NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. MJ/SR1798 R27, 23 Apr. 1692.


3. Ibid., 6–7.


5. Although serious attacks like nose slitting or taking out an eye were defined as felonies under the law, they were often, in practice, treated as misdemeanors and prosecuted only by recognizance.

6. See, for example, Michael Dalton, The Courty Justice (London, 1655), 203.

7. In addition to assault, the various “trespasses against the peace,” are “Battery, . . . where any person hath violently struck another”; “Bloodshed, . . . where upon any such Battery Blood hath been shed”; and “Maihem,” which involved mutilations of various kinds. W. T., The Office of the Clerk of Assize . . . Together with the Office of the Clerk of the Peace . . . 2nd ed. (London: Printed for Henry Twyford, 1682), 127. For a more comprehensive description, see Sir William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England in Four Books, Book Three (reprint, Philadelphia: Geo. T. Bisel Co., 1922), 120–22. As mentioned earlier, terms such as battery, mayhem, and bloodshed were not present in many of the assault recognizances that bore descriptions appropriate to such offenses.


9. For a discussion of the variety of acts described in assault recognizances, see chapter 5. Appendix A and chapter 2 elaborate on JPs’ freedom in writing recognizances.

10. Note that the 105 recognizances to appear to prosecute an assault (type b in appendix A, figure A.1) have also been used as accounts of petty violence, except where stated in the quantitative analyses.

11. Of the 7,129 recognizances to appear to answer a charge of assault, 9 percent (636) also bound the defendant to keep the peace (combining types a and c); 21 percent (1,527) were to be of good behavior (combining types a and d); and 32 percent
(2,301) simply added the condition that the defendant was not allowed "to depart the court without licence" (type e). Of the remaining recognizances, 14 percent (1,002) bound the defendant for a combination of keeping the peace, good behavior, or not departing the court without permission, leaving 24 percent where there was no extra condition other than to appear to answer the assault charge (type a). None of these conditions bear any significant relationship to the severity of the offense or its description. While, in theory, recognizances for maintaining good behavior were more serious than those for the peace, in practice there was little distinction between the two; and they seem to have been used rather arbitrarily, at the discretion of each individual JP. See Robert Shoemaker, "Using Quarter Sessions Records as Evidence in the Study of Crime and Criminal Justice" Archives XX, no. 90 (1993), 151, and Landau, “Appearance at the Quarter Sessions,” 34.


29. See, for example, Gowing, Domestic Dangers, and most recently, T. Meldrum, Domestic Service and Gender, 1660–1750 (New York: Pearson Education, 2000).


34. D. Hay, “Property, Authority and the Criminal Law,” in Albion’s Fatal Tree, 35.


36. Unless otherwise stated, “London” has been used to refer to the metropolis rather than only to the City.


39. Wrigley, 46–49.


42. N. Landau, “Appearance at the Quarter Sessions,” 33.

43. The assizes for Cumberland, Northumberland, and Westmorland are the exception, being held only once a year, until the nineteenth century. J. S. Cockburn, A History of English Assizes, 1558–1714 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 19, 45.


47. The relationship between King’s Bench and the Westminster Quarter Sessions is discussed in more detail in appendix A.


49. Ibid., 16. However, pages 20–21 show how, unlike the assizes, the sessions of
the peace for the City and Middlesex County were integrally connected to the Old Bailey sessions of oyer and terminer and jail delivery.


51. According to John Beattie, the Westminster and Middlesex JPs may have been excluded because of their lower social status. Beattie suggested that, because the meetings of the Old Bailey (like the assizes in the counties) were prominent social occasions, the City magistrates and their families may have been motivated by their distaste for associating with the families of the Westminster and Middlesex Justices whom they felt to be their inferiors. Beattie, *Policing and Punishment*, 13–14.


54. For example, Westminster was governed by twelve life-appointed burgesses, because “neither [the City of] London, nor the Court nor Parliament had ever wished to have to deal with a Lord Mayor of Westminster.” G. M. Trevelyan, *Illustrated English Social History, Volume Three: The Eighteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1942), 42.


56. Porter, 96, 140.


59. The social status of only 415 (6 percent) of the 7,129 prosecutors could be determined, and six of these 415 prosecutors were laborers (for women, their husband’s occupation was used, except for the rare occasions where the woman’s own occupation was recorded). This is only 1 percent of the 415 total. It seems likely that the real proportion of laborer prosecutors is somewhat higher, however, because most of the 415 complainants’ occupations were determined when they bore an aristocratic title, distorting the data in favor of wealthier prosecutors. Untitled prosecutors’ status was determined only when they either had entered into a bond to prosecute (which occurred in only 1 percent of all 7,234 assault recognizances) or had been prosecuted themselves and had to enter into recognizance.


62. Norma Landau cites 6,432 recognizances at Middlesex Quarter Sessions from 1701 to 1705 (less than 1,300 per year), increasing to 2,071 in 1734 but rising still more dramatically to approximately 5,650 a year in the late 1780s (22,593 from 1788 to 1791). “Appearance at the Quarter Sessions,” 45, table 1.
Notes to Chapter 2


2. See appendix A for detailed evidence.

3. MJ/SR2290 R205, 8 May 1717, is a window into the process, as it described Dorothy Hall bringing a warrant to a constable in his bakery and asking him to serve it. In this particular case, the constable refused to serve the warrant and was prosecuted, creating a record of the event for posterity.

4. Beattie, Policing and Punishment in the City of London, 1660–1750: Urban Crime and the Limits of Terror (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 131, states that “there was no expectation that a constable would investigate crime, discover the perpetrator, formulate and bring the charges . . . [this] was still thought to be the victim’s work.”


8. MSP 1711 Jy/71, Informacon of James Mortimer of Kingsland Comon in the Parish of St. Mary Islington, dated 2 June 1711.

9. Ibid. They found a halter, a “set of Picklock Keys,” and various weapons on the man, resulting in his arrest for horsetheft.


