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From the eighteenth century, churchgoers in Scotland who opposed the undemocratic procedure of patronage left the Established Church to set up alternative places of worship. The body of literature describing these schisms has concentrated on the formation of the Free Church in 1843, but study of the two earlier divisions which formed the Associate Presbytery and the Relief Churches is a much-underworked area. This dissertation aims to extend the knowledge by investigating the social class and political standing of the members of their congregations in the town of Leith during the period 1820-1845.

The secondary literature is in general agreement that those attending worship in Seceder Churches were largely composed of skilled workers and tradesmen, whilst the Established Church retained both the rich and the poor. Using details from the Baptismal Registers from both the Established and the Seceding Churches, together with the 1841 Census, the occupations of these church members were used to establish the social composition of the congregations. The findings did not concur with the secondary literature; both the Established and Seceding Churches showed a similarity in the number of tradesman and skilled artisans attending and many poor attended the Seceding Churches.

Scottish dissenters were already outside the political and religious establishment and were therefore more likely to adopt a more radical attitude. The secondary literature adds little to an understanding of any political involvement by these individuals. In this study, evidence of involvement in two political campaigns was sought from contemporary newspapers and books. It was found that the Secession Church was active with regard to the campaign for Repeal of the Corn Laws, a cause which resonated with their belief in an equal society. The Established Church remained neutral; ministers standing to gain should corn prices remain high. Chartism had little appeal to either denomination in the study, possibly because of the fear that violence would be used to achieve its aims.

In summary, the social composition of the early Seceding Churches needs to be reconsidered. A more nuanced picture of their members has emerged with an analysis of their involvement with contemporary political campaigns.
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1. Introduction

By the early nineteenth century, the Protestant faith in Scotland was remarkable by its degree of schism; with even small communities being home to two or more Presbyterian denominations. Although adherence to a religious denomination may be because of its theological stance, the first part of this study seeks to build on the existing historiography, which suggests there was a relationship between social class and choice of church. A comparison will be made of the social composition of the congregations of the Church of Scotland and two Seceding denominations; the Associate Presbytery and the Relief Church in Leith in 1841. The second part of the study attempts to extend the understanding of political activities in which these church members may have engaged over the period 1820 to 1845.

Leith is a port on the Firth of Forth, situated two miles north of Edinburgh. By the late seventeenth century, it saw a shift from European to trans-Atlantic trade with the West Indies, the Canaries and North America. Tobacco and sugar were imported and linen and processed tobacco re-exported. This growth in trade transformed the economic life of the town and created the ancillary industries of shipbuilding, tobacco processing and sugar refining. By the start of the nineteenth century, whisky distilling, soap and glass manufacture were also established. Leith was chosen for this study as, by 1820, it possessed a political, social and institutional framework which could support these major industries and related

---

trades. It contained both Established and Secession Churches; making possible an analysis of a relationship between denominational adherence and social class. Leith experienced a period of extensive political activity during the period 1820-1845, hosting local campaigns for legislative and electoral reform. Following the 1832 Reform Act, the town returned a Member of Parliament for the first time. Leith became independent from Edinburgh in the following year and consequently elected its first town council.

The Church of Scotland was the Established Church, providing a church, minister and school within each parish. It had been democratic in structure; the minister being elected by the male heads of household, until the Patronage Act of 1712 restored the right of presentation of a minister to the principal landowner in the parish. Although the change was reluctantly accepted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, many ministers and congregational members regarded the practice of patronage as undemocratic and elitist. In consequence, four ministers defected from the Established Church and founded the Associate Presbytery in 1731. Thirty years later a second, larger schism took place, forming the Relief Church. It can be argued, therefore, that these Seceding Churches broke away as a result of political differences, rather than theological disputes. The existing historiography suggests those who disaffiliated were mainly

---

5 Leith Local History Society <www.leithlocalhistorysociety.org.uk> [accessed 1 October 2019].
7 Brown, p.18.
9 Devine, p.73.
self-employed artisans and tradesmen and this study seeks to find substantiating evidence, by using occupational data from the 1841 census.

The historiography of the Seceding Churches has evolved in the last fifty years. Ecclesiastical historians, writing in the seventies, regarded Seceders as fanatical schismatics, ‘The Cave Dwellers of Puritanism’, but omitted to give details of their social class or political outlook.⁰¹⁰ Later historians, using a sociological analysis, concluded that members of different classes adhered to specific denominations, with the Seceding Churches attracting self-employed artisans and tradesmen.¹¹ Within the past twenty years, historians have stressed the importance of these groups having sufficient means to build their own churches and pay their minister’s stipend, thus making a secession possible.¹² This suggests the unskilled and poor had to remain in the Established Church, where the financial outlay for members was considerably less. Within the secondary literature there is an assumption of homogeneity in membership of the Seceding Churches; there being no mention of regional differences or variances over time.

Statistical studies supporting the theory of an association between class and denomination tend to focus on the Free Church of Scotland, which split from the Established Church in 1843, leaving the study of the earlier seceding Associate

---

Presbytery and Relief Churches as a much-underworked field. There are, however, two studies of the class structure within these denominations in cities during the mid-nineteenth century. Both found a higher proportion of skilled workers in the Secession Churches and showed that the majority of unskilled workers had remained within the Established Church. Both studies focussed on large cities such as Glasgow and Aberdeen. This study seeks to discover whether a similar pattern existed in the town of Leith in 1841.

Social class is determined by occupation and the 1841 census was the first to list this information in its returns. Making a direct connection between occupation and social class is not without its problems, however, as there are instances where individuals in different social classes are allocated the same occupational label in the census returns. For example, ‘shoemaker’ could relate equally to the owner of a shoe shop or an employee. To overcome this problem, the local Trade Directory, which lists business owners, has been used as clarification. Occupations will be grouped according to the schema adopted by Hillis, the details of which are given in Chapter 1.

It was necessary to find a primary source document from each of the churches containing a list of their members in the years preceding the census. For all four churches in the study, the Baptismal Rolls for 1839-1840 are available. These give the Christian names of father, mother and child, together with the family surname. Using these details, families can be matched with the 1841 census enumerators’ returns for North and South Leith, which states the father’s occupation. There are drawbacks in using baptismal data, as those who did not marry, did not have children, or whose wives’ childbearing years were over are absent from the Baptismal Rolls and are therefore not included in this analysis.

The second part of the study seeks to discover evidence for the activity of the members of Seceding Churches with respect to legislative or electoral reform in the period 1820 to 1845. The increasing numbers and wealth of small tradesman in the early nineteenth century led to an intensified sense of class identity and this group now questioned deference to the landowning and professional classes.17 The 1832 Reform Act had extended the franchise, but not to tradesmen and artisans, causing political unrest in this group.18 If the existing historiography is correct and Seceding Church congregations contained a high proportion of these, as yet, unfranchised men, then political activity through the agency of the Church might be expected. Ecclesiastical historians, however, dismiss any hint of radicalism; seeing dissenters merely as malcontents, whose actions split communities.19 Smout regards them as reactionary, promoting a return to Calvinism and its harsh discipline.20 On the other hand, later historians agree that,

17 Muirhead, p.80.
18 Devine, p.275.
19 Drummond and Bulloch, p.51.
20 Smout, p.221.
from the late eighteenth century, privileges enjoyed by the Church of Scotland, as
the Established Church, led to increasing hostility from the Seceding Churches
and the emergence of a consequent political radicalism.\(^{21}\)

This second part of the study will seek to uncover evidence for activity of the
Seceding Churches in Leith in campaigning for political reform through support of
the Anti-Corn Law League and the Chartist Movement. The period covered will be
from 1820 to 1845, when these political agencies were active both at a national
and local level. This will involve the examination of minutes of organisations and
societies within the Seceding Churches, together with reports from local and
national newspapers, church periodicals and published material such as
pamphlets or tracts.

\(^{21}\) A.C. Cheyne, *Studies in Scottish Church History* (Edinburgh: T and T. Clark, 1999), p. 96; Muirhead, p.81; C.
and Society in Fracture During the Scottish Economic Revolution’ in *Conflict and Stability in Scottish Society
Chapter 1: The Social Composition of the Established and Seceding Churches

This chapter will seek to compare the social composition of the congregations of the Established and Seceding Churches in Leith in 1841, by providing evidence of their occupations. It will do so in order to substantiate the claim in the secondary literature that the majority of the members of the latter denomination were skilled artisans and tradesmen. This literature will be discussed and the methodology of this part of the study explained. Contemporary accounts of the four churches in the study: Leith North, Leith South, Leith Relief and Leith St. Andrew’s Place will be examined. The findings concerning the social make-up of the congregations will be presented and their similarity, or difference, to the patterns of membership described in the secondary literature assessed.

Bruce refutes the idea that the many schisms which arose in Scottish Presbyterianism in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries came about through theological differences. He argues instead that those divisions occurred as a result of radical changes in the structure of society.¹ Industrialisation and urbanisation led to the erosion of the traditional pattern of social groupings found in agrarian communities and created a class structure better suited to the demands of the new, urban economic systems. As a consequence, the

Established Church lost its traditional domination of worship in rural parishes. The emerging religious pluralism in towns and cities meant it was now one of many denominations in which Presbyterians could worship. Such a major upheaval in a relatively short period of time increased social tension in both the spheres of politics and religion. In Scotland, where patronage embodied the inequality between upper and lower classes, it has been argued that discontent caused by this practice was the driving force behind dissent. The current historiography appears to support Bruce’s argument, noting the difference in the social class between the members of the Established and Seceding Churches. The former was considered to be the place of worship for the wealthy of the parish, as they financed the church, manse and school. Paradoxically, those with very little income also worshipped in the Established Church; firstly as their only outlay would be a contribution to the poor fund and secondly, their presence in church ensured their eligibility for that fund should they ever require support. A number of historians have maintained that Seceding Churches attracted self-employed artisans and tradesmen in the early to mid-nineteenth century.

‘Members of different social groups and even occupations developed a propensity to adhere to specific churches or none. Tradesmen such as masons, wrights and butchers adhered strongly to dissenting Presbyterianism, notably the Relief and Secession Churches.’

---

7 Brown, Religion Since 1730, p.4.
It will be noted that the secondary literature refers only to male artisans and tradesmen. The 1841 census, which is used in the study to determine the occupation of an individual, did not list the occupation of married women. For these reasons, only men will be considered in the study.

In order to provide statistical evidence to prove, or refute, these associations between class and denominational adherence, an empirical study will be made of the membership of two Established and two Seceding Churches in the town of Leith. This will be done by comparing the occupations of a sample of one hundred men from the each of the congregations of North Leith, South Leith, Leith St. Andrew’s Place and Leith Relief Churches. For ease of comparison, occupations will be classified following the method employed by Hillis, in his study of the relationship between class and denomination, details of which are given below.

