

# **The Newgate Calendar**

Edited By Donal Ó Danachair

## **Supplement 2**

Published by the Ex-classics Project, 2016

<http://www.exclassics.com>

Public Domain

# THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

## CONTENTS

GERALD FITZGERALD <i>Executed For Murder, 24th of December, 1703</i> .....	10
JOHN BIGG <i>Convicted of Altering a Bank Note</i> .....	11
JOHN GORDON, WILLIAM KERR AND JOHN DORRELL <i>Jacobites Executed for High Treason</i> .....	12
JOHN MATTHEWS <i>Executed for High Treason in Printing a Jacobite Pamphlet</i> ...	13
FRANCIS BRIGHTWELL AND BENJAMIN BRIGHTWELL <i>Tried For a Highway Robbery</i> .....	15
ANTHONY DRURY <i>Executed for Highway Robbery</i> .....	18
JAMES CARNEGIE, ESQ. <i>Tried for Murder</i> .....	20
MARTIN NOWLAND <i>Executed for High Treason</i> .....	22
JAMES ANNESLEY, ESQ, AND JOSEPH REDDING <i>Tried for Murder</i> .....	24
RICHARD BIGGS <i>Executed near Bath for the Murder of his Wife, 14<sup>th</sup> September, 1748</i> .....	28
JOHN LANCASTER <i>Executed for Housebreaking, 24<sup>th</sup> September, 1748</i> .....	29
SAMUEL HILL <i>Executed for Murdering his Landlady, 23d of March, 1762</i> .....	31
JOHN ANDREWS <i>Executed for Forgery, 23d of March, 1752</i> .....	33
JOHN POULTER ALIAS BAXTER <i>Executed For Highway Robbery</i> .....	35
JOHN BRETT <i>Executed For Forgery</i> .....	42
JOHN SMITH AND ROBERT MAYNE <i>Executed for a Mutiny on Board the King George, 10<sup>th</sup> May, 1762</i> .....	45
JOHN KELLO <i>Executed for Forgery, 13<sup>th</sup> October 1755</i> .....	46
THOMAS USHER <i>Executed for Robbery, 4<sup>th</sup> May, 1764</i> .....	49
WILLIAM JAQUES <i>Executed for the Murder of a Black Man, August, 1764</i> .....	50
RICHARD SWIFT <i>Transported for Buying Stolen Goods</i> .....	51
ELIZABETH BURROUGHS <i>Executed for Murder, April 4<sup>th</sup>, 1766</i> .....	53
JOHN M'CLOUD <i>Executed for the Murder Of Mr. Stoddard, October 24<sup>th</sup>, 1768</i> ....	54
MICHAEL SAMPSON <i>Forger, whose Death Sentence Was Commuted to Transportation because he Had Saved a Nobleman's Servants from Drowning</i> .....	55
JAMES MURPHY AND JOHN DOGAN <i>Executed for Being Concerned in Wilkes's Riots, July 11<sup>th</sup>, 1768</i> .....	57
MOSES ALEXANDER <i>Executed For Forgery although Innocent, 9<sup>th</sup> August, 1769</i>	59
CHARLES DAVID MORGAN, DAVID MORGAN, WILLIAM SPIGGOT, WILLIAM WALTER EVAN, WILLIAM MORRIS, AND DAVID LEWELLIN <i>Executed for the Murder Of Mr. Powell, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 1770</i> .....	62
JOHN STRETTON <i>Executed for Robbing the Mail, 1<sup>st</sup> August, 1770</i> .....	65

SUPPLEMENT 2

RICHARD MORGAN <i>Executed for Privately Stealing, 27<sup>th</sup> May, 1772</i> .....	68
EDWARD BIRCH AND MATTHEW MARTIN <i>Executed for Forgery, 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 1772</i> .....	71
WILLIAM EDWARDS WHITE <i>Executed for Murder, 25<sup>th</sup> October, 1772</i> .....	75
ROBERT POWEL <i>Executed for Forgery, 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 1772</i> .....	77
JOSEPH GUYANT AND JOSEPH ALLPRESS <i>Executed for Robbing the Mail, 8<sup>th</sup> July, 1772</i> .....	80
JOSEPH COOPER <i>Executed for Robbing his Master, 30<sup>th</sup> June, 1772</i> .....	83
LIEUTENANT-GENERAL WILLIAM GANSEL <i>Tried for Firing a Pistol at John Hyde, 8<sup>th</sup> September, 1773</i> .....	85
ISAAC DARKING, Alias DUMAS <i>Executed for Highway Robbery, 16<sup>th</sup> April, 1761</i> .....	87
SAMUEL MALE <i>Executed for Robbery, 25<sup>th</sup> March, 1773</i> .....	91
JOHN CHALLENGOR <i>Executed for Parricide 23<sup>rd</sup> August, 1773</i> .....	93
CHARLES MILLS AND JOHN PUGH <i>Executed for Highway Robbery, 7<sup>th</sup> November, 1774</i> .....	94
WILLIAM HAWKE <i>Executed for Highway Robbery, 1<sup>st</sup> July, 1774</i> .....	96
WILLIAM FARMERY <i>Executed for the Murder of his Mother, 5<sup>th</sup> August, 1775</i> ...	98
MESSRS. RUMBOLD AND SYKES <i>Members of Parliament for Hindon, in Wiltshire, Imprisoned for Bribery, in the Year 1776</i> .....	99
JOHN MADDY, or MANNING <i>Another Case of Adultery</i> .....	102
FRANCIS DAVID STIRN <i>Convicted of Murder, but Poisoned Himself in Newgate, 12<sup>th</sup> Sept, 1760</i> .....	103
WILLIAM ODELL, A SOLDIER, AND JOHN DEMPSEY, A SAILOR <i>Executed at Tyburn, September 15, 1760, for Murder</i> .....	111
THE MAYOR OF BODMIN, IN CORNWALL <i>Barbarously Executed in the Reign of Edward VI</i> .....	112
JAMES NICKOLSON <i>Murderer, convicted fifteen years after the murder</i> .....	114
COUNTRY RIOTS, OWING TO THE HIGH PRICE OF PROVISIONS IN THE YEAR 1766 <i>With an Account of The Execution of Some of the Rioters</i> .....	115
EDWARD AND JANE M'GINNIS <i>Brother and Sister Executed at Tyburn, July 18, 1766, for Burglary</i> .....	121
ISAAC LONG <i>And Other Sham Doctors</i> .....	122
JAMES FRITH <i>Convicted of Robbing His Master's House, in the Dead of the Night, and Transported in the Year 1772</i> .....	124
WILLIAM KELLY <i>Executed near Gloucester, and His Body Hung in Chains, September the 28th, 1772, for Murder</i> .....	128

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

<i>WILLIAM WELCH AND PETER CONWAY Two Boys, the first fourteen, and the latter nine years of Age, Tried at the Old Bailey, for a Highway Robbery on the Person of a Female Infant, still Younger</i> .....	129
<i>NICHOLAS MALLARD Sentenced to Three Years Imprisonment, for an Assault Committed in a Singular Attempt to Commit a Robbery on the 16th Of April 1774.</i>	131
<i>WILLIAM CARR Convicted in the Ecclesiastical Court for Slander, May 4, 1774, and Sentenced to be Imprisoned Four Years</i> .....	132
<i>STRICTURES ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF MR. HOWARD Respecting Prisons, and the Treatment of Prisoners</i> .....	134
<i>CHARLES PIPKINS Executed at Tyburn, October 23, 1776, for Burglary</i> .....	138
<i>HYMAN ISAACKS An English Jew, Executed at Ostend, in the year 1777, for Forging on the Bank of England</i> .....	139
<i>JOSHUA CROMPTON Executed at Gangly-Green, near Guildford, in Surrey, July 31, 1778, for Forging Bank of England Notes</i> .....	140
<i>FRANCES PEARCE Convicted of Privately Stealing, in October Sessions, 1778, at the Old Bailey, and Sentenced to be Imprisoned for Three Years</i> .....	141
<i>WILLIAM FLINT A Pick-Pocket, Twice Sentenced to Hard Labour on the River Thames, for Privately Stealing</i> .....	142
<i>WILLIAM MEYER, ESQ. Executed at York, April, 6 1781, for Murder</i> .....	144
<i>JOHN LEE, ESQ. Who, from the Honourable Post of Captain in the British Army, Degenerated into the Humiliating Employ of a Strolling Player, wherein he Committed Forgery; and for which he was Executed at Tyburn, on the fourth of March, 1784</i> .....	145
<i>JOSEPH RICHARDS A Most Ungrateful and Barbarous Villain, Executed at Kentish Town, near London, February 27, 1786, for Murder</i> .....	147
<i>THE MILKMEN OF LONDON And Their Impositions upon the Public</i> .....	148
<i>ROBERT JAQUES Convicted at the Old Bailey, July 11, 1790, of Being a Party in a Conspiracy against the Warden of the Fleet Prison, and Sentenced to be Imprisoned and Pilloried</i> .....	150
<i>JAMES WATTS A Quaker, convicted of Robbing his Employer, at the Manchester Quarter Session for 1787</i> .....	157
<i>JOHN MEAD The Boy Incendiary, Executed before Newgate, August 31, 1791, for Setting Fire to his Master's House</i> .....	158
<i>HOLDERNESS, THE WATERMAN Convicted and punished for Ill Treatment to his Fare, 1792</i> .....	159
<i>JOHN BURKITS Sentenced to Twelve Months Imprisonment, for Dog Stealing, October 13, 1789</i> .....	160
<i>JOHN HORNBY MORELAND Convicted at the Lent Assizes 1790, at Bury, in Suffolk, For Bigamy</i> .....	162

SUPPLEMENT 2

PIERRE AUGUSTINE, ALIAS PETER AUGUSTINE, ALIAS PETER CHUMLEY, ALIAS PETER CHAPMAN, ALIAS PETER DEVAL <i>Executed before Newgate, August 31, 1791, For Robbing his own Countryman</i> .....	163
THOMAS DUNN <i>Convicted, Pilloried, and Imprisoned, at Lancaster, September 2, 1794, for Perjury</i> .....	164
WILLIAM TILLEY, JOHN CROSSWELL, GEORGE HARDWICK, JAMES HAYDEN, JOHN HAWDEN, SIMON JACOBS, JOHN SOLOMONS, JOHN PHILLIPS, AND JOHN HENLEY <i>Convicted at the Old Bailey, July 1, 1795, of a Conspiracy, and Sentenced to Transportation</i> .....	166
GEORGE COLLEY, MICHAEL BLANCHE, AND FRANCIS COLE <i>Murderers and Pirates, Executed at Execution Dock, January 22, 1796</i> .....	169
MICHAEL COX, ROBERT M'LAURIN, JOHN SULLIVAN, MARTIN EALEY, AND WILLIAM MORRISON <i>The Mutineers of the Grand Fleet, Executed at the Yard-arm of the Defiance Man of War, March 8, 1796</i> .....	171
VALLERIE COFFRE <i>A Frenchman, Executed at Winchester, July 11, 1766, for the Murder of his Fellow-Prisoner</i> .....	172
JAMES O'COIGLEY <i>Executed on Penningdon Heath, June 7, 1798, for High Treason</i> .....	173
SAMUEL BURR <i>Convicted of a Forgery, in the year 1787</i> .....	177
WILLIAM GRANT (A Negro) <i>In whose Conviction we shall Introduce a Sketch of the Pawnbroker and the Jew</i> .....	180
JEREMIAH READING <i>The Scape-goat of Swindlers, Convicted of Forgery at the Old Bailey, the Judgment Arrested, and the Condemned Pardoned</i> .....	182
JOHN DAY <i>The Most Execrable Murderer of Father, Mother, and their Servant</i> ..	185
WILLIAM WINTERBOTTOM <i>A Dissenting Preacher, Fined and Imprisoned for Preaching Seditious Sermons</i> .....	187
CHARLES TALMAGE <i>Convicted along with Mary Mallet, of Burglary, and Hanged at Winchester, March 12, 1794</i> .....	189
ROBERT WATT and DAVID DOWNIE <i>Convicted of High Treason, at Edinburgh, with Particulars of the Execution of a Traitor in Scotland</i> .....	190
EDWARD COOKE AND HENRY PARISH <i>Soldiers in the Oxfordshire Militia, Condemned at a General Court Martial, and Shot at Brightelmstone (i.e. Brighton), June 12, 1795, for Mutiny</i> .....	201
TIMOTHY DUNN, EDWARD JONES, MATTHEW RILEY, AND DENNIS CONROY <i>Soldiers, Executed March 21, 1796, for Murder</i> .....	203
ELIZABETH HALL <i>Convicted, Fined, and Imprisoned, for Cruelty to her Female Apprentices</i> .....	204
MARTIN LAAS <i>A Norwegian, Executed at Maidstone, for Murder</i> .....	206
EDWARD POWELL <i>Master Mast-maker of his Majesty's Dock-yard, at Portsmouth, Executed near Winchester, for Murder</i> .....	208

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

REBELLIONS IN IRELAND IN 1803 <i>Their Rise and Progress—Assassination of the Lord Chief Justice and his Nephew.—Particulars of the Lives and Executions of the Principal Rebels</i> .....	209
ROBERT EMMET, ESQ <i>A Counsellor at Law, and Chief of the Irish Rebels, in 1803; for which he was Executed</i> .....	212
EDWARD KEARNEY, alias CARNEY; THOMAS MAXWELL ROCHE; OWEN KIRWAN; JAMES BYRNE; FELIX ROURKE; JOHN KILLIN; JOHN M'CANN HENRY HAWLEY; JOHN M'INTOSH; THOMAS KEENAN; DENNIS LAMBERT REDMOND and THOMAS RUSSEL <i>Other Rebels of 1803</i> .....	217
FRANCIS FINLAY <i>Convicted at the December Sessions, at the Old Bailey, in 1802, and Executed for Forgery</i> .....	226
LAWRENCE INNIS <i>A British Seaman, Executed on Pennenden-Heath, January 21, 1803, for Murder</i> .....	229
STEPHEN STILWELL <i>Executed on the Top of the New Gaol, Southwark, March 26, 1803, for the Murder of His Wife</i> .....	231
JOHN THOMPSON, ALIAS KELLY <i>A Mean and Cowardly Robber, Executed at Newgate, October 6. 1803, for Robbing and Ill-Treating a Poor Defenceless Old Woman</i> .....	234
MARY PARNELL <i>Executed at Newgate, July 12, 1804, for Forgery</i> .....	236
ELIZABETH LARGHAN <i>Executed at Chelmsford, March 21, 1804, for the Murder of her Female Infant Child</i> .....	238
GEORGE KENNEDY, MARTIN MOODY, AND RICHARD BARTON <i>Soldiers of the Foot Guards Convicted of a Robbery, Attended with Circumstances of Cruelty</i>	239
SAMUEL WILD MITCHELL <i>Executed before Newgate, January 14, 1805, for the Murder of his Infant Daughter</i> .....	242
JOHN ROGER TURNER <i>Executed at the Old Bailey, May 5, 1805, for Forgery</i> ...	248
JOHN HARDING <i>Executed before Newgate, November 13, 1805, for Forgery</i> .....	250
WILLIAM HONEYMAN <i>The Young Swindler; Convicted of Forgery at the Lent Assizes, 1806, for Kent, and Executed upon Pennenden Heath</i> .....	252
ANDREW AKOW <i>A Chinese Sailor, Executed at Execution-Dock, July 18, 1806, for Murdering his Countryman</i> .....	257
PHILIP MATSELL <i>Executed August 22, 1806, at Birmingham, for Firing at and Wounding T. Twyford, a Watchman of that Town</i> .....	258
EDWARD M'ELROY <i>Indicted for Setting Fire to a Car-house</i> .....	259
EDWARD WILLIAM ROBERTS, DAVID MAITLAND, AND SAMUEL COLE <i>Convicted at the Lent Assizes for Hertford, 1809, and Pilloried for a Conspiracy</i> ...	261
RIOTS OF THE MANCHESTER WEAVERS <i>The King against Hanson, Lancaster Lent Assizes, 1809</i> .....	265
ANNE LEAK <i>A Horse Thief, Eleven years old</i> .....	266
THOMAS LUCAS and SARAH WELLS <i>Christians Prosecuted by Jews</i> .....	267

SUPPLEMENT 2

JACOB LITTLEBOY, WILLIAM GLADMAN, AND WILLIAM PENN *Convicted at the April Sessions for Middlesex 1809, of Stealing a Dead Body out of the Grave* .....268

HANNAH, ALIAS DIANA CONOLLY, CATHERINE HANDLEY, AND ELIZABETH COX *Convicted (Separately) for concealing the Delivery of a Child, and Sentenced to Imprisonment* .....269

JOSEPH SMITH AND CHARLES MEYRICK *Convicted of a Burglary in Breaking into Bagnigge Wells, The Noted Tea Gardens near London* .....271

MICHAEL CONNOR, JAMES KELLY, AND JOHN CARR *The Two Former Convicted of Highway Robbery, February 1809, and Sentenced to Death* .....272

JOHN SPEED, ESQ. *A Lieutenant-Colonel in the British Army, Convicted at the Lent Surrey Assizes, 1809, of Bigamy* .....273

PHILIP FACEY *A Singular Case of Bigamy, of which he was Convicted at the Summer Assizes for Surrey, 1809, Fined and Imprisoned* .....275

RICHARD COSTELLO, JOHN SAYLOR, and JAMES MACLALLEY *Soldiers in the British Army, Convicted at Chelmsford, in March Assizes, 1809, of the Murder of a Fellow Soldier* .....276

THE SCALE OF ROGUERY EXEMPLIFIED *From the Earliest Stage of Human Depravity*.....277

JOHN PALMER *Executed 23<sup>rd</sup> November 1808, for Cutting and Maiming in the Course of a Burglary* .....281

RICHARD THOMAS DUDMAN AND EDWARD WOOD *Convicted of a Conspiracy, of the Foulest Nature, at the Middlesex Sessions, and Sentenced to Imprisonment and the Pillory* .....285

THE PARSON'S HORSE AND THE WINDMILL. *A Singular Case*.....286

MUTINY AT MALTA, APRIL 1807 *A Caution to Soldiers* .....287

JOHN TROY *Executed before Newgate, for Forgery, 3<sup>rd</sup> July 1805* .....289

GEORGE RICHARD WALKER AND CHRISTOPHER DODDS *Executed before Newgate, for Forgery, 11<sup>th</sup> June, 1806* .....290

RICHARD NEWELL *Whipped for Cruelty to his Apprentices* .....293

ANN THOMPSON *A Prostitute, Indicted for the Murder of her Keeper, and Found Guilty of Manslaughter* .....294

JOHN LEONARD WHITE *Executed before Newgate, for Cutting and Maiming, 15<sup>th</sup> February 1806* .....296

ANDREW SCHOSTOCK *A German Soldier Serving in the King's German Legion, Executed in Kent, for the Horrid Murder of a Woman, in the Isle Of Thanet, 27<sup>th</sup> March, 1807* .....297

BENJAMIN PLUMBER, JOHN SPITTLE, CHARLES SIFLEET, AND JOHN SAVAGE *Convicted of Burglary at Maidstone Assizes, 27<sup>th</sup> March 1807* .....299

PATRICK PRENDERGAST *Executed before Newgate, the 25th of March 1807, for Burglary* .....300

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

ALEXANDER DAVISON <i>Convicted of a Fraud to a Large Amount upon Government</i> .....	301
SAMUEL DAVIS, JOHN MARRYATT, JOHN LAWRENCE BARRON, GEORGE WINDLE, AND SARAH GROVER <i>Pilloried and Imprisoned, for a Conspiracy</i> ...	310
ROBERT WILSON, ALIAS JAMES WOOD <i>A Soldier, and a most hardened Villain, Executed in the Island of Guernsey for Murder</i> .....	311
THOMAS JEWETT <i>Executed at York for a Rape on his Master's Daughter</i> .....	312
GABRIEL KABLINSKI <i>Executed in France for Murder, Friday 19<sup>th</sup> April, 1811</i> .	314
WILLIAM BRAGGE <i>Convicted at the Lent Assizes, for the County of Durham, 1809, and Fined and Imprisoned, for Perjury</i> .	315
JOHN ANNIS <i>A ship broker, convicted of Fraud, 14th of January, 1809</i> .....	319
HENRY GAWLER <i>A Clerk in the Navy Office, Convicted the 11th of April, 1808, of a Fraud</i> .....	320
CHARLES LLOYD <i>Convicted of Stealing in a Dwelling House, and Sentenced to Imprisonment</i> .....	322
SINGULAR ROBBERY AT THE BRITISH MUSEUM. <i>By a Villain who Escaped Justice</i> .....	324
JOHN GONDREU <i>Convicted at the Court of Criminal Jurisdiction, held at the Criminal Court, of the Town Sydney, in New South Wales, (commonly called Botany Bay,) on the 12<sup>th</sup> of September 1809, and Sentenced to Death for Burglary</i> .....	325
ISAAC WEST and JOHN DUNCAN <i>Convicted of Burglary in Botany Bay, 12<sup>th</sup> of September 1809</i> .....	329
JOHN BOULTON <i>Punished by the Stocks in Botany Bay</i> .....	330
HENRY KELLY <i>Punishment of a Prevaricating Witness in Botany Bay</i> .....	331
JAMES HEATH and HENRY WILLIAMS <i>Sentenced to Death, having Pleaded Guilty to an Indictment before the Court Of Criminal Jurisdiction at Sidney, (Botany Bay,) Charged with a Burglary</i> .....	332
THOMAS HERBERT <i>Indicted for Assault, 8th December 1809</i> .....	334
REBECCA LEE <i>A Cruel Mistress to her Servant Maid</i> .....	335
THE GEMMEN OF THE WHIP <i>And their Misdemeanours</i> .....	336
JOHN KING <i>Convicted the sittings after Michaelmas Term 1810, in the Court at Westminster, of Perjury</i> .....	339
HANNAH WHITELOCK ALIAS TAYLOR <i>Transported for Seven Years, for Stealing Articles from Ready-furnished Lodgings</i> .....	341
CHARLES DON <i>Convicted at the Summer Assizes 1810, at Chelmsford, and Sentenced to Death, for Horse Stealing</i> .	342
FOUR NATIVE INDIANS OF BOMBAY <i>Tried and Punished, 1810, for a Conspiracy, to Murder George Cumming Osborne, Esquire</i> .	343
THOMAS WREN <i>Convicted of Assault at the Middlesex Sessions, December, 1810</i> .....	344

