squadrons furious ride,
To conquer or to die.

In terms of their economic impact, the volunteer forces represent not income, but consumer expenditure on uniforms, horses, weapons and dinners. However, this too drove economic growth, encouraged the development of skills and infrastructure and drew in English immigrants. The Englishman Charles Sadler’s child was born in Edinburgh in 1798 because he was farrier to the Norfolk Cavalry, which was providing security staff for the field-day of the Edinburgh Volunteers. Unlike the regular forces, the volunteers had a redistributive effect on income, given the substantial contributions in cash and kind from the elite, and that the lower ranks were paid.

Charlotte Chapel cannot present a complete picture of the economic impact of the French wars on Edinburgh. The sample is skewed in favour of the successful: single women, whom Nenadic identifies as a significant collateral casualty of the war in Highland society, are particularly invisible. However, the few glimpses there are suggest it would be dangerous to make assumptions about women and war in Edinburgh. The story of Mary Stewart and her daughter Mary Douglas shows that women’s lives could be economically blighted by their military husbands; but in the case of Robert Brown, while her Christian name came from her deceased warrior father, her surname came from her mother, who inherited an estate from an uncle of that name. The overwhelming evidence from Charlotte Chapel’s large proportion of members engaged in war is of individuals who prospered from it, and who brought their new wealth into Edinburgh at all social levels.

4.4 Land

Figure 4.1 suggests that Charlotte Chapel was founded firmly on landed wealth: 74 (38%) of men whose occupation was known were landowners. Devine writes that after 1700

48 Scots Magazine (1798) vol.60 p.717.
50 Inglis, Inglis.
Figure 4.2: Map of hereditary estate ownership amongst Charlotte Chapel members. Some markers represent more than one person (eg two sisters): see Table 4.4 for numbers in each area. (Outline Map (c) Craig Asquith 2006, [www.craigasquith.co.uk](http://www.craigasquith.co.uk))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-east</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Belt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of UK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Location of landowning families in Charlotte Chapel.
land was regarded more as constituting ‘assets from which revenue and profit could be extracted’ than as a basis of military power.\footnote{51} However, there are grounds for suspicion as to how foundational a source of wealth land was. Of the seventy-four landowners, sixteen were known to have combined their landowning with military service or trade, three of these and seven others were known to be in financial difficulties, and the circumstances of twenty-six are obscure. Most of the remaining twenty-five were either great aristocrats or English. Land conferred local and national political influence as well as great social prestige: while landowners certainly looked to increase the profitability of their estates, this was as a prerequisite to keeping them. It would be misleading to understand them as purely economic assets.

Highland gentry struggled to make money from their estates: all except two of the nine Highland estates in figure 4.2 were in considerable financial difficulties. \textbf{Georgina Lamont}’s father John Lamont of Lamont and \textbf{Edward MacKenzie} thought they could support Edinburgh lifestyles on rental income, but ruined their estates in the process. \textbf{Ranald MacDonald} of Staffa made a bold attempt to demonstrate that it was possible to be a true clan chief on traditional lines \textit{and} run a profitable estate on Ulva with the help of the kelp boom. He built schools and watermills, championed Highland culture and is remembered fondly by local historians – but he went bankrupt in 1817, and the tenantry were cleared by apparently reluctant but more hard-nosed successors.\footnote{52} At the end of his life \textbf{MacDonald} lived in a modest suburban apartment in Edinburgh’s industrialising south-west, with an entry in the Post Office Directory almost bigger than his house: ‘Sir Reg. Steuart Seton MacDonald, of Staffa and Touch, advocate, Sheriff of Stirlingshire; hon. sec. to the High. and Agric. Soc. of Scot, New Club, 17 Gardner’s Cresc’. A similar slow tragedy played out on the Seaforth estates, where Finlay McKichan describes ‘confused policymaking’ by the well-meaning chief, whose aunt \textbf{Euphemia MacKenzie} was buried by \textbf{Sandford}.\footnote{53} In Ranald MacDonald’s case, his policymaking was clear, but based on short-term economics. One of the two successful estates was that of his neighbours (and historic rivals), \textbf{Margaret Clephane} and her mother, implementing improvements with the advice of a lowland farmer, turning multi-tenant farms into individual crofts and introducing the potato in lazy-beds. Since Margaret’s father also owned es-

\footnote{53}Finlay McKichan, ‘Lord Seaforth and Highland Estate Management in the First Phase of Clearance (1783-1815)’, \textit{SHR} 86 (Apr. 2007), 50-68.
tates in Fife and had a career in the army, it is not clear how economically self-sufficient this estate was. In the Romantic poetry of her English husband, [Spencer Compton] Lord Northampton, one can perhaps detect a sneer at the industrial developments on MacDon-
ald’s estate from a family which was more sheltered from Highland economic reality:

[...] nought of man is seen, far, far around,

Save some lone fisherman who plies the oar,

Or kelp’s white-wreathèd smoke on Ulva’s shore [...][54]

The other successful Highland estate owner, [John MacKenzie]’s father MacKenzie of Applecross, is remembered with no fondness by Applecross historians for what they regarded as the brutal development of a monetarised sheep- and kelp-based economy based on concepts of ‘enlightenment’ and ‘improvement’ gleaned from too much time spent in Edinburgh.[55] Applecross’ family have several connections with Charlotte Chapel in this period: he married [Martha Elphinstone]’s sister, making him an uncle by marriage of the leading layman [Colin MacKenzie], and his teenage son [John MacKenzie]’s funeral was at Charlotte Chapel in 1815. Yet Applecross appears to have been unique amongst Charlotte Chapel Highland landowners in creating a genuinely profitable enterprise. Whether or not he was more exploitative than his neighbours who subsidised their estate with a fortune made in the army or India, or who went bankrupt and sold up, his reputation certainly suffered more for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristocracy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baronetcy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Members of families in Charlotte Chapel owning land in the rest of the UK.

Sixteen members of Charlotte Chapel had wealth based on land outside Scotland (Table 4.5). Most of these were titled women who married into Scottish high society, like [Harriet Bouverie] who married the Earl of Rosebery; or [Anne Lake] and [Anne Lindsay], daughters of English and Irish aristocrats, who married prosperous brothers [John Wardlaw] and [Robert Wardlaw Ramsay]. None of the men was a long-term resident in Edinburgh:

[55] Private communication from Gordon Cameron, Curator, Applecross Heritage Centre, 13 September 2011.
four of the five, Spencer Compton, Edward Poore, Daniel Maude and Robert Shuttleworth married in Charlotte Chapel. Compton, heir to the Earl of Northampton, married Margaret MacLean Clephane, daughter of the laird of Torloisk on the island of Mull. Poore, who was extending his Wiltshire estate of Rushall which featured a new house and a remodelled park, and Shuttleworth, who refurbished the Elizabethan Gawthorpe Hall for his residence out of choice of family seats in Lancashire and Yorkshire, married Agnes and Janet Marjoribanks whose father’s estate of Lees in Berwickshire was prone to flooding and is described by local historians as ‘homely’ rather than ‘grand’ compared with neighbouring estates. Three days after Shuttleworth’s wedding, his wealthy neighbour Daniel Maude of Painthorpe married Janet Munro daughter of the agent for the Shotts Iron Company who lived in the suburban Elder Street, beyond the east end of the New Town.

One might surmise their stay was short but involved lavish expenditure: they could all offer their brides more affluent lifestyles than they had enjoyed in their fathers’ houses.

The forty-seven non-Highland Scottish landowners, the majority, are poorly covered by either local or scholarly writers: more detailed study of this group would form a useful addition to Scottish economic and social history. In general they appear to have been relatively affluent: only three are known to have faced financial difficulties, and eight left moveable fortunes of over £10,000. Agricultural history suggests the Scottish lowlands prospered in the later eighteenth century: the unproductive carses of Stirling and Gowrie, for example, were drained after 1750 to create some of the most fertile land in Scotland. One might expect the lowland proprietors to be the source of much of the wealth flowing into Edinburgh in this period, but this is not entirely clear: only seven of the twenty-three men in the group had an address in Edinburgh in their own or their mother’s name. Anecdotal evidence suggests lairds were reluctant to spend money in the capital. Margaret Maxtome’s father, for example, scraped together money to take his ‘pretty daughters’ to Edinburgh to find husbands, an investment which paid off when Margaret married West Indian overseer Thomas Ramsay the same day with her sister.


58 These were: Alexander Keith (mother), John Keith (mother), Marten Dalrymple (mother), Lachlan Duff Gordon (mother), John Pringle (mother).
married William Stewart of Ardvorlich. The three Charlotte Chapel officials in this group had banking or legal careers which probably provided the majority of their income. The one route by which profits from land certainly did flow into the capital was through its requirement for legal services. Yet the relative lack of evidence for lowland lairds spending money on residence in Edinburgh in this period compared with other groups like soldiers, government officials and nabobs suggests Edinburgh’s prosperity was not achieved by draining the rest of the country.

Figure 4.3: 23 small estates owned by 25 Charlotte Chapel professionals (including two father/son pairs). Blue markers show estates they inherited, or to which they were the anticipated heir, which they supported with their professional income. Magenta markers show estates they purchased with their earnings. (Outline Map (c) Craig Asquith 2006, www.craigasquith.co.uk.)

Twenty-five men in Charlotte Chapel congregation owned estates, but have not been included in the ‘landed wealth’ group because their estates appear to have been primarily objects of expenditure rather than income with a ‘social’ or ‘amateur’ function. This group have been identified on the basis of their full-time participation in a professional career, which a gentleman whose estate yielded a sufficient income of its own would be

---

59 Lachlan Duff Gordon, Gilbert Stirling, Alexander Keith.
Table 4.6: Occupations of small estate owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inherited</th>
<th>Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inherited</th>
<th>Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unlikely to pursue. Of these, twelve (marked in blue in figure 4.3) were family estates which they had inherited, or to which they were the heir, while thirteen were purchased. As Table 4.6 shows, two-thirds of these owners were lawyers. The interplay between wealth and rank is particularly evident in these small estates. Lawyers divided evenly between those who funded their ancestral estate with a legal career and those who purchased new, and there is no clear trend towards inherited or purchased estates between advocates and writers, or salaried officials and freelance. Amongst the more dangerous professions, however, those who inherited estates preferred to defend them with a military career, while those who had made their fortunes in India purchased. In fact, none of the twenty-three members of Charlotte Chapel who made their fortune in India, discussed in the next section, originally came from the privileged ranks of society (Figure 3.2).

The location of these estates was significant. Uneconomic inherited estates were often in remote parts of Scotland. Advocate William Fraser Tytler, for example, inherited Balnain from his mother. He was able to reside there and continue in his profession as Sheriff of Inverness-shire, and by 1816 his friend Walter Scott was embarrassed that Tytler was still theoretically Edinburgh Professor of History despite having ‘retired for some years into the north country, and does not even pretend to lecture’. At the other end of the Great Glen, Coll MacDonald of Dalness built up a practice as Writer to the Signet administering property transactions, law enforcement and infrastructure development in Ballahulish, Knoydart, Fort William, Campbeltown, Glengarry, Glenfinnan, Glencoe and elsewhere.

While the journey between his houses in Castle Street and Dalness might be inconvenient, they represented the two ends of a business practice, rather than a working residence and a holiday retreat. The Whig Thomas Maitland was heir to Drundrennan in Galloway, which later gave him the basis to take advantage of political reform and be

---

62 CM 12 May 1898, 9 August 1798, 27 July 1799, 2 May 1801, 10 August 1805, 21 August 1806, 13 November 1806, 13 November 1806, 10 September 1807, 15 October 1807, 22 March 1810, 4 November 1810, 10 January 1811, 9 February 1811.
elected Liberal MP for Kirkcudbright in 1845. For men like these who supported their inherited estate with a professional career, there was no question of selling it to purchase a more convenient one: far more likely was that the location would shape their career.

For purchasers, however, convenience was a factor. Alexander MacKenzie purchased Portmore, 15 miles south of Edinburgh, inherited in 1806 by his son Colin MacKenzie, also a Writer to the Signet. Perhaps inspired by his honeymoon in the Lake District, Colin built a ‘whimsical cottage’ (in reality a substantial gentleman’s house) to house his growing family, with a vague intention of replacing it with a mansion one day. In 1809 he wrote,

> We are really enjoying the cottage. In spite of the session we can continue to spend 8 out of every 14 days [...] at it. Thus on Saturday the court rises about 1/2 past 12. We get out there in good time for dinner & have an afternoon walk. Then we have Sunday & Monday till 6 in the evening. [...] But farther every second Wednesday is a Teind Court only with which I have nothing to do. I go therefore on Tuesday out to dinner & stay there till Wednesday evening [...] I even intend now and then to steal a leave of absence on the intermediate Tuesday & so be in the country from Saturday to Thursday. This is a Gentlemanlike way of holding office.

The convenience was evident. Bishop Sandford regularly went to Harcus Cottage to baptise its latest additions, and enjoy Colin’s hospitality. On the other side of the Pentland Hills, Alexander Young had built the grand Harburn House in 1804 with a landscaped park and lake. Towards Edinburgh lay John Tod’s estate of Kirkhill, whose eighteenth-century mansion he had extended by architect Thomas Hamilton in 1828. In Morningside, on the southern approach to Edinburgh, Adelaide Falconar’s father employed Hamilton to transform the mansion into the spectacular Falcon Hall around 1811, with pillared facade, statues of Wellington, Nelson and falcons, and inside a grand stair leading to a magnificent oval drawing room inspired by the Bay of Naples. On the edge of the Pentlands, Henry Cockburn described how the investment of time and money into these purchased estates was a labour of love, creating a bond with the land as sacred as one hallowed by generations of inheritance: ‘Every thing except the two burns, the few old trees, and the mountains, are my own work, and to a great extent the work of my

64 Colin MacKenzie to James Skene, 13 June 1809, NLS MS.20471.23.
own hands’

Walter Scott's Abbotsford stands out in Figure 4.3 as the only purchased estate in the Borders. As Sheriff-depute of Selkirkshire, Scott was required to reside in the county. The other sheriffs-depute in the congregation, Archibald Campbell (Perth), William Tytler (Inverness-shire), Adam Duff (Forfar), Ranald MacDonald (Stirlingshire), James Clerk (Edinburgh) and David Hume (Berwickshire) had inherited local landed connections, through which they gained these offices. It is one of the marks of Scott's astonishing (and later successfully obscured) social rise that his estate stands out in this analysis of his community: he gained the sheriffship without already having an estate in the county, or anywhere else, and was obliged to purchase one. The far more remote estate of Appin in Argyll was purchased by the nabob Robert Downie, a man of very humble origins: his father was a farmer and distiller in Menteith, Perthshire, possibly a ‘moss laird’ who emigrated from the Highlands to improve the carse of Stirling for Lord Kames in the 1770s, in which case Appin could have been a return to historic family roots.

While Scott's and Downie's choices appear eccentric compared with the modern convenience of Cockburn and MacKenzie, they were in fact the pioneers of what in the railway age became a stampede of nouveaux riches purchasing remote Romantic roots.

The landowners in Charlotte Chapel were a large and very varied group: struggling Highland and prospering lowland gentlemen, wealthy English visitors, lairds who had ceased to pretend their estates could support them and turned businessman, and professionals who purchased weekend retreats and turned gentleman. Their diverse stories suggest that while land might appear to be the largest wealth-base of Charlotte Chapel congregation, it was not the main foundation of Edinburgh’s economic growth, and Edinburgh was not an economic drain on the land. Landowners did bring some wealth to Edinburgh by purchasing its legal services and consumer goods, but more often, wealth flowed back to the land in the shape of landowner-professionals and landowner-businessmen, to provide local improvement, infrastructure and employment around Scotland.

4.5 Law

The third most common occupation for men in Charlotte Chapel was the law. One in eight were advocates (the Scottish term for barristers) or writers (solicitors), summarised in Table 4.7. Most of the writers were members of the professional body, the Society of
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Table 4.7: Occupations of lawyers in Charlotte Chapel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Women’s fathers</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate holding office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherited estate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased estate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer to the Signet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherited estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lawyers</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writers to the Signet, and almost half of the advocates also held an official salaried position such as a sheriff-depute. Unsurprisingly, this group yielded the most comprehensive probate information of the congregation. Only 30% of all the men in the congregation were listed in the Edinburgh Post Office Directories between 1794 and 1818, but they include all but three of the lawyers (two of whom were very young bachelors). All but two (John and Robert Cay) were Scottish, and only 20% had a British connection, compared with 49% of all men in the congregation (Figure 3.6). The large kinship network in the congregation (Appendix) included 25% of the congregation but 70% of the lawyers and lawyers’ daughters. The lawyers were wealthy: all but four died with moveable wealth of over £1,000, seven over £10,000 and three over £40,000, amongst the top five probate valuations in the congregation. Over half were rated for tax in 1811, owning four of the top ten houses in terms of rental value. Lawyers supplied twelve out of the eighteen chapel officials. Firmly rooted in Edinburgh, wealthy, and influential, the lawyers of Charlotte Chapel were not the largest but they were the most important group in the congregation, and the economic basis of the community, a role they appear to have played in Regency Edinburgh as a whole.

The economic role of law, as a service industry, is less immediately obvious than that of the agricultural or manufacturing sectors. Was lawyers’ wealth subtracted from or contributing to the wider economic development of Scotland? Did they challenge or uphold the existing social order? The initial impression is that they were a conservative force, because of their strong link to the land. Although lawyers derived their main income from their profession, all but six (including the two lower-rank writers) owned an estate, half inheriting and half purchasing – and of the purchasers, half were younger sons of landed men. Many were younger branches of old Scottish landed families, to whose estates their work was closely connected: Colin MacKenzie administered land transactions.
in Inverness-shire, Coll MacDonald in Argyll, John Tod in the Borders. Yet the development of a sophisticated and impartial legal system was crucial to Scotland’s ability to take advantage of economic opportunities. Lawyers were continuously engaged in improving the governance of Scotland, as discussed below in Chapter Five (p. 186), and much of the division between Whig and Tory in Edinburgh revolved around the question of the quantity of legal reform required to ensure conditions for the best flourishing of Political Economy. How far their activities were successful in creating these conditions in early nineteenth-century Scotland is beyond the scope of this study. Meanwhile, the types of ways lawyers used their wealth is illustrated by a closer study of the richest section of the group, the salaried officials.

4.6 Salaried Officials

Ten members of Charlotte Chapel, including seven of the chapel officials, held salaried government positions. With the exception of William Arbuthnot, secretary to the Board of Trustees for Fisheries and Manufactures, all were lawyers. The economic and political successes of this group were tightly entangled. They were ostensibly merely concentrating public funds in Edinburgh via a corrupt patronage mechanism. In 1807, the young advocate Adam Duff purchased his first post, sheriff-depute of Forfar, from the previous incumbent Patrick Chalmers of Auldbar, over the head of another aspirant, John Hagart, who was ‘firmly attached to the principles of Fox, and his political zeal may be said to have in some degree exceeded his prudence’. This would not have been a problem when Hagart first asked for the post in March 1806, but a year later when the Whig government fell he was still haggling over Chalmers’ pension demands. Duff entered negotiations for the post in June 1807, enclosing a letter of introduction to Dundas, his pen poised to sign the bond for Chalmers’ annuity, chatting amiably about India budgets and enquiring after Chalmers’ health. Chalmers gave every assistance to this polite and businesslike young man, ensuring that Henry Dundas ‘would take care that nothing should interfere to your detriment’, and in less than two months was happily entering on his retirement.

In this correspondence, Duff appears as not merely privileged and Tory, but also as an easy man to deal with. His obituary described him as ‘respected by both
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Whigs and Radicals, and beloved by all who came in contact with him. Few men have passed through such stormy times, and left behind them a character so unblemished.'

Duff’s story suggests that the beneficiaries of government patronage in Edinburgh were more than simply economic leeches. They are evidence for McCloskey’s economic ‘alertness’ (p. 134). Individuals whose financial privilege and political compliance gave them an attitude of passive entitlement struggled to prosper. Walter Scott’s lazy brother Tom had the sinecure of ‘Extractor’ at the Register Office, procured for him. William Carmichael, Scott’s assistant, was also an extractor and fought for compensation for himself and Tom when the office was abolished in 1809. Scott wrote to Tom’s wife advising her to be grateful for the meagre £130 annuity:

I had some hopes of getting it up to £200 but could not accomplish it and Tom’s particular situation as not residing and carrying on the business himself might have entitled them to cut his claim off altogether. Besides considering that Carmichael [...] had more advantage by bringing grist to his own mill [...] it is impossible you could have made so much of it in any other way.\(^{73}\)

Tom, reliant on the compensation but failing to ‘bring grist to his own mill’, continued to struggle after this incident, whereas Carmichael’s personal qualities ensured he took advantage of new opportunities and prospered. His grand-daughter recalled him as hard-working, ‘very methodical, clear and exact; his eyesight and his memory were wonderful; he [...] gladly did at all times more than his share of the work.’ He was also ‘too acute not to know the difference between the page-consuming style of the Waverley novels and ordinary [...] legal reports [...] even when only glanced at upside-down.’ In addition, he was trustworthy: when Scott’s authorship was a secret, ‘there was a tacit understanding that though each knew that the other knew, there was nothing to be said about it.’\(^{74}\) Finally, he was sociable (p. 180). William Arbuthnot was remembered for similar qualities: he was a strong supporter of Edinburgh civic and charitable projects, and with his wife a tremendous socialiser: ‘no parties could be pleasanter than those they gave’\(^{75}\). For Duff, Carmichael and Arbuthnot it was not merely privilege and political compliance, but diligence, reliability, perception, and companionability which ensured their success.

\(^{71}\)Taylor, Duffs p. 319.
\(^{73}\)Scott, Letters, vol. 7 p. 435.
\(^{75}\)Elizabeth Grant, Memoirs of a Highland Lady, ed. Lady Strachey (London: John Murray, 1811) p. 309.
As well as assisting such men to succeed in the undeniably inequitable Dundas regime, these qualities ensured they made creative use of the wealth, connections and influence they obtained. Although Cockburn sneered that there was ‘not one person except Walter Scott’ amongst these Tory officials ‘who rose to distinction in literature’, this seems somewhat disingenuous given the scale of Scott’s success, and given also that the biggest Whig success was largely in literary criticism. Nor did these men waste the opportunity for influence provided by their offices by treating them as sinecures. As sheriffs of adjacent counties, Duff, Clerk and Scott were involved in the construction of the Bell Rock Lighthouse in 1810, an important piece of improvement to coastal navigation: in gratitude for their assistance Robert Stevenson named ledges of the rock after them on a commemorative map. In 1805 Clerk oversaw the establishment of a paper-stamping office in Edinburgh, and in 1807 Lord Advocate Archibald Campbell masterminded reform of the Scottish courts. While the system for filling government appointments in this period might have been corrupt, the qualities required to play the system successfully in fact helped to ensure that they were given to businessmen who would effectively re-invest the money, influence and opportunity to develop Edinburgh and beyond.

4.7 India

Adelaide Falconar’s father and Alexander Tod were two of the richest men in Charlotte Chapel. The flurry of British mercantile activity in India between the 1780s, when Tod was captain of the East Indiaman Busbridge, to the 1810s, when Falconar returned from Madras to Morningside near Edinburgh, is regarded as crucial by historians of Indian political economy; but hitherto marginal by those studying the economic development of Britain. Indian historians agree that the British extraction of wealth – unpaid-for exports, take-home profits, exploited markets and embezzled revenues – was having a significant detrimental effect on the Indian economy by 1800. Although the British East India Company continued to found commercial success on a track record of fair practice, building trust with groups such as the Hindu Bania merchants of Bombay, from the 1760s exploitation accelerated. On the Coromandel coast the Company created a ‘monopsony’ (where several sellers face one buyer) in which weavers were forced to sell
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exclusively to the Company at below-market prices, buy raw materials at 100% mark-up, and surrender ‘sub-standard’ work for sale by the Company on the open market for better prices than the weavers received for their ‘acceptable’ work.\textsuperscript{79} Tax revenues from Bengal were diverted to purchase goods for export or develop Company infrastructure elsewhere such as the port of Penang.\textsuperscript{80} More subtly, private British merchants would sell their rupee fortunes to the Company in return for bills redeemable as sterling in London, liquidising Company investments and profits within India without the trouble of shipping bullion from Britain, but ensuring nothing came to India in return for its exports.\textsuperscript{81} The China trade developed partly for the very purpose of transferring wealth to Britain: ships exporting goods from India to China left the proceeds of their sale in the Canton treasury, converting them to Company bills which they could redeem in London.\textsuperscript{82} Edmund Burke estimated that £20 million was extracted in this way from Madras between 1760 and 1780.\textsuperscript{83} It might be argued that the spectacular successes of British merchants demonstrated a skill in stimulating trade and manufacture, a worthwhile ‘import’. How-


\textsuperscript{81}Om Prakash, ‘Politics of Trade’, p. 180.


ever, the situation was unbalanced: both exports and cash flowed from India to Britain, and no equivalent community of Indian merchants grew up making fortunes out of the British. On the contrary, the 1780s was the decade in which merchant dynasties like the Ali Rajas, trading in the Indian Ocean since the eleventh century and flourishing in the eighteenth, became mere pepper suppliers to the British.

John Riddy suggests that between 1774 and 1813, when Scots represented only a tenth of the British population, over half the British best placed to make fortunes in India were Scots. It seems inconceivable that the transfer of wealth which could affect a country of 200 million people, with merchant networks seven centuries old, could have so marginal a place in the economic transformation of so tiny a country as Scotland, with its huge involvement in India, as historians like Daunton and Marshall (p. 36) have led us to believe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Own or Father’s Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Arbuthnot</td>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>EIC Chief Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamina Belsches</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>EIC Writer to the Signet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Cadell</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>EIC Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederica Campbell</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>EIC Civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Carnegy</td>
<td>Penang</td>
<td>EIC Civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Demorgan</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>EIC Ensign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Downie</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Independent Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Dyce</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>EIC Major-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte and John Elphinstone</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>EIC Member of Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Falconar</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>EIC Chief Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hay</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmeline MacLeod</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>Secretary to the Nizam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah and Maria Morley</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>EIC Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ogilvy</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Ramsay</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>EIC Magistrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Robertson</td>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>EIC Captain, Cirencester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Roxburgh</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>EIC Botanist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Schaw</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>EIC Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Smith</td>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>EIC Captain Busbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander and Susan Tod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Charlotte Chapel Members with involvement in India: 23 individuals, 9 economically active men, and 14 women/children whose 11 fathers’ occupations are used for economic analysis. Most had official appointments with the East India Company (EIC).

Charlotte Chapel members were resident in all the locations where these activities were taking place (Figure 4.4), and so while they cannot provide a detailed account of

---

Indian wealth in Scotland, they serve well as a preliminary study suggesting its enormous importance to Edinburgh’s economic growth. Twenty-three members of Charlotte Chapel were known to have derived their livelihood from India. This analysis is of the twenty economically active men and fathers (Table 4.8). Their most common base was Madras, followed by Calcutta and Bombay. They included five senior Company officials, six officers of its military and naval service, others in more obscure Company positions, and one independent merchant, Robert Downie. Nine of these men were known to be significantly wealthy.\cite{86}

Tom Devine argues that Indian wealth generally ‘fortified the entrenched positions of the traditional elites in Scotland’.\cite{87} The sample from Charlotte Chapel shows that sometimes Indian wealth did indeed reinvigorate established gentry families. Sarah Morley married Captain William Ogilvy a few weeks after his ship arrived in Portsmouth in 1803, and ten years later her sister married another member of the clan, Donald Ogilvy of Clova. Their father’s mercantile wealth from Bombay was added to their husbands’ profits from Royal Naval service and agriculture. Like the Ogilvies, Williamina Belsches family were historically Berwickshire gentry, although they lost their money in the seventeenth century: it was thanks to the Indian fortune of her grandfather, a younger son, that the family rose to significance again, substantiated when her father bought the estate of Fettercairn in Aberdeenshire and inherited the title of High Steward of Scotland.\cite{88} Indian wealth continued to reinforce gentry families into the next generation: George Cadell was one of the sixteen children of Neill Campbell of Duntrune and Oib, who possessed little but a twelfth-century castle on a tide-swept rock and a fierce sense of identity. In 1785 Campbell was declared bankrupt and was invited by Sir Archibald Campbell of Inverneil, Governor of Madras, to join him there, one of a crowd of needy kinsmen dubbed ‘The Scottish Invasion’.\cite{89} In India Frederica married Alexander Dyce, an Aberdeenshire laird, who was raising a native infantry battalion which distinguished itself in 1801 by

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[86]These were: George Arbuthnot, Williamina Belsches father, Adelaide Falconar’s father, Sarah and Maria Morley’s father, Thomas Robertson, and Emmeline MacLeod’s father.
\item[87]Devine, Scotland’s Empire, p. 335.
\item[89]Herbert Campbell, The Campbells of Duntrune and their Cadets (Exeter: W. Pollard, 1913).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
suppressing a rebellion. In 1807 [Frederica and Alexander] brought their children to 23 Charlotte Square. Their sons’ achievements included degrees at Oxford and Cambridge, a Scottish sheriffship, senior positions in India, and an edition of Shakespeare. For gentry like these, India was not reinforcing their position but rescuing it from catastrophe. The established social order or even the Scottish Enlightenment would have meant little to them without India.

However, the most conspicuous Indian fortunes were made by men from modest professional or trade backgrounds. [George Arbuthnot]’s father was a businessman who died shortly after being ruined in the Ayr Bank crash of 1772, and George was brought up in genteel penury by his mother in Aberdeen. He secured a post as Chief Secretary to the Governor of Ceylon, and founded the Arbuthnot Bank in Madras. In 1801 he wrote to a friend, ‘I shall look upon every Pagoda saved, as a step towards Home, where I still hope to return before either you or I are too old to enjoy each others’ Company.’ In 1810 he married [Eliza Fraser], daughter of an Inverness solicitor who was staying with her uncle in Madras. They returned to Britain in 1823, purchased an estate in Surrey, visited Rome and saw the tombs of the Stuarts, and had thirteen children. [Arbuthnot], whose brother [William] was amongst the chapel officials, and whose twin daughters were baptised by [Sandford] in 1816, might be regarded as a good example of the kind of nabob P.J. Marshall considered typical. He retired to an estate and played little part in British economic development; but in Charlotte Chapel he was the only example.

Other successful nabobs from professional and mercantile backgrounds settled in Edinburgh. Two of the richest were [Thomas Robertson] and [Alexander Tod], both sons of Writers to the Signet who became captains in the Company Navy. commanded various ships in the 1770s and 80s to the Coromandel Coast, Bay of Bengal and China. Between 1782 and 1784 his second officer on the Busbridge (755 tons) was [Robertson], who by 1788 was commanding the same ship. In 1811 [Tod]’s house at 121 George Street was taxed on 45 windows, more than anyone else in the congregation, and at his death it was described as ‘one of the largest in the street [...] The public rooms are uncommonly spacious, double stair-case, [...] double coach-house, stable, cow-house, waste-house,
coachman’s rooms etc. all in perfect repair. \textsuperscript{96} Indiaman captains made their fortunes not from the £10 a month salary, but from their 50 tons personal cargo space, typically filled with British luxuries such as the latest London fashions or recent publications, effectively another means by which British profits were remitted to Britain rather than being reinvested in India or part of a balance of trade that benefited India. In 1795 \textbf{Tod} was owed £4,877 by the deceased Nawab of Arcot for ‘a state carriage, which [...] Captain Tod had brought from England’. \textsuperscript{97} Wallajah was ruler of one of the successor states of the collapsed Mughal empire, an ally of the East India Company and enthusiast for British culture, whose regime was secured by the Company’s military. \textsuperscript{98} The spectacular debts he contracted formed a crux of Edmund Burke’s argument in 1785 that the British were spoiling a conquered India when they should be governing it. \textsuperscript{99} Burke’s view finally became policy thirty years later, about the time Alexander’s daughter \textbf{Susan Tod} and \textbf{George Cadell} married in Charlotte Chapel before returning to Madras.

Between 1798 and 1805 \textbf{Tod}’s younger colleague Captain \textbf{Thomas Robertson} sailed Cirencester (1,504 tons), the fourth biggest in the fleet, to China, Bombay, St Helena, Madras and Bencoolen. \textsuperscript{100} On one ‘double voyage’ to both India and China which Cirencester habitually made, profits could be up to £30,000, a sum which in an average earnings comparison equates to £20 million today. \textsuperscript{101} By 1802 \textbf{Robertson} lived at Cramond House, convenient for Edinburgh and with a sea view, where he amended his will to increase his widow’s annuity to the generous sum of £500. \textsuperscript{102} By 1814 he owned 99 George Street, a townhouse on Edinburgh’s most prestigious street. \textsuperscript{103} \textbf{Robertson} was appointed in 1817 to the first vestry of St John’s, bringing to the new chapel both his financial weight and a strong connection to St Cuthbert’s Presbyterian Church next door: he was a first cousin of the minister Henry Moncrieff Wellwood. \textbf{Robertson}’s grandfathers were lairds, putting him in a category which could lend weight to Devine’s argument that Indian wealth kept power in the hands of traditional elites. However, within the context of the Episcopal Church, Robertson had been participating in the restructuring of a traditionally elitist

\textsuperscript{96} Assessed taxes for the Burgh of Edinburgh 1811, NRS E327/51; CM, 22 March 1817.
\textsuperscript{97} House of Commons, Papers Relating to East India Affairs, vol. 10 (London: House of Commons, 1813) p. 294.
\textsuperscript{98} National Galleries of Scotland, Mohamed Ali Khan Walajah, Nawab of Arcot, 1777, URL: tigerandthistle.net/scots435.htm (accessed 20/01/2012).
\textsuperscript{100} Oracle 12 May 1798, 11 October 1800; Morning Post 29 April 1801, 13 June 1801, 19 November 1801, 28 January 1802, 7 October 1805; Evan Cotton, East Indiamen: The East India Company’s Maritime Service (London: The Batchworth Press, 1949) p. 47.
\textsuperscript{101} Cotton, East Indiamen, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{102} Thomas Robertson’s Inventory and Will, National Archives of Scotland SC70/1/27/429.
\textsuperscript{103} Edinburgh Post Office Directories.
but impoverished church into one that was comparatively wealthy and based on an urban, bourgeois identity, confirming Rowan Strong’s impression of ‘emerging middle class power [...] at the beginning of the nineteenth century’.  

