



**CENTRE FOR RESEARCH COLLECTIONS
EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
GEORGE SQUARE
EDINBURGH
EH8 9LJ**

TEL: +44 (0)131 650 8379

FAX: +44 (0)131 650 2922

BOOK-SCANNED 2019

SHELF MARK: Per. .9 Edi.

TITLE: The Book of the Old Edinburgh Club Vol. 20

AUTHOR: Old Edinburgh Club

N.B. Scanned as spreads.

The text contains some pagination errors.

THIS IS THE BEST COPY AVAILABLE.

The University of Edinburgh Library



This PDF is supplied under a Creative Commons CCBY License:

you may share and adapt for any purpose as long as attribution is given to the University of Edinburgh. Further information is available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Please address all enquiries to Centre for Research Collections.

The Library wishes to be informed of work based on this Pdf copy, and would welcome a copy of any publication that makes use of it.

The University of Edinburgh is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SC005336



OLD EDINBURGH CLUB



EDINBURGH
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Per. .9 Edi.

Edinburgh University
Library



~~U.L. 21.00.15~~

~~E.U.L. - 5 MAY 77~~

THE BOOK OF THE
OLD EDINBURGH
CLUB

TWENTIETH VOLUME

THE BOOK OF THE
OLD EDINBURGH CLUB



EDINBURGH

PRINTED BY L. AND J. CONNELL, LTD.

FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE CLUB

Issued to Members

April 1935

19541

THE BOOK OF THE
OLD EDINBURGH
CLUB

TWENTIETH VOLUME



EDINBURGH

PRINTED BY T. AND A. CONSTABLE LTD.
FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE CLUB

1935



THE HAMMERMEN OF THE CANONGATE:

PART II

UNLIKE other trades, the Hammermen of the Canongate seem to have been slow to invest their money in property. The Bakers of the same burgh possessed several houses on both sides of the street, with which they parted one by one before they acquired the land which changed the name of Hammermen's Close to Bakehouse Close—but that is to anticipate.

I

From the earliest mention of the craft's finances it appears that they lent out their money in small sums to a variety of persons, including burgesses of Edinburgh, and met with the usual difficulty both in obtaining payment of their annual-rents and in recovering the principal when they wanted it. At last they wearied of the difficulties, and resolved to collect all the cash due to them and to invest it in the purchase of a house in the burgh. It was a move which had much to recommend it, in so far as they had no settled place for their assemblies, meeting sometimes in the open air, sometimes in one of the available buildings in the burgh. On 9th October 1646 the whole craft, premising that 'thair predecessours (except of laite yeiris) have been very cairless and slauchfull in manadging and governing the Craftis estaite and meynis,' resolved to buy the land and great lodging in the Canongate, above the Canongate Cross, from its owners, the

THE HAMMERMEN OF THE CANONGATE 79

heirs of Mr. John Scharpe, and to borrow for that purpose such extra sums as should be necessary.

No further progress was reported for nearly a year, the craft being too much occupied in setting its affairs in order after the disappearance of the plague. Then, on 23rd September 1647, it was reported that the house had been bought and paid for. By the boxmaster's accounts, presented on that day, it appeared that the craft had raised 4476¹¹ 17s. 8d., partly their own, partly borrowed money—the latter by far the greater sum—and had paid for the house, the composition to the City of Edinburgh as superiors, legal expenses and the pointing of the buildings 4308¹¹ 18s. 2d., leaving a balance of 167¹¹ 19s. 6d.

This great lodging has been, unfortunately, one of the houses of Old Edinburgh round which hangs a wholly erroneous tradition. The late President of our Club, in his 'Note on Huntly House' (*O.E.C.*, vol. xiv.), did his best to lay it, but the name of Huntly House, assigned to it on insufficient evidence, still sticks. But the chronicle of owners excludes the possibility of the supposed ownership of the Earls of Huntly and their family, of which two members, Henrietta, Dowager Duchess of Gordon, and her son Lord Adam Gordon, were, towards the close of the Hammermen's tenure, tenants of a part of the building.

The craft made no important structural alterations upon their new purchase. All they did was to add on several rooms, to subdivide others and to alter the staircases to admit of more tenants being accommodated in their new possession. For, when they purchased the house, it was more to obtain a good investment than for their own purposes as a craft, and they set about recouping themselves by letting it out to tenants.

The charter of the Town Council bears that the house had been acquired by Richard Guthrie from John Schairp, a minor, for the sum of 5442 merks 6s. 3d., with a further

sum of 183¹¹ for expenses, being 3811¹¹ 4s. 2d., showing that he made quite a substantial profit in getting rid of the place to the craft. They, apart from the purchase price, had to pay a feu-duty of 8¹¹ a year to Edinburgh, and a sum, which there is no means of estimating, as interest on the borrowed money. With these was also another payment, a survival of pre-Reformation times, in the form of pittance silver payable to the Abbey of Holyrood.

The craft seemed to have moved slowly in all alterations of their property. It was not till 30th October 1648 that they set about contriving a place of meeting for themselves, when it was decided unanimously, 'That the divisione betwixt the tua loftis in thair land above the Kitchine be takin away and baith maid ane for ane conveening hous and that the same be reparet, drest new with sylerine bankeris and utheris easmentis with ane chimney and stair buirdis and utheris requisit and putt in gude ordour as becumes.' On the same day the fore lodging, high and low, with kitchen and yard, vacant by removal of a tenant, was set to Patrick Creighton of Lugton for 220¹¹ a year, with the condition that, while he paid regularly, he should be asked, neither to pay more, nor to remove. Four months later the craft decided that 'these southmost housis of thair lodging at the baikhous to be reedifiet and buildit and beattit and maid tua hous hight and the ruiff put on and theikit conforme to an visite maid thairof be Maister David Hereot, advocat, and Richard Guthrie Wryter to the Signett and that with all possible diligence and ordanis the boxm^r. to get and borrow money and deburs all necessars for that effect.' An act of September 1649 records the letting of a 'low' house to James Crombie, deacon of the weavers, for 40¹¹ a year.

Prior to that date the Hammermen had begun to realise that their investment had proved costly so far, for 'considering the great burdings lyeing on the trade in building and repairing of the land belonging to them' and to defray

a part of the debt on the house, the sum of 6s. 8d. a quarter was ordered to be levied from all brethren of craft, under the penalty of the loss of the right of voting, should two quarters remain unpaid, and a fine of 40s.

Creighton did not require his lodging for long, but in 1650 asked permission, which was granted, to put in a sub-tenant. It was unlucky for the Hammermen, but not surprising, since the application came three weeks after the battle of Dunbar, for who would have wished to stay in a place occupied by the English Army when he had responsibilities elsewhere. Worse followed in March 1651 when it was recorded 'annent the present conditione of the whole land bak and fore within and at the close heid now given over by the present possessors and lest the said houses shall be prejudiced by anything which may fall through the not taking care of them . . . condescendit . . .' that the deacon, boxmaster and a committee of four should do everything possible for the letting of the said houses. In 1655 it was determined to let the lodging 'in which Mr. Culling dwells' for the highest possible price, presumably over his head.