13. MSP 1697 Dec/27–29, ff 27, The Informacon of Elizabeth Webster daughter of Mathew Webster, dated 1 Nov. 1697.


15. DL/C/244 f 264, Hall c. Ruggsbys, 15 Jan. 1694/5.


17. MJ/SR2270 R112, 12 May 1716.

18. For recognizances involving prosecutions and counterprosecutions between
different families (presumably representing neighborhood feuds), see MJ/SR1741 R197 (30 Apr.), R220 (3 May), and R222 (4 May) 1689; MJ/SR1841 R31, R32, R33, and R34, 17 July 1694; MJ/SR1855 R42 (21 May) and R37 (18 June) 1695; MJ/SR1969 R150 (27 May), R154 (28 May), and R132 (27 June) 1701; MJ/SR2013 R47 and R49, 8 May 1703; MJ/SR2250 R43 and R44, 14 May 1715; and MJ/SR2353 R24 (24 Aug.) and R23 (29 Aug.) 1720.

20. MJ/SR1897 R92 and R93, 14 and 10 July 1697 respectively.
21. Robert Shoemaker, 284–85, has noted the greater likelihood of urban disputants to launch a formal prosecution than to come to an informal agreement mediated by a JP.

23. Ibid.

25. This varied according to the parish. The Webbs recounted “the ‘Justices of Covent Garden’ . . . sometimes meeting ‘by surprise’ in one of the taverns of the Strand,” while the JPs of St. Margaret’s seem to have consistently held their petty sessions “at the Vestry room’ once or twice a month.” S. and B. Webb, English Local Government, Volume 1: The Parish and the County (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1906, reprinted, 1963), 403, 405.

26. John Beattie describes the City aldermen hearing complaints “in their own residences.” However, by the end of our period, JPs’ work had become much more formalized. Beattie, Policing and Punishment, 92. According to Beattie (110), “[T]he most active, crime-fighting magistrates in the area around Covent Garden to the west of the City thought it necessary to create structures for this work that were in effect courtrooms.”

27. In the interrogatory, which was based upon the ministrant’s (defendant’s) defense, prosecution witnesses were asked, “[D]o you not know . . . that [Clift] was upon the Acc[oun]t of her keeping a disordily house . . . denied a Lycense . . . to sell drink and that her thinking [Lutrell] had a hand in the denying the said Lycense was the Cause of her bringing this suit she having sworn . . . she would be revenged?” DL/C/259, interrogatory 2, f 385, Clift c. Lutrell, 21 June 1720.

28. The alternative forms of prosecution for assault are laid out in appendix A.
29. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show an overall decrease in the total numbers of assault complainants and defendants before Westminster Quarter Sessions from 1701 to 1705, suggesting that the War of Spanish Succession (1702–13) had a dampening effect on Quarter Sessions’ activity.
30. The number of complainants mentioned in more than one recognizance for the same assault is largely balanced out by the number of defendants bound in separate recognizances for assaulting multiple complainants at the same time. One
might have thought that multiple defendants would be more likely to appear in separate recognizances, though they had attacked the same complainant (thus inflating the number of repeat complainants), because they each had to find sureties. Many seem to have used the same sureties and to have been bound on the same recognizance, however. In fact, the total number of recognizances listing more than one defendant is roughly equal to the total number listing multiple complainants (333 and 340 respectively).

32. MJ/SR2343, R11, R12, and R13, 2 Jan. 1720.
34. Sir Thomas Deveil, Observations on the practice of a Justice of the Peace: intended for such gentlemen as design to act for Middlex or Westminster . . . (London, 1747), 13–14.
35. According to Landau (508), indictments for assault filed at Middlesex Quarter Sessions “aimed not at punishing the defendant, but instead at obtaining compensation.” Through various formal and informal means, defendants were able to escape many of the punishments the court might exert, by paying the plaintiff directly in return for what was basically a withdrawal of prosecution. N. Landau, “Indictment for Fun and Profit: A Prosecutor’s Reward at Eighteenth-Century Quarter Sessions,” Law and History Review 17, no. 3 (1999), 507–36. Shoemaker (131) has also noted that “it is possible that the number of [Quarter Sessions] indictments which addressed disputes typically heard in civil courts increased during this period” and “the practice of prosecuting civil cases at quarter sessions continued through at least the mid-eighteenth century.”
37. It is interesting to note that only one of this type of assault recognizance—that brought by shopkeeper Hannah Lee—indicates that the prosecution went on to generate an indictment. MJ/SR2315 R300, 4 Oct. 1718.
39. WSP 1705 Ap/1, Peticon of Elizabeth White, undated (1705). Petitions were accepted at Quarter Sessions, and, according to a clerk’s handbook, the party against whom the petition was presented was given a chance to answer it; if the party did not show up or the evidence against him was convincing, the court could make an Order upon the petition. W. T., The Office of the Clerk of Assize . . . Together with the Office of the Clerk of the Peace . . . 2nd Ed. (London: Printed for Henry Twyford, 1682), 178.
40. For further speculation upon the impact of maternal images upon the courts, see chapter 4.
42. For detailed evidence on this point, see appendix A. In his investigation of early modern murder cases, Malcolm Gaskill has also emphasized popular agency in legal records. M. Gaskill, *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 203–41.

43. E. Bohun, *The Justice of Peace his Calling and Qualifications* (London: printed for T. Salusbury, 1693), 150. Note also that “[i]n every Warrant . . . where sureties are to be found or required, the Warrant ought to contain the special cause or matter,” unless “it be fore some great Crime.” W. Shepard, *The Justice of Peace, His Clerks Cabinet* (London: John Steater et al., 1672), 5.

44. We cannot test this theory because none of the manuals explicitly depict JPs using the text of the warrant in drawing up the resulting recognizance, and no warrants have been preserved to be viewed directly.