In the Hebrides, the Indian wealth of Emmeline MacLeod’s family turned traditional social relationships upside down and demolished the clan system in all but surname. Emmeline’s great-grandfather was tacksman of Bernera on the Harris estate. Her grandfather made his fortune as captain of the Indiaman Mansfield and lent money to the clan chief, MacLeod of MacLeod, eventually purchasing Harris from him, and becoming his own father’s landlord. While the chief faced ‘confinement in a remote corner of the world, without any hope of extinguishing the debts of my family or of ever emerging from poverty or obscurity’, Captain Alexander gained a reputation as a good laird, building infrastructure for a fishing port and textile manufacture at Rodel and repairing the church and school. His son, Emmeline’s father, had a lucrative appointment in India and little connection with his Scottish estates, whose management he approached in a fully commercial manner, racking rents to take advantage of the kelp boom, terminating the tack of his cousin Isabella MacLeod of Bernera, renting directly to crofters, and, disliking the climate, residing in England. In Harris, India fuelled an arc of development and a pattern of community response similar to that in Applecross (John MacKenzie) and Staffa (Ranald MacDonald): the indebted chief replaced by the popular improving laird, and subsequently by the hated commercialising landlord. 

Whereas individuals who remained in Scotland were knitted into a complex web of kinship, heritage and historic loyalties, those who returned from India were not only wealthy, but also independent, disconnected, so far as they wished, from their past lives, and more or less free to choose their position in society. Alexander Ramsay’s origins are obscure, but as a distinguished civil servant in Bombay he was able to marry Mary Congalton, whose family had lived on the same East Lothian estate for eighteen generations. Lieutenant Robert Sands was also of obscure origins and had been very narrowly acquitted for murder in Madras. Yet he and his wife, Jane Schaw, were amongst the first residents of Hope Street on the corner of Charlotte Square, enjoying such high-ranking neighbours as Helen and Georgina Lamont of Lamont. Yet whereas the Lamonts
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were forced to sell their house in 1815, Jane died possessed of hers, and with £2,500 in the bank.

The two members of Charlotte Chapel who brought the most spectacular fortunes from India, and invested the most in Edinburgh, were also from the most humble origins. Alexander Falconar was born in Nairn, the son of a major and grandson of the minister of Ferintosh. He trained as a writer as if to follow his family as a provincial professional, but went to India and became Chief Secretary to the Governor of Madras. In 1811 he retired to Scotland with £120,000 and several daughters, one of whom, Adelaide Falconar died in 1813 and was buried by Sandford. In protecting his daughters from fortune-hunters, his will so penalised them if they married that all but one remained single, and maintained Falcon Hall together as Morningside philanthropists. Falconar’s friend, Robert Downie, came from even humbler origins (p. 153). Presumably lacking the political connections to gain an official appointment, Downie became a partner in one of the private ‘houses of agency’ founded in Calcutta from the 1780s financing ships and plantations, running banks and insurance, and arranging cargoes and remittances. He returned to Scotland in 1813 and lived in Charlotte Square. Like Thomas Robertson, he was appointed to the first vestry of St John’s, and was also a benefactor of the Presbyterian Kirk in Norriestown, where he had grown up, and Appin, where he purchased an estate. In Edinburgh he chaired the committee which built the Union Canal and developed the Lothian Road area around its basin (Map, 7).

While, by concentrating on those who returned, the Charlotte Chapel registers emphasise the success stories of India, there are also hints of the high human cost which made it an all-or-nothing gamble. Mary Roxburgh had been a playmate of Alexander Tod’s daughters, and a favourite of his wife. She was another child of India who spent her childhood and last days in Edinburgh. Stricken at thirty with disease, she came to the New Town not to enjoy a life of genteel consumerism, but only to false hopes of convalescence: news of her death first reached India in a letter from Susan Tod announcing her marriage to George Cadell the same month. Even more poignant were the deaths of Charlotte and John Elphinstone, nephew and niece of Martha Elphinstone and cousins

110 Caledonian Mercury, 7 September 1815 p.3 and 19 June 1815 p.1; Strong, Episcopalianism, p.92.
111 Mary Stone, “Letters to her husband Henry”, Hampshire Archives 94M72/F748, May 1812; “Letter and memoranda relating to the death of Mary Stone”, Hampshire Archives 94M72/F749, June 1814.
of Colin MacKenzie Sandford recorded that they were ‘lost on board the Alexander East Indiaman which was wrecked near Weymouth’ as they travelled aged five and six to be educated in Edinburgh, and were ‘buried in the Church Yard of Wyke Regis, whence the remains were removed to Scotland’. Their monument in St Cuthbert’s Churchyard recorded the bitter disappointment of ‘friends who once hoped to be delighted with their innocence and cheerfulness, and to assist in the pleasing task of cherishing and improving their opening virtues and talents’. Both these tragedies resonated through networks of family and friends forged partly in Scotland and partly in India.

Yet as with military casualties, even these sad stories have their place in the economic history of Scotland. While Mary, Charlotte and John might be considered losers in the India lottery game, they represent many who competed for resources in Scotland’s overcrowded upper classes, and who made space for others to rise. The twenty-three individuals in this group challenged the social order because the broad spectrum of social ranks from which they originated was effaced by the power of new, liquid wealth. The prominence of India in Charlotte Chapel, on the one hand, suggests that Edinburgh’s economic dynamism in this period came through a combination of exploitation and tragedy; but on the other, this close-up view reveals the rich new social networks, cultural influences and creative activities that India enabled in the Regency West End of Edinburgh.

4.8 Colonies

Charlotte Chapel members also went west. Thomas Ramsay, a baronet’s younger son, worked hard as an overseer in Jamaica: in 1785 a friend thought he had ‘had all the management and drudgery of the estate for some years, without the Salary that he justly merited’, but by 1797 his fortunes had improved and he was able to retire, marry his second cousin Margaret Maxtone and settle in 133 Princes Street whence he engaged in charitable and improvement projects around Edinburgh until he was buried in St John’s churchyard in 1833. Thomas was the only example in the congregation of a man whose West Indian fortune enabled him to marry a poor, well-born woman. More often West Indian money came into Charlotte Chapel through heiresses. Catherine and Mary Stirling, for example, were the daughters of a Stirlingshire laird who was also a partner in a firm of Jamaican planters. Catherine married James Erskine of Linlathen in Angus, and

112 Funeral Register of Charlotte Chapel, NRS CH12/3/26 p. 519.
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Mary James Russell of Woodside in Stirlingshire, distributing sugar profits amongst the lowland gentry. Accountant John Deas Thomson married Rebecca Freer, daughter of a planter in Carolina, and lived in a mansion in Ratho outside Edinburgh. Accountant John Deas Thomson married Rebecca Freer, daughter of a planter in Carolina, and lived in a mansion in Ratho outside Edinburgh. [114] Catherine Prettejohn’s father was a planter in Barbados whose insurance claim following a great hurricane in 1780 came to £7,000 [115]. She married army officer Frederick Maitland, grandson of the Earl of Lauderdale. Susan Beckford, daughter of the flamboyant, homosexual sugar millionaire William Beckford of Fonthill, married Alexander Hamilton Marquis of Douglas [116]. Marriages were not necessarily purely economic arrangements: wealth might even be an inconvenience. Matilda Robley, daughter of a Cumbrian businessman who owned hundreds of acres and thousands of slaves, was described by her governess as ‘by far one of the most charming women I have ever known: young, beautiful, amiable and accomplished; with a fine fortune’ [117]. James Grahame, a solicitor’s son, fell so far in love with her that he put aside his aspirations for a literary career, and his abolitionist principles, to train as an advocate and marry her. Following her early death, and tormented by his wealth, he agreed with his children that ‘every shilling’ of the income ‘is to be devoted to the use of some part of the unhappy race from whose suffering it is derived’ until they were of age and could agree to sell the shares [118].

Whereas nabobs like Robert Downie, Adelaide Falconer’s father, Thomas Robertson and Alexander Tod spent their wealth in the New Town, Rebecca Freer, Catherine Prettejohn and Marianne Bullock all moved with their husbands to England while Catherine and Mary Stirling, although they stayed in Scotland, did not keep townhouses. Thomas Ramsay, the planter who settled in Princes Street, and George Arbuthnot, the nabob who retired to Surrey, stand out because they did not fit the wider pattern of West Indian wealth funding landed estates and East Indian wealth being spent in the city. It is possible that shareholding in West Indian plantations was more widespread amongst Charlotte Chapel members the known examples suggest. However, the colonies appear to have been far less important than India.

Wealth from the West Indies also appears to have posed far less to challenge the social order than that from the East. Despite the East India Company, members of Charlotte

Chapel effectively participated in India as individuals, gambling with their person for a fortune or a wealthy husband. This meant that those who profited were those who had previously had little to lose. The West Indies, on the other hand, with medium-scale concerns, often yielded its profits to shareholders who never left Britain, and tended to reinforce the established social order. Mary and Catherine Stirling and Matilda Robley’s fathers both worked at the British end of the transatlantic business, receiving the sugar imports. Plantations were long-term investments: heiresses could bring a dowry of shares which would continue to yield profits over years to come. They or their families would naturally hope to buy rank with this valuable asset, so (with the romantic exception of Matilda Robley) they married lairds, or lords, in proportion to the size of their fortunes. The examples from Charlotte Chapel suggest that whereas wealth from the east was a dynamic and transformative force within the Edinburgh economy, wealth from the west tended to reinforce existing activities, property ownership and social order.

4.9 Consumer Economy

The Charlotte Chapel biographies suggest that the connected economic arenas of war, land, law and India channelled wealth into Edinburgh on an unprecedented scale. One consequence of this boom was reflected in the chapel registers: the rapid development of a specialised consumer economy. Chris Whatley writes that Scottish manufacturing was blighted by a skills shortage, and efforts to entice English experts proved troublesome. Yet while deliberate efforts to encourage skilled industrial immigration might have been ineffective, the pull of the Edinburgh consumer economy drew them of their own accord, forming much of the ‘petty-bourgeois’ group identified in the previous chapter as a large component of the congregation. This section examines thirty-nine members of Charlotte Chapel engaged in this kind of activity.

Henry Cockburn was aware of the impact on Edinburgh society of the physical move to the New Town. ‘The single circumstance of the increase of the population, and its consequent overflowing from the old town to the new [...] altered the style of living [...] and destroyed a thousand associations [...] It not only changed our scenes and habits of life, but, by the mere inundation of modern population broke up and, as was then thought, vulgarised our prescriptive gentilities’[120] The physical move, driven by the wealth com-

ing from outside, facilitated a relaxation of social codes in favour of economic growth. In the ‘inundation of modern population’ it was not so much that conspicuous consumption became necessary as a marker of status, as that where conspicuous consumption could be afforded, draconian regulation of status became unnecessary.

Many immigrants were engaged in the food and drink industries. After her husband John Nourse’s death around 1805, Elizabeth Burn founded a School ‘teaching those useful Arts of Cookery, Pastry, Confectionary, Pickling, and Preserving’, which combined well with catering: ‘as she is frequently employed to furnish full Suppers, Young Ladies have an opportunity of seeing them placed in proper order’. In 1809 she self-published *Modern Practical Cookery*, reaching four editions by 1821, whose ‘receipts may be safely put into the hands of the most inexperienced person, being the result of upwards of thirty years’ daily practice’, and were therefore superior to books ‘merely collected and compiled by persons not practically acquainted with the art’ – *A New System of Domestic Cookery* by ‘A Lady’, for example, was being widely publicised at the time. In 1831 *Modern Practical Cookery* was taken up by Blackwoods, and a reviewer said that it ‘stands higher in our estimation than any work of the kind we have yet seen, mainly because it is of all the plainest and most perspicuous. [...] Her remarks are all shrewd and sensible [...] combining elegance and excellence with economy.’ In 1845 an edition appeared in Canada, where ‘Mrs Nourse’ remains an important source of inspiration for heritage food events. The example of Elizabeth Burn demonstrates how within the consumer boom, global connections and literary infrastructure of Edinburgh a gardener’s daughter could become an international author. Other members of the congregation with English surnames who were engaged in food and drink retail in the New Town included Richard Townsend, Michael Magan, George Searcy, and Samuel Hopporton. Hopporton was a gentleman’s servant from near Portsmouth, who in 1798 married Margaret Wood from Banbury in the Midlands. By 1804 he occupied a grocer’s shop in the Lawnmarket (Map, 16). Hopporton briefly went into business with William Glen in the New Town, first as the Edinburgh Chemical Company, then as wine merchants, before returning to grocery. For a time his shop sold the tickets for the Scottish regalia, newly ‘discovered’
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During the 1830s he appears to have retired to the new southern suburb of Newington, but in the 1840s he was in business again there as ‘tea dealer and coal agent’. Hopporton like Elizabeth Burn was an English immigrant who rose into the petty-bourgeois ranks through retail.

Several women, like Elizabeth Burn began their social climb in marriage but consolidated it in widowhood. Labourer’s daughter Anne Hall married gentleman’s servant Nicholas Baldock and ten years after his death still ran the stabling business they had set up. Anna Underwood from Colchester married James Lapsley in Charlotte Chapel in 1817, and after his death in 1829 continued their hairdresser and purfumer business for over 40 years. When she died worth almost £4000, two of her children were struggling financially, but the others had risen into the professions: her daughter Jemima married a Writer to the Signet, and her son William became Principal Medical Officer for the convict establishment in Perth, Australia. For some women the demands were overwhelming. When Helen Hall’s husband died of typhus in 1816, leaving her with six small children, she maintained their spirit shop for a year before disappearing from the Post Office Register, perhaps remarrying, or returning to England as did Maria Frost. Maria, despite her successful separation case against her violent husband John Mather the organist, was unable to enforce his alimony payments after he was sacked from St John’s in 1820, and, failing to find work of her own as a music teacher in Sheffield, was compelled to write to St John’s vestry to beg for help. As in all the areas of dynamic economic activity in this study, there is a cruel sense of survival of not merely the fittest but also the luckiest. Yet many were lucky, and Charlotte Chapel registers suggest the thriving consumer economy of the New Town included a large contingent of enterprising English businesswomen.

Daniel Sandford himself came to Scotland in 1792 on hearing of ‘the advantage which might accrue to an English clergyman of popular talents’, and advertised the desirable commodity he had to sell, teaching ‘the Grammar and Pronunciation of the English Language’. In 1801 Sydney Smith described him as ‘a poor respectable clergyman with a numerous & an increasing family’. His biographers were eager to stress that he could have enjoyed the easy income of English livings: ‘in accepting the episcopal office,
he despised the call of worldly policy and prudence’, wrote Edward Ramsay; his bishopric proved an ‘insurmountable obstacle’ to a ‘valuable preferment [...] in the vicinity of Windsor’, hinted his son John. John Sandford and Ramsay were eager to defend not only from the vulgarity of Evangelicalism (p. 32), but also (in a manner the British Critic considered suspicious, p. 90) from the vulgarity of being a free-market religious tradesman, earning his bishopric as the nabob earned his estate. Sandford’s own texts, however, disarm their economic as much as their theological snobbery, making a virtue out of poverty with a quite radically egalitarian ecclesiology, in which there was no ‘temporal rank [...] to create a distance between the several orders of the Clergy’ or ‘worldly honour or emolument to dazzle or mislead’. Like many of his congregation, was successful in his business, his frequent change of address showing his increasing respectability. Within a year of moving to Edinburgh he exchanged his original Old Town lodgings for 5 Hanover Street, then moved to 3 North Castle Street, then in 1804 to one of the first houses in Heriot Row, and finally in 1809 to one of the first houses in Melville Street, later numbered 17, where he spent the rest of his life. While he might claim the ‘same rank in society’ as his fellow clergy, he was a notch lower in wealth than his trustees (p. 137): the ecclesiastical equivalent of the executive secretary of a board. Yet was a participant in Edinburgh’s economic miracle, and was in a different league of wealth from many of his Episcopal contemporaries. One suspects he was unaware he had necessitated the begging of new vestments for Bishop Torry because gentry had seen wearing ‘robes every Sacramental day’ and ‘little [...] consider the heavy expense attending the purchase of such vestments’; or of the foppish impression he gave by fussing over the state of Bishop Jolly’s wig as the bishops prepared to be presented to King George IV. lived amongst the wealthy, but, whether because of his charitable giving, or simply raising a large family on a moderate income, he amassed no fortune.

Immigrants making a new start might bring their problems with them. An indebted musician from Sheffield, opened his new career in Edinburgh in 1811 with
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a concert ‘upon a greater scale than any heretofore performed in Edinburgh’. It was a triumph, and Edinburgh connoisseurs had high hopes [Mather’s work would prove ‘a rich treat to the lovers of music’, a musical revival ‘quitting the beaten track of dull and tedious repetition’ [137] Yet while [Mather] appointed Charlotte Chapel organist in 1814, appears to have been the best choral trainer and accompanist in Edinburgh, his financial management was catastrophic. He was ‘advised’ and ‘induced’ by ‘Gentlemen Amateurs’ to give grander concerts, on which he made a heavy loss [138] He always lived impulsively beyond his means: the debt he brought to Edinburgh resulted from setting up home for his young wife [Maria Frost] when he was a schoolmaster in Doncaster. In 1815 he acquired a mistress, and, according to his wife, ‘entertained company in her house at Stockbridge and provided articles of goods and furniture at his own expense for her, thus squandering away his means’ [139] The two excellent salaried positions created for him, Director of the Edinburgh Institution for the Improvement of Sacred Music in 1816, and Director of the Choir of St John’s in 1818, precipitated the collapse of his fortunes. His creditors imprisoned him, releasing him in exchange for a proportion of his salaries, and almost simultaneously his wife left him on grounds of domestic violence, successfully suing him for alimony. With his salary almost entirely sequestered, [Mather] lost his motivation and his positions, and spent the next thirty years as an undistinguished freelance performer and teacher living in addresses in Lothian Road to the south and then at High Terrace to the east [140] wrought his own downfall, yet it is easy to see how the fêted young musician was flattered into subsidising the entertainment of the Edinburgh elite, and lured into becoming a shopper in the consumer boom which he entered as a retailer.

4.10 Industry, Trade and Banking

On a first impression, the most concerted industrial effort amongst members of this group was Highland landowners taking advantage of the wartime boom in the price of kelp for glassmaking. This was highly profitable in the short term but it is difficult to find a laird who succeeded in turning kelp to the mutual benefit of himself and the community.
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Ranald MacDonald was popular but went bankrupt (p. 147); Emmeline MacLeod’s father made profits but alienated the community (p. 163), as did John MacKenzie’s father in Applecross. Kelp turned out to be a Highland wartime peculiarity; however, in terms of contemporary perceptions, until the price crashed after 1815 these men must have appeared in the West End as progressive landowner-industrialists. The kelp industry flared up quickly and burned out fast, but in Edinburgh, slower but more significant developments in trade and industry were taking root.

Banking and finance often went along with, or grew out of, mercantile or legal careers. While the section above emphasised their links with the land, the lawyers in the congregation also had a long history of involvement in the urban financial sector. Colin MacKenzie, Writer to the Signet, was administrator of the Scottish Episcopal Fund which for the first time provided support for retired ministers. On reporting progress of his efforts to gain support for the fund from the British government he wrote, ‘I know few events that will give me purer gratification than […] the extension of the assisting, & protecting hand of government to our venerable Bishops & primitive Clergy’. This practical financial expression of religious belief has parallels with an Edinburgh Writer to the Signet of an earlier generation, the father of Margaret and Mary Hay, two elderly members of the congregation, who had been Charles Edward Stuart’s treasurer in Edinburgh.

Figure 4.5: Bankers, merchants and Writers to the Signet amongst Charlotte Chapel trustees. Names highlighted in white were trustees of Charlotte Chapel; those highlighted in grey appear in the Chapel Registers.

Colin MacKenzie was at the centre of a closely-related group of solicitors, bankers and
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merchants who formed the core of Charlotte Chapel’s management (Figure 4.5). Colin’s younger brother John was described as ‘merchant in Leith’ when he married in Charlotte Chapel in 1817, but his chief career was as agent for the Bank of Scotland in Inverness. A third brother, William, was apprenticed to Colin as a Writer to the Signet. He married Mary Mansfield whose father James was a Leith wine merchant who went into banking. James Mansfield’s son-in-law William was a partner in his bank, and his grandson Gilbert Stirling was another Chapel trustee. Colin MacKenzie’s wife Elizabeth was the daughter of two banking families, the Hays and Forbes, and her father and brother were closely involved in the management of the chapel. This group gained the tools for promoting Episcopalianism from their urbanised economic activity.

While this group who formed the heart of the chapel management were all Scottish, and married Scots, other merchants and industrialists in the congregation forged strong cross-border links. Lowland industrialist Marten Dalrymple married Frances Spence of London. Scottish linen merchant Leonard Horner married Anne Lloyd, who also grew up in London but whose father began as one of the wealthiest cloth merchants in Leeds, and whose mother’s family were iron manufacturers in Staffordshire. Whisky heiress Janet Haig married Michael Fell, cloth merchant from Leicestershire.

Large-scale infrastructure projects required collaboration with partners and landowners, and two examples from Charlotte Chapel show how this drew various groups from the community together in economic interest. In June 1809 Marten Dalrymple proposed ‘an IRON RAIL ROAD from the Monkland Canal to Lanark, Peebles, Kelso, and Berwick-upon-Tweed’, to carry coal, iron, slates, limestone, freestone, lead, corn, and cotton down to the sea at ‘One Penny per Ton per Mile’.143 The committee appointed to commission a survey included Colin MacKenzie, Walter Scott, John and Thomas Tod’s brother, William Forbes’s brother, and Janet Hay’s brother John.144 The survey was carried out by Thomas Telford, but unfortunately Dalrymple’s sudden death on 23 November brought an end to the project.145 A project which was seen through to completion (although more controversial) was the Union Canal. This was a Whig project, chaired initially by Alexander Hamilton, Marquis of Douglas and Clydeside, and subsequently by the low-born, vastly wealthy, recently-arrived nabob Robert Downie. Whig lawyer James Grahame wrote in its support and joined the management committee.146 The proposal was op-
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posed by Tories including William Forbes, William Arbuthnot and Janet Hay’s brother. Thomas Telford, ‘an impartial and eminent engineer’ was once more consulted. His report ‘that the Union Line [...] is the shortest, cheapest, and most advantageous [...] for supplying the city of Edinburgh with coal, and for completing an inland navigation between Edinburgh and Glasgow’, carried the day and the Union Canal was built.\footnote{CM, 19 June 1815.} It is significant that when Charlotte Chapel appointed the vestry for their new chapel St John’s, William Forbes, William Arbuthnot and Robert Downie were all appointed in what may have been a deliberately non-partisan choice as with the directors of the Edinburgh Academy five years later.\footnote{Magnus Magnusson, The Clacken and the Slate: the Story of the Edinburgh Academy (London: Collins, 1974) p. 75.} In Daniel Sandford’s congregation, leaders appear to have been chosen for their proven business ability rather than their rank or party.

A final marked feature of the merchants and industrialists in the group is the quantity of warm tributes to them in memoirs. Marten Dalrymple was one of the few in the group to earn a newspaper obituary, which described him as ‘eminently distinguished for the best qualities both of the head and heart’, whose ‘enlightened views’, ‘sound judgement,’ and ‘persevering activity’ would be remembered as long as ‘private worth and public usefulness are held in esteem’.\footnote{CM, 4 December 1809.} An Inverness resident recalled that ‘there was no-one who dispensed hospitality with a more lavish hand, no one who was more generous to all who needed help’ than John MacKenzie, the banker. ‘Hospitality was, however, the least distinguishing trait of a noble character. His fine, free, forgiving nature, is not forgotten to this day, especially in Kintail’ where ‘his own faith in the Highlanders and strong feelings of clanship, made him launch in the world with disinterested generosity many who thus advanced to fortune through his means’\footnote{Isabel Harriet Anderson, Inverness before Railways (Inverness: A. and W. MacKenzie, 1885) pp. 9-10.} He was much the stateliest and truest piece of character who ever sate at our merchant feasts’. It is striking in these comments how involvement in trade, far from demeaning these men in the eyes of the commentators, appears to be one of their qualities, a transformation in attitudes from the hierarchical society of the late eighteenth century. Some of this transformation might be due to Walter Scott. ‘In the first chapter of The Antiquary’, Ruskin added (elaborating the details in his recollection), ‘the landlord at Queen’s Ferry sets down to his esteemed guest a bottle of Robert Cockburn’s
best port; with which Robert Cockburn duly supplied Sir Walter himself, being at that time, if not the largest, the leading importer of the finest Portugal wine’. As will be seen, in Scott’s novels, admiration is due to ‘character’ rather than rank, and Ruskin certainly saw the Cockburn family through the filter of Scott ‘Archibald, a fine, young, dark Highlander, was extremely delightful to me, and took some pains with me, for the sake of my love of Scott telling me anything about fishing or deerstalking that I cared to listen to’. While Burns might have articulated the radical politics, it was the Tory Scott who showed nineteenth-century readers how,

The rank is but the guinea’s stamp,
The man’s the gowd for a’ that

4.11 Literature

There are few communities which could count literature as a significant economic factor, but if any have existed, Edinburgh in the first two decades of the nineteenth century would be amongst them, with its industrial spin-off in the shape of the Scottish paper industry. This economic success owed as much to the business genius of the Edinburgh publishing industry, in particular Archibald Constable, as to the literary genius of its intelligentsia. Francis Jeffrey, editor and major contributor to the Edinburgh Review, and Walter Scott made fortunes comparable to those of Indian nabobs: Scott’s Lady of the Lake (1810) alone made him around £10,000, around a third of what Alexander Tod could expect to earn on one of his ‘double voyages’. Yet many others in Edinburgh, some in Charlotte Chapel, were engaged to a smaller extent in the profitable literature industry. Sydney Smith wrote for the well-paid Edinburgh Review. Daniel Sandford’s sermons, James Grahame’s Whig ideology and Margaret Clephane’s poems were published for reasons other than profit; but Elizabeth Burn’s recipe book was a successful business venture. The publishing industry was an unusual aspect of Edinburgh’s economy which made a small but significant contribution to the wealth of Charlotte Chapel congregation.
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4.12 Conclusion

Discussing attitudes to the Scottish economy through the lens of the *Edinburgh Review*, Biancamaria Fontana writes that the eighteenth-century interest in comparison between Scotland and England was lost: ‘Now underdeveloped Scotland disappeared from the map, while England’s economic supremacy became an undisputed reality [...] It was England, as a developed commercial country and a colonial power, which had become the central object of economic investigation’\(^{156}\) This ‘anglicising’ narrative is at odds with the evidence of Charlotte Chapel congregation. Far from the Scottish economy sinking into underdeveloped obscurity, its integration with English patronage and colonial networks had enabled it to catch up. ‘England’ was a normal synonym for ‘Britain’, a usage which, like Charlotte Chapel’s label ‘English Chapel’ did not develop exclusivist connotations or provoke indignant reactions until a century later, although, as Linda Colley observes, the British Empire was so clearly a British-wide achievement, with Scots so disproportionately involved, that it was never known as the ‘English Empire’\(^{157}\). In this period, Scottish economic success was such that for the first time it was possible for commentators like the Edinburgh reviewers to talk about the British (or ‘English’) economy as a whole rather than continually contrasting two economies.

This chapter opened with a survey of the paucity of research on Edinburgh’s economy in this period and the assumption that it was of small relevance to the Scottish economy. The picture of Charlotte Chapel congregation is not of a self-contained, wealthy elite, but of entrepreneurs engaged in a diverse, dynamic economy. Their aims were not merely, often not primarily, the bottom line: economic development was often a by-product of the defence of the country against invasion or the establishment of social status as a secure landowner. Moreover, the business success of people from Adam Duff the privileged sheriff to Robert Downie the self-made nabob was based not merely on financial acumen. From a wide range of social backgrounds, Charlotte Chapel’s wealthy formed a tight network of kinship and partnership centred on the small geographical area of the West End, breaking the deadlock which partisan politics threatened to hold on Edinburgh. They gained a nationwide reputation for combining sharp business intelligence with warm generosity; a deep-rooted sense of identity with an outward-looking, alert attitude which gave them an almost heroic reputation. Industrial development such as the Union Canal


and paper manufacture, rather than being ‘kick-started’ in the intentional way implied in much of the literature, appears rather to have been tugged into the service of this urban growth. The picture is dynamic and vibrant, with flows of resource into and out of the city: a strong hint that the received picture of Edinburgh as a backwater, and imported wealth and luxury consumption as economically redundant, are in urgent need of correction. Edinburgh appears, albeit in miniature, more similar to London: a capital city driving national growth by reaching a critical mass of entrepreneurs, improvers, investors and consumers. While this analysis puts Edinburgh back into the narrative, it does not do so in a particularly flattering light. Like so much economic ‘progress’, Edinburgh’s ‘development’ came from the blatant exploitation of India, a corrupt political system, the profits of war, and (to a much lesser degree) West Indian slave plantations and exploitation of the Scottish Highlands. Yet it was a city where fortunes were made as well as spent: in Charlotte Chapel we can watch bankers, gentry, officials, professionals, luxury tradesmen, builders, shopkeepers and servants, spinning the straw of imported wealth into the gold of economic growth.
Chapter 5

Politics, Piety and Gender

An attempt to understand the intellectual, spiritual and domestic life of Charlotte Chapel necessarily focuses on the minority of the group who have left the qualitative evidence required, mostly, but not entirely, from the privileged and educated portion. The introductory literature review (p. 37) tended to portray Regency Edinburgh as a city with a religiously sceptical intelligentsia, strongly divided by Whig and Tory allegiances, and with an Episcopal Church characterised by nervous political loyalty and social conservatism. This chapter reassesses, and questions, these assumptions in the light of the evidence from Charlotte Chapel. The first section explores the links between the themes through the commonly-used dichotomy of public and private, questioning its usefulness in the case of this community. The second examines political allegiance in the group and evidence for a social rather than ideological tendency to prefer Whig or Tory. It is useful to note that in a political context, ‘Tory’ denotes the supporters of William Pitt, led in Scotland by Henry Dundas, rather than adherents to a high church Tory theological position. The third section argues that, in terms of ideology, the two parties had far less to distinguish them than might be assumed, and shared a great deal of common ground, and leads into a fourth section illustrating this in various areas of civic engagement. The fifth section looks at the complex relationships between gender and piety in the group, leading into explorations of the influence of the Jacobite inheritance, and Daniel Sandford’s own teaching on the subject.

5.1 Private and Public

The concept of public and private spheres remains tenacious in studies of Victorian Britain: Gordon and Nair, for example, find it useful for understanding middle-class Victorian
Glasgow, Philip Carter suggests the growth of the ‘private sphere’ was symptomatic of new divisions in class rather than gender: the assembly and walk replaced by the more easily vetted dining- and drawing-room. Shoemaker argues conversely that women by 1800 had gained and retained possession of the public sphere, at the heterosocial assembly, and as published authors. The literature provides only one really solid example, although a potentially crucial one, of a gendered separation into ‘spheres’. Michele Cohen notes that whereas in eighteenth-century polite society both boys and girls were educated ‘privately’ at home and ‘publicly’ at school, after 1800 a preference emerged for boys’ education in a public school and girls’ education at home with a governess, a new gendering of childhood experiences which would merit further exploration.

There is little sense amongst Charlotte Chapel members of a public-private dualism, and certainly not a gendered one. While amongst professional men some work was conducted in male ‘public’ institutions such as the court or pulpit, much professional work was primarily home-based: Daniel Sandford wrote his sermons, Coll MacDonald wrote his legal letters, John Mather taught his music pupils, Walter Scott wrote his literature and Marten Dalrymple administered his estates from home. While women’s work of motherhood began at home, they were also in charge of forging social connections through outings, visiting, dinners and assemblies. The factors of class and education identified by Carter and Cohen may have created the new domestic and public dualism observed by Gordon and Nair in Glasgow by the 1830s, but in Edinburgh in the 1810s, this was not yet apparent.

The interactions between rank and gender in Edinburgh institutions appear far more complex than the masculinisation narrative implied by Linda Colley, who describes the Old Town Assembly Rooms as run by women, as opposed to the New Town one with a male steward and regulations about feminine dress. The fact that the Old Town had accounts kept by women and no written rules was not a sign of girl-power, but of aristocratic elitism: it seemed extraordinary to Henry Cockburn, looking back, that one’s dancing partner had to be approved in advance by a clique of controlling families (pp. 128).
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Unlike the Old Town’s all-male courts, college and High School (Map, 38), and the female tyranny of the Assembly, the defining New Town institutions were heterosocial: the Theatre, Assembly Rooms, Corri’s music rooms. There were also some male institutions, such as the Royal Society (Map, 12) which moved to the New Town in 1807, and female ones, like Elizabeth Burn’s School of Cookery. Whereas the celebrities of the Old Town were ministers, physicians, professors and aristocratic ladies, in the meritocratic New Town institutions, talented women were held in highest acclaim. The touring virtuoso soprano Eliza Salmon was the visiting star of numerous concerts during the 1810s, often accompanied by John Mather. ‘In point of sweetness of voice, judgement, and delicacy of expression, we esteem her [...] superior to almost any singer whom we have heard’, enthused the reviewers. Assembly Room balls were under the patronage of Lady Charlotte Campbell, famous beauty and literary hostess. The Edinburgh theatre was co-managed by Harriet Siddons (1783-1844), who with her brother established it on a sound financial basis by staging adaptations of Walter Scott’s novels, in which she played the leading female roles, from 1817 and other eminent lawyers worked with Mrs Siddons in 1808 to secure a new lease for the theatre. These women were all married and highly respectable, yet also exercising their artistic and business talents in public at a professional level, and engaged in associated political activities.

William Carmichael was a precise legal assistant, but his home was characterised by music: he ‘could play the fiddle so as to make the heart ache or rejoice at his will’. His granddaughter recounted a family legend of how Walter Scott used sometimes to slip along in the late evening from Castle Street to Maitland Street to talk about office work; but that done, he always asked for the fiddle. Sometimes [...] to ask, ‘What is the tune for this?’ reciting some verses he had just composed. To such novelties the musician would guardedly say, ‘This tune would do for that [...] the skirl comes in the right place for the feeling’.

Life in these Edinburgh homes revolved around annual feasts. For Sandford these were
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the church festivals of the Episcopalian year, ‘to him delightful seasons, and none was more so than that of the nativity, which he always spent in the society of his family.’  