These are all the entries for what later writers termed the 'usurpation.' It is not surprising: the Canongate depended still on the nobility and gentry within her borders, and to these, at such a time, there was no inducement to live in the burgh. In 1666 'Mr. Culling's' name recurs, but as plain Thomas Couling in an act arranging for a meeting with him anent his tenancy. Five years later the craft were building again. So far as can be gathered from the entries, the roof was heightened on either side of the central gable to make two additional 'houses.' The craft consulted with 'Mr.' Mylne, the King's Master Mason, and their own wrights and masons about the construction of a turnpike stair and entry. It appears that this must have been in view of the additional houses, for it was agreed that a 'skellie' stair should be made to the east turnpike and that, if need were,

the turnpike itself should be enlarged. The question of 'syllering' or plastering the new rooms was discussed with six experts and the former method settled upon. One of the new rooms was to be painted, but as cheaply as possible, and the room next the convening house was to be painted also. The cost of these additions was 4649¹¹ 17s.

It is matter for regret that so little is recorded about the tenants of the house. In 1670 the deacon was permitted to let the craft's lodging to the Earl of Morton for a year, but neither terms nor any other particulars are given. Between 1672 and 1674 one tenant, the laird of Brounchall, was allowed certain improvements, a coal house in the back yard and the re-decorating of his parlour, either plaster work or panelling as the craft, the laird and the tradesmen could agree.

But, with the end of a volume and the year 1685 the Hammermen's records stop abruptly, and the story of the house has to be pieced out from other sources. According to Maitland, in his *History of Edinburgh* (1753), the Dowager Duchess of Gordon was living there. It need not be imagined that she had the whole, or even the greater part of the house, for, when her son took over the lodging at her death in 1760, he was only one of many tenants. That is shown from the list of inhabitants given at the time of the sale of the property by the Hammermen in 1762. This list is worth quoting as an instance of the truly democratic existence possible in Old Edinburgh. There were seventeen tenants, including Lord Adam, four weavers, a plumber, a painter, a merchant, a blacksmith, a staymaker, a letter-carrier, a stabler and a gardener. Lord Adam and two others had leases of their lodgings, but the Incorporation, when disposing of their property to William Wilson, writer, and George Innes, cashier of the Royal Bank, gave 'power to the purchasers to quarrell the said tacks upon any ground of law that will not infer warrandice against the Corporation.' There may have been a flaw in the leases, but history is silent. The purchase price

of the house and lands was £1400 sterling, a sum which, compared with what the craft paid for the land, should have been enough to discharge their liabilities.

In 1784 the Bakers of the Canongate offered for and acquired a part of the buildings in Hammermen's Close for a bakehouse, and the year after erected an oven with bakehouse and a convening room above. It is due to their ownership that the old name of the close was superseded by the present name of Bakehouse Close. They sold a part of their land, 'the large old house,' in 1786 for the purpose of defraying part of the debt incurred in making the purchase. The last notice of any interest connected with the Hammermen is found in 1834, when one of the new schools, which had sprung up in Edinburgh since 1812 for the education of the poor, was housed in the Hammermen's Hall. To be exact, it is not stated definitely that the hall was the original one, but the presumption is fairly strong that the name had stuck—at least in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

II

It is an almost invariable rule of early burgh legislation that it is not preventive but corrective. Only after the steed was stolen was the stable door locked and, to continue the metaphor further, it had to be relocked frequently. It was a simple enough matter to enact statutes and rules, but very difficult to enforce them.

In this the Hammermen are no exception. Their laws are nearly all framed to combat abuses which had sprung up among themselves. The methods of enforcement were few. In serious cases the authorities could be invoked, the bailies of the regality of Broughton and burgh of the Canongate, but this appears to have been a last resort, to which application was made but seldom, and the ordinary punishments

were fines of various magnitude, loss of freedom or social ostracism. The latter two rarely failed of their effect—in time.

The statutes, copied in May 1613 into the new book, cannot embody the earliest craft ordinances, for the first entry is dated only in 1537. But, as was the practice with other crafts and in other burghs, the original constitution and laws of the Canongate Hammermen must have been given in their Seal of Cause, while later acts dealt with occasions for discipline as they arose. There is a marked tendency to repetition in all of them, showing how difficult it proved for the deacon and masters to exact the standard of conduct which they thought desirable.

The first act is concerned with upholding the authority of the deacon and masters. It enacted that no master or servant should 'contempne, lichtlie or disobeye' the deacon or his masters under penalty of a fine of 40s. and loss of the right to vote in craft meetings for a year; for the third fault the punishment was loss of freedom. The substance of this is repeated frequently. The 12th act, dated 1560, alludes to such as are so 'unreverent' as to strike their servants in the deacon's presence, awarding a fine of 40s. for the offence; the 26th, that no brother 'truble or molest' another in his presence, under pain of 40s. fine and loss of his vote. Act 35 forbids the brethren of craft to seek any other judges but the deacon and masters, with the condition that, failing justice from them, they may apply to the old deacon and masters, 'and quhasoever brekis or violatis any point of this presentis to lose the priviledges of craft and never to have vote amang us.' This act, passed in 1598, was confirmed later in act 55 in a slightly modified form, making it necessary for a member of the craft to complain to the deacon before he sought another judge.

The ordinary minutes of the craft abound in prosecutions for this offence, alluding to 'malicious and wicked speeches'

against the deacon and masters. Sometimes the deacon, thus insulted, called upon the old deacon to take his place while he made his complaint, as in a case in 1615 when Francis Mowtray, deacon, was accused of partiality. In that, as in other cases, the punishment was a fine, loss of freedom and complete isolation, insomuch as his companions were forbidden to work, drink, buy, sell or lend with him, a punishment which brought submission in the end, though certain hardened sinners held out for long, in one case at least for about two years.

It was perilously easy to break this statute, when 'mis-calling' the deacon behind his back, giving the lie to another in presence of the deacon, or similarly abusing or striking one another in his presence. Tempers apparently were hot among the Hammermen, and 'idle and disdainful speiches' were only too common, due very probably to the common practice of reporting fellow-craftsmen's delinquencies at the meetings. The Cromwellian occupation of the burgh seems to have set the nerves of the Hammermen on edge, for such incidents are very frequent and the clerk of the period reported them at length. There was the occasion when one man interrupted a discussion of trade affairs by saying that 'if John Padyeane wer hanged that he sould have his mynd so accomplished as his intent was,' and for his 'absurditie and base cariage' was fined 40s.