*The Established Churches in Leith*

At the start of the nineteenth century, Leith was home to two Established Church congregations, the North and South Parish Churches; both founded following the Scottish Reformation in the mid-sixteenth century. In common with towns throughout mainland Britain, Leith experienced a rapid and sizable increase in population in the last decades of the eighteenth century. In 1791, the inhabitants numbered 13,841, but the 1841 census shows this number to have more than
doubled to a total of 28,268.\textsuperscript{8} As the population grew, there was a concomitant demand for more church accommodation and consequently, a larger church was built in the parish of North Leith at a cost of £15,000, opening in 1816.\textsuperscript{9} According to the findings of the Royal Commission on Religious Instruction in Scotland, which was published in 1837, the parish of North Leith had 1,768 ‘persons in the habit of attending’, of which of which 1,456 were communicants. The larger part of the congregation was reported to be made up of the ‘poor and working classes.’\textsuperscript{10}

For the purposes of this local study, the social class of an individual will be predicated upon their occupation and it was therefore necessary to find a primary source that would fulfil two criteria. Firstly, it would give details of the names and addresses of men in the congregation, in order to identify them in the 1841 census returns. Secondly, for the sake of accuracy, this information would have been recorded within five years of the census. For the parish of North Leith, the list of Heads of Household, taken in 1838, was originally considered as a possible source.\textsuperscript{11} This gives the names and addresses of over eight hundred male members of the congregation. Such lists arose as a result of the Veto Act passed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1834, which gave congregations the right to reject the patron’s choice of minister.\textsuperscript{12} To facilitate this,

\textsuperscript{10} Royal Commission on Religious Instruction in Scotland, 1837 (Cd31) Volume XXI First Report Appendix p. 17.
\textsuperscript{11} Edinburgh, National Records of Scotland, hereafter NRS, (CH2/621/12) North Leith Heads of Household 1838.
lists of the names and addresses of Male Heads of Household were drawn up by parishes throughout Scotland and that for North Leith survives.

On using data from this source, however, it was found that just under half of the names listed as Heads of Household appeared to have no corresponding entry in the 1841 census. Whether this anomaly is the result of poor record keeping by the church, or inaccurate recording by the census enumerator, it is difficult to determine; but an entry in the minutes of Leith North Kirk Session from 1834, is revealing. It appears that the minister provided a list of communicants to the Session Clerk, but without details of their residence. To resolve this anomaly, parishioners were requested to ‘provide their addresses on a slip of paper when collecting their communion tokens’ in April of that year.13 It is not difficult to imagine the problems that could arise from this course of action; slips of paper being lost, or addresses being erroneously recorded. It certainly appears that this list of communicants must have been unsuitable in some way, as the minutes of the Kirk Session show the same procedure being repeated in the following year.14 This difficulty in creating an accurate record of the parishioners of North Leith Church could be one of the reasons why so few individuals from this institution have corresponding entries in the 1841 census.

As the initial choice of primary source data had proved untenable, it was necessary to find another. The Baptismal Register for North Leith Church was also available and covered the years preceding the 1841 census. This source records

the family surname and Christian names of the infant and parents. Although the address is not given, having three Christian names plus a surname, meant the majority of families could be accurately linked to entries in the 1841 census. Exceptions occurred in the case of common surnames such as Brown or Wilson, where upwards of ten families in the area were found to contain the same three Christian names. As it was impossible to determine with any accuracy which of these families was the one recorded in the Baptismal Register, these were omitted from the sample. The process of identification continued until a total of one hundred men was reached and their occupations ascertained. Details of these are shown in Appendix 1 below. Using this information, they were grouped into social class according to the schema adopted by Hillis. The results are shown in Table 1.2 and Figure 1.1 below.

The parish of South Leith was larger and more populous than that of North Leith.\textsuperscript{15} The 1837 Royal Commission on Religious Education in Scotland lists 2,250 ‘persons in the habit of attending’, of which 1,265 are communicants. Just over half of these are listed as being ‘of the poor and working classes.’\textsuperscript{16} For the purposes of the study, the Baptismal Register for the parish of South Leith for the years 1839-40 was used as the primary source. The same process was used as with North Leith; matching the families listed in this document with entries in the 1841 census and again omitting common surnames. Details of these are shown in Appendix 2 below. Using this information, they were grouped into social class


\textsuperscript{16} Royal Commission on Religious Instruction in Scotland, 1837 (Cd31) Volume XXI First Report Appendix p. 17.
according to the schema adopted by Hillis. The results are shown in Table 1.2 and Figure 1.1 below.

The Arrival of the Seceding Churches in Leith

By 1800 Scotland, in common with other Western European countries, had moved from a position where its inhabitants worshipped at the one, universal Kirk to one of religious pluralism. The Established Churches of mainland Britain lost a substantial number of adherents to new denominations which established themselves in communities during the late decades of the eighteenth and early years of the nineteenth centuries.¹⁷ The Church of Scotland had been Episcopal from 1660, but with the accession of the Protestant William of Orange, it lost power in favour of the Presbyterian Church. Episcopalians were energetically purged from both church offices and university posts.¹⁸ Following the Toleration Act of 1712, Scottish Episcopalians were granted freedom of worship and the denomination became popular with the Scottish landed classes, as part of their increasing desire to adopt the manners and customs of their English counterparts.¹⁹ Methodism, brought into Scotland by members of English regiments following the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion, grew slowly from the mid eighteenth century.²⁰ The Baptist Church had been established in Scotland in the 1770s by the brothers Haldane and spread slowly across the Lowlands, aided by an inflow of English Baptists coming north, seeking employment.²¹

¹⁸ Devine, p. 64.
¹⁹ Muirhead, p.39.
²⁰ Muirhead, p.119.
²¹ Muirhead, p,113.
There are few statistics relating to church adherence in Scotland before the mid-nineteenth century, as it was assumed all but ‘heretics and schismatics’ would attend the one, universal kirk.22 One notable exception is the statistical evidence provided by the Royal Commission on Religious Instruction in Scotland, published in 1837. This shows there to be at least six other denominations having a presence in Leith. In addition to the United Associate Congregation and the Relief Church who form part of this study, there were also congregations of Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists and Independents.23

This ability to worship in an alternative denomination was in contrast to the situation described in The First Statistical Account of Scotland, written in 1793, where the entry for North Leith states ‘Almost all the parishioners attend the Established Church. The number of other persuasions does not exceed fifty’.24 Allowing that the author of the entry was the minister of North Leith Parish Church, who may have been less than objective with regard to the dominance of the Established Church, the changes in patterns of worship over the next forty years led to a substantial erosion of its membership. Brown estimates that 32% of Lowland Scottish population were Presbyterian dissenters by the 1820s, larger than the level of nonconformity in early nineteenth century England.25 Data from the Royal Commission on Religious Instruction shows that the number of dissenters continued to rise, with 42% of churchgoers in the City of Edinburgh,

24 Sinclair, p.572.
which, at that time, included the town of Leith, attending one of the Presbyterian dissenters’ churches by 1837. 26

As argued above, the movement of worshippers from the Established to the Seceding Churches was not caused by theological disputes, but to the deep hostility engendered by the right of individual patrons, mainly landowners, to present their candidate to vacant church offices within their parish. From the middle of the eighteenth century, patronage became a symbol of the subordination of the Established Church to the landed, upper classes. 27 The financial burden of church upkeep was increasingly being transferred to lower income groups through increasing burial, baptism and church service fees. At the same time, these groups were not being allowed to participate in the choice of minister. This led to protest and, ultimately, defection. 28 The first secession from the Established Church occurred in 1733 and was led by Ebenezer Erskine, who preached a controversial sermon in which he denounced the system of patronage. His continued criticism of the General Assembly’s failure to repudiate this practice led to his removal as a minister of the Church of Scotland. Together with three like-minded colleagues, he established the Secession Church, which gathered followers from across southern Scotland; establishing forty-two churches by 1745. 29 In the next fifty years, an increasing number of patronage disputes led to the spread of Secession Churches across the rural Lowlands. 30

28 Brown, The People, p.15.
29 Muirhead, p.74.
30 Brown, The People, p.10.
One of these, formally known as a United Associate Congregation, was established in Leith in 1768. It was not, however, a direct result of the patron, Lord Balmerino, exercising his right to install a minister of his choosing. When the minister of South Leith died in 1739, Balmerino allowed an election involving elders and male heads of families. Although the majority of the congregation was in favour of calling William Aitken, a minority of members opposed this and broke away from the Established Church. Due to the shortage of ministers serving the rapidly growing Secession Church, a congregation could not be ‘provided with sermon’ in Leith and this group of seceders made the five-mile round trip to worship in Bristo Church, in central Edinburgh. Twenty years later, in view of the increasing age of these worshippers, permission was granted for a congregation to meet in Leith. They met originally in a meeting-house in Cables Wynd until 1775, when a new church was built in Kirkgate.  

The First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction, Scotland, in 1837, lists Leith Kirkgate United Association Congregation as having 1,110 persons in the habit of attending, of which 760 were communicants. The Commissioners make the intriguing observation that all of the congregation were all from the ‘industrious classes’.

This evidence from a primary source appears to support the existing historiography of the Seceding Church, which agrees that that the majority of its members were artisans and tradesmen; productive members of the community.

---

33 Muirhead, pp 78-.80; Drummond and Bulloch, p.51.; Hillis, ‘Presbyterianism and Social Class’, p.63.
The only surviving record which lists both the names and addresses of members of Leith Kirkgate Church is the Communion Roll, which covers the years 1829-1836. Less than half of the names listed in this document could be identified with entries in the 1841 census. This was unsurprising, given that there were twelve years between the earliest entry and the census; during which individuals could have changed residence within the town, or moved outwith the area. In addition, mortality was high at the time of this study; the annual rate being estimated at 26.7 per 1000 in Scottish cities. These would increase in Leith after January 1832, due to an outbreak of cholera, in which 319 persons lost their lives. Again, for this local study, the initial choice of primary source data had proved impractical.

There was another United Associate Congregation Church in Leith, which had emerged as a result of a dispute among the members of the Kirkgate Church. This new congregation had been formed in 1785, after the suspension and subsequent deposition by the Synod of John Proudfoot, the minister of Kirkgate Church. This action split the loyalties of the congregation. The majority sided with the disgraced Proudfoot and, surprisingly, managed to retain the church building at Kirkgate. As a result, those who agreed with the suspension found themselves without a place of worship and moved to a new building beside Leith Links. In 1787, the congregation built a new church at St Andrew’s Place, from which the church took its name. By 1837, the Royal Commission found 1,100 worshippers were in the

---

habit of attending there, consisting of, ‘few poor and five hundred working class’.\textsuperscript{38} For the purposes of the study, names from the Baptismal Register for this church for the years 1837 to 1840 was used as the primary source. Again, families listed in this document were matched with entries in the 1841 census. Using the same method as before and omitting common names, one hundred men were identified and their occupation determined. Details of these are shown in Appendix 3 below. Using this information, they were grouped into social class according to the schema adopted by Hillis. The results are shown in Table 1.2 and Figure 1.1 below.