John Tosh notes the domestication of the community festival of Christmas as important amongst the duties of the Victorian domestic male. Coleridge is often credited with creating the Victorian Christmas, yet celebrating Christmas, which was not a practice of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, already had a new self-consciousness in Scotland as the most distinctive piece of Episcopalian behaviour in Regency Edinburgh. The newspapers reported annually that, ‘being Christmas, the same was observed with the usual solemnity by those of the Episcopalian persuasion, and the banks and public offices were shut’. At Christmas 1798, William Fraser Tytler’s father, one of the group who helped reunite the Episcopal Church (p. 86) sent to the prisoners in the Tolbooth, two guineas [...] the family having for near a century, sent the like at Christmas.  

This Scottish Episcopalian consciousness of the specialness of Christmas might have been one of the inspirations behind the Christmas included in Marmion, relocating it from the Episcopalian margins to the heart of the Romantic movement:

Domestic and religious rite  
Gave honour to the holy night;  
On Christmas Eve the bells were rung;  
On Christmas Eve the mass was sung.  

For Scott’s assistant William Carmichael, however, the ‘great annual feasts’ were secular ones: ‘New Year’s Day and the 4th of June; the latter was always honoured as “The King’s Birthday,” even after the death of George III [...] A patriarchal family assembled, and there was no room for children or any one else, except [Carmichael’s best friend] Mr French’  

Prioritising New Year over Christmas might suggest that, despite having his daughter baptised in Charlotte Chapel, was from a Presbyterian rather than Episcopalian background. ‘methodical, clear and exact’ but ‘disturbed by no literary imaginings or ambitions of his own’, his house filled with fiddle music and grand feasts, is reminiscent of Dickens’ Wemmick, the personification of separated spheres in

---

13 CM, 27 December 1798.  
14 Walter Scott, Marmion (1805) Introduction to Canto Sixth.  
15 Stopes, “Glimpses of Scott”.
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Great Expectations, who keeps the very existence of his home, Walworth, carefully concealed from his employer. Wemmick’s gothicised, gadgety suburban villa forms a comic petty-bourgeois homage to Abbotsford. Yet Carmichael’s house was no Walworth. Making music with his employer Scott followed discussion of business. Carmichael’s ‘great annual feasts’, like Sandford’s Christmas, although celebrated in a more than usually private manner with other guests excluded, were not family birthdays or anniversaries, but public political or religious festivals. While the roles of public and domestic spaces may be observed to have been changing in Regency Edinburgh, there were no ‘separate spheres’.

5.2 Whig and Tory: Political Allegiance in Charlotte Chapel

![Figure 5.1: Political allegiance by rank of 45 members of Charlotte Chapel of known party affiliation.](image)

Within the Charlotte Chapel group, twenty-three individuals can be identified as Tory, opposing political reform that would extend the franchise, and twenty-two as Whig, in favour of it. The biggest observable difference between them is in their rank (Figure 5.1). Henry Cockburn gave a Whig’s-eye-view of the demography of politics during the Dundas despotism: ‘A country gentleman with any public principle except devotion to Henry Dundas, was viewed as a wonder, or, rather, as a monster. This was the creed, also, of almost all our merchants, all our removable office-holders, and all our public corporations. So that, literally, every thing depended on a few lawyers’[16] The figures in Figure 5.1 suggest that there was some truth in his words. Of the three landed gentry

---

classed as Whig in Figure 5.1. Thomas Maitland was also a lawyer, while Martin Hunter and Nathaniel Cameron’s estates were in England, and their reformist preferences were demonstrated in the 1830s and ‘40s: hardly examples of Scottish gentry during the Dun-
das Despotism. Members of the Scottish landed elite tended to be Tory which, since they
would lose power by extension of the franchise, was perhaps not surprising.

Aristocratic members of Charlotte Chapel, who had a less immediate interest in the
franchise for the Commons, were more divided. Charles Scott, Duke of Buccleuch, was
Tory and a pillar of the Dundas regime in Edinburgh, but other local aristocrats Archibald
Primrose, Earl of Rosebery, and Alexander Hamilton, heir to the Duke of Hamilton, were
Whig. Employment in their service formed an alternative route to financial security for
Whig professionals wishing to avoid the Dundas regime: Alexander Young enjoyed con-
siderable wealth as Hamilton’s factor. Aristocrats also provided important establishment
weight to Whig projects. Primrose was amongst the directors of the Lancastrian School
Society; and Hamilton spoke in support of Robert Downie’s Union Canal in parliament in 1816.[17]

Another Whig, Emilia MacLeod’s father Norman MacLeod of MacLeod was not tech-
nically a member of the British aristocracy but as a clan chief was certainly regarded as
of aristocratic rank, and gained a place in Robert Burns’ hagiography of reformers:

Here’s Chieftain McLeod, a Chieftain worth gowd,
Tho’ bred amang mountains o’ snaw.18

Having become MP for Inverness-shire with the assistance of Dundas, MacLeod pro-
cceeded in 1790 to draft proposals for reform of the Scottish counties including the aboli-
tion of faggot votes (extra votes artificially created within a landed estate) and a lowering
of the qualification from £400 to £100 Scots. While clearly moderate, such reforms would
have demolished Dundas’ ‘political management’. When Dundas attempted to get rid of
him with a vague promise of office in India, MacLeod joined the Friends of the People
and steadily supported Fox until Dundas was able to exclude him from the seat in 1796.[19]

Although this period was the height of Scotland’s ‘Dundas Despotism’, after 1806
cracks in it began to appear. In 1812 several Charlotte Chapel members were involved in a
key Tory defeat in Roxburghshire. The losing Tory candidate was Lucretia Montgomerie’s
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[17] CM 19 November 1814, 20 April 1815. ‘The Edinburgh Lancastrian School Society’ was the spelling of the contemporary name; historians now refer to the system in general as ‘Lancastrian education’.

[18] Robert Burns, Here’s a Health to Them That’s Awa’ (1792, first published complete in Scots Magazine, January 1818).

husband Alexander Don, and he was supported by John Pringle and Walter Scott. Although Gilbert Elliot of Minto was the successful Whig candidate, the key Whig family in the constituency were the Tods, two of whom, Thomas Tod, advocate, and his brother John Tod, Writer to the Signet, were members of Charlotte Chapel. Their father was a Writer to the Signet and owned the estate of Drygrange in Roxburghshire, inherited by their brother Archibald in 1800. The Tods’ Whiggism probably had less to do with personal ideological commitment and more to do with the fact that, like Alexander Young, they were legal agents to a senior Whig family, the Elliots of Minto. While the Whigs might have favoured electoral reform, they had no qualms about exploiting the flaws in the current system: Alexander Don remarked on ‘the unprecedented manner in which the roll of the county had been swelled, by the creation of votes on the Minto estate’, and John and Thomas, whose votes for Minto were recorded although they were landless younger brothers, were probably two of these.

In 1807 and 1814 letters from Archibald and John to Minto reveal them busily managing the electoral roll. Walter Scott, who ‘returnd from the election as sulky as a Bear with a headache, for we were most completely beaten’, was consoled by the knowledge that ‘Raeburn whom the Tods had instigated to the unnatural attempt of running down my vote sunk his own in the attempt – so the disappointed squire returnd on his grey palfrey over Lilliards Edge voteless and disconsolate’.

Although numerous members of the Tod family were recruited to swell the Whig vote, the relative newness of the Scottish Whig and Tory parties meant that there was perhaps less sense of deeply rooted political identity in landed families, than there was in England where allegiance could be traced back to 1688. In Roxburghshire, the Whig Archibald Tod married the sister of the Tory John Pringle of Stitchell. Pringle married Emilia MacLeod, daughter of the Whig ‘Chieftain MacLeod’. Perhaps more important in Scottish politics than county family allegiances were urban circles of friendship, such as the Edinburgh Reviewers, engaged in a joint literary project, or the Tory Clerks of Session Hume, MacKenzie and Scott, performing their official duties at adjacent desks. This was not to say that political allegiance did not have a great deal to do with personal relationships: socialisation and intermarriage between members of the same party.
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20CM 7 November 1812.
21Archibald Tod to Gilbert Elliot 26 August 1807, and John Tod to Gilbert Elliot 29 September 1807, 4 June 1814, 6 December 1814, NLS MS.11918 fol.7,15,33,43.
22Scott, Letters vol. 3 p. 192.
tended to reinforce ideological positions. In Charlotte Square, John Tod became part of one of these Whig urban networks through his marriage to Helen Duff in 1808. Her sister Mary had married Henry Cockburn’s brother Robert in 1805. Both couples lived in Castle Street until 1813 when John and Helen moved to Charlotte Square one street away, where Henry Cockburn and his new wife Elizabeth had settled on their marriage in 1811. In 1809 Cockburn described a Saturday party involving all the families, ending when ‘we landed at Tod’s, and down we sat to whist, chess and backgammon – and more gooseberry pyes and more cream and more ginger beer’.

John Tod’s professional Whig allegiance was reinforced in his personal life.

While social position does appear to have influenced party allegiance in Charlotte Chapel, the picture was more complex than Cockburn’s ‘literally, every thing depended on a few lawyers’ implied. The shaping of political culture depended on a far greater constituency than the few who could actually vote. Family, friendship, professional opportunity, and intellectual decision were all factors in determining political allegiance, whether for gentry, professionals or merchants. Once a path was chosen, all of these came into play to reinforce an individual’s decision.

5.3 Intellectual Common Ground

Despite their divisions into Whig and Tory, the group identified as predominant in Charlotte Chapel on p. 122, the ‘Scottish privileged’ whence most of the chapel leadership was drawn, shared a tremendous amount of common ground. All the lawyers, as well as many of the gentry and other professionals, shared an intellectual formation rooted in the Scottish Enlightenment as taught in Edinburgh University, most notably by Dugald Stewart (p. 14). This shared Enlightenment mindset was common to Whigs and Tories and becomes clear in the light of examples of Charlotte Chapel members’ involvement in Scottish legal developments, which, in the absence of a Scottish parliament, formed the most important arena for political policymaking.

For members with Highland connections, while the ban on the wearing of tartan might have been the most memorable of the measures taken in the aftermath of the ’45, and the ban on the Scottish Episcopal Church the one which affected members of the congregation of Charlotte Chapel most directly, it was the ban on heritable jurisdictions and
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the bearing of arms that changed their society most fundamentally. Instead of law and order being administered locally, the clans would now be expected to conform to Scottish law, enforced by the British army: it was a shift from feudal to modern state justice. However, as with the other developments in Scottish society after 1745, it took practice some time to catch up with ideology, and Charlotte Chapel members were closely involved in the process of ongoing legal reform.

The elimination of local and clan justice was not a simple matter, as became clear in 1752. The Hanoverian government official Colin Roy Campbell, the ‘Red Fox’, was murdered by a marksman, and suspicion fell upon the Jacobite clan whose estates he was administering, the Stewarts of Appin. The chief suspect, Alan Breck Stewart, having fled, another representative, James of the Glens, was convicted by a jury in which eleven of the fifteen were Campbells, amongst them the ancestors of several Charlotte Chapel members: Frederica Campbell’s father Neil of Duntroon and Georgina and Helen Lamont’s grandfather Duncan of South Hall. Susan Campbell’s grandfather, Sheriff-Depute of Argyll, oversaw the whole process.  

Jacobitism was suppressed, but if the purpose of their suppression was to establish a better rule of law, then such oppression of the defeated by those in power had to be challenged. Hanoverian Moderate historian Hugo Arnot argued the Appin murder trial ‘points out [...] the propriety of [...] alterations in the criminal law of Scotland’ to prevent it becoming a tool for clan warfare. The fact that fifty years after this miscarriage of justice these women were worshipping in the same congregation as the children of Jacobites shows how old divisions were healed, and helps explain the strong sense of progress towards a more harmonious and prosperous society.

However, the development of commercial society and then the French Revolution divided opinion as to whether the government of Scotland was fully enlightened or whether the process was ongoing. Scottish burghs were governed by procedures which, where they occurred in England, were regarded as ‘rotten’. ‘Omnipotent, corrupt, impenetrable’, was how Henry Cockburn regarded the Edinburgh town-council: ‘Silent, powerful, submissive, mysterious, and irresponsible, they might have been sitting in Venice.’

Scottish Whigs shared their desire for reform with English Foxites, but whereas in England the desire was to bring abusive cases up to the standards of better practice, in Scot-

26Hugo Arnot, A Collection and Abridgement of Celebrated Criminal Trials in Scotland from 1536 to 1784 (Glasgow: A. Napier, 1812) p. 257.
27Cockburn, Memorials, p. 96.
land it appeared to be the failure of an entire national institution. The older Whigs supported campaigns for burgh reform before the French Revolution, but the authoritarian wartime regime put it beyond possibility. Whigs argued that, in a commercial society, a sufficient education and income to guarantee intellectual independence should be regarded as a sufficient qualification to participate in politics; Tories (who as was explained on p. 16 were really an older form of Whig, also committed to the Enlightenment ideal of impartial justice) maintained the civic republican view that the most important factor in good government was not intelligence (vital as this was) but interest. A clever, wealthy man would govern not in the public interest but in his own, unless he had a stake in the public interest in the form of land. Both points of view were conceived within the classical paradigm espoused by the Enlightenment, in which the quality which served the public interest was virtue. The Whig argument, characteristic of the teaching of Dugald Stewart, was that education really could make people more benevolent and virtuous.

This was the intellectual context for the Scottish burgh reform bill which failed in Westminster in April 1792, as French aristocrats fled and France declared war on neighbouring countries. As events in France rapidly degenerated, the Whig advocate Thomas Muir, one of the organisers of the Association of the Friends of the People which campaigned for a new reform bill, was sentenced to fourteen years’ transportation. This was a ‘show trial’ designed to reaffirm Tory ideology: ‘in this country, it [government] is made up of the landed interest, which alone has a right to be represented’, said the judge Lord Braxfield.

Since the Association had proved unruly, Scottish Tories could have made a strong case against Muir’s Whig faith that non-landed individuals were fit to be entrusted with political power; but they panicked, and turned to authoritarian methods. By hand-picking the jury in Muir’s trial, the Tory establishment left itself open to accusations of exactly the same miscarriage of justice as had occurred in the Appin murder trial, disregarding the rule of law to oppress the weaker party. Cockburn described Braxfield’s ‘indelible iniquity’ in his conduct of the sedition trials as ‘a disgrace to the age’. However, as Cockburn had been in his early teens at the time, and wrote this after his own involvement in later radical trials between 1815 and 1820, this was not so much an assessment of Tory activity at the time, as of how it appeared a few years later, after the panic about sedition had subsided. Charlotte Chapel members were involved in Muir’s trial: the Sheriff of Edinburgh who initially interrogated Muir was chapel trustee
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Two of the jurors were parents of Charlotte Chapel members, and both expressed doubts about the procedure. Leonard Horner’s father, Cockburn, wrote, ‘told me that when he was passing [...] to get into the box, Braxfield, who knew him, whispered—“Come awa, Maister Horner, come awa, and help us to hang ane o’ thae daamned scoondrels”’

John Inglis’s father Captain John Inglis ‘before being sworn, mentioned that he was a servant of Government’, and requested to be allowed to decline, since as ‘Mr. Muir was accused of a crime against Government [...] he did not consider it as proper, that Mr. Muir should be tried by a Jury composed of servants of Government’, a request which was refused.

Between 1806 and 1808 most of the advocates listed in Charlotte Chapel registers were involved in the deliberations over the reform of the Court of Session, which illuminated and clarified Edinburgh’s party politics. In 1806 the Foxite Whigs briefly gained power at Westminster and their supporters were placed in the highest Scottish political offices of Solicitor General and Lord Advocate. While Henry Cockburn remembered this brief interlude in Tory hegemony as valuable for correcting the ‘tendencies of both parties, of the one towards hereditary insolence, and of the other towards confirmed despondency’, he regarded it as deservedly failing. One reason was the division within the Whig party: ‘the senior Whigs had at this time considerable jealousy of the higher class of their juniors; especially after it became manifest that the younger men saw the imperfections of their leaders, and could not be relied upon’

Cockburn described the energetic, optimistic Edinburgh Reviewers being admitted to the old Whigs’ club, the ‘Ante Manum’, to find a disillusioned party sharing dull in-jokes and systematically killing themselves with ‘steady quiet draughts of claret’.

The Whig party suffered from a generational rift. The brief change in government generated circumstances which tested and confirmed allegiances amongst the younger generation. There are hints that Scott had youthful Whiggish tendencies, and he wrote for the Edinburgh Review until 1808, but with no family patronage, allegiance to the Dundas regime was indispensable for his prospects. Scott’s post of Clerk of Session, promised to him by Pitt’s administration, was generously confirmed by the Whigs in March 1806. His biographers still argue that the of-
fensively anti-Whig song he circulated to celebrate the acquittal of Dundas from charges of impeachment was intended to demonstrate that he had not been bought, although Cockburn’s comment when Lockhart originally suggested this was that it ‘seems absurd to impute this to a sensible man’[37] In any case, observed Cockburn, it was not the partisanship which caused offence to Dugald Stewart amongst others, but the unfortunate line ‘tally-ho to the Fox’, since Fox was dying at the time[38]. When the Tories returned to power in 1807 they made Archibald Campbell (a Charlotte Chapel trustee) Lord Advocate. [Henry Cockburn] had his own loyalties tested when he was made Advocate Depute thanks to his family connection to Dundas – an incident highlighting the easy privilege which, unlike Scott he enjoyed[39]. It took until 1810 for Campbell to realise Cockburn’s Whiggism was more than ‘ “a mere youthful fervor,” which was expected to wear off’, and dismiss him. Cockburn admitted an influence not wholly different from the one he had considered ‘absurd’ when imputed to Scott that ‘my fear that they might think so had only made the fervor warmer’[40].

The Whig ministry brought in reforms for the Scottish Court of Session, chiefly in an attempt to reduce the number of appeals reaching the House of Lords. Cockburn described the original proposals as supported by the senior Whigs ‘wishing chiefly to concur with the existing Government’, opposed by the Tories, ‘equally decided against all change’ and supported, but only in a modified form, by ‘the more moderate of all parties’ including ‘almost all the younger Whigs’. The Tory opposition was headed by David Hume and supported by ‘even the practical Walter Scott [...] who was thinking of feudal poetry, not of modern business’[41]. The Caledonian Mercury printed the names of those who supported Francis Jeffrey’s motion that a new Court of Review was unnecessary: this included both the ‘younger Whigs’[42] and the Tories[43]. Two of the Charlotte Chapel advocates, Thomas Tod and Thomas Miller voted for the bill as it stood: at only eight and two years older than Cockburn they were hardly in the ‘Ante Manum’ generation, but Tod’s Minto connections suggest younger Whigs too might be tied to Whig party interest, unlike the unreliable Reviewers[44]. Reform of the courts provided a rare
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[37]Sutherland, Scott p. 110.
[38]Cockburn, Memorials, pp.208.
[39]Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 118. Cockburn was Dundas’ nephew: his mother Janet Rannie and Dundas’ wife Elizabeth Rannie were sisters.
[40]Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 242.
[41]Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 211.
[42]From Charlotte Chapel, [Henry Cockburn]
opportunity for the Edinburgh advocates to show their political colours in public.

By 1810, the process appears also to have generated divisions within the Tory party. In 1808, Colin MacKenzie and then when he fell ill, Walter Scott went to London to lobby for fear the Clerks of Session would be abolished. Scott's lobbying was so successful that their office not only survived but had its salary increased from £800 to £1300 with a pension. By 1810 Scott had fallen out with Campbell apparently because the latter wanted to reduce the clerks’ salaries, although Scott had been writing to him in a friendly manner about reviving the Edinburgh Theatre (Map, 27) in October 1808 after the initial round of lobbying by the clerks. The late Advocate [...] cared for no communication except that between his pocket & the Exchequer', Scott wrote to Charles Scott, Duke of Buccleuch, in 1817. Campbell was married to Mary Anne Erskine, sister of Scott's best friend William, and herself a good friend of Scott, but this feud caused a breach which lasted the rest of their lives. In December 1827 Alexander Young wrote to Scott passing on a letter from Mary Anne offering to fund William’s now-orphan daughters, her nieces, to go to India. ‘God knows it is the last place I would have chosen for them’, Scott replied to Young ‘considering that they are not themselves indigent’, and deploring that the financial assistance was accompanied by no ‘cordiality of affection’. Unless there were some misunderstanding, ‘my old friend Mary Anne must be much altered’. Young, to whom Scott wrote in this confidential tone, was a Whig. This example of private relationships being more important than party allegiances challenges Cockburn's generalisation that, ever since the 1790s, party overwhelmingly determined friendship because of the ‘incompatibility of public difference with private cordiality’, even when ‘age and changed times made longer severance absurd'. In Scott’s case, the ‘absurdly long severance’ was with a member of his own party.

However, with the exception of Campbell, Scott appears to have enjoyed good relations with all the Tories in Charlotte Chapel, and his Tory circle of friends was very wide. One was Alexander Keith, who married Georgina Lamont, grand-daughter of the Appin murder juror (p. 186) and who had a perhaps understandably pragmatic approach to politics. In 1819 he succeeded to his uncle’s wealthy estate of Ravelstone, a few miles west of Edinburgh, and asked Scott to intercede with Robert Dundas (Henry Dundas’ nephew.
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45Sutherland, Scott, p. 111.
49Cockburn, Memorials, p. 92.
and heir) regarding the title of Knight Marischal: ‘He pres’d me so much to mention the matter to your Lordship that I cannot decline doing so without giving him offence which improved as it would doubtless be by some of the Mid Lothian Whigs who have been long nibbling at him might be prejudicial’.\textsuperscript{50} The threat worked, and Keith was rewarded when he was able to take a leading role in Scott’s pantomime when George IV visited Edinburgh in 1822: ‘nobody was so gallant as the knight Marischal who came out with a full retinue of Esquires and yeomen’, said Scott.\textsuperscript{51}

Another Tory friend of Scott involved in all the events described in this section was also a Chapel trustee: David Hume, nephew of the philosopher. Cockburn acknowledged Hume’s importance in the Scottish legal Enlightenment: ‘before Hume’s Commentaries had made our criminal record intelligible, the forms and precedents were a mystery understood by the initiated alone’. Indeed, Cockburn said, before Hume’s lectures, as Professor of Law from 1786, elucidated the mysteries sufficiently to equip advocates to make opposing cases, the only priest of the mysteries had been ‘the ancient clerk’ Joseph Norris, giving judges like Braxfield effective power to condemn whom they liked: ‘Hoot! just gie me Josie Norrie and a gude jury, an’ I’ll doo for the fallow’.\textsuperscript{52} However, Hume also appears in Cockburn’s Memorials as one of the chief Tory villains, although one whose power was fading. In the 1790s Cockburn reported he was exercising real oppression: Cockburn’s friend George Cranston told him that ‘a written test’ of political loyalty had been put to him ‘by a celebrated Professor of Law acting for the Tory party. It was rejected; and Cranstoun found it convenient to leave the bar, and spend some time, chiefly in Ireland, as an officer in a regiment of fencible cavalry’.\textsuperscript{53} By the time of the reform of the courts in 1806-8, Hume was on the defensive, as the leaders of the Tories opposed to all change: he ‘made a mournful oration over the death of any portion of the ancient system’.\textsuperscript{54} By 1819, when his Commentaries were published, Cockburn thought it was a case of rescuing some reputation from a lost cause: ‘Hume’s work was composed in a great measure for the purpose of vindicating the proceedings of the Criminal Court in the recent cases of sedition’.\textsuperscript{55}

Cockburn and Scott’s accounts of David Hume can make him appear a bully in politics but dominated by larger personalities. However, Cockburn admitted he was

\textsuperscript{50}Scott, Letters, vol. 5 p. 312.
\textsuperscript{51}Scott, Letters, vol. 7 p. 226.
\textsuperscript{52}Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 116-117.
\textsuperscript{53}Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 93.
\textsuperscript{54}Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 211.
\textsuperscript{55}Cockburn, Memorials, pp. 159.
a significant Enlightenment scholar; and he was influential in how [Scott] regarded the law as a repository of national worth and identity. Adopting his uncle’s understanding of historical process, [Hume] portrayed the law as developing not through a deliberate programme of legislation, but from its feudal origins through custom and judicial decision. This gave it, Harriet Wood argues, authenticity, uniqueness, and, in [Scott’s] eyes, romance: ‘innovated, altered, broken in upon by the changes of times […] until it resembles some ancient castle, partly entire, partly ruinous, partly dilapidated, patched and altered during the succession of ages by a thousand additions and combinations’ [56]

This sense of the patchwork romance of historical process was one of the materials from which [Scott] created his novels, although, in practice, the more enlightened modern reforms were unquestionably better than the old ways. ‘I have observed the Edinburgh gentlemen of the bar […] pique themselves upon an indifferent administration of justice, without respect to rank and family’, the clever, villainous lawyer Glossin baits the pompous rustic magistrate Hazlewood, who interrupts, ‘No sir […] the guilt of an injury is enhanced by the rank of the person to whom it is offered, done, or perpetrated, sir’ [57] These unenlightened lawyers form a striking contrast to Edinburgh lawyer Pleydell, whose competence is tempered with humanity (‘we lawyers are not of iron, sir, or of brass, any more than you soldiers are of steel’) and learning (‘a lawyer without history or literature is […] a mere working mason; if he possesses some knowledge of these, he may venture to call himself an architect’) [58] However, even the enlightened Pleydell stands in contrast to lawyers of [Scott’s] own day by his extraordinary capacity for frivolity and alcohol. Pleydell tells an anecdote of how he and his clerk drew up an appeal on a Saturday night when ‘I had a fair tappit hen under my belt’, and ‘we were obliged to have somebody to dip his pen in the ink, for he could not see the standish’, but ‘not three words required to be altered’ next morning. [Scott’s] footnote assures us this characterisation of the Scottish bar had not ‘overstepped accuracy’ since this anecdote had been told to him by the grandfather of ‘my friend, the present Sir [Alexander Keith] of Ravelstone’ who was the lawyer’s apprentice at the time. Kidd argues that the process of Scottish legal reform which began with the abolition of heritable jurisdictions enabled Moderate historians to develop their narrative of progress, but in the process rendered Scotland a ‘historyless’ nation, since its institutions had proved so deeply incapable of guarding the

58 Scott, Guy Mannering, p.209, 213.
freedom of individuals that the only solution was to abolish them in favour of new ones on an English model.[59] Scott, while he longed for the patchwork castle of Hume and created such a patchwork in his novels, was unable to deny even within the fiction that antiquity and romance per se were no criteria for good law, and wherever the quaint old ways inhibited the administration of fair and equal justice (which effectively was what quaintness implied) the only answer was to eradicate them.

Another Tory lawyer who demonstrated a stronger commitment to Enlightenment than to party allegiance was the chapel’s leading member Colin MacKenzie. His harsh, effective economic policies sometimes put him at variance with his benevolent but impractical Tory employer the Earl of Seaforth regarding the management of his estates both in the Highlands and the West Indies. The reputation of these lawyers suffered badly in the early histories of the Highland Clearances. The villainous lawyer Glossin in Walter Scott’s Guy Mannering might have provided the model, if not entirely an appropriate one, for the portrait of Colin’s younger brother William MacKenzie in the late Victorian History of the Chisholms. William was a Whig, but role in assisting ‘The Chisholm’ to convert his loss-making estates to economically viable sheep walks appears to have been very similar to Colin’s on the Seaforth estates. William was opposed by Chisolm’s ‘noble souled’ sister and Dowager mother. Following a series of Scott-esque confrontations with these women, ‘cowed with shame and confusion, Mr. MacKenzie gathered up his papers, left the house, and never again returned to it during the life of the venerable lady, who […] did not allow a single tenant on her jointure lands to be disturbed’. It is difficult to gather any real understanding of the contemporary issues and economics from such accounts.

The Tory Colin did not only share a Whiggish hard-nosed attitude to economics, but also an enlightened understanding of human equality that put him at variance with older Tories. In an extraordinary case in 1811, two female Edinburgh schoolteachers successfully sued Lady Cumming Gordon for libel, after she had withdrawn her half-Indian natural granddaughter Jean from their school following Jean’s reports that the teachers were having a lesbian affair. Supporting evidence came from another pupil, Janet Munro, daughter of the agent for the New Shotts Iron Company, who was married in Charlotte


Chapel in 1816, MacKenzie thought the judges’ attitudes inexcusably benighted. Reporting Lady Cumming’s loss of the case he said that despite the teachers’ skilful counsel, ‘she was still safe if the stupid body Woodhouselee had not taken or imbibed a strange view of the case – one of his arguments was that poor black Jeanie had a polluted imagination which was proved by herself swearing that it was by her own reflections she became satisfied they were indecent together – What? said Ld Glenlee, was it not enough to the most ignorant person when she saw one of them atop of the other in naked bed?’

Despite MacKenzie’s Toryism, he considered the race of Jeanie, rank of Janet, and youth and gender of both, to have no bearing on their ability to observe and testify in court. The ‘stupidity’, in MacKenzie’s view, all lay in the outdated prejudice of someone very close to his own circle: the high-born, male, university-educated judge Woodhouselee, the father of another of Tory colleague, William Fraser Tytler.

The leading members of Charlotte Chapel, while ostensibly divided between Whig and Tory, shared a common intellectual ground. The key features of this common ground were an egalitarian understanding of the value and potential of individuals, irrespective of rank or gender; and a commitment to a sceptical, scientific methodology particularly in the field of political economy. Based strongly on education in Edinburgh University and developed in the shared work of administering justice in Scotland, this ‘Stewartite’ mindset was to a certain extent characterised by geography (Edinburgh as opposed to the Highlands), generation (those young enough to have been influenced by Dugald Stewart), and gender (since it was based on a professional education restricted to men). Understanding this strong and distinctive common intellectual ground amongst Charlotte Chapel’s leading male members helps to understand their sometimes uncomfortable but ultimately creative relationship with the chapel’s main business: religion.

5.4 Political and Religious Engagement

Religious and political attitudes were tested and shaped as members of Charlotte Chapel engaged in a range of issues of current importance: education, poverty and slavery. Exploring their participation in these issues, which involved a range of collaborations and policy statements, provides a fuller and more nuanced understanding of the developing shared ‘Stewartite’ mindset, overlaid by differences of Whig and Tory, presbyterian and episcopalian, and high church and evangelical.

62 Colin MacKenzie to James Skene, 6 March 1812, NRS MS.20471.34.
5.4.1 Education

In 1810, [Sandford] was one of the founding committee of the Edinburgh Lancastrian School Society, heading the list of Ordinary Directors alongside his Presbyterian neighbour Henry Moncrieff Wellwood [William Forbes] Dugald Stewart and Archibald Alison represented progressive Episcopalianism amongst the Extraordinary Directors, but [Sandford] represented the Episcopal establishment, and was on the working committee. The school opened in the Lawnmarket in April 1811, and within a year was housed in a ‘long, low, wood and brick erection’ on Calton Hill (Map, 39). Monitorial education was widely admired as a solution to illiteracy. However, its two chief promoters, the Quaker Joseph Lancaster and the Anglican Andrew Bell, had been driven into bitter competition when the Anglican author Sarah Trimmer suggested that Lancaster’s non-denominational method threatened to undermine the Church of England, ‘to which, as connected with the STATE, even her very enemies owe the protection of the laws of our excellent government’. The Whig [Sydney Smith] accused Mrs Trimmer of ‘defending what is right without judgement, and believing what is holy without charity’. Trimmer’s attack on, and [Smith]’s scathing defence of the Lancastrian system led to years of Whig and Tory bickering about who had first invented monitorial education. Yet the important ideological debate remained that of whether Lancaster’s children emerged enlightened or irreligious; whether Bell’s were humane or bigoted.

Like the Leslie affair (p. 48), the Lancasterian debate illuminated the interplay of religion and politics in Edinburgh. A visiting Irish bishop, Thomas O’Beirne, attacked the schools in a sermon on 9 February 1812, praising the Scots by abusing the English, and concluding that Mr Lancaster’s ultimate product was ‘that modern monster, a female freethinker’ of the kind which had ‘levelled with the dust a throne which had existed for a thousand years’ in France. The Whig [Henry Cockburn] said O’Beirne had been put up to it by ‘some of the established clergy’ and the ‘Episcopalian illiberals’. The Tory [Walter Scott] had the grace to seem embarrassed by this misogynist and racist (or,
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in Cockburn’s words, ‘insolent and ignorant’) sermon, glossing over the ‘very pleasant’ O’Beirne and trying to make the ‘furious attack’ on O’Beirne by Moncrieff Wellwood, ‘Pope of our Presbyterian divines’, appear equally outrageous. ‘We discharged Sir Harry at him’, recalled Cockburn gleefully of the same event. Parallel scenarios, in which bigoted, backward attitudes are superseded by unanswerable Enlightenment, but half-glimpsed yet infinitely precious values are in danger of being lost on the way, played out again and again in Scott’s historical novels, formulating a new Romantic Tory ideology which could provide a more satisfactory answer to the Whigs than O’Beirne. Meanwhile, the most striking aspect of Moncrieff’s sermon, like Sandford’s Charge of 1807, was its powerful defence of religious toleration. It was dedicated to Richard Watson, the Whig Bishop of Llandaff, ‘expressing the respect with which I have always regarded [...] a Christian Bishop’. ‘Different as the views of the most upright men may often be arising from their very different capacities and attainments,’ Moncrieff wrote, ‘their fidelity to their common Master requires them [...] to acquire more perfect information, to surmount the prejudices which serve to divide them [...] [and] to unite heartily in the things in which they are agreed’. Moncrieff agreed that division was the result of misunderstanding, and toleration the sign of greater, not lesser piety. In this collaboration, Sandford and Moncrieff were putting into practice the friendship Sandford had initiated at his consecration (p. 88).

Bishop Sandford’s wholehearted support for the Lancastrian Schools was significant: he rarely courted public attention. In April 1812 the Society held a dinner which Joseph Lancaster himself attended. In the toasting afterwards the leader of the Edinburgh Whigs, Francis Jeffrey, gave particular mention to ‘the cordial support’ of Sandford, ‘this liberal and enlightened clergyman’ kept aloof from partisan allegiances, but supported policies according to his own religious set of priorities. In the eyes of the newspaper reporter, more significant than Jeffrey’s toast was the ‘modest’ speech by the school’s headmaster thanking Sandford for his ‘unremitting attention’. ‘It had been the regular practice of the Bishop,’ the headmaster said, ‘to examine the children as to their proficiency in the church catechism [sic], whenever he visited the school’. A bishop
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examining children on the Presbyterian catechism in a school founded by a Quaker: here was missionary religious toleration in action.