The principal subject of the statutes, and indeed a very large part of the Book, dealt with the relation of masters and apprentices and with the conduct of servants and apprentices. From the statutes alone it might be assumed that the life of the latter was a hard one and that justice was rarely done them. From the Book it appears that any prentice with a justifiable complaint against his master was sure of redress, backed by the whole influence of the craft, while any complaint, however unfounded, was sure of a hearing.

A constantly recurring trouble was the conduct of servants and apprentices, both with regard to their work and their leisure. As has been seen, qualification for freedom of the craft required a definite record of service with one or more masters, and not only the apprentices, but also the servants were required to engage themselves formally with masters. The former evaded this whenever possible and paid the penalty when caught, and their attitude seems to have been copied by the servants. Among several acts to much the same effect the earliest is quoted here for the choice and emphatic nature of its language :—

'The deacon and Maisters of hammermen craft within the Cannogait for good ordour to be keipit amangis and that thair be na servandis nor unfriemen going about lyk vagaboundis from booth to booth not acknowledging ane Maister nor yit will fie themselves with any Mr. in hie contemptatioun both of us and our occupatioun as also in contempt of the baillies and commontie. We thairfore all in ane voce statutis and ordanis that fra this furth nane of our brethrene nor frie men tak upoun hand to resset ressave or hald within thair boothis or company any sick vagabondis or unfriemen the space of xij houris except he fie himself for yeir or half yeir at the least. . . .'

It should be remembered that apprentices were definitely part of the household of their masters, who were responsible for them at all times, a fact which helps to account for the multiplication of statutes anent their behaviour. If all were as unruly as the acts make out, the life of a master must indeed have been a difficult one. One early statute forbids prentices or servants to 'mak any stryffe debaitt, querrelling or tulyie' either within or without their masters' booths. Another forbids them to absent themselves from their masters' service without permission asked *and received*. Again, the deacon and masters, finding that some of their apprentices and servants were given to drunkenness, night walking and unlawful pastimes 'quhen they could be better excercysed quherby thair hes fallin out dangerous accidentis

and slawchter,' enacted that any servant or prentice, found to be players of cards or dice, or otherwise offending, was to be fined at the discretion of the deacon and masters. The offence of night walking had a further act to itself in which it was explained how the offenders 'will not gang to thair bed in dew tyme quhairby they may be the mair abill to ryse in the morning to thair Mr^{is} work.' Sabbath observance also was regulated, and it was enjoined that apprentices and servants must accompany their masters to church both forenoon and afternoon. This act was expanded in 1686, forbidding any master to allow his prentice out after eight at night.

There were other graver faults which had to be corrected. In 1560 it appears that it had been the custom to allow servants and apprentices to work for their own hand on Saturday evenings and any times when work was slack. This had led to 'great pykrie and stealing' of materials from their master's booths, and the craft promptly ordered the practice to cease. Again, the craft found reason to complain of the 'pryd and stuburnes' of the prentices and servants to their masters and 'houssies,' or masters' wives, and imposed a penalty for such offences of a fine of 20s. and imprisonment. This statute appears to have been necessary indeed, for the records abound in instances of such defiance. The stress on the 'houssie' as well as the master is a reminder that women seem to have helped their husbands and, at their death, frequently kept on the shop, apprentices and servants till the termination of their indentures or of the years for which they were hired.

The engagement of servants appears to have been a troublesome business. Freed from the restrictions of a long apprenticeship, the young men appear to have been trying in the extreme, for a variety of acts record the different kinds of offence against which precautions had to be taken. They were apt to leave one master for another with-

out sufficient notice—forty days being the prescribed time. They posed as disengaged when they had already been feed by one master, they hired themselves out to two masters at a time, they left a master to whom they were in debt, and took another to escape paying what they owed. These offences were dealt with by fines and by enacting that all servants were to be engaged in presence of the deacon and several masters. It is possible that the masters themselves were partly to blame for this state of affairs, for acts in the Book of the Hammermen show that the rate of payment was not uniform, while some perquisites added to the wages must have been more tempting than others. The would-be servant might choose between a pair of shoes, or two pairs, a new shirt and a pair of shoes, a suit of his master's old clothes, a pair of shoes and a pair of old breeches, or some similar offering.

Another grave offence, repeated several times, was of a different nature, and it is recorded how servants were guilty of enticing prospective customers from a neighbour's booth to their own master's. This zeal was frowned upon by the authorities, and the offenders were warned or fined.

Apart from regulations as to behaviour, the statutes deal at some length with the fees chargeable for admission to the craft, either as apprentice, servant or freemen, as noted earlier. The fees showed a steady tendency to increase as the currency depreciated and the cost of living rose, with one exception. For while the craft agreed to raise the payments for admission as freemen in 1657, they found good to rescind the act of that date in 1664 and to revert to an earlier agreement, which was less burdensome. They were consistent in trying to keep down the incidental expenses of the various admissions, partly because of the extravagance involved, partly because of the 'ryots' which were apt to supervene on the festivities on these occasions. A custom, called 'apron ale,' the standing of free drinks to fellow-

servants by one newly engaged with a master, was viewed with disfavour: so also was the custom of feasting at the time of offering an essay, and several statutes limit the amount of 'banquet silver' on such occasions to 20 merks, a sum which, even in these days, would not permit promiscuous entertaining.

But, even in times which were poor and when morals were severe, the craft apparently liked entertainments, and used means which appear now inadvisable, not to say slightly dishonest, to obtain them. A statute was passed towards the end of the sixteenth century, forbidding the deacon and masters to 'drink or spend any of the commoun good belonging to the craft.' In 1630 another statute, after explaining that on the day of the elections it had been the custom to banquet at the craft's expense and that 'jarris and inconvenientis' had occurred, ordered all freemen to keep in their own hands their quarterly dues and that the banquet should be discontinued. There is, however, no evidence that the statute was enforced, and judging from the example of the Canongate bailies, it is probable that the act was a dead letter.

The officials and meetings of the craft were the subject of considerable legislation. As regards the deacon, it was enacted that he must not override the opinion of masters of the craft. It was also settled that, to make him eligible for the office, he must have served for a year at least as boxmaster. In 1683 a statute was passed, relating that continuance in office for two years together had resulted in financial loss to the deacons so elected, and that in future such appointments were to last for one year only. The same statute was made applicable to the office of boxmaster.

That official, whose appointment dated only from 1560, was in charge of the craft's financial affairs and submitted his accounts yearly, before the elections. Because of irregularities and delay, it was enacted in 1614 that the accounts

must be submitted before the election of a new boxmaster, and later it was agreed that they must be shown and audited quarterly. This was done, but the accounts are disappointing in that the detail is never recorded but merely the totals, and for this reason it is impossible to come to any satisfactory idea of the craft's finance.