Not all who objected to the system of patronage felt comfortable with the tenets of United Associate Congregation, who had from their foundation, adopted a robust, Calvinistic attitude.\textsuperscript{39} By the middle of the eighteenth century, many churchmen adopted a less harsh attitude to the morals of the community.\textsuperscript{40} Among these was Thomas Gillespie, who was expelled from the Established Church following his refusal to instate a minister chosen by the patron.\textsuperscript{41} He founded the Relief Presbytery in 1761, offering ‘relief of oppressed Christian congregations’, who suffered under the practice of patronage.\textsuperscript{42} These congregations were again formed predominantly in the Lowlands and that in Leith was instigated by a group of people who were resident in the town, but were presently worshipping at the Relief Church in St. James’ Place, Edinburgh. In 1822 they petitioned the Relief

\textsuperscript{38} Royal Commission on Religious Instruction in Scotland, 1837 (Cd31) Volume XXI First Report Appendix p. 18.
\textsuperscript{39} Muirhead, p.77.
\textsuperscript{40} Brown, Religion Since 1707, p.19.
\textsuperscript{41} Muirhead, p.78.
\textsuperscript{42} Brown, Religion Since 1707, p.24.
Presbytery in Edinburgh for sermon.\textsuperscript{43} There was ‘a strong and general desire for such an establishment; and with a view to accomplishing this object, some of the petitioners have rented the old parish Church of North Leith for a year’.\textsuperscript{44} The request for sermon was granted and the congregation worshipped in their rented premises for three years until the completion, in 1825, of their own church in Great Junction Street. £4000 was raised for the building of the church by issuing shares to the value of £10.\textsuperscript{45} Their first minister was Frances Muir, ‘called by the forming Relief Congregation in Leith’ in April 1823 and formally ordained as pastor two months later.\textsuperscript{46} The First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction, Scotland, shows that by 1837, Leith Relief Church had 1,000 persons in the habit of attending, of which 850 were communicants.\textsuperscript{47} According to the report, three quarters of the congregation was made up of ‘the poor and working classes’.\textsuperscript{48} The Relief Church was noted for its liberal outlook and relaxed attitude to discipline.\textsuperscript{49} This tolerance might not have been extended to the Leith congregation, however, where the Kirk Session Minutes make frequent mention of admonishment of parishioners by the minister for indulging in prenuptial fornication or Sabbath breaking.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{43} Leith Local History Society www.leithhistory.co.uk [accessed 03/05/2019].
\textsuperscript{45} Edinburgh, NRS, (GB234/CH2/621) Leith Relief Church Kirk Session Minutes 22nd March 1834.
\textsuperscript{46} ‘Appointments, Promotions & etc: Ecclesiastical’, The Scots Magazine, 1st April 1823, p.132.
\textsuperscript{47} Royal Commission on Religious Instruction in Scotland, 1837 (Cd31) Volume XXI First Report Appendix p.13.
\textsuperscript{48} Royal Commission on Religious Instruction in Scotland, 1837 (Cd31) Volume XXI First Report Appendix p.18.
\textsuperscript{50} Edinburgh, NRS, (GB234/CH2/621) Leith Relief Church Kirk Session Minutes 8 September 1826, 17 April 1828, 19 January 1827
As with the other three churches described above, names of the members of this congregation has been obtained from the Baptismal Register for the years 1839-1840. The Kirk Session Minutes state ‘To prevent improper persons from obtaining privileges of the church, every church member wishing baptism for his child be required to make appellation to the elder of the district’. This stipulation meant that children baptised in the Relief Church were from families who attended the church on a regular basis. Following the same procedure as before, one hundred men were correctly identified. Details of these are shown in Appendix 4 below. Using this information, they were grouped into social class according to the schema adopted by Hillis. The results are shown in Table 1.2 and Figure 1.1 below.

Findings from the local study

As stated above, the names of one hundred men from each of the four churches in this local study were taken from the relevant Baptismal Register, matched with entries in the 1841 census returns for North and South Leith and their occupations discovered. Adopting Hillis’ classification detailed below, the social composition of each church was determined.

---

51 Edinburgh, NRS, (GB234/CH3/728) Leith Relief Church Kirk Session Minutes 1st September 1836.
Table 1.1: Classification Code for Church Members (per Hillis, 2002)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Professional Group</td>
<td>e.g. lawyers, surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Commercial Group</td>
<td>e.g. bankers, accountants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Large Merchant Groups</td>
<td>e.g. merchants, ship agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Retired/Rentier Group</td>
<td>e.g. ship owners, independent means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Public Servants (1)</td>
<td>e.g. local government officials, ship masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Public Servants (2)</td>
<td>e.g. teachers, clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Small Tradesmen</td>
<td>e.g. shop-keepers, joiners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Semi-skilled Workers</td>
<td>e.g. gardeners, coachmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Unskilled Workers</td>
<td>e.g. labourers, porters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Social class of congregational members of Established and Seceding Churches in Leith, 1838-41.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Leith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Leith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith St. Andrew’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Relief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 1: Social class of congregational members of Established and Seceding Churches in Leith, 1838-41

Under Hillis’ scheme, Groups A-C represent the upper class. Groups D-F signify the middle class. Groups G to I are the working class.

This local study set out to confirm the assertions made in the local historiography that members of seceding congregations were drawn from the ‘tradespeople and skilled artisans’ within the community. At first glance, the most numerous group, comprising 65.5% of the membership of St. Andrew’s Place and Leith Relief Churches, came from Group G, which includes tradespeople and skilled artisans such as bakers, spirit dealers, joiners and blacksmiths. This finding would seem to fully support the assertions in the current historiography.

regarding this finding must be made, however. This proportion of congregational members from Group G cannot be said to be significantly different from that found within the two Established Churches in the study, where the figure is 63%. What this local study appears to show, therefore, is the similarity in numbers of tradespeople and skilled artisans attending the Established and Seceding Churches in Leith in 1841. This group cannot therefore be said to favour the Secession over the Established Churches.

A reason for this finding may lie in the time period in which the study took place. By 1841, the United Associate Congregation had been in existence in Leith for seventy-three years. It could be argued that, by 1841, the reputation for protest and defiance attributed to the Seceding Churches had lessened. Where, in the years following Erskine’s break from the Established Church, the ‘dormant tradition of covenanting resistance was revitalised in puritanism, fiery oratory, fierce discipline and internal rancour’, it is possible that over the next seventy years, this defining ethos mellowed. 55 If it was no longer seen as differing in its political outlook from the Established Church, perhaps other factors, such as family tradition or proximity to house or business influenced the choice of church, leading to the observed similarities in the congregations. The second part of this study, which aims to investigate the political activities of the members of the two denominations may add a further dimension to this finding. Although the two denominations are similar in terms of social composition, there may be differences in the degree in which the members addressed the contemporary campaigns for tariff and electoral reform.

55 Brown, Religion Since 1707, p.23.
Assertions have been made, by both Muirhead and Callum Brown; that those from the upper classes who left the Established Church in the nineteenth century were not drawn to the Seceding Churches. From the evidence gathered in this study, it appears that this assertion is true and the Seceding Churches in Leith held little appeal for the upper classes. Only 1.5% of the membership of this denomination came from classes A to C, whereas this group represents 7% of the congregations of the two Established Churches. Seceders had rejected the practice of patronage and may have been regarded by the upper classes as suspiciously radical. Instead, the wealthy and fashionable gravitated to the newly respectable Episcopal Church of Scotland, attracted by ‘its cultured liturgy and decorous furnishings’. 56

Those members of the upper class who remained in the Established Church of Scotland encouraged the rise of the Moderate Party in the early decades of the nineteenth century, who despite their name, advocated a more liberal and university-educated ministry. This was popular with those wealthy Scots who aspired to reject their parochial status and become members of the British ruling class. 57

Findings from this study would also suggest the middle class were equally reluctant to worship in the Seceding Churches. 10% of the congregations of Leith North and Leith South Churches are from groups D to F, compared with 2.5% in Leith Relief and Leith St Andrew’s Place. There is the possibility that the middle class were following the example of the wealthy, though there is no supporting

56 Muirhead, p.53.
57 Brown, Religion Since 1707, p.19.
evidence in the secondary literature for this supposition. Perhaps a more convincing explanation can be found by drawing parallels with MacLaren’s study of the social composition of Kirk Sessions in the Established Church. These were found to be dominated by the middle class, who perpetuated the status quo by co-opting, or carefully managing, the election of new members from the same group.58 Middle class control over the Sessions conferred a powerful voice in the Presbyteries, Synods and ultimately, the General Assembly.59 It may be these men were reluctant to abandon this substantial degree of influence and therefore remained within the Established Church.

This study can find little evidence, however to support the assertion made by historians with regard to the number of unskilled workers to be found in the Seceding Churches. Firstly, both Stewart Brown and Cheyne maintain that this group, whose income was low and uncertain, would remain in the Established Church, where the financial outlay for members was considerably less.60 As those who left required sufficient means to contribute to the support of their own churches and preachers, through regular and substantial financial contributions, the poor would be reluctant to join this denomination. Hillis is in agreement, attributing the low level of church attendance in Scottish cities in the nineteenth century to ‘the relative failure of non-established Presbyterian churches to attract

59 A.A. MacLaren, Social Class in Scotland Past and Present (Edinburgh: John Donald, No Date) pp 3-4.
more members from the unskilled and urban poor.\textsuperscript{61} In this local study, however, 18.5\% of the members of Seceding Churches are unskilled workers. From reading individual entries in the census returns, this group was found to include labourers, porters and carters. These were the very people whose income was uncertain; having no regular employer and being the first to be without hire when trade was slack.\textsuperscript{62} It may be that a system of Poor Relief similar to that operated by the Established Church was operated by Leith Relief Church. The minutes of the Kirk Session shows collections were made in January in most years between 1836 and 1843 ‘for the poor of the congregation.’\textsuperscript{63} The church also had a Home Mission Society, founded in the 1830s, by which the poor of the parish were visited, at least once a month, by members who distributed food, bedding and clothes.\textsuperscript{64}

These charitable actions may explain why almost one third of the sample of this congregation was made up of semi and unskilled workers.

Although membership of the Church of Scotland is not the direct concern of this study, one surprising finding emerged, which is perhaps worthy of note. The social group which accounted for over half of the sample of the membership of the Established Church, was that containing artisans such as carpenters, coopers and seamen. This high proportion is at odds with McLaren’s research, which found the level of working-class membership of the Church of Scotland, in the early nineteenth century, to be low. Amongst the factors cited as contributing to this was the practice of ‘pew renting’, whereby the seating in the church was rented out

\textsuperscript{62} Devine, p.263.
\textsuperscript{63} Edinburgh, NRS, (GB234/ CH3/728) Leith Relief Church Kirk Session Minutes 13 January 1836, 25 January 1837, 10 January 1839, 15 January 1843.
\textsuperscript{64} Edinburgh, NRS, Leith Relief Church Missionary Society Minutes 1839-1847; (GB234/CH3/447)
to members of the congregation.65 Pew rents varied according to their position in the church and were paid quarterly. This practice led firstly, to a segregation of social classes within the church building and secondly, served as a disincentive to those whose income was low, or uncertain.66 Another factor discouraging working class attendance was said to be the patronising attitude of the middle class adherents to the lower income groups.67 These factors, which McLaren cites as reasons for an absence of working class members, do not seem to have had the same influence in this local study.

One explanation for this may lie in the fact that the Trade Incorporations of Leith such as the Mariners, Coopers and Shoemakers occupied certain pews within South Leith Church which they, ‘adorned with heraldic emblems of their craft’.68 This seems to suggest that, within these groups, membership of the Established Church was an accepted part of working-class life in early nineteenth century Leith. Their pews in the church were a source of pride which conferred a degree of self-esteem which might counteract any middle-class condescension.

The findings from this part of the study were based on evidence obtained from the census returns. This information may not be totally reliable. Firstly, as Higgs points out, census statistics have been constructed via a language where ‘some answers are considered more correct than others.’ 69 It is possible that responses made

65 McLaren, p 76.  
67 McLaren, p.79.  
were informed by a desire to be seen as ‘more reputable’ than was actually the case. In addition, mistakes can be made by those interpreting the data, as individual job titles imply little about the scale of production. For example, the category ‘spirit merchant’ does not distinguish between the levels of wholesale and retail; meaning that there is uncertainty as to whether the individual was a merchant or shopkeeper, who fall into different social classes. Similarly, there is no distinction between those involved in manufacture or retail. This means that ‘shoemaker’ could relate equally to the owner of a shoe shop or a journeyman shoemaker, again being members of different social classes. In view of this, the Post Office Directory for Edinburgh and Leith 1839-1840 has been used as an additional primary source. These directories were published annually and give details of those carrying out a trade, or profession, in the area. Entries for each of the individuals within Class G have been sought under their occupational classification. If the individual has a listing, it has been assumed that they are the owner of the business and could be designated middle class. If they are not listed, then it has been assumed that they were an employee and therefore a member of the working class. A comparison of the of the four churches in the study is made below:

---

Table 1.3 Numbers of members of church congregations owning their own business. \textsuperscript{72}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Owners of business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leith North (Church of Scotland)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith South (Church of Scotland)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Relief Church (Seceding)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith St. Andrew’s Place Church (Seceding)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2 Percentage of members of church congregations owning their own business.