45. Ibid., 354. See also Nelson, 484. There would not have been any point in reciting a Latin indictment to the defendant, but recognizances had only the names, addresses, and occupations of the principal and sureties in Latin, and the condition—the part that described the offense for which the principal was bound—in English.

46. Words and phrases have been added, above the line of text, in a few recognizances to suggest afterthoughts on the part of the recorder—perhaps prompted by the prosecuting victim. For examples of this type of clerical activity, see J. Hurl-Eamon, “‘She being bigg with child is likely to miscarry’: Pregnant Victims Prosecuting Assault in Westminster, 1685–1720,” *London Journal* 24, no. 2 (1999), 25.

47. MJ/SR2275 R150, 14 July 1716.


49. MJ/SR2133 R72, 21 June 1709. Emphasis in original.

50. MJ/SR2275 R59, 7 Sept. 1716.

51. MJ/SR1883 R73, 30 Dec. 1696. For other examples, see MJ/SR1754 R37, 21 Feb. 1689/90; MJ/SR2230 R16, 30 Apr. 1714; and MJ/SR2310 R4, 6 May 1718.

52. MJ/SR2286 unnumbered recognizance to prosecute, 26 Jan. 1716/7.

53. MJ/SR2290 R196, 14 June 1717 and MJ/SR2037 R22, 1 Sept. 1704 respectively.

54. MJ/SR2348 R107, 7 May 1720.

55. *The Compleat Justice* (London, 1656), 19. It should be noted that justicing handbooks encouraged JPs to record fears or threats in recognizances for the peace or good behavior, and this legal consideration may be behind some of the recognizances where they are mentioned. See, for example, J. Bond, *A Compleat Guide for Justices of the Peace* (London, 1707), 181, which states, “A justice granting the peace . . . must take an Oath of the Party so demanding, that he is in bodily fear &c.” However, complainants’ fears and defendants’ threats are mentioned even in assault recognizances that bind only to appear and do not go on to demand the peace or good behavior. Thus, in some cases at least, fears and threats were recorded simply because the complainants must have impressed the JP with these aspects of the assault.


57. MJ/SR2290 R37, 29 June 1717 and MJ/SR1860 R19, 21 Aug. 1695 respectively.


61. Defendants’ narratives tended to emphasize their own passivity. After a dispute of honor arose between Thomas Heath and Samuel Cook, a swordfight resulted in Cook’s death. A witness for Heath testified that though Cook grew “Warm, and Angry, and clapt his Hand to his Sword . . . several times,” Heath never tried “to draw, or meddle with his sword,” adding that there was “no just Provocation given by Mr. Heath at the time of this unhappy incident.” OBP, 15–17 June 1718 (London). In OBP, 27–30 Apr. 1715 (London, printed for Samuel Crouch), 6, a landlord was accused of killing his lodger. The lodger’s wife testified that her husband was peaceably packing to leave when the landlord burst in and “threaten’d to fight the deceas’d,” but the prisoner’s version made the killing an inadvertent result of the lodger’s aggression. According to the landlord, “[T]he deceased drew his Sword on him without Provocation.” However, fights clearly had occurred in these cases, eliminating the possibility of an acquittal for self-defense. The courts held that any “quarrel” inevitably “arose from some . . . provocation, either in word or deed: and . . . in quarrels both parties may be, and usually are, in some fault” (Blackstone, 187). Thus, both Heath and the landlord were charged with manslaughter and sentenced to be burned in the hand.

64. MJ/SR2192 R27, 5 May 1712.


67. Ibid. and note 59.
68. Shoemaker, 26.

70. Ibid. While Dalton is speaking specifically about recognizances to keep the peace, it seems likely that his position could be extended to all assaults.

71. For more on trading justices, see appendix A.

72. According to Norma Landau, The Justices of the Peace, 1679–1760 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 185, trading justices operated by binding “disputants in recognizances to keep the peace and appear at Quarter Sessions, and then at the disputants’ plea releas[ing] those bound from their obligations,” and collecting fees for both the implementation and the release of the bond.

73. None of the recognizances were returned concordantur (agreed), which would
indicate the defendant’s release by the prosecutor from the obligation to appear at Quarter Sessions and which suggest the manipulations of a trading justice. In addition, Robert Shoemaker’s analysis of those justices most likely to fit the profile of “trading justices” (because their defendants were least likely to be indicted) identified only two Westminster JPs, John Chamberlayne and James Dewy, who are not overly prominent among the recognizances discussed below. Shoemaker, *Prosecution and Punishment*, table 8.5, 226–27.

74. Douglas Hay, “Dread of the Crown Office: The English Magistracy and the King’s Bench 1740–1800,” in N. Landau, ed., *Law, Crime and English Society 1660–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), suggests that busier justices with less social cachet—such as those operating in the metropolis—were more vulnerable to the infamy of disciplinary action before King’s Bench and may have curbed their activities accordingly, avoiding the more controversial practices. I am grateful to Dr. Hay for allowing me to read this article prior to its publication.

75. For example, in the years 1695, 1705, and 1715, this type of recognizance occurred as follows as a proportion of the total of assault recognizances (to answer) taken in the same year:

1695: 6 of 141 = 4%
1705: 4 of 113 = 4%
1715: 36 of 367 = 10%

The dramatic rise by the end of the period may be due to an increase in trading justices during this period, or it may be because more JPs felt that everyone who came before them had a right to the court’s justice, and they thus allowed more formal prosecutions. Shoemaker, *Prosecution and Punishment* (225–27) dealt with the character of the Westminster and Middlesex benches but did not note any dramatic changes in this period.