SUPPLEMENT 2

MARY FORDHAM <i>Tried at Hertford, the 18th March 1811, for the Wilful Murder of her Bastard Child, Found Guilty of Concealing its Birth, and Sentenced to Two Years' Imprisonment</i> .....	345
JOHN HUGHES <i>Convicted at the Summer Assizes Held at Dolgelly, in North Wales, 1811, and Sentenced to Death for Sheep Stealing.</i> .....	347
JOHN PURCEL, ESQ. OF HIGHFORT, NEAR CHARLEVILLE <i>Extraordinary Defeat of a Desperate Gang of House-breakers</i> .....	348
GEORGE KENDRICK <i>Imprisoned Twelve Months in the Middlesex House of Correction, for Pheasant Stealing</i> .....	350
GEORGE RATCLIFFE <i>Executed for Rape, 4<sup>th</sup> April 1811</i> .....	351
COMBINATION OF JOURNEYMEN BOOT-MAKERS. <i>A Lesson to Journeymen of every trade</i> .....	352
CHARLES BENNETT <i>Sentenced to Three Months Imprisonment in the House of Correction, for Defrauding his Employers of Sixpence</i> .....	353
WILLIAM M'CORMICK <i>One of those Daring Thieves Called Hustlers, Transported for Hustling and Robbing a Passenger in the Borough of Southwark</i> .....	354
JAMES FORD <i>Fined for a Brutal Attack upon a Woman</i> .....	357
JOSEPH BROWN <i>Executed at York, for the Murder of his Landlady several Years before, in order to Possess himself of her Property</i> .....	358
ANN ILLIARD AND HER DAUGHTER <i>Fined and Imprisoned for Keeping a Brothel</i> .....	362
RICHARD RIPPON and JOHN POLLARD <i>Sentenced to Transportation, November 1811, for Stealing Jewels</i> .....	363
RICHARD LOWE, ALIAS LONG NED <i>A most Infamous Villain, Sentenced to Hard Labour in the House of Correction in Coldbath Fields, for an Aggravated Assault upon a Surgeon at Chelsea</i> .....	364
ABRAHAM WATSON <i>Convicted of a most Daring Assault, and Sentenced to Six Months Imprisonment</i> .....	366
DAVID MOORE, AND JOHN WILD <i>Midnight Guardians of the Peace Of London, Imprisoned for Abuse of Office.</i> .....	367
MONTGOMERY BROWN <i>Captain of a Merchant ship, Executed at Antrim in Ireland, 27th July 1812, for Murder</i> .....	368
JOHN HUGHES AND JAMES ROBINSON <i>Imprisoned and Pilloried, for a Conspiracy in Aiding the Escape of French Prisoners of War</i> .....	370
JAMES WESTBROOK AND ELIZABETH PHIPPS <i>Convicted at the September Sessions 1812, and Sentenced to Death, for Burglary</i> .....	374
THOMAS FARNSWORTH THE YOUNGER <i>Convicted at the Middlesex sessions, of an Assault and Libel upon his Father</i> .....	375

## GERALD FITZGERALD

### *Executed For Murder, 24th of December, 1703*

GERALD Fitzgerald was the son of a respectable farmer near Limerick, in Ireland, where he was born in the year 1671, and educated in the Protestant religion, his father being of that persuasion.

At the age of fifteen he came to London to learn the art of peruke-making under a relation of his father's: but soon associating himself with bad company, he ran away from his kinsman at the expiration of three years, and entered into the service of Sir Henry Johnson, and had the direction of the domestic affairs of his new master. However, he had not been long in this service when his old associates persuaded him to leave it, on which he entered on board a man of war, and was soon advanced to the station of steward to the captain.

He made some voyages to the East and West Indies, and on his return to England was married to a relation of the captain, a young lady whose singular good qualities were admirably calculated to give happiness to any man who had possessed wisdom sufficient to have known in what true happiness consisted.

He had not been married many months before he went out as purser to a man of war bound to the East Indies; but this ship being lost on the coast of China, he returned to England in a merchantman, and afterwards sailed as a purser in a ship of war, which took some prizes, of which Fitzgerald received his share.

Being again in London, he began to grow neglectful of his wife, engaged in the vices of the town, kept the worst company, and frequented houses of ill-fame. In one of these he quarrelled with a gentleman named Pix, respecting a woman of the town, and a violent contention arising, Fitzgerald killed the other on the spot with his sword.

For this offence he was tried at the Old Bailey, and, being convicted on full evidence, he was hanged at Tyburn, on the 24th of December, 1703, dying a sincere penitent for his crimes, which, though aggravated in their nature, had been but of short continuance.

The fate of Fitzgerald should afford a lesson of caution to youth in general never to associate with women of abandoned characters; and, in particular, this resolution ought to be impressed on the minds of married men. This unhappy malefactor was united in wedlock with a young lady, whose relation to him demanded his protection, and whose superior virtues had every claim to his tenderest regard: yet, in a rash quarrel about a woman of the town, could he murder his friend, make his relations wretched, and bring destruction on his own head.

Fitzgerald had been educated in a strict regard to the duties of religion; but this wore off by his being a constant witness of that dissoluteness of manners which too frequently prevails on board our ships, when it often happens that no chaplain attends to perform that duty for the discharge of which he is paid out of the wages of the seamen: a shameful abuse, which calls for redress from those whose station includes the superintendence of naval affairs.

**JOHN BIGG**  
*Convicted of Altering a Bank Note*

On the 2d of June, 1715, John Bigg was indicted at the Old Bailey, on two indictments, the one for erasing, and the other for altering, a bank note of 100*l.*

On the trial it appeared that the bill in question was drawn in favour of James White or bearer, and had been signed by Joseph Odam, for the governor and company of the Bank of England: that this bill having been brought to the bank, 90*l.* was paid and endorsed on it: that it was afterwards brought again, when 25*l.* was paid and endorsed as before; and the clerks finding that this bill, among others, had been overpaid, were surprised to think how it could have happened, till one Mr. Collins informed them that the prisoner had tempted him to be concerned with him in taking out the letters of the red ink on the notes, by means of a certain liquid; and had even shown him in what manner it was to be done.

It appeared likewise that the prisoner had discovered this secret to Mars, who had seen him make the experiment, had received money for him on the altered notes, and was promised a third part of the profit for his share in the iniquity.

The prisoner did not deny the charge; but his counsel pleaded that Mr. Odam was not a servant properly qualified to make out such bills, unless he had been authorized under the seal of the corporation. They likewise insisted that writing with red ink on the inside of the bill could not be deemed an indorsement; and even if it were so accounted, the fact with which the prisoner was charged could not be called an altering or erasing.

After some altercation between the king's counsel and those of the prisoner, the opinion of the court was that Mr. Odam was a person properly qualified to make out such bills; but a doubt arising respecting the other articles, the jury gave a special verdict.

The judges meeting on this occasion at Sergeants'-inn Hall, Fleet Street, the case was solemnly argued; after which the unanimous opinion of the reverend sages of the law was given, that the prisoner was guilty, within the meaning of the act of parliament; in consequence of which he received sentence of death in December, 1715, but afterwards obtained a free pardon.

From the case of this malefactor we may see the tenderness with which Englishmen are treated in matters which concern their lives. In cases of special verdicts prisoners have the advantage of the opinions of two juries: the first not knowing in what light to consider the crime, the learned bench of judges form a kind of second jury, where, all partiality being set aside, the supposed criminal is judged according to the strict meaning of the law; and, even after conviction, has a chance of obtaining the royal mercy, as happened in the case of the offender in question.

Hence, then, let Englishmen learn the value of those laws by which they are protected, and be devoutly thankful to that Providence which hath cast their lot in a country, the wisdom of whose legislature is the envy and admiration of the universe.

**JOHN GORDON, WILLIAM KERR AND JOHN  
DORRELL**

*Jacobites Executed for High Treason*

ALL the particulars we have been able to learn respecting these men are as follows. They had all of them served as officers in the army during the wars in the reign of Queen Anne, but they were zealous friends to the cause of the Pretender.

Having learnt that the rebels had got as far as Lancashire, they appear to have been animated with the hope that success would attend the enterprise; whereupon they held meetings at a public house in Shoe Lane, London, where they agreed to set off for different parts of the country, to enlist some men to promote the undertaking; and they bound themselves to each other by the most solemn oaths to keep their transactions secret.

But they defeated the effects of these oaths almost the moment they took them; for they met so often, and were so careless of what they said, that they were heard by persons who listened at the door of their room; in consequence of which information was given, and they were taken into custody, tried, and, being convicted on full evidence, were hanged and quartered at Tyburn, on the 7th of Dec. 1716.

They were the first persons that suffered on account of the rebellion, professed themselves Roman Catholics, and died denying the justice of the sentence against them.

## JOHN MATTHEWS

### *Executed for High Treason in Printing a Jacobite Pamphlet*

John Matthews was the son of a printer in Aldersgate Street, to whom he was apprenticed; but, his father dying, he continued to serve with his mother. Having made connections with some persons of Jacobitical principles, he printed some papers against the government, for which he was once taken into custody; but, the evidence being incomplete, he was dismissed.

Encouraged by this escape, he was induced to print a pamphlet, entitled '*Ex Ore tuo te Judico: Vox Populi vox Dei.*' (That is, 'Out of thy own mouth will I judge thee: the voice of the people is the voice of God.') For this offence he was brought to his trial on the 30th of October, 1719, when it appeared that he had composed the pages of the pamphlet in question, but locked them up, lest they should be found, and made use of to his prejudice.

An elder brother of Matthews, apprehending that the youth might endanger himself by his propensity to the printing such pamphlets, directed a journeyman, named Lawrence Vezey, to lock up the door of the printing-office every night, and bring him the key: but Vezey, like a villain as he was, first suffered the young fellow to print the supposed treasonable matter, and then gave evidence against him.

A general warrant being granted by the secretary of state, for the search of Mrs. Matthews's house, the messengers of government found a number of the supposed libel in a room which the prisoner acknowledged to belong to him; on which he was carried before the secretary of state, who committed him to Newgate, on his refusing to give up the author.

When Matthews was arraigned at the bar, Vezey swore that the prisoner brought the form, containing part of the book, to the press, and bid him pull a proof of it, which he did; and that the prisoner afterwards came down to him, and said that the pages had been transposed, but he had now put them right; and he then pulled him another proof: he said that then the prisoner desired this evidence to come early in the morning to work off the sheets, saying that he himself would take care of the paper, and that everything should be ready.

Accordingly Vezey went early next morning, intending to call up William Harper, the apprentice; but the prisoner came to the door, let him in, and called Harper, who assisted Vezey in working off the sheets, Matthews standing by, and taking them from the press, for the greater expedition: and, when the work was done, the prisoner paid Vezey for his trouble. This evidence was likewise confirmed by Harper, as far as he was concerned in the transaction, and he added that he saw the prisoner composing the matter from the manuscript copy. (Note: 'Composing the matter' is a term with printers, which signifies picking up the letters and arranging them in proper order for their being worked off by the printing-press.)

The counsel for the crown exerted their utmost abilities to aggravate the crime of the prisoner, and, the king's messengers swearing to as much as they knew of the affair, Matthews was found guilty, and sentence of death was passed on him.

After condemnation he was attended by the Reverend Mr. Skerrett, who also accompanied him to the place of execution. His whole behaviour after sentence was such as might be expected from one who had too much sense to expect favour from

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

the people then in power; for it was not customary with the ministers of George the First to extend mercy to persons convicted of treasonable offences: but perhaps their seeming want of humanity will appear the more excusable if we reflect on the fatal consequences that might have ensued from the rebellion in 1715.

But nothing can excuse the method they took to obtain evidence in this case. It is but of late years that the issuing of general warrants has been legally condemned; and Englishmen are not a little obliged to the man who procured the condemnation of those warrants. Happily, we can now sit quietly, and write our sentiments in our own houses, without being liable to have our papers seized by the arbitrary mandates of a secretary of state. While we recollect that we are obliged for this favour in a great degree to the perseverance of Mr. Wilkes, we should not forget that the judicial determination of Lord Camden perfected the plan so happily begun, and so steadily pursued.

The above-mentioned John Matthews was executed at Tyburn on the 16th of November, 1719, before he had completed the 19th year of his age; and was pitied by everyone who had not lost the common feelings of humanity.

From the fate of Matthews young gentlemen in the same line of business should be taught to be cautious how they engage in the printing of political pamphlets; for though, to the credit of the good sense and humanity of the present age, there is now much less danger than there formerly was, yet recent experience has taught us that great trouble and

expense may ensue, where all risk of life is out of the question.

We should all pray that we may live to see the time when the liberty of the press will be established in its fullest extent, and when no villain will dare to be guilty of an atrocious action, lest some honest man should reproach him with it in public. By this, however, we do not mean to encourage the licentiousness of the press—detested be the heart that should dictate, and the hand that should write, a line to destroy domestic happiness, or corrode the mind of one worthy individual: but the public villain should be ever held up as the object of public scorn and censure!

**FRANCIS BRIGHTWELL AND BENJAMIN  
BRIGHTWELL**  
*Tried For a Highway Robbery*

As it is one professed design of this publication to give trials, in extraordinary cases, on which the parties accused have been acquitted; in compliance with this rule we insert the following, though it will be seen that the supposed offenders, so far from being thieves, were an ornament to human nature.

In the month of August, 1724, Francis Brightwell and Benjamin Brightwell were indicted for assaulting John Pargiter on the highway, and robbing him of three shillings.

It was sworn by Mr. Pargiter that he had been robbed, on the road to Hampstead, by two fellows dressed in soldiers' clothes; and that, being on the same road a few days afterwards, he was showing some farmers the spot where he had been robbed, at the very time when the Brightwells came in sight; on which he declared that they were the persons who had robbed him; whereupon they were immediately taken into custody; which was a work of no great difficulty, as the surprise, on being charged with a crime of which they were wholly innocent, deprived them of all idea of resistance.

These brothers were soldiers in the grenadier guards; and, when they were carried before a magistrate, though Mr. Pargiter swore positively to their persons, Francis alleged that he was on guard at the time of the robbery, and Benjamin said that he was at home.

On the trial, the sergeant produced the regimental book, from which it was evident that, when the robbery was committed, Francis was on guard at Kensington; and several persons of reputation proved that Benjamin was at his lodgings in Clare Market, and likewise gave him an excellent character.

With regard to Francis, Mr. Hughs, a clergyman, delivered his testimony in the following words: 'I have known Francis Brightwell near twenty years. He was always reputed to be a person of the fairest character for sobriety, piety, and justice. He was, to an extraordinary degree, accomplished with Latin and Greek literature, and had good skill in Roman antiquities; and, in a word, he carried so great a share of exquisite learning under his grenadier's cap, that I believe there is not such another grenadier in the universe.'

This testimony of Mr. Hughs was confirmed by a number of military officers; and the Court and jury considering that Mr. Pargiter must have been mistaken in the parties who robbed him, the brothers were honourably acquitted.

On the 22d of the month in which he was tried, Francis Brightwell died at his lodgings at Paddington, as supposed, of the gaol distemper. He was attended, during his short illness, by the late eminent Sir Hans Sloan; but the malignity of his disorder defied the power of medicine.

The following curious letter, respecting Francis Brightwell, is extracted from The British Journal of the 5th of September, 1724:

"SIR,—Finding that all our public papers, from the 4th of August to this day, have omitted to make honorable mention of some very remarkable circumstances

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

relating to a very private person, I desire his memory may be deposited in your journal. The person I mean is Francis Brightwell, the grenadier, who was tried and acquitted at the Old Bailey, for a robbery sworn against him; and who, since his coming out of prison, died, as 'tis said, of the gaol distemper.

"When evidence was given against him in Court, Brightwell, by several witnesses, proved that he was upon the king's guard, at Kensington, at the time that the robbery (if a robbery) was committed. Hereupon the Court went into an inquiry concerning the reputation and character of the prisoner. Some officers who had known him long in the service gave testimony to his sobriety and diligence in the duty of a soldier. As to his honesty, a lady (present in Court) declared she had intrusted him with a thousand pounds at a time; and a gentleman, that he had committed his house and goods, to the value of 6000*l.* to his keeping: in both which trusts Brightwell had acquitted himself to the satisfaction of the parties concerned.

"These ample testimonies, concurring to the honour of a man in so low a condition of life, gave, you may imagine, no small surprise to all that were present; when a clergyman added to their astonishment by declaring that he had long known the prisoner to be not only a person of sobriety, but likewise of very excellent learning, and particularly in Latin and Greek; for that Brightwell had often consulted him upon difficult passages in Virgil and Horace.

"Thus much for what appeared at the trial of this grenadier. I shall only remark upon his learning, that I am amazed that scholarship is not very common among military men, considering their profession admits of more leisure hours than any other. Perhaps these gentlemen are afraid of knowledge, from a celebrated maxim delivered by John Dryden:—"The learned all are cowards by profession:" yet Alexander and Caesar were scholars, they did not seem to want courage.

"But, to pursue what further particulars I have learned of this deceased grenadier. He was contented in his station, studious of leisure, and ambitious only of knowledge. He had offers of being promoted to the rank of corporal or sergeant, which he declined, that he might have as few avocations as possible from his studies. Neither did he ever covet money; and, I am apt to believe, had he been at the sacking of a town, he would not have thought of carrying off any other plunder but a valuable book or two. Take the following instance of his disregard of gain:—He had an excellent manner of cleaning and furbishing arms, for which he had his settled prices. An officer, whose arms he had brightened, was so well pleased with his work, that he sent Brightwell (over and above the usual price) a guinea, for a present. The philosopher took his price, and returned the guinea by his servant. Some time after, when the gentleman saw him, 'Why,' said he, 'would you not accept the guinea I sent you?' 'I am paid for my work,' replied the sentinel, 'and desire no more.' 'Accept of a crown, then, if your modesty makes you think a guinea too much,' said the officer. 'Excuse me, sir,' answered the veteran, 'and do not think it vanity or affectation, when I refuse your kindness; but, indeed, Sir, I don't want it; but I am thirsty, and have no money about me; so that if your honour will be pleased to give me threepence to drink your health, I will thankfully accept of it.'"

This last particular of our grenadier runs so very parallel with a story in Sir William Temple's Observations of the United Provinces, that I think it proper to transcribe it on this occasion. Vol. i. p. 50.

"Among the many and various hospitals that are in every man's curiosity and talk that travels in Holland, I was affected with none more than that of the aged seamen at Enchusyden, which is contrived, finished, and ordered, as if it were done with a kind intention of some well-natured man that those, who had passed their whole lives in the hardships and incommodities of the sea, should find a retreat,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

stored with all ease and conveniency that old age is capable of feeling and enjoyment. And here I met with the only rich man that I ever saw in my life: for one of these old seamen, entertaning me with the plain stories of his fifty years' voyages and adventures while I was viewing this hospital and the church adjoining, I gave him, at parting, a piece of their coin, about the value of a crown: he took it, smiling, and offered it me again; but, when I refused it, he asked me what he should do with the money. I left him to overcome his modesty as he could; but a servant coming after me saw him give it to a little girl that opened the church-door as she passed by him: which made me reflect on the fantastic calculation of riches and poverty that is current in the world, by which a man that wants a million is a prince, he that wants but a groat is a beggar, and this was *a poor man that wanted nothing at all.*"

The case of these brothers offers an admirable lesson to prosecutors to be cautious how they swear to the identity of persons. It is better that the guilty should escape than that the innocent should be punished.

It likewise affords us an instance of the mysterious providence of God. Two innocent men are charged with a crime; and the consequence of imprisonment, and possibly of grief, ends in the death of one of them. We may presume that he was too good for this wicked world; and that the Almighty chose this method of calling him to a better!

**ANTHONY DRURY**  
*Executed for Highway Robbery*

This offender was a native of Norfolk, and the son of parents in reputable circumstances, who imprudently neglected to bring him up to any business; so that, when he arrived at years of maturity, he wandered about the country curing smoky chimneys, which procured him the appellation of 'the smoky doctor' among those who knew his profession.