The meetings of the craft are alluded to frequently in the statutes. There were penalties attached to the calling of meetings on insufficient grounds as a waste of time. Equally it was a punishable offence not to attend a meeting to which summons had been made, or to reveal to outsiders the business considered by the deacon and masters or by the whole craft. To a great extent the Hammermen met only as need arose, though it was ordered that the deacon and masters must convene at least once a fortnight on Wednesdays. Behaviour and precedence at meetings was provided for also, as follows:—

'no frie brother . . . sall keip privat or publict discourse with one another at the table when the deacone boxm^r. and remanent brethrene of the traid as mett about thair lawfull ocationes bot what sall be requyred of thame from the deacone for the tyme. And also ordanes that ilk maister of trad sall without debait or questione sitt doune at the table when the trad is mett eache of thame in thair respective places and this for decensie and good order of traid in tyme coming. . . .'

The act 'that nane of the brethrine at any meitting mak ony noise or Mutinie nor speak quhill they be requyret and thair vote cravet . . . ' speaks for itself. It may be appropriate to note in this place that, till the house was bought by the Hammermen, they met either in the open air, on McNeill's Crag, or in Trinity College Church, the Abbey Church or the Canongate Tolbooth. Meetings of masters, though it is not stated, probably were held in the house of the deacon for the time.

No less than four acts are directed towards the necessity for attendance of the whole craft at the funeral of any one

of their number, even stipulating that none might appear on such occasions in working dress, that is in an apron. The use of the craft's mortcloths also was prescribed. Over these they had trouble with the Kirk Session, as the income from the burgh mortcloths was applied usually to the support of the poor and the possession of private mortcloths was detrimental to that fund. But the craft were strong enough to have their own way, subject to the restriction that they might not hire out their cloths to unfreemen.

Other acts forbid the changing from one art to another, insist on the use of individual marks for all goods sold, forbid the taking of booths or houses to the prejudice of a fellow-craftsman, safeguard the giving of charitable support or of loans by disqualifying any recipient from a vote in craft affairs, and condemn in no measured manner the evils of drunkenness.

III

It is disappointing that the records of the Hammermen are almost exclusively concerned with their own business, and that during a century when Edinburgh was the centre of national politics—more, the leader to a great extent of public opinion—this Canongate craft is almost altogether without allusion to the events of the time. In this, it must be said, they run true to type, for, even in the Town Council of Edinburgh, a careful avoidance of debatable matter is the rule.

The happenings of the century might well have provoked some comment, if not some legislation, but the Hammermen passed over the visits of Charles I. in silence, were not at all concerned with the National Covenant, and were apparently untouched either by the Bishops' wars or the lightning campaign of Montrose which roused Edinburgh to such acute anxiety. Before the advent of Cromwell's army, nothing

seems to have touched them save the payment of their share of the taxation imposed by the parliament of Charles I. The whole craft was convened in 1625 to consider the tax, and agreed to assess themselves for 50 merks, 'this being kollektid with descresiane amongis the said craft.' From that time till 1651 the troubles of the country were not considered worthy of mention. Then they manifested not a little anxiety for the preservation of their own valuables. They ordered the titles of their new house to be built up in a corner of one of the rooms and confided their other papers to the deacon, with the express condition that he was not to be held responsible for their loss. The craft's mortcloths were bestowed in the custody of another member, despite his protests that 'by reasone that the Inglish armie being heir that the said mort cloath may be plundered robd or taken from him and that he would not byd the hazard theroff.' That they had reason for their precautions is apparent by an act of 26th May 1651 relating that 'thair lockit book quhairin wes all thair acts and statuts for reiding of the traid and the samyne actis and statuts being reft spoiled and all lost,' the said acts were to be rewritten and bound in the old boards. The explanation of the cause of the damage is given briefly in another act—the book had been 'wronged by the suldiers.' The craft then settled down to endure the English occupation as best they might.

There appears to have been little interference with the life of the burgh, so little indeed, that freemen admitted to the craft seem to have taken the usual oath to uphold the King and government of the realm till 1658, when an alteration in the formula made them swear obedience to the supreme magistrate.

In February 1686 there is a hint of the anti-popish agitation in the neighbourhood, due to the actions of James VII. and II., probably with particular reference to his act setting apart the Abbey Church, then the only church of

the parish of the Canongate, to be his Chapel Royal, and the orders for fitting it up as a Roman Catholic Church. The craft's act is entirely non-committal as to the views of the individual members, and destined merely to prevent disorder in the burgh:—

'Taking to their serious consideration the frequent abuses that of late have fallen out by a rabble and rascality of people convocated together in time of divine service and at other times to the great prejudice of the place and to the effect that all prentices and other servants belonging to the members of the incorporation may be free and innocent of the said tumultuous meetings they consent that each member shall order his prentices and servants to keep the Sabbath day and not be found on the street in time of divine service or on the street at any tumult, and that each master do not suffer his prentices or servants to go abroad after eight o'clock at night, with certification that, if they do, they shall be disowned by their respective masters who shall concur in seeing them punished and imprisoned. And each person failing to pay to the trade 10^{li}.'

IV

A similar reticence characterises the craft with regard to the relations with Edinburgh. The capital for long had viewed with jealous apprehension the liberty of the adjacent burgh and, during the time of the last commendator, Robert Stewart, had made a determined effort to prove unfounded the Canongate's undeniable right to be considered as a burgh of regality. The attempt had failed, but up till and after the acquisition of the superiority of the burgh by Edinburgh, the Town Council tried repeatedly to obtain control of the crafts there.

One dispute, heard before the Privy Council on 20th March 1594-95, concerns the Hammermen. The Bailies and Council of the Canongate espoused the cause of George Foullair, armourer burgess, and produced his complaint before

the Privy Council. It had to do with the right of free markets in Edinburgh, held on three days of the week 'fra sone to sone,' and bore that the inhabitants of that town, induced by the 'impunity' of their magistrates, had begun to molest the Canongate men. Foulair, on three separate days, had had goods reft from him; first, four new sword scabbards, valued at 40s.; next, a new sword worth 10 merks; next, a sword worth 10¹¹ and three scabbards worth 30s. The Privy Council ordered that his wares should be restored to him and remitted the whole question to the Lords of Council and Session. Pending their decision there was to be freedom of trade in the markets. Their decision, however, does not appear to have been recorded.

The whole transactions regarding the acquisition of the superiority of the Canongate by Edinburgh are passed over in silence in the craft records. It is true that the Town Council, with marvellous discretion, forbore any interference with the government of the burgh, save in so far as regarded the appointment of the baron bailie. Also they abstained from any meddling with the rights of the Hammermen. Possibly as a result of this tact, the craft in 1643 upheld their brethren in Edinburgh in a complaint made against William Roger, saddler in the Canongate, forbidding him to have benefit of the craft till he appeared to answer the charge against him. The man held out for three months and then gave in, but five years later was convicted again of an offence against the boxmaster of the Edinburgh Hammermen and fined 4¹¹.