The significance of the Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools, and the wider British monitorial schools movement of which they were a part, has largely been forgotten. Robert Anderson in *Education and the Scottish People* (1995) dismissed Lancasterian schools as an unfruitful experiment because, ‘being supported by clergymen, employers, and other local notables’ they had an insufficiently ‘radical image’.\(^76\) Lancasterian schools were praised in the analysis of the Marxist Edward Thompson, who despite their paternalist conception recognised them as a product of the Enlightenment, calling them the first alternative to ‘religious terrorism’ for the working class, motivated ‘by genuine educational intentions’.\(^77\) Monitorial schools, with their factory efficiency, have also been criticised by historians as examples of the depersonalising tendency of Utilitarian philosophy and industrial revolution generally. Thomas Markus describes them as ‘great “moral steam engines” […] Under the all-seeing eye of the master or mistress […] a clockwork hierarchy was created which became the utilitarian embodiment of Rousseau’s and Locke’s philosophies.\(^78\) This disparagement of Lancasterian education is symptomatic of a more general undervaluing, by a left-leaning Scottish historiography, of the achievements of the last era of paternalism.

However, assumptions of a dehumanised, oppressive system are not based on observers’ reports, but on the school rule-book. Sandford, Cockburn and Moncrieff’s accounts of the schools’ actual development, and their hopes for its impact on society, are completely opposite. While they are clearly biased in the schools’ favour, they were sincere and intelligent observers, and their reports suggest that Thompson’s analysis was the more insightful. Sandford, preaching a fundraising sermon in 1813, said that the schools’ economic efficiency made them practical, but their real advantage over a traditional school with one large class being taught together by a master, was their ability to awaken a delight in learning amongst the pupils, ‘not only “without the toil and disgust which attend the ordinary modes, but even with entertainment and delight” […] the attention of each individual pupil is constantly kept alive, and his progress accurately ascertained, while a just spirit of emulation is excited among the children, by appropriate


distinctions and rewards. As for depersonalising children or keeping them from rising in society, this was, in Sandford’s view, a failure of imagination: ‘haply the day may come, when some one of these children now present, advanced to the close of his earthly life, may recount to his family around him, with grateful recollection, the benefits which he derived from your present bounty’. Lancasterian education was not, in Sandford’s opinion, assisting the process of turning interdependent ‘ranks’ into conflicting ‘classes’, as Markus argues, but rather counteracting it.

Lancaster’s system was also criticised for his code of degrading, shame-based punishments. These loom large in the assessment of historians of education from the 1960s onwards: Harold Silver reported that ‘punishment was normal, ranging from severe to sadistic’, while more recently Eric Hopkins attempted to justify the schools contextually by pointing out that such practices were ‘thought entirely normal’, even in more upper-class schools. Sarah Trimmer had attacked Lancaster’s punishments at the time, causing some embarrassment to his supporters, but they were not intrinsic to the system and appear to have been completely dispensed with in Edinburgh. The Caledonian Mercury described the ‘several judicious improvements’ which the Edinburgh society had introduced into Joseph Lancaster’s system: ‘the discipline of the School is almost entirely maintained, by means of rewards’, and by 1812, apart from ‘two cases of aggravated and obstinate disobedience’ in which the children had been expelled, the only punishments inflicted had been half-hour detentions. When Cockburn Jeffrey, and others from the same circle founded the Edinburgh Academy for their own sons, they agreed that corporeal punishment should only be inflicted in cases of severe misbehaviour, and never for academic failure. Edinburgh educational developments were self-consciously humane.

The Moderate party appears to have united behind the schools once they were established. In 1814 the annual dinner was attended by ‘most of [...] the Town Council’, and Moderate clergy including Thomas MacKnight, who in 1805 had been the Moderate opposition candidate to John Leslie. The Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools ran until
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they were superseded around 1840. For the Whigs it was an important victory, successfully engaging religion on their side and leaving the Tories backward-looking. The Tories soon made their ideological comeback, critiquing the depersonalising tendency of Whig devaluation of history and identity in a utilitarian march of progress into the future: led a Romantic Tory revival based on the humanising potential of history and identity. This was the emotive ideological lens through which Markus saw the schools as ‘great “moral steam engines”’. In the very different economic and religious conditions of the 1830s and 40s, Whig, Tory, Evangelical and Episcopalian had evolved to mean very different things. However, in the 1810s, the Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools, an optimistic glimpse of social progress towards universal education, equal opportunity and religious friendship, marked the high point of Sandford’s ministry of reconciliation.

5.4.2 Poverty

In a sermon ‘On Confessing Christ’ in 1802, Sandford preached that, ‘the basis, the groundwork, the support of all [education], must be laid deep and sure in religious knowledge. It is this which must give direction and vigour to the whole of life’.

In his Evangelical theology, he believed that if the heart were converted, charitable action would result as an inevitable consequence: Christianity ‘will not confine itself to the bosom of that family where it took its birth, – but its “light will break forth as the morning,” to spread gladness and happiness, and to communicate the benefits of Christian goodness to other dwellings’. The form of this communication, he suggested, would primarily be practical charity: ‘The servant of Christ will hear the cry of the afflicted, and will help them; the desolate and fatherless will he seek out, and the needy will not beg his bread from him in vain’.

In 1819, he still preached the value of charity, as ‘the channel through which God’s bounty is to be distributed to other men’. Inequality is a prerequisite of charity, so the ‘apparently unequal allotment of the portions of this life’ is in fact ‘an appointment of infinite benevolence and wisdom to unite mankind to one another by the bonds of mutual charity and affection’. This kind of paternalist attitude suggested to the historian Rowan Strong that the Episcopal Church was characterised by ‘social attitudes
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[...] marked by conservatism and caution’ in this period; however, paternalism appears to have been universal amongst the educated classes across the political spectrum and simply part of the culture of western society, so cannot be regarded as a symptom of particular ‘conservatism’ or as distinctive to Episcopalianism. For example, David Brown describes the Stewartite thought, which could hardly be described as ‘conservative’, that Lord Palmerston learned in Edinburgh as ‘Whiggish paternalist liberalism’. However, while Sandford continued to preach the social value of charity, he appears to have become less confident in it as a signifier of a converted heart. Preaching on the rich man and Lazarus, he observed that the fact that Lazarus was at his gate implied that the rich man was charitable towards him, and was probably respected as a benevolent man. The reason the rich man went to hell was not his lack of charity, but that he had forgotten to maintain ‘a devout sense of the mercy to which we are so much indebted, and a humble acknowledgement of our own unworthiness’. As noted above (p. 133), Sandford’s theology tended to stress attitude over action, and this could easily translate into complacency.

Figure 5.2: Collections for Edinburgh Charity Workhouse, from three Episcopal Chapels: Charlotte Chapel, Cowgate Chapel and St George’s York Place.

This emphasis might provide one explanation for Charlotte Chapel’s rather undistinguished contributions to Edinburgh charity collections. When the Scottish Episcopal Friendly Society was founded in 1806, Bishop Gleig reported to Bishop Torry that the new Bishop Sandford had ‘preached for her [the Friendly Society] a charity sermon, by which she received above £160, the greatest collection that I believe ever was made for a charitable purpose at one church in Edinburgh’. However, hopes of unparallelled mu-
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nificance under the new bishop proved optimistic. Figure 5.2 shows the proceeds from regular collections at the church doors for the Edinburgh Charity Workhouse (Map, 18) from Charlotte Chapel, Archibald Alison’s Cowgate Chapel, and the other New Town Episcopal Chapel, St George’s. St George’s was small and from 1800 struggled under an absentee rector: its collections improved on the arrival of Richard Shannon in 1810. One might have expected Charlotte Chapel to improve in comparison with the older Cowgate Chapel as the latter began to suffer from its location in the Old Town, but Archibald Alison’s congregation appeared to have grown more generous after joining the Episcopal Church, while Sandford’s, whose donations had matched and surpassed those of their well-established neighbour when Charlotte Chapel first opened, fell behind during Sandford’s episcopate.

Figure 5.3: Comparison in Collections for Edinburgh Charity Workhouse between Charlotte Episcopal Chapel and St Andrew’s Parish Church.

Figure 5.3 compares Charlotte Chapel with the New Town parish church, St Andrew’s. This serves as a reminder that the Episcopal Church was still a minority church even in Edinburgh. The overwhelming dominance of the Church of Scotland in Edinburgh charity collections overall testifies to its status, and more importantly size, as the national church. However, the graph also highlights the fact that whereas St Andrew’s was tending to improve its level of donation (possibly connected to the appointment of an assistant for the ageing minister William Moodie around 1803), Charlotte Chapel’s, which rivalled the parish church in 1801, stabilised at less than half its level. The decline in workhouse donations could admit of another explanation. It is unlikely to reflect a collapse in congregation numbers, given the decision to build an enlarged chapel in 1815. It might, however, reflect the broadening of the chapel’s social base, discussed on p. 106. With a smaller proportion of the seats in the apparently crowded chapel available to the
wealthier ranks of whom paternalism was expected, charitable giving might decline.

Figure 5.4: Collections for other charities, from three Episcopal Chapels. Charities include emergency poor relief, widows and orphans of war casualties, prisoners for debt, Lancastrian schools, and parish Sunday schools.

Another possibility is that members of Charlotte Chapel had begun to question the value of giving to the charity workhouse, and to redirect their giving to other projects. Data to support this theory is difficult to find, but Figure 5.4 hints that this might have been the case. In 1805 Sandford’s congregation gave marginally more than Alison’s both to the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary (Map, 35) and for the relief of widows and orphans of casualties at Trafalgar. In 1815 and 1816 Charlotte Chapel gave significantly more (although the totals were smaller) towards parish Sunday schools, a project set up by the Kirk perhaps partly in response to the Lancastrian Schools which had highlighted the need for greater educational provision in the city. It appears surprising that Charlotte Chapel did not give more to the Lancastrian Schools, given Sandford’s particular support for this project. However, many of the congregation may have already given recent donations: Sandford had preached a sermon for the Schools in March, at which, ‘although the congregation was not numerous, yet the collection was liberal, and amounted to £43’, and had subsequently been selling copies of it.

By the time the city-wide collection was made in December, members of Charlotte Chapel might well have felt they had done their bit.

In addition to collections by churches, newspapers frequently published the donations of individuals to subscriptions for various causes. Thirty-two Charlotte Chapel
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Figure 5.5: Collections for various charities from individual members of Charlotte Chapel.

the Lancastrian Schools, were better remedies for poverty than simple charity, which was regarded as perpetuating bad systems.

A particular example of this Stewartite ideology was the Society for the Suppression of Begging, founded in 1813. Despite its authoritarian-sounding name, this was a strategic attempt to relieve destitution without creating structural poverty, suggesting that charity should be redirected to fund a central soup kitchen which would provide relief where it was genuinely needed, and discourage practices encouraged by casual giving such as ‘exposing children, on the most frequented streets and roads, during the coldest nights of this inclement season’ to ‘work upon the feelings of passengers, and extort their charity’. The newspaper report considered the fact that the Society was to be supported by voluntary contributions to be a ‘capital point’, since ‘all plans of compulsory charity [...] however excellent the intention of their contrivers [...] become in the long run scenes of jobbing, and profligacy and meanness of every sort; operating as a standing encouragement to idleness and beggary, and tending to sow enmity and division between the rich and the poor’. The English Poor Law was cited as a dreadful warning. This comment helps elucidate how Sandford’s (and the Whig Lord Palmerston’s) paternalism fits with Stewartite political economy: within the politically free framework individuals had a strong moral obligation to help the afflicted and, as society progressed, so would benevolence.

Charlotte Chapel was deeply committed to the project. William Forbes was a vice-president, and Daniel Sandford, Colin MacKenzie, James Clerk, Adam Duff and Thomas Ramsay were amongst the directors. While these names, and the commendation of the Tory Caledonian Mercury suggest it was a Tory-dominated project (unlike the Lancastrian Schools, founded at the same time), this did not make it less Stewartite: Tories like Colin MacKenzie were no less influenced by his worldview. It is striking that whereas Henry Cockburn condemned the (non-Stewartite) Tory opposition to John Leslie and the Lancastrian Schools as bigoted and benighted, he commended the Tory Society for the Suppression of Begging as ‘the first modern systematic attempt that had been made in Scotland to check public mendicity’, and reported that it was a success: ‘this early step in the philosophy of pauperism, materially promoted the subsequent institutions of Houses of Industry, Houses of Refuge, Savings Banks, and many others for preventing, methodising, and relieving necessary destitution [...] Let those who despair
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of eradicating mendicity [...] study the facts of this Edinburgh case, and be comforted’.

Part of the intellectual context for the discussion of poverty surrounded the debate which followed the publication of Thomas Malthus’ *Principle of Population* in 1798, which continued throughout the period of this study. In 1816 Whig advocate James Grahame contributed to the debate with a pamphlet which argued that most apparent Malthusian crises were in fact the effect of ‘ill-regulated and oppressive government on population’. Grahame, anticipating the 1940s Philips Machine which demonstrated economic processes through water flow, compared inept government intervention to a dam or blockage which would ‘impede or divert the natural progress of a stream, and increase the depth and quantity of the waters at particular places’. Grahame commended ‘such societies as that which originated in Edinburgh for the suppression of public begging, by private and therefore well-directed relief’, as well as savings banks and ‘the more fundamental institutions which disseminate education amongst the poor’. The charitable institutions in which Daniel Sandford gave a lead modelled an enlightened Christianity with a distinctively Edinburgh flavour, informed by the philosophy of Dugald Stewart.

5.4.3 Slavery

Bishop Sandford’s name is absent from the annals of the Scottish abolition campaign, and black slavery is never mentioned in his writings. This seems surprising. Not only was it a cause popular with Evangelicals, but his first bishop Beilby Porteus and some of his closest Episcopalian predecessors and successors were at the forefront of the Scottish abolitionist movement. In 1788 William Forbes, who later introduced Sandford to the Episcopal Church, headed the first Scottish abolition petition from a non-ecclesiastical body, the Chamber of Commerce; while Lord Gardenstone, who built the church at Laurencekirk and hosted the synod in 1804 which led to Sandford’s union, chaired the Edinburgh Committee for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, the oldest and strongest Scottish organisation. In the 1820s and 1830s, Scottish Episcopalians Charles Terrot and Edward Craig played a leading role in the Edinburgh committee. Yet Sandford’s name was nowhere to be seen.

There are a number of possible reasons for Sandford’s absence. The main one was
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probably timing. With the exception of some Scottish participation in the London campaign\footnote{Whyte, *Scotland and Abolition*, p. 107.}, the French Revolution and sedition trials effectively repressed all Scottish abolition campaigning between 1792, the year \textbf{Sandford} arrived in Edinburgh, and 1814. The campaign of 1814, the ‘first assembling of the people for a public object that had occurred here for about twenty years’, had a highly party-political aspect\footnote{Cockburn, *Memorials*, p. 268.}. \textbf{Sandford} had collaborated with Whigs on Lancastrian Schools two years earlier, which despite not being a public meeting had given him politicised prominence. To attend the abolition meetings of 1814 would have been far more overtly Whig. While \textbf{Sandford} and his congregation do not appear to have displayed the obsession with demonstrating loyalty which Rowan Strong regards as a persistent characteristic of the post-Jacobite Episcopal Church until the 1820s, for the Bishop of Edinburgh to have attended the first Whig political meeting for twenty years might have been a step too far.\footnote{Strong, *Episcopalianism*, p. 158.} As the issue of slavery returned to prominence, and the significance of public meetings in Scotland receded, what might at the time have appeared as delicacy began to appear more like cowardice, but by the time campaigning was respectable again in the 1820s, \textbf{Sandford}’s health had declined and he had largely retired from civic life.

A second reason for \textbf{Sandford}’s lack of involvement might be personality. \textbf{Sandford} consistently proved unwilling to believe ill of anyone (p. 60). This endearing but naive trait would not fit well with abolition campaigning. It would seem out of character, for example, for \textbf{Sandford} to confront the brutality of overseers when he had the ex-overseer and public-spirited Princes Street gentleman \textbf{Thomas Ramsay} amongst the stalwart members of his congregation.

A third reason might be the slave interests of the powerful family of \textbf{Sandford}’s wife \textbf{Helen Douglas}, whose head was \textbf{Charles Douglas}, Marquess of Queensberry. \textbf{Helen}’s second cousin \textbf{James Douglas} was the grandson of a slave-owner although he and his father had followed military careers in Jamaica\footnote{William Douglas, *Descendants of the 1st Earl of Queensberry*, in *The Douglas Archives: A Collection of Historical and Genealogical Records*, URL: www.douglashistory.co.uk (accessed 06/06/2011).}. James married the daughter of the Island Secretary, \textbf{Marianne Bullock}, and brought her to Edinburgh to start a family, although after five years they joined other West Indian repatriots living in the warmer Georgian new town of Clifton in Bristol. \textbf{James} was one of around fifteen relatives of \textbf{Helen} who appear in the chapel registers, and it was said to have been her family who
initially invited Sandford to Edinburgh. It is possible Sandford found himself under some pressure not to jeopardise the family income.

One intriguing incident suggests Sandford might have been undermining slavery by non-political means. In 1813 he baptised Charles Stewart ‘a negro aged 16’, one of only two adult baptisms in the register (the other was William Stroud). Iain Whyte has shown how baptism, with its emancipatory symbolism, played an important role in the abolition of slavery within Scotland in the late eighteenth century. To baptise an ex-slave was to affirm that he was indeed ‘a man and a brother’. It is tempting, especially in the case of debates with still-current resonance, to condemn those who did not speak out actively against an injustice as colluding in it; yet the case of Sandford shows that there might be complex political, financial and personal barriers to active involvement. It appears more likely that Sandford was a quiet supporter of abolition.

There was no doubt that sugar plantations formed a significant part of the wealth of Charlotte Chapel (p. 165). The links between income and attitudes to slavery were, however, far from straightforward. The army officer Frederick Maitland, Lieutenant-Governor of Grenada 1805-1810, whose wife Catherine Prettejohn was the daughter of a wealthy Barbados planter, was unsurprisingly opposed to abolition. However, sugar fortunes were more often associated with Whigs from mercantile backgrounds than Tories from Scottish landed backgrounds. Elizabeth MacDowall, for example, whose husband Henry Cockburn organised the meeting and petition of 1814, was the grand-daughter of William MacDowall of Castle Sempill, whose slave activities gave him the claim to be the richest commoner in Scotland. Until the American and French wars caused the loss of the family fortune in the 1790s, the MacDowalls spent lavishly on agricultural improvement and industrialisation in Renfrewshire. Elizabeth’s sister Isabella Cockburn married Thomas Maitland, who like Cockburn went on to become a leading Scottish Liberal judge and politician. The young Whig James Grahame, from a Glaswegian merchant background, and his future wife Matilda Robley from a Cumbrian one might have shared a sense of identity when they met in the south of England, but Grahame’s idealistic abolitionism was challenged by his wife’s slave wealth. Whig aristocrat Alexander Hamilton, Marquess of Douglas, married sugar heiress Susan Beckford.
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Slavery has usually been studied from the perspective of an interested group, such as abolitionists or slaves themselves. By studying slavery as one of many issues within a Regency community rather than as a separate topic, new questions arise. How many people were dissuaded from involvement in the 1814 campaign by its partisan nature and the significance of it being the first public meeting in Edinburgh since the French Revolution? It was striking that whereas churches had been in the forefront of the 1780s campaign, in 1814 only six of the 141 petitions were from churches, four of them Methodist. What quiet and non-partisan activities, like the baptism of slaves or the divesting of slave assets, were taking place amongst those who did not publicly campaign? Was abolition indeed a campaign led chiefly by the beneficiaries of its mercantile bonanza? These questions and connections demonstrate how prosopographical studies can enrich thematic ones by drawing together the small threads from a group with a range of levels and angles of interest on that issue.

5.5 Gendered Piety

The charge of scepticism against Regency Edinburgh discussed in the literature review (p. 37) is qualified by the testimony of Charlotte Chapel’s clergy. The problem they perceived was specifically that religion had become feminised, and men had become irreligious. Edward Bannerman Ramsay recalled, ‘The late Bishop Sandford told me that when he first came to Edinburgh [...] few gentlemen attended church [...] Sydney Smith [...] seeing how almost exclusively congregations were made up of ladies, took for his text the verse from the Psalms, “O that men would therefore praise the Lord!” and with that touch of the facetious which marked everything he did, laid the emphasis on the word “men”’. This section explores the reasons behind this feminisation of religion at the beginning of the nineteenth century by examining expressions of piety or impiety amongst the men and women of Charlotte Chapel, and seeks to understand how, over the course of Sandford’s ministry, the situation changed and educated men in the Charlotte Chapel community became more articulately religious.

Other evidence from Charlotte Chapel supports this suggestion that religion in Edinburgh at the beginning of the nineteenth century was largely a feminine affair. In 1811, Margaret Hope kept accounts of expenses incurred in the education of her niece.
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and nephew whom she was bringing up at 1 Charlotte Square. These included seat-rent for Charlotte Chapel, and popular Evangelical books: William Jay’s *Discourses*; Hannah More’s *Practical Piety*; Isaac Watts’ *Catechism*; John Hill’s *Faith’s Estimate of Afflictions*, and seventy-five tracts, perhaps for charitable distribution. In 1814, Susan Tod wrote to India to inform Mary Roxburgh’s husband of his wife’s death, reassuring him of the ‘un-speakable comfort contained in her almost dying words, the firm and confident reliance which she had in our Saviour’. In 1815, Colin MacKenzie’s aunt, Martha Elphinstone, left the handsome sum of £50 ‘to the Right Revd Bishop Sandford [...] to buy a ring in remembrance of me’, a legacy raised a year earlier from her original bequest of £30.

In 1816, when Leonard Horner accompanied his dying brother to Italy, his mother wrote ‘Don’t, my dear Leonard, ever forget your duty to your Maker; for that affords a comfort, nothing in the world can bestow’. She added, as if she feared he would find such sentiments ridiculous, ‘God bless you, read this with that warmth of affection that I have written it, and take it as it is meant’. When Susan Campbell died in 1817 she bequeathed to her grand-daughter Susan items designed to form her pious character: her Bible ‘which I pray God she may make a right use of’, pictures of her parents for ‘reflecting on the tempers and manner of the two they represent’, and her gold watch ‘to regulate her time’.

Euphemia MacKenzie’s will the same year began with a desire to make it ‘in the presence of Almighty God and humbly pray that I may do it according to his blessed will, and do it justly and as I ought’. These women represent a range of backgrounds. Euphemia MacKenzie was the daughter of a Highland Catholic aristocrat; Susan Campbell the daughter of an employee of the Hanoverian Duke of Argyll; Margaret Hope came from a lowland gentry family; Leonard Horner’s mother Joanna Baillie, who was buried at St John’s in 1723, and Martha Elphinstone were lawyers’ daughters; Mary Roxburgh was the daughter of an Ayrshire botanist and East Indian adventurer. It is difficult to find equivalent expressions of piety from the men in the group in this period: in the 1810s pious discourse, especially with an Evangelical tone, had a feminine air.

Cockburn’s recollection was that, while men had never been irreligious, the attention...
of Edinburgh literati around 1800 had been focused on other things: ‘Religion is certainly more the fashion than it used to be [...] Grown up people talked at this time of nothing but the French Revolution and its supposed consequences; younger men of good education were immersed in chemistry and political economy’.[120] **Leonard Horner**, writing to his wife **Anne Lloyd** a few months after his mother’s fervent letter, betrayed little personal religious commitment. He rejoiced that the French Revolution had ‘destroyed the superstition of the Catholic religion’, but regretted that it had also ‘destroyed that religious feeling, from which so much comfort is derived to the great body of the people, and from which much solid political benefits are derived’.[121] At Christmas in Pisa he hoped to find ‘grand ceremony and [...] fine music’ but ‘the vocal music was very indifferent’ while the ceremony had ‘very little impressive in it, from the infinite changes and shifting of the scenes, some of which were quite ludicrous’.[122] The benefits of religion for **Horner** appear to have consisted in social control and artistic patronage.

In 1809, **Marten Dalrymple**’s glowing obituary (p. [121]) said nothing about his religion. In 1815, **James Moray** of Abercairny, who had been married in Charlotte Chapel, presented John Clark to the Presbyterian living of Blackford, which was in his gift. This living had been held by Henry Moncrieff Wellwood until his translation to St Cuthbert’s, Edinburgh in 1777, and the Minutes of Blackford United Free Church, surveying subsequent events, commented that from that day ‘the darkness began to come down upon the Parish of Blackford’ with a succession of 5m Good letter on why cold air outbreaks this year probably not linked to climate change. ‘true Moderates of the old school’. ‘The work of the Holy Spirit was denied, Conversion laughed at. [...] The pure Gospel was never preached but in its stead a cold heartless morality.’[123] **Moray**’s appointment Clark, who was still there in 1843, preached the sermon at the controversial induction of Robert Young, presented to Auchterarder by the Earl of Kinnoull, whose father had been one of the high church laymen promoting **Sandford**’s union with the Episcopal Church (p. [86]). It was the confirmation of Young’s induction, despite his call being signed by two families and vetoed by 287, which precipitated the Church of Scotland’s Disruption. The men of Charlotte Chapel seemed not only resistant to Evangelical religion themselves, but active in obstructing the lower orders’ access to it. The evidence suggests that the educated men
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who were married or had their children baptised in Charlotte Chapel did so for the sake of social convention rather than religious conviction.

When the Stewartite literati engaged with religion, it was often to attack it; but a closer examination of the nature of their attack suggests that their objection was not so much to Christianity as such, as the way faith was being taught and used by the religious establishment. Their tone of irreverent critique jarred with their successors: Dean Ramsay could not keep out an air of censure at his predecessor’s frivolity even as he retold Sydney Smith’s anecdote (p. 208). Sydney Smith was famous for his irreverence. ‘He ought to have been in some freer sphere; especially since wit and independence do not make bishops’, said Cockburn. In 1807 Jeffrey and Scott irreverently reviewed William Forbes father’s Life of James Beattie: ‘If Dr Beattie had been able to refute these doctrines [of David Hume], we cannot help thinking that he would have [...] disdained to court popularity by so much fulsome cant [...] by such babyish interjections, as ‘fy on it! fy on it!’ The reviewers made a counter-argument, that the scepticism of Hume resulted not in religious doubt, but in intellectual humility:

The argument, as commonly stated by the sceptics, leads only to a negative or sceptical conclusion [...] that the present sensation, which we call memory, affords no evidence of past existence [...] We think this undeniably true; and so we believe did Dr Beattie. He thought it also very useless; and we agree with him: but he thought it very wicked, [...] and there we cannot agree with him at all. It [...] affords a useful mortification to human reason, – and leads us to that state of philosophical wonder [...] in which we ought to feel the impropriety of all dogmatism or arrogance in reasoning upon such subjects. This is the use and the only meaning of such sceptical speculations.

Scott and Jeffrey leave their readers in no doubt that the kind of religion espoused by Beattie and his biographer Forbes was infantile: ‘dandled into popularity by bishops and good ladies’ While one might question the self-awareness of cocky young literati accusing their seniors of ‘arrogance’, there is no reason to think that they violated Henry Moncrieff Wellwood’s definition of integrity, quoted by Daniel Sandford, ‘that he should
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be fully persuaded of that of which he endeavours to persuade other men’[128] These men were confident they were attacking not religion, but unenlightened religion. In 1804 [Scott] had moved into his first country house at Ashestiel, ‘seven miles from kirk and market’ where, ‘finding there was some chance of my family turning pagans, I have adopted the goodly practice of reading prayers every Sunday, to the great edification of my household’[129] One of [Scott]’s greatest motivations was the construction of his own identity, so one might argue that this was an affectation of piety really aimed at shaping his patriarchal identity. Yet if religion was out of ‘fashion’ amongst Whig Edinburgh literati, and Tory Episcopal landowners like [Moray] and Kinnoull were untroubled by their reputation of being the enemies of Evangelical religion, [Scott]’s demonstrative piety was not the nouveau-riche fitting in to elite culture, but a bold counter-cultural reclamation of religion from ‘bishops and good ladies’. This was precisely what [Daniel Sandford] aimed to do, preaching an Evangelicalism free from the canting attacks on Enlightenment learning which excited ‘nausea and compassion’ in the grown men taught by Dugald Stewart[130].

The relationships between piety, denomination and party were complicated. One of the arguments that the Edinburgh intelligentsia were sceptical or secularised in this period was the readiness of lawyers to become elders in the Church of Scotland expressly so as to have a partisan voice in the General Assembly. ‘There is little doubt […] that this non-resident elder was ordained by the minister and session – the patron of the parish was a Whig […] – for the purpose of returning him as a commissioner to the General Assembly’, writes Iain MacIver of [Henry Cockburn]’s eldership in Peeblesshire in the 1830s, making it clear this manipulation of pre-Disruption Kirk structures had nothing to do with piety[131]. However, in his wider study of the General Assembly eldership MacIver thwarts any possibility of generalising from [Cockburn] to all 1830s Whig lawyers, observing that in 1835 John Cunninghame noted a group of Evangelical advocates he called the ‘very godly’, who were largely Whig lawyers[132] ‘I am proud of my country. In not another land in the world would such a thing have been done’, wrote the leader of the Scottish Whigs, Francis Jeffrey, when the Evangelicals left the Kirk in the Disruption of 1843.

In the Church of Scotland, the unlikely alliance between Whig and Evangelical
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forged in the Charlotte Chapel era tended to strengthen into the 1830s. Cockburn’s apparent ungodliness as a non-resident elder may have been partly due to his (previously unrecognised) Episcopalian allegiances. In fact, many of the lawyers whose names appear in Charlotte Chapel registers were General Assembly elders: these include three leading young Tories, Archibald Campbell, Ranald MacDonald and Walter Scott, between 1801 and 1806. In the 1810s, they were joined by two Whigs, Thomas Maitland and Thomas Hamilton Miller, a shift in party representation indicative of the shifting political culture in Edinburgh. Rowan Strong suggests this readiness of Episcopalians to serve on the General Assembly represents not a cynical attitude to the Kirk, but a culture of Episcopalian ‘quietness’ inherited from the era of penal laws, acquiescing in the Presbyterian establishment and attending Presbyterian worship where Episcopalian was unavailable, a practice which tended to reduce the Episcopal church as younger generations developed a Presbyterian affiliation.

In the Charlotte Chapel community, however, such quietism was being challenged by a new activism amongst the laity which sought to revive the Episcopal church in Scottish localities. David Gillespie helped found the Episcopal chapel at Cupar in Fife in 1820. Colin MacKenzie took the lead in the Scottish Episcopal Fund, founded in 1806 by his father-in-law William Forbes, to augment the livings of clergy. In 1813, MacKenzie was liaising with the Primus John Skinner and Sandford’s friend John Bowdler in England to see whether a treasury grant could be secured to boost the Scottish Episcopal Fund; and in 1815 was Bowdler’s agent in Scotland for his project to fund the construction of new chapels. In 1819, MacKenzie worked on a scheme proposed to his fellow bishops, apparently to link the Fund to the clergy’s own Friendly Society in return for the clergy organising collections for contributions, a proposal which ran into opposition from northern bishops. Sandford and ‘my excellent friend Mr Colin MacKenzie’ had a close personal and professional relationship: Sandford regularly visited MacKenzie’s Harcus Cottage in Peeblesshire, where he baptised many of MacKenzie’s children. MacKenzie’s participation in the acquisition of St John’s graveyard was noted above (p. 107); he also
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travelled to Exeter to purchase St John’s first organ.\textsuperscript{140} Like Gillespie, he built an Episcopal Chapel near his estate, in Peebles, employing the same architect, William Burn, which opened after his death in 1832. St John’s sold the organ from Charlotte Chapel to the Peebles chapel for a nominal sum, ‘as a small return for the many important services rendered by him to the Chapel on all occasions’\textsuperscript{141} This renewed activism was enabled by the repeal of the penal laws and union of the Episcopal Church, and perhaps inspired by the example of the older generation of active laymen behind these achievements (p. \textsuperscript{86}), and the activist theology of Sandford.

The Charlotte Chapel evidence supports Strong’s picture of ‘emerging middle class power’ in Edinburgh, in contrast to a landed, often aristocratic rural Episcopalianism; but the examples of landowners Gillespie and MacKenzie suggest that the old rural patronage patterns perpetuated outside Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{142} However, one example from Charlotte Chapel congregation shows the new urban model could also be imitated in commercial provincial towns. James Lundin Cooper was a writer in Kirkcaldy, a busy shipping port in Fife, in sight of Edinburgh on the other side of the Firth of Forth. The son of a saddler, Cooper’s educated profession suggests he intended to benefit from the possibilities for social mobility, as does his marriage in 1816 by Bishop Sandford to Sarah Brown, daughter of a Kirkcaldy merchant, one of a handful of ‘petty bourgeois’ marriages in Charlotte Chapel (see Chapter Three, Figure \textsuperscript{3.4}). Like writers in Edinburgh, Cooper was well-placed to engage in business, and by 1828 was Manager of the Kirkcaldy and London Shipping Company, running three 132-ton smacks.\textsuperscript{143} He was also the leading manager (the lay committees who ran small Episcopal chapels were often termed ‘managers’) of Kirkcaldy Episcopal Chapel, where his colleagues included Alexander and Charles Walker, ‘manufacturer’ and shoemaker, brothers of Sandford’s colleague James Walker, who had succeeded him as Bishop of Edinburgh in 1830. Around this time, the managers persuaded a young clergyman, Mr Marshall, to replace their elderly incumbent on very poor financial terms. Marshall challenged the corruption of the managers, who ran the chapel in their own interests, and the managers, led by Cooper, complained about him to the bishop.\textsuperscript{144} Marshall had a good reputation in the Episcopal Church, while Bishop Walker advised that ‘he had more trouble with Kirkcaldy than with all the other chapels.