\textsuperscript{72} General Post Office Directory for Edinburgh, Leith and Their Environs, 1839-40, (Edinburgh: Ballantyne and Hughes, 1839).
This set of data does little to confirm any claims in the existing historiography which states the level of middle-class membership in Seceding congregations to be less than that found in the Established Church. In this local study it would appear there was a degree of similarity in the number of middle-class members in both the Established and Seceding Churches.

The findings of this study have obvious limitations. The sample of individuals on whom it was based was very small; four hundred in a town where the number attending the churches studied totalled just over six thousand.\(^73\) The sample itself was not representative of the congregation as a whole. As the Baptismal Registers of the four churches were used as the primary source, those in the study are all men whose wives were of childbearing age. This omits the young, the elderly, the unmarried and the childless. The study only provides a ‘snapshot’ of the social composition of the congregation in the year 1841, rather than a study over time. In addition, entries 1841 census taken in North and South Leith may not be wholly reliable and the reasons for this has been discussed above. Despite these weaknesses, however, it has explored an area of local historical research that has not been previously undertaken and raises the possibility of a subsequent study involving a larger, more representative sample of individuals over a longer period of time.

Chapter 2: The Political Standing of the Members of Seceding Churches

This chapter will investigate the political standing of the members of Seceding Churches in Leith 1820-1845. The first part of this study demonstrated that the majority of members of the Seceding Churches in Leith in 1841 were skilled tradesmen and shopkeepers. From the early part of the nineteenth century, this group had become increasingly politically aware and this subsequent discussion seeks to provide evidence of their political standing. The secondary literature on the subject will be examined and the methodology of this part of the study explained. This will be followed by a brief discussion of the prevalence of a religious culture in everyday life in nineteenth century Scotland, showing its impact on the political views held. Evidence for involvement in the contemporary political campaigns by the members of the Seceding Churches in Leith will then be evaluated.

Hempton has highlighted the importance of the Christian religion in the political divisions found throughout the British Isles.¹ There is a substantial body of work on the relationship between Dissent and political reform in England.² This group had

¹ David Hempton, Religion and Political Culture in Britain and Ireland, (Cambridge: CUP,1996) p.49.
been subject to restrictions imposed by the Test and Corporation Acts and this
discrimination, it has been argued, promoted an organisational culture from which
effective pressure groups emerged, campaigning for electoral and tariff reform.³

With regard to Scotland, commentaries concentrate on the political importance of
the conflict which led to the emergence of the Free Church in 1843, seeing it as a
significant instance of national protest.⁴ The few writers who have explored the
earlier secessions, which produced the Associate Presbytery and Relief Churches,
have little to say on the political outlook of their members, beyond their being
schismatic and reactionary.⁵ Devine, on the other hand, makes the point that
Scottish dissenters were already outside the political and religious establishment
and were therefore more likely to adopt a more radical attitude.⁶

In order to find relevant evidence for political campaigning by members of the
churches in question, several primary sources have been consulted. The Kirk
Session Minutes for three of the four Seceding Churches in the town: Leith Relief
Church, North Leith United Associate Church and Leith Kirkgate Associate
Congregation have been studied for the years 1820 to 1845. A search of
contemporary newspapers and pamphlets has been made for articles which give
an account of the political activities of the minister or congregation of the above
churches. As it has been claimed that ministers of the Seceding Churches set out
to 'influence the public mind in the direction of freedom', by speeches and

⁵ W. Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1968); T.C. Smout, *A History of the
sermons from the pulpit, evidence from these sources will also be considered. In addition, evidence from the report on Public Petitions to the House of Commons 1840-41 will be examined.

In order to justify an examination of the role of the church in nineteenth century politics, it is important to realise the importance of religion in society at that time. In the period on which this part of the study is focussed; 1820-1845, both the authority of the Church and Christian faith were important influences in the lives of the British people; in their behaviour, culture and political views. In Scotland, the Presbyterian Churches continued to exert considerable social control over their parishioners' lives. Although misdemeanours such as Sabbath breaking, drunkenness and prenuptial fornication were no longer civil offences or resulted in 'rebuke before the congregation', they were still actions that would be noted and result in a private reprimand by the Kirk Session, or the minister himself. In the Kirk Session minutes of all three Seceding Churches in Leith, there are repeated mentions of such wrongdoings. For example, the Kirk Session minutes of Leith North Association Congregation note,

'William Stark was seen coming out of Water Lane intoxicated and in company with two women in the same state. He denies this but several people are willing to give testimony. His niece is willing to put in writing that she saw him as described.'

---

This entry continues by noting that William Stark is to be ‘denied the privileges of the church’ until such time as the elder of the district will call on him to be rebuked in private, by the minister.  

Christianity also permeated the culture of the time. Everyday reading such as chapbooks; the small cheap booklets sold on Scotland’s streets, were widely available and often contained ‘improving’ stories where virtue, faith and sacrifice were rewarded, or intemperance and self-interest punished. Sermons from the pulpit delivered on Sunday were subsequently published to be read and digested at leisure. Access to spiritual writings were not limited by the ability to buy. Religious tracts were left wherever people congregated: railway stations, factories, public houses and thrust, in thousands, directly into the hands of the poor. Leith Kirkgate Associate Church, Leith Relief Church and Leith North Associate Congregation all had Home Mission Societies founded in the 1830s, by which the poor of the parish were visited, at least once a month, by members of these Societies who distributed such religious tracts.

With regard to the influence of religion in politics, the parish church had for centuries been one of the few meeting places for the community where matters,
including politics, could be discussed and views exchanged.\textsuperscript{13} The extraordinary social and economic changes taking place from the late eighteenth century kindled a greater political awareness, which could be strengthened and given a means of expression through the agency of the Church. There was, however, a complex inter-relationship between political attitudes and ecclesiastical allegiances and this part of the study will seek to find evidence in primary sources for this connection between the Seceding Churches and radicalism in Leith.\textsuperscript{14}

In seeking to explain why members of the Seceding Churches might be more radical in their outlook than their counterparts who remained in the Established Church, it has been argued that both the Associate Presbytery and the Relief Church separated from the Established Church of Scotland due to political, rather than theological differences; with patronage being the catalyst for both secessions. Patronage epitomised the disproportionate influence of those possessing wealth and land, in spiritual, as well as secular matters.\textsuperscript{15} From their objection to inequality within society, it can be argued that the members of the Seceding Churches, in common with English nonconformists, aspired to a more democratic system of politics and were part of a distinctive form of religio-political radicalism.\textsuperscript{16} The means to express this militancy was already in place in Leith from the 1830s, as the town was home to several political societies. These included a Working Man’s Association, a Radical Society, an Anti- Corn Law Association and a

\textsuperscript{14} K. Robbins in Hempton, p.49.
\textsuperscript{15} Stewart Brown and Michael Fry, eds., \textit{Scotland in the Age of Disruption} (Edinburgh: EUP,1993) p.6
\textsuperscript{16} Hempton, p.140.
Charter Association. The last two organisations were set up to achieve specific political goals; the first for repeal of tariff legislation and the second for more democratic electoral system and this part of the study will seek to find evidence for activity by the members of the Seceding Churches within them.

The Secessionists and The Corn Laws

The Corn Laws, statutes first passed in 1815 by a parliament dominated by landed interest, regulated the import and export of cereals and imposed duties on foreign corn to protect domestic agriculture from the effects of cheap imported grain from the continent. Those who opposed the tariff believed cheaper bread would satisfy the very real problem of hunger, release income for expenditure on other goods and stimulate the economy. There was widespread support throughout Scotland, expressed through the activities of the Anti-Corn Law League, for abolition of the tariff. The reasons for this were twofold; firstly, the economic interests of the country were closely connected to non-protectionist policies and secondly, for the perceived unfairness and immorality in bringing further hardship to those whose income was low or uncertain. Miller has argued that this second factor resonated particularly well with members of the Seceding Churches. Evidence of this perceived sense of injustice can be seen from the published text of a lecture denouncing the Corn Laws, given in Glasgow in 1842, by a minister of

---

21 Miller, p.883.
the Relief Church. He criticises the legislation as, ‘being enacted for the aggrandisement and pampering of one class of the community at the expense of the interests of all the rest.’

The writer goes on to cite the high cost of bread as contributing to demoralization, illiteracy and intemperance in society and most importantly, for members of the church, the Corn Laws are seen to be ‘promoting irreligion’ amongst the poor.

If this argument provoked any reaction by the congregational members of the churches in this local study, it is not reflected in the Minutes of the Kirk Sessions. Entries refer only to the steps taken to ensure the spiritual welfare of the congregations and the everyday running of the churches. There are lengthy discussions on the growing practice of Sabbath breaking, the need for repairs on church buildings, or arrangements for elders to visit the members of the congregation, but there is not one mention of the presence of congregational members or ministers at secular meetings, such as those of the Anti-Corn Law League.

Despite the lack of evidence from the Minutes of the Kirk Sessions, other primary sources have shown that ministers of the Seceding Churches in Leith were indeed active in organised agitation for such reform. From 1838, the Anti-Corn Law League sought to harness the energies of organised dissent throughout mainland

---


23 Anderson, pp.16-17.

Britain and, to this end, organised a series of conventions in major cities, with the purpose of showing the strength of popular feeling against the tariff. A large group of ministers and members from Scottish Dissenting Churches met together at Edinburgh in December 1841. One hundred and fifty-three ministers and three hundred and twenty-eight members from the Seceding Churches attended. These high levels of attendance, especially from the members of the congregations, are indicative of the level of support within the Seceding Churches for reform of the tariff. The purpose of the conference was to canvas the opinions of upward of five hundred ministers of different denominations throughout Scotland as to their own and their congregations’ views on the Corn Laws. This was done by submitting a series of written questions on the desirability of abolishing duties on imported corn. The results were collated and published by Duncan McLaren, a future Provost and Member of Parliament for Edinburgh and a leading member of the Scottish Anti-Corn Law Movement. The appendices to his book contain minutes of preliminary meetings held prior to the conference for the purpose of organising the campaign. From these it can be seen that two of the ministers from the Seceding Churches in Leith; Frances Muir of the Relief Church and James Harper of the Associate Congregation were active in these preparations.

25 Miller, p.900.
26 ‘Dissenters Anti Corn Law Conference’, The Scotsman, 18 December 1841.
29 MacLaren, pp.68 and 77.
The responses to the survey were published in a way which ensured the anonymity of both the minister and congregation. However, as all forty-eight ministers of the Dissenting Churches in the county of Edinburgh, which included Leith, stated that they were in favour of an entirely free trade in corn, it can concluded with certainty that the seceding ministers in the town expressed their opposition to the Corn Laws.\(^{30}\) This survey is the only primary source, found to date, which in which the views of the members of the congregations are shown. The few congregations which advocated support for the legislation were those in which farming was the principle occupation.\(^{31}\) Historians have cautioned against exaggerating the importance of economic factors in determining whether communities favoured repeal.\(^{32}\) Although a large number of the inhabitants of Leith would have employment related to its function as a seaport and would most likely support free-trade; the wealthier class, who may have had links to the corn trade, would favour protectionism.\(^{33}\) The first part of this local study demonstrated that the wealthier class in Leith gravitated towards the Established Church which would suggest these protectionists were not members of Seceding Churches. It also found that unskilled workers formed a large proportion of the seceding congregations. These people were the group in society who suffered most when the price of bread was high and would therefore favour repeal. The differences between denominations concerning their opinions on the legitimacy of the Corn Laws appear to link to the wider differences of social class found in the community.