So far all had been amicable, but on 19th October 1649 comes the echo of a 'contraversie' between the two burghs anent the privileges of the Canongate as 'have been practesed of all superiours before the towne of Edinburghs challenge.' The craft consented unanimously to bear any charges put upon them 'ay and quhill the contraversie shall be endit.' The matter in question, which no records give in detail,

appears from the Acts of the Edinburgh Town Council to have dragged on through the years 1650 to 1653 without any agreement being reached. The Hammermen noted the continuance of the dispute in May 1650 when they agreed to pay 100 merks for the defence of their liberties with the other trades in the action before Parliament, and again, more forcibly, in May 1652:—

'Annet the desire of the toune of Ed^r. toward the discrepancies betwixt them and the toune of the Cannogate and anent the submission craved be the toune of Ed^r. to yield all obedience to their demands thereanent as also in the mater of the act relative of the said deacone to be counsellour in the Cannogate. After consideration and examination with voyceing about of the trade convenit they all in ane voyce disclame dissasent and pass frae the whole substance contenit in the twa decreits from Ed^r. counsell ane wherof daited the twelf of May ane uther of the nynteenth of May for the reasons conteenit in the twa severall decreits and to saiff the trade and their successours from present and future periurie therein.'

The decrees have not been traced, but it may be allowable to assume from the act of the craft that it was an attempt of the Edinburgh Council to place the trades of the Canongate under the control of the deacons of the royal burgh. The affair was not settled in June 1654, but the craft resolved not to proceed with the case against Edinburgh for the moment because of the shortness of the session and the importance of the matters at issue.

In 1659 comes an allusion to the powers of the Town Council, as superiors, to impose taxation on the Canongate. The craft, on that occasion, were concerned only to defend the deacon against the insinuations of a fellow-member. John Makie had 'scandalized' the deacon, Andrew Wilkie, by declaring that he had no right or warrant from the trade to give 'any condiscendence to the toune of Ed^{rs}. impositione upon 8d. of the pynt of the malt,' and for expressing his opinion was fined 40s.

The latent hostility between the Hammermen of Edinburgh and the Canongate is shown in an act of the Hammermen of 10th May 1667, fining Gilbert McKaill, pewterer, 40s. for 'devulging of his brothers waiknes to the friemen of Edr. and not representing the caice to the deacone of this trade.' Whatever the exact offence it was judged so serious that any repetition of it was to involve a fine of 10 merks.

An attempt to control the crafts in 1676 found the spirit of the Canongate unbroken. The Hammermen registered, in June of that year, their intention to help the fleshers of the Canongate in their defence against the skimmers of Edinburgh and to spend in their defence as much as any other trade consented to do.

In 1686 the tumult in which the apprentices and servants were concerned, already noticed as an expression of popular feeling against the King's attempt to favour Roman Catholicism, gave Edinburgh a legitimate excuse to interfere. The Hammermen had tried already to suppress disorder so far as they were concerned by their act of 2nd February, but, four days later, they recorded that the Town Council had presented a bond to be signed by them as surety for their servants and apprentices. It sounds a comparatively trivial obligation into which they were asked to enter, but the craft thought advisable to discuss the bond with an advocate and to take his advice how far they might engage themselves without prejudice to their liberties. It seems probable that they fought shy of signing, and that the rest of the inhabitants of the Canongate did likewise, because they suffered the usual penalty for disturbances by having troops quartered upon them.

The royal burgh was the stronger, and the eighteenth century saw the gradual waning of the independence of the Canongate. The weakening of the craft's powers was not due entirely to that, but to changing circumstances and more modern views as regarded freedom of trade. It was a gradual

process and common to the trades of all burghs, and the final stage was reached in the conclusions of the 1835 Commission on the Royal Burghs. The Commissioners examined the state of the Canongate and interrogated all the crafts as to whether their former privileges were worth retaining. The evidence with regard to the Hammermen was that they had instituted only ten prosecutions for breaches of their privileges in the past thirty years, and that these privileges did not form any considerable inducement to enter the craft and might with safety be abolished.

V

Compared with its neighbour beyond the Netherbow, the Canongate had a most peaceable record of civic government in which the strife between merchants and craftsmen was practically unknown. Still, it appears to have been found necessary to have some definite organisation among the more important of the crafts, the hammermen, the tailors, the bakers and the shoemakers. This agreement, dated 14th February 1610, is dealt with and given *in extenso* in the *Book of the Old Edinburgh Club*, vol. xiv., and so requires but slight comment in this article. It is, however, worthy of note how jealously the crafts guarded their own privileges, especially as regards matters of discipline. The Hammermen, who doubtless were not unique in so doing, made it a punishable offence to appeal beyond the jurisdiction of their deacon and masters; the agreement between the four trades also stresses that point, even though they were represented on the Council of the burgh. In the Book of the Hammermen one allusion is made to this document, termed the 'union band,' another is found among the acts of the bailies. The former, dated 1647, runs as follows: 'The brethren having often desired that the union band might be read in their

presence that they might understand the nature of it, the deacon and masters caused it to be read openly that they might pretend no ignorance of the acts contained in it. Thereafter it was statute that if any freeman divulge or talk of it he or they shall be not only censured and punished but debarred from all privilege of craft.' The other act, dated 1709, bears that the deacon of tailors, representing all the incorporations, gave in a petition for ratification of their right to judge in matters solely regarding their own incorporations, according to their 'union contract.' The bailies approved the petition, with the provision that difficulties which could not be settled among themselves must be referred to the magistrates.

Neither a favourable sett nor the 'union band' could prevent clashes with the magistrates, and in September 1622 the deacon, masters and brethren met in the College Kirk

'anent ane wrang that wos doune be the baillies of the brughe in electing and shoosing of thair majestrats the wrang being delaited to the hail brithering and everie ane of thair consentis being speired thairanent all with ane voce concluded to ask for remeid of law thairanent and to concour with the uther thre dekins and quhat is warid thairupon sall be thankfullie alluid in thair compts and everie ane of the said brithering to defend the sameine actiounne gif neid beis to the uttermost of thair powar to understand of the wrong that this miting and ak was concludit was for the liting of the M^{ris} at thair aune hand and not siking consent of the dekins.'

The spelling and grammar of the clerk, Robert Bruce, is shaky, but the sense is abundantly clear. The quarrel was one similar to the almost annual affair in early Edinburgh history; the difference lay in the fact that the Canongate crafts were strong enough to defy the bailies. While in Edinburgh the crafts had to submit to choosing their deacons from a leet made by the Town Council and to having no voice in the leeting of magistrates, in the Canongate the principal crafts at least were uncontrolled in the nomination

of their representatives. The threat of litigation seems to have been enough. Barely a week later the Council Book recorded an act of the bailies and council, ordaining that the deacons of the Hammermen, Tailors, Bakers and Shoemakers, with their brethren, were to have a vote in the leeting and election of the magistrates, treasurer and council in future, and that one deacon was to be present at the collecting of the votes. The craft recorded their victory as follows:—

'Conserving ane upror that rais anent the electiounne of the majestrats efter gud advysement and for keiping of gud order in tyme cuming hes obtinid ane ordinans of the bailyies and counsel that the counsel heirafter sall not usurp or do wrang to the four dekins in na maner of way as the ordinance beiris at mair lenthe quhilk ordinans was extraktid from the clark for the tyme and pit in the bokis in presens of the hail maisters to be ane evident for all tyme cuming.'