76. Note that Joseph Keble, *An Assistance to Justices of the Peace for the Easier Performance of their Duty* (London: printed for W. Rawlins et al., 1683), 428, encouraged any JP who had “granted the peace to one that in the Justices judgement . . . require[d] it only out of malice, or for vexation, the Justice may presently in good discretion bind him to the good behaviour that so required the peace.” In other words, if JPs were worried that person X was bound to keep the peace toward person Y, when Y really had no genuine cause to fear person X, the JP could then bind person Y to be of good behavior toward X to even the score. Keble makes no mention of assault, but the same principle probably applied for JPs here as well.
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Notes to Chapter 4

1. In the eighteenth century “virtuous” motherhood was narrowly defined, and many poorer women fell outside the definition and were denied pride and authority
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**Notes to Chapter 5**

2. Chapter 4 explores the areas where domestic violence was seen by its victims as violation and was prosecuted.


6. The next section returns to this argument.


8. There is no specific legal definition for “violent assault” in the legal literature, and “maiming”—arguably the most serious type of assault (a felony without benefit of clergy)—was mentioned in only six recognizances—not even as often as would seem appropriate, given the description in some other recognizances. It is impossible, therefore, to know for certain why certain assaults were recorded as violent, but it seems safe to assume that a particularly wounded and shaken victim caused the JP to have the assault specified as “violent.”
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82. Beattie, 123. The constable in a play enacted in Drury Lane, 1639, vowed to make wrongdoers "stoope Under my staffe of office." Glapthorne, Act 4, Scene 1.
83. MJ/SR2334 R82, 22 Sept. 1719.


85. The “marshal’s men” referred to here must not be confused with the assistants to the county marshal, who were also known by the same name. The principal function of the latter was to arrest prostitutes and vagrants and to control crowds during public events such as hangings and riots. Beattie, 158–63. The officers of the marshalsea courts, rather than the assistants to the county marshal, are examined in the following pages, because the context in which the term “marshal’s men” appears in the assault recognizances suggests that they were the same “marshals men” referred to in The Ancient Legal Course and Fundamental Constitution of the Pallace Court or Marshalsea (London: Printed for Robert Crofts, 1663), 52, or the pamphlet by Robert Robins, entitled A Whip for the Marshalls Court, and their Officers (London, 1648).


88. Along with the sheriff and constables, the bailiffs had to “be in attendance” at Quarter Sessions, “with the obligation of reporting such offences or derelictions of duty as had occurred within their respective jurisdictions,” and—because the courts of the verge dealt mostly with debt (discussed below)—marshal’s men also resorted to Quarter Sessions to prosecute violence against them. Webb, 296.


91. MJ/SR2330 R76, 11 Apr. 1719. The public whipping of women was banned by 57 Geo 3 c. 75 in 1817, but there is no evidence that it evoked significant popular resentment in this period.


95. OBP, 26–28 May 1680 (London, s.n.), 3.
96. MJ/SR2037 R12, 26 Aug. 1704. See also MJ/SR2260 R214, 7 Oct. 1715, for a description of a marshal's man assaulting a woman.
98. According to James Sharpe (32), “[C]omplaints of bribery, corruption and extortion against bailiffs were all too widespread and too plausible.”
99. Even a defender of the Palace Court was forced to admit to “the petty meane conceit and estimation people generally have had” for the Palace Court, “though its Decrees are as valid and binding as any of the Benches of Law at Westminster.” The Ancient Legal Course, 48–49. Similarly, Robins—imprisoned on its authority in the mid–seventeenth century—asserted that “that court . . . is of no validity, nor hath any power or Jurisdiction to execute [its] authority . . . upon the ignorant people every day.”
100. Douglas Green (275) concluded that “the superior courts at Westminster wanted to limit the Marshalsea’s jurisdiction.” Robins recounted his indicting two marshal’s men for assault because the court they served had no real authority in the seventeenth century. In MJ/SR2295 R128, 28 Aug. 1717, John Felton prosecuted a marshal’s man for assault. (Note that Felton’s assailant is listed only as a “messenger to the board of green cloth”—one of the four criminal courts of the verge, also known as the Court of the King’s Counting House, which allows me to identify him as a marshal’s man. I am grateful to conversations with Matthew Szromba for this information. See M. P. Szromba, “The Wicked Man Shall Not Abide in My House: The Courts of the Verge and the English Monarchy, 1660–1760”, Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University, 2004). The officer was also bound “for a contempt in disputing the Constables authority in executing a warrant against him” for that assault.
101. Robins.
102. Twelve Ingenious Characters, 10, and A Description of Devils, 14, respectively.
103. An Epistle Narrative, 4.
104. News from Tybourn.
105. MJ/SR2280, R183, 3 Dec. 1716. Succliffe was also charged with barratry which resonates with a case before the Bishop of London’s Consistory Court in which a bailiff admitted to calling “Anne Anderson Nasty Comon Bawdy house whore,” claiming drunkenness as his defense. DL/C/255 f 186, Anderson c. Blew, 23 Mar. 1714/5.
106. It seems safe to assume that bailiffs were the most obvious, if not the only, officers empowered to arrest those accused of debt in the early eighteenth century, because the studies of imprisonment for debt mention only bailiffs, though they do not explicitly deny constables a role in such arrests. Innes, 255–56; P. Haagen, “Eighteenth-Century English Society and the Debt Law,” in S. Cohen and A. Scull, eds., Social Control and the State: Historical and Comparative Essays (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1983), 235–36; and O. R. McGregor, Social History and Law Reform (London: Stevens and Sons, 1981), 40.
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2. See, for example, Nicholas Rogers, *Crowds, Culture and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 223.
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6. Dalton, 282. A similar statement appears in W. Nelson, The Office and Authority of a Justice of the Peace, 5th Ed. (London, 1750). However, 1 Hawkins c. 65 s 14, 159, says that “women are punishable as rioters” and does not specify that they have to be led by a male; and Joseph Keble, An Assistance to Justices of the Peace for the Easier Performance of their Duty (London: printed for W. Rawlins, etc. 1683), 647, refers to “sundry women” being convicted of rioting by the Court of Star Chamber, but they were wearing male clothing.