\textsuperscript{140}Minute of St John’s Vestry, 29 November 1817, NRS CH12/3/3 p.35.
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\textsuperscript{142}Strong, \textit{Episcopalianism}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{143}Edinburgh Almanack (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1828).
within his diocese put together’. Cooper’s role was exposed in a pamphlet ‘by a clergyman of the Episcopal Church of Scotland’, which described Cooper as the ‘only one’ in the committee ‘of a profession which implies a tolerable education’, and commented that ‘in his case there may be education, and there may, to a certain extent, be status in society; but other qualifications requisite to sustain him in his character as the accuser of a clergyman are evidently wanting’. Whether as a result of his lost reputation, or through similar misjudgement in his business, Cooper went bankrupt in 1836, and died three years later. The example of Charlotte Chapel, in which the Scottish Episcopal Church and individuals engaged in commerce rose in social status, respectability and piety in a situation of mutual benefit, provided a model for imitation elsewhere in Scottish commercial society. Yet as Cooper discovered to his cost, the fact that, in Charlotte Chapel, the laity’s wealth created a power-relationship in which the Bishop was effectively a dependent employee, did not mean that non-privileged laity could wield power by treating their clergyman in a high-handed manner. Social imitation was taking place within the Scottish Episcopal Church, but the outcomes were complex.

Evidence of missionary religion is abundant amongst male Charlotte Chapel members after the congregation’s move to St John’s. Robert Ramsay was an early supporter of the younger generation of Evangelical Episcopalian clergy Gerard Noel and Edward Craig (p. 59). He was elected vice-president of the Edinburgh Auxiliary branch of the Church Missionary Society, established at a meeting chaired by Noel in the Assembly Rooms in May 1818, and with Craig was amongst the speakers at the third anniversary meeting of the Sabbath School Union for Scotland the following year. He chaired ‘a very numerous public meeting of the friends and members of the Edinburgh Temperance Society’ in St Cuthbert’s in 1836, at which it was said this was a cause which should ‘take precedence even of negro emancipation, inasmuch as the wide-spread slavery of intemperance was voluntary, and therefore more degrading’. David Gillespie appears to have enjoyed better relations with the kirks on his estate than did James Moray in Perthshire, although they numbered notable Evangelicals amongst their ministers including Thomas Chalmers and Charles Nairn. At his death in 1827, Gillespie bequeathed first ‘to each of the Kirk Sessions of Kilmany, Creich, Forgan, Logie and Leuchars the
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sum of fifty pounds sterling [...] for the benefit of the poor for these parishes"[150] Gillespie might have learned active, interdenominational piety from his mother-in-law. His wife Mary Carnegie's father was an exiled Jacobite who died in 1799 having restored the family fortunes, but her mother lived until 1821. In 1820 Mrs Carnegie built a chapel of ease for Montrose parish, inspired by Thomas Chalmers' Essay on the Causes and Cure of Pauperism. Chalmers' argument that the unnoticed growth in urban population had left thousands of people out of reach of the church, 'burst on my awakened soul like a beam of light. I saw the evil; and old and insignificant as I am, resolved to begin to remedy it in my own neighbourhood, even at this (to me) late hour'[151] The old Jacobite lady saw the changed times, and embraced missionary activism. As for the worldly Leonard Horner by 1829 he appeared to be turning into his mother. Writing to his daughter Frances on the death of her friend he advised that such tragedies 'should make all who are young [...] better prepared for a change, should it please God so to order it. Such reflections need not damp the cheerfulness and gaiety of youth [...] they will only check the needless folly and emptiness of thought of unwise people, and will temper lightness of heart with the sobriety of reason'. Such words could have been written by Daniel Sandford. Moreover, Horner had heard some girls repeat passages of the Bible by heart, and 'should like very much to see my dear girls able to do the same [...] I should like you and your younger sisters to try'. He gave them Matthew 5-6, Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 13 as an initial challenge[152] Horner was one of the leading Edinburgh Whigs, demonstrating that the new 'fashion' for religion was not confined to the Tory party.

Two of Colin MacKenzie's sons were later distinguished for their religious zeal. William Forbes MacKenzie (1807-1862) was Tory MP for Peebleshire from 1837 to 1852, in which year, as a member of Disraeli's cabinet, he was responsible for the Forbes MacKenzie Act, which closed Scottish public houses on Sundays and at 10pm on weekdays[153] His brother Charles (1825-1862) became the first Bishop of Central Africa. Colin's cousin Charles Fraser's son-in-law was George Tomlinson, first Bishop of Gibraltar. Bishop Sandford's congregation appears to have been a rich breeding-ground for missionary and colonial bishops: his grandson Daniel Fox Sandford (1831-1906) was promoted from third rector of St John's to Bishop of Tasmania in 1883. Henry Alexander Douglas, first

[150] David Gillespie’s Will, NRS SC70/1/40/743.
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cousin of Sandford’s wife Helen had a son of the same name (1821-1875), who became Bishop of Bombay in 1869. Bishop Sandford considered his own episcopate to be a missionary one, in a manner not possible in the Church of England, but Edinburgh’s East Indian connections made him aware that by the 1810s the kind of diocesan structures he had re-established in Edinburgh were completely lacking in other parts of the world. In 1816 he baptised the thirteen-year-old daughter of James Carnegy and Mary Ogilvy, noting in the register, ‘NB There being great doubt whether the above named Isabella Carnegy had been baptised in infancy by a lawful minister, she was hypothetically baptised according to the form provided for that purpose by the Church’.

The family had recently returned from Penang, where until 1805 there was no Anglican clergyman, and baptisms, marriages and funerals were performed by the first Assistant Secretary to the Governor.

George Arbuthnot’s religious consolation on the death of his wife in 1834 sounds stoical rather than Evangelical: ‘I have recourse to prayer. I pray for resignation, I pray for strength of mind to bear up against despair and for fortitude to do my duty as becomes the Father of a Family.’ Yet other Charlotte Chapel members who returned from India appear to have brought back a tendency to Evangelicalism. Arbuthnot had business dealings with George Cadell who had been married in Charlotte Chapel, and they were successive vestrymen of the Anglican Church in Madras. Cadell returned to Scotland in 1841 and lived in the New Town until his death in 1857 when he left legacies to Evangelical charities and to the Sustentation Fund, which supported the Free Church of Scotland following the Disruption. Adelaide Falconar’s sisters, the last of whom died in 1887, used their nabob wealth to help build Morningside Parish Church in 1838, fund the chancel and spire of Morningside Episcopal Church in the 1870s, and leave in their will £1000 to each of the two large Edinburgh Episcopal churches, St John’s and St Paul’s, as well as legacies to 100 Edinburgh charities of all kinds.

Some people found religious articulacy in anti-Catholicism. Robert Ramsay, Robert Cockburn and Sandford’s son Erskine Douglas Sandford were amongst those present
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to hear the Marquis of Tweeddale ‘recollect that the happiest day which the inhabitants of this country every [sic] witnessed was the bright day of sunshine of the Reformation, when the light of Protestantism first dispelled the black clouds of Popery’ at the inaugural meeting of the Edinburgh Protestant Association in 1835.

John Wolffe notes that this short-lived Evangelical and Tory campaign to repeal Catholic Emancipation was most active in Scotland, and was important in establishing Conservatism on a basis of popular support.

This reassertion of a Protestant Constitution was taken up by the Ultra-Tory movement led by John Sandford’s patron Bishop William van Mildert, and Bishop Thomas Burgess whose episcopacy bore similarities to Sandford (p. 70).

The rise in articulate Evangelical-influenced religion made it difficult for the generation baptised in Charlotte Chapel, such as John Sandford, to comprehend the religion of their parents. Colin MacKenzie’s daughter Anne ‘doubted whether there was much real religion’ growing up in her father’s household and recalled that ‘it consisted in thinking ourselves superior to our Presbyterian neighbours’.

Yet this seems a harsh judgement on her father given the extent of practical support which he gave to the resurgent Episcopal Church (p. 213). Other members of the Charlotte Chapel trustees betray deeply-held religious feelings. Religious preambles were rare amongst the wills of members of Charlotte Chapel, yet those who died before 1840 were more likely to have one than those who lived later. William Arbuthnot, resident of Charlotte Square and Tory provost when George IV visited Edinburgh in 1822, bequeathed his soul to God when he died in 1829: ‘I most humbly recommend my soul to the mercy of Almighty God the first great author of my being, earnestly imploring his forgiveness’.

Jane Duff, who died in 1839, was the wife of one trustee (James Clerk) and sister of another (Adam Duff). Her will had the most Evangelical preface of all the wills in the congregation: ‘Whereas the hour of death is so uncertain & trusting in the mercies of my Blessed Redeemer that when I am drawing near to my great change I will be supported by him & that my mind may be free from worldly anxiety and that I may rest in him.’

Scott commenting on the Lancastrian School Society (p. 195) described it as ‘the most vehement & rigid Calvinists in league with the Metaphysical school of the Edinburgh
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‘Review’, implying the reviewers’ scepticism had led to religious doubt after all. However, this was the hyperbole of political polemic. The ‘metaphysical school’ of Dugald Stewart’s philosophy might be irreverent, like Sydney Smith or Scott himself and Jeffrey in their attack on James Beattie, but this irreverence stemmed from a desire to shake the church out of what they regarded as an intellectual backwardness detrimental to religion. As Episcopalian they might, moreover, have inherited a tradition of quietism, acquiescing for practical purposes in the establishment of the Church of Scotland but keeping their religion of the heart firmly private. In Charlotte Chapel, Daniel Sandford demonstrated that religion need not be intellectually backward; in uniting the Episcopal Church and demonstrating it had no quarrel with the Presbyterians, he removed the need for quietism; and in his preaching he challenged quietism in favour of ‘confessing Christ’, as he entitled one of his Sermons for Young Persons. The result was a resurgence in active, articulate religion. The narrative from the perspective of Charlotte Chapel, where Sydney Smith, Henry Cockburn, and Walter Scott were all connected, suggests a subtle process of transformation of the position and nature of religion in Edinburgh intellectual society: the intellectual discrediting of the religion of the elites by the Enlightenment; the retention of religious feeling amongst women and the lower orders; the availability of impiety as a tool of attack by political opponents; and the consequent desire to reassert a ‘grown-up’, enlightened form of religion. This interpretation helps to explain the popularity of Charlotte Chapel, and the rapid rise, from a culture critical of religion, of Evangelicalism in elite Edinburgh.

5.6 The Jacobite Inheritance

Charlotte Chapel congregation bore a weight of Jacobite inheritance which gave a distinctive shape to their religion and politics in Presbyterian Edinburgh. Attachment to Jacobite ideas was strongest amongst groups not exposed to Stewartite influence: older, female and less Edinburgh-based members of the congregation. However, despite the younger generation’s rejection of its unenlightened premises, Jacobite culture provided the seed of creative developments at the end of the period.

Although founded fifty years after the ‘45, Charlotte Chapel congregation still contained Jacobites who had grown up before the possibility of another attempt at Stuart restoration waned towards Charles Edward Stuart’s death in 1788. Mary and Margaret Hay
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were the daughters of John Hay of Restalrig, treasurer to Charles. They were girls of around fourteen and eleven at the time of Charles’ occupation of Edinburgh, of an age for the wearing of a white cockade and the waving from windows to a delivering prince to make the deepest impression. Their contemporary Margaret Urquhart was the daughter of the Jacobite John Urquhart of Craigston and Cromarty who considered his narrow escapes in 1715 from slaughter at Sheriffmuir, capture at Clova and arrest in London, and his successful privateering in Spain, which enabled him to recover the family estates, as marks of divine favour. Men faced pressure to change their beliefs to pragmatic Hanoverianism, if they were gentry (like William Forbes, below) wishing to recover confiscated estates or to vote, or if they were professionals who wished to hold office. Episcopal bishops saved their consciences from the charge of pragmatism by turning to mystical religion and Hutchinsonianism, to free their church from the theology which put them under penal law (p. 26). Physicians, who were not required to swear an oath of abjuration, were notoriously Jacobite. Sandford’s wife Helen’s father Erskine Douglas (d.1791) and Mary Congalton’s father Charles were both physicians who initially fled abroad but were later able to return to live privately. When the memorialist Alexander Carlyle met Charles Congalton in Leiden in 1758 he found a ‘naïf and ingenuous soul’ cherishing his heartfelt Jacobitism, while John Sandford wrote that his grandfather Erskine Douglas remained with Charles Edward in France, and ‘never spoke of the prince but with tears in his eyes, as “his dear master”‘. Women, too, faced little pressure to change their beliefs. It is significant that it was an elderly lady who disconcerted Daniel Sandford at the start of his ministry by her ‘habit of starting from her knees during the most solemn parts of divine service’, because she maintained that ‘prayer for the house of Hanover [...] was little short of sacrilege’. A strong influence in the 1790s childhood of Linlathen and his theologian brother Thomas was their Jacobite grandmother who continued to hold nonjuring Episcopalian services in Airth castle. The strength of this historic religio-political worldview in Edinburgh would prove a strong influence in the political development of the younger generation.

There was a strong Jacobite heritage amongst Charlotte Chapel’s founders, besides Sandford’s father-in-law, William Forbes’s father, sixth baronet of Pitsligo and Sandford’s
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Scottish patron (p. 86), might have remembered the ‘45 as an event in early childhood: he was born in 1739. His uncle, Alexander Lord Forbes of Pitsligo, was a Jacobite mystic who lived in hiding in Scotland until his death in 1762. The sixth baronet bought back the forfeited family estates thanks to his success as a banker. Although the family’s restoration required him to pledge allegiance to George III, his heart was not in this pragmatic loyalty. In 1793 he decided it would be unwise to meet the Stuart heir, Cardinal Henry, while in Rome: ‘to have called him His Majesty, I could not think altogether proper on my part’, but he could not conceive of addressing him in any other form.\footnote{Quoted in Rowan Strong, Alexander Penrose Forbes of Brechin: the First Tractarian Bishop (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) p. 4.}

James Clerk twenty-five years younger, was not a Jacobite himself, but was heir to a leading non-juring theologian, Bishop Thomas Rattray. William Arbuthnot’s widowed mother was Margaret Urquhart’s sister, so tales of his grandfather’s Jacobite adventures (p. 219) featured largely in family lore.\footnote{Slade, “Craigston Castle, Aberdeenshire”.
}

Colin MacKenzie’s wife Elizabeth was William Forbes’s sister, and his brother William MacKenzie married another direct descendent of Bishop Rattray, Mary Mansfield. These strong Jacobite connections challenge assumptions about the nature of this qualified chapel with its English clergyman. Far from being an alien ‘intrusion’ from the Church of England, Charlotte Chapel had deep roots in Jacobite Scottish Episcopalianism.

Like Forbes and Urquhart many elite Charlotte Chapel families followed a pattern of Jacobitism, exile and recovery. Euphemia MacKenzie, Anne Lindsay and John MacKenzie all had ancestors who had come out in the ‘15 and subsequently recovered the family estates and titles, although for the younger Anne and John these events must have seemed as distant as the First World War heroism of the ancestor of a twenty-first-century undergraduate. Far more recent recoveries had been made by families whose members came out in the ‘45 and subsequently fled to Europe. Mary Carnegie’s father made a fortune in exile in Sweden, buying back the family estate of Pitarrow aged forty. Agnes Hamilton’s grandfather William Hamilton rebelled from his Whig family to become a Jacobite poet: their influence and his literary popularity gained his pardon in time for him to return from France and inherit the family estate of Bangour in West Lothian from his brother. The grandfather of Agnes’ husband John Chichester was not so lucky: a major in Charles Edward’s army, he was executed in 1746.\footnote{A. MacDonald and A. MacDonald, The Clan Donald vol. 3 (Inverness: Northern Counties Publishing Company, 1904) p. 460.}

Yet Jacobitism was a fading force.
George Arbuthnot was reminded of his grandfather’s Jacobite adventures when he visited the tombs of the Stuarts in Rome in 1828. His account expresses a tourist’s curiosity with none of the discomposure felt by William Forbes’ father making a similar journey thirty-five years earlier: ‘This James used in my early days, when spoken of in Scotland to be distinguished by the name of the Chevalier’, he wrote of the name on one tomb. The convinced allegiance to the House of Stuart of those who fought in the ‘45 was not passed on to their descendents.

While Jacobite politics died out, the younger generation of Charlotte Chapel inherited a rich, and valued, cultural heritage. Elizabeth MacBean was the wife of Coll MacDonald whose legal career in Edinburgh put his ancestral Highland estate back on a firm financial footing (p. 151). Elizabeth and Coll lived at the heart of the Edinburgh establishment at 42 Castle Street, with a growing family baptised at Charlotte Chapel and a luxury entourage of horses, dogs and servants in his tax records. Coll was one of a small group who still paid hair-powder tax in 1811, which according to Cockburn had even by the 1790s become a mark of staunch Hanoverianism: ‘Our loyal [...] though beginning to tire of the greasy and dusty dirt, laid it on with profuse patriotism’. However, the hero of family legend was a far less elegant character. Elizabeth’s grandfather, Gillies ‘Mor’ MacBean, an innkeeper at Dalmagerry near Inverness, was a six-foot giant who had slain thirteen dragoons at Culloden before falling himself. He was commemorated in verse by Lord Byron, in a song set to dramatically sentimental music by the popular British composer John Clerk-Whitfeld:


Such sentiments, which would have been seditious in the 1760s, were by 1815 a very acceptable form of romance for a professional Edinburgh family. Robert Shuttleworth, an Englishman who married Janet Marjoribanks in Charlotte Chapel in 1816, also had romantic Jacobite connections. Janet’s family home was in Lees, close to Walter Scott’s home at Abbotsford. Shuttleworth reopened the family house
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Gawthorpe Hall in Lancashire, an Elizabethan mansion with a legend about Jacobite treasure in the east wing. However, he died tragically in a carriage accident in 1818, leaving an infant daughter and cutting short his ambitions to be a model country gentleman. When Janet remarried in 1824 her second husband described Robert’s portrait as ‘a harsh, rather powerful and very intelligent countenance but showing much ill-temper and by no means of a liberal cast’[177] In Scott’s novel Redgauntlet (1824), the hero Darsie Latimer is proved to be the heir of Sir Robert Redgauntlet by his ‘way of bending his brows, that men saw the visible mark of a horseshoe in his forehead, deep dinted, as if it had been stamped there’[178] The fierce-faced Lancashire Jacobite Robert Redgauntlet seems to bear a striking resemblance to Shuttleworth whom Scott probably met in 1816. Redgauntlet concludes with a masterful anticlimax in which the Jacobite conspirators, who believed themselves committed to succeed or die, ‘return quietly home to their own houses’ at the bidding of the unarmed General Campbell. Yet even the Hanoverian Campbell cannot but be touched by the romance of Charles Edward’s last exile from Britain, and ‘Whig and Campbell as he was, [...] could not help joining in the universal Amen! which resounded from the shore’ in response to the blessing a nonjuring ‘Oxford divine’ sends after the Pretender’s departing boat[179] Scott’s fictional Jacobites prove as amenable to ‘common sense’ as if they had attended Dugald Stewart’s lectures; yet his sympathetic Whig Campbell learns from them that Enlightenment alone was a cold creed. For Scott the legacy of Jacobitism was to demonstrate not that the Enlightenment was wrong – he demonstrates its necessity for peace and prosperity – but that it was insufficient, if it was devoid of warmth and romance.

At the time of Charlotte Chapel, Common Sense philosophy gained credence from the real material blessings of Hanoverian Britain in an economic boom. It was the next generation, growing up in more difficult circumstances, who began to question it. One of the first vestry of St John’s, Roger Aytoun, was a Whig lawyer rising in social rank. His wife, however, whose grandfather was a trustee of the non-juring church Old St Paul’s, retained her Jacobite worldview, and bequeathed it to her son William Edmonstone Aytoun. William had reason to question Whig optimism: his father’s later years had been blighted by financial difficulties and he had died in debt. William grew up with a renewed faith in a divinely-ordained hierarchical society. Whereas for Scott balladry and
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clanship were matters of historical interest, for young Aytoun they were really true:

Rise, hill and glen! rise, crag and wood!
Rise up on either hand –
Again upon the Garry’s banks,
On Scottish soil we stand.

Aytoun was one of the founders of an early Scottish nationalist movement, the Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights. However, with little hope of success for his political agenda, he developed an alternative voice as a satirist and critic, as Whigs had done in the previous generation, writing hilarious tales of doomed railway projects in obscure glens and absurd Scottish town councils blighted alike by timeless clan feuds and an obsession with British commerce:

I heard a wee bird singing clear,
In the tight, tight month of June –
‘What garr’d ye buy when stocks were high,
And sell when shares were doun?’

Oh bonny were the Midland Halves,
When credit was sae free! –
But wae betide the Southron loon
That sold they Halves to me.

Just as Whig reviewers like Sydney Smith had criticised the Tory hegemony, so Aytoun satirised the new Whig one his father had helped to create.

Charlotte Chapel shows how the Jacobite legacy was transmitted to nineteenth-century Scottish thought, but also that it was not a continuous legacy. Walter Scott was as much a product of the Enlightenment as his Whig contemporaries, and while he employed Jacobite history to criticise it, that criticism was from a shared, enlightened, philosophical premise. Aytoun’s son’s ‘neo-Jacobitism’ and Scottish nationalism was not the same as the original Jacobitism of women like Mary Hay but a new phenomenon.

5.7 Daniel Sandford and Gender Reconciliation

The discussion so far suggests a that around 1800 Edinburgh had a gendered intellectual climate, with university-educated men committed to reason and the scientific method increasingly in conflict with women as the guardians of piety and tradition. It has already been observed how Daniel Sandford and Sydney Smith challenged this gendering by encouraging men to return to church and preaching a religion compatible with the scientific Enlightenment. This section argues that Daniel Sandford, with his background amongst intellectual women (p. 45), also worked from the other direction, to encourage women to develop their intellects and challenge Scott and Jeffrey’s generalisation about ‘bishops and good ladies’. In her study of the impact of the Scottish Presbyterian Church on the position of women after 1830, Lesley Orr Macdonald argues that the church tended to reinforce social and biological difference of women, limiting them to a domestic sphere. However, as discussed above (p. 46) Daniel Sandford does not fit this pattern, nor, as will be seen below (p. 195) can he be included in Hilton’s generalisation about religious attitudes based on the example of the high church opponent of unrestricted education, Sarah Trimmer.

Only once did Sandford provide different advice for men and women. Cautioning them in 1802, before the rise of ‘wholesome’ examples of the genre, ‘against that pernicious class of books, called Novels’, Sandford suggested, ‘it may be particularly necessary to bid young women to beware of [...] the least evil, that they will infallibly destroy their taste for good and sensible writing [...] and to caution young men against the authors, who may [...] unsettle their principles, and, under the specious pretence of delivering them from the thrall of prejudice, [...] cheat them out of their religion and morality’. It is striking that he regard the danger to women as the ‘least evil’: men, with their poor church attendance (p. 208), were regarded as in greater moral danger in Edinburgh.

This relatively trivial discussion of novel-reading in his very first published sermon
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was the first and last time Sandford published gendered instruction. Elsewhere in the same sermon he appears about to do so, but dismisses the difference as inapplicable to changing times: ‘Although the evils [of ‘the world’] here enumerated, may be considered as chiefly affecting youth of one sex only, and not as much to be apprehended by those whose lives ought to be much more retired, and therefore less exposed to a mixture of society, – still let these last remember, that the manners of the world at present do but too loudly proclaim, that young women, as well as young men, have in no small measure their share in these dangers’. This was also the only time he suggested women’s lives ‘ought to be much more retired’: from this point on, his emphasis was always on activism. If he regretted the rise of mixed assemblies, as his son claimed he ‘sometimes regretted that the days were gone when birth and breeding were preferred to wealth’, the evidence of his published writing suggests his theology adapted to the New Town’s mixed ranks and sexes with barely a backwards glance.

Sandford’s abandonment of any distinction between retired women and active men accompanied the development of his message that the religious manifestation of Enlightenment activism applied just as much in the domestic as the political arena, if not more so. His ‘rule of life’ (p. 50) dismissed moral codes which could be followed ‘without descending to the serious and often minute occurrences of our domestic concerns’. In urging young people to honour their parents, he said that providing a Christian upbringing was one of the highest, and most richly rewarded, expressions of faith: ‘no man, believe me, who has not felt it, can by any means express the exultation, and transport, which a parent experiences in the good and virtuous behaviour of his son.’ He cautioned parents against valuing a child’s marriage only for its economic benefits. ‘We forbid them not to attend to the injunctions of temporal prudence; [...] But [...] let them not refuse to [...] learn from the marriage of “the sons of Seth with the daughters of Cain”, the consequences which may be expected from alliances formed without the fear of God’.

Sandford’s emphasis on the domestic stemmed as much from his personality as from his beliefs. He believed the chronic pain he suffered for much of his life to be an easy trial
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sent by a kindly God, since ‘a more than ordinary share of domestic happiness was the blessing that counterbalanced it’[191]. The death of his eldest daughter Eleanor at twenty-one was the hardest challenge his faith encountered. ‘Thou gavest, and thou hast taken away, – blessed be thy holy name,’ he wrote in a private prayer. ‘Thou hast been pleased by the removal of my very precious child to teach me my folly and sin [...] Why [...] should I be unwilling to resign her to thy will? [...] I feel this sorrow weigh down my heart; support me, for I am nothing but weakness’[192]. His religion of the heart found its supreme location in domestic relationships.

The British Critic’s rather cynical review of the Remains, nevertheless praised highly the portrait of Sandford as a father: ‘His letters to his sons [...] give us the highest opinion of the Bishop’s head and heart, and are well deserving of the deepest attention by every young person who enters [...] university. [...] In] the letters to his daughters, we perceive the same good spirit of piety, parental love, and unceasing care [...], mixed with an amiable playfulness which could not fail to render his communications quite delightful’[193]. This gendering of this comment derives more from the attitude of the reviewer than from the letters themselves. Sandford’s children followed the conventional gendered paths, his sons going to university while his daughters spent time visiting friends, yet the qualities of parenthood revealed in the letters do not suggest Sandford expected his sons and daughters to think differently. In December 1813 he advised his fifteen-year-old son Daniel Keyt, ‘young people [...] are too apt to think that cheerfulness cannot exist without levity. Now, levity is unbecoming a man of sense, a gentleman, and a Christian. Do not consider this an observation of “old square toes”’[194]. This was very much the kind of remark the Critic considered ‘piety, parental love, and unceasing care [...], mixed with an amiable playfulness’. If there is an implication in the Critic’s remarks that his letters to his daughters had less intellectual content, this is misleading. A few weeks after his letter to Daniel, he wrote to his daughter Sarah, ‘The most pleasing thing I have seen in the papers for a great while is Segur’s proclamation to the people of the department de l’Aube [...] which the Austrians are about to enter; and neither Segur nor his wicked master can rouse the people to arms, probably for a very good reason, namely, that the late conscription has left very few capable of bearing arms’. Sandford appears to realise

this is an unconventional way to write to a thirteen-year-old girl: 'I am writing politics to
my little girl', he adds, but he is confident, as she is reading Classical history, that she will
understand the evangelical import of the present events: ‘You are reading Rollin who
will show you how divine Providence brought about the Revolutions in the Old World –
the same irresistible power and infinite wisdom are producing the wonderful events of
this day’. The following August, Sandford sent Sarah a detailed linguistic, exegetical
and liturgical answer to a question from her about the Hebrew interjection ‘Selah’ in the
psalms.

Sandford’s letters to his daughters recall his aunt Hester Chapone’s belief that young
women should enter deeply into the study of history, science, literature and especially
scripture, and the interest he took in his daughters struck readers at the time. Sandford’s
Remains was the last book Coleridge ever read, noting of John Sandford’s comment, ‘in
the society of his daughters he was always happy and always delightful’, that ‘I have
never met with this remark in any other book – it is most beautiful, & of the deepest &
dearest moral interest’. After Frances married, her father wrote to her less as
a pupil and more as a fellow-scholar, for example engaging her in his hunt for ‘internal
evidences’ of the truth of scripture. Eight years earlier he had written to Frances, then
sixteen, that girls’ education inclined them to impatience and inattention: ‘We male crea-
tures have one advantage [...] The attention which we are taught to bestow on Euclid’s
Elements, we learn to transfer to other things, and this is the whole secret of the observa-
tion that men generally reason better than women. They do so, I believe, generally, and
only because they are obliged, while they are learning to be men, to cultivate the habit of
attention.

Women were educated differently, and played a different role in society, but
they were men’s intellectual equals. Yet it is clear, from the serious courses of reading and
the tasks he set his daughters, that he believed women perfectly capable of overcoming
this educational disadvantage. Through the Lancastrian Schools, he aimed to begin the
process of making the benefits of education truly universal. When Sandford preached
for the schools in 1813 he explained that one of the two new buildings would be dedi-
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cated to ‘female children, in which, besides the ordinary instruction, the pupils will be taught such branches of female education as are likely to fit them to be more useful in the different departments of common life’. Whereas boys of the labouring classes might earn their living by physical strength, girls would advance in the world only through skill: their curriculum was therefore fuller.

Despite this stress on the intellectual equality of women, in one of his sermons of 1802 gave a classic description of the patriarchal family. The ‘master and father’ at the head should show ‘mildness in commanding [...] and solicitude for [...] those who are under his controul [sic], and guidance, and protection’, and should ‘love his wife even as himself’, the wife should be characterised by ‘tenderness, and meekness, and obedience’, the children by ‘submission and reverence’, and, at the bottom of the hierarchy, the servants should work as if they were ‘the servants of Christ’. The patriarchal family provided the basis of his conception of the divine order: ‘Moses was only a servant in that house of which Christ is the head and the builder [...] But Christ came as a Son, over his own house, to govern with eternal dominion the family whom he had created.

Yet, given the scriptural justification for the patriarchal family, the biologically dictated division of gender roles, and the supposed reassertion of paternalism in this period, it is more striking that this is almost the only reference, again, only at the start of his publishing career, that this home-loving man made to the patriarchal structure of the family.

Sandford’s theology made no distinction between gender or rank in the sight of God. Listing the different ways in which holy communion might be useful, he did not list different types of person – men, women, rich, poor, for example – but different conditions which might affect most people over the course of their life: ‘the strong’, ‘the weak’, ‘those [...] engaged in the business and active duties of life’, the dying, ‘the prosperous and happy’, and ‘the suffering’ When he preached on the disobedience of Eve, there was no hint that her sins had anything to do with their gender. ‘Deprived of the protection of the faith and the fear of God, Eve fell an easy prey to the seducer,’ he explained. ‘The progress of sin is the same in all cases with ourselves’ His inclusive first-person plural emphasised that what happened to Eve could happen to anybody. Similarly, Lot’s wife provided an example for all humanity of the need for unswerving repentance.
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Sandford’s sermons and letters suggest he fully adopted Hester Chapone’s belief that women were capable of serious, rational scholarship for its own sake rather than to attract a husband, and applied that belief to his daughters, catechumens and wider society. To this bluestocking inheritance he added the universality and activism of Evangelical religion. He prepared male and female children for confirmation together, teaching them equally to consider themselves as soldiers under the banner of Christ, and it was a young woman he recalled as a particularly good pupil (p. 96). Just as he encouraged young men to regard religion as worthwhile and manly, so he taught young women to conceive of themselves, in Stewartite and evangelical terms, as perfectible beings, with a heroic task before them, and the full support of God and society behind them. Without making outspoken challenges to his society’s norms, Sandford’s ministry of reconciliation included narrowing the gap between male and female.

5.8 Conclusion

The Charlotte Chapel study provides a fresh angle on party, gender and religious relations in the early nineteenth-century. The intellectual leadership of this community were shaped above all by the Common Sense Enlightenment taught by Dugald Stewart at Edinburgh University. This was true not only of the Whig party but also, the evidence of Charlotte Chapel’s Tory majority suggests, of the Tories. Daniel Sandford’s Evangelical preaching successfully reclaimed Episcopacy from the Jacobite remnant as a fashionable and enlightened form of Protestantism, re-evangelising this disenchanted male intelligentsia. At the same time, influenced by the egalitarian philosophy of the enlightenment and his own formative years in the circle of the English Bluestockings, he encouraged women to develop their reason, grow out of superstitious or irrational religion and regard themselves as fully participatory in this intellectual, spiritual project. Sandford and his congregation, unlike high church episcopalianism, were friendly towards Presbyterians and eager to engage in interdenominational projects such as the Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools or Edinburgh Institution for the Improvement of Sacred Music. There are signs that a new Tory identity was beginning to distinguish itself from the Stewartite consensus, although this took two forms. One, of which there was little sign of favour amongst the Charlotte Chapel group, was the influence of high church Toryism which found expression in the opposition to Lancastrian education, which publicly opposed. The other, for which there is far more evidence of interest amongst
the Charlotte Chapel group, not least because St John’s Chapel and the Waverley Novels were both products of its members, was the influence of romanticism. These findings shed new and nuanced light on our understanding of intellectual positions and conflicts in Regency Edinburgh.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

Lawrence Stone listed various areas of historical enquiry which he believed might be illuminated by the prosopographical method. These have all been explored in the Charlotte Chapel study, and a summary of them serves to demonstrate the value of the methodology. Stone’s first area was ‘analysis of the role in society, and especially changes in that role over time, of specific [...] status groups’. The changing composition over time of the congregation (p. 106) and of the chapel officials in particular (p. 123) as well as the significance of the wealth arriving in the community from India during the 1810s (p. 157) all suggest the relative decline of traditional Scottish landed elites in favour of new moneyed individuals: the embryonic middle class. Prosopography reveals how the physical building of the New Town and rapid economic growth resulted in social change.

In Stone’s second area, ‘the degree of social mobility at certain levels by a study of the family origins, social and geographical’, Charlotte Chapel revealed a high level of social mobility at all levels and in both directions in Edinburgh in this period. In some ways it appears as a levelling: former servant Samuel Hopporton (p. 168), former Highland laird Ranald MacDonald (p. 147), and formerly grandly aspirational Mary Douglas (p. 142) and John Mather (p. 170) all ended their lives on the fringes of suburban Edinburgh gentility. Yet for others it was a time of spectacular fortune-making. Henry Cockburn, Roger Aytoun, Colin MacKenzie and Walter Scott demonstrated how education and patronage could turn into a landed estate and a West End mansion thanks to Edinburgh’s legal, literary and official opportunities, although these beneficiaries of Edinburgh’s boom all experienced the harsh realities of cyclical economics, and struggled financially from the late 1820s. The biggest gamble was India, with its high mortality rate, to which,

for example, Mary Roxburgh fell victim, but the possibility of spectacular fortune, from which people like Robert Downie reaped the benefits.