In 1638 the Hammermen and Wrights brought a question of their respective privileges before the bailies and council. One wright complained that his own deacon and brethren had imprisoned him in the Tolbooth and compelled him to sign a bond promising not to work for any neighbours, particularly the Hammermen, without express permission from his own craft. This, he protested, was contrary to law. The Hammermen upheld him, taking instruments to the same effect. The bailies and council considered the case for a fortnight and pronounced the action of the Incorporation of Wrights to have been unlawful, since the complainer, as freeman and burgess of the burgh, was entitled to use his calling to work for all the King's lieges.

VI

It has been a matter of regret to many that, while there exists a sufficiently ample record of Edinburgh civil cases, there appears to be none of criminal trials. With the

Canongate it was otherwise. The books of the regality of Broughton and of the burgh of the Canongate supply both civil and criminal cases. The matter, however interesting, is outside the scope of the present article, except in so far as the Hammermen came before the courts as accused, accusers, witnesses or assize.

The manuscript record of the meeting of these courts starts about 1569 and continues down to the eighteenth century, though in the later records all entries tend to become merely formal. As the volumes are many and, as yet, unindexed, it has not been possible to make an exhaustive search through them for the history of the Hammermen. Yet the contents of several volumes, chosen more or less at random, may be taken as typical, on the whole, of the appearances of the craft in the courts.

There were two courts: that of the regality, presided over by the bailie of Broughton, and that of the burgh, presided over by two bailies, who sat, sometimes together, sometimes separately. For the most part the appearances of the Hammermen are in the burgh court, though occasionally members of the craft, not burgesses of the Canongate, but merely freemen in the regality, figure in the court which had authority over them.

The craft appear in few serious cases, a fact probably due to the efficiency of their own organisation. Various members sat frequently on the assizes in criminal cases, particularly when the case concerned a burgess and craftsman, for usually scrupulous fairness was exercised by the court in allowing a man to be judged by his peers. Between 1593 and 1619 there are two instances of Hammermen being accused in criminal trials. The first is in 1593 when Andrew Mathesoun, smith, was tried for attacking John Gray, smith, and wounding him in the 'wambe.' Mathesoun was found guilty, but the sentence was not recorded, probably because it would have depended upon the recovery or death of the

wounded man. If Gray recovered, it would merely have been a case of 'bluidwyte'; if he died, of murder, with the inevitable capital punishment. In August 1600, Thomas Huchesoun, younger, armorer burgess of the Canongate, was 'indytit and accusit for the cruell hurting wounding and bluid drawing of James Skathowie upone the chakill bane of his richt arme with ane swoird at the leist ane dager throw the quhillk he is abill to be mutillat all the dayis of his lyfe.' The assize of craftsmen found him guilty, and a tailor of the burgh became caution that he would give satisfaction to the wounded man. In August 1619 a Hammerman was the victim. John Gray, pewterer, son of the late Martin Gray, pewterer in Dundee, was brought to trial for the murder of William Sibbald, pewterer burgess of the Canongate. Sibbald had been a member of some consequence, having held the office of boxmaster and having been elected a master several times, including the year May 1618 to May 1619. The Hammermen's records give nothing against him, save that once he was fined for not booking a servant, and there is no indication of any motive for the crime. On the assize, among other Canongate craftsmen, were Thomas Glen, dagmaker, and William Smith, blacksmith. The indictment bore that John Gray had struck Sibbald with a whinger above the left breast, inflicting a wound of which the victim 'lay bedfast' for forty-eight hours and then died. Gray had fled to the Cowgate and had been arrested by the officers and constables of Edinburgh, and conveyed to the Tolbooth in that town. He had lain there till the day of the trial, when he had been delivered by the bailies of Edinburgh to John Bellenden, baron bailie of Broughton. He was found guilty and ordered to be conveyed to a scaffold at the Canongate Cross, there to be executed by 'the instrument callit the Maydin.'

The craft figured as frequently as others in civil cases, processes of removing, retours of heirs, actions for debt, in

which they appeared either as pursuer or pursued. A few examples may serve to show their nature. In 1570 Janet Robertsoun and David Schang, her husband, were ordered to pay 26s. 8d. to Thomas Murdoch for a culverin received from him, that Schang might make a 'skrow' for it. The culverin had been given in three months past, had not been returned, and had been valued at the price stated. The following, typical of many others, shows how the wives of craftsmen and merchants eked out their husband's trade with an industry of their own. In 1570 George Barbour was ordered to pay to Christian Dernling, wife of John Richesoun, cutler, 20s. for four barrels of ale furnished by her. In 1573 John Roger, steel bonnet maker, was convicted of having insulted Patrick Burrell, also steel bonnet maker, calling him 'false throat cutter and thief.' The provocation had resulted in Burrell's attacking him with a whinger and wounding him on his right arm, for which he too was fined.

The following gives an idea of the standard of living of a fairly prosperous member of the craft. In 1619 the widow of Robert Tailfeir, cutler, was ordered to give up to his nephew, a burgess of Edinburgh, certain heirship goods, including a copper cauldron of 24 gallons and brewing utensils, valued at 100¹¹; a silver piece, valued at 42¹¹; a furnished feather bed, an almery and long settle of oak, 20¹¹; a dozen plates, a dozen trenchers, 24¹¹; a suit of black clothes of Scots 'seybombasie,' a brown cloak of English cloth, a pair of woven worsted 'shanks,' a Scots hat with a crape band, all valued at 80 merks; a sword and other arms, a chest, a chair, six stools, a brass pot of two gallons, a brass candlestick and a dozen shirts, these last valued at 20¹¹.

VII

With the Reformation and the alienation of church lands new problems came before the inhabitants of burghs, the

support of the ministry and the poor. To a certain extent these were considered as one, for while each craft was responsible for its own poor, the unattached poor were ministered to by the Kirk Sessions. For this reason little enough comes into the Hammermen's records. But ministers' stipends, the expenses of their transportation, the matter of church seats and such like received at least a cursory attention, and the acts concerning these matters are noted briefly.