At length he married a woman who was said to possess a very considerable fortune; but, whatever this fortune was, Drury never received more of it than 500*l*. He now lived some years with his wife at Andover, but occasionally ranged the country in search of that business in which he seemed to place his chief delight. His wife used every argument to prevail with him to remain at home; but her solicitations were without effect.

Sometimes he would stroll to London, and bring with him valuable articles for his support; and on one of these occasions he pawned some plate for twenty pounds, dissipating the money in company with women of abandoned character.

By degrees he stripped his wife of great part of what should have supported her, so that she was obliged to the friendship of her relations for a maintenance. By a continued course of extravagance, he grew daily more and more vicious, and at length determined to commence highwayman.

In London he made an acquaintance with Robert King, the driver of the Bicester waggon. This King was a fellow of most execrable character, whose practice was to inform the highwaymen when he had any persons to travel in his waggon who possessed any considerable sum of money, or valuable effects, that they might be robbed on the road; on which occasions a share was always given to the driver. [Note: Formerly people of great property used to travel in waggons; but the frugal manners of our ancestors are abolished, and post-chaises and flying machines take place of the other carriages.]

Drury, being in company with this King, was told by him that a gentleman named Eldridge would travel in the waggon on the following day, and that it would be prudent to rob him before he got far from town, as he would have with him a very considerable booty.

Our adventurer listened eagerly to this tale, and the next day robbed Mr. Eldridge of two hundred and fourteen guineas. As he took money only, he had very little apprehension of detection: but another traveller in the waggon, happening to know him, repaired to London, and gave information against him; whereupon he was taken into custody, and, being brought to trial, was convicted on full evidence.

After he received sentence of death his behaviour was consistent with his unhappy situation. He was a regular attendant on divine worship, and a constant peruser of books of religion: but at the same time he did everything in his power to procure a respite of the fatal sentence.

Some people of consequence exerted themselves to obtain the royal mercy for Drury, but in vain: his character and crime militated too forcibly against him.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

After conviction he repeatedly wrote to his wife, desiring her to come to London; and, among other motives to prevail on her, told her that she might redeem the plate he had pawned: but all he could say had no effect; she lent a deaf ear to all his entreaties.

He appeared to be greatly disturbed in mind at this unfeeling indifference of his wife, which prevented the calmness of disposition that was requisite towards a proper preparation for his approaching exit.

Two days before his death he received the sacrament with every mark of real contrition. On the evening preceding his execution a gentleman sent a woman to inquire what declaration he would make respecting the waggoner; to whom he answered, that he had no idea of committing the crime till King proposed it to him; and that his life was sacrificed in consequence of his taking that advice.

When at the place of execution he appeared to possess more courage than he had done some time before, and again declared that the waggoner had seduced him to commit the robbery. He earnestly exhorted young people to avoid bad company, as what would most infallibly bring them to destruction.

This malefactor suffered at Tyburn, Nov. 3, 1726, in the twenty-eighth year of his age.

**JAMES CARNEGIE, ESQ.**  
*Tried for Murder*

MR. Carnegie was a gentleman of fortune, whose estate being contiguous to that of Charles, Earl of Strathmore, a considerable degree of intimacy subsisted between the parties, which was increased by the similarity of their political sentiments, both of them being favourers of the claims of the Pretender.

Lady Auchterhouse, who was sister to Mr. Carnegie, having invited some of the neighbouring gentry to visit her, there went among the rest John Lyon, Esq. a young gentleman who paid his addresses to another sister of Mr. Carnegie. Mr. Lyon's view in this visit was to ask Carnegie's consent to the match; but this the latter absolutely refused, and treated Lyon with so much asperity, that a quarrel ensued, and swords were drawn by both parties. The Earl of Strathmore, anxious to prevent bloodshed, exerted all his influence to reconcile the contending parties; and at length so far succeeded, that all animosity seemed to have subsided, and the company sat down and drank together, as if no quarrel had arisen.

The conversation now took a political turn; and, as the company were of different sentiments, high words of altercation arose; and the King and the Pretender were abused in a manner equally illiberal.

At length the passions of the parties were so inflamed that they had recourse to blows; and some of them quitting the house, among whom were Lyon and Carnegie, the former pushed the latter on the ground, which enraged him so much that he arose and drew his sword; but Lyon had consulted his safety by flight. Carnegie followed him a little way, but, falling in the pursuit, was lifted up by some of the company; when, turning about with the fury of a madman, he ran his sword into the body of Lord Strathmore.

This melancholy event had no sooner taken place than the company returned to Lady Auchterhouse's, except the Earl of Strathmore, who was carried home by his servants, and died, after languishing two days.

A neighbouring magistrate, being informed of what had happened, went to the house and demanded the gentlemen's swords, which were delivered: but Mr. Carnegie having been concealed under some flax in an outhouse, it was required that Lady Auchterhouse should tell where he was, which she did; and the magistrate, having received his sword, sent him to the prison of Forfar.

Some weeks afterwards he was removed, to be tried before the Court of Justiciary at Edinburgh, which is somewhat similar to our Court of King's Bench in England. [Note: There are no grand juries in Scotland; the king's advocate draws the indictment. The judges determine if the crime be capital; and the fact is tried by a petty jury.]

It was fully proved upon the trial, that Lyon had behaved in the most insulting manner to Carnegie, who did not draw his sword till he had been pushed down, as above mentioned. It was likewise proved, that Lord Strathmore had lived on terms of the utmost friendship with Mr. Carnegie; and that, on other occasions, when the latter had been insulted by Lyon, the earl had protected him.

A witness swore that Mr. Carnegie had proposed Lady Strathmore's health when in company, and that he sat next the earl. It was sworn also that Carnegie, since

## SUPPLEMENT 2

his confinement, had regretted the melancholy issue of the quarrel, as it had deprived him of one of his most valuable friends, and a person whom he could have had no thought of injuring.

Another evidence deposed that the behaviour of Mr. Lyon to Mr. Carnegie was insupportably aggravating; that he pushed him on the breast, and otherwise ill-treated him; and that he had seized Lady Auchterhouse by the hand, and struck it so violently on the table, that she cried out through the extremity of pain.

On the other hand, one of Lord Strathmore's servants swore that Mr. Carnegie stabbed his master *twice* in the belly; but the surgeon who examined the wound gave a more favourable account of the matter than the servant.

The trial lasted a considerable time, when the jury, considering on the whole matter, gave a verdict that the prisoner was Not Guilty. These transactions took place in the month of July, 1728.

**MARTIN NOWLAND**  
*Executed for High Treason*

This traitor was a native of Ireland, and, while a youth, was decoyed from his parents, conveyed to Dunkirk, and entered into the regiment of Dillon. In this station he continued fourteen years, at the end of which time he was sent to London, to enlist men into the French service; and was promised a promotion on his return, as a reward for the diligence he might exert.

On his arrival in London he endeavoured to connect himself with people of the lower ranks, whom he thought most likely to be seduced by his artifices; and one day going on the quays near London Bridge, he met with two brothers, named Meredith, both of them in the army, but who occasionally worked on the quays, to make an addition to their military pay.

Having invited these men to a house in the Borough, he treated them with liquor; represented the emoluments that would arise from their entering into the French service; and, among other things, said that, exclusive of their pay, they would receive four loaves of bread weekly.

When they were thus refreshed Nowland prevailed on them to go to his lodgings in Kent Street, where he farther regaled them, and then said he hoped they would enter into the service. They expressed their readiness to do so; and said they could aid him in enlisting several other men, if he would spend the evening with them at a public house in the Strand.

This proposal being assented to, they took him to a famous alehouse near the Savoy, called the Coal hole, where Nowland was terrified at the sight of several soldiers of the Guards; but the Merediths saying they were their intimate acquaintance, the parties adjourned to a room by themselves, Here the brothers asked Nowland how much they were to receive for enlisting, which he told them would be four guineas; and that he was commissioned to pay their expenses till they should join the regiment.

The intention of the brothers seems to have been to obtain some money of Nowland; but, finding it was not in his power to advance any while they remained in England, one of them went to the sergeant at the Savoy, informed him of what had passed, and asked him how he must dispose of Nowland. The sergeant said he must be detained for the night, and taken before a magistrate on the following day.

On the soldiers' return to the public house Nowland produced a certificate, signed by the lieutenant colonel of the regiment, as a proof that he was actually in the service of France. He likewise said that the soldiers must dispose of their clothes, and purchase others, to prevent their being detected at Dover; and he repeated his promise of the bounty-money, and other accommodations proper for a soldier, on their reaching the regiment.

When the Merediths, and the other men, had drank at Nowland's expense till they were satisfied, they conveyed him to the roundhouse, and on the following day took him before a magistrate, to whom, after some hesitation, he acknowledged that he had been employed to enlist men for the Irish brigades in the service of France. Inquiry being made respecting his accomplices, he acknowledged that a captain belonging to his regiment was in London, and that some other agents were soon

## SUPPLEMENT 2

expected in the kingdom: on which he was informed that he should be admitted an evidence if he would impeach his accomplices, He replied, 'that he was a man of honour, and would never be guilty of hanging any other person to save his own life.'

He was committed to Newgate in consequence of this confession, and, being brought to his trial, was convicted at the following sessions at the Old Bailey, and received sentence of death.

Nowland being of the Roman Catholic persuasion, it is not possible to give a particular account of his behaviour after conviction, as he declined holding any correspondence with the Ordinary of Newgate. When he came to the fatal Tyburn tree, on the 4th of February, 1742, he performed his devotions in his own way, and, being executed, his body was carried to St. Giles's, and soon afterwards buried in St. Pancras churchyard by some of his Roman Catholic friends.

The folly of a man's attempting to recruit the French army in London is more to be wondered at than the commission of the crime. This man, before he attempted to corrupt the allegiance of an Englishman, must surely have been apprized of the conviction and execution of Thomas Hennings, for enlisting a man for the King of Prussia, which took place just before he accepted a French commission to commit a similar crime. Little more can be said of Nowland's case than that it is treasonable in the highest degree, aiming a mortal blow at the constitution of our country, by enticing us to join our enemy. Yet we cannot, however, pass over the particulars, without expressing admiration at the loyalty of the soldiers whom he endeavoured to corrupt.

**JAMES ANNESLEY, ESQ, AND JOSEPH REDDING**  
*Tried for Murder*

MR. ANNESLEY was the son of Arthur, late Lord Baron of Altham, of the kingdom of Ireland, by his wife, Mary Sheffield, (natural daughter of John, Duke of Buckingham,) to whom he was publicly married in the year 1706, contrary to the inclination of his mother, and all his relation, particularly Arthur, late Earl of Anglesea, who entertained an inveterate hatred to the duke; and for that reason did all in his power to set the marriage aside; but, finding that impossible, he never would be reconciled to lard Altham, who was presumptive heir to his estate.

After a cohabitation of something more than two years, a separation took place between Lord Altham and his lady; and his lordship, having involved himself in debt by a life of dissipation, thought it prudent to retreat to Ireland, where he had a good estate; and, after some time, he and his lady were reconciled, through the influence of the Duke of Buckingham.

At the end of about a year from this reconciliation, Lady Altham was brought to bed of a son, whose singular life and adventures we are now to record. When the child was about two years of age, a second quarrel arose between his parents, and a second separation ensued; on which Lady Altham came to England, and lived in London, in the most retired manner, till the year 1729, when she paid the debt of nature.

In the interim Lord Altham lived at Dublin in the most extravagant style, kept the worst company, and paid little regard to the education of his son, who would have been deprived even of the common necessaries of life, but for the intervention of some farmers, who supplied him with sustenance. Occasionally, indeed, his father would send for him; but was generally so intoxicated when he saw him, that the child reaped no advantage from these visits, and was soon reduced to a state of absolute penury.

Lord Altham dying, in the year 1726, a sacrifice to his own irregularities, his brother, Captain Richard Annesley, formed a scheme of succeeding to the Anglesea castle, by secreting the right heir; and for this purpose he made use of many artifices to get the youth into his possession: these failed for some time, as he was boarded and protected by a butcher named Purcel. The youth having acquainted Purcel that he was the son of lord Altham, his story began to engage the public attention, and a counsellor at law took him into his protection, with a view of obtaining for him a legal claim to his hereditary possessions.

The youth had not been long in this station when he was found by the diligence of those who were employed to search for him, who forcibly dragged him on board a ship bound for Newcastle, on the Delaware River, in America, where he was generally kept to hard labour, but occasionally indulged with the liberty of diverting himself with fishing and fowling.

One day, on his return from shooting, he met two Irishmen, to whom he communicated the particulars of his birth and connections and they, happening to remember several circumstances relating thereto, prevailed on the captain of a trading vessel to interest himself to procure his release from slavery.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

This being effected, he hired himself as a common sailor in a trading vessel bound to Jamaica; and these, being entered on board one of his majesty's ships under the command of Admiral Vernon, openly declared his parentage and pretensions. This extraordinary claim made a great noise in the fleet; and one of the midshipmen, hearing of it, said 'he had been schoolfellow with Lord Altham's son; and should know him again, if not greatly altered, as he still retained a perfect idea of his countenance.'

Hereupon it was proposed that the experiment should be tried; and the midshipman going on board the ship that the claimant was in for that purpose, all the sailors were assembled on deck, where the midshipman, casting his eyes around, immediately distinguished Mr. Annesley in the crowd; and, laying his hand on his shoulder, said, 'This is the man;' affirming, at the same time, that while he continued at school with him the claimant was reputed and respected as Lord Altham's son and heir, and maintained in all respects suitably to the dignity of his rank. Nay, he was in like manner recognised by several other persons in the fleet, who had known him in his infancy. These things being reported to the admiral, he generously ordered him to be supplied with necessaries, and treated like a gentleman; and, in his next dispatches, transmitted an account of the affair to the Duke of Newcastle, among the common transactions of the fleet, Mr. Annesley arriving in London towards the latter end of the year 1741, intelligence of this circumstance was immediately sent to Ireland, on which his uncle, who had heretofore treated him in so unworthy a manner, came to England, in order to carry on the scene of oppression which lay nearest his heart; but a gentleman, named M'Kercher, having taken Mr. Annesley under his protection, sent him to board at the house of a farmer near Staines, in Middlesex. Mr. Annesley had not been long in this situation before an accident happened which greatly contributed to render his future life unhappy. Being passionately fond of sporting, he obtained leave of the gentlemen of Staines to permit him to shoot on their estates; and as he was what is called a fair sportsman, and a professed enemy to poachers, he went into the fields with Joseph Redding, who was gamekeeper to Sir John Dolben, in search of such people as might be found offending against the game-laws. They did not meet with any poachers for game; but, seeing Thomas Egglestone and his son fishing in a river belonging to the manor, they ran to the spot, in order to seize the net; when Egglestone opposing them, Mr. Annesley's gun went off accidentally, and killed him on the spot.

The son, having witnessed the death of his father, hastened to Staines, and informed the inhabitants of what had happened, several of whom went out in search of Annesley and Redding, whom they found at a farmhouse in the neighbourhood. The supposed offenders, being taken into custody, were sent to London, and lodged in the New Prison, and arraigned at the next sessions at the Old Bailey in consequence of bills of indictment which had been found against them by the grand jury.

After the trial had been put off one day, at the request of the counsel for the prosecution, the Court ordered it to be brought on. It is not in language to describe the unworthy part that his uncle, now become Earl of Anglesea, acted in this business. Exclusive of procuring an attorney to offer five hundred pounds to young Egglestone to swear that Annesley pointed the gun at his father and pulled the trigger, he even appeared in person on the bench at the trial, in order to browbeat the unfortunate prisoner. It is asserted that the earl spent above a thousand pounds in this prosecution.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

In his defence Mr. Annesley informed the Court that his education having been greatly neglected by those whose duty it was to have taken every possible care of it, such

a defence as might suit his birth was not to be expected: but he said that 'the gun went off by accident; and, whatever might be the verdict of the jury, he should consider that unhappy accident as the greatest misfortune of his life.'

Redding urged in his defence that it was his duty, as gamekeeper, to seize all nets within the bounds of the manor.

The instructions given by the Court to the jury were, that, if they thought the gun went off accidentally, they should bring in a verdict of chance-medley; but that Mr. Annesley would be deemed guilty of manslaughter, unless it appeared that he was engaged in a lawful act. With regard to Redding it was observed, that as he seized the net under the protection of the law, as gamekeeper, it was but just that he should be protected by the law.

On Mr. Annesley's case four counsel argued several hours; and when the jury were possessed of all the requisite information, they went out of Court, and, having maturely deliberated on the affair, they returned with a verdict of 'Chance-medley,' which of course acquitted both the prisoners.

This singular transaction took place in May, 1742; but it may not be unentertaining to our readers to learn something of the future occurrences of Mr. Annesley's life.

Mr. M'Kercher, the disinterested friend of Annesley, now determined to exert his utmost endeavours to obtain for him the state which was his undoubted right; and, with that view, took him to Ireland, where Mr. Annesley granted a lease to a person named Campbell, that the affair might be determined in a legal way. Campbell, taking possession of the estate of which he had thus obtained a lease, was driven from it by Lord Anglesea; on which a writ of ejectment was brought against the earl.

The cause was tried by a special jury of gentlemen of property, before the barons of the Exchequer in Ireland. More than a hundred witnesses were examined respecting the legitimacy of Mr. Annesley's birth, and the trial lasted fifteen days. Two servants who had lived in Lord Altham's family swore that Annesley was the son of a servant girl, who had been debauched by Lord Altham; and a popish priest swore that he baptized the child as a bastard: but, to invalidate this last evidence, another priest swore that the former had received two hundred pounds as a gratuity for what he had sworn.

Mr. Annesley's being the son of Lady Altham was proved by the evidence of three women servants, who lived in the family at the time of his birth; and above ten persons who were present at his christening swore to several circumstances respecting his birth. Two ladies proved on oath the reconciliation of Lord and Lady Altham, who had resided at the house of the father of one of the deponents several months; and from thence the lady went into the country to be delivered.

It was sworn by a farmer that the child had been placed with him by Lord Altham as his son and heir; and that the farmer had boarded him, though he had never been paid; which, indeed, he attributed to the extravagant manner in which his lordship lived.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

The attorney who had been employed to tamper with the witnesses against Mr. Annesley, on his trial at the Old Bailey, being brought to Ireland by Mr. M'Kercher, a doubt arose whether an attorney should reveal his client's secrets, when, after a debate of a whole day among the counsel, it was determined by the judges that the examination of the attorney ought to take place.

In consequence of this examination it appeared that several persons had been engaged to swear against Mr. Annesley at his trial in London; and at the singular trial in Dublin, of which we are now speaking, the judges remarked that there was oath against oath: at length, however, the jury determined that Mr. Annesley was the real son of Lord and Lady Altham. Notwithstanding this determination, the right heir could not take possession of his estate; for a writ of error was brought against the verdict, and writs of appeal were lodged in the Houses of Peers of England and Ireland, as the estates in question were situated partly in each kingdom. Mr. M'Kercher, having spent a considerable fortune in support of the claim of the injured party, was at length arrested for debt, and remained several years in prison; and, in the mean time, Mr. Annesley was married to the daughter of a farmer in whose house he had lodged, and lived afterwards in a most retired manner, being utterly disqualified, by his education and former way of life, from obtaining any decent support as a gentleman.

The Earl of Anglesea lived but a few years after the affair we have recorded, and left his estate greatly involved.

Mr. M'Kercher's situation now rendered him unable to minister to the necessities of Mr. Annesley, who occasionally obtained some small gratuities from the nobility, and died in the year 1761, after lingering out a life of perpetual anxiety and fruitless expectation; but he never took a gun in his hand from the time of his unhappily killing the poor man.

Of all the extraordinary characters we have had occasion to remark on in the course of this work, that of Mr. M'Kercher is one of the most singular and valuable. He took up the cause of an unfriended youth, of whom he knew nothing but from report, and supported him through a long, an arduous, and an intricate business; not, indeed, to the restitution of the sufferer, but to his own essential injury: for he spent more than ten thousand pounds in this pursuance of the rights of another.

Seldom shall we hear of so much disinterested benevolence as was displayed by this man; seldom hear of greater, and more undeserved injuries, than were sustained by Mr. Annesley!

**RICHARD BIGGS**

*Executed near Bath for the Murder of his Wife, 14<sup>th</sup>  
September, 1748*

On the 14th day of September, 1748, was executed at Old Down, near Bath, Richard Biggs, for the murder of his wife, with horrid barbarity. Her head, breast, arms, thighs, and legs, were full of bruises and wounds. After having beat her to death, he carried the body and threw it into the river near Bath, He was convicted on the evidence, shocking to relate! of his own son, a boy only eleven years of age. When on the ladder, and before the rope was affixed to the fatal tree, he jumped down and lay flat on the ground, refusing to stir. He made great opposition, and long struggled for life. Thus, though he had so inhumanly deprived his wife of existence, he showed how sweet life was to himself by his reluctance to yield it up, though forfeited to the laws of his country.