Stone’s third area, ‘the uncovering of the deeper interests that are thought to lie beneath the rhetoric of politics’ is explored in Chapter Five, for example, in the link between political allegiance and social rank (p. 182). Finally, Stone’s ‘correlation of intellectual or religious movements with social, geographical, occupational or other factors’ might be said to sum up the aim of the thesis, showing how Daniel Sandford’s Evangelical Episcopalianism was suited to the British, bourgeois and aspirational society of Edinburgh’s West End. To understand this society is to understand Henry Cockburn’s apt description of the twenty years following the French Revolution, ‘every thing, not this or that thing, but literally every thing, was soaked in this one event’, applied to the social, economic, political, religious and domestic life of a community. Far from being a staid bastion of a stable social order against the French Revolution, this new chapel, in a restored denomination, located in a new town, within a city which for the past fifty years had been at the forefront of the European Enlightenment, was receptive to new ideas and experiencing rapid and sometimes uncomfortable social change.

The importance of reassessing Daniel Sandford shaped the study as a prosopography combined with biography, with the group portrait of the congregation and the individual portrait of the rector, developed in Chapter Two, each lending insight to the other. Daniel Sandford was habitually described in print at the time by his credentials ‘of Christ Church, Oxford’. Yet the more important influences on his thought appear to have been the warm, enlightened spirituality of the bluestocking circle, and the active, scientific Common Sense philosophy of Dugald Stewart’s Edinburgh. Sandford was responsible for the union and growth that were transformative for the social and financial position of the Scottish Episcopal Church, although his outward, activist focus and his readiness to collaborate with Presbyterians in the missionary task made him a problematic figure within a church whose clergy and historians set a high value on distinctiveness. Sandford was one of a generation of theologians whose ‘casual’ attitude to denomination was, as Reginald Ward observed, ‘quite opaque’ to historians from the 1830s onwards, but the same might be said of other aspects of his theology. John Sandford reinvented his father as a Victorian Anglican with charming eighteenth-century quirks. Whereas recent eccl-
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siastical historians have assumed that Episcopal clergy distanced themselves both from Edinburgh’s ‘Humeish’ Stewartite philosophical circle\(^4\) and from the egalitarian Evangelical revival\(^5\). Sandford’s writings suggest that, as is now recognised of mainstream Anglicans elsewhere\(^6\) and of Edinburgh’s Conservative ideologue Scott\(^7\), his worldview was transformed by these ideas, which shared a great deal in common.

Where Sandford appears to have diverged from this ‘Whig-wild’ coalition, which came to political prominence in Edinburgh in the 1805 Leslie affair (p. 48), was in rejecting the more utilitarian or dogmatic developments of these worldviews from the late 1810s in favour of the more heartfelt direction of the early romantic movement. The importance of the romantic movement in Charlotte Chapel appears in Walter Scott’s close personal ties to many leading members of Charlotte Chapel (p. 17), the apparently romantic rather than high-church motivation behind Sandford’s worship style in the new St John’s (p. 81), parallels with the romantic cultural revival of Bishop Burgess (p. 84), the links to Episcopalianism in Scott’s romanticism for example regarding Christmas (p. 182) and Jacobitism (p. 222), and the suggestion of Scott’s romantic influence in the style of Sandford’s commission to young confirmants (p. 98). The role of high-status women in retaining Jacobite ideology into the nineteenth century, long after men in their families had come under pragmatic pressure to conform, and transmitting it to a younger generation (p. 219) is a potentially important cultural influence in this process which would merit further research. The links between the revival of Enlightened Episcopalianism and the popularisation of the romantic movement would merit further dedicated study.

Chapter Three presented the social history findings of the prosopographical study of 431 individuals connected to Charlotte Chapel as officials in through the registers, listed in the Biographical Catalogue. The conclusions challenge assumptions about Episcopalian elitism in studies such as those of Brown and MacLaren\(^8\). Charlotte Chapel congregation did reflect the high status nature of its location, but, as Gordon has shown, the first New Town had a far higher level of social integration than later developments, and the congregation reflected the full range of inhabitants, with around half the congrega-
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tion coming from the artisan, serving or labouring ranks. The assumption generalised from John Sandford’s remark that Charlotte Chapel was ‘English’ proved misleading, since there were twice as many Scots as English in the congregation (Figure 3.5).

Studying experiences of marriage in the group is problematic: both the sample, based largely on the baptism register which represents young, fertile couples, and the other evidence, which being largely wills and personal letters represents the higher status members as does the marriage register. It would be a mistake, therefore, to generalise about Edinburgh society, or Episcopalian society, on the basis of the findings of this section. However, this analysis does suggest that the social leadership of this society, the young professionals of Charlotte Square and the surrounding streets, was characterised by a highly successful domestic life with long, happy marriages and large, healthy families – although one might speculate that this predominant success may have made life more difficult for those whose lives did not conform. Although numerous examples of the single (e.g., Adam Duff), the infertile (Elizabeth Erskine), the failed husband (John Mather), the unmarried mother (Christian Chapman), or the bereaved father (Thomas Tod) are found amongst the group, they have not, unlike the domestically successful, left personal reflections on their experiences.

The final part of Chapter Three, which analysed the addresses of Charlotte Chapel’s members, suggested that Sandford’s chapel was not what might be described as a ‘cult’ model of religion, with people gathering from a wide area to find a very specific religious product, but rather a ‘community’ model, serving people for whom it was the most convenient place of worship, perhaps including some from Presbyterian backgrounds. The evidence from Charlotte Chapel is of limited value, however, in the absence of a wider study of patterns and motivations of lay church attendance in Edinburgh which, given its unusual religious landscape, would provide an interesting comparison to similar studies of other parts of Britain. Charlotte Chapel appears to have been a fast-growing, bourgeois and British community, with a close-knit Scottish, privileged core and a diverse periphery characterised by large numbers of English petty-bourgeois and Scottish servant classes taking advantage of the booming Edinburgh consumer economy. Over the

11See p. 170 for John Mather, p. 119 for Elizabeth Erskine, p. 119 for Thomas Tod. Sandford notes in the register that John Chapman is Christian’s ‘natural son’. the bachelor Adam Duff demonstrates an interest in his posterity by leaving legacies to three great-nephews and two sons of dependents named Adam (Will, NAS SC70/1/59/513).
period, Charlotte Chapel became more socially diverse, and witnessed a striking revolution in its leadership from the social core, representing an interconnected hereditary elite, to more lowly and obscure but far wealthier individuals from India and commercial backgrounds. The changing social and national composition and the importance of successful domesticity amongst its social leaders pose interesting questions for the largely uninvestigated social history of Regency Edinburgh, as to whether these patterns were typical or unusual.

The background to the social changes was Edinburgh’s economic boom, of which little has been written, and of which Charlotte Chapel forms an interesting case-study developed in Chapter Four. This study of the congregation’s wealth suggests that if Whatley had compared London in 1700 with late eighteenth-century Edinburgh, once the country of which it was capital had reached a comparable level of economic development, his conclusion about Edinburgh as a driver of growth might have been very different.\(^{12}\) The economic activity of Charlotte Chapel’s government officials (p. 155) or returning nabobs (p. 161) suggests similar patterns to those among the London merchants studied by David Hancock, powerful agents of economic transformation whose opportunistic, global, improving and integrative careers defy macro-economic study.\(^{13}\) An analysis of the sources of the group’s wealth suggests that the late eighteenth-century Scottish economic miracle had no less dubious foundations than economic miracles elsewhere: a corrupt political system, the plunder of India, the profits of war, and to a lesser degree the exploitation of West Indian slave plantations and the Scottish Highlands. However, the miracle depended on the economic ‘alertness’ both of the beneficiaries of this wealth, who reinvested it in improvement, infrastructure and social development; and of the immigrants who transformed the consumer economy. Banker [John MacKenzie](#), merchant [Robert Cockburn](#) and industrialist [Marten Dalrymple](#) developed almost heroic reputations. Entrepreneurial widows like caterer [Elizabeth Burn](#) and hairdresser [Anna Underwood](#) ran businesses, published books and launched their children into the professions.

The first beneficiaries of the economic boom were the families of the established elite, able to access military commissions and civilian offices through the Dundas regime. These men largely proved competent and efficient, reinvesting their wealth to benefit


the economy further. However, their fortunes began to be outclassed by lower-born adventurers prepared to gamble with their lives in India, or their reputations in literature. While he did not go to India or make a fortune, Daniel Sandford himself was a prime example of this new economic order: an immigrant entrepreneur who, with little chance of promotion in England was prepared to make the daring but successful personal commitment of uniting with the Scottish Episcopal Church. This helps to explain the originality and appropriateness of his ministry in Edinburgh at the time.

The continued neglect of the economic role of Scotland’s largest city before 1830 distorts the national historiography. Devine’s emphasis on industry in History of the Scottish Nation, based on data after 1841 when Glasgow was indeed larger and more dynamic, is moderated in Scotland’s Empire, 1600-1815 which argues that the economic impact of empire has been underestimated; however, this study mentions Edinburgh only eight times, either as the location for ceremonial events, or to make unfavourable economic comparisons with Glasgow. While Charlotte Chapel congregation was a small and unrepresentative group, the range and dynamism of its economic activity hints at the importance of a reassessment of Edinburgh’s development in this period for understanding Scottish economic takeoff. The impact on Edinburgh of India, in particular, would appear particularly worthy of more detailed study.

Chapter Five explores politics, piety and gender in Charlotte Chapel, both to give intellectual context to Daniel Sandford’s theology, and to understand the influence of Sandford’s theology in the vibrant intellectual world of Edinburgh. It necessarily focuses mainly on chapel’s university-educated elite, who were the most articulate, although there are hints, for example in the case of James Cooper (p. 214) of how this elite culture appears to have been partly imitated and partly transformed lower down the social scale, a phenomenon which would form an interesting part of a wider study on Scotland’s regency petty-bourgeoisie. The most striking aspect of gender relations in the group is the absence of ‘separate spheres’, a theme which has remained so persistent in studies beginning in the 1830s of ostensibly similar communities, for example on Presbyterian churches by Lesley MacDonald and on the West End of Glasgow by Gordon and Nair.

In the community of Charlotte Chapel, political links were strengthened through marriages and family outings, much professional work was done at home, the highly domes-
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ticated culture was owned and celebrated by men, and women were involved in public institutions in a wide range of ways. This study tends to support Amanda Vickery’s conclusion, based on her study of Lancashire society in an overlapping period, that the appearance of ‘spheres’ rhetoric ‘was simply a defensive and impotent reaction to public freedoms already won’, rather than a true resurgent conservatism.\(^{16}\) This helps explain the correlation between rank and Whig and Tory party affiliation. Figure 5.1 suggests that while privileged professionals like [Henry Cockburn](#) might have made an ideological choice based on the arguments of the debating society, the ‘old money’ landed gentry were largely Tory, while self-made and petty-bourgeois ‘new money’ were mostly Whig.

In [Henry Cockburn](#)’s account, the Whig and Tory division appears as a mighty geological feature in this Edinburgh era; yet this study emphasises rather the importance of intellectual common ground of the generation of the Charlotte Chapel baptism registers, and the greater importance of rifts with older and younger generations. This was hinted at by [Cockburn](#) when he described the young Whigs’ awkwardness at the Ante Manum Club (p. 188). The majority of educated professionals in Charlotte Chapel were members of the less well-studied Tory party, men such as [Colin MacKenzie](#), [David Hume](#), and [Walter Scott](#), and these appear as committed to the scientific and progressive worldview of Stewartite Common Sense philosophy and Political Economy as the more well-studied Edinburgh Whigs.\(^{17}\) This Stewartite Edinburgh Toryism appears in contrast to that of the uneconomic paternalism of Tory landowners (p. 193), and shared common ground with Whiggism in collaborative local action such as the Society for the Suppression of Begging.

Rowan Strong’s account of a fragile church desperate to demonstrate political loyalty has obscured other more ambitious and outward-focused political motivations at the heart of the newly respectable Episcopal Church, which made it an influential force in shaping nineteenth-century society.\(^{18}\) While Bishop [Daniel Sandford](#) might hesitate to support the highly party-political Whig cause of abolition of slavery in 1814, he was prepared to look conspicuous by taking a high-profile role in the whiggish and evangelical Lancastrian Schools, where he was fully convinced of the rightness of the cause and effectiveness of the methodology. The Charlotte Chapel example hints at wider currents in Edinburgh
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political culture and suggests the benefit of more detailed social history of Scottish politics.

The strong Stewartite consensus amongst Edinburgh’s university-educated men helps explain the feminisation of religion. The assumption of historians writing on subjects as diverse as the Leslie affair, Scott or sexuality that Whig intellectual culture around 1800 was sceptical is often stated in simplistic or misleading ways. It is too easy to conclude from superficial similarities that the religious culture of Regency Edinburgh was similar to that of twenty-first century secularisation. Stewartite Common Sense philosophy encouraged a highly sceptical, in the sense of questioning, attitude towards the prejudices and absurdities of the existing churches, yet it did not reject religious faith outright. The gendering proved temporary since clergy such as Episcopalians Daniel Sandford, Sydney Smith, Archibald Alison, James Walker and George Gleig all embraced and absorbed this scepticism into their theology as eagerly as other intellectuals absorbed it into political activity or scientific enquiry. Whereas in the case of Smith and Alison’s latitudinarianism, and Walker and Gleig’s high churchmanship, this enlightenment tended to be at the expense of spiritual warmth, Daniel Sandford in his evangelical theology successfully embraced enlightenment ideas without losing the religion of the heart characteristic of older Hutchinsonian Episcopalianism. The far more abundant evidence of men in the Charlotte Chapel group becoming religiously articulate – evangelical – from the 1820s – testifies to the success of this theology. Far from becoming feminised as Callum Brown argued (p. 41), religion in Charlotte Chapel was reclaimed by intellectual men and, as impiety began to be used as a tool for political attack, became a ‘fashion’ (as Cockburn called it) which both sides were eager to adopt. The Jacobite inheritance, which during the rise of the Stewartite worldview came to appear the quaint preserve of elderly Episcopalian ladies, was resurrected and reinvented by a younger Episcopal generation as material for romanticism.

Daniel Sandford’s work of religious gender reconciliation was not only a case of re-evangelising Edinburgh’s male intelligentsia. It also involved teaching women to regard themselves as equally qualified to participate in the enlightenment project, a task for which he was well-prepared by his upbringing amongst the English Bluestockings, and which perhaps represented a significant intellectual import to Edinburgh, which does

---

20Henry Cockburn, Memorials of his Time (Edinburgh: T.N.Foulis, 1909) p. 49.
not appear to have had a similarly vibrant and self-conscious eighteenth-century Blue-
stocking culture. As with many of the themes of this study, the evidence of the Charlotte
Chapel group raises more questions than it answers, and calls for more detailed research,
building on that of Jane Rendall amongst Whig Presbyterian women, into women’s in-
tellectual participation in Regency Scotland.  

This study of Daniel Sandford and Charlotte Episcopal Chapel in the short period
between 1794 and 1818 has demonstrated how biography and prosopography can com-
bine to enrich one another. The reassessment of Bishop Sandford’s Evangelical Episco-
palian theology, with its enlightenment basis and romantic influences, sheds consider-
able light on the wider Scottish religious landscape. The shifting alliances and conflicts
between Hutchinsonians and Newtonians, high churchmen and whigs, latitudinarians
and evangelicals, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, rationalists and romantics, are all il-
luminated by a fuller understanding of Sandford’s long and influential ministry, and
demonstrates the value of similar detailed study of other influential Scottish Episcopalian
theologians. The social history of Charlotte Chapel congregation shows how Sandford
was both shaped by his era and his community, and was a shaping force within it. The
bourgeois, British congregation, with a core strongly knit by kinship ties and a looser
periphery of local residence and passing visitors, suited a religion that was both toler-
ant and warm, spiritually engaging without being disciplinarian, and accompanied by a
beautiful architecture and music. In a community characterised economically by a con-
sumer boom, Sandford was, like many of his congregation, an immigrant entrepreneur
with a new product: this was religion as a commodity. The venture was a success, re-
claiming Episcopacy from the Jacobite remnant as a fashionable form of Protestantism,
re-evangelising a disenchanted male intelligentsia by providing religion in tune with
the latest in Edinburgh’s philosophical developments, and encouraging women to re-
gard themselves as fully participatory in this intellectual, spiritual project. By 1818, after
which the ambitions of the congregation were dampened by Sandford’s impaired health,
Episcopalianism’s growing theological divisions, and Edinburgh’s economic downturn
on top of a large debt incurred building St John’s, Charlotte Chapel had made its mark.
Early nineteenth-century Edinburgh had been influenced deeply by Evangelical, Enlight-
ened Episcopalianism.

21 Rendall, “Women and Whigs”.
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d.inf died in infancy
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Regency spelling and capitalisation of names beginning Mc or Mac was highly inconsistent: these have all been standardised to the form ‘MacKenzie’.

Anne Aitkin  m. John Crawford  ch. Nancy 1817-. br. 1817

Jane Alder  1766-1816. p. Thomas Alder of Prendwick. m. 1785 David Hume ch. Joseph 1819-, Elizabeth, Agnes, Catherine. a. 47 George Street. br. 1816

Christian Allan  m. Thomas Allan  ch. Christian 1810-, Thomas 1811- a. 19 Charlotte

Square. br. 1811, 1812

**Thomas Allan** 18.8.1785-19.7.1854. p. Robert Allan, banker -19.7.1818. m.ch.a.br. see Christian Allan m. 2. Mary Tweedie. o. Banker. w. £19,337. i. Whig. 203

**Anne Alves** 1778-1846 p. Dr John Alves, physician Inverness -10.1788; Helen Baillie. m. 13.9.1800 William Arbuthnot ch. Robert 1801-, John 1802-, George 1803-, Archibald 1804-, Helen 1805-, William 1807-, James 1809-, Henry Dundas 1811-, Helen Elizabeth 1819-, Anne 1822-. a. 16 Charlotte Square. br. 1811. 18

**Alexander Anderson** m. 29.7.1813, Mary Charters ch. Helen 1814-. o. Mariner. br. 1814


**Mrs Jane Anderson** m. John Anderson ch. Catherine 1810-, Harriet 1817-, Susanna 1822-. br. 1810, 1817

**John Anderson** m.ch.br. see Mrs Jane Anderson

**William Arbuthnot** 1776-1829. p.c. see George Arbuthnot m.ch.a.br. see Anne Alves o. Secretary to the Trustees for Fisheries and Manufactures, Provost of Edinburgh 1815-1817, 1822. w. £35000. i. Tory. of. 1815. 6, 18, 122, 155, 156, 161, 174, 203, 218, 221

**Jane Archibald** m. John Laing ch. John 1811-. br. 1811

**Williamina Helen Baker** 1801-. p. William Baker of a line of William Bakers who were tenants and then freeholders of Baker’s farm, Fonthill Bishop, sold to Susan Beckford’s father in 1796; Helen -1816, living in Hermitage Place, Edinburgh, 1816, then in Cornhill. m. 12.8.1816 David Young ch. William Baker 1818-, Charles 1819-, Robert Hunter 1820-, David 1821-, Helen 1824-, Patrick Henry 1826-, Catherine Jane 1831-, Isabella 1833-, James Addison 1834- went to Australia, Archer 1836-. mr. 1816. 123

---

23 Arbuthnot, *The Arbuthnots.*

Nicholas Baldock  m. 26.11.1811, Anne Hall  ch. Edward 1813-1833, Mary Anne 1814-, James 1819-1840 engraver. o. Servant, stabler. a. Elder Street br. 1813, 1814. 117, 169


Thomas Folliott Baugh 9.10.1772-19.10.1857. p. eldest son of Job Walker Baugh of Stonehouse 1748-1817; Elizabeth Sayse 1750-. m. 6.4.1809, Mary Scott  ch. Mary Harriet 1812-, Isabella 1813 d.inf, 1814-, 1816-, 1817-. c. Alexander Duff  both descendents of Thomas Lord Folliott of Ireland. o. Royal Navy, 1784 Captain’s Servant, Captain, Jamaica and Newfoundland; 1794 Lieutenant, West Indies and Mediterranean; 1802. Commander; 1807 Captain, Clio, Ireland; 1810 Post-Captain. mr. 1809. br. 1812 25 141


Dorothy Bell m. James Bell  ch. James 1812-, Jane 1816-, Elizabeth 1818- first baptism in St John’s. br. 1812, 1816

James Bell m.ch.br. see Dorothy Bell

Sophia Bell 1770-1847. p. William Bell, merchant in Guernsey. m. 6.5.1789, Alexander Young  ch. William, Mary 1790-, Sophia 1792-, Henrietta 1796- m. Dr Thomas Shortts, Elizabeth 1800-, Georgina 1802-, Anne Dashwood 1810- m. General James Conway Victor. a. 48 Queen Street. of. St John’s Vestry 26

Williamina Belsches 1776-1810. p. Sir John Belsches of Tofts, Berwickshire, subsequently baronet of Castlemilk, and 1797 changed his name to Sir John Stuart of Fettercairn; Lady Jane Leslie, eldest dau. of David, Earl of Leven and Melville. m. 1797

26Hardy Bertram McCall, Some Old Families (Birmingham: privately printed, 1890) p. 287.
William Forbes  ch. Jane 1798-, son 1806-, three others, James David 1809- Edinburgh Professor of Natural Philosophy who developed understanding of glaciers and of a continuous radiation spectrum. c. Walter Scott unsuccessful suitor. a. 39 George Street. br. 1798[27] 11, 18, 118, 120, 127, 144, 159, 160

Janet Black  m. John Black  ch. Andrew 1798-. br. 1798

John Black  m.ch.br. see Janet Black o. Royal Military Artificers

James Blair  c.1732-4.3.1814. fr. 1814

Isabella Blaney  m. William Blaney  ch. William 1817-. br. 1817

William Blaney  m.ch.br. see Isabella Blaney o. Private in the 42nd Regiment (Black Watch)

Harriet Bouverie  1790-1834. p. Bartholomew Bouverie 1753-1835 MP for Downton, Wiltshire; Mary Wyndham Arundel. m. 1808-1815, Archibald Primrose divorced following her affair with her sister’s widower St John Mildmay, whom she married. ch. Archibald 1809-, Harriet 1810-, Mary Anne 1812-, Bouverie Francis 1813-1898. br. 1813. 148

Thomas Bowes  1773-1846. p. John Lyon, 7th Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne; Mary Eleanor Bowes, a very rich heiress from Co. Durham. m. 1. Mary Carpenter, 2. Eliza Northcote, 3. 13.12.1817, Marianne Cheape ch. Thomas George Lyon-Bowes 1801-1834. His grandson Claude Bowes-Lyon had ten children, the youngest of whom was HM Elizabeth, the Queen Mother. e. 1820 Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne, seat at Glamis Castle. mr. 1817. 117

Elizabeth Braithwaite  -1820. p. Admiral Richard Braithwaite of Warcop. m. Alexander Christie ch. Archibald, Alexander, Andrew 1798-, Braithwaite, Eleanora, Eliza, Anne and Alicia. a. 51 George Street. br. 1798

Thomas Brereton  1778-1846. p. Thomas Brereton of Clonanchy; Anne Laurence of Ash Park. m. 1810, Maria Watson ch. Honoria Anne 1812-, Thomas 1814-, Henry 1816-, William 1818-, Caroline 1820-, Robert 1823-. o. Captain in the Cambridgeshire militia. br. 1812. i. Known as ‘English Tom’. 140

Robert Johnstone Brown  1796-1826. p. Posthumous only child of Captain Robert Johnstone of the 31st Regiment, was killed in May 1796 at Sir Ralph Abercromby’s attack

---

of St Lucia; Mary Brown, heiress to her uncle’s estate.

Sarah Brown 7.1.1795-. m. 30.5.1816, James Lundin Cooper ch. Elizabeth and Michael -1825, Elizabeth 1826-1838, Michael 1828-1842, Mary 1833-1838. mr. 1816 29 214

Elizabeth Brunton m. James Brunton ch. John 1817-. br. 1817

James Brunton m.ch.br. see Elizabeth Brunton

John Bryson m. Charlotte Gordon ch. Jane 1817-. o. Music seller. a. 16 Bank Street. br. 1817

John Buchanan 1767-1836. p. see Jane Demorgan m. 27.8.1804, Bonhill, Dumbartonshire, Helen Yuille ch. Jane 1810-, Amelia -1829, John 1817-. a. 64 George Street. br. 1810. 140

Marianne Bullock -1861. p. William Bullock, Secretary of Jamaica -1832. m. 1815, James Douglas ch. Marianne 1816-; James 1817-; Major, m. Georgina Beresford; Caroline 1819-, Sholto James 1820- barrister, m. Anne Harriet Mills of Saxham Hall; Elizabeth 1822-, Stair, Edward m. Anne Arbuthnot; William; Charles; another dau. c. John Cay, brother-in-law. a. 1815-1820 29 Heriot Row. br. 1816, 1817 29 166, 206

Elizabeth Burke 1764-1854. p. Sir Thomas Burke; Christian Brown of Limerick. m. 17.3.1799, John Thomas de Burgh ch. Hester Catherine 1800-. Ulick 1802-, Emily. a. 1799 14 Queen Street. br. 1800

Elizabeth Burn p. Walter Burn, gardener at Hawick; Janet Ker. m. 18.11.1793, Hawick, John Nourse ch. William 1794-, Jessie 1795-, Mary 1796-, Walter 1797-. o. Confectioner, cookery school proprietor, author. a. 1799 51 Nicolson Street, 1806 38 Princes Street, 1809 14 and 15 George Street, 1816 3 Greenside Place, 1817 3 George Street, 1818 14 Nicholson Square, 1821 North St David’s Street, 1822 11 Frederick St, 1824 23 Howe Street. br. 1797 i. published Modern Practical Cookery (1809) 30 104, 123, 168, 169, 175, 180, 236

George Cadell 1738-1857. p. John Cadell of Cockenzie, Haddington -1814; Marie Buchan dau. of John B. of Letham -1841. m. 7.1.1814, Susan Tod 2. 1820 Margaret Molle.

---

30 Aberdeen Journal 12.11.1851; Caledonian Mercury 25.3.1809, 11.9.1813, 4.8.1821.
John 1815-, Alexander 1816-, James 1817-. c. John Inglis, their families connected by marriage and business partnerships in Carron Iron Works; George Arbuthnot.

Walter Scott o. EIC Military. w. £28000. mr. 1814[31] 140, 159, 160, 162, 164, 217

William Cairns m. 20.6.1815, Maxwell Henderson ch. William 1816-. o. Innkeeper at Haymarket. br. 1816

Sarah Callow m. Thomas Callow ch. Jane 1817-. br. 1817

Thomas Callow m. ch. br. Sarah Callow


Mrs Colin Campbell -19.11.1814. a. 31 James Square. fr. 1814

m. 2.11.1807, Anne Dorrat ch. Margaret Charlotte 1816-, Ann Durward, Charlotte Scott, Helen Burke, Marion, Mary, Jane, Martha French, Adelaide, Sophia, Walter Scott, William and James Ferrier. o. Walter Scott’s assistant. a. 3 Register Street. br. 1816. 18, 156, 180, 181

Mary Carnegie 15.12.1775-1845. p. George Carnegie -1799; Susan Scott of Benholm, Kincardineshire -1821, poet and philanthropist of Montrose. m. 1801, David Gillespie

---

Susan Lyndsay Carnegie 1790-1.7.1815. p. James Lindsay Carnegie of Boysack and Spynie -1815 d. in north America of marsh fever; Mary Elizabeth Strachan of Lower Tooting, Surrey. m. 15.3.1814 Thomas Tod ch. Susan Mary Elizabeth 1815-. mr. 1814. fr. 1815. br. 1815.

James Carnegy m. 5.7.1798, Calcutta, Mary Ogilvy ch. Isabella 1803-, Patrick Ogilvy 1804-, Charlotte 1806-, Mary c.1809-1836, Anne c.1816-1833, Agnes Clubley 1818-, Margaret m. Mr Clubley, James. o. East India Company Civil Service, Penang. br. 1816. 159, 217

Alison Carson m. David Govine ch. Mary Carson 1818- br. 1818

Catherine Carter m. Andrew Robertson ch. Agnes Simpson 1812- br. 1812


Elizabeth Chandler p. Edward Chandler, butcher in Morpeth. m. 16.6.1798 in Perth James Fairbairn ch. James 1798-. br. 1798. 123

Christian Chapman m. unmarried. ch. John 1810- natural son. br. 1810. 235


---

Charles 1805-, the first three baptised by Sandford, Charles by Frances Spence’s husband John Thompson of Duddingston. a. 2 North Castle Street, 39 Castle Street. br. 1799[^36] 18, 118

Mary Charters c.1784-19.9.1849. p. Edward Charters, Northumberland. m.ch.br. see Alexander Anderson a. died at 21 India Place


John Palmer Chichester 1769-1823. p. John Chichester Arlington; Mary Macdonald of Tirandrish. m. 1. Mary-Ann Cary of Tor Abbey, Devon; 2. 3.7.1793, Bath Agnes Hamilton 3. Catherine Ford. ch. John Palmer-Bruce 1794- Liberal MP, Margaret Caroline, Julia, George, James Hamilton, Robert Bruce 1800- barrister. o. Colonel of the Royal Cardigan Rifle Corps. e. Arlington. br. 1800[^38] 221

Alexander Christie 14.12.1850-1822. p. Archibald Christie of Stenton; Anne Gordon, son of Alexander Gordon, collector of Customs in Aberdeen, third son of Sir James Gordon of Lesmoir. m.ch.a.br. Elizabeth Braithwaite o. Royal Navy Captain. w. £6000. e. Baberton, inherited 1789 from his uncle who purchased it with the proceeds of a winning lottery ticket[^39] 141, 142, 144, 203

Alexander Clark m. Catherine Clark ch. Hugh 1798-. o. West Lothian Cavalry. br. 1798

Catherine Clark m.ch.br. see Alexander Clark

James Clerk 1763-1831. p. David Clerk, 1724-1768, Physician to the Royal Infirmary. m. 3.1.1791 Jane Duff ch. David Kennedy 1792- Midshipman RN drowned 1807; Robert 1795- heir; Jane 1794 m. 1844 William Waring Hay-Newton of Newton. c. Margaret Maxtone distant cousin. o. Advocate. 1794 Sheriff-depute of Edinburgh, 1809 Baron of Exchequer. w. £9500. a. 1793 George Square, 1795 53 Princes Street, 1805 92 Princes Street. e. Bonnington, purchased 1774, Craighall Rattray inherited from his grandmother 1817 when he took the name Rattray. of. Trustee

[^37]: Scots Magazine 75 (1813) p.879.
Charlotte Chapel, Vestry St John’s. i. Tory. Involved in repression of sedition in the 1790s. 17, 79, 80, 107, 122, 144, 153, 157, 188, 203, 204, 218, 221

Robert Cockburn 1780-1844. p.c. see Henry Cockburn m. 1805 Mary Duff ch. Ellen 1810-; Robert 1812-1836 d. on first expedition to explore the Euphrates; Gordon Duff 1819-d.inf.; Alexander and Archibald who succeeded their father in business. o. Wine merchant, founding a firm of shippers in Oporto, which became Cockburn’s Port. w. £3500. a. 36 North George Street, 1805 26 Castle Street. br. 1810, 1812. 6, 130, 174, 185, 203, 217, 236

Charles Hore Cogan 1771-11.1.1816. m. 30.4.1801 Mary Douglas ch. Mary Anne Elizabeth Campbell 1810-. o. 3rd Regiment of Foot Guards. w. bankrupt. a. d. at Cunningham’s Lodgings, 1 Frederick Street. br. 1810. fr. 1816 40 142

Spencer Joshua Alwyne Compton 1790-1841. p. Charles Compton, Earl of Northampton, -1828; Mary Smith -1843, dau. of Joshua S. MP. m. 24.6.1815 Margaret Clephane ch. Charles 1816-, William 1818- who both inherited, also probably others. e. Lord Compton, 1812 Earl Compton of Compton, 1828 Earl of Northampton. mr. 1815 i. a maverick Tory, poet, published The Tribute (1837) 41 6, 148, 149

Mary Congalton -29.11.1849. p. Charles Congalton, Physician; Agnes MacIntosh -1818 buried in St John’s, dau. of John MacIntosh, surgeon in the navy. m. 1.11.1806, Alexander Ramsay ch. Agnes m.1826 Henry Harvey Esq of St Audries, Somerset. His wife left a legacy to Amelia, dau. of Lady Robert Kerr, ‘she being the daughter of my loved husband’. a. 41 George Street until 1807. mr. 1806 42 122, 163, 220


m.ch.mr. see Sarah Brown o. Writer, shipowner and gas-manufacturer in Kirkcaldy, 1828 Manager of the Kirkcaldy and London Shipping Company with 3 smacks of 132 tons. w. bankrupt. i. Troublesome manager of the Episcopal Chapel in Kirkcaldy 43 119, 214, 215, 237

James Corns m. Jane Corns ch. James Charles 1814-br. 1814

---

40 London Gazette 27.7.1811 p.35.
41 Jack B. Morrell, ‘Compton, Spencer Joshua Alwyne, Second Earl of Northampton (1790-1851)’, in ODNB.
Anne Cecilia Craigie  

*John Craigie 1757-1813 son of advocate John Craigie, deputy commissary general for British Army in Quebec, 1801 member of the Executive Council of the Assembly, 1808 convicted of embezzling army funds, died owing £24,000; Susannah Coffin, dau. of James C., widow of James Grant, 1815 renounced her claim on her husband’s mines and ironworks assets, brought her children to her husband’s relatives in Scotland. m. 3.3.1817, Joseph Mills ch. ‘at least six’. c. Laurence Craigie distant cousin; Adelaide Falconar’s sister Jessie married Anne’s brother Henry. mr. 1817[44]

Laurence Craigie 3.12.1780-17.3.1865. p. John Craigie of Glendoick; Agnes Clerk, dau. of Sir George C. m. 27.2.1806, Harriet Wright ch. Elizabeth Joplin 1810-, Harriet Margaret Hay 1814-, Cecilia Barbara 1815-, Maria Lewis Finlayson 1817-, Robert Collins, another son killed in a railway accident. br. 1810. c. Anne Cecilia Craigie e. Glendoick, Perthshire. br. 1811, 1814, 1815, 1817[45]

Eleanor Crane m. Robert Crane ch. Mary Emilia 1812-br. 1812

Robert Crane m h br see Eleanor Crane

Anne Crawford 1735-18.11.1814. p. Rev Cornelius Crawford of Mursley, Buckinghamshire and Lamorran, Cornwall, -1753. m. Sir Robert Pollok Baronet, of Pollok. ch. Cornelia d.inf. 1785 w. £6016. a. 12 Queen Street, 1800 9 South Charlotte Street. fr. 1814[46]