In 1625 the Hammermen, considering the abuse of their places in church, ordered that none but the deacon, old deacon and such as had held that office, with the boxmasters, new and old, should sit in the front seat. No boys or servants were to sit in the second and third seats. Three years later, the craft, meeting in the Abbey Kirk to consider a proposal made to them by the Kirk Session to take their seat down and put it up in another place, refused unanimously to alter it, and also refused the monthly contribution claimed from them by the Session. In 1641 the craft sent a deputation to the Kirk Session to ask for space for a new seat between the two pillars at the east end of the King's old seat. The request was long in obtaining an answer, for it was not till 1643 that confirmation was granted by the bailies and council to the permission of the Kirk Session for a 'high loft' between the pillars east of the pulpit pillar, in addition to the low seat already possessed by them. The rivalry between craft and craft immediately prompted the tailors and weavers to ask and obtain similar concessions.

There is no mention in the craft's records of a minister of the Canongate earlier than 1629, when, in June, they authorised a payment of 30¹¹ to the deacon for his expenses at the baptism of Mr. James Hannay's ¹ son. The following year saw a controversy between Mr. James Hannay and his parishioners of which the first stage probably is represented by the act of the Hammermen on 9th February. Then they

¹ Later, Dean of Edinburgh.

agreed unanimously to collaborate with the other three crafts 'anent the stopping of the gift purchest be the minister againes the treddis for evicting of thair haille upsettis.' The act is worded rather obscurely, but seems to relate to the minister's attempt, noted in the Council Book on 11th March, to obtain support for the poor of the parish. He may be surmised to have failed in his attempt to obtain the upsets or entrance dues of the crafts for his purpose, and to have substituted for that demand, a monthly collection from all parishioners for the poor, 'the rather that his Maiestie being of purpose to cum to his ancient Kingdome this somer it wilbe ane verie uncristiane thing that strangers sould see our poor starving and deing in the streits and that his Maiestie nobilitie and gentrie of both the Kingdomes sould be troublit with their importunitie.' The council, influenced by this plea and by a complaint of the Privy Council that beggars pestered them as they came and went from meetings, agreed to the minister's proposal.

Though Hannay remained as minister of Holyroodhouse till his translation to Edinburgh in March 1635, his name does not occur again in the Canongate records, while in 1631 there is mention of Mr. Matthew Wemyss, at whose coming to the burgh, the Hammermen agreed to give a propine to his wife. A year later they agreed to pay to him at the baptism of his child what the other crafts were paying, and in 1635 they agreed to give him 'for composition' a like sum for one year only, with the stipulation that the gift was to constitute no precedent.

In 1641 the craft became involved in a quarrel with the ministers and Kirk Session about mortcloths. It is undeniable that Kirk Sessions looked upon the hire of mortcloths as a substantial part of their income for charity: it is equally certain that the crafts prided themselves on the possession of private mortcloths, spent large sums on them and were not averse from lending or hiring them out. The

Hammermen had collected recently the sum of 103¹¹ to replace their old cloths with new velvet ones, and the ministers and Kirk Session apparently took the opportunity of complaining. The craft were somewhat uneasy in their consciences as to the matter and promptly yielded upon conditions. 'Willing to avoid dissention' they would pay 10 dollars for the use of the poor, if they were not troubled in future, and if they were allowed to use their mortcloths for their own brethren and families and elsewhere to landward. If the Kirk Session refused their request, they would go to law.

In the same year as the quarrel the Hammermen contributed 27¹¹ to the brethren of North Leith to enable them to put up a seat in the church there. In an elaborate document the craftsmen of that port acknowledged their gratitude, bound themselves to keep the seat in repair and to allow access to the craftsmen of the Canongate, and promised to pay all dues to their Kirk Session.

The payment of 10 dollars to the Canongate Kirk Session does not seem to have closed the matter of claims on them by that body, for in 1643 the craft resolved to give them 40¹¹ 'freely,' provided that the gift constituted no precedent. Possibly the payment was again for the poor, but the act gives no hint of the intention. In the matter of mortcloths the Session had the last word. In April 1657 an act of the Council records that the Kirk Session's mortcloths had been lost in 1650. Since the Session was too much in debt to buy others, the Council ordered that the profits of the mortcloths of the various trades should be divided equally between the respective trades and the Session, till new ones could be got. After that no trade was to hire out its mortcloths.

A part of their 'quarter compts' or quarterly dues was used for the assistance of the widows, orphans or decayed members of the craft, but the Hammermen were generous enough to take exceptional cases into account and to give assistance. Such a case is seen in 1615: 'gevis and grantis

to Peter Littiljohnne for help and support to put his sone to France the sowme of ten pund.' That, unfortunately, is all, and there is no explanation why the lad was being sent away. Possibly it was to learn modern methods in a particular art. In 1616 the deacon and masters ordered that a cloak, costing 20 merks, should be given to Patrick Law. It was an expensive gift for charity and may have been bestowed as a reward or an honour. A year later, the widow of John Foular, armorer, petitioned the craft for assistance with the funeral expenses of her late husband. The deacon and masters considered the petition and, finding that all the expenses had been paid except the winding sheet, ordered 30s. to be given to her. They were obliged to deal with other cases for assistance at the same time, and two other grants were made, one of 40s. for the support of the child of one of their freemen, the other of a suit of grey clothes, cloak, coat, breeches, stockings and a pair of shoes, to another freeman who had fallen on hard times.

In 1619 there is a list of small sums given apparently as pensions: 3¹¹ 6s. 8d. was given to John Foular's widow and a similar sum to another widow. One Katherine Cleuch received 40s., as did the recipient of the suit of clothes, while two other men received 40s. and 14s. respectively. An act of a year later explains this list. The boxmaster was ordered to 'answer the puir folkis billis.' Pensions ordinarily needed no special act, so these must have been particular cases, when individuals made application by written petitions. A different variety of charity is seen in the same year. Thomas Forster, being imprisoned, probably for debt, begged for 10 merks to get his release, which the boxmaster was ordered to pay.

A little tragedy recorded in a few lines was the cause of another donation in 1622. The clerk, Robert Bruce, described it in his usual laconic style: 'The dekin and maisters convind at Lethe Wynd anent the funatur of Gilbert Halliday Vyf

with consent of the dekin and maisters ordind the bokis maister Wm. Smithe to gif three punds to bye ane kist and ane Winding sheit to his Vyf funatur and to the said Gilbert Halliday funatur immediatlie threttie shellings for ane kist to the said Gilbert Halliday.'

Some time before May 1631, Patrick Lauristoun, armourer, died, leaving a son Patrick, who apparently had no other relations. Patrick senior had been a master, but also a troublesome and unsatisfactory member of the craft. That did not influence the craft in their treatment of his son: the deacon and masters agreed to share with the Kirk Session the cost of apprenticing young Patrick to a craft, paying his dues and providing him with clothes. Two masters 'trysted' with the Kirk Session and came to an agreement. Patrick was apprenticed to another armourer for eight years, and the craft agreed to pay 50 merks towards his dues and his clothing. The end of the episode was satisfactory. Lauristoun served his apprenticeship and his two years as servant, was admitted to his assay and received freeman in 1642, entering burgess in the same year. He was a master in 1645, but probably died during the plague, for his name disappears from the records.