**JOHN LANCASTER*****Executed for Housebreaking, 24<sup>th</sup> September, 1748***

We could wish, seriously, to caution all young people against a habit of attending fairs. They constitute an assemblage of idle people, where are indiscriminately mixed thieves and pickpockets, who go from fair to fair; loose women, strolling players, and vagabonds of every description, waiting to plunder the honest part of the people. Saint Bartholomew's fair, from its long continuance, is a school of vice which has initiated more youth into the habits of villainy than even Newgate itself. Some time since a numerous gang of infant thieves, of both sexes, were detected in committing depredations of every description which they could accomplish. They had, in imitation of Macheath's gang, their captain, and the receiver of the stolen property, who, though the oldest of the confederacy, were not more than thirteen or fourteen years of age!

The parents of John Lancaster were poor but honest people, who put him to school to be instructed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and, when about fourteen years of age, apprenticed him to a velvet-weaver, who, as well as his parents, lived in Whitechapel. After the term of his servitude had expired, he for some time followed his trade as a journeyman. He was naturally inclined to vicious practices, and constantly associated with the most profligate company. He was known to have committed several offences against the laws, for one of which he was apprehended and secured in Newgate, where he contracted an acquaintance with a man named Lewis. They were both acquitted in the same sessions—Lewis in defect of evidence, and Lancaster because no prosecutor appeared.

They went together to Rumford, predetermined to obtain money by violence. At Stratford they stopped a gentleman, and robbed him of his watch, a guinea, and some silver. Their success in this attempt giving them a greater flow of spirits, Lewis (who had long been a notorious thief) said, 'Come along with me, my boy, and we shall soon get money enough to live like gentlemen;' and they agreed to seek no means of support but that most dangerous and unjustifiable one of making depredations on the public. They now determined to go to Smithfield, it being the time of Bartholomew fair, and met there a boy of their own iniquitous profession, who, being acquainted with them, produced a silver mug, which he informed them he had stolen, at the same time offering to allow them a share in the booty. Leaving the fair, they went to Duke's Place, in order to sell the mug to a Jew named Levi Chitty; but he not being at home, they adjourned to a neighboring alehouse to wait till his return: but they had not long been there before Lancaster broke open a drawer, and from thence stole several valuable articles. They now paid for the beer they had drunk, and escaped without suspicion. Having disposed of their booty, Lancaster and Lewis determined to divide the whole produce, in exclusion of the boy who had stolen the silver mug, and therefore they sent him to a public house in Bishopsgate Street, where they promised to meet him, but with a resolution to forfeit their word. On the following day they stole a quantity of brass candlesticks, which they sold for fifty shillings to the Jew, who told them that he would not have given so high a price but that he was desirous of encouraging them to steal articles of greater value. They made a booty of a number of silk handkerchiefs, and the money received for them from the Jew they spent in the company of several prostitutes, among whom was Sarah Cock, the widow of George Cock, whose [memoirs we have already recorded](#).

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

Lancaster, Lewis, and Sarah Cock, went the following evening to the Royal Exchange, where they picked the pockets of several passengers of watches, pocket-books, purses of money, and other property. They frequented all places of public resort; and, during divine service on a Sunday evening at the Foundery, near Moorfields, they picked the pockets of several of the congregation. On their return from the place of worship they came to the house of a velvet-weaver; and, Lancaster knowing him to be reputed as a man of considerable property, it was determined to break open and rob the house. Having effected an entrance, they secured a quantity of plate, and then went into the warehouse, whence they stole velvet to the amount of more than one hundred pounds. Having obtained this considerable booty, they went to Sarah Cock, and, giving her the velvet, adjourned to an alehouse in Houndsditch, to wait till she had disposed of it to the Jew.

The sum Cock demanded for the velvet the Jew said was more than he could really afford to give, as the colour was very indifferent, and he should be put to expense in sending it to Holland, where all his stolen goods were exported for sale. During their conversation they were observed by a weaver and a constable, who suspecting the velvet to have been stolen, the woman was interrogated as to the manner of its coming into her possession. She acknowledged having received the property from Lancaster and Lewis, and mentioned the house where they were then waiting; in consequence of which they were both apprehended, and secured in Newgate. Lewis being admitted an evidence for the crown, Lancaster was convicted of stealing the silver mug and other property, and sentenced to die.

While under sentence of death the Ordinary endeavoured to give him a proper idea of his duty to his Creator; but to the very moment of his death he obstinately persisted in a refusal to make what atonement was yet in his power for the many offences he had committed. On the 24th of September, 1748, John Lancaster was executed at Tyburn. Lancaster was bred to a business that would have procured him a comfortable livelihood; but, instead of supporting himself in a reputable manner, he indulged a disposition to indolence and a fondness for the company of dissolute people, which led him to transgress the laws, whereby he was doomed to a violent and ignominious death. We shall conclude in the words of the Rambler: 'He that does his best, however little, is always to be distinguished from him that does nothing. Whatever busies the mind, without corrupting it, has at least this use, that it rescues the day from idleness; and he that is never idle will not often be vicious.'

**SAMUEL HILL*****Executed for Murdering his Landlady, 23d of March, 1762***

This malefactor was a native of Buckeridge, in Staffordshire, received a decent education, was apprenticed to a shoemaker, and served his time with fidelity. At the expiration of his servitude he came to London, and worked as a journeyman till he had saved about ten pounds: and this instance of his industry and frugality coming to the knowledge of his aunt, who lived at Hawkehurst, in Kent, she bequeathed him fifty pounds by her will

On the death of the aunt he received the money, married, and commenced business as a master in Kent, where he unfortunately got connected with some smugglers, who dealt with him for shoes, for which they paid him in smuggled articles. This connexion was very pernicious to Hill; for a party of dragoons attacking the smugglers, and Hill taking part with the latter, he was desperately wounded. In the end the smugglers were victorious; but Hill, being wounded, was obliged to get on board a cutter, which carried him to France, where he put himself under the care of a surgeon, and was perfectly cured.

When restored to health he returned to England with a quantity of contraband goods; but the custom-house officers soon afterwards attacked him and another smuggler, and took them into custody. They continued seven months in prison; and were then released by an order from the Exchequer. Hill and his associates now bought a quantity of prohibited goods, and proceeded towards London to sell them; but, being attacked by several custom-house officers on the Deptford road, an engagement ensued, in which one of the officers was wounded in the leg, and the smugglers got off, and sold their goods in London. Not long after this the smugglers paid an officer a sum of money to connive at their proceedings; instead of which he laid an information against them; whereupon they pulled down his house, to testify their revenge. Thence they went to Sandwich, and attempted to land some run goods; but a party of dragoons attacking them, one of the smugglers was killed on the spot, on which the rest galloped off with the utmost precipitation.

Not long after this affair the officers made an attack on the smugglers near Bromley, when one of the latter was wounded, and three horses were killed belonging to the opposite party. The smugglers now vowed revenge against the custom-house officers, one of whom they seized, and, conveying him to the house of Hill, treated him, for ten successive days, with the utmost barbarity. At length they consulted whether they should murder the unhappy man; but, some of them advising that he should be sent to France, he was conveyed to the sea-side, and proposals made to take him on board a cutter: but the master of the vessel, having been formerly punished for receiving a person on board in a similar situation, refused to accept him, unless he would declare that it was his free will to go; and this declaration not being made, the smugglers beat him severely, and then permitted him to depart.

Soon after this transaction Hill grew tired of his connexion with the smugglers, and retired to the practice of his own business; a circumstance that exasperated his late associates to such a degree, that they robbed his house of effects to a considerable amount, and a hundred and fifty pounds in cash. Distressed by this circumstance, and apprehensive of farther consequences, Hill determined not to remain longer in the country, and therefore wrote a letter to his sister in London, who took a house for him,

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

whither he removed, and soon afterwards buried three children, who had died of the small-pox.

Hill went to visit a smuggler who was confined in Newgate, but had formed a design of effecting his escape, which he communicated to Hill, and offered him a hundred pounds to assist him in putting it into execution. The proposal was, that some other smugglers should come to Newgate, with offensive weapons hid under their clothes, and, having seized the keepers, should set the prisoners at liberty. Hill endeavoured to engage the smugglers to take a part in this affair; but they were too cautious to embark in so hazardous an undertaking. Hill, however, was daring enough to afford assistance to the prisoner, who effected his escape, but was not generous enough to give even a single shilling to his agent. After this Hill was promised a sum of money to assist another smuggler in making his escape from Newgate; in consequence of which he did all in his power to forward the plan, but never obtained the least gratuity for his trouble.

Hill's wife dying about this time, he seemed to decline all farther thought of acquiring money in a dishonest way; and, boarding in the house of a widow woman at Poplar, obtained his living by working as a journeyman at his own business: but at length he became in debt to his landlady, who seized a new suit of clothes for what he owed her. Exasperated by this circumstance, Hill, on the following morning, attempted to wrest the keys of the house from the woman's hands: but, on her making resistance, he seized a rope that lay by him, with which he strangled her so that she expired immediately. This being done, he robbed the house, and put the stolen effects on board a boat, which went down the river: but, being pursued, he was soon taken, and carried before a magistrate, who committed him to Newgate.

Being brought to trial at the next sessions at the Old Bailey, he was capitally convicted, and received sentence of death; after which he submitted with the utmost patience to his fate, confessing that he was highly deserving of the ignominy that his complicated crimes had brought on him. He was hanged at Tyburn on the 23d of March, 1752, after cautioning the surrounding multitude to take warning by his fate. A few words only will be necessary by way of remark on the case and fate of this malefactor. His unhappy connexion with the smugglers seems to have hardened his mind, so as to have rendered him capable of the commission of any crime—even of the greatest. From his unhappy end, then, we ought to learn to be cautious how we violate the laws of honesty in the smallest degree, since such violation too often leads to the perpetration of the most enormous offences.

**JOHN ANDREWS**  
*Executed for Forgery, 23d of March, 1752*

This offender was born in Essex, and, having commenced grazier, sent a number of cattle to Smithfield market; but, after a series of trade in this way, he sailed to the East Indies, where he acquired a sufficient sum to enable him to deal in seamen's tickets on his return to England. This business, sufficiently oppressive to the poor sailors, he carried to the height of extortion, and frequently obtained of them fifty per cent, on the advancing money on their tickets. After thus lending money for some time, he adventured on the dangerous practice of forging the wills of seamen, in order to defraud their widows; and met with a narrow escape at Maidstone, on a charge of publishing a forged letter of attorney. Andrews employed some women of his acquaintance in London, to whom he used to give small gratuities to personate the widows of seamen; and by their perjuries he frequently acquired considerable sums of money.

This mode of practice at length brought him to destruction, as will appear from the following narrative. Quarrelling with a woman named Elizabeth Nicholls, with whom he was connected, blows ensued, and the woman determined to be revenged, but disguised her sentiments till she had an opportunity of injuring him in the most essential manner. He applied to her on a particular occasion to personate the widow of a seaman to whom thirty pounds were due, and to swear that she had a will in her favour. The woman, with a view first to make an advantage of Andrews, and then to betray him, did as she was directed, and signed her name to a forged will in Doctors' Commons, in consequence of which Andrews received thirty pounds at the Navy-office, and became possessed of the seaman's ticket for fourteen pounds. This ticket he offered for sale to a man who kept an alehouse in Oxford Road; but the latter refused to buy it, unless the woman would sign the receipt for it, which she readily did, expecting Andrews would give her a good part of the money thus illegally obtained; but, on his refusal to give her more than half a guinea, she determined on immediate revenge. To carry her scheme into effectual execution, she went to another woman with whom Andrews was connected; and, both of them having given information against him, he was taken into custody, and lodged in Newgate. As it was presumed that his offences had been numerous, the following scheme was adopted to find full evidence of his guilt. The lord mayor commissioned a person who had formerly known him to go to Newgate, and hint to him that a warrant would be issued to search his lodgings. Andrews, having papers which he thought it of great consequence to conceal, desired his supposed friend to pack them in a basket, and leave them with an acquaintance in the Minories. Hereupon the prisoner gave the man his keys, and he went and packed up the goods, and carried them as directed. This was done to discover, if possible, whether Andrews had any accomplices; that, if he had, his guilt might be the more clearly ascertained by procuring strong evidence against him. When the papers were deposited in the Minories, the lord mayor issued a search warrant, in consequence of which his officers found sixty-four forged wills and powers of attorney; but no proof arose that he had any accomplices, except the women whom he had employed as his agents. One of these women, however, deposed that she had received above five hundred pounds for him, by swearing to forged wills; but that half a guinea for each perjury was all the gratification she received. Andrews, who was in possession of a considerable sum of money when he was committed to Newgate, had no idea that sufficient evidence could be adduced of his guilt; but, when

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

he was brought to trial, the testimony of the two women was so positive against him, that the jury did not hesitate to convict him, and sentence of death passed of course. His behaviour after conviction was remarkably morose, reserved, and untractable. He absolutely refused the good offices of the Ordinary of Newgate, which at first caused a suspicion that he was a Roman Catholic; but, as he was not visited by any priests of that persuasion, this suspicion wore off, and his refusal was attributed to the obstinacy and gloom of his own mind. He refused to acknowledge the justice of the sentence by which he was condemned; alleging, in excuse for his conduct, that, having lost large sums of money by some seamen, he was justified in endeavouring to make others pay the deficiency. He seemed agitated in the highest degree when he was put into the cart on the morning of execution. His whole frame was convulsed; and, when at the fatal tree, despair seemed to have taken possession of his soul. He only said a short prayer, but refused to address the surrounding multitude. He was hanged at Tyburn on the 23d of March, 1752. The crimes of this man were of the greatest magnitude, a continued series of fraud and robbery, supported by the perjuries of ignorant creatures whom he employed: and it is hardly a breach of charity to say that he was equally guilty of those perjuries with the poor wretches who actually committed them: perhaps more so, as his knowledge must be supposed to have been superior to theirs.

If the crime of forgery was less enormous than it is, one would think the excess of danger attending it would prevent any man from being guilty of it. Fatal experience, nevertheless, too frequently proves the contrary. Let us hope, however, that the fatal examples of the many unhappy victims to the rigid (and in this case necessary) justice of their country will have a good effect in future; and that this crime may decrease in proportion as, for some years past, it has unhappily increased, to the injury of many an individual, and the utter ruin of many a worthy family. It is dreadful to reflect on the vast numbers who have become widows and orphans through the horrid prevalence of this practice; which, as it is generally committed by persons in a rank of life above the vulgar, it is to be hoped those who may be tempted to the commission of it will have sense and virtue enough to make the proper use of these admonitions, and to consult their own safety, while they have a due regard not to infringe on the property of their neighbours.

## **JOHN POULTER ALIAS BAXTER**

### *Executed For Highway Robbery*

This malefactor was the son of honest people, in indigent circumstances, residing at Newmarket, in the county of Cambridge; who, when he had nearly completed his seventh year, put him to a day-school, which he continued to attend till he was about thirteen years old, when he was engaged as an assistant to the grooms in the service of the Duke of Somerset. Having remained in this situation six years, he was hired by Lord John Cavendish, whose horses he attended about three years, and then entered into the service of Colonel Lumley, brother to the Earl of Scarborough. He was sent by this gentleman three times with horses to France, and was considered as an honest and industrious servant. Being of a temper that delighted in a change of situation, he entered on board a trading ship belonging to Bristol; and he discovered no inclination to vicious courses till he had made several voyages to the West Indies and North America.

The ship to which he belonged being paid off on the conclusion of the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, he connected himself with Mary Brown and Mary Davis, women of abandoned characters; and they, in conjunction with John Brown, persuaded him to join them in committing depredations on the public. They directed their course towards Litchfield, and, upon their arrival there, went into a public house for refreshment. Being introduced to a parlour, Mary Brown observed a chest; and, the lid not being close, she put in her hand, and stole a sum of money, and several other articles of value. Having obtained the above booty, the gang proceeded to Chester, where Poulter stole some plush, and sent for a tailor to make it into a suit of clothes. While the tailor was measuring him a pistol that was in his pocket accidentally went off, but fortunately no damage was done by the ball. The tailor carried the plush home, and then went to the mayor, to whom he communicated his suspicions. Officers were dispatched to examine Poulter and his companions; but, being apprized of their approach, they embarked on board a packet-boat, which conveyed them to Dublin.

Soon after his arrival in Dublin Poulter hired a public house, where he sold on an average five barrels of ale weekly, and other liquors in proportion. His great success in business induced him to make a resolution of entirely declining illegal pursuits; and to this he would, in all probability, have strictly adhered, had he not been unluckily compelled to renew his acquaintance with abandoned people. General Sinclair had his pocket picked of a valuable gold watch, either in going into or departing from Leicester House; and two men, named Harper and Tobin, were suspected to be guilty of the fact, and committed to the Gate-house. A desperate gang of twenty-four Irishmen rescued Harper; in consequence of which a proclamation, offering a reward for apprehending them, was issued; but they all escaped to Ireland. One of the above gang, named James Field, who had been acquainted with Poulter, went up to him while he was standing at his door; and, after some conversation, they drank together. On the following day Field took the whole gang to Poulter's house. He requested them to depart, and at other times endeavoured to dissuade them from frequenting his house, urging that their visits might be productive of very disagreeable consequences to him; but they disregarded what he said, and continued their meetings as usual. At length they were observed in the house by a messenger that had been dispatched in search of them from London, and taken into custody. In consequence of

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

the above affair Poulter absconded from his house in the night, and his stock of liquors and other effects were seized by the magistrates.

Poulter now intended to reside at Cork; but, not being able to get a house there that he thought would answer his purpose, he went to Waterford, and took a public house, which he kept about three months. His brewer in Dublin wrote him word that he might return without the least danger of molestation; and therefore he departed from Waterford, and took a house about two miles from the city, at a place called the Shades of Clontarf. His house being adjacent to the sea, he purchased a boat, and applied himself with so much industry to the business of a fisherman, that his weekly profits seldom amounted to less than three pounds. Thomas Tobin being acquitted of the charge of stealing General Sinclair's watch, through defect of evidence, and learning that Poulter had struck into an advantageous line of life, he determined to visit him. In pursuance of this design, Tobin and a woman with whom he cohabited travelled to Holyhead, and there embarked in the packet for Dublin. Poulter received them with great kindness, and entertained them with equal generosity; but entreated, in the most earnest manner, that they would not repeat their visits too frequently, nor make his place of residence known to their accomplices. Though they had faithfully promised to comply with his request, they in a few days introduced several of their associates to Poulter's house, which, before many weeks had elapsed, became the receptacle for thieves of every denomination, by whom Dublin and its environs were infested. Poulter still adhered to his resolution of gaining a livelihood by honest labour, and informed his unwelcome guests that he would permit them no longer to frequent his house.

In revenge for this they concerted and put in practice a plan for effecting the ruin of Poulter. Six pounds of smuggled tea being procured, one of the gang privately conveyed it into Poulter's boat, and then lodged an information against him; in consequence of which the boat was seized and condemned; and Poulter, though innocent, judged it expedient to abscond. He embarked for Bristol, and on his arrival there was entirely destitute of money. From Bristol he proceeded to Bath, where, he met with his former acquaintances, Richard Branning and John Roberts, who prevailed upon him to join them in committing depredations on the highway. They mentioned a man of property who lived at Towbridge, and frequently came to Bath to change bills; and it was resolved to attempt robbing him. They met at Roberts's house, where the plan of the intended robbery was concerted, and then they repaired to the public house which was frequented by the gentleman of Towbridge; and observing him counting money, they concluded that they could not fail obtaining a considerable booty. However, they were disappointed; for the gentleman, suspecting their design, returned by a road which he had not been accustomed to travel, and by that measure luckily preserved his property.

They now proceeded into Yorkshire, and in their way committed several robberies. At the inn where they alighted at Halifax they were joined by a clergyman, whom they seduced to prick in the belt, by which stratagem they defrauded him of twenty-five guineas. They now went to Stockport, in Cheshire, where they lay one night, and then travelled to Chester.—putting up at a house kept by one James Roberts, who had formerly belonged to the gang, he informed them that the pack-horses with Manchester goods would pass in the evening; and it was resolved to steal one of the horses and the goods he carried. As the horses passed, Roberts pointed to that loaded with the most valuable effects, and advised his companions to go about a

## SUPPLEMENT 2

mile from the town, and drive the beast into the fields, adding that he would scarcely be missed by the carrier in less than two hours, in which time they might secure the goods and escape. The horse they seized was not that pointed out by Roberts; and their booty consisted only of callimancoes. Finding himself separated from his companions, the horse neighed so loud and frequent, that they judged it necessary to gag him, lest the noise should lead to a discovery. They reached Whitchurch, in Shropshire, the same night; and, after refreshing themselves at a house notorious for the reception of robbers, cut the marks from the goods, and exposed them for sale in the market. Having sold the callimancoes, they proceeded to Grantham, in Lincolnshire, and defrauded a farmer of that place of near sixteen pounds by pricking in the belt; immediately after which they set out for Nottingham, where they stole a silver tankard, and, after selling it to a shopkeeper in the town, proceeded to York. Having stolen some plate from the inn where they put up, and committed several robberies in different parts of Yorkshire, they deemed it prudent to remove from that part of the country, lest they should be apprehended, and came to the resolution of joining their former associates at Bath.