Mrs Anne Crawford m. James Crawford ch. William 1816- br. 1816

James Crawford m.ch.br. see Mrs Anne Crawford

John Crawford m.ch.br. see Anne Aitkin

Alicia Cropper m. John Cropper ch. Mary Anne 1812- br. 1812

---

John Cropper  *m.ch.br. see Alicia Cropper*

Mary Cuisnes  *m. William Cuisnes  ch. Janet 1817-. br. 1817*

William Cuisnes  *m.ch.br. see Mary Cuisnes*

Letitia Pryce Cuny  -1849.  *p. John Powell Cuny of Golden, -20.7.1824, Rector of St Brides; m.2.6.1788 Mayzod Elizabeth Pryce -1.8.1821. m.ch.br. see Nathaniel Cameron.  e. heiress through her mother of the Gellihir Estate, on condition her sons were given the name Pryce and she resided there.*

Marten Dalrymple  -23.11.1809.  *p. William Dalrymple of Cleland and Fordel, 1748-1794; Diana Molyneux of Preston -27.4.1817. m. 12.5.1798, St George’s Hanover Square Frances Spence  ch. Ingram William 1799 and dau. at Cleland House in 1805, 1807 (probably Emily d.1815) and 1808. w. £11000. a. 30 George Street, his mother’s residence. e. Fordell and Cleland. br. 1799*  

Elizabeth Dalzell  1790-1837.  *p. second dau. of Robert Dazell of Glenae, advocate, 1755-1808; m.1783 Anne Armstrong of Kirtleton -1797. m. 1812, Henry Douglas  ch. William Henry 1813-, Robert Johnstone-Douglas 1814- m. dau. of the Marquess of Queensberry, Henry Alexander 1821-, Edward Octavius of Kilchassie 1830-. br. 181*  

James Davidson  *m. Isabella Douglas  ch. John 1811-. br. 1811, 1814*

Eustatia Davie  *p. John Davie of Orleigh, whose ancestor John made a fortune as a Bideford tobacco merchant around 1700; Eleanora Bassett, dau. of John B. of Heanton Court, Devon -1757 and Eleanora Courtenay of Powderham Castle, Devon. m. 22.8.1797, William Shairp  ch. William Joseph 1798- Bathgate, John Walley 1801-1822 sunk in HMS Confiance, Alexander Mordaunt 1802- m.Emily Shairp of Stonehouse, Henry Bromley, Stephen Francis m. Caroline Michaelmore, Eustatia Courtenay d.inf., Charles Mordaunt, Eustatia Harriett, Frances Mary, Mordaunt, Peregrine Courtenay d.inf. br. 1801*

John Thomas de Burgh  1744-1808.  *p. John Smith Bourke, afterwards de Burgh, 1720-1782, Earl of Clanricarde; Hester Amelia Vincent -1803, dau. of Sir Henry V. of Stoke*

---


**Janet Dickson** *p.* John Dickson, farmer in East Lothian. *m.* 7.10.1806, Edinburgh, [John Robinson] *ch.* James 1811-. *br.* 1811


**Grace Dirom** 9.5.1769-2.2.1814. *p.* Alexander Dirom -1788, writer of Muiresk, Provost of Banff; m.1754 Annie Fotheringham. *m.* unmarried *fr.* 181451

**Betsy Dodds** *m.* [James Dodds] *ch.* Betsy 1799-. *br.* 1799

**James Dodds** *m.ch.br.* see [Betsy Dodds]

**Anne Dorrat** 6.5.1784-1872. *p.* William Durward, 1784 ‘smith’ in Nicholson Street; 1807 builder ‘on the Water of Leith’; Anne Dickson. *m.ch.a.br.* see [William Carmichael]


Henry Alexander Douglas 1781-1837. p.c. see Charles Douglas
m.ch.br. see Elizabeth Dalzell. o. Merchant in London and Director of the Provincial Bank of Ireland from 1825; bankrupt 1836. w. £20.216

Isabella Douglas m.ch.br. see James Davidson

Margaret Douglas p.c. see Mary Stewart m. 17.4.1797, John Philipps ch. John 1813-, Mary, Margaret Jane. br. 1813. 138

Mary Douglas 6.5.1769-17.11.1848. p.c. see Mary Stewart m.ch.br see Charles Cogan

Mary Douglas 1737-1816. p. James Douglas first Earl of Morton; Agatha dau. of James Halyburton of Pitcur. m. Second wife of Charles Gordon Earl of Aboyne 1726-1794, who cleared his estate from debt. ch. Douglas Gordon, 1777-, succeeded to Pitcur and took the name Halyburton. c. Her step-dau. Margaret Gordon was Susan Beckford’s mother. a. 2 St Andrew’s Square until 1794. fr. 1816. 117, 127, 144, 203

Mary Clementina Douglas 1776-. p.c. see Helen Douglas m. Douglas MacMurdo ch. Eleanor Katharine Bernie Mitchelson b. Leeds 1805, Caroline Douglas 1810. br. 1812, 1813

William Douglas m. Elizabeth Nisbett ch. Henry 1811-. a. Portobello. br. 1811

Adam Duff 1775-1840. p. Admiral Robert Duff of Logie and Fetteresso; Lady Helen Duff dau. of William, Earl of Fife. m. unmarried. c. Jane Duff sister. o. Advocate. 1807 Sheriff-depute of Forfar; 1819 Sheriff-depute of Midlothian. w. £15000. a. He had lodgings at 95 Princes Street until 1819 when he moved to 25 Charlotte Square.

e. Findon. of. St John’s Vestry. i. Tory


52Private communication from Catherine McCourt, family historian.
54Taylor and Taylor, Duffs pp. 274-280.
Helen Duff 1789-22.9.1873. p. Alexander Duff of Hatton; Mary Leslie of Glenmyre. m. 1808 John Tod. ch. Thomas 1809, Alexander 1810, Helen Clementina 1812, John Robert 1814, Mary Jane 1821, Charlotte Joanna 1828, Caroline Jane 1823, Louisa Garden 1828, Joanna Helen, four others d. unmarried. c. Mary Duff, sister, Isabella MacDowall, close friend. a. 1809 43 Castle Street, 1813 46 Charlotte Square. br. 1810, 1812, 1814. 55 120, 185

Jane Duff 1765-1839. p.c. see Adam Duff m. ch. a. of James Clerk w. £712. i. In 1798 Daniel Sandford corresponded with her regarding taking her cousin’s son as a pupil 56 140, 203, 218

Mary Duff 1788-1858. p.c. see Helen Duff m.ch.a.br. see Robert Cockburn w. £700. i. Subject of Byron’s Song and Don Juan 5.V.4 57 117, 185

Elizabeth Dundas 1749-1817. p. Doctor Thomas Dundas in Edinburgh, son of Ralph Dundas of Manour; Jean Fairbairne, dau. of James F. m. unmarried. w. £700. a. 65 Castle Street. fr. 1817

Elizabeth Dunkley m. William Dunkley ch. Emma Crewe 1814-. br. 1812, 1814

William Dunkley m.ch.br. see Elizabeth Dunkley

Janet Durham c.1747-1817. m. unmarried. a. 22 Hanover Street. fr. 1817

Alexander Dyce 10.3.1758-24.12.1835. p. Alexander Dyce of Rosebank, -1773; m.1757 Mary Ochterlony, dau. of David O. of Tillyfrisky. m.ch.a.br. see Frederica Campbell o. 1776 Cornet; 1800 raised 92nd Punjabis, a native infantry battalion; 1818 commanded southern division of Indian army. e. Rosebank, Aberdeenshire. 139, 159-161

Jane Eales m. Thomas Eales ch. William 1817-. br. 1817

Thomas Eales m.ch.br. see Jane Eales


55 Taylor and Taylor, Duffs.
56 Correspondance of Sir James Grant, NRS, GD248/671/5.
John Elphinstone 1811-28.3.1815. p.c.fr. see Charlotte Elphinstone 159, 164, 165


Elizabeth Erskine 31.3.1782-. p. General Sir William Erskine of Torrie -1795; Frances Moray of Abercairny. m. 1.5.1806 in Torrie House, James Moray ch. none. mr. 1806. 119, 235

James Erskine 1787-1816. p. David Erksine of Linlathen -1791; Anne Graham -10.3.1836 dau. of Anne Stirling of Ardoch. m. 1811 Catherine Stirling ch. Catherine 1815-. e. Linlathen, Angus br. 1815 5895, 96, 165, 220

Mary Anne Erskine 1773-. p. Rev William Erskine, Episcopal incumbent of Muthill; Helen Drummond, grand-dau. of John Drummond of Keltie.

m.ch.a.br. Archibald Campbell c. her brother was Walter Scott’s best childhood friend 59 18, 190, 203

James Fairbairn m.ch.br. see Elizabeth Chandler o. Sergeant in the Perthshire Volunteers

Adelaide Falconar 1802-1814. p. Alexander Falconar, son of Major William Falconar and grandson of Rev Alexander Falconar of Ferintosh, 1809 Chief Secretary to the Governor of Madras, 1811 retired; Elizabeth Davidson, whose father was a writer EICS, from Cromarty. She had 12 daughters and 2 sons, five d.inf. m. unmarried. c. Anne Craigie Robert Downie was a trustee of her father’s will. a. Falcon Hall, Morningside. fr. 1814 60 6, 152, 157, 159, 164, 166, 217

Michael Fell 28.7.1779-25.3.1837. p. Dr William Fell, Rector of Sheepy, Leicestershire, -1819: his eldest son, grandson and great-grandson were all Rectors of Sheepy; Anne Cotton, dau. and co-heir of Robert Cotton of Worcester. m. 3.1.1816, Janet Haig ch. William Edwin Cotton 1818-1866, Helen Jane 1820-1876 m. James Haig, Robert

58 Trevor A. Hart, ‘Erskine, Thomas, of Linlathen (1788-1870)’, in ODNB.
60 Charles J. Smith, Morningside (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1992) pp. 135-143.
Walter 1826-, Henry Haig 1828-, Anne Eliza m. George Augustus Haig. o. merchant. a. Lochrin House, Tollcross. mr. 1816.61 123, 140, 142, 173

Euphemia Fenton m. [John Thomson] ch. Jane 1809-, George 1815-. br. 1810, 1815

Anne Ferguson m. [William Ferguson] ch. Catherine 1813-. br. 1813

William Ferguson m. ch.br. see Anne Ferguson

Mary Finlay p. co-heiress of William Finlay of Gunnets. m. ch.br. see Alexander Duff 135


Georgina Anne Forbes p. c. see Augusta Forbes m. Archibald MacNeill ch. George 1798-. br. 1798, 117, 118


John Forrest m. [Wilhelmina Forrest] ch. Margaret Oswald 1797-. br. 1797

Wilhelmina Forrest m. ch.br. see John Forrest

Margaret Forsyth m. [William Hodgson] ch. Helen 1813-. br. 1813

Charles Fraser 9.6.1792-7.3.1871. p. Alexander Mackenzie of Inverallochy, who 1803 received the name Fraser and 1814 succeeded to Castle Fraser, MP for Ross and Cromarty; m.1786 Helen Mackenzie -1802 dau. of Major William M. m. 25.4.1817, Janet Hay ch. Alexander -1843, John Wingfield -1846, Charles Murray -1846, Francis -1849, Kenneth -1836, Frederick 1831-1897, Mary -1847, Eleanor Jane -1858 m.1853 Right Rev George Tomlinson, 1st Bishop of Gibraltar, Grace Harriet, Augusta Charlotte m.1854 Robert Drummond, other issue. c. Frederick Fraser brother. o. 1808-9 52nd Regiment, Peninsular War, 1812 Coldstream Guards, 1815-19 MP for Ross and Cromarty. e. Inverallochy and Castle Fraser. mr. 1817. 139, 216

---

Eliza Fraser 4.3.1792-1834. p. Donald Fraser 1760-1798 writer (solicitor) of Inverness; Mary Ord 1768-1842 dau. of Richard O., overseer of salmon fishing on the Ness. m.ch.a.br. see George Arbuthnot i. Joined her uncle in Madras in 1807 63 120, 161

Frederick Alexander MacKenzie Fraser -12.1848. p. see Charles Fraser, brother. m. 1. 29.3.1817 Emmeline MacLeod. 2. Georgina Augusta Bagot. ch. Frederick Charles, Colin, Isabel. o. At his marriage he was Captain in his Majesty’s 78th Regiment of Foot. He later became Assistant quarter-master general to the forces in Canada. mr. 1817 64 139, 140


Maria Frost p. Thomas Frost, Merchant Tailor in Sheffield.

m. 25.12.1804 John Mather, separated 25.7.1818. ch. at least two daughters. o. music teacher. a. 17 Castle Street, moving in 1816 to 2 Queensferry Street. of. Organist’s wife 66 120, 169, 171

Janet Gardiner m. John Miller ch. Nancy 1813-. br. 1813

David Gillespie 26.4.1777-1827. p. John Gillespie of Kirkton; Janet Scrimgeour, dau. of David S. of Birkhill. m.ch.br. see Mary Carnegie w. £20000. e. Kirkton and Mountquhanie. i. 1820 Trustee of St James Episcopal Church, Cupar 67 213-215

Charlotte Gordon m.ch.br. see John Bryson


66 Process of Separation and Aliment, Maria Frost v. John Mather, NRS CH8/6/1703.
67 Act of consecration of the Episcopal Chapel at Cupar, Fife, 1820, NRS, CH12/12/2262; FraserW67.
David Govine  m.ch.br. see Alison Carson

Margaret Cusans Grant 1781-1862.  p. only dau. and heiress of George Grant -1819.  
m. 12.3.1801, Drumsheugh William Tytler  ch. Alexander, George, William Fraser, James Macleod Bannantyne, Elizabeth Fraser, Jane Anne, Mary Fraser, Margaret Fraser 1811-, Christina 1813-, Emily Isabella Frances.  e. Burdsyards or Sanquhar.  br. 1811, 1813

Charles Griffiths  m. Elspeth Griffiths  ch. Thomas 1817-.  br. 1817-

Elspeth Griffiths  m.ch.br. see Charles Griffiths

m.ch.a.br. see Michael Fell c. Jesse Ness was a clerk in her father’s distillery.  w. £6409, proceeds from capital for her use including bank investments, properties in Edinburgh, family annuities and shares  E142, 173

m.ch.a.br. see Nicholas Baldock o. She appears to have continued to run the stables after her husband’s death.  w. £92 including two horses, an ‘old carriage harness’, horse clothes, gas fittings in the stable, household furniture and linen.  7, 117, 169

Helen Hall  m. John Hall  ch. Margaret 1811-, James 1813-, Jane 1814-, Charlotte 1815-.  
a. 1812 Rose Street; 1816 34 Castle Street.  br. 1811, 1812, 1814, 1815.  7, 129, 169

John Hall -24.10.1816.  of typhus fever m.ch.a.br. see Helen Hall o. Grocer then spirit dealer.  fr. 1816.  7, 129

Agnes Hamilton c.1770-1814.  p. James Hamilton of Bangour: His father William 1704-1754 was a Jacobite poet and friend of Hume who wrote ‘The Braes of Yarrow’ and an ode on Prestonpans; m.1770 Margaret Bruce (Peggy), whose brother James Bruce of Kinnaird (1730-1794) supplied coal to the Carron ironworks, and spent the profits exploring Abyssinia, searching for the source of the Nile, and crossing the Sudanese desert.  m.ch.br. see John Chichester  221

68 Elverston, Captain Michael Edwin Fell.
69 Murray G.H. Pittock, ‘Hamilton, William of Bangour (1704-1754)’, in ODNB; Nigel Leask, ‘Bruce, James, of Kinnaird (1730-1894)’, in ODNB.
Frances Hay  m. James Hay ch. William 1813- br. 1813

James Hay 1795-. p. from the East Indies. br. himself, 1799. 159

James Hay m.ch.br. see Frances Hay o. Private in the 94th Regiment

Janet Hay 1800-. p. Fourth dau. of Sir John Hay Bart of Haystoun, 1755-23.5.1830, banker in Edinburgh, died worth £27,000, gave Janet £3,000 as her marriage portion and £500 for her use; Mary Elizabeth Forbes, dau. of James, 16th Lord Forbes. m.ch.br. see Charles Fraser c. William Forbes first cousin: his mother was her father’s sister. 139, 173


Mary Hay 1731-5.2.1816. p. see Margaret Hay m. Michael Carmichael of Hazelhead -1788. ch. Maurice of Eastend -1811 m. Mary Honeyman, John physician, Anne -1836 m.1782 Alexander Tweedie of Quarter WS, Rebecca Thomas m. Patrick Russell, Jane Douglas, Mary m.1810 George Clerk Cragie of Dumbarnie. w. £550. She received an annuity from the estate. a. 1 South St David’s Street. fr. 1816. 172, 219, 224

Alexander Henderson m. Anne Henderson ch. William Giles 1812-. br. 1812

Anne Henderson m.ch.br. see Alexander Henderson

Maxwell Henderson 1790-. p. William Henderson, 1790 ‘Quarrier at Whitehouse Toll’, 1815 ‘laborer, of Tobago Street’; Margaret Gardner. m.ch.br. see William Cairns 7

Margaret Henning m. William Henning ch. William 1798-. br. 1798

William Henning m.ch.br. see Margaret Henning

William Hodgson -26.6.1851. m.ch.br. see Margaret Forsyth o. Painter. a. died at 35 Lothian Road. 123

Rachel Hog p. Roger Hog of Newliston. m. ch. a. of see Lachlan Gordon spouse

70 Francis J. Grant, Register of burials in the Churchyard of Restalrig 1728-1854 (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1908); James Grant, Old and New Edinburgh, vol. 5 (London: Cassell, 1880) p. 131.


Hannah Huitson -1814. *m.* 6.2.1792 in St George’s Hanover Square Michael Magan *ch.* Emily 1811-. *a.* 202 Rose Street. **br.** 1798, 1811. **fr.** 1816.[73] 132

Elizabeth Hunter *m.* Thomas Mudie *ch.* Thomas 1801-. **br.** 1801

John Inglis 14.5.1783-1847. *p.* Vice Admiral John Inglis, 1743-1807, b. Philadelphia, where his father had gone from Scotland and become a successful merchant, who inherited Redhall from another branch of the Inglises; Barbara Inglis, co-heiress of Auchindinny and Langbyres. *m.* 30.7.1815, Robert Brown 2. 1828 Maria Monro. *ch.* five by his second wife. *o.* 1805 Advocate: ‘To the end of his days he was quite unable to make a speech under any circumstances’, and made total fees of five guineas before giving up. *e.* Redhall. **mr.** 1815. *i.* Tory.[74] 117, 188, 189

Catherine Innes *m.* David Linn *ch.* William Innes 1816-. **br.** 1816

Jane Jack *m.* John Marshall *ch.* John (1816) (baptised Charlotte Chapel), Robert Gray 1818- *m.* Janet Johnstone and emigrated to New Zealand, William Paul 1821-, Alexander 1821-, Thomas 1825- (all baptised St Cuthbert’s). **br.** 1816[75]

Robert Jacks *m.* Sarah Jacks *ch.* Mary 1810-. **br.** 1810

Sarah Jacks *m.* see Robert Jacks,

---

[71]‘Accounts of Miss Helen Hope’, NRS, GD253/108; Account Current of Miss Helen Hope with James Hope WS, 31 Dec 1822, NRS GD253/107/6.


Elizabeth Johnston  m. John Johnston  ch. Daniel 1815-, William Elstob 1817-. br. 1815, 1817

John Johnston  m.ch.br. see Elizabeth Johnston

Joan Keir  1771-1861. p. James Keir of Kinmonth; married 1750 in the house of the Rector of Old St Paul’s, Margaret Orme, dau. of Alexander O. of Balvaird, trustee of Old St Paul’s, and Agnes Keith, aunt of Alexander Keith  m. ch. a. see Roger Aytoun  br. 1810  

Mary Keir  29.9.1750-29.12.1816 at Bruntsfield Links, Edinburgh. p. see Joan Keir  sister m. unmarried. fr. 1817

Alexander Keith  1780-4.11.1832. p. William Keith of Corstorphine Hill, -1803, accountant. He bought his estate in 1791; Mary Anne Rae of Coldsheaf. m. 16.9.1813, Georgina Lamont  in Charlotte Square by Mr Oliver, Presbyterian minister of Ancrum. ch. Helen Margaret Oliphant (1814), William Campbell. c. John Keith  brother; Joan Keir  first cousin once removed; Walter Scott  second cousin. a. Inherited 43 Queen Street in 1819. e. Inherited baronetcy of Ravelston from his uncle in 1819. of. 1805. br. 1814  

John Keith  -8.4.1814 suddenly, while bathing at Cramond. p. see Alexander Keith  brother. m. unmarried. fr. 1814. 149

John Kennedy  m. Mary Kennedy  ch. Mary 1809-. a. Bo’ness. br. 1809

Mary Kennedy  m.ch.br. see John Kennedy

Janet King  p. Probably Adam Watt. m. William King  ch. Margaret 1810. br. 1810

William King  m.ch.br. see Janet King  o. Grocer. a. Queensferry Street

Sarah Kingdom  1797-1817. p. Edward Kingdom, 94th Regiment, fought at Serigapatam and the storm of Badajoz, 1810 Captain, 1818 retired. m. unmarried. a. 4 Queensferry Street. fr. 1817

76Mary E. Ingram, A Jacobite Stronghold of the Church (Edinburgh: R.M.Grant, 1907) p. 84; ‘Register of Marriages, Old St Paul’s, Edinburgh’, The Scottish Antiquary 51 (1901), 8-21, p. 149.
77Caledonian Mercury, 2.1.1817.
Anne Kirkaldy 1800-7.6.1816.  p. John Kirkaldy of Amelia Bank, Dundee -18.11.1816; m.1797 Amelia Gardyne -1830 heiress to Baldovie.  m. unmarried.  a. Died at Mrs Evans Furnished Lodgings, 56 Frederick Street. fr. 1816[80]

Jane Kittins  p. William Kittins, shoemaker.  m. see John Courgan a. before her marriage, Luckenbooths, Tolbooth

Elizabeth Knight m. George Knight ch. John 1813- br. 1813

George Knight m.ch.br. see Elizabeth Knight

John Knox m. Mary Knox ch. James 1797-, William 1799-.  a. stone carver.  a. 2 North St James Street. br. 1797, 1799

Mary Knox m.ch.a.br. see John Knox

James Laing m. 13.11.1813 Mary Miller mr. 1813 (first in register)

John Laing m.ch.br. see Jane Archibald

Anne Lake p. Gerard, 1st Viscount Lake 1744-1808, commanded British Forces during the Irish Rebellion of 1798 and was later Commander-in-chief of the military in British India; m.1770 Elizabeth Barker.  m. 6.7.1812, Dublin, John Wardlaw ch. Anna Maria 1813, Gerard 1817, James 1818.  br. 1813, 1817[81] 148

Georgina Lamont 23.12.1779-1857.  p. John Lamont of Lamont 1741-1817; Helen Campbell dau. of Duncan Campbell of South Hall.  m.ch.a.br. see Alexander Keith c. Helen Lamont sister.  a. Before her marriage, 7 Charlotte Square.  104, 127, 147, 163, 186, 190

Helen Elizabeth Lamont c.1782-1827.  p.a. see Georgina Lamont sister.  m. 28.11.1806 John Porch ch. John de Courcy 1809-1812, Henry Elliot -1830 British Merchant Service, Helena Amelia m. Alexander Charles Maxwell and moved to Sydney, Australia.  br. 1809.  127, 163, 186

James Lapsley -c.1829.  m. 25.11.1817, Anna Underwood ch. James -c.1850, possibly from a previous marriage or illegitimate, hairdresser, bankrupt; Jemima Anne m. David

McNeilie, Chancery, son of David McNeilie WS; Daniel Underwood; William Ferguson, Principal Medical Officer for the Convict establishment in Perth, Australia then Deputy Surgeon-General of the British Army.  

*a.* Perfumer and hairdresser.  

*a.* 1817 186 Rose Street, 1819 37 Hanover Street.  


*p.* John Leith -1763 of Leith Hall; Harriot Steuart, dau. and heir of Alexander Steuart of Auchluncar, Royal Stewart.  

*m.br.* see Augusta Forbes  

*o.* 1780 Army, 10.1794 Colonel to raise Aberdeen Fencibles, 1798-1803 Ireland, 1804 Peninsula, 1813 Lieutenant-General, 1814 Commander of the forces in the West Indies and governor of the Leeward Islands, restoring French possessions to the Bourbons then reconquering them from Napoleon.  

**Elizabeth Liddell**  1770-1831.  

*p.* John Liddell shipmaster of Dockwray Square, North Shields 1735-1802; Jane Hubback 1736-1805.  

*m.ch.a.br.* see Robert Cay  

*i.* Talented artist.  

**Annabella Lindley**  

*m.* William Lindley  

*ch.* Eliza Dundas Marie Anne 1813, Francis Henry James 1814.  

*br.* 1813, 1814  

**William Lindley**  

*m.ch.br.* see Annabella Lindley  

**Anne Lindsay**  9.5.1797-1846.  

*p.* Alexander Lindsay, 6th Earl of Balcarres; Elizabeth Bradshaigh Dalrymple, heiress of Haigh Hall near Wigan.  

*m.* 21.3.1811, Robert Ramsay.  

*ch.* William 1813, Robert Balfour 1815.  

*br.* 1813, 1815.  

**David Linn**  

*m.ch.br.* see Catherine Innes  

**Thomas Livingstone**  1770-1853.  


*m.* 26.8.1809, Janet Stirling  

*ch.* none.  

*o.* 1782 Navy, 1838 Vice-Admiral.  

*e.* 1795 succeeded to the Baronetcy of Westquarter, Stirlingshire, which he rid of debt; 1803 custodian of the Linlithgow Palace and Blackness Castle.  

*mr.* 1809  

References:  


Anne Susan Lloyd 1786-1862.  p. Gamaliel Lloyd 1744-1817, Leeds woollen merchant and political reformer; Elizabeth Attwood, dau. of James Attwood, Staffordshire ironmaster.  m.ch.a.br. see Leonard Horner[86] 121, 173, 210

Amelia Luthman 1797-.  p. Captain Abraham Luthman, c.1755-55 Regiment, of West Grange, Swedish; Douglass Smith of Stennes, Orkney 1756-1817.  
m. 12.2.1817, James Stewart, c. Alexander Ramsay, was a witness at her wedding; his wife Mary Congalton grew up at West Grange.  mr. 1817. 140

Elizabeth Barbour MacBean 1780-1856.  p. Donald MacBean of Kinchyle, son of Gillies ‘Mor’ MacBean; Anne MacIntosh dau. of James M. of Kyllachy.  m. 22.10.1796, Coll MacDonald, ch. Isabell, Lillas, Henry, James, Charles, Susan, Duncan 1809-, Elizabeth 1811- m.Charles Neaves, Marjory Cameron 1816-, Margaret m. Mr Downing.  a. 42 Castle Street, 1818 18 Great King Street.  br. 1809, 1811, 1816.  [87] 140, 222

Coll MacDonald 1756-1.1.1837.  p. James MacDonald of Dalness, of a family whose cooperation in the face of debt saved the estate.  m.ch.a.br. see Elizabeth MacBean, c. Duncan MacDonald, brother.  o. 1788 WS.  e. Dalness, which he extended[88] 141, 151, 155, 179, 222

Duncan MacDonald -27.11.1814.  p. see Coll MacDonald, brother.  m. unmarried.  o. Colonel in the 57th Regiment. Its Caledonian March, is said to have been a great favourite of his.  fr. 1814[89] 141

Ranald MacDonald 10.5.1777-15.4.1838.  p. Colin MacDonald of Boisdale, remembered as a shrewd businessman who extended his estates and gave one to the eldest son of each of his two marriages; Isabella Campbell, dau. of Robert C. of Glenfalloch.  m. 23.1.1812, Elizabeth Steuart, ch. Henry James (1812), Archibald, Colin Reginald, Isabella (1816), Lillas Margaret.  o. 1798 Advocate, 1811 Sheriff of Stirling.  a. 34 Frederick Street until 1816; 17 Gardner Crescent in 1830s.  e. Staffa; his lands included Ulva and elsewhere until they were sold in 1821.  mr. 1811.  br. 1812, 1816.  Tory friend of Walter Scott[90] 147, 153, 163, 172, 189, 203, 213, 232


m.ch.a.br. see Henry Cockburn c. Isabella MacDowall sister. 118, 120, 185, 207

Isabella Graham MacDowall 26.10.1792-27.8.1864. p. see Elizabeth MacDowall m. 8.7.1815, Thomas Maitland. ch. George Graham 1817 d. at 14 days, Adam 1827-1854 Captain in 79th Highlanders, James William -1860 at Staten Island New York, Margaret 1818-1821, Eliza 1822-1846, Helen m. Robert Sandilands, Stuart Cairns merchant in New York, George Ferguson, Graham m.1837 Alfred Tritton Fawkes. c. mentions Helen Duff in her will as a close friend. a. 35 Charlotte Square. mr. 1815. 207

Alexander MacFrederick m. 19.9.1809, Jean MacIntosh ch. Alexander 1812-
o. Sergeant in the 94th Regiment. br. 1812

James MacGennis m. Euphemia Turner ch. Thomas 1818-. br. 1818

Jean MacIntosh p. James MacIntosh, labourer. m.ch. see Alexander MacFrederick

Lily MacIntyre m. Robert MacIntyre ch. Elizabeth 1811-. br. 1811

Robert MacIntyre m.ch.br. see Lily MacIntyre

Catherine MacKay m. William MacKay ch. Thomas 1797-. br. 1797

William MacKay m.ch.br. see Catherine MacKay o. The Sutherland Fencibles


Princes Street. e. Cromartie. fr. 1814. c. Steward at the celebration of William Pitt’s birthday in 1814 with Walter Scott and William Forbes[90] 147


John MacKenzie 13.10.1787-28.10.1854. p. see Colin MacKenzie, brother. m. 4.12.1817, Mary Pierson ch. ‘Miss MacKenzie of Ness House’ had a dance tune written for her by Joseph Lowe. o. Merchant in Leith then Agent for the Bank of Scotland in Inverness. mr. 1817. i. Alexander Blair, Treasurer of the Bank of Scotland in 1832, was rigorous in de-politicising the bank’s business following the collapse of the old municipal interest after the burgh reform Act of 1833. The Liberal MacKenzie, whose political activity had been criticised in the press, was the first victim of Blair’s policy, and retired rather than give up his campaigning[91] 173, 174, 236


George MacLay m. Leonora MacLay ch. Alexander Campbell 1814-. o. Captain, Assistant Quartermaster General. br. 1814. 140

[90] Caledonian Mercury, 23 February 1815.
Leonora MacLay  m.ch.br. see George MacLay

Daniel MacLeod  m. Mary MacLeod  ch. Elizabeth Cay 1817-.  br. 1817

Emilia Anne MacLeod  c.1791-22.2.1830.  p. Lieutenant-General Norman Macleod of Macleod; m.1784 Sarah Stackhouse -1822, dau. of Nathaniel Stackhouse, second member of Council at Bombay. m. 5.6.1809, her cousin John Pringle  ch. John Robert -1847, James -1865, Norman, Katherine -1846, Anne Crawfur -1899, three other daughters. a. Probably stayed at his mother’s house, 25 Castle Street. mr. 1809[93] 139, 183, 184

Emmeline Sophia MacLeod  1790s-before 1843.  p. Alexander Hume MacLeod; Sophia Wrangham 1666-, dau. of William Wrangham, family of St Helena planters: her elder sister Amelia was a famous St Helena belle. m.ch.nr. see Frederick Fraser[94] 139, 160, 163, 172

Mary MacLeod  c.1752-8.8.1829.  p. John MacLeod -1767, eldest son of Norman MacLeod of MacLeod but predeceased his father so the chieftainship passed to his son; captain in Louden’s loyal Highland Regiment in 1745; m. 1751, Emilia Brodie. m. David Ramsay  ch. Catherine -13.10.1814, William Norman -1815 at Waterloo, Alexander -1815 at New Orleans, Anne -1830, Frances, Louisa. c. aunt of Emilia MacLeod. a. 24 Dublin Street. fr. 1814 infant dau[95] 117

Mrs Mary MacLeod  m.ch.br. see Daniel MacLeod

Douglas MacMurdo  m.ch.br. see Mary Clementina Douglas

Catherine MacNama  m. John MacNama  ch. Nancy 1817.  br. 1817.

John MacNama  m.ch.br. see Catherine MacNama

Archibald MacNeill  p. Donald MacNeill, 4th of Colonsay, refused to join the Jacobites in 1745; Grizel MacNeill of Belfast. m.ch.br. see Georgina Forbes. a. Raised and commanded the 3rd Argyll Fencible Regiment in 1799, garrisoned Gibraltar. e. Colonsay, his lairdship remembered as a golden age, establishing the Kilchattan crofting district and subsidised fireplaces and chimneys in tenants’ houses[96].

Michael Magan -c.1820. p. Probably from Westmorland. *m.ch.a.br.* see

Hannah Huitson o. Grocer and Spirit Merchant. *w.* died in debt [97] 129, 168

Thomas Maitland 1792-1851. p. Adam Maitland -1843; Stewart McWhan, dau. of Joseph McWhan and heir of her uncle, Dr Thomas Cairns of Drundrennan. *m.ch.a.mr.* see

Isabella MacDowall o. 1813 Advocate; 1840 Solicitor General; 1845-50 Liberal MP for Kirkcudbright; 1850 Judge of Session (Lord Drundrennan). *Henry Cockburn* described his magnificent library, ‘a monument honourable to his taste and judgement’ [98] 151, 183, 207, 213

Mary Mansfield 1788-1818. p. Eldest dau. of James Mansfield of Midmar -1823, banker and partner in Bell and Rennie, wine merchants of Leith; Marion Dalrymple Horn Elphinstone, great-grand-dau. of Episcopalian Liturgist Bishop Thomas Rattray. *m.ch.a.br.* see

William MacKenzie c. Gilbert Stirling first cousin [99] 173, 221


Janet Marjoribanks 8.1.1796-1855. p.c. see Agnes Marjoribanks m. 5.11.1816, Robert Shuttleworth 1824 Frederick North. ch. Janet 1817-72 inherited Gawthorpe, 1840 enlarged Gawthorpe School, m.1842 James Phillips Kay, Secretary to the Board of Education. He began the restoration of Gawthorpe, where Charlotte Brontë visited, but Janet left him in 1851 and lived abroad. *mr. 1816 [100] 149, 222*

John Marshall *m.ch.br.* see Jane Jack o. Private soldier. In 1821 he was a labourer in Stockbridge

Hannah Martin m. Joseph Martin ch. James Nairne 1815-. br. 1815

Joseph Martin *m.ch.br.* see Hannah Martin

Daniel Maude 1773-21.9.1838. p. Second son of Francis Maude of West Hall 1731-1810; Mary Skilbeck 1728-1824 dau. of John Skilbeck of Hull. m. 8.11.1816, Janet Munro

---

[98] G. C. Boase, ‘Maitland, Thomas (1792-1851)’, in ODNB.
ch. Daniel John 1.12.1817-, George Skilbeck 1819-1844 wealthy art collector of Middlewood Hall but died of TB, Matilda, Elizabeth, Jane.  c. Robert Shuttleworth lived c.3 miles from Painthorpe, and m. in Charlotte Chapel 3 days before him.  w. He bought Middlewood Hall in 1830 from Hon. Henry Savile for £11,000.  e. Painthorpe, later settling at Middlewood Hall near Barnsley: a rich coal and manufacturing area.  