In 1634 there was another batch of petitions from the poor, and the boxmaster was ordered to pay them 26¹¹ 4s., according to their bills, all 'minuted' on the back. In 1638 there is an allusion to the hospital, called St. Thomas, situated at the north-east corner of the Canongate: 'the craft ordains the box maister to caus mak ane fir bed in the chapell at the fute of the gait with the hammermens airmes therupon to serve James Hairt and any uther of the craftis pure that sall come ther heirefter.'

A plea for assistance once found the craft short of ready money and three masters with the boxmaster were invited to borrow to pay Widow Loch's debts, with the safeguard that 'what money they sall happin to spend reasonably' would be allowed in the trade's accounts.

In 1683 comes a curious entry. It states that several of the trade's creditors had been troubling the boxmaster for payment of the interest of their money, and that there were persons who had offered to lend money and had promised also to mortify something towards the poor of the trade. The deacon was empowered to accept such offers, one of which was for 5000 merks with the mortification of such a sum as the lender should think 'convenient.' The trade's management of their money is at all times obscure, but, in this particular instance, it is difficult to see why the lender, not being a member of the craft, should feel any obligation to help its poor. The only possible reason seems to be that to lend to the Hammermen was considered a good investment and therefore worth some concession.

VIII

Short of reproducing the whole Book of the Hammermen, it is not possible to show its great attractiveness properly. There is something in the wording of the acts, combined with the arbitrary spelling, which makes even the smallest detail graphic and usually amusing. A few transcripts of separate acts follow to illustrate the nature of the rest. It must be owned that the various clerks seem to have been at their best when chronicling delinquencies, for all the acts to be quoted refer to disciplinary action.

'Compeirit Walter Smyth servand to James Nasmyth, dagmaker, and is challengit for cuming to Thomas Glen dagmaker his buith with ane pestilot in his lap and tuik ane gentilman away thairfra quhilk was standit therin quhilk wes provin be the said Walter his awin brother The deacon and Mr^{is} knawing that be sick doing thair hes bene great stryfe and debait betwix Mr and Maister of befor and great inconvenients fallin out amang them convicts him thairfoir in xx^s to be payit presentlie to the boxm^r and he to be dischargit wark till he pay the samyn.'

'Compeirit Alex^r. Broun Johne Law and Johne Hagie quha ar found to have bene over lait out of thair beds and drinking efter the dew and law¹¹ tyme of nicht of ganging to bed quhilk the deacon and Mr^{is} thinks very offensive and contrair to the acts of craft. They have confest the samyn and ar cum in the crafts will thairfore the deacon and Mr^{is} convicts ilkane of them in x^s for this fault and ordanis them to pay the said xxx^s amang them to the boxm^r and taks them actit not to do the lyke under the pane of the penaltie contenit in the crafts buik and gif thai or ony uther beis fund doing the lyk it sall be an impediment to thame gif evir it sall pleis god that evir thai be fremen.'

'Comperid Thomas Craig and complinid upone his prenteice Thomas Hendersone for this unthankfull service and for blasfeming of me with his tung and upbraiding me with his hands and feit quhilk was confessed be the said Thomas Hendersone out of his ounne mouthe. The dekin and Maisters ordinis that in tyme to cum gif the said Thomas be not ane thankfull and obedient prenteice and disobey his said Mr in any poynt the dekin and Mr^s all in ane voce concludis that the said Thomas sell be puneissid according to the acts of thair buik and sall tyne his libertie. . . .'

'The deacone and Mr^{is} being convenit anent the complaint gevin in be Wm. Fergusoun aganes J^{on}. Law his Mr. for abuisis done be him in not learning him his tred And not suffering him to worke in peace The said craft desyret J^{on} Law to inact him self of his awin consent not to trubill his prenteis heirefter he absolutlie refusiet bot utterit sic speaches not beseeming ane cristiane The craft ordines him to haif na place as ane Mr quhill he mak satisfactioun.'

'They unanimouslie inact and unlaw Johne Smyth prenteis to Andrew Wilkie in the sowme of fourtie schilling Scots money and that for the running away out of his Mr^{is} service and thereafter wryting most abusefull sklanderous and opprobrious lynes and letters to his said Mr his wyfe and children and also heirby inacts and declares that if ever he comit the lyk fault in tyme comeing he sall be declaired voyd of ever being ane frieman except he by the same as an stranger.'

'Alexr. Wilson present deacon and Joⁿ. Cook present boxm^r and Remanent brethrein of the hammermen being convened unlaues Hew Somervell gunsmith in ane unlaw of ffourtie schilling Scots for the reasons ffollowing ffirist for Refusing to come in to the table and set down in order as be cometh and Lykwayes for cursing within the

110 THE HAMMERMEN OF THE CANONGATE

conveining house Be saying devill swall George Reid and all that wes at Wm. Stenhousis dynner and when he went out at the doore by God he wold goe to the Baillie.'

'John Gellatlie did abuse John Wilson and his wiff and called hir Glengorie bitch with severall uther abusses not worthie to be rehearsed And did lykewayes abuse his maister and mistres at severall tymes for which he showld be noticed Lykway he since hes left the friemen in the Cannogate and went and served John Simsone in Ed^r. the years he had to serve and called all the trad butthers and bumsters.'

MARGUERITE WOOD.

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RIDING SCHOOL *

PROFICIENCY in the equestrian art, as the phrase went in the old days, was once deemed essential to a first-class education. This may sound strange in the twentieth century when the horse has been displaced by the motor car and the aeroplane as a means of locomotion, and horsemanship is restricted to the racecourse, the hunting-field and the circus. Yet there was a time when riding was an acquirement that no young gentleman could afford to be without, since it made accessible the pleasures of the chase and, more important, enabled him to serve his country in time of war. A variety of circumstances, chiefly economic, have in our time considerably lessened the devotees of this old-fashioned if graceful accomplishment. But in the eighteenth century, horsemanship was at the zenith of its popularity, and in order that it might be regularly and effectively practised, institutions known as riding academies were set up in every large town, and widely patronised by the nobility and gentry.

The foregoing remarks, however, are more applicable to England than to Scotland. For many years after the Union of 1707 horse-riding was looked upon by the generality north of the Tweed as an expensive and not too reputable luxury. Writing so late as 1778, Hugo Arnot expresses surprise at the neglect of riding and attributes it to a 'base effeminacy.'¹ Captain Topham, the English traveller, was also struck by the comparative indifference of our nation to the equestrian

* The drawings on pp. 120-21 are reproduced from *The Architecture of Robert and James Adam* (2 vols., 1922), by permission of the author, Arthur T. Bolton, and the publishers, *Country Life*.

¹ *History of Edinburgh*, new ed., 1816, p. 325.