Soon after their arrival at Bath the whole gang set out for Sandford Peverel, in Devonshire, in order to be present at a great fair for cattle; and during their residence there they obtained considerable sums by pricking in the belt, and other infamous practices. They next went to Great Torrington, where they defrauded a farmer of twenty pounds. Enraged by the imposition that had been practised upon him, the farmer took every opportunity of relating the particulars of the fraud; so that the whole neighborhood was alarmed, and in pursuit of the sharpers; and they were therefore under the necessity of dispersing. Poulter and Brown directed their course to Exeter; and, having defrauded an inhabitant of that town of five pounds, proceeded to Crookhorn, in expectation of meeting their associates: but on their arrival they learnt that two of them were in confinement, charged with fraudulent practices. This information occasioned the rest of the gang to make a precipitate retreat; and in their way to the north of England they obtained several sums by a variety of infamous stratagems. They remained some months at York, Durham, and Newcastle; and, after defrauding a number of farmers, and some other persons, of money, they went to Bath, where they assumed the character of smugglers. They had not been long at Bath before they determined to go to the next Blandford races in search of adventures. During the races one party attended the cock-pit each morning; some were upon the course in the afternoon; and others were employed in cheating the keepers of the booths. They were so successful in their respective departments of villainy as to amass a very considerable sum; and, on the conclusion of the races, they ordered an elegant dinner at the Crown tavern, in Blandford, whence they stole a portmanteau, containing eighteen guineas, four broad pieces, a large sum in Portugal pieces, some silver coin, a gold repeating watch, with superb appendages, several necklaces set with diamonds and other jewels, a great quantity of rich clothes, a pair of gold shoe-buckles, a gold girdle-buckle, a gold coral, and many other articles of value. Immediately after the above robbery Poulter and Brown set out for London, and, having sold the effects to some Jews in Duke's Place, they joined their accomplices at Roberts's house at Bath, where the produce of their booty was divided.

The next expedition was to a fair held at Corsham, where Poulter stole a silver tankard, which he carried to Roberts's house. They now went to Farringdon, in Berkshire, in order to wait there for the Coventry carrier, whom they had determined to rob. After waiting two days the carrier arrived; and when he left the town in the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

morning they followed him, and robbed him of effects to a considerable value. They next rode to Newbury, where they fraudulently obtained four guineas, his horse, and watch, from an unsuspecting countryman; and then returned to their rendezvous at Bath. They endeavoured to force open a house at Bath; but being observed by a man in a state of intoxication, who was casually passing, he exerted the utmost strength of his voice to alarm the neighborhood, which occasioned the villains to decamp without effecting the intended burglary. On the following morning Coulter and some of his companions went to Bristol, where they joined company with a countryman, and defrauded him out of twenty guineas, which he had borrowed of an acquaintance, who kept a shop in the neighborhood.

Their villainies had now rendered their characters so notorious, and their persons so well known, throughout the west of England, that they determined to decline their former practices, and adopt that of horse-stealing. To avoid detection, they were careful not to offer horses to sale in that part of the kingdom where they had stolen them; and they still continued to travel occasionally to Bath, where they spent a great part of their money in Roberts's house. A customer to Roberts showed him twenty pounds, saying he had just received it; and Roberts immediately pointed out the man to Poulter, informing him at the same time of the booty he might acquire by robbing him. Towards night the countryman mounted his horse, and was followed by Poulter, who, holding a tinder-box to him instead of a pistol, demanded his money, which was delivered. Soon after the above robbery the gang went again to Bristol, and, watching an opportunity of lifting up the parlour sash of a gentleman's house, they stole several silver spoons, and some other articles. One of the gang got unperceived into a watchmaker's house in the same city, while his accomplices waited without, in order to rescue him if he should be detected. He brought from the upper apartments many articles of value, besides a quantity of wearing apparel; and it was some hours before the robbery was discovered. On the following night Brown secreted himself in a shed adjoining to a barber's house, into which he made a forcible entry about midnight, and was carrying off some wearing apparel, when he was heard by the barber and his apprentice. Upon the family being alarmed Brown got through the garret window to the roof of the house, and remained three hours concealed behind a stack of chimneys. Unable to escape by any other way, he at length resolved to attempt passing through the house; but, while upon the stairs, he was heard by the boy, who ran towards him with a knife in his hand, crying "Thieves!" Alarmed by the boy, the barber's wife came; and, upon Brown assuring her that he had taken shelter in the house in order to avoid the pursuit of bailiffs, she informed him that he might remain there till he could go home in safety; but he deemed it prudent to seize the opportunity of making an immediate retreat. During the ensuing fair at Bristol they robbed and defrauded several clothiers, and other dealers, of property to a very considerable amount. The produce of these effects being expended in Roberts's house, the gang determined upon an expedition into Staffordshire. While they remained in Staffordshire they stole several horses, which were taken to Roberts, who sold them at different fairs held at places adjacent to Bath.

An Irishman, named Bush, an intrepid and desperate fellow, who had acted as hostler to Roberts, was at length admitted to the gang; and soon afterwards he set out in company with Poulter towards Towbridge, in Wiltshire, with a determination of committing robberies. Meeting a chaise, Bush declared he would rob the passengers; but Poulter objected, thinking his companion inclined to commit murder. At length he consented to rob the chaise, after it had been agreed that no cruelty should be

## SUPPLEMENT 2

exercised. It being nearly dark, Poulter thrust his hand through the glass of the chaise, not knowing that it was drawn up, and, it being terribly cut, he hastily withdrew it, and his pistol went off by accident. Bush, supposing the fire to proceed from the gentleman in the carriage, discharged his pistol, but without any particular aim. Poulter now called to his companion to desist; and, after taking out of the chaise a child, which he kissed, and carefully set upon the ground, he robbed Dr. Hancock, of Salisbury, of a guinea and a half, six shillings, a gold watch, some child-bed linen, and wearing apparel belonging to his lady. After the above robbery the villains adjourned to a public house, that had been long frequented by the gang, and produced the stolen effects to the landlord and his wife; and the latter supplied them with a bag for packing the clothes in. The landlord then drew the charge from a fowling-piece, to furnish them with powder; after which they melted a pewter spoon, and cast two bullets. Bush asking the woman if she was not terrified at seeing them load their pistols, she said that many pistols had been loaded in her kitchen, without giving her the least alarm; adding, that they would do right to travel as far as they could before break of day, and, if they would inform her where they put up, she would transmit them news from Bath. Leaving this house, they stole a horse at an adjacent farm, and proceeded to Exeter, where they sold the stolen effects to a man who had long carried on an illegal traffic with the whole gang.

In a short time after the above Poulter was apprehended in a public house on suspicion of having robbed Doctor Hancock; and, being taken before a magistrate, he gave information against his accomplices, mentioning the several places to which they resorted, and recommending the most effectual measures for taking them into custody; particularizing those who had been sentenced to transportation, and returned before the expiration of the term of their exile. While he was under examination he advised that the discoveries he had made might be kept profoundly secret, observing that many persons connected with the gang lived in a reputable manner; and he particularly requested that the messenger who was ordered to make inquiries at Bath might carefully conceal his business from every person excepting the mayor. Notwithstanding this precaution, the messenger had not been at Bath more than an hour before the names of all the villains were universally known; and, on the following morning, printed lists of them were hawked about the streets. In consequence of this imprudent conduct Poulter's accomplices escaped, and the good effects which the public might have derived from his discoveries were, in a great measure, defeated. Great part of the property stolen from Doctor Hancock was restored to that gentleman, who visited Poulter in prison, and assured him that he would not be a severe prosecutor; and told him that, if he should be convicted, he would, in all probability, be deemed an object deserving the royal clemency. Notwithstanding the doctor's promise, he used his utmost endeavours to procure the conviction of Poulter; and even waited upon the judge, to prevent the time of his execution being prolonged. However, he was respited for six weeks. During his confinement he wrote accounts of a great number of robberies in which he had been concerned in divers parts of the kingdom. His discoveries were judged to be of such public importance, that the corporations of Bristol, Bath, Exeter, and Taunton, and many private gentlemen, exerted their utmost interest in his behalf; and it was generally expected that he would receive a pardon, or that the sentence of death would, at least, be mitigated to that of transportation. He was examined by a gentleman of the law, to whom he related the particulars of the robberies committed by himself and his accomplices, with but very trifling variations from his confession

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

before the magistrate, and what was recited in the papers written by him after his commitment.

Poulter behaved with a decency and moderation becoming his unhappy circumstances; but he was, notwithstanding, an object of the implacable enmity of the gaoler. Though he had paid an extraordinary price for the use of a bed, this inhuman villain would allow him only straw to lie upon, even in the most rigorous season of the year, when he was in a state of health that threatened his speedy dissolution. The cruelty of the gaoler's treatment occasioned some gentlemen to write to him, desiring he would allow the prisoner a bed. It was imagined that the malicious representations of the gaoler induced a gentleman of great interest at court to intercept the royal mercy, which, it was generally believed, would be extended to Poulter. A report being circulated that Poulter was to be executed on the 1st of March, he wrote to a gentleman from whom he had experienced many instances of humanity, requesting to be informed whether it was founded in truth, and complaining that the gaoler added to his distress by perpetually reminding him that he must inevitably fall a victim to the law.

Poulter's dread of being executed daily increasing, he determined to attempt breaking out of prison; and, having communicated his design to one of the debtors, on Sunday, the 17th of February, they forced an iron bar out of one of the windows, and escaped. Poulter travelled as far as Glastonbury with one of his irons on; and, after disengaging himself from that incumbrance, he continued walking all night, although he was extremely weak through long illness, and his legs were galled and swelled in a terrible manner. In the day they concealed themselves in a hayrick, and agreed to direct their course towards Wales; but, being ignorant of the road, they on Tuesday morning found themselves at Wookey, near Wells. Poulter was so excessively fatigued as to be unable to pursue his journey, and it was therefore agreed that they should take some repose. They went into an alehouse, where they slept till two o'clock; and they were preparing to depart, when a mason, who lived in the neighborhood, came to the house for some liquor, and, recollecting the person of Poulter, called to his journeymen to assist in apprehending him. He was secured till the next day, and then conducted back to Ivelchester gaol.

When he was lodged again in prison nine days of the time for which he was respited remained unexpired; but an express was dispatched to a member of parliament, requesting him to use his interest to obtain an order for his immediate execution. In consequence of this an order was issued, commanding the high sheriff to cause the sentence of the law to be inflicted on Poulter within twenty-four hours after the receipt of the express. Poulter was greatly shocked up on learning that the warrant was received for his sudden execution; but he soon recovered his spirits, and endeavoured to atone for past offences by a sincere repentance. After receiving the sacrament in a very devout manner, he prayed with an appearance of great fervency, and expressed strong hopes of obtaining pardon from the Almighty, whose displeasure he had not incurred (however great his offences in other respects) by the spilling of innocent blood. He behaved in a very penitent manner, but still preserved a decent fortitude, at the place of execution. He solemnly declared to the truth of all he had related respecting his accomplices; and, after warning the surrounding multitude to avoid such practices as had proved the cause of his destruction, he prayed some time in a composed and fervent manner, and was then turned off. John Poulter was hanged at Ivelchester on the 25th of February, 1755.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

It is to be lamented that Poulter, through the villainy of his former accomplices, was deprived of the advantage that would have necessarily resulted from a reformation of conduct. Denied the opportunity of supporting himself by honest means, he was, in a manner, compelled to join in the iniquitous practices of his former associates; for he was conscious that, had he been hardy enough to oppose their designs, they would have effected his destruction. Though this man's offences were great, we cannot but regret his being subjected to the utmost rigour of the law; since, to that public he had so highly injured, he made no inconsiderable reparation, by causing the most dangerous set of villains that ever infested these kingdoms to be dispersed. Doctor Hancock visited the prisoner, and gave him hopes of life; but afterwards used every possible endeavour to hasten his execution. Thus he seduced the unhappy man to neglect a preparation for eternity, to which he labored to precipitate him ' with all his imperfections on his head.

The conduct of the gaoler cannot be mentioned in terms of sufficient abhorrence. What character can more provoke our hatred than the man who, instead of alleviating, insults distress; instead of calming a perturbed spirit, adds to the poignancy of affliction; and in capacities a miserable wretch, tottering on the verge of eternity, for appealing to the Almighty with that steady and fervent zeal by which alone he can obtain forgiveness? As a contrast to this inhuman villain of a gaoler, we shall mention Mr. Dagg, who was keeper of Bristol prison during the confinement of the unfortunate Richard Savage, Esq. He was a man of strict integrity and universal benevolence; and his behaviour to Savage gave the ingenious biographer of that unhappy poet occasion for the following reflections: 'Virtue is undoubtedly most laudable in that state which makes it most difficult; and therefore the humanity of a gaoler certainly deserves this public attestation; and the man whose heart has not been hardened by such an employment may justly be proposed as a pattern of benevolence. If an inscription was once engraved to the honest toll-gatherer, less honours ought not to be paid to the tender gaoler.' We shall here conclude with observing that guilt must ever be attended by wretchedness: perpetual fears and alarms will destroy the hope of future happiness; and we no longer consider life as valuable than while we are able to cherish the expectation that permanent felicity will reward the toils of the present hour.

**JOHN BRETT**  
*Executed For Forgery.*

This offender was the son of a clergyman in the north of Ireland, and, having received an excellent education, obtained an ensign's commission in the 49th regiment of foot, on the Irish establishment, when he was about twenty years of age. His disposition inclining him to feats of arms, he distinguished himself so greatly at the siege of Ticonderago that he was advanced to be a lieutenant, and likewise made adjutant of a regiment. The regiment being ordered from America to Jamaica, was stationed there some years; and in this island Brett married a gentleman's daughter, and received a considerable fortune with her: and two children were the issue of this marriage. The regiment remaining in a state of inactivity, Brett was at a loss how to dispose of his time, and thereupon took to a habit of gaming, which incurred the censure of his father-in-law, who blamed him for a conduct so inconsistent with the interest of his family. Recriminations becoming mutual, the family became uneasy, and Brett wished for an opportunity of returning to Europe.

This opportunity soon offered; but, to lead to the occasion, we must mention the following fact:—Deserters from the regiments in Great Britain, and sometimes persons who have been capitally convicted, are sent to serve in regiments in the West Indies; and the officers on duty there go in rotation to England to examine such persons before they are sent over. Now it happened that, at the period of which we are writing, the officer appointed to sail to the port of London wished rather to remain in Jamaica; and Brett making application to go in his stead, his request was complied with; and he sailed in a man of war, which landed him at Portsmouth. Going immediately to London, he associated with a set of gamblers, who soon stripped him of his own money, and likewise of some cash with which he was intrusted on behalf of the regiment to which he belonged Thus distressed by his imprudence, he endeavoured to borrow money to make up his loss; but, failing in all his applications, he determined on the commission of forgery; whereupon he wrote the following letter to Messrs. Frazier, Wharton, and Mullison, merchants in London:

"Gentlemen,

This goes by a St. Eustatia vessel, by one Mr. Richard Horton, a purser of a man of war, whose bills upon you, to the amount of one thousand guineas sterling, I must request the favour of you to honour, and you may depend that I shall soon send you proper remittances on that account. I have no more to add at present, but to desire you will be kind enough to comply with this, as it will not only be of service to him, but to myself likewise; and in so doing you will very much oblige

Your humble servant,  
WALTER PRINGLE."

This letter was dated from the West Indies, but not written in Mr. Pringle's hand, a circumstance that gave some suspicion to the gentlemen to whom it was directed; who were surprised that the person in whose favour it was drawn did not deliver the letter himself, but sent it by the post. This occasioned suspicion of a forgery; and the gentlemen resolved not to accept any bills in consequence of the letter. A few days afterwards they received a bill, of which the following is a copy:

## SUPPLEMENT 2

"March 18, 1761.

Gentlemen,

Twenty days after sight please to pay Mr. William Huggins, or order, fifty pounds; and charge the same to the account of Walter Pringle, Esq. of St. Christopher's, merchant, as per advice you will find by a letter of credit in my favour by Walter Pringle.

Richaud Houton."

As it was known that no packet had arrived about that time from the West Indies, little doubt remained but that a forgery had been committed; wherefore the merchants determined to make the most cautious inquiry. On the Monday following a gentleman, named Huggins, called for the bill, on which Mr. Mullison asked him how he came by it. He acknowledged to have received it, in his shop, of a person who would call again. Hereupon a peace-officer was employed to attend at Mr. Huggins's house; and two days afterwards Brett came, and, being carried before Sir John Fielding, he acknowledged the forgery not only of the bill, but of the letter of credit, on which he was committed to Newgate.

Brett, being brought to his trial, pleaded 'Not guilty;' but, when Mr. Mullison had sworn to the facts, he begged leave to retract his former plea, and, having remarked that he had been ill advised by his attorney, said, 'I will not give the Court any trouble to prove the name Richard Horton not to be his handwriting; I have nothing to say but to plead guilty;' and in consequence hereof he received sentence of death. After conviction he behaved in the most contrite and penitent manner. His father made all possible intercession to obtain the royal mercy for his unfortunate son; and in the meantime he wrote to him, to advise him to make proper preparation for that ignominious death which he had but too much reason to expect.

Great interest was made to save him, but in vain: the crime was of such a nature, that it would have been a point of false lenity to pardon it in a commercial kingdom. On the day of execution Brett was conveyed to Tyburn, with three other malefactors, one of whom was David Morgan, who had been convicted of robbing Mr. Dobbison on Finchley Common. When at the place of execution, a respite was brought for Morgan, just as the executioner was on the point of tying him up. This being received by the under-sheriff, he went into the cart, saying 'Which is Morgan?' to which he answered 'My name is Morgan:' on which the under-sheriff said 'Loose him; take him away.' Morgan, now turning to Brett, said 'My reprieve is come; fare you well!' and they took a most affectionate leave of each other, after which Brett earnestly continued his devotions to the last moment. Morgan's reprieve arose from the following circumstance. He had stopped the above-mentioned Mr. Dobbison and Mr. Aukland in a chaise. Dobbison attempted to fire a blunderbuss at him; but it flashed in the pan. On this Dobbison begged his life; to which Morgan replied, 'God forbid I should take, your life: you know what I want; I am in necessity.' Mr. Aukland said, 'All you can desire of a gentleman is to ask your pardon;' to which Morgan replied 'I do not desire even that.' Brett was hanged at Tyburn on the 12th of June, 1761.

After the repeated remarks we have made on the nature, danger, and consequence of the crime of forgery, it will be the less necessary to extend our observations on this particular case of Brett. One observation, however, is too striking to be omitted. He was a military man. Military men universally consider themselves as gentlemen; so, indeed, they ought to be, and as such they ought to behave; but the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

misfortune is, that the pay of officers, excepting those in the higher ranks, is not equal by the day to what a ticket-porter will get in London. Officers, therefore, of all men, should learn the great lesson of frugality, if they would wish to live with credit in that rank to which their interest or merit may have advanced them.

**JOHN SMITH AND ROBERT MAYNE**  
*Executed for a Mutiny on Board the King George, 10<sup>th</sup> May,  
 1762*

On the trial of these men, along with five more of the crew, it appeared that disputes arose on board the King George, a fine privateer of thirty-two guns and two hundred men, commanded by Captain Reed, and cruising against the enemies of the country, concerning some prize wine, which was stowed in the hold, some of the crew insisting on its being hoisted up to be used for the whole ship's company. This would have been attended, in their then situation, with both difficulty and danger, and was consequently opposed by Captain Reed and his officers.

Thus disappointed, a factious discontented set endeavoured to corrupt the remainder, who soon gained over so formidable a party, that they determined to seize the ship, and turn pirates in the Indian seas. In order to this, off Cape Ortugal, the mutineers demanded the keys of the arm-chests, on the refusal of which they drove the captain and officers into the cabin. They then placed a guard at the door, and brought a nine-pounder carriage-gun, loaded with round and grape shot, to fire among the officers; but were prevailed upon to desist by the entreaties of Mr. Gardener, the sailing master. To him they offered the command of the ship, acquainting him with their intention of steering for the East Indies; but on his refusal they put him under a guard, and took the ship into their own care, until they had, for want of skill, nearly lost both the ship and themselves. They then released Mr. Gardener, and gave him the helm; when he steered into Camarinas, in Spain, where most of the mutineers took to the boats, and made their escape.

Such as were apprehended were brought to trial; and though two more, viz. Thomas Baldwin and Laurence Tiernan, were found guilty, yet Smith and Mayne only were executed, who were the ring leaders of the mutiny. They suffered at Execution Dock, May the 10th, 1762. They were both Irishmen, and Roman Catholics, and were attended by a priest of that religion.

A few years after this affair a mutiny broke out among the crew of the Namur, of ninety guns. Fifteen were found guilty, and ordered to be hanged. They were brought for execution on board the Royal Ann, with halters round their necks, and, while waiting for the fatal gun being fired, were told that his majesty had pardoned fourteen of them, but one of them must die; and they were ordered to cast lots. How exquisite must have been the feelings of these miserable men at the awful moment of deciding on the fate of one! The fatal lot fell upon the second man that drew, Matthew M'Can, who was soon run up to the yard-arm, where the body hung nearly an hour. The pardoned seamen were turned over to the Grafton and the Sunderland, under sailing orders for the East Indies.