Christy Maxwell  m. John Maxwell  ch. William 1817.  br. 1817

John Maxwell  m.ch.br. see Christy Maxwell

Alexander Meek  m. Mary Anne Meek  ch. Alexander 1810-.  br. 1810

Mary Anne Meek  m.ch.br. see Alexander Meek

John Miller  m. Janet Gardiner  ch. Nancy 1813-.  br. 1813

Mary Miller  m. mr. see James Laing

Thomas Hamilton Miller  9.4.1777-3.10.1843.  p. Patrick Miller of Dalswinton 1731-1815 self-made Glasgow banker and inventor of a paddle steamer in 1788; Jean Lindsay -1798 ‘beautiful, accomplished, a writer of easy and graceful verses’.  m. 4.4.1809, Mary Anne Ram  ch. Thomas Digby 1810-.  a. 1802 Advocate, 1832 Sheriff-depute of Selkirkshire.  w. died in debt.  a. 1807 77 Princes Street; 1811 15 Northumberland Street.  br. 1810.  i. Whig 189, 213

Isabella Milne  p. Alexander Milne, merchant in Leith; Helen Bartlet.  m. 1795, James Watson  ch. James; Nicolas or Nicola c.1770-1837 m. Robert B. Wright MD of Jamaica, Samuel.  a. 77 Princes Street. of. Wife of trustee

Elizabeth Mitchell  p. Walter Mitchell, miller in Fountainbridge.  m. 25.5.1795, William Vallance  ch. William 1798-, George 1817 breeches maker and glover who d. worth £41,079, Walter, John Ruddiman, Jean, Elizabeth.  a. 7 West Register Street, ‘3 fire rooms and one other on ground storey, 3 fire rooms and a pantry on the upper storey, back yard to the south 30 feet long and nine feet broad’.  br. 1798

103 William Vallance’s will, NRS.
John Mitchell  m. [Margaret Mitchell]  ch. Eleanor 1813-.  o. Private in the 95th Rifle Brigade: joined Captain G. Miller’s no.1 Company of the 2nd battalion on 1 April 1813, and was wounded at Waterloo and invalided home.  br. 1813

Margaret Mitchell  m. [David Stewart]  ch. James 1813-.  br. 1813

Margaret Mitchell  m.ch.br. see [John Mitchell]

Lucretia Montgomerie  1791-19.2.1817.  p. George Molineaux Montgomerie c.1759-1804 of Garboldisham Hall, Norfolk; Elizabeth White 1762-1836, dau. of Michael White, Governor of the Leeward Islands who left his family in poverty after unsuccessful speculations.  m. 23.11.1813, Sir Alexander Don of Newton Don 1779-1826.  ch. none.  a. 4 Thistle Street.  fr. 1817 103 183, 203

James Moray  18.10.1798-1840.  p. Charles Moray of Abercairney -1810; Anne Stirling dau. and heiress of Sir William Stirling of Ardoch.  m.ch.mr. see [Elizabeth Erskine]  w. The contents of Abercairney were valued at £3,000; the rest of his wealth had been put in trust in 1831 for payment of his debts.  e. Abercairney, Perthshire.  210, 212, 215

Anne Morgan  m. 18.11.1792, [Abraham Orton]  ch. William 1798-.  br. 1798

Maria Morley  1782-1843.  p. James Morley 1742-1798, merchant in Bombay, bought Kempshott, Hampshire in 1787 but returned to India the following year; Sarah Richardson 1756-1787, from Gloucestershire, went to Surat where she married 1775.  m. 8.2.1815, [Donald Ogilvy]  ch. Jean, Dorothea Maria, Henriette Anne Mary, Julia Clementina, Walter 1822-, Donald 1824-, David 1826-.  c. [Sarah Morley], sister.  mr. 1815 106 105, 159, 160


104George Caldwell and Robert Cooper, Rifle Green at Waterloo (Leicester: Bugle Horn Publications, 1990) p. 166.
107Hampshire Telegraph 31 May 1802.
Lilias Morrison  c.1743-1814.  m. John Morrison Esq of Gibraltar.  a. 10 Charlotte Street.  
fr. 1814

Thomas Mudie  m. Elizabeth Hunter  ch. Thomas 1810-.  br. 1810

Janet Munro  8.7.1824.  p. George Munro, Agent for the New Shotts Iron Company, and  
later partner.  m.ch.mr. see Daniel Maude  a. Her father’s house was at 16 Clyde  
Street.  mr. 1816.

Marion Ness  m.ch.a.br. see Jesse Ness

Ellen Nicol  m. William Nicol  ch. James 1815-.  a. 74 Rose Street.  br. 1815

William Nicol  m.ch.a.br. see Ellen Nicol  o. Bootmaker

James Nicolls  m. Mary Nicolls  ch. Maria 1816-, James 1818-.  br. 1816

Mary Nicolls  m.ch.br. James Nicolls

Elizabeth Nisbett  m. William Douglas  ch. Henry 1811-.  br. 1811

Catherine Norton  m. Henry Norton  ch. Catherine Moncrieff 1798- m.29.4.1816 John Sinclair music seller.  o. Captain.  br. 1798

Henry Norton  -before 1816.  m.ch.br. see Catherine Norton  o. Captain. 140

John Nourse  c.1805.  m.ch.a.br. see Elizabeth Burn  o. ‘Gentleman Servant’ at his marriage; ‘John Nourse and Co’ confectioners and grocers by 1799. 104, 168

Donald Ogilvy  1788-1863.  p. Walter Ogilvy, brother of the attainted Jacobite Earl of Airlie; Jean Ogilvy, dau. of John physician in Forfar; his parents were divorced in 1798 and she died in 1818.  m.ch.mr. see Maria Morley  w. A letter to Donald in 1825 from his solicitors suggests he received a large income from sheep and sport, as well a large dowry from Maria, an India heiress. He still appears wealthy in his will: his furniture was worth £1700 and he left generous annuities to his younger children.  
e. Clova, Angus.  i. Tory MP for Forfarshire 1831-2 105, 160

---

108 State of the Process, Miss Marianne Woods and Miss Jane Pirie against Dame Cumming Gordon 149, 193 Edinburgh, 1811.
William Ogilvy  c.1760-1823. p. John Ogilvy, Fifth Baronet of Inverquharity d.1802; Charlotte Tullideph. m.ch.br. see Sarah Morley. o. Royal Navy Captain 1797, Captain of the Magicienne 1798-1803 regularly reporting captures and prizes. In 1819 he became Eighth Baronet of Inverquharity following the death of his elder brothers. e. Lindertis, Angus[110] 105, 140-142, 160

Mary Ogilvy m. 5.7.1798, James Carnegy, Calcutta. ch. Isabella 1803- baptised Charlotte Chapel 1816, Patrick Ogilvy 1804-, Charlotte 1806-, Agnes Clubley 1818-, Margaret, James. br. 1816. 159, 217

Abraham Orton m.ch.br. see Anne Morgan. Of Birmingham


Elizabeth Patoun -1818. p. John Patoun of Inveresk; Jean Douglas dau. of George of Friarshaw. m. 1779, Sir Archibald Hope, his second wife. ch. Step-children: Thomas -1801, Catherine (m. Grahame), Elizabeth; her children: John 1781-1853, MP for Edinburgh, Hugh, William, Magdalen. c. John Pringle and Margaret Hope, third cousins of her husband; Elizabeth and Isabella MacDowall, nieces of her husband’s first wife. a. 9 Heriot Row. fr. 1818. i. Her sons’ tutor was the high church Episcopalian Rev James Walker

John Philipps m. 17.4.1798, Margaret Douglas ch. John 1813-, Mary, Margaret Jane. br. 1813

Euphemia Philips m. John Philips ch. John 1814-. br. 1814

John Philips m.ch.br. see Euphemia Philips

Mary Charlotte Pierson -1883. p. Robert Pierson, merchant in Riga. m.ch.mr. see John MacKenzie i. ‘Mrs MacKenzie was a lady of cultivated mind and refined tastes, an admirable musician, artist, and linguist [...] and possessed a large store of amusing anecdotes, which she had the gift of telling remarkably well. Her family was an ancient Forfarshire one, the Piersons of Balmadies [...] but she was born and educated in Russia, in which country she ever maintained deep interest”[111]

[110] London Packet, 5 June 1797; Caledonian Mercury 7 February 1801, 6 December 1800.
Edward Poore 1795-1838, buried in Salisbury Cathedral. p. Edward Poore 1773-1814; Martha Anne Wolff. m.ch.mr. see Agnes Marjoribanks o. Heir and then (1820) Baronet of Rushall. e. Rushall, Wiltshire. ‘Of an old Tory family’. He kept a nature diary, toured the continent, and attended fancy balls at Almacks

John Elliot Porch Wells, Somerset. 1784-1817. p. nephew of O.E. Elliott of Binfield, an important landowner in Berkshire. m.ch.br. see Helen Elizabeth Lamont o. In 1798 Lieutenant in the Berkshire infantry; later Captain of the Guards

Catherine Warsam Prettejohn c.1769-1853. p. John Prettejohn 1731-1800 of Exmouth, large-scale planter in Barbados: in the great hurricane of 10 October 1780 he claimed £7,000 worth of damages, including 12 slaves; Catherine Worsham or Warsam. m.ch.br. see Frederick Maitland w. She received a civil list pension of £50 a year in consideration of her husband’s distinguished military services


Neil Primrose 1729-1814. p. James, second Earl, 1691-1755; Mary Campbell, dau. of Hon John of Mamore. m. 1. 1764, Susan Randall dau. of William of Yarmouth; 2. Mary Vincent dau. of Sir Francis of Stoke d’Abernon. ch. Archibald Francis, Charlotte, Mary, Dorothea, Hester. o. Third Earl of Rosebery; a younger son who began a mercantile career in London until his brother d.1755; travelled in Europe; representative peer 1768-80. e. Dalmeny. fr. 1814. i. Holland House Whig

John Pringle 1784-15.6.1869. p. Sir James Pringle; Elizabeth MacLeod, dau. of Norman MacLeod, d.1826. m.ch.a.mr. 1. see Emilia MacLeod 2. 1831 Elizabeth Maitland Campbell, dau. of John 1st Marquess of Breadalbane. o. Captain in 12th Light Dragoons for 10 years then fifth baronet of Stitchell.

112 Rushall Concise History, Wiltshire Council Website bit.ly/SZCn8p (accessed 08/01/2011); Poore Family Papers, National Archives of England 1915/44; The Times 20 January 1821; Morning Post 23 May 1827.
Mary Anne Ram  -10.7.1819.  p. Abel Ram of Clonattin -1830, Tory MP for Wexford; Elizabeth dau. of Joseph Stopford, brother of the Earl of Courtown. m. 4.4.1809, Thomas Miller. ch. Thomas Digby 1810. a. 15 Northumberland Street. br. 1810

Robert Wardlaw Ramsay  11.5.1774 - 1837.  p.c. see Elizabeth Balfour. m.ch.br. see Anne Lindsay. o. Captain in the army before his marriage. w. £65,000. e. Balcurvie, Fife; Tillicoultry; Whitehill, Dalkeith. 148, 215, 217

Thomas Ramsay  1757-1.7.1833.  p. Sir James Ramsay of Banff d.1782; Elizabeth dau. of George Rait of Annistoun. m.a.ch.c.br. Margaret Maxtone. o. overseer in Jamaica 116 6, 130, 149, 165, 204, 206

Elizabeth Raredon  m. William Raredon. ch. Hannah 1814, John 1815, Hannah 1817. br. 1814, 1815, 1817

William Raredon  m.ch.br. see Elizabeth Raredon

Anne Recount  m. Nicholas Recount. ch. John, 1817. br. 1817

Nicholas Recount  m.ch.br. see Anne Recount

Marion Reid  m. Archibald Roger. ch. Archibald, 1817. br. 1817

Andrew Robertson  m. 13.2.1816, Anne Seward. ch. Francis Stephen 1817. o. Butler in the New Town. br. 1817

Andrew Robertson  m. Catherine Carter. ch. Agnes Simpson 1812. o. in the 94th Regiment. br. 1812

Elizabeth Robertson  -12.1831.  m. 3.1791, Thomas Robertson. ch. James -1817, Anne Mary m. 1825 Thomas M. Griffith of Wrexham, Isabella Elizabeth -1820, Maria Love m. 1839 Rev T. Burnett Stuart of Trinity College Cambridge. w. £600 in bank stock. a. 99 George Street. She remained in England after her husband’s death. of. Wife of vestry member

John Jefferson Robinson  p. from Newcastle or Carlisle. m. 7.10.1806, Edinburgh, Janet Dickson. ch. James 1811. o. Grocer. br. 1811

115 Thomas Cloney, A personal narrative of those transactions in the county Wexford, in which the Author was engaged (Dublin: James McMullen, 1832) pp. 170, 176.

Archibald Roger  m.ch.br. see  Marion Reid  a. Cramond

Elizabeth Russell  m. William Russell  ch. Mary Gibson 1818. br. 1818

James Russell  1784-1830. p. David Russell of Woodside -1808; Elizabeth McCall of Braehhead, d. 1788. David subsequently married in 1795 Mary dau. of James Robertson Barclay of Keavil. m. 4.1808, Mary Stirling  ch. David 1809, John 1810, Mary 1811, Elizabeth 1812, Henry 1814, Catherine 1816, James 1817, Graham 1819. c. Thomas Robertson, his stepmother’s brother. o. 7th Hussars; Colonel in the Stirlingshire Militia. w. £3,200 but most of his wealth was in land. a. He owned 13 Castle Terrace, which was the permanent home of his stepmother, who outlived him. e. Woodside, Stirlingshire. mr. 1808. 105, 139, 149, 166

William Russell  m.ch.br. Elizabeth Russell

m. Thomas Croker of Dublin. ch. Anne or Armida 1750-1816 m. 1767 Sir Edward Crofton of the Mote. a. 22 Abercromby Place. fr. 1816

Charles Sadler  m. Sarah Sadler  ch. Elizabeth 1798. o. Farrier to the Norfolk Cavalry.  
br. 1798. 145

Sarah Sadler  m.ch.br. see Charles Sadler


Frances Catherine Sandford  1795 - 1875. p.c. see Eleanor Sandford  m.ch.a.br.of. see Charles Lane 117 69, 71, 91, 104, 228

117Newcastle Courant 17.7.1830; Times 26.8.1843; Standard 10.1.1850; Morning Post, 3.10.1860.
Edward Sankey -21.6.1813. m. 2.10.1798, in Leith North church Catherine, dau. of Donald McKay in Coalhill. o. Captain in the Royal Westminster Regiment. fr. 1813.

Jane Schaw -19.8.1815. p. Dr James Schaw of Preston. m. 20.7.1787, Robert Sands, Lieutenant EICS d.1812. ch. none. w. £2,500, bequeathed to 7 nephews and nieces. a. 15 Hope Street, a three-floor, 15-window house bought in 1805 from the builder Robert Wilkie. e. owned land in Balgownie near Culross. fr. 1813

Caroline Scott 1777-1854. p. Henry Scott, 3rd Duke of Buccleuch; Elizabeth, eldest dau. of George, 1st Duke of Montagu. m.ch.br. see Charles Douglas c. Charles Scott brother


Jane Scott p. William Scott, solicitor in Edinburgh. m.ch.br. see Brian Hodgson

Mary Scott 23.7.1778 baptised by Rev Hugh Blair. p. Francis Scott of Harden d.1803; Mary, dau. of Alexander Don of Newton. m.ch.br. Thomas Baugh c. Lucretia Montgomerie who married her cousin Alexander Don. a. Her father lived at 27 Queen Street. Many of her children were born at her grandmother’s house in George Square. mr. 1809. br. 1812.

George Searcy m. Helen Searcy ch. William 1810, Marianne 1813. o. Spirit dealer or grocer. a. 154 Rose Street, which in 1811 was assessed for 6s window tax and a rental value of £20. br. 1810, 1813. 129, 168

Helen Searcy m.ch.a.br. see George Searcy 129

Mary Anne Seaward m. William Seaward ch. George Montague Scott 1811, Jane Catherine Steuart 1812. br. 1811, 1813. 123

William Seaward m.ch.br. see Mary Anne Seaward

118 Edinburgh Annual Register 1812 p.363.
  m.ch.br. see Andrew Robertson

William Shairp  -1840.  p. Major William Shairp of the Marines, d.30.7.1817 Villiers Street, London; Ann Bromley Mordant c.1753-24.11.1826, ‘a kind and affectionate parent, charitable to the poor and needy, and much respected by all who knew her’.  m.ch.br. see Eustatia Davie  o. Lieutenant 64th Foot.  3.1797 Captain 29th Foot. By 1818 Collector of Customs at Bo’ness.  e. Kirkton, near Bathgate, in West Lothian: this property was on the market 1805-1818.119  140

Robert Shuttleworth  1784-1818.  p. Robert Shuttleworth c.1745-1814, whose father James was a Tory MP suspected of Jacobitism; Anne d.1801, dau. of General Thomas Desgauliers.  m.ch.mr. see Janet Marjoribanks  e. Gawthorpe Hall, Lancashire.120  149, 222

Anne Sime  m. David Sime  ch. Peter 1817, Anne 1819.  a. 123 Rose Street.  br. 1817

David Sime  m.ch.a.br. see Anne Sime  a. baker

Hugh Sime  m. Isabella Sime  ch. James 1814.  br. 1814

Isabella Sime  m.ch.br. see Hugh Sime

Mary Smith  9.1.1796-3.3.1819.  p. Joseph Barnard-Smith, merchant in Calcutta, 1774 juror in forgery trial of Maha Rajah Nundocomar, 1776 Secretary of the Provincial Grand Lodge Calcutta, d.2.6.1822; Rose Morrow.  m.ch.a.of see Robert Downie121  6, 159

Anne Song  m.ch.br. see John Song

John Song  m. Anne Song  ch. David Anderson 1816.  br. 1816

Frances Ingram Spence -11.10.1845.  m. 1. Marten Dalrymple  witnessed by Thomas Ingram and Martha Spence.  2. 12.1813, John Thompson, 1778-1840, Minister of Duddingston from 1805, landscape artist, previously married to Isabella Ramsay.  ch. in addition to Marten Dalrymple’s children, stepchildren: Thomas Thompson

1802- Mayor of Stratford-upon-Avon, John 1803- HEICS, Isabella 4.1809-; children by Thompson: Francis 1814- MD, Henry Francis 1819- coffee planter, Edward 1821- went to Australia, Emily 1816-, Mary d.inf. This complicated family are supposedly the origin of the phrase ‘a’ Jock Tamson’s bairns’. a. 30 George Street. br. 1799[122] 173

Elizabeth Margaret Steuart 10.1790-2.8.1866. p. Sir Henry Steuart of Allanton; Lilias, dau. of Hugh Seton of Touch. m.ch.a.br. see Ranald MacDonald. o. Succeeded through her mother to the office of heritable armour-bearer to the Queen, and squire of the royal body. e. Allanton and Touch

George Stevenson m. [Isobel Stevenson] ch. George 1817. br. 1817

Isobel Stevenson m.ch.br. see George Stevenson

Charles Stewart c.1797, ‘a negro’. br. 1813 (himself). 207

David Stewart m.ch.br. see Margaret Mitchell a. Jordan, Morningside

Grizzel Stewart 1746-3.2.1818. p. Archibald Stewart of Allanbank, Provost of Edinburgh 1745, acquitted from a charge of high treason for admitting the Pretender to the city after David Hume wrote a pamphlet in his defence. m. before 1763, Edward Marjoribanks of Lees, wine merchant in Bordeaux. ch. John (Provost of Edinburgh when St John’s was built, baronet 1814) Campbell, Stewart, Edward, James, Matilda. c. Agnes Marjoribanks and Janet Marjoribanks grand-daughters by John. a. 30 Charlotte Square.
fr. 1818[123]

James Stewart 13.11.1785-11.11.1837. p. John Stewart. m.mr. see Amelia Luthman o. John Stewart & Co. of Greenock, later Stewart & Rennie and then J & W Stewart had been trading in St John’s, Newfoundland, since 1781. Three generations of Stewarts were involved. James Stewart Jnr was managing partner in Newfoundland from 1819-1827[124] 141

Margery Stronach Stewart 1799-9.1.1815. p. ‘In the family of Mrs E. MacKenzie’. fr. 1815

[122]Baird, John Thomson; Chapman, The Register Book of Marriages belonging to the Parish of St George, Hanover Square p.181; Aberdeen Journal 29.10.1845.
Mary Stewart 1734-3.1.1816. m. Lt General Colonel John Douglas, fifth regiment of Dragoon guards d.1790. ch. William d.1794, John d.1799, Jane d.1826 m. John Duncombe EICS, [Mary Douglas] [Margaret Douglas]. Anne d.1849 m. James Boyd, Elizabeth d.1861 unmarried in [Mary Douglas] house. w. Her daughter’s will mentions ‘The trust estate of the late Mrs Mary Douglas my mother’. a. 26 Frederick Street. fr. 1816.125 128, 138, 145

Catherine Stirling 1791, Kippenross-4.3.1868, at 47 Norfolk Square, London. p. John Stirling of Kippendavie, 1742-1816, partner in Stirling, Gordon & Co, sugar planters in Content, Jamaica; Mary Graham, dau. of William Graham of Airth. m.ch.br. [James Erskine] c. [Mary Stirling] sister.126 165, 166

Gilbert Stirling c.1779, Mansfield, Ayrshire-13.2.1843. p. Sir James Stirling, banker, provost of Edinburgh 1790s; Alison Mansfield d.1823, dau. of her husband’s business partner James Mansfield. m. unmarried. c. [Mary Stirling] sister. o. Coldstream Foot Guards, served at the Helder, Egypt under Abercrombie, the Peninsula under Wellington. Retired in 1812 as Lieutenant-Colonel. Baronet 1805. w. £61,222, the second largest moveable estate in the group. a. Charlotte Square. c. Larbert, mansion completed 1825. of. Charlotte Chapel Trustee. 122, 143, 149, 173

Janet Stirling 16.9.1775, Edinburgh - 1831. p.c. see [Gilbert Stirling] m.ch.mr. see Thomas Livingstone 117, 119, 139

Mary Stirling 1786, Kippendavie, Dunblane-1820. p.c. see [Catherine Stirling] m.ch.a.br. see [James Russell] 105, 165, 166

Charlotte Stoddart m. [Laurence Stoddart] ch. John Laurence c.1806; Elizabeth 1814; Charlotte 1815; Charles James 1819. br. 1817

Laurence Stoddart -27.11.1828. p. possibly William Stoddart of Park Hall. m.ch.br. see [Charlotte Stoddart] He was probably the ‘Laurence Stoddart, a paralytic Scotsman’ who was amongst the détenus permitted to visit or reside in Paris between 1806 and 1811.127

126Glasgow Herald 10.3.1868.
John Strachan  c.1794, St Dunstan, East London-2.7.1816.  p. James Strachan, formerly merchant in East London, who paid armorial bearings tax in Edinburgh; Mary Leigh, one of five daughters and co-heirs of John Leigh, esq of Northcourt, Isle of Wight, and Miss Turner of Oxfordshire.  a. Since 1807 his family lived at 134 George St.  fr. 1816.  

Janet Symmonds  m. Thomas Symmonds   ch. Isobel (1811).  br. 1811

Thomas Symmonds  m.ch.br. Janet Symmonds

Mary Tapling  Woodstock, Oxfordshire.  p. Thomas Tapling, shopkeeper.  
m. 8.11.1813, Matthew Winter ch. Charlotte Mary (1814), Thomas (1818).  a. Before her marriage, Mallocks Close, Canongate, ground floor.  br. 1814. 123

John Thomson  m.ch.br. see Euphemia Fenton

John Deas Thomson  c.1763, Edinburgh-21.2.1838, Farleigh Priory.  p. John Thomson, officer of the civil department of the Navy; Catherine Deas.  m.ch.a.br. see Rebecca Freer  
o. 1798 he and his father were amongst four people in Edinburgh licensed to sell state lottery tickets; 1801 Naval Officer and store-keeper, Leith; Accountant-general to the Royal Navy; 1805 Commissioner without special functions; 1832 knighthood of the Hanoverian Guelphic Order.  e. 1810 Norton, Ratho; later Farleigh Priory, Maidstone, Kent. 129 166, 203

George Thorpe  c.1770-.  m.ch.br. see Anne Paton  
o. Servant to Lieut Col Ordd of the Princess of Wales Fencible Cavalry; or Weaver in Leeds. 142

m.ch.mr. see George Cadell  c. John Tod and Thomas Tod  first cousins.  138, 141, 159, 162, 164, 209

Thomas Tod  1771-23.11.1850.  p. See John Tod  m. 1. 15.3.1814, Susan Carnegie.  m. 2. 15.3.1822, Amelia Erskine.  ch. Susan Mary Elizabeth 1815.  c. John Tod  brother; 128

128 Assessed taxes for the Burgh of Edinburgh year ending at Whitsunday 1812, National Archives of Scotland E327/54.  
Alexander Tod uncle; Susan Tod first cousin. o. Advocate 1795, Judge of Commissary Court 1807. w. £8,500. a. 21 George Square. br. 1815. i. Whig. His father was on the committee which built the Cowgate Chapel in 1774. Director of the British Linen Company[130] 120, 173, 184, 189, 235

Elizabeth Townsend m. Richard Townsend ch. Ellen, 1810. a. Back of James Court. br. 1810

Harriet Catherine Townsend 11.1773, Frognal House, Kent-8.1814. p. youngest dau. of Thomas Townsend, first Viscount Sydney, after whom Sydney, Cape Breton, Canada (1785) and Sydney, Australia (1788) were named after when he was a member of William Pitt’s cabinet responsible for organising the transportation of convicts; Elizabeth Powys, dau. of Richard Powys MP. m.ch.br. see Charles Scott 203

Richard Townsend m.ch.a.br. see Elizabeth Townsend o. Vintner. 168

Euphemia Turner m.ch.br. see James MacGennis

James William Tydeman 1782-1871. p. James Tydeman, Blacksmith. m. Mary Wishart. ch. John Wishart, James 1815. o. possibly domestic servant; from 1829 he was a hairdresser and perfumer and from 1836 lodging house keeper in the New Town; emigrating to Melbourne around 1841 to become a teacher. br. 1815[131] 123

Mary Tyler m. Peter Tyler ch. dau., 1815. br. 1815

Peter Tyler m. ch. br see Mary Tyler

Christina Elizabeth Tytler c.1794, Edinburgh-11.7.1827. p. Lieutenant-Colonel Patrick Tytler; Isabella Erskine, dau. of Hon. James Erskine of Alva. m.ch.br. see George Terry c. Isabella Tytler sister; William Tytler first cousin[132] 138, 140

Isabella Clementina Tytler 1796, Edinburgh-16.11.1815. p.c. see Christina Tytler a. 11 Melville Street. fr. 1815. 138, 140

Anna Underwood 29.11.1872. p. Mr Daniel Underwood of Colchester; Jean Green. m.ch.a.mr. see James Lapsley o. From 1830 (on her husband’s death), perfumer

---

and hairdresser: from 1841-2, she ran the business jointly with her son James, but by 1843 they were in competition, for several years a few doors apart on Hanover Street; James went bankrupt in 1843, and her will suggests she was tired of subsidising him: ‘I have left no legacies to the two younger children of the said James Lapsley solely on account of my having expended large sums on their maintenance and education’. w. £3897. 105, 137, 169, 236

**Margaret Urquhart** (Peggy). 21.5.1732 at Craigston Castle, northeast of Turriff-19.1.1814. p. John Urquhart, 1696-1756, an amiable Jacobite known as ‘The Pirate’ whose privateering ventures enabled him to buy back the confiscated family estates of Craigston and Cromarty; Jean Urquhart, m. when she was 15 and he 41, who bore him 7 children. m. 20.5.1766, Robert Clark of Mavisbank, c.1723-17.5.1814. c. William Arbuthnot and George Arbuthnot nephews; Adam Duff and Jane Duff first cousins once removed. a. 95 George Street. e. Mavisbank, Midlothian. fr. 1814 220, 221

**William Vallance** c.1775-27.8.1822 of an asthma attack. m.ch.a.br. see Elizabeth Mitchell. c. Alexander Keith had an account with him at his death. o. Glover. w. £1553. 103, 137

**John Wade** c.1746-9.2.1818. o. ‘English traveller’. fr. 1818

**John Wall** m. Mary Wall ch. Thomas 1815. br. 1815

**Mary Wall** m. John Wall ch. Thomas 1815. br. 1815

**James Wallis** m. Joan Wallis ch. James 1813. br. 1813

**Joan Wallis** m. James Wallis ch. James 1813. br. 1813

**John Wardlaw** 13.6.1775, Kilconquhar-1848. p.c. see Elizabeth Balfour m.br. see Anne Lake. o. Colonel of the 76th foot 134 148

**William Warren** ch. William Lawson 1802; a. In 1800 he lived at West Register Street. br. 1802

134 *Caledonian Mercury*, 11.7.1812; *Lothian’s Annual Register for the County of Clackmannan* (J. Lothian, Alloa, 1877).
P. John Watson, writer in Edinburgh; Isabella Abercromby.  
m. 1. 1788 Nicolas Buchan (d.1790), dau. of Thomas Buchan of Auchmacoy;  
m.ch.a.mr. see 2. [Isabella Milne] o. WS 1770. w. £4,100. of. 1806 135 122, 124, 128

Maria Brereton Watson -1832.  
P. Thomas Brereton Watson.

m.ch.br. see [Thomas Brereton]

George Winbolt  
m. [Lucy Winbolt] ch. Lucy Ann 1797 christened in London, Caroline (1799).  o. 1790 Ensign by purchase. In 1796 he was promoted from Lieutenant in the 48th foot to Captain of a Company in the York Rangers. In 1799 he was promoted from the half-pay of the York Rangers to Captain in the 4th regiment of foot. br. 1799 136 140

Lucy Anne Winbolt m.ch.br. [George Winbolt]

Matthew Winter c.1759-15.7.1832. m.ch.br. see [Mary Tapling] o. Gentleman’s Servant in Charlotte Square

Mary Wishart m.ch.br. [James Tydeman]

Alexander Wood 1788.11.12 Edinburgh-1864.7.18.  
P. George Wood, MD; Isabella Campbell, dau. of John Campbell of Glensaddle and Newfield.

m.ch.a.mr.br [Jane Anderson] o. Advocate 18.6.1811, Crown Counsel 1825, Sheriff of Kirkcudbright 1830, Dean of Faculty 12 Nov 1841, Lord Wood 1842, resigned 1862.  
w. £43,456.  a. Before his marriage 45 Queen Street.  
e. Woodcot Park, near Pathhead, Midlothian[137] 203

Margaret Wood p. Ralph Wood of Banbury. m.ch.a.br. see [Samuel Hoppornton] 168

Harriet Wright -1848. m.ch.br. see [Laurence Craigie]

m.ch.a.of. see [Sophia Bell] o. WS, in partnership with [Roger Aytoun] and factor to the Duke of Hamilton.  
w. £3,354.  
e. Harburn, Midlothian.  
i. Whig. 122, 124, 127, 152, 183, 190, 203


[137] Grant, Restalrig p.10.
David Young  c.1776-1852.  p. William Young; Margaret Malcolm of Dunblane.

m.ch.mr. Williamina Baker  w. £500.  e. Cornhill, near Aberdeen

Helen Yuille  -10.11.1865.  p. George Yuille of Darleith, tobacco trader; Margaret Murdoch, dau. of George Murdoch, Merchant of Glasgow.

m.ch.a.br. see John Buchanan  £3,000 135

138GriffithWS12
Kinship Networks

The three following diagrams show the relationships between all 431 individuals in Charlotte Chapel. The coloured links are the key element in these diagrams, rather than layout on the page, which is dictated by the space constraints of showing 431 individuals on one diagram. There is a tightly knit core at the lower centre around Alexander MacKenzie, and a second core, at the top right around Mrs Sandford, Helen Douglas. ‘Galaxy arms’ spiral out from these cores. Smaller kinship networks, disconnected couples and individuals are shown around the main groups.

The coloured links show the type of connection: marriage, parent/child, grandparent, sibling, sibling-in-law, aunt/uncle/niece/nephew, great-aunt (etc), first cousin, other cousin, and professional relationship. ‘Other cousins’ includes cousins once-removed (parents or children of first cousins) or second-cousins (the children of two first cousins). Third cousins are also included if the link was through a famous common ancestor, such as in the cases of James Clerk and Mary Mansfield, both descended from the famous Scottish Episcopalian liturgist, Bishop Thomas Rattray (p. 30). The chief practical test of such relationships is whether they have entered the ken of the historian at a distance of 200 years. In a genealogically-conscious ranked society, relatives of this distance who met in the chapel would certainly have known of their relationship, and it is likely that the diagram under- rather than over-estimates the number of important ‘other cousin’ relationships.

The kinship network diagrams also show the year of marriage, the nature of professional relationships, and chapel officials, named in bold text. The first diagram focuses on these relationships, distinguishing women, men and chapel officials (all men), and is discussed on p. 11. The second shows social rank and the third nationality, using the same colours as the diagrams in Chapter Three and discussed on p. 123.