\(^{30}\) MacLaren, pp.10-13.
\(^{31}\) MacLaren, p.42.
\(^{33}\) Miller, p.908.
Petitioning both Houses of Parliament was a popular method by which ordinary people could campaign for political change in the early nineteenth century. Signatures were often gathered by groups: inhabitants of a street or town, employees at a workplace or church members.\textsuperscript{34} The Anti-Corn Law League organised annual petitioning drives from 1839 to 1843.\textsuperscript{35} The Select Committee on Public Petitions in the House of Commons made an annual report of the number of petitions received, their originators and the number of signatures contained in each. The details of these were published for one parliamentary session only, 1840-41, and this Report shows a petition received from the Dissenting Church ministers and members present at the Edinburgh conference, mentioned above. The eight hundred and twenty-six signatures on this document would include those from the ministers and member delegates from the four Seceding Churches in Leith. The Report shows petitions submitted by several Scottish Seceding Churches; but none from Leith. This is not to say that the churches did not use this method of protest. There may have been a petition signed in another year by the members of one, or all, Seceding Churches in Leith, but details for these years were not published. As the Anti-Corn Law Association of Leith submitted a petition in 1841, members of the churches in the study may have registered their support for repeal in this document.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34} Miller, p.885.
\textsuperscript{35} Miller, p 890.
\textsuperscript{36} A return of the number of petitions, memorials or addresses presented to Her Majesty for repeal of the corn laws PP 1842 (563) lx 443- 53 (p.452).
It is unfortunate that newspaper accounts of the meetings of the Anti-Corn Law League mention by name only those who were considered to be of importance in the community, such as local councillors, advocates and ministers. The identities of the majority of those attending the meeting remain unknown and it has therefore been necessary to use the presence, or absence, of ministers at these meetings to gauge the political stance of the congregation as a whole. This generalisation can be justified; in a time where so many alternative places of worship existed in Leith, any individual who disagreed with their minister in political matters could leave and seek a church with a clergyman more suited to their outlook.

Examination of contemporary newspaper accounts show that a meeting of the Anti-Corn Law League was held in Edinburgh in 1841 and attended by Francis Muir, minister of Leith Relief Church. The following year, he was one of the speakers at the same gathering, advocating free trade as a method of ensuring peace between nations. This meeting was also attended by James Harper of the Associate Congregation and Robert Culbertson of Leith St. Andrew’s Place Church. Within the Leith Anti-Corn Law Association, Harper was appointed in February 1842 as delegate to the Anti-Corn Law League Convention in London.

In January 1843, the leaders of the movement, Richard Cobden and John Bright attended a banquet in Trinity House, Leith at which Frances Muir asked a blessing and toasted, ‘The Liberal Members of the Bar of Scotland’. There is an account of a similar dinner, held in Edinburgh two days later, at which Muir gave the Vote

---

40 ‘Anti-Corn Law Soiree in Leith’ Caledonian Mercury, 16 January 1843, p.3.
of Thanks and Harper proposed a motion to decry the Corn Laws.41 The Relief Church was the venue for a meeting of the Leith branch of the Association held the following year where William Marshall, minister of Leith Kirkgate Church, joined Muir and Harper on the platform.42

The presence of these ministers at Anti-Corn Law gatherings would have less significance in this study if they shared the platform with clergy from the Established Church. This would suggest that reform of the legislation was the wish of all Presbyterian ministers in Leith, irrespective of denomination. No mention is made, however, in the above accounts of either of the two ministers serving the Established Church of Scotland in the parish of South Leith between 1830 and 1845: James Grant and David Thorburn. Both play an active part in public life: the former as an extraordinary director of the Scottish Widow’s Fund Life Association Company and Vice Chairman of the Ministers’ Sons’ Club.43 The latter appears to have varied interests which included serving on the committee of the Leith branch of the Association on Behalf of the Poles, formed to help exiles from that country after the failure of the November Rising of 1830-1.44 A similar situation exists for the two ministers of North Leith Parish Church: James Buchanan and Alexander Davidson. The former was a well-known author of books on popular religion; one of which his Comfort in Affliction, a widely read series of meditations on Bible passages, going into its fifth edition in 1838.45 There is no evidence from

42 ‘Leith Anti-Corn Law League Public Meeting’ Caledonian Mercury, 20 January 1844, p.3.
45 ‘New Works Recently Published by John Johnstone’, Inverness Courier, 15 August 1838, p.1.
contemporary newspapers as to the activities of Davidson, except as a celebrant at weddings and baptisms in North Leith Church.46

From the evidence gathered from the study in Leith, it would appear that the ministers of the two Established Churches in the town had no involvement in the local branch of the Anti-Corn Law League. This is unsurprising if the allegations made at the Seceding Churches Conference in 1841 were true. It was said that the Established Church had, ‘a deep pecuniary interest in maintaining corn at the highest possible price.’ This was attributed to the fact that the annual stipends of those ministers were linked to the price of corn.47 There is evidence that this was indeed the case. ‘Teinds’, the Scottish equivalent of the English ‘tithes’ were that proportion of the produce of the parish that was allocated for the support of the clergy. It fluctuated from year depending on the price of ‘victual’, which in agricultural communities would include corn.48 On the other hand, the members and ministers of all four Seceding Churches in Leith were opposed to the Corn Laws, with two of those ministers being particularly active within the local Anti-Corn Law Association. Newspaper accounts confirm the presence of two other Seceding ministers at two of the meetings in the town.49 Leith Relief Church was the venue for one of these and it is possible there may have been other meetings which were not reported.50

46 ‘Marriages’, *Perthshire Advertiser*, 1 August 1844, p.2.
47 MacLaren, p.7.
50 Leith Anti-Corn Law League Public Meeting’ *Caledonian Mercury*, 20 January 1844, p.3; ‘Anti-Corn Law Soiree in Leith’ *Caledonian Mercury*, 16 January 1843, p.3
The Secessionists and Chartism

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the extensive changes to the British economy and the structure of its society engendered by the processes of industrialisation and urbanisation were not accompanied by far-reaching developments in the political sphere. The Reform Act of 1832 had increased the Scottish electorate by a factor of sixteen, but this legislation was far from radical. Although the vote was extended to the urban middle classes, the predominance of landed influence remained. The legislation was initially greeted with enthusiastic support by the working class, from whose keen agitation the Reform Movement had largely derived its success. This was replaced by disillusionment, however, as it became evident that there were no plans to extend the franchise further. This discontent led to The People’s Charter being drawn up in 1838 comprising a list of six points of political reform which including universal male suffrage. Chartist Associations were formed throughout Britain and by 1839, Scotland was home to 130 such groups. A Radical Association had been founded in Leith in 1836, following a visit to the town by Feargus O’Connor, proprietor of the Northern Star and a leading figure in Chartism. Between this time and 1843, this organisation became known as Leith Charter Association.

The close relationship between politics and religion in the early nineteenth century has been discussed above and Yeo has recognised the strong link between the
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radical Christian outlook and Chartism in England.\footnote{Yeo, p.122.} A similar situation existed in Scotland; many of those who supported Chartism in Scotland in the 1830s were possessed of a strong Christian faith and looked to the Church for assistance and leadership.\footnote{Wilson, p.13.} Not all Scottish Churches were supportive of electoral reform, however. Within the Established Church of Scotland, the local gentry, as heritors, paid the minister's stipend and were responsible for the building and upkeep of the parish church, manse and school.\footnote{Alexander T.N. Muirhead, \textit{Reformation, Dissent and Diversity: The Story of Scotland's Churches 1560-1960} (London: Bloomsbury, 2005) p.72.} This gave this, largely protectionist, group the financial leverage to discourage any radicalism in the local clergy. Wilson has also argued that the majority of ministers were unlikely to support any extension of the franchise as a result of having little sympathy, or genuine interest, in the rights of the working class.\footnote{Wilson, p.13.} Indeed, one of the most influential Scottish churchmen of the nineteenth century, Thomas Chalmers, argued that universal suffrage was against biblical teaching, quoting from Ecclesiasticus on the danger of giving working men influence in government. His opinion did not change, even with the passing of the Reform Act in 1832, when the owners of houses throughout Edinburgh were asked to show their approval of the legislation by showing lights in those rooms visible from the street. Chalmers' refusal to do so led to his windows being broken by a hostile crowd.\footnote{‘Life of Dr. Chalmers’, \textit{Edinburgh Evening Courant}, 2 September 1851, p.3.}

In contrast to the position held by the Established Church, it could be assumed that the Secession and Relief Churches would actively support the Chartist movement. Firstly, these denominations had come into being through a deep
hostility to the disproportionate influence enjoyed by the landed classes. Secondly, their membership came largely from artisans and tradesmen, who would benefit directly from any extension to the franchise. Evidence to support this assumption, however, has not been found on a local level. In a situation similar to that described above with respect to the Anti-Corn Law League, the Kirk Session Minutes for three of the churches in the study contain only entries relevant to the spiritual welfare of their congregations; with no mention of the political events taking place in the town. If the ministers of the four Seceding Churches had been mentioned in contemporary newspaper accounts as being present at meetings of Leith Chartist Association, this could be taken as evidence of the Church’s support. In contrast with the meetings of the Anti-Corn Law League, there is not one mention of the presence of the local Seceding ministers at Chartist gatherings in the town.

Gurney has argued that ‘it is a historiographical commonplace that Chartists were generally hostile to the League’ and examination of the relevant primary sources provides evidence to suggest this hostility extended to Scottish Dissenting Churches, of which the Leith Seceding Churches were a part.60 Firstly, in 1840, the ‘Public Meeting of Dissenters’ was called in Edinburgh to discuss their stance on patronage. This was attended by churchmen and town councillors from throughout central Scotland and included the ministers of all four Seceding Churches in Leith. There were several Chartists present in the audience, who heckled the speaker when he stated, ‘a limited franchise might do as well as well as a more extended one’. The subsequent dialogue between speaker on the
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platform and the heckling Chartists was far from amicable.\footnote{\textit{Public Meeting of Dissenters}, \textit{The Scotsman}, 19 December 1840, p.3.} This could suggest that it was common knowledge that Dissenting Churches did not support extension of the franchise and the Chartists attended the meeting with the sole intention of disrupting it.

Within the town of Leith, there is evidence that this hostility continued. The involvement of the James Harper of Leith North United Associate Congregation in the Leith Anti-Corn Law Association has already been noted. In 1842, the meeting at which he was selected as a delegate to a forthcoming conference in London was gate-crashed by Chartists who were sufficiently numerous to table an amendment to the original proposal. This stated,

‘The approaching conference is totally uncalled for. There is not a shadow of hope that the Corn Laws can be repealed until the People’s Charter shall be made the law of the land.’

\textit{According to the Northern Star and Leeds General Advertiser,} the editor of which was a leading Chartist, the amendment was carried “amid a cheering and clapping that beggars description”.\footnote{\textit{Leith}, \textit{Northern Star and Leeds General Advertiser}, 12 February 1842, p.15.} The account of the same meeting in \textit{The Scotsman}, a liberal newspaper, makes no mention of such celebration and condemns the behaviour, ‘Never in the experience of the oldest inhabitant in Leith was such a flagrant outrage committed on any of its townsmen.’\footnote{\textit{Leith Corn Laws}, \textit{The Scotsman}, 9 February 1842, p.3.} The Chartists’ actions in interfering with the meeting would
provoke hostility in the members of Leith Anti-Corn Law League, which has been shown to include the ministers of the Seceding Churches in the town.

Further evidence suggests that relations between the Leith Chartists and the ministers of the town’s Seceding churches were less than cordial; the establishment of a Chartist Church in Leith by 1841. 64 Chartist Churches were set up by members of the movement between 1839 and 1842, and there were at least twenty such congregations in Scotland.65 Many of the congregation were former members of the Seceding Churches, who found that these churches rejected their political ideology and subsequently founded their own place of worship.66 The Chartist Church in Leith was able to administer the sacrament of baptism. ‘In June 1841, Feargus O’Connor, infant son of Mr. James MacLaren of Leith, was duly registered and baptised.’ 67 The establishment of a Chartist Church in Leith suggests that in this locality, as nationally, the Chartist Movement had little support from the Seceding Churches.