**JOHN KELLO**  
*Executed for Forgery, 13<sup>th</sup> October 1755*

John and Joseph Kello were the sons of a mercer in an extensive way of business, in Houndsditch, who placed John at a grammar-school at Ludlow in Shropshire where he attained a great proficiency in classical learning. His education being completed, he was articled to a reputable merchant; and, soon after the expiration of his clerkship, he procured three hundred pounds for the purpose of establishing himself in business, with which sum he embarked for Virginia; and, soon after his arrival there, he connected himself in partnership with a person who had been some time settled in that colony in an advantageous branch of trade. Joseph Kello had served a Blackwell Hall factor some years in the capacity of a clerk, and in that time he contracted an intimate acquaintance with Mr. Cotton, a packer, of Aldermanbury, who was employed to do a great deal of business for a gentleman named Partridge; and, from frequenting Mr. Cotton's house, Joseph had frequent opportunities of seeing Mr. Partridge's writing, and became acquainted with many of that gentleman's commercial concerns.

After a residence of about three years in Virginia John Kello returned to London, and hired lodgings in the neighbourhood of Bloomsbury Square; but, being addicted to a life of pleasure, he soon found himself in very embarrassed circumstances. The situation of Joseph was not more eligible than that of his brother; for he was equally attached to scenes of dissipation; nor was he more inclined than John to industry in his profession or economy in his expenses. With the view of relieving themselves from their embarrassments, they concerted a plan for obtaining a thousand pounds, by means of a forged draft, in the name of Mr. Partridge; and learning that, on the 28th of August, he was gone to Harlow, they determined to seize the opportunity of his absence for carrying their villainous plan into execution.

Joseph having taken one of the checks under the firm of Amyand, Staples, and Mercer, from Mr. Cotton's compting-house, carried it to his brother, at the Red Lion alehouse, in Moorfields, and there filled it up in a hand very nearly resembling Mr. Partridge's writing. The counterfeit instrument was now enclosed in a letter to Mr. Cetton, purporting to be the writing of Mr. Partridge, desiring him to receive the thousand pounds expressed in the draft in one bank-note, and leave it under cover at the bar of Sam's Coffee-house, directed for Mr. Rous. The letter enclosing the counterfeited draft was dispatched by a porter, who, upon delivering it, was asked by Mr. Cotton who was his employer; in reply to which he said he had received the letter from a gentleman in the street, and that no answer was required. The hand of Mr. Partridge being imitated with great nicety, Mr. Cotton had no suspicion of an intended fraud, and immediately set out for the banker's house in Cornhill, where he presented the draft to Mr. Mercer, who, after checking him for coming after the usual hour of paying money, paid the thousand pounds in one bank-note. Mr. Cotton immediately went to the coffee-house, and sealed the note in a cover, which he directed to Mr. Rous; but after waiting about three hours, in expectation of seeing the gentleman, he returned home, taking the note with him, and leaving word at the bar for Mr. Rous to call at his house in Aldermanbury.

When Mr. Cotton got home he found Joseph Kello there, and mentioned to him that, as the sum Mr. Partridge had authorized him to receive was considerable, he judged it not prudent to leave the note at the coffee-house, lest some mistake or

## SUPPLEMENT 2

accident should happen. Hereupon Joseph went to his brother, who was waiting at Seymour's Coffee-house, in Pope's-head Alley, whence they dispatched a chairman to Mr. Cotton, with a verbal message, as from Mr. Partridge, desiring him to leave the note for Mr. Rous at the coffee house. Joseph now returned to Mr. Cotton; and presently after him came the porter, and delivered his message. Mr. Cotton set out for the coffee-house, being desirous of giving the note into the possession of Mr. Rous; and, upon inquiring for a gentleman of that name, the landlady said he had been gone from the house only a few minutes, but had left word that he should return in a short time. John, who waited to receive the note under the name of Mr. Rous, went out of the house upon observing that the messenger did not return alone. Mr. Cotton, recollecting that Mr. Partridge had connexions in trade with a gentleman named Rous, who lived at Hackney, concluded that he must be the Mr. Rous for whom the thousand pounds were intended; and, after waiting at the coffee-house till near midnight, he left a note at the bar, intimating that he would the next morning wait upon Mr. Rous, at Hackney, with the bank-note.

Upon going home he found Joseph Kello at his house, and gave him an account of his conduct. Joseph Kello intimated that he was apprehensive Mr. Partridge would be highly offended upon learning that the note was not delivered according to his order. Mr. Cotton, however, still adhered to his resolution of keeping the note till he could dispose of it without hazard; and he directly went to the post-office with a letter to Mr. Partridge, assigning reasons for his conduct in the affair. Joseph slept at Mr. Cotton's that night; and the next morning (which was Sunday) he informed his brother of Mr. Cotton's design of going to Mr. Rous, at Hackney. It was now agreed that another letter, as from Mr. Partridge, should be written to Mr. Cotton, purporting that he (Partridge) had received notice by express that Mr. Rous had not received the note, and desiring the directions contained in his former letter might be immediately obeyed. This letter they artfully sent, under cover, to Mr. Partridge's house; and that gentleman's porter carried it to Mr. Cotton, who had set out for Hackney, but stopped for refreshment at the Sun alehouse, at London Wall, where the porter found him. In consequence of the forged letter Mr. Cotton immediately went to Sam's Coffee-house, and there left the note in a cover, directed for Mr. Rous. Joseph, learning that Mr. Cotton had acted agreeably to the pretended order of Mr. Partridge, communicated the circumstance to his brother, who went to the coffee house, and received the note under the name of Mr. Rous.

On the day the note was obtained by John, Mr. Cotton and Joseph dined together; after which the brothers met by appointment, and went into the fields near Sadler's Wells, where the cover was opened, and the enclosed bank-note taken out. They then adjourned to John's lodgings, in Bloomsbury, where it was resolved that he should set out in a post-chaise for Bristol, in order to procure cash for the note; and Joseph borrowed ten guineas for his expenses on the road. Not being able to obtain the money at Bristol, he proceeded to Bridgewater, in Somersetshire, where the clerk to the receiver-general of the land-tax changed the note. He had no sooner received the cash than he travelled post to London, and took up his residence with a woman of the town in a street near Westminster Abbey. He gave the woman with whom he cohabited a bag, in which was the cash received in exchange for the bank-note, desiring her to take care of it, and saying it contained halfpence to the amount of five pounds.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

Joseph Kello being taken into custody, charged on suspicion of the forgery, he made use of some expressions which seemed to convey an indirect accusation against his brother; and, after he had been particularly questioned respecting the affair, it was agreed to admit him an evidence for the crown, in case of John being apprehended. The postilion who had driven John to town recollected the place where he had ordered his trunk to be conveyed; and that circumstance facilitated the discovery of his lodgings, where he was taken into custody by Sir John Fielding's men, who recovered more than nine hundred pounds of the money obtained by means of the counterfeit draft. John Kello being brought to trial at the Old Bailey, his brother's evidence was exceedingly strong, and supported by a great number of corroborative circumstances; and he was therefore convicted of the crime alleged in the indictment.

Being summoned to attend prayers, he refused, saying he was a Dissenter. Hereupon Mr. Akerman sent him word that he might be attended by a minister of his own persuasion, but that his presence in the chapel was expected; and to the latter part of the message Mr. Akerman is supposed to have been induced by an unwillingness to trust him in the cells alone, the servants belonging to the prison being engaged in attending the other prisoners during divine service. He obstinately persisted in refusing to be attended by any dissenting minister; and, nearly to the end of his life, appeared to be totally indifferent as to the necessary preparations for eternity.

When the morning on which he was to be executed arrived the Ordinary put several questions to him respecting his sentiments of the doctrines of Christianity, in which he declared he entertained a firm belief, and that pride alone had suggested whatever reasons he had given for an opinion to the contrary. At the place of execution he acknowledged his guilt with every appearance of unfeigned contrition; but his voice was so low, through a very decayed state of health, that he was to be heard only by those who were in or very near the cart. Being asked by the Ordinary whether he forgave his brother, his answer was, that he forgive him as far as he could, 'consistent with humanity.' His devotions being concluded, he was turned off, October the 13th, 1764; and, after hanging the usual time, his body was delivered to his friends, by whom it was privately interred in a decent manner.

From the above narrative we may learn that, however nearly allied by blood and friendship, no obligations will be found sufficient to prevent our best friends from becoming our accusers when they are impelled by the double motive of self-preservation and the desire of making some reparation for the crimes they have committed. It would be a difficult point to determine which of the brothers had the greatest share of guilt. Perhaps the ignominious death of John was not a more severe punishment than what was sustained by Joseph; for it is scarcely to be supposed that any favourable change of circumstances could restore him to happiness after having proved so material an instrument in producing the destruction of a brother. Wealth is desirable only as the means of procuring the conveniences and comforts of life: but let our readers remember that, when it is obtained by unjustifiable actions, the consciousness of guilt will perpetually obtrude upon the mind, wholly disappoint or take off the relish of every promised enjoyment, and leave us miserable slaves to the tyranny of continual alarms and dreadful apprehensions.

**THOMAS USHER**  
*Executed for Robbery, 4<sup>th</sup> May, 1764*

This treacherous thief was clerk to the owner of the Bristol waggon. A captain of a ship having delivered to him, and entered on his books, a parcel to be forwarded to London, containing one thousand eight hundred pounds, the unworthy servant determined appropriating it to his own use. Before he set off, willing to plunder to the utmost, he took two hundred pounds belonging to Mr. William James, his master, and even robbed his fellow-servants of their watches.

Upon the discovery of the flight and robbery, Mr. James pursued him to London, where he had reason to suppose the thief would take refuge. He traced him to the Oxford Arms, in Oxford Road, to which he came in a post-chaise and four, but he soon after set off in a hackney-coach. Mr. James now despaired of tracing him any farther; but, being persuaded to lay the case before Sir John Fielding, the myrmidons of that active magistrate soon found the coachman who had taken up Usher and his booty. It appeared that he had paid an extra fare to be driven by the Islington road to the Black Bull, at Whitechapel, with a view to evade pursuit. From thence he was followed to Sabridgeworth, in Hertfordshire, and there apprehended. Most of the money lodged by the Bristol captain, which was in Portugal gold, was found upon him. A letter was also discovered, directed to his wife, appointing her to meet him at an inn on Epping Forest, and to invite her brother and sister to come along with her, having joyful news to tell them; no less, continued the letter, than a thousand pounds gained in the lottery, and which he had about him. The wife was, however, deprived of the pleasure of the journey, by the officers apprehending her, on whom they found above one hundred pounds, and one of the watches stolen by her husband, which left little doubt of her having been privy to the robbery.

Usher was brought back to Bristol, and indicted for the offence at the next Court. Upon the trial, the circumstances already related being proved, and the evidence of his master full and positive, he was found guilty, and sentenced for death. During his execution, which took place at Bristol, May the 4th, 1764, while the attention of the populace was wholly employed upon the malefactor, a single highwayman, well mounted, committed a robbery, in the sight of thousands, and, for a time, escaped!

**WILLIAM JAQUES**

***Executed for the Murder of a Black Man, August, 1764***

This treacherous murderer was a seaman in the royal navy, and a disgrace to that brave and generous set of people. He belonged to the *Stag* frigate, and the black man was also one of the crew. They had lately been paid off, and each received twenty-eight pounds. Jaques soon squandered away his share in dissipation among lewd women, and determined to replace it by robbing the negro.

For this purpose he decoyed his victim into a wood, and, taking him unawares, he dashed his brains out with a hedge-stake, rifled his pockets, and then made his escape. In a few days the corpse was found; and suspicion falling on Jaques, from their having been seen in company, he was pursued and taken in a public house at the Devizes. There were found upon him sixteen thirty-six-shilling pieces; and about his neck was the handkerchief of the deceased. He had with him the bloody stake with which he committed the murder, and immediately confessed the crime, and signed his confession.

He also acknowledged that he had murdered three more men, and had robbed a gentleman on Hounslow Heath of ten pounds. He was a wretch who drew little pity for his fate, and was executed at Salisbury, in August, 1764.

## **RICHARD SWIFT**

### *Transported for Buying Stolen Goods*

Swift was the son of poor people living near St. Luke's Church, Old Street, who gave him some share of education, and bound him apprentice to a turner. During the term of his servitude he associated with a number of abandoned people, who supported themselves by thieving; and, when the period specified in his indenture was expired, he wasted the greatest part of his time in the company of those profligate wretches at an infamous house in Golden Lane.

Swift by some means ingratiated himself into the favour of a brewer, and had the address to interest him so warmly in his behalf, that he put him into a public house in Old Street, which was known by the sign of the Barley Mow, and had been long a receptacle for thieves of every denomination. When Swift commenced landlord he afforded all possible encouragement to his iniquitous customers, who, after spending the day at his house in blasphemy, drunkenness, and riot, constantly departed on the approach of night, in order to commit depredations on the public.

The persons inhabiting the neighbourhood where Swift lived were so dissatisfied with his conduct, and made such frequent complaints of the irregularities committed by his customers, that he was under the necessity of changing his place of abode; and, taking an alehouse near Shoreditch Church, he persisted in his usual course of wickedness, instructing thieves in what manner to obtain booties, frequently assisting in the actual commission of robberies, and constantly receiving the goods stolen by his associates. It is supposed that, before Swift was brought to justice, upwards of twenty men were hanged, and a much greater number transported, whom he had instructed and encouraged in the various arts of thieving; and, though it is known that he was many times committed to Newgate, and the New Gaol, Southwark, for offences of various kinds, he escaped the sentence of the law till he was upwards of fifty years of age.

Swift and some of his associates followed a waggon one evening from Snow Hill to The Cock Inn, Aldersgate Street; where Swift, being known to some of the ostlers, left his accomplices (Fossett, and a Jew named Solomons), giving them directions to steal as many goods from the waggon as they should be able, and bring them to him. Fosset and Solomons concealed themselves in the yard; and, after waiting some time, observed the ostler and wagoner go into the taproom together. They seized this opportunity of robbing the waggon, whence they stole a box containing seventy-two pounds of candles. They carried the box to Bishopsgate Street, where they opened it, but were greatly disappointed upon finding what it contained; for they imagined that they had acquired a valuable booty of plate. They carried the candles to Swift's house; and he gave them a small sum for the stolen goods, in order to encourage them to commit robberies of more consequence.

Fosset being apprehended on suspicion of the above robbery, he was examined by Sir John Fielding, to whom he confessed the particulars of the fact; and Swift having been long known as a daring violator of the laws, it was judged expedient to admit Fosset an evidence for the crown. In consequence of Fosset's information Swift was apprehended, and indicted for purchasing goods knowing them to be stolen. The evidence against him being indisputable, he was convicted, and sentenced to transportation for fourteen years. He had not been in America a month when he

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

embarked as a passenger on board a vessel bound to Liverpool; and, at the expiration of the year 1764, he landed at that town. On his way to London he stopped at Coventry, where he was apprehended, and secured in prison. At the ensuing assizes he was brought to trial before Sir Henry Gould. The record of his former conviction being produced, it appeared that the person who wrote it, in specifying the weight of the candles, had inserted seventy instead of seventy-two. The prisoner, having heard the copy of his conviction read, pointed out the error, and requested the judge to allow him counsel, which was readily granted. After the case had been argued in a very learned manner, the judge declared that the error was fatal to the indictment, and that the prisoner must therefore be acquitted. When Swift was on the point of being discharged, one of Sir John Fielding's men made oath that an accusation was lodged against him for stealing a quantity of cotton in the county of Middlesex. Here upon he was ordered to be conveyed to London. No indictment was found against him for stealing the cotton; but, being put to the bar of the sessions-house in the Old Bailey, the Court ordered him to be transported for the remaining part of his former sentence.

Richard Swift was a second time put on board of one of the transport vessels on the 24th of April, 1766. Since the time of Jonathan Wild the above malefactor was one of the most notorious receivers of stolen goods by which this country has been infested. If such delinquents were to be punished by death, it is beyond a question that great advantages would accrue to the public; for, if thieves were to find a difficulty in disposing of their booties, they would be effectually discouraged from pursuing illegal courses; and those who should be hardy enough to continue them would seldom escape the justice due to their iniquity. Receivers of stolen goods are to be classed among the most infamous species of felons. They encourage robbers, and are therefore accessory to the crimes they commit; they are guilty even of a species of deliberate murder, since the practices they countenance seldom fail to bring the more immediate perpetrators thereof to violent and premature death.

**ELIZABETH BURROUGHS**  
*Executed for Murder, April 4<sup>th</sup>, 1766*

On the trial of this woman it appeared that one Henry Steward, a broker, at Bury St. Edmunds, had taken into his house, in the capacity of servant, a girl named Mary Booty, whose father was then recently deceased, and whose goods had been sold by Steward, in the way of his business. Elizabeth Burroughs had lived as a servant to Steward, but was not then in his employ. Finding that Booty supplied the place that she had formerly filled, fired with jealousy (as she expressed herself), she went, for the purpose of quarrelling with her late master, to his house. For some time there was a general fray among the three; but the man, finding that Burroughs had struck Booty on the head with a hammer, quitted the house, and left the girls together. In the course of the night Mary Booty was found in the street, expiring before Steward's door.

Many circumstances concurred for supposing that she had been thrown out of the window by Burroughs: her skull was fractured, and she was otherwise much beaten and bruised. Yet, under these proofs and corroborative evidence, the hardened wretch, to the last moment, asserted her innocence. Her last words were, 'I know a lie will avail me nothing; I am innocent of the murder for which I suffer.' She was executed at Bury St. Edmunds, April the 4th, 1763.

We do not know a more dangerous step towards the ruin of the peace of mind, in fact, eventually, of every individual of a family, than that of the master becoming familiar with his female servant. No person can read this unhappy case without entertaining the idea of an improper intercourse having taken place between Steward and Burroughs; and, though it appears she had left her ostensible employ, yet it is plain she considered the favours of her master still at her command, and that they were encroached upon by the admission of the deceased. On this point, unfortunately, we find that a grey beard does not always bring wisdom.

**JOHN M'CLOUD**

***Executed for the Murder Of Mr. Stoddard, October 24<sup>th</sup>, 1768***

Though the crime for which this unfortunate youth justly suffered was of the deepest dye, yet his execution excited much commiseration. He was not twenty years of age when he met his untimely and ignominious death, and was apprentice to a glazier; but he gave way to that fatal habit to all apprentices of attending public houses when his master's business was done for the day; when evil example soon caused him to throw off almost all restraint, and he was frequently seen intoxicated when he should have been at work.

This kind of life, everyone knows, is supported at no little cost; and the lost youth is soon driven to some dishonest practice, in order, for a short time, to keep up the enticing, but fatal, career he has begun. Their first plunder is too often upon their masters, because it is done with less danger, and frequently without mistrust. M'Cloud chose the highway for this purpose; and, accompanied by another stripling, who escaped justice, on the 15th of October, 1758, sallied out, armed with knives and bludgeons, on the road leading to Islington. The first unhappy passenger whom they met was Mr. Stoddard, keeper of Clerkenwell Bridewell, returning to the prison from Islington—a man of resolution, and the keeper of robbers. He resisted their attack, and would have secured them both, had they not drawn their knives, and stabbed him many times, when he fell, and the villains ran off, after rifling his pockets. The unfortunate man died of his wounds on the 18th.

M'Cloud alone was apprehended, and, untaught in villainy, confessed his crime; that it was his first attempt to do a dishonest act; and that the murder was involuntary, for that neither his companion nor himself had any such intent. He further said, that he could not say which of them gave the death-wound; but that, finding himself pressed, he drew his knife in his own defence. When brought to the bar of the Old Bailey, it was remarked that so open and honest a countenance, had not often been arraigned there; and his behaviour coincided with his appearance; but what can all this avail in purging so foul a deed?

He was condemned to be hanged, and his body to be delivered to the surgeons for dissection. At the fatal tree he bitterly lamented his folly, and earnestly exhorted all his fellow-apprentices against neglecting their master's employ, which he said would, sooner or later, bring them to an untimely end. He was executed at Tyburn on October the 24th, 1768.

**MICHAEL SAMPSON**

***Forger, whose Death Sentence Was Commuted to  
Transportation because he Had Saved a Nobleman's Servants  
from Drowning***

We give a place to this case from its presenting a singular extension of the royal mercy in the crime of forgery. The greatest interest since this instance has been made in vain for pardon to forgers, particularly for the two brothers, Robert and Daniel Perreau, Dr. William Dodd, and William Wynne Ryland, whose cases we shall hereafter give, and many others.

Michael Sampson was not, in fact, arrived at the estate of man when he committed a forgery, without, perhaps, being aware of the enormity of the crime, and for which he was tried at the Old Bailey, and found guilty. He had received a good education, was brought up to the sea service, and already commanded a merchant vessel; and, young as he was, he was distinguished by the appellation of Captain Sampson. When brought up to the bar, May the 5th, 1764, to receive judgment, on being asked by the clerk of the arraigns, in the usual form, 'Why sentence of death should not be passed upon him?' he thus addressed the Court:—

'My Lords,

'After having voluntarily pleaded guilty, I humbly wait to receive the sentence of the law. Great as my crime is, his majesty's mercy is still greater; and if, in my past conduct, any circumstances have happily appeared, by which I have (under God) been the means of saving the lives of any of his majesty's subjects (and with truth I can say that I have saved above two hundred from perishing), I hope those circumstances will, in some measure, recommend me, a truly sincere penitent, to his royal mercy; and, if it should be his gracious pleasure to save that forfeited life, which before had been the means of saving so many others, the remainder of it shall be spent in a manner becoming the situation of one sensible of that inestimable blessing.