8. MJ/SR2098 R97, 3 Sept. 1707.


10. Shoemaker, “The London Mob,” 274 (table 1) and 278.

11. MJ/SR2118 R130, 29 Sept. 1708 and MJ/SR2270 R160, 21 May, 1716 respectively. For more examples of assaults and riots “about” the victim’s house, see chapter 5.


15. MJSR2290 R110, 22 May 1717.


17. MJ/SR2052 R19, 17 Apr. 1705.


19. MJ/SR2093 R4, 28 Apr. 1707. See also Recognizances 2, 3, and 5, which bound the male rioter-assailants. Sir Richard Buckley is absent in the Dictionary of National Biography. The only surviving record of a man by this name is a pamphlet that he authored in 1690, entitled The Proposal for Sending Back the Nobility and Gentry of Ireland (London: Printed for Sir Samuel Holford and Sold by R. Baldwin, 1690). According to Buckley, his proposal provoked “a parcel of Rabble” to “rail and roar at” him, and he referred to “continual calumnies and threats” from them “ever since, to do him some mischief.” Unfortunately, there is no concrete evidence to indicate the cause of the 1707 riot against him almost two decades later.

20. Ibid., R2.

21. Of the 150 assault recognizances for “raising a mob,” 84, or 56 percent, named female defendants. (Recognizances binding both male and female defendants were not included.) There was no special legal category for “raising a mob,” and the closest mention of this type of offense is in Keble, s. XLII no. 2, 663: “if any person . . . raised or caused to be raised twelve persons or above,” that person is guilty of riot.

22. Jessica Warner and Frank Ivis, “Damn you, you informing Bitch”: Vox Populi and the Unmaking of the Gin Act of 1736,” Journal of Social History 33, no. 2 (1999), 311, state that the "typical scenario" of women's riot activities “was for women to incite
violence without actually participating in it.” They cite E. P. Thompson, Malcolm Thomis, and Jennifer Grimmett to substantiate their claim that, by raising the mob rather than being mere participants in a riot, women were able to remain nonviolent. However, while Thompson, Thomis, and Grimmett offer corroborating evidence of women’s significant role as mob raisers, they say nothing to substantiate Ivis and Warner’s contention that mob raising was nonviolent. Indeed, in discussing mob raising, Thompson, Thomis, and Grimmett give many examples of women who explicitly used violence to incite their fellow rioters. Malcolm I. Thomis and Jennifer Grimmett, *Women in Protest, 1800–1850* (London: Croom Helm, 1982), 37–39; E. P. Thompson, “The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century,” *Past and Present* 50 (1971), 115–16; and idem, *Customs in Common*, (New York: New Press, 1993), 312, 334.

32. MJ/SR2255 R81, 23 July 1715 and MJ/SR1855 R41, 15 May 1695 respectively.
33. MJ/SR2221 R10, 2 Jan. 1714.
36. There are ten recognizances binding women to answer seditious words charges, and ten binding men. Nicholas Rogers (Crowds, 223) found a grand total of 238 prosecutions for seditious words in the metropolis between 1714 and 1716, and while only 15 percent of these charged women, he argues that this was much higher than the percentage of women charged with any more serious, Jacobite-related offense.
37. MJ/SR2108 R142, 30 Mar. 1708.
40. MJ/SR2310 R70, 17 June 1718.
41. MJ/SR2260 R151, 1 Nov. 1715.
42. MJ/SR2315 R199, and one unnumbered recognizance to prosecute, 11 Aug. 1718.
45. Monod, 234.
47. Paul Monod asks whether “drunken or angry or antagonistic expressions [can] be interpreted as evidence of political sentiments” and suggests that a toast to King James might sometimes be no more than “a playful jest without serious content” (239).
48. Three of the eleven women (27 percent) in contrast to two of the seventeen men (12 percent) accused of speaking seditious words used violent imagery as part of their sedition.
49. MJ/SR1551 R55, 26 Nov. 1689 and MJ/SR2330 R78, 8 Apr. 1719 respectively.
52. Roger B. Manning, “The origins of the Doctrine of Sedition,” *Albion* 12, no. 2 (1980), 104. Interestingly, only Ann Murkott was bound “for speaking treasonable words,” yet she does not appear to fall within the definition.
56. MJ/SR1873 R99, 14 May 1696.
57. MJ/SR2310 R40, 30 May 1718.
60. Mughouses were the meeting places for Loyal Societies, which toasted the King at every meeting with a “Mug of true English Ale.” George Waldron, *A Speech Made to the Loyal Society at the Mug-House in Long Acre 7 June 1716* (London, 1716), 12.
61. OBP, 6–10 Sept. 1716 (London, printed for J. Phillips by M. Jenour), 2; emphasis in original.
62. OBP, 10–11 Oct. 1716 (London, printed for J. Phillips by M. Jenour), 2. Note that “patens” are clogs or overshoes worn to keep the wearer out of the mud; they often contained hard wooden or iron soles.
65. *An Account of the riots, tumults, and other treasonable practices since his Majesty's accession to the throne . . .* (London, 1715), 8, 24.
67. Ibid.
68. Paul, 95. See also, Meriton, 31–34; Exact Constable, 29; and Sheppard, chapter 2, section 1, no. 18.
70. Keble, 223.
73. MJ/SR2083 R67, 28 Nov. 1706.
74. Ibid. and R101 respectively.
75. The upper marshal “was expected to exercise a general if vague supervision over night-time policing by riding around the City several times a week”—but the sheer volume of his task, coupled with the likelihood of his own corruption, meant that such supervision rarely occurred in practice. Beattie, 159.
77. MJ/SR2118 R76, 28 July 1708. R77 bound John Parish for the same offense.
79. MJ/SR2013 R18; ibid.
80. MJ/SR1912 R63, 1 May 1698 and MJ/SR2260 R192 (for Joseph) & R193 (for Anne), 21 Nov. 1715, respectively.
81. MJ/SR2221 R25, 23 Oct. 1713. See chapter 5 for the possible significance of removing a man’s hat and wig in an assault.
82. MJ/SR1969 R33, 27 May 1701 and MJ/SR2042 R1, 7 Oct. 1704 respectively.
87. MJ/SR2013 R32, 28 June 1703. Note that the recognizance indicates that Hill was successful in rescuing only one of the “wenches.”
88. MJ/SR2310 R200, 15 May 1718. This example resonates with that of Jane Cox, who performed a similar rescue by smuggling in “an chisel a mallet & a long Rope” to enable a male prisoner to make his escape. MJ/SR2295 R263, 14 Aug. 1717. A group of “Confederates” of Newgate prisoners, whose gender is not specified, helped the prisoners escape by providing them with “two saw knives [and] two Plough-coutlers,” which allowed the “dextrous” prisoners “to saw of all their Irons, and make a large breach in the Wall, and sliding down by a Rope, make their escapes.” *OBP* 26 Feb.–1 Mar. 1679/80 (London, printed by D.M.), 4.
89. MJ/SR1826 R85, 4 Nov. 1693. According to the *OED*, a vizard-mask was
worn to conceal the face, and women who wore such masks were associated with prostitution—to the extent that prostitutes could be called “vizards.”