Outwith the churches, there is in Leith, there is an indication of a more secular nature that Chartists and members of Seceding Churches were not in agreement. In July 1839, The General Convention of Chartists had called for the implementation of a raft of measures aimed at putting pressure on the middle classes to support the Charter. These included exclusive dealing; whereby supporters of the Chartist movement would deal only with shopkeepers willing to
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pledge support for the cause. 68 This tactic led to the rapid establishment of Chartist Stores and in 1839, a Chartist Provision Store was set up in Leith which aimed to ‘provide the necessities of life at the cheapest possible rate and of the best quality.’ 69 The store was established by selling shares of ten shillings each, to be paid for in weekly, sixpenny instalments. 70 This direct competition to the shopkeepers of the town, many of whom were members of the Seceding Churches, may have been a further cause of animosity between the two groups.

Uncovering evidence for the involvement in campaigns for political reform by the members of the Secession Churches in Leith has not been straightforward. The minutes of the Kirk Sessions of the Churches, which it was hoped would provide accounts of meetings held in the building, or attended elsewhere, offered only details of efforts to maintain the spiritual integrity of the congregation and the fabric of the building. Newspaper accounts of political meetings have been the main source by which political activity has been substantiated. These have two drawbacks, however. Firstly, the reports give only the names of attendees who were well known in the community and leave the vast majority unidentified. Because of this, it has been necessary to equate the presence of the church minister at a gathering with the outlook of his congregation. This is simplistic as there may well have been communicants who disagreed with the stance taken, although given the choice of places of worship this may be unlikely. Secondly, reports of the activities within the meeting reflect the political stance of the newspaper. Reports from the liberal Scotsman differ from those in the Chartist
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Northern Star and Leeds General Advertiser. Although the former was liberal in outlook, it did not match the fervent Chartism displayed by the latter. In addition, the two political campaigns examined, the Anti-Corn Law League and Chartism existed in a state of antipathy both on a national and, as been shown here, on local level.

In addition to exploring the part played by the members of the Seceding Churches in contemporary political campaigns, evidence of a wider political allegiance was sought. No examples were discovered which showed the members of the Seceding Churches to be present at political rallies in the town. It may be possible that they did, in fact, attend, but as they had little power or influence, their names have not been recorded. Another possible primary source lay in the contemporary newspapers which published letters discussing a particular political point. None to date has been discovered to have been written by any person readily identifiable as connected with the churches in the study. The search has been obfuscated as most of the letters are not signed by the name of the contributor, rather using initials, or adopting a pseudonym.71

The first part of the study demonstrated a similarity in the social composition of the Established and Seceding Churches. It was suggested this may be due to the fact that time had lessened the reputation for protest and defiance attributed to the Seceding Churches. It was hoped that the second part of the study might demonstrate differences in the degree in which the members of the different
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denominations were involved in contemporary campaigns for tariff and electoral reform. This has been the case with respect to the campaign for the repeal of the Corn Laws, in which there is evidence to show considerable involvement by the ministers of the Seceding Churches in Leith. There is no proof of any similar participation by the clergy of the Established Church, possibly because the level of their stipends was connected to the price of corn, which the legislation kept artificially high. As regards involvement in the campaign to adopt the People’s Charter, it would seem that in the town of Leith, the members and clergy of both Established and Seceding Churches were not involved and there is evidence of hostility between the Chartists and the latter. In seeking an explanation as to why these denominations chose not to support the Chartist movement, a description of the way in which its members were regarded by their contemporaries may be useful:

‘It is difficult to realise that to be a Chartist during the decade 1838-1848 produced something of the same shock to upper and middle-class mentality that being a Communist does today.’  

These words were written by Mechie, an Ecclesiastical historian, in 1957, just months after Moscow acted to crush the Hungarian Revolution by brutal military action and mass executions. It conveys the fear caused by the language of some Chartist leaders which suggested they would use confiscation, violence and bloodshed against the upper and middle classes to achieve their aims. Although some Chartists decried violence, the Chartist Association in Edinburgh, less than two miles away, declared that they would have universal suffrage ‘at all hazards’.  

It was members from this group who were recruited by their colleagues in Leith to disrupt the Anti-Corn Law Meeting discussed above, at which two ministers from Seceding Churches in Leith were present.74 It may well be that the members of the Seceding Churches felt they could not, in conscience, support a movement where the use of force was considered legitimate, should peaceful agitation fail.

Conclusion

Although the connection between social class and religious denomination in the nineteenth century has already been explored, the majority of these studies have been carried out in English localities, investigating the social composition of the many English Dissenting denominations. Those studies seeking to investigate similar connections in Scotland have largely focussed on those individuals who left the Established Church in 1843 to form the Free Church. The study of the earlier secessions from the Church of Scotland is not extensive and those few studies which have made a comparison of social class of the members of Established and Seceding Churches have centred on large cities such as Glasgow and Aberdeen.

In order to expand the body of knowledge on the social class of the early seceders, this local study examined the membership of the Associate Presbyterian and Relief Churches in the town of Leith in 1841. From the evidence gained, it firstly sought to confirm, or refute, the existing historiography which states the majority of seceders to be self-employed artisans and tradesmen. Secondly, the study attempted to give a more nuanced picture of these individuals by looking at their involvement in the campaigns for legislative and political reform between 1820 and 1845; a time when both Leith, and Britain as a whole, were experiencing a substantial degree of political activity.

The first part of the study was largely quantitative. Using data from the Baptismal Rolls of the churches and the 1841 census, the occupations of two hundred men
from the Established Churches and a further two hundred from Seceding Churches in Leith were established. The findings of the investigation confirmed that, in 1841, the majority of the members of the Seceding Churches were skilled tradesmen and artisans, of which a small number could be verified as being self-employed, thus supporting the assertions made in the secondary literature. Although this was an encouraging outcome, the class profile of the Established Church contained an almost equal number this group and a slightly larger number of self-employed workers. This similarity between the denominations has been explained by assuming the Seceding Churches may have lost, over time, some of their reputation for radicalism.

From examination of the ‘class profiles’ of the congregation, the study also confirmed the claim made in the secondary literature that the upper and middle classes were reluctant to join the Seceding Churches. With respect to the former, this may have been due to the lingering legacy of the patronage disputes; the upper class being unlikely to join a group who had so publicly expressed their abhorrence at the practice. It was suggested that the middle class may have enjoyed a degree of power and status as office bearers in the Established Church, which they would be reluctant to relinquish by leaving.

The study produced evidence to show the seceding congregations in Leith had a higher number of unskilled workers than the Established Church. This was in contradiction to the assertion made in the secondary literature which claimed this group would remain members of the Established Church in order to secure their right to Poor Relief, which was funded by the church. An explanation lay in the fact
that at least one of the Seceding Churches operated a similar system of relief, with collections being taken from members of the church to assist the needy within the congregation.

The second part of the study was qualitative and sought to find evidence for political activity by the members of the Seceding Churches in Leith, with particular reference to two national campaigns of the time: the Repeal of the Corn Laws and the Adoption of the Peoples’ Charter. As no mention of activity connected with either of these campaigns was made in the minutes of the Kirk Sessions, evidence for this party of the study was largely from accounts contemporary newspapers naming those of importance attending meetings in support of the causes. The repeal of the Corn Laws was seen by the Seceding Churches as a legitimate fight against poverty and its perceived result, irreligion. In Leith, ministers from these churches were active attending local meetings, fund-raising soirees and national conferences in support of the cause. There was also an incidence of the church premises being used as a venue for one of these meetings. No evidence was found, however, of any participation by ministers of the Established Church in the town. It was argued that there were two factors contributing to this lack of involvement. Firstly, their stipend was linked to the price of corn, meaning repeal of the tariff would result in a reduction of income. Secondly, it had been shown from analysis of the occupations of the congregation that they were less likely to advocate free trade and would not favour a minister who openly opposed their views.
Many Chartists were of strong religious faith and it might be expected that the Seceding Churches, with their more radical stance, would support the campaign for a more democratic electoral system. In this local study, however, no evidence has been found to confirm this supposition. It has been argued that the Seceding Churches in Leith did not welcome Chartists into their congregations, made evident by the building of a Chartist Church in Leith. The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, it seems likely that the willingness of some Chartists to use violence in pursuit of their cause might have alienated those who embraced the Christian faith. Secondly, on a secular level, a substantial proportion of the Seceding congregations made their income from trade and would not favour the establishment of a Chartist store in Leith, diverting business from their establishments.

Although these findings have added to the current knowledge of the membership of Seceding Churches, the sample of members on which the study was made was restricted by the nature of the primary source used. The use of Baptismal Registers meant women, unmarried and childless men were excluded. Further studies in the same geographical area using a different primary source, such as Marriage or Burial Registers, might obtain a more representative sample of church members and reach other conclusions. Studies in other parts of Scotland, such as rural areas, where many workers had a vested interest in the price of corn, might also provide evidence for different findings.