'My lords, I applied to the Court last sessions to put off my trial, in order that I might be able to lay many favorable circumstances before this Court that might incline your lordships to mercy; but, being advised that those circumstances were more proper to be laid before his royal majesty, I confessed that guilt which in conscience I could not deny.

'Your lordships are men; you feel as men; and, perhaps, may now feel some compassion for an unhappy youth, truly penitent, and not yet twenty years of age.

'Permit me, my lords, to add, that, if your lordships, who are now proceeding according to strict law, shall be pleased to render me any compassionate services, that obligation to myself and my worthy relations, now involved in my sufferings, but not in my guilt, will never be forgotten. But, my lords, if, after all, the bitter cup of justice is not to be removed from me, I humbly submit to thy will, O God, in whom I trust.'

A certain nobleman, high in office, several of whose domestics were among the number whom Sampson had been the principal cause of saving from drowning, used all his influence in favour of the wretched youth; and succeeded in first obtaining a respite, and eventually a pardon. The consideration which moved the royal breast to mercy was, doubtless, his having saved the lives of so many fellow. creatures from perishing in the Dublin packet, bound for Ireland; yet still it opened a door to pardon for an offence which never can be endured in a commercial country like Britain.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

When the conditional pardon reached Newgate it was found to include eight unhappy culprits, then under sentence of death, on condition of transportation for life to America; viz. Michael Sampson, William Brown, Richard Bevas, William Bellet, James Wharton, John Boylan, Richard Gray, and John Faulkner; and the following pardoned on condition of transportation for seven years; viz. Richard Jewes, William Manning, William Smith, and Elizabeth Osborne. Sampson being asked in the usual manner, as well as all the rest, whether he would accept his majesty's favour on the above condition, he thus replied:—

'My Lord,

'It is entirely above my comprehension to express the gratitude and thanks I owe for such extraordinary mercy to an unfortunate young man, whose life was forfeited to public justice. I most humbly accept of the proffered terms, and will never cease to pray for the eternal happiness of my most benevolent king, through whose most gracious mercy I now exist.

'Words cannot, my lord, yet my future conduct shall demonstrate, that it may not be amiss sometimes to temper justice with mercy. And I most humbly return your lordship, and this honourable Court, my most grateful thanks for the trouble they have been at, and for their generous behaviour towards me.'

This unfortunate young man was sent to Virginia, pursuant to his sentence of transportation.

**JAMES MURPHY AND JOHN DOGAN**  
*Executed for Being Concerned in Wilkes's Riots, July 11<sup>th</sup>,  
 1768*

The first and most daring mob during these riots was occasioned by the coal-heavers, of which gang were Murphy and Dogan. They demanded an increase of wages; and, because the sailors in the coal-ships would not second their unlawful and exorbitant demand, they were attacked, and various dreadful skirmishes ensued. The rioters then went on board the coal-ships, and obliged the men who were at work to leave off; so that the business of delivering ships in the river was totally at a stand. They complained that their employers, called undertakers, oppressed them in various shapes; curtailed the wages paid to them, not in money, but in liquor and goods of a bad quality; and that those undertakers got fortunes while they and their families were starving.

One day they proceeded, with colours flying and drums beating, towards the Palace Yard, as they said, to lay their complaints before the king; but were met by the justices, with Sir John Fielding at their head, who, with much entreaty, prevailed on them to return. On the 12th of June their insolence arrived to such a height that the military was called in to the assistance of the civil power. The desperadoes even attacked the soldiers, who fired upon them, which killed several rioters, and who, in return, murdered three of their opponents. Twenty of the leaders were secured, and committed to prison.

A monthly publication at the time, on this subject, says, 'The gaols are full of these fellows, who would neither work, nor let others work, so that the business of the river has been greatly obstructed.' Nothing intimidated the rioters, who for some time paraded the streets in large bodies, armed with cutlasses, bludgeons, and other offensive weapons, crying out 'Five pounds for a sailor's head, and twenty for a master's! We'll cut the lightermen's throats, and murder all the masters, burn their houses, and set fire to their ships.' In this daring manner they continued to terrify those concerned at the water-side. The military frequently dispersed them; but no sooner were they retired than the coal-heavers sallied out from their lurking-holes, and continued their riotous practices.

The sessions, however, were at hand, and Murphy and Dogan, two of the most active, who had been secured at the affray wherein the soldiers were killed, were convicted of the murders, sentenced to death, and their bodies to be delivered to the surgeons for dissection. On the morning of their execution, which took place at Tyburn, July the 11th, 1768, a great number of Irish women assembled at Surgeons' Hall, and set up the funeral howl of their country upon the bodies being carried into the hall for dissection, pursuant to the sentence; nor would they disperse until they found no hopes of rescuing their 'dear countrymen,' whose death they insisted was a 'big burning shame.' [Note: Formerly, in the country parts of Ireland, where a corpse is sometimes carried several miles for interment, the women, as the procession passes on the road, set up a mournful cry, which they call *Keening*—a custom now nearly extinct.]

This example intimidated the remainder of the discontented rabble, who were soon glad to be again taken into their former employ. On the 26th of the same month seven more of the riotous coal-heavers, having been tried, found guilty, and

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

condemned at the Old Bailey, were carried from Newgate to the Sun Tavern Fields, the spot of their riot, and executed pursuant to their sentence. The whole of the London constables and peace-officers were, by the sheriffs, ordered to attend the execution. A party of the guards was posted in readiness, in case of any attempt to rescue the culprits; but though more than fifty thousand people, on a moderate calculation, were present at the place of execution, no disturbance happened, and the guards never appeared in sight of them.

**MOSES ALEXANDER*****Executed For Forgery although Innocent, 9<sup>th</sup> August, 1769***

The unhappy man, whose memoirs it is our present task to record, was a native of the city of Glasgow, in North Britain. He was scarcely arrived to manhood when he travelled to London; and for several years he carried a pack about the country, retailing different sorts of goods; but linen was the principal article in which he dealt. He was naturally of an industrious disposition; and his industry procured him success. He made overtures of marriage to a young woman who had two uncles possessed of considerable property; and knowing that they intended to give her a marriage portion, and to make her their heir, he gained credit for a large assortment of linen drapery goods, and opened a warehouse on Fish Street Hill, with a view of giving himself consequence with his intended bride and her wealthy relatives. The young woman's relations, believing Alexander to be in flourishing circumstances, gave their consent to the marriage, which was in a short time solemnized; and soon afterwards he connected himself in partnership with a linen-drapeer in Holborn, named Nicol, who was a man of unblemished integrity, but encumbered with a numerous family and some pecuniary embarrassments.

Mr. Nicol being perfectly conversant in the wholesale branch of the linen trade, it was agreed that he should travel to Manchester, Glasgow, and other places, for the purpose of purchasing goods. Alexander kept the circumstance of his partnership a profound secret from his wife's relations; but, after he had obtained from them several considerable sums, the matter was divulged in the following manner:— One of his wife's uncles happened to be in Alexander's counting-house, when a bill was brought for acceptance, payable by Alexander and Nicol. Hereupon the gentleman upbraided Alexander for concealing from him so material a circumstance as that of his being connected in partnership: the other declared that no partnership subsisted; that Nicol was no more than his servant, and had inserted his own name in the draft either through mistake or villainy. Mr. Nicol returned to London in about two months, when Alexander denied his having a right to part of the business, and said he would submit the decision of the case to the Court of Chancery. Though articles of co-partnership had been regularly executed, Mr. Nicol was averse to involving himself in an expensive suit of law, which he feared his circumstances would not enable him to support; and therefore he declined engaging in a tedious contention with a man who had treated him in so injurious a manner.

The difference between Nicol and Alexander took place in the summer of 1765; and about eight months afterwards the latter, who had quitted his house on Fish Street Hill, and opened a warehouse in Tooley Street, Southwark, failed to the amount of about sixty thousand pounds; and it was then publicly known that he was the principal of a great number of retail shops established in different parts of the town, under a variety of names; and it was considered as an extraordinary circumstance that, with a capital so very inadequate to the extensive trade into which he had launched, he should be able to support his credit for so long a period: but the public surprise abated when it was discovered that he had chiefly depended on the circulation of notes of hand and bills of exchange. Some time having elapsed, he engaged again in business, and a second failure took place, though for a sum greatly inferior to the claims of his former creditors. He had now no expectations of assistance from his wife's relations; but he contrived means for establishing himself again in business, which he was the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

better enabled to carry on by means of notes of hand being frequently lent him by a man named Brown. Brown was in France towards the end of the year 1768; and about that time he became connected with one Aked, of Leeds, in Yorkshire, whose notes he passed for the support of his drooping credit in the manner that he had formerly negotiated those of Brown.

Alexander had borrowed eighty pounds on a note of Aked's, indorsed in the name of Brown, for ninety-eight pounds, six shillings; and it not being paid when due, he gave Mr. Fryar, who had advanced the money, another note, as collateral security, assuring him that in a few days the notes should be redeemed. At length Fryar accused Alexander of forgery; and he was committed to Newgate. He was acquitted on indictments found against him for two other offences of a similar nature; but, though several witnesses swore the writing was not the prisoner's, he was convicted of forging the indorsement on the bill for ninety-eight pounds, six shillings. Brown would have proved the most material witness; and, had he been in England, the prisoner would, perhaps, have derived great advantage from his evidence. The behaviour of Alexander in Newgate was such as could on no account be disapproved in a man under his unhappy circumstances; and he entertained strong hopes of being considered as an object of the royal mercy. From a variety of circumstances great numbers of people believed him to be innocent of the fact; and very powerful interest was made for preserving his life.

On the morning appointed for his execution he was respited for a week: before the expiration of that time, and it being represented that messengers were gone to France in search of Brown, he was respited for a week longer. Brown's affidavit was brought from France, expressing that he wrote the indorsement that Alexander had been charged with forging. The affidavit being carried to his majesty at Richmond, he was pleased to refer the matter to Lord Weymouth; but his lordship's interference could not be obtained, he being then at his country seat. The sheriffs attended at Newgate the next morning, in order to conduct the prisoner to the place of execution. He informed them that his friends were gone to Richmond, to make a second application to the king; and they consented to defer their melancholy office till the issue of the intercession should be known. No further respite being obtained, the prisoner was taken from Newgate about half past twelve o'clock, attended by a dissenting minister, with whom he prayed in an earnest and devout manner. At the place of execution his behaviour was decent and composed; and he persisted in the declaration of his innocence till the last moments of his life. Moses Alexander was executed at Tyburn about half past two in the afternoon of the 9th of August, 1769.

The imprudence of Alexander in launching into a trade too extensive for his capital to support produced a train of difficulties that ended in an ignominious death. His conduct in regard to Mr. Nicol proved him to be divested of all principles of integrity; and certain it is that in several instances he was guilty of forgery, and other unjustifiable practices; but whether he committed the offence of which he was convicted is a question that we pretend not to decide. We are aware that, if legal decisions were to be frequently reversed, the reverence that is due to the law would be highly endangered; but in cases of a doubtful nature reason and humanity will justify the suspension of a convict's sentence till his criminality shall be more clearly proved. We mean not to insinuate the least reflection against the sheriffs, who acted perfectly consistent with the duties of their office; but we cannot avoid observing that it was a most unfortunate circumstance for Alexander (because, had Brown personally

## SUPPLEMENT 2

acknowledged the indorsement on the day of trial, an acquittal must have necessarily ensued) that, in the absence of the secretary of state, one or more of the judges had not power to determine whether Brown's affidavit was of sufficient authority to leave the convict's fate in suspense till his guilt or innocence could be more satisfactorily ascertained.

**CHARLES DAVID MORGAN, DAVID MORGAN,  
WILLIAM SPIGGOT, WILLIAM WALTER EVAN,  
WILLIAM MORRIS, AND DAVID LEWELLIN**  
*Executed for the Murder Of Mr. Powell, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 1770*

This was a murder of so unprovoked, premeditated, daring, and cruel a nature, that every reader must be shocked at the recital. For a man to have his house beset by a troop of villains, for the sole purpose of assassinating him, in a country famed for laws and the protection of persons and property, surprised every individual of the nation; and each circumstance connected with this dreadful tale serves to increase its horror. This crime was premeditated by one William Williams, a mercer, at Llandovery, in Carmarthenshire; and there is too much reason to fear that the wife consented to the murder of the husband: at all events, the accounts of the transaction would warrant such suspicion.

It appeared that William Powell, Esq. a gentleman of good estate, resided at Glanareath, in the parish of Llangaddock, in Carmarthenshire, in Wales. For some time he lived on bad terms with his wife, to whom he allowed a separate maintenance of one hundred pounds a year, and placed the children at a boarding-school near London. Mrs. Powell (a fatal step, too often taken by repudiated wives) incessantly railed against her husband, and, opening her complaints to Williams, urged him to assist her in taking away the children from under their father's care. This infatuated man accordingly accompanied Mrs. Powell to the school; and they had address enough to prevail upon the master to give them up the children, which Williams immediately placed into another, pointed out by the mother. Mr. Powell being soon apprized of these proceedings, he applied for his children; but their new master replied that he had received them from Mr. Williams, and that to him alone could he deliver them.

The Court of King's Bench was now moved for an habeas corpus, and Williams was served with a rule to show cause 'Why he should not deliver up the children to the father?' but of this serious proceeding Williams took no notice, until he was served with an attachment for a contempt of Court. This writ being sent to the sheriff for execution, Williams absconded, and formed the diabolical determination of revenging Mr. Powell's proceedings against him in the Court by his death. Failing in different attempts to shoot him, this remorseless villain tampered with a number of poor and ignorant Welshmen, to assist him in the horrid deed. This gang, according to the confession of one of them, consisted, altogether, of fourteen, of the following description:

William Williams, the instigator, of Llandovery, escaped.  
Charles David Morgan, labourer, executed.  
William Charles Morgan, his son, acquitted.  
William Spiggot, a barber, executed.  
William Morris, a saddler, executed.  
John Spiggot, a servant, brother to William, acquitted.  
William Walter Evans, labourer, executed.  
David Morgan, an itinerant tinker, executed.  
Walter Evan, his apprentice, executed.  
William Thomas, a glover, admitted evidence for the crown.\*

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Thomas Drayn, labourer, escaped.  
John Isaac, ditto, escaped.  
Morgan James, a pedlar, escaped;  
and another ruffian, called Captain Bowen, of Kel-y-Cwm, escaped.

[\*Note: William Thomas soon met the fate of his companions, whom he now appeared against, as evidence for the public; for we find, in a note of Welsh Criminal Records, that on the 18th of September, 1773, little more than three years after the murder of Mr. Powell, this identical William Thomas was hanged at Pensarn, in Carmarthenshire, for a highway robbery.]

This horrid gang, in the evening, when Mr. Powell was sitting with his family, broke into his house in disguise, and murdered him with a ferocious cruelty too shocking to relate. The trial of that part of this gang who were apprehended came on at the city of Hereford, where they were removed by writ of habeas corpus, before Sir Joseph Yates, one of the judges of the Court of King's Bench.

A case so very extraordinary, in fact scarcely paralleled in the annals of criminal history, drew together the people from all parts of the county. Charles David Morgan, David Morgan, William Spiggot, William Walter Evan, William Morris, and David Lewellin, were found guilty: the evidence did not reach some, and the remainder of this horrid gang escaped from justice. The following speech of the judge, on passing sentence, will amply show the nature of their crime:—

'You (naming the prisoners) have been tried, and, upon evidence that leaves not the smallest doubt, have now been found guilty of the most wicked, the most savage, the most horrid murder that ever stained the hand of man—a cool, deliberate, preconcerted assassination! without a quarrel to provoke, without a passion to incite, without a motive to tempt you but the blackest that ever disgraced human nature—a willingness to earn the wages of iniquity, the execrable wages of a hireling assassin. And how hardened, how determined, were the preparations you made for that bloody work! Day after day projecting the design, till, at last, deliberately putting on the ruffian's frock, and blackened face, you daringly entered the doors of the deceased; and, in his own house, murdered him, most inhumanly murdered him, with every circumstance of savage barbarity! yet he had never done the least injury to you, not the smallest provocation of offence.

'That unfortunate man is now in his grave, and in two days you will be as cold and lifeless as he. But how different will be your departure! By your bloody hand he was wickedly murdered. You for that murder will justly die. It is now my duty to pronounce that dreadful sentence; an office which to me is ever painful. I feel for the melancholy condition you are in, who are so soon to die by the hands of justice; but how little did you feel for the poor man you murdered!

'Friday next, the day after to-morrow, will in this world be your last: but think of the more dreadful day to come, when you will appear before a far more awful tribunal, before the Great Judge of all mankind. Think how you will stand before him, covered over with the blood of your fellow-creature, whom you so wickedly murdered, most daringly presuming to destroy that life which the Almighty gave, and which He alone had a right to take away.

'You have now but two days to live, and in that short time have much work to do. I therefore most earnestly entreat you to employ every moment that is left you in

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

imploing God's mercy and forgiveness, that your soul may escape that dreadful punishment which lasts through all eternity. At this bar you must expect no mercy.

'The sentence of the law will most certainly be executed upon you; and that sentence is, 'That you must be taken from hence to the place from whence you came; and from thence, on Friday next, to the place of execution; that you be there hanged by the neck till you are dead; and that your bodies afterwards be delivered to the surgeons, to be dissected. And the Lord have mercy on your souls!'

They were executed accordingly, amid the execrations of a vast concourse of spectators, at Hereford, March the 30th, 1770.

**JOHN STRETTON*****Executed for Robbing the Mail, 1<sup>st</sup> August, 1770***

This unhappy man was descended of respectable parents, who gave him a liberal education; nor did any circumstance arise to throw blame on his character till the discovery of the crime which cost him his life. He was apprenticed to a grocer in London, and served his time with a degree of fidelity that would have done credit to any servant; and he appeared to gain the general good opinion of those who were acquainted with him. At the expiration of his apprenticeship he went to live as a journeyman to a grocer in Bishopsgate Street, where he still maintained a fair character, and continued in this station several years, during which he married, and had a daughter; but his wife died a considerable time before the perpetration of the fact which rendered him a fatal victim to the violated laws of his country.

Mr. Stretton, having by his frugality accumulated a sum of money, opened a shop in Bishopsgate Street on his own account, and had every reasonable prospect of success; for so regular had been his conduct, and so irreproachable was his character, that not any person in his own way of business refused to give him credit to any reasonable amount. Unhappily, however, he had not long embarked in trade before his ruin ensued, from a cause which one would have thought very unlikely to produce it. Having conceived a design of advancing himself in life by a second marriage, and a butcher in the neighbourhood being reputed worth a considerable sum of money, he paid his addresses to his daughter, who was so well pleased with him, that she did not hesitate to make a declaration in his favour; but the father, unwilling to part with any money, as a portion for his daughter, resolved not to give his consent, because Mr. Stretton was not in circumstances of independence. In the meantime the lovers contrived frequent opportunities of seeing each other, and the young woman repeatedly informed Mr. Stretton with the determination of her father. Chagrined by this circumstance, and resolved to remove the objection which seemed to arise from his presumed poverty, he made the dreadful resolution of robbing the mail.

He had not, however, for some time an opportunity of carrying his intention into execution; for he was seized with a severe fit of illness, which confined him to his bed for some weeks, during which time he was frequently visited by the girl whom he had courted, and also by her mother, who was a warm friend to the proposed marriage. At length he recovered his health in a very considerable degree; on which he resolved to complete, if possible, the plan which had so long agitated his mind. In pursuance hereof he took an opportunity, when his shopman was in bed, one Saturday night, to quit the house, and go as far as the City Road, between Islington and London, where he awaited the arrival of the northern mail, which came opposite Peerless Pool about two o'clock in the morning. Stretton, observing the postboy coming up, stopped the mail, and took out such bags as he thought proper; after which he went into Moorfields, where he examined the contents of the bags, and, selecting such bills and notes as he considered most valuable, left the bags behind him, and retired to his own house.

As soon as the robbery was made known at the post-office, the Post master-General offered by advertisement, as is usual on such occasions, a reward of two hundred pounds for the apprehension of the robber: but nothing transpired in the course of several weeks; and it is probable that the offender might have remained much longer undetected but for the following circumstance. Stretton still continued to

pay his addresses to the butcher's daughter; but her father, unwilling that she should marry a man in low or doubtful circumstances, was continually talking to Stretton on the subject of money matters; till at length the latter was so imprudent as to show him the drafts in his possession, and even to send a porter to Mr. Boldero's, the banker, for the acceptance of one of them, that no doubt might remain of their being good notes: but the porter had no sooner presented the bill than he was detained, and a peace-officer, and other persons, were sent in search of Mr. Stretton, whom they found at his own house. They inquired how he came to be possessed of the note in question; to which he replied that he had taken it in the course of business from a person in Bond Street, who was in his debt. This story did not seem to be credited: however, a coach was called, and the parties went together to Bond Street, in search of the person who was said to have paid the bill: but no such man could be found; on which the suspicions against Stretton being greatly strengthened, he was conveyed to the house of Sir John Fielding, who committed him to Newgate, to abide the event of a trial.