90. Ibid. Such transvestism emerges a few times in the legal records of London over this period. John Ridgway was “taken up in womens apparel” in 1701 and could give “no good account of himself,” so he was bound over. MJ/SR1799 R36, 22 Jan 1701. The Old Bailey heard a trial in 1717 of a man “indicted for assaulting and robbing” a woman while he was wearing “a Ridinghood”—a feminine item of dress. OBP, 1–4, May, 1717 (London, printed for J. Phillips by M. Jenour), 5–6. See also D. Cressy, Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England: Tales of Discord and Dissension (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 109–10, and E. P. Thompson, “The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century,” Past and Present 50 (1971), 115–16.

91. N. Z. Davis, “Women on Top,” in Society and Culture in Early Modern France (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965), 132. The use of the clothing of the opposite sex for disguise was occasionally a tactic for female rescuers as well, and Richard Vincent was accompanied by Hannah Whiston and Sarah Brounchier, both spinsters, who were “drest up in mens cloths” to rescue Mr. St. Legar.

92. MJ/SR1826 R90 & R89, 1 Oct. 1693 respectively. These recognizances are also interesting because the women, as their own sureties, were bound for £150—perhaps because (as their recognizances state) the focus of their rescue, Mr. Gibson St. Legar, was in jail for “concealing and conveying away Esq Leviston after he had killed Mr Charles Howard.” In other words, they were caught rescuing the rescuer of a murderer.


94. This observation is based on a search of the pre-nineteenth-century publications listed in the English Short Title Catalogue under the keyword rescue.


Notes to Chapter 8


3. These points are outlined in more detail in Appendix A.

1. For example, mayhem, which was an assault of particular violence “with intent to maim or disfigure” the victim, was a “felony without benefit of clergy.” Sir William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England in Four Books, Book Four (reprint, Philadelphia: Geo. T. Bisel Co., 1922), 207. Assaults such as MJ/SR2270 R137, 14 June 1716, where the victim’s nose was slit and the alleged offender was bound only to appear at the next sessions and be of good behavior in the interim, legally constituted mayhem. The victim should have been forced to prosecute by indictment from the outset, yet the recognizance suggests that she did not.


3. Only indictments found to be “true bills” by a grand jury would go on to a trial. Hay discovered that over half of the indictments for assault in late-eighteenth-century Staffordshire were not found to be true bills, suggesting that the reason was that the grand jury dismissed them as either vexatious or more civil than criminal prosecutions. “Prosecution and Power: Malicious Prosecution in the English Courts, 1750–1850,” in D. Hay and F. Snyder, eds., Policing and Prosecution in Britain 1750–1850 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 362n.

4. Note that there are no extant recognizances for Westminster between 1680 and 1685; after that date, however, there is a virtually complete set.

5. Without a justice’s signature, a recognizance was invalid and was not returned to Quarter Sessions. Assault recognizances needed only one JP’s signature, unlike recognizances such as those binding alehouse keepers, which required two justices’ signatures, or those to bind over someone who “depraved the sacrament,” which required three. W. S[hepard], A New Survey of the Justice of Peace his Office (London: J.S., 1659), 16, and idem, The Office of a Justice of Peace, 219–20.

6. Sureties were generally bound for at least £20, and the offender for twice that amount, according to Norma Landau, “Appearance at the Quarter Sessions of Eighteenth-Century Middlesex,” London Journal 23, no. 2 (1998), 33. Some, though not all, female defendants who were bound on their own recognizances were bound sup’ impr (on pain of imprisonment) rather than listing a monetary sum. The totals for which sureties were bound were dependent on the laws and principles governing bail, examples of which can be seen in Matthew Bacon, A New Abridgement of the Law, Vol. 1, 7th Ed. (London: A. Strahan, 1831), 494–95, and Charles Viner, A General Abridgement of Law and Equity, Vol. 3 (Hampshire, 1741), 467. Duke of Schomberg v. Murrey, 12 Mod. 420.Mich.12.W.3. However, JPs had considerable discretionary powers in deciding the amount and reliability of sureties.

7. Recognizances for prosecutors or witnesses to appear in assault cases are fairly rare, probably because they were used only for very serious cases, and thus exist in greater numbers for felonies, as Shoemaker notes. R. Shoemaker, “Using Quarter Sessions Records as Evidence for the Study of Crime and Criminal Justice,” Archives XX, no. 90 (October 1993), 147.