The Presbyterian Churches in Scotland has had a troubled history, where denominations split over matters of theology or politics but, by the middle of the
twentieth century, these divisions were healed and the Church of Scotland had reunited with the majority of the Seceding Churches. At the time of this local study, however, the importance of being able to worship in accordance with political belief manifested itself in the abundance of places of worship. Much of the built heritage remains with us today, although the names and doctrines of the denominations have been forgotten. This local study has sought to give substance to those who chose to worship in the Seceding Churches by exploring their social and political standing. It has shown that they were far from being the ‘Cave Dwellers of Puritanism’, being prepared to engage in peaceful political activity in order to overturn legislation they saw as unjust and discriminatory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>CHILD</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>DIRECTORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMSON</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>ESTHER</td>
<td>OLD CHURCH STREET</td>
<td>GREENGROCER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>SANDPORT STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AITKEN</td>
<td>RACHEL</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>DOCK PLACE</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLAN</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ALISON</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>GARDINER</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ELZA</td>
<td>BALTIC STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>MITCHELL STREET</td>
<td>PROVISION PRESERVER</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>FORT STREET</td>
<td>SAWYER</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>HOPE STREET TERRACE</td>
<td>SAWYER</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>LONDON ROW</td>
<td>ACCOUNTANT</td>
<td>EMPLOYEE</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>PORTLAND TERRACE</td>
<td>SEAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>SANDPORT STREET</td>
<td>FISHERMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOULTON</td>
<td>ALISON</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>QUEENSFERRY STREET</td>
<td>SHIP CHANDLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYCE</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>NEWHAVEN CROSS</td>
<td>MASON</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHANAN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>YORK PLACE</td>
<td>MINISTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHANAN</td>
<td>CHARLES</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>CITADEL STREET</td>
<td>SEAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURMANN</td>
<td>MARY ANN</td>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>EDINBURGH</td>
<td>EXCISE OFFICER</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTCHER</td>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>LAPICIDE LANE</td>
<td>FLESHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIRNCROSS</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>TRAFALGAR LANE</td>
<td>JOINER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMERON</td>
<td>BARBARA</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>RIDDLES COURT</td>
<td>PROVISION MERCHANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>SHORE</td>
<td>CLERK</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDLISH</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>LODGING HSE KEEPER</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTLEY</td>
<td>PETER</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>HILLHOUSEFIELD</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNIE</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>LAMB'S COURT</td>
<td>FISHERMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNIE</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>MAIN STREET NEWHAVEN</td>
<td>FISHERMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNIE</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>LISTON</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>MAIN STREET NEWHAVEN</td>
<td>FISHERMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARNIE JANET WILLIAM JEAN NEW LANE NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
CARNIE ROBERT ROBERT ELIZABETH NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
CHISHOLM JANE JAMES JANE KING STREET CARPENTER G
COCHRAN SOPHIA WILLIAM CATHERINE LEITH WALK IRON FOUNDRYMAN G
COLLINS THOMAS ROBERT ISABELLA TOLBOOTH WYND SPIRIT DEALER OWNER G
COMB JAMES JOHN GRACE PIER PLACE MERCHANT SEAMAN G
COMBE EUPHEMIA WILLIAM DARNLEY NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
CROMBIE JAMES JAMES JOHNSTON NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
CRUICKSHANKS JANE WILLIAM JANET ANCHORFIELD LODGING HSE KEEPER H
DALZIEL JANE THOMAS MARGARET COUPAR STREET MERCHANT SEAMAN G
DAVIDSON CHARLES ARTHUR MARGARET CROMWELL STREET SHIP MASTER E
DONALD THOMAS MALCOLM ELIZABETH COUPAR STREET SHIP MASTER E
DURHAM ISABELLA RUTHERFORD MARION NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
DURHAM JEAN ADAM JEAN NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
EDWARDS ADAM JAMES JEAN YARDHEADS SMITH G
FAIRGRIEVE HELEN ANDREW HELEN COUPAR STREET BLACKSMITH G
FAIRLIE MARGARET ROBERT ELIZABETH SANDPORT STREET MERCHANT SEAMAN G
FARQUHAR WILLIAM ALEXANDER HELEN CITADEL SPIRIT DEALER G
FERIE ROBERT THOMAS AGNES COBURG STREET CARTER I
FINLAY JEAN ROBERT MARGARET OLD CHURCH STREET BUTCHER G
FINLAYSON MARGARET JOHN HELEN COUPAR STREET SEAMAN G
FLEMING GEORGE GEORGE JANET MAIN STREET NEWHAVEN SHOEMAKER G
FLETCHER MARGARET JAMES BETSY COUPAR STREET CUSTOMS OFFICER E
FLUCKER GEORGE GEORGE ISABELLA NEWHAVEN PILOT F
FLUCKER JANE THOMAS JACOBINA MAIN STREET NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
FLUCKER JOHN ROBERT JEMIMA NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
FLUCKER ROBINA PHILIP ROBINA NEWHAVEN FISHERMAN G
FOBISTER  ISABELLA  DAVID  ELIZABETH  BROAD WYND  JOINER  G
FOGGO  WILLIAM  ROBERT  SUZANNA  SOUTH FORT STREET  TEACHER  SELF EMPLOYED  F
FORBES  PETER  WILLIAM  WILLAMINA  COUPAR STREET  PAVER  G
FRAME  THOMAS  JOHN  HELEN  COMMERCIAL PLACE  CARPENTER  G
FRENCH  AGNES  JAMES  CATHERINE  BALTIC STREET  INDEPENDENT  D
GALLOWAY  ROBERT  ALEXANDER  JANET  COBURG STREET  SHIP OWNER  D
GARSON  ALEXANDER  THOMAS  CATHERINE  COUPAR STREET  SEAMAN  G
GAVIN  ISABELLA  WILLIAM  ISABELLA  WILLIAMFIELD  INDEPENDENT  D
GAVIN  CRICHTON  WILLIAM  ANN  WILLIAMFIELD  MERCHANT SEAMAN  G
GEDDES  THOMAS  ARCHIBALD  SARAH  ST ANDERW'S STREET  LABOURER  I
GERRARD  ARCHIBALD  CHARLES  MARGARET  COUPAR STREET  MERCHANT SEAMAN  G
GILLESPIE  ALEXANDER  GORDON  MARGARET  COBURG STREET  SPIRIT DEALER  OWNER  G
GILLON  ROBERT  JAMES  ELIZABETH  ALBANY COURT  SPIRIT DEALER  G
GLASS  JANET  ROBERT  FLORA  OAKFIELD  PORTER  I
GLOVER  ELIZABETH  WILLIAM  JANE  TAPHALL  WRITER TO THE SIGNET  OWNER  A
GOLDIE  JAMES  ROBERT  ISABELLA  CITADEL STREET  BAKER  OWNER  G
GOURLAY  THOMAS  DAVID  JEMIMA  YARDEHEADS  SHIP WRIGHT  OWNER  G
GOWANS  ANDREW  JAMES  CATHERINE  CITADEL STREET  CARPENTER  G
GRANT  ANN  ALEXANDER  ELIZABETH  LONG ROW  LABOURER  I
GRAY  JANET  ROBERT  GRACE  COBURG STREET  SEAMAN  G
GRAY  ALEXANDER  ALEXANDER  JANET  JAMES SQUARE  SHOEMAKER  G
GREEN  MARY ANN  GEORGE  MARY ANN  BROUGHTON  SPIRIT DEALER  G
GRIEVE  ANDREW  GEORGE  EMILY  HILLHOUSEFIELD  SMITH  G
GUNN  CATHERINE  ROBERT  AGNES  ALBANY STREET  SOLICITOR  OWNER  B
HALL  ANN  SEATON  MARION  AUCHINLECK'S BRAE  FISHERMAN  G
HALL  WILLIAM  WILLIAM  ANN  MAIN STREET NEWHAVEN  FISHERMAN  G
HARPER  JOHN  ADAM  ANN  HOPE STREET  LABOURER  I
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Tolbooth Wynd</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Yardheads</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewat</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Berry's Court</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Pier Place</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Auchinleck's Brae</td>
<td>Seaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>Trafalgar Lane</td>
<td>Millwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Mayfield House</td>
<td>Timber Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Hillhousefield</td>
<td>Cabinet Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamieson</td>
<td>Magnus</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Maitland Street</td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidd</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Pier Place</td>
<td>AG Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Butler's Land</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Main Street Newhaven</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinghorn</td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>Joiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laird</td>
<td>Mungo</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lascelles</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Restalrig</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Granton</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leask</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Citadel</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leask</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Cassel's Place</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 2 Leith South Church of Scotland. Details from entries extracted from Baptismal Register 1839-1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>CHILD</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>DIRECTORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JEAN</td>
<td>HIGH STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>GILES STREET</td>
<td>SHOPKEEPER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AINSLIE</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>JANEN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>GLOVER STREET</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AITKEN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>HERMITAGE ROW</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ARCHIBALD</td>
<td>ARCHIBALD</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>FOX LANE</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALISON</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>AT SEA</td>
<td>CORN FACTOR</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLAN</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>ST ANDREWS STREET</td>
<td>SHOEMAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARDYCE</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>KATHERINE</td>
<td>ST ANTHONY'S PLACE</td>
<td>BOOKSELLER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>CHARLES</td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>QUALITY STREET</td>
<td>PHYSICIAN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>WATSON</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>ELBE STREET</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>PETER</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>OLD SUGAR HSE CLOSE</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>BRUNTON CLOSE</td>
<td>SHOEMAKER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>LEITH MOUNT COTTS</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMOUR</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>STEAD'S PLACE</td>
<td>BRICKLAYER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR</td>
<td>SARAH</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>SARAH</td>
<td>WILSON'S PLACE</td>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAILIE</td>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>GLOVER STREET</td>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>JEAN</td>
<td>AT SEA</td>
<td>SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARKER</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>SAMUEL</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>STARBANK COTTAGES</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNET</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARIA</td>
<td>ST ANDREW'S STREET</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARR</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>CABLES WYND</td>
<td>MASON</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAXTER</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>CITADEL STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAXTER</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>ALLAN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>OLD BRIDGE END</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGG</td>
<td>BLAIR</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>COATFIELD LANE</td>
<td>COACHMAN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNET</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>WELLINGTON PLACE</td>
<td>CORN FACTOR</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNET</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>CITADEL STREET</td>
<td>WAGGONER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRRELL</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>YARDHEADS</td>
<td>CURRIER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ST ANDREW'S STREET</td>
<td>SHOPMAN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>EASTFIELD</td>
<td>CORK MANUFACTURER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>COLIN</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>ELBE STREET</td>
<td>ROPE MAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLYTH</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>WEST BUSH</td>
<td>CUSTOMS OFFICER</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOON</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>ST ANDREW'S STREET</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWDEN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>ALISON</td>
<td>JOCK'S LODGE</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYCE</td>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>BURNS STREET</td>
<td>CUSTOMS OFFICER</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGES</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>BOWLING GREEN ST</td>
<td>GLAZIER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROADFOOT</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>QUALITY STREET</td>
<td>SHIP BROKER</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROTHIE</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE STREET</td>
<td>TEA MERCHANT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROTHERSTON</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>CHARLES</td>
<td>SUSAN</td>
<td>EASTER ROAD</td>
<td>LABOURER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE</td>
<td>MARJORY</td>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>BERNARD STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYDEN</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>KIRKGATE</td>
<td>FLESHER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHAN</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>EUPHEMIA</td>
<td>BURNS STREET</td>
<td>GARDINER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHANAN</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MOSES</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>ELBE STREET</td>
<td>CUSTOMS OFFICER</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLENDER</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>HERMITAGE BRAE</td>
<td>TANNER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMERON</td>
<td>KENNETH</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>BATH STREET</td>
<td>ROPE MAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>ELBE STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDELL</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>JOSEPH</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>BERNARD STREET</td>
<td>BANKER</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOW</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>BATH STREET</td>
<td>BLACKSMITH</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSE</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>FOX LANE</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAVAYE</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>JOCK'S LODGE</td>
<td>INDEPENDENT MEANS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALMER</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>FOX LANE</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALMERS</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>FOX LANE</td>
<td>LABOURER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHISHOLM</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>JOCK'S LODGE</td>
<td>TAILOR</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKSON</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>CASSEL'S PLACE</td>
<td>CHINA MERCHANT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Middle Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Regency Terrace</td>
<td>Brass Founder</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connell</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Old Sugar Hse Close</td>
<td>Box Maker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquer</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Bowling Green St</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corstorphine</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Calton</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Leith Walk</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Morton Court</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Lochend</td>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie</td>
<td>Archibald</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Spence Place</td>
<td>Cork Manufacturer</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbertson</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Darlings Brae</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalziel</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Wellington Place</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Shirra Brae</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Lochend</td>
<td>Stone Breaker</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>St Andrews Street</td>
<td>Colour Manufacturer</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Commercial Place</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>Tobacco Maker</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Sandport Street</td>
<td>Tobacconist</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Lovers Lane</td>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryburgh</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Fox Lane</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudgeon</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Euphemia</td>
<td>Johnston Street</td>
<td>Sugar Refiner</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Glover Street</td>
<td>Pattern Maker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Poplar Lane</td>
<td>Ropemaker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Self Emp</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>WILLIAM</th>
<th>JAMES</th>
<th>ELIZABETH</th>
<th>BROAD WYND</th>
<th>BAKER</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAIRBAIRN</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>GLOVER STREET</td>
<td>WAREHOUSEMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLEY</td>
<td>JEAN</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>RICHMOND LANE</td>
<td>FLESHER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>CALTON</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>CALTON</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERGUSON</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>FOX LANE</td>
<td>BLACKSMITH</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERGUSON</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>WATER LANE</td>
<td>FLESHER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERGUSON</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>WATER LANE</td>
<td>FLESHER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERGUSON</td>
<td>EUPHEMIA</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>BARBARA</td>
<td>SPENCER'S PLACE</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERLIE</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>CITADEL STREET</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERRIE</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>WATER LANE</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINLAY</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>VINEGAR CLOSE</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEMING</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>SUSAN</td>
<td>BEDFORD STREET</td>
<td>LABOURER</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBES</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>STEAD'S PLACE</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORREST</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ALISON</td>
<td>VINEGAR CLOSE</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOTHERINGHAM</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>SOUTH LEITH</td>
<td>CUSTOMS OFFICER</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYFE</td>
<td>NELSON</td>
<td>NELSON</td>
<td>RACHEL</td>
<td>KIRKGAZE</td>
<td>CORK MANUFACTURER</td>
<td>OWNER G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBB</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>JESSIE</td>
<td>OLD SUGAR HSE CLOSE</td>
<td>SHOEMAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBSON</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>QUEEN'S PLACE</td>
<td>HARBOUR MASTER</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILCHRIST</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>WATER LANE</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLIES</td>
<td>ALAN</td>
<td>HECTOR</td>
<td>ALISON</td>
<td>DOCK STREET</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLIES</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>REDFORD'S CLOSE</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLON</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL PLACE</td>
<td>SHIP'S CARPENTER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Leith Relief Church. Details from entries extracted from Baptismal Register 1839-1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>CHILD</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>WIFE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>DIRECTORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>CITADEL STREET</td>
<td>BLOCKMAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>ARTHUR</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>COUPER STREET</td>