8. The Westminster recognizances for the peace clearly show that certain JPs would bind a person to keep the peace unto the king and his subjects, while others would specifically name the complainant. In other words, the mention of a specific complainant in recognizances for the peace depended more upon the proclivities of the JP than on any legal consideration.
9. A recognizance for the peace or good behavior was often referred to in the justicing handbooks as a “surety” for the peace or good behavior. In lay terms, an eighteenth-century Londoner might also be said to “swear the peace against” someone when binding him or her to keep the peace.

10. This is recognizances of type (f), those which bound a defendant to answer an assault, who was also prosecuted by indictment for the same offense. There are 679 recognizances that probably went to indictment, because they bear clerical annotations in their margins that mention an indictment. However, not all recognizances that went to indictment may have consistently recorded this fact, and only 88 percent (6,280) in total bear legible clerical annotations. Shoemaker’s study of the recognizances as a whole for the county found that “28 per cent of the defendants who were bound over to appear at quarter sessions were also indicted,” and Shoemaker added 5 percent to “account for the fact that the clerks did not always record the existence of indictments in the relevant recognizance.” *Prosecution and Punishment*, 31.

11. This is substantiated by Shoemaker’s findings for the metropolis as a whole, in *Prosecution and Punishment*, table 3.5.

12. John Beattie’s data from the London Justice Room Charge Book (Oct. 1729–30) shows 172 (plus an additional 3 involving assaults on officers) of a total of 234 persons accused of assault having “settled” their cases. Though the table deals only with those assaults that went to indictment or were settled, or those in which the charges were dismissed (not giving numbers of assaults that were bound over to allow for a comparative reading), it is still clear that a substantial number of assault cases could be dealt with informally. J. M. Beattie, *Policing and Punishment in the City of London, 1660–1750: Urban Crime and the Limits of Terror* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), table 2.2.

13. Prisoners who were not released prior to the next Quarter Sessions might appear in the “Gaol Calendars”—records of those in prison at the time of each Quarter Sessions. However, these calendars served as wrappers for the sessions’ rolls and are in very poor condition—much too illegible to provide a reliable indication of the numbers and types of assaults prosecuted in this way. Beattie’s work on Lord Mayor Ashurst’s charge book found fourteen of thirty-three alleged assailants (42 percent) committed for want of sureties in January–June 1694. Beattie, *Policing and Punishment*, tables 2.1 and 2.2 respectively. Beattie noted (97) that Ashurst’s work was “clearly only a fraction” of the assaults in the city of London at this time. Douglas Hay’s study of the extant Staffordshire Assize and Quarter Sessions Gaol Calendars (1752–1802) found only 9 of 183 indicted assaults (4.9 percent) that were not bailed and were committed to jail before trial. The proportion rises to 10.5 percent in the period 1806–1817. I am grateful to Dr. Hay for sharing this evidence.

14. “It is probable that women used recognizances more frequently than any other type of legal procedure in the secular courts.” R. Shoemaker, *Prosecution and Punishment*, 207.


16. One hundred eighty-two of the 3,542 recognizances in which the defendant’s occupation could be determined were laborers.

18. The only clues to the disposition of recognizances are in marginal Latin inscriptions, which appear on only 87 percent of all of the assault recognizances. More than half (3,748) read only “ven & exon” (*venit et exoneratur*), simply that the defendant had appeared and met the conditions of his binding over. (“*Venit & exoneratur*” means “he/she came & was/is exonerated.” I am grateful to Bridget Howlett (of the L.M.A.), Ian Gentles, and Norma Landau for their help with translating my abbreviations.) Another 904 said that the recognizance had been “respited,” usually meaning that the recognizance was carried over into another Quarter Sessions because the complainant had a legitimate excuse for not proceeding at that point in time.


21. S. Hindle, “The Keeping of the Public Peace,” in Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle, eds., *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996), 235. Note that Hindle dealt only with recognizances to keep the peace, but even sureties guaranteeing only accused assailants’ appearance in court might wish to prevent him or her from harming the victim further because they wished to avoid having to act as the defendant’s sureties again in the future.

22. N. Landau, “Appearance at the Quarter Sessions,” detailed the meticulous enforcement of appearance at Quarter Sessions, where defendants who failed to appear could have their recognizance estreated, and they and their sureties would have to scramble to pay the resulting fines in order to avoid being liable for their very expensive bonds, and if the accused assailants were unable to comply at any stage in the process, they risked imprisonment. Even those who appeared had to pay 2s to the Quarter Sessions Clerk, plus an additional 4d for the town crier. Landau, 35, 47n.

23. Those who were prosecuted by indictments were almost always bound to appear and answer the charge or were imprisoned if they were unable to provide suitable sureties. In addition, prosecutors could go to a lawyer, instead of a clerk, for an
indictment, but this was a more expensive route, and as a result was probably rarely used. I am grateful to Douglas Hay for this information.

24. Though there were many areas where a JP was prohibited from informal mediation, JPs were encouraged to deal with assault cases in this way. Shoemaker, *Prosecution and Punishment*, 24.

25. Norma Landau, *The Justices of the Peace, 1679–1760* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 184–85. Trading Justices were seen to be most prevalent in London, where they could drum up “a perpetual flow of business.” Webb, 324. Norma Landau found that the introduction of stipends for JPs in 1791 dramatically reduced the number of recognizances returned to the Middlesex Quarter Sessions, suggesting that the use of the recognizance as a prosecutorial tool was significantly influenced by the pecuniary needs of the Justices. N. Landau, “The Trading Justice’s Trade,” in idem, ed., *Law, Crime and English Society 1660–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). I am grateful to Dr. Landau for allowing me to see this article prior to its publication.


27. Ibid.

28. This group, therefore, is responsible for 4,717 recognizances, or 66 percent of the total.

29. Of the total number of recognizances for assault, 2,265 bore descriptions that could not be classed under one of the 275 categories created for the database without special clarification.