<td>SAWYER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAXTER</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>LAPICIDE LANE</td>
<td>SAWYER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>CHRISTIAN</td>
<td>SHORE</td>
<td>JOINER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>ELBE ST</td>
<td>ROPEMAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>EUPHORIA</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>LOCHEND ROAD</td>
<td>LABOURER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKIE</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>HADDINGTON PL</td>
<td>CHAIMAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKIE</td>
<td>SAMUEL</td>
<td>SAMUEL</td>
<td>GRACE</td>
<td>YARDHEADS</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGGS</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>DUKE STREET</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>VINEGAR CLOSE</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNTON</td>
<td>RACHEL</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>CABLES WYND</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYCE</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>KIRKGATE</td>
<td>SHIP'S CARPENTER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYSON</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ARCHIBALD</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>WEIR'S CLOSE</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHAN</td>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>LAPICIDE LANE</td>
<td>SAWYER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHAN</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>EUPHORIA</td>
<td>BURNS STREET</td>
<td>GARDINER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>ARCHIBALD</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>BONNINGTON PL</td>
<td>TAILOR</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHADWICK</td>
<td>ROBINA</td>
<td>COLIN</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>CITADEL STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALMERS</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>DUKE STREET</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALMERS</td>
<td>JEAN</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>HIGH ST</td>
<td>GILDER</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAPPERTON</td>
<td>BARBARA</td>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>BARBARA</td>
<td>HOUSEFIELDHILL</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLIER</td>
<td>CHRISTINE</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>COATFIELD LANE</td>
<td>COACHMAN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>ELBE ST</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMMIN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>KIRKGATE</td>
<td>SHOEMAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRIE</td>
<td>BEGBIE</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>STOVIES' ALLEY</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALGLEISH</td>
<td>HANNAH</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>HANNAH</td>
<td>ST ANDREW'S ST</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Shirra Brae</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Fort Street</td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewar</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewar</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>Duke Street</td>
<td>Iron Foundryman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Commercial Pl</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td>Elbe St</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>Tobacco Maker</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Elbe St</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>Owner G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Euphemia</td>
<td>St Ninian's Lane</td>
<td>Boat Builder</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunson</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Cooper Street</td>
<td>Coppersmith</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Burns Street</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Yardheads</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Duke St</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td>Sailmaker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>Hillhousefield</td>
<td>Boilermaker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Duke Street</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldie</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Citadel Street</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Owner G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodall</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>Yardheads</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourlay</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Jemima</td>
<td>Yardheads</td>
<td>Shipwright</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Fox Lane</td>
<td>Ropemaker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>James Lane</td>
<td>Tinsmith</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>James Square</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeve</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Hillhousefield</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieg</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Taphall</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Owner G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groves</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliday</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Moray Street</td>
<td>Iron Foundryman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Leith Walk</td>
<td>Silk Dyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmond</td>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Leith Walk</td>
<td>File Grinder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Euphemia</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hislop</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Dock Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Marget</td>
<td>Shipwright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosie</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Spirit Dealer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchison</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvin</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Ropemaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>South Leith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemp</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>Giles Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Coatfield Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Matilda</td>
<td>Lowrie's Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Burns Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>India Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>James Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizards</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackie</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Hermitage Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBeath</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Cromwell Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdonald</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Maitland Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdougal</td>
<td>Aitken</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Citadel Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcgregor</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Yardheads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mckay</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Dock Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mckenzie</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Muckle's Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G: General
H: Helper
I: Indigenous
E: Employee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCLACHLAN</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>PRIMROSE STREET</td>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLEISH</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>SHIRRA BRAE</td>
<td>SOAP MAKER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLENNAN</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>DONALD</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>MCNEIL'S PLACE</td>
<td>SAWYER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMICHEAN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>SANDPORT STREET</td>
<td>GARDINER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIKLEREID</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>BOYD</td>
<td>REBECCA</td>
<td>LEITH</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELVILLE</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>MCNEIL'S PLACE</td>
<td>IRON FINISHER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERRYLEES</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>BATH STREET</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER</td>
<td>HUGH</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>POPLAR LANE</td>
<td>GILDER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRISON</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>YARDHEADS</td>
<td>MILLWRIGHT</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOLO</td>
<td>CHRISTIAN</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>GARDINER</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISBET</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>HAY</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>MORAY STREET</td>
<td>PRINTER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIVEN</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>JULIAN</td>
<td>LAPICIDE LANE</td>
<td>GARDINER</td>
<td>H OWNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>LEITH</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATON</td>
<td>CHRISTINA</td>
<td>PETER</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>BROAD WYND</td>
<td>JOINER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETERSON</td>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>BATH STREET</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETERSON</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>AT SEA</td>
<td>MERCHANT SEAMAN</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTTs</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>SPENCER'S PLACE</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POUSTIE</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>BACK ROW</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURDIE</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>CHRISTIAN</td>
<td>DUNCAN PLACE</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYOTT</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>BATH STREET</td>
<td>INDEPENDENT MEANS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMAGE</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td>BARBARA</td>
<td>GILES STREET</td>
<td>BLACKSMITH</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 Leith St. Andrew’s Place Church. Details from entries extracted from Baptismal Register 1838-1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>CHILD</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>ENT</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>YARDHEADS</td>
<td>CANDLE MAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>TOLBOOTH WYND</td>
<td>SHOEMAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>GRACE</td>
<td>TOLBOOTH WYND</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMSON</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>GILES STREET</td>
<td>SHOPKEEPER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AINSLEY</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE STREET</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>RACHEL</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE STREET</td>
<td>POLICE SUPERINTENDANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAILLIE</td>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>GLOVER STREET</td>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAILIE</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>RICHARD</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>BURNS ST</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>TOLBOOTH WYND</td>
<td>SHOPMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAIKIE</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>WALTER</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>PORTLAND TERRACE</td>
<td>SHOPMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRODIE</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>WEIR’S CLOSE</td>
<td>BLACKSMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRODIE</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>CHURCH STREET</td>
<td>STOCKING MAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYCE</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ELBE STREET</td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYCE</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>GEORGE ST LANE</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYDEN</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>KIRKGATE</td>
<td>FLESHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAWFORD</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>KIRKGATE</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMMING</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL PLACE</td>
<td>LABOURER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTHBERTON</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>EBINEEZER</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>CARPET LANE</td>
<td>GREENGROCER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALGIESEN</td>
<td>AGNES</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>MARY</td>
<td>CALTON</td>
<td>WAREHOUSEMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALGIEISH</td>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>ELBE STREET</td>
<td>ROPE MAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARLING</td>
<td>EUPHEMIA</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>CHRISTIAN</td>
<td>COATFIELD LANE</td>
<td>LABOURER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIDSON</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>WILLIAMINA</td>
<td>KIRKGATE</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICKSON</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>WATSON’S PLACE</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>RACHEL</td>
<td>COLIN</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE</td>
<td>CROMWELL STREET</td>
<td>COAL MERCHANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Married Name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERSKINE</td>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>MERRYLEES CLOSE</td>
<td>CORK CUTTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRGREIVE</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>COUPER STREET</td>
<td>BLACKSMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERGUSON</td>
<td>PATRICK</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>BRIDGE STREET</td>
<td>PAPER MERCHANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERGUSON</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>SPENCER'S PLACE</td>
<td>BASIN MAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBSON</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>GLEBE STREET</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBSON</td>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>DUKE STREET</td>
<td>SAWYER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLESPIE</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>KING STREET</td>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLESPIE</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>BATH STREET</td>
<td>LABOURER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVEN</td>
<td>JEAN</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>BERNARD STREET</td>
<td>SPIRIT DEALER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUNDWATER</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>TOLBOOTH WYND</td>
<td>SHOEMAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTHRIE</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>WATER LANE</td>
<td>JOINTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAY</td>
<td>SAMUEL</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>FOX LANE</td>
<td>CANE WEAVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDERSON</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>ST JAMES' STREET</td>
<td>COACHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDERSON</td>
<td>MARGARET</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>THISTLE STREET</td>
<td>COWFEEDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOGG</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>BURNS ST</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTER</td>
<td>ISABELLA</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>ELBE STREET</td>
<td>SERVANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK</td>
<td>WILLIAM</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>ST ANDREW'S ST</td>
<td>CORK CUTTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSTON</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>LEITH WALK</td>
<td>JOINTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIM</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>CHARLOTTE STREET</td>
<td>TINSMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINNAIRD</td>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>BURNS ST</td>
<td>GROCER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRK</td>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>COALFIELD LANE</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>KIRKGATE</td>
<td>TAILOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWSON</td>
<td>ANN</td>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>JAMES LANE</td>
<td>ROPEMAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWSON</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>DOCK STREET</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGGAT</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>GIDEON</td>
<td>COALFIELD LANE</td>
<td>GROCER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>ALEXANDER</td>
<td>TRAFALGER LANE</td>
<td>MASON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGAN</td>
<td>ELIZABETH</td>
<td>ROBERT</td>
<td>POPLAR LANE</td>
<td>HANDBLOCK WEAVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathie</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td>Tolbooth Wynd</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCubbin</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Dickson's Nursery</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdonald</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Constitution St</td>
<td>Slater</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcgie</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Mid Arthur Place</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrylees</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Constitution St</td>
<td>Cork Manufacturer</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moncrieff</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Bowie's Close</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossman</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Duke Street</td>
<td>Cork Cutter</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Couper Street</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisbet</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>Boat Builder</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrie</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Bath Street</td>
<td>Rope Maker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Montgomery St</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peebles</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Coburg Street</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porteous</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Glover Street</td>
<td>Ag. Imp. Maker</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pringle</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>At Sea</td>
<td>Merchant Seaman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsay</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Bedford Street</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>Salamander St</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennie</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Anderson Place</td>
<td>Warhouseman</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Madeira Street</td>
<td>Ship Master</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Tolbooth Wynd</td>
<td>Ship's Carpenter</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Duke Street</td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>St James' Street</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Brunton Close</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Cables Wynd</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Middle Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Elbe Street</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shier</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Coalfield Lane</td>
<td>Tinsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td>Engraver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Fox Lane</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Coalfield Lane</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Couper Street</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Charlotte Street</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Darlings Brae</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storrar</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Davies Street</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strang</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Newhaven</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>St Andrew's St</td>
<td>Ship's Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Johnston Place</td>
<td>Spirit Dealer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Bath Street</td>
<td>Wireworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bristol Streer</td>
<td>Groom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Home Street</td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkingshaw</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Duke Street</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wares</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Silverfield</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Shrub Lane</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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