30. On the authority of statutes 5 & 6 Ed. 6 c. 4; 22 & 23 Car. 2 c. 1; and 5 H. 4 c. 5, respectively, a person caught drawing a weapon in a church or churchyard “shall forfeit one of his ears,” and an assailant who “maliciously cut out the tongue, put out the Eye, slit or cut off the Nose, or disabled any Member of another, with intent to disfigure him, that Fact is Felony without Clergy, and the Offender shall suffer the pain of death.” W.T., *The Office of the Clerk of Assize*, 121, 127–28, respectively. See also Bond, 73. For more on these types of assaults, see chapter 5.

31. W. Nelson, *The Office and Authority of a Justice of the Peace*, 5th Ed. (London, 1750), 59. The importance of including “Vi & Armis” had continued in practice, though, in fact, the phrase was actually not essential after a statute of 1545. J. H. Baker, “The Refinement of English Criminal Jurisprudence, 1500–1848,” in L. Knafa, ed., *Crime and Criminal Justice in Europe and Canada* (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1979), 23, 40n29. In addition, evidence has been found to indicate that the rules regarding the wording of indictments were not as strictly followed and policed as the handbooks recommended. See Cockburn, “Trial by the Book,” 60–79; and Baker, “The Refinement,” 17–42.

32. This issue is also discussed in chapter 2.

33. Jacob, 406. See also Bond, 251. A historiographical debate exists as to whether the JPs actually performed such duties, though the argument focuses upon the late-sixteenth-century assizes. John Langbein asserted that the JP had to “prepare himself to assume where necessary the forensic role of prosecutor at trial” (*Prosecuting Crime in the Renaissance: England, Germany, France* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974], 35). J. S. Cockburn has since disagreed with him, arguing that the
attendance lists from the assizes revealed that a “majority” of justices regularly failed to appear (“Trial by the book,” 70).


35. For the low rate of recidivism suggested by the assault recognizances, see chapter 2.


37. A writ of *certiorari* removed the defendant’s indictment from Quarter Sessions to King’s Bench, but it did not affect any recognizances made at Quarter Sessions. Writs of *mandamus* removed JPs’ personal discretion and subjected them to the dictates of King’s Bench, but this writ was almost never used, according to Norma Landau, *The Justices of the Peace, 1679–1760*, 345n. *Habeas corpus* writs served only to check JPs’ errors in writing warrants, and only those resulting in imprisonment; and, of course, warrants that resulted in imprisonment were not connected with recognizances.

38. Defendants already bound before a justice for an identical offense could obtain a writ of *supersedeas* to prevent a second JP from forcing them to enter into another recognizance. The writ of *supplicavit*, on the other hand, had very specific instructions on how recognizances should be drawn up, but, according to Earl Jowitt, “[T]his writ was seldom used, for when application had been made to the superior courts, they had usually taken the recognizances there, under the statute of 1623, 21 Jac. I c. 8.” Earl Jowitt, ed., *The Dictionary of English Law*, Vol. II (London: Sweet & Maxwell Ltd., 1959), 1706.

39. See, for example, Nelson, 93, and Jacob, 354.

40. William Shepard’s handbook for clerks gives a series of examples of the Latin section on the sureties and explains that “by these [samples] all other recognizances may be made, for they are after one form.” The section that follows only vaguely describes the wording for the various offenses that may appear in a recognizance, significantly stating that a JP could draw up his recognizances “after the same manner [as the samples], by changing only that which is to be changed.” Shepard, *The Justice of Peace, His Clerks Cabinet*, 100, 104; emphasis added. William Lambard, *Einrarcha . . .* (London, 1614), 107, included only the Latin portion dealing with the sureties’ information and alluded vaguely to “a condition added or endorsed in English” in his examples of the proper forms for recognizances. James Harvey (191) had only an “&c.” where the specifics of the offense would appear. See also Nelson, 390; Robert Gardiner, *En[c]hiridion clerica* (London, 1712), 18; Joseph Higgs, *A Guide to Justices: being modern English precedents . . .* (London, 1734), 128, 168; Edward Crocker, *The Young Clerk’s Tutor Enlarged*, 14th Ed. (London, 1700), 7–13.

41. For example, Giles Jacob (42) included forms for an indictment and a warrant for assault, but not for a recognizance. Michael Dalton offered forms for recognizances for the peace, for good behavior, to appear (again with “&c” for the offense), or even “for him that hath dangerously hurt one,” but none explicitly mentioned assault. M. Dalton, *The Countrey Justice* (London, 1655), 439–44. W. Stubbs and G. Talmash, *The Crown Circuit Companion . . .*, 5th Ed. (London, 1783), 106–16, laid out forms of indictment for a wide variety of assaults, ranging from “common assault” to “an assault
and beating out an eye,” but did not include a similarly systematic treatment of assault recognizances.

**Notes to Appendix B**


3. Hale, 50.


5. Ecclesiastical law in the diocese of London was administered by the consistory, the lower commissary, and the Archdeacon's courts, but the Consistory Court saw the overwhelming majority of defamation litigation. Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, 50–51.


7. M. Harris, “Trials and Criminal Biographies: A Case Study in Distribution,” in R. Myers and M. Harris, eds., *Sale and Distribution of Books from 1700* (Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1982), 5 and 28n4. Harris also noted (7) that the contents of the *OBP* were regulated when “the Court of Aldermen agreed that nothing should be published without the assent of the Lord Mayor and the other Justices present.” Legal historian John Langbein has since testified to their accuracy. J. Langbein, “The Criminal Trial before the Lawyers,” *The University of Chicago Law Review* 45, no. 2 (Winter 1978), 267–72.

8. John Beattie (Policing and Punishment, 21) described a situation where a “Devon country gentleman,” who also happened to be a JP, employed an agent in London “to buy books and keep him informed of the doings in the capital.” He was regularly sent information from the *OBP*, either in the text of a letter or in entire copies. Those outside the direct administration of justice were also interested in the contents of the *OBP*, however, and Langbein (“The Criminal Trial,” 269) cited the
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