Objections being made by counsel to the putting him on his trial at the first and second sessions after his commitment, it was accordingly brought on at the third. [Note: It ought to be mentioned, to the credit of our courts of justice, that the slightest argument, which has but the appearance of reason, is sufficient to influence the Bench in favour of the prisoner.]

When Mr. Stretton was put on his trial, full proof arose that the drafts and notes which had been taken out of the mail were found in his house; and, as he could give no probable account how they came into his possession, there was a strong presumptive, amounting almost to positive, proof that he had himself committed the robbery; for it appeared evident to the jury that a tradesman, who had taken these bills and notes in the common course of business, could have accounted for the manner in which he became possessed of them, or at least the greater part of them. After a full deliberation on the case, the jury did not hesitate to pronounce him guilty, the consequence of which was that he received sentence of death.

After conviction he was regular in his attendance on the offices of divine worship; but no arguments that were made use of could prevail on him to acknowledge his guilt, and he steadily persisted in a denial of the justice of his sentence. Notwithstanding this, he appeared exceedingly penitent for all the faults which he had ever committed; and declared that he expected salvation only through the merits of the Redeemer of mankind: but, with regard to robbing the mail, he insisted that he had never been guilty of it; and that he detested the thought of such an execrable baseness, and was totally innocent of the crime alleged against him. These declarations he repeatedly made; and on the morning of execution, when he was called down to the Press-yard, to have his irons knocked off, he was urged by the Ordinary of Newgate to make an explicit confession of the crime; but, far from doing so, he still avowed his perfect innocence. He was attended to the place of execution by immense crowds of people, who wished to hear the dying words of a man to be executed for so capital a crime, for which he would never acknowledge the justice of that verdict by which he had been condemned. This unhappy man suffered at Tyburn on the 1st of August, 1770.

Many people have thought it impossible, and indeed humanity would suppose it so, for any man to die with a lie in his mouth; but in the case of Stretton it will be very hard to form an opinion in his favour; for, if he did not obtain the notes and drafts by robbing the mail, how did he procure them?—If he could have given an

## SUPPLEMENT 2

honest account how he became possessed of them—if he could, as Shakspeare emphatically phrases it, have delivered 'a round unvarnished tale'—it would have been almost impossible that he should have been convicted; for the jurymen of this country (to their honour be it recorded) are exceedingly tender of the lives of their fellow-citizens. The presumption then, in this particular case, is very strong that the malefactor must have denied his crime from a species of pride altogether unwarrantable. We would not wish to be thought severe or uncharitable in our conjectures; but it is improbable that any man could have been possessed of the contents of a mail, which had been robbed, without knowing how they came into his possession. His sending the draft to the banker's for acceptance is a proof of the most egregious folly; for he must have been morally certain that his messenger would be stopped, and that his own detection would inevitably ensue. If we suppose that his love induced him to take this dangerous step, we should recollect that he had been married before, and was therefore the less likely to have been involved in a passion so violent as to tempt him to so dangerous an experiment. Upon the whole, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, the presumption is very strong that this man was in distressed circumstances, which he sought to repair by marriage; but, finding his hopes at least postponed, he took the most dangerous method imaginable to repair his shattered fortunes. It is astonishing that, during his sickness, he should not have had recollection enough to induce him to desist from carrying into execution the dangerous plan he had formed. In general sickness is productive of thoughts more serious than those which attend us in perfect health; but the whole of this unhappy man's conduct should teach us to pray continually for the assisting grace of God, that we may not be led into temptation, but delivered from all the evils that surround us; so that, after a short passage through this troublesome world, we may be received into the arms of eternal mercy!

**RICHARD MORGAN**  
*Executed for Privately Stealing, 27<sup>th</sup> May, 1772*

Illustration: [Morgan at the club](#)

This malefactor was a native of Ellesmere, in Shropshire, descended of poor parents, whose virtuous characters were the greatest part of their possession. They bestowed on him as good an education as their circumstances would admit, and were careful to instruct him in the duties of religion. When he grew towards years of maturity he entered into the service of a farmer in the neighbourhood, with whom he lived near three years with an unblemished reputation. After this he engaged to serve other farmers in different parts of England, continuing to labour as a husbandman till he became almost two-and-twenty years of age, and then repaired to London, in order to obtain subsistence by his honest endeavours. He had not been long in town before he entered into the service of Mr. Hotchkin, a capital linen-draper near Smithfield Bars. His principal business was to carry out parcels, and his behaviour was such, for a considerable time, as entitled him to the approbation of his master.

At length he was unfortunate enough to become acquainted with the servant of a distiller in the neighbourhood, who introduced him into a set of company which led to his ruin. Morgan had been hitherto remarkable for his sobriety; but a fatal change soon took place. The distiller's servant was one of a low alehouse club, of which Morgan became a member: and each of the company paid fourpence halfpenny for his evening's expenses in beer and tobacco. It was in this club that the first taint appears to have been given to Morgan's morals. Some of the company, who were chiefly porters, used to boast how considerably they defrauded their masters, and even mentioned the names of the parties to whom they sold the stolen effects. For some time Morgan appeared shocked at the idea of obtaining money by such a violation of the laws of duty and integrity, and actually absented himself from the club; but at length the servant of the distiller prevailed on him to rejoin the company, which he did, but with a reserve in his own mind that he would not be concerned in any of their iniquitous transactions. These good resolutions, however, did not last any considerable time; for his companions, wishing him to enter into their practices, artfully took him to the house of the man who received the stolen goods, where he saw such various articles which porters had stolen from their masters, and remained undetected, that he was but too easily induced to commence the illicit practice.

His mind being thus prepared for acts of dishonesty, he soon began to purloin his master's effects, which he stole in considerable quantities; and as Mr. Hotchkin had a very large stock, and dealt in the wholesale trade, the articles could not be easily missed, so that he had an opportunity of continuing his depredations for a considerable space of time; and, indeed, when the articles were at length missed, no one suspected Morgan to be the thief, as his character had been hitherto irreproachable, and his behaviour such as to entitle him to general respect. His custom was to convey the stolen goods to a stable in Durham Yard, Chick Lane, where they were deposited till the usual purchaser came, and bought them, and carried them off. Morgan's practices in this way were so considerable, that his companions of the club

## SUPPLEMENT 2

began to look on him as a proper agent for disposing of such goods as should be stolen by others; but this plan was defeated almost as soon as it was formed.

Mr. Hotchkin at length discovering that he had been robbed, and that the depredations had been frequently renewed, and observing that not any person had broken into his house, he concluded that the robber must be one who lived in the family. In consequence hereof a person was appointed to watch the motions of Morgan; and on his going out he was followed to a house, whence he took several parcels to an inn, to be carried by the Birmingham waggon. Inquiry being made into the affair, it was discovered that Morgan had a considerable quantity of goods destined for the same place; and these, being examined, were found to be the property of Mr. Hotchkin, whose marks were on the several pieces; on which the offender was taken into custody, and carried before a magistrate. On his examination he denied having been guilty of the crime alleged against him; but, as the presumptive evidence of the fact was too strong to allow of his being dismissed, he was committed to Newgate, till the ensuing sessions at the Old Bailey, that his guilt or innocence might abide the award of a jury.

On his trial the evidence against him was so conclusive that no hesitation could be made to find him guilty, and judgment of death passed of course. After conviction he acknowledged to the Ordinary of Newgate the justice of his sentence, and owned that he had defrauded his master of goods to a considerable amount. He was constant and regular in his devotions, both in the chapel and in his cell; nor did he seem to entertain a hope of that mercy which he had no right to expect. When he was told that his name was included in the warrant for execution, he received the dreadful news with great composure; and confessed that he had merited the shocking fate that awaited him. He behaved even with pious resignation, and acknowledged that faith in the merits of Christ by which poor sinners are to expect salvation. He was visited after conviction by a number of people who had known him in the former part of life, and who kindly assisted him in his solemn preparations for eternity. He received the sacrament on the morning of his death, and repeated the declarations he had formerly made of his guilt. At the fatal tree he addressed himself to the surrounding multitude, earnestly desiring servants not to defraud their employers. He prayed in the most earnest manner, and so audibly as to be heard by great numbers who attended his fatal exit. After the body had hung the customary time it was delivered to his friends, in order to its being buried as they might think proper. Richard Morgan suffered at Tyburn on the 27th of May, 1772.

From the case of this unfortunate man persons in a dependent situation should principally learn two things; viz. never to injure their masters; and by all means to avoid any connexion with low company at alehouses, as the keeping such company may insensibly involve them in expenses which may lead to the commitment of acts of dishonesty. Honest countrymen are generally too fond of repairing to London, in the vain hope of making that fortune which very few of them ever acquire; and perhaps those who do might be more happy in their native fields, undisturbed with the cares of the busy world. It is not every man that grows rich that becomes happy of course; and perhaps the contrary is more generally the case. Upon the whole, we should learn resignation to the will of Providence, and be taught the great doctrine of being content in any station in which we may be placed:—

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

'Life's but a short chase; our game's consent  
Which most pursued is most compelled to fly  
And he that mounts him on the swiftest hope  
Shall often run his courser to a stand;  
While the poor peasant, on some distant hill,  
Undangered, and at ease, views all the sport,  
And sees content take shelter in his cottage.'

SHAKESPEARE

*(sic—actually these lines are by Colley Cibber)*

**EDWARD BIRCH AND MATTHEW MARTIN**  
*Executed for Forgery, 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 1772*

The first-mentioned of these malefactors, Birch, was the son of very respectable parents, and born at Hereford; and, after having received a very liberal education, he served as a lieutenant in the militia during the war. Being concerned in a matter respecting a family estate, the right of which was litigating in the Court of Chancery, he came to London in the year 1766; and as his business obliged him to stay in town for a considerable time, and being of a scheming turn of mind, and possessed of ready money, he determined to employ it in some manner that he thought would prove advantageous. While he was deliberating on the best method of disposing of his cash, he became acquainted with a person named Cobb, a mechanic of singular ingenuity, who had contrived a machine for the catching of fish in much greater numbers than by the usual methods. Mr. Cobb was not in circumstances to carry his plan into execution, yet was exceedingly anxious to reap the fruits of his ingenuity. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that he readily embraced an offer of partnership with Birch, who was able to lay down the sum that might be wanted for the completion of the scheme. This being the situation of both parties, the partnership of course ensued, the terms of which were very advantageous to Birch. Mr. Cobb having procured a patent to secure to him the sole emoluments to arise from his scheme, Birch advanced the money to pay for it, and a farther sum to fit out a vessel, which was sent to sea under the immediate direction of Cobb. This step was intended merely to ascertain the success that was likely to attend the scheme; but, as the first trial exceeded the most sanguine expectations of either party, Birch formed the ungenerous design of becoming sole proprietor of the patent. With this view he found a pretence to quarrel with Cobb. The scheme did not take complete effect; but the partnership was dissolved on the following terms, viz. 'That Birch should be allowed the use of Cobb's machine to fish with till such time as the money owing to him was paid; while Cobb was to carry on the fishery in what manner he thought proper.'

This agreement took place in the year 1768; and Cobb, being now reduced to very low circumstances, embarked for Denmark, where he continued many months. Birch, in the meantime, flattered himself with the hope of obtaining a very considerable fortune by the new project; and at this period he married a girl, with whom he received a fortune of five hundred pounds. During Mr. Cobb's absence from England Birch went to South Wales, where he engaged in the business of the fishery, which, for some months, was attended with as great success as could have been expected. In order to dispose to advantage of the fish thus taken, an agent was employed to sell them in London; and they were regularly sent up in machines constructed for bringing them with expedition, and without injury. It happened that a quarrel arose between Birch and the person who was his agent, respecting the punctuality of payments; on which the latter was arrested by Birch; but he instantly gave bail to the action, and then prevailed on a rope-maker to arrest Mr. Birch. These matters were litigated with the utmost warmth and imprudence on both sides; till at length Birch found himself so embarrassed by the expenses of law that he was obliged to take refuge in a prison. [Note: Surely no man in his senses would deliberately embark in law. How many instances do we see of the lawyers swallowing up the whole property! It is better for a man to submit to an injury than to be stripped of all he has in the world, as is but too frequently the case.]

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

The business of his fishery was now wholly neglected, and at length he determined to take the benefit of an insolvent act; and it is said that he was perjured in this matter, swearing that he was in Ireland at the time prescribed by law, though he had not been out of this kingdom; but this we do not aver as a fact, unwilling to load the unfortunate, and the deceased, with the imputation of crimes which possibly they may never have committed: and we are the more diffident of admitting the alleged crime in this particular case, because it is probable that, if Birch had been perjured, he would have been prosecuted with the utmost severity of the law. Be this as it may, he was now in circumstances of great distress,—having no other support for himself and his wife than what arose from the casual bounty of his friends. We are told that, for a year after he was cleared by the act for the relief of insolvent debtors, he was perpetually devising schemes to raise money, some of which were not the most laudable: and that at length he engaged in a forgery, not less extraordinary in the design than fatal in its consequences.

It happened that Sir Andrew Chadwick, who was one of the band of gentlemen pensioners, was in possession of estates to a very considerable amount. Sir Andrew, having attained a very great age, had repeatedly drawn his will, at distant periods, but had not signed his name to any will that he had made, though there were many copies of what he intended to have done for his relations and immediate heirs at law. Birch becoming acquainted with a woman who had found one of the wills in an old trunk that had been the property of Sir Andrew, the former seemed to think, on the perusal of it, that some emolument might arise from the possession of this paper.

In a short time afterwards Sir Andrew died; and, no will regularly executed being found, a gentleman of Lancashire, who had married a niece of the deceased, took possession of his fortune, in defect of claim being made by any nearer relation. In the meantime Birch made diligent inquiry after the relations of Sir Andrew, and at length found that one of them, who lived in Ireland, had a better title to the estate than the person who was then in possession of it. With a view to make a private advantage, Birch made known his discovery to Matthew Martin, the other subject of this melancholy narrative. Martin was a watch maker by profession, and in easy circumstances. He advanced a sum of money to enable Birch to go to Ireland, and find out the right heir to the estate. Birch set out on this expedition; and, having found more than one claimant, he returned to London, and made a new will in the name of the deceased, conveying the fortune to the Irish relations. This being done, Birch and Martin submitted the forged will to the inspection of an attorney; and it was agreed to commence an action for recovery against the gentleman who was in possession of the estate.

It appeared that the presumptive will had been dated in the year 1764; but some drafts of wills made since that time by Sir Andrew Chadwick being found among the papers of the deceased, a suspicion arose that a forgery had been committed in the business; on which Birch and Martin were taken into custody, and carried to Sir John Fielding's office, where Birch's behaviour was plausible in a very high degree; and he gave such an account of his becoming possessed of the will as would have satisfied persons not aware of the knavery of mankind. Several persons attended at the office, ready to bail Birch and Martin; but the magistrate refused to accept of any bail, and committed the prisoners to Newgate. In the interim between the commitment and the trial, one of the most extraordinary circumstances happened that was ever recorded in a work of this nature. A paper-maker, who lived at

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Maidstone, being in town on his private business, fell into company with the attorney who was employed to carry on the prosecution; and, the conversation happening to turn on the circumstances of the presumed forgery, he begged to have a sight of the will, which at this time being in the hands of Sir John Fielding, the attorney took him to the office of that magistrate, where the will was presented to him; and no sooner had he taken a view of it than he declared that, in the year 1768, he had made the paper on which that very will was written.

The trial of the prisoners was brought on at the ensuing session of gaol delivery at the Old Bailey. The paper-maker above mentioned was an evidence, and the most material one, on the trial; for he proved that the paper had a mark upon it, which he himself invented in the year 1768, and he positively swore that the paper was of his own manufacture. Though there were several collateral proofs of the fact, yet they would not have been of sufficient weight to convict the prisoners but for this positive evidence of the paper-maker. Birch cross-examined the witnesses in such a manner as proved that he was a man of subtlety and address; but, notwithstanding all his artifices, both the prisoners were found guilty, after a trial which continued thirteen hours. The counsel for the convicts moved an arrest of judgment on the last day of the sessions, founded on a point of law presumed to have arisen in their favour. No objection being made to this motion, the sentence was postponed till the final opinion of the learned judges had been taken on the case. This case was learnedly argued before the judges (nine of whom were present) at Sergeants' Inn Hall, in Michaelmas term, 1771; when the reverend bench were unanimous in opinion that the convicts were guilty of the crime alleged against them; in consequence of which they were condemned to die.

After sentence of death was passed on them they behaved with a decent and devout resignation to their fate; for, not entertaining the least hope of that pardon which could not reasonably be expected, they made every preparation for the awful change that was to await them. On the day of execution they were fervent in their devotions at the fatal tree; and, after the customary ceremonies on such solemn occasions, they were turned off. After hanging the usual time, their bodies were delivered to their friends in order to be buried. These unhappy men suffered at Tyburn on the 2d of January, 1772.

The intervention of Providence in the detection of guilt is most strongly exhibited in the case of these malefactors. Who could have conceived that the discovery of forgery should have arisen from a circumstance so apparently trifling as the writing a presumptive will on one sheet of paper rather than on another? Yet so it happened. Little did the forger think, when he purchased the sheet of paper, that it was to be the immediate instrument of his own destruction! We have had many opportunities, in the course of this work, of remarking on the horrid nature and dangerous consequences of forgery; but nothing has equalled the particularity of the cases of Birch and Martin, and perhaps such an instance may not occur again for an age: yet surely this ought to afford a lesson of the highest caution, never to be guilty of a crime which leads to such certain and absolute destruction. In the affair of the malefactors in question their counsel started an objection, which left their case to the consideration of the judges. Very few cases have we known where the opinions of the judges differed from those of the juries of this country. In fact, the juries, according to the construction of our laws, and in the eye of reason, are the true judges of the fact, the essential declarers of the guilt or innocence of the party accused. Notwithstanding

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

this, we ought to think ourselves happy in the tender exertion of our legislative power. When one jury has found a man guilty, the slightest error, real or accidental, will entitle his case to the retrospection of a second—that of the venerable bench of judges, who cannot be supposed to be biassed by any interest, to be influenced by any consideration, to give their opinions in favour of either party, contrary to the established rules of right, and the known laws of the land. Upon the whole, we have a claim to triumph in the protection afforded us by the laws; and those who wilfully transgress them ought to be punished in the most exemplary manner.

**WILLIAM EDWARDS WHITE**  
*Executed for Murder, 25<sup>th</sup> October, 1772*

The cruelty and depravity of this villain alone deserve notice in our Criminal Catalogue. He first broke his oath to God, that he would faithfully serve his king, as a good soldier; then deserted the service of his country; and, thus let loose upon the public, he fell to plundering and murdering the innocent traveller. How many were his victims, or to what amount he had plundered, does not appear; for he was a hardened villain, denying at the very gallows the murder which we shall now proceed to relate. On the 10th of September, preceding his execution, the body of a man was found near the public house called the Hampshire Hog, on the Hammersmith road, near London. The skull was fractured in a shocking manner, and the pockets of the deceased were found rifled of all their contents. Suspicion soon fell upon the soldier who had been, seen lurking about the neighbourhood, and White was therefore apprehended, and committed to Newgate.

On Friday, the 20th of October, 1773, he was brought to his trial at the Old Bailey; and, without a doubt remaining in the mind of the jury, they found him guilty. Being convicted of murder, execution must follow within forty-eight hours; and, in order to give the unhappy culprits as much time as possible to make their peace with the Almighty, they are generally tried on a Friday, and, Sunday being by the law deemed *dies non*, execution cannot take place until the day after; and the Monday subsequent to the conviction of White was the anniversary of the accession to the throne of King George III. A writer of the time says, 'It is remarkable, that, since the 25th of October, 1760 (the accession), no man had been hanged on that day, in London, except a murderer, who then suffered death at the end of Bow Street, Covent Garden.

White was executed at Tyburn, October the 25th, 1773, and died an obdurate and unrepenting sinner, acknowledging the robbery, but denying the murder.

Two days after his execution the same gallows suspended five well-looking and penitent men, whose fate caused very different sensations in the breasts of the spectators. These men were

Thomas Ashby and Edward Lundy M'Donald, for a burglary in the house of Mr. Edmund Bailey, in Oxford Street, and stealing therefrom a quantity of plate and other effects.

William Cox, for stealing bank notes and cash to the amount of four hundred and forty pounds, the property of Mr. Kendrick, in Oxford Street.

Emanuel Peel, for breaking into the house of William Bakewell, Esq. in Jermyn Street, and stealing thereout a quantity of plate, and other valuable articles;

and John Sterling, for forging a will, purporting to be the last testament of Elizabeth Shooter, with an intent to defraud the South Sea Company of three hundred and fifty pounds.

Their behaviour was very devout, and Sterling was remarkably penitent. Just before Cox was turned off he whispered something to Mr. Toll, who acted as Ordinary, and who, with a loud and distinct voice, acquainted the spectators 'that William Cox begged their prayers; that he acknowledged he committed the crime for which he was about to suffer, and hoped that God would receive his soul.' On this the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

dying man expressed much consolation, and the people cried 'Amen.' A proof that these unfortunate men were respected and pitied on their journey to eternity appears from a circumstance somewhat unusual, of both the sheriffs, with their under-sheriffs, attending on horseback, and two men in black scarfs and hatbands, and with black staves in their hands, walking before the carts which conveyed the prisoners to the place of execution, where they were allowed an hour and a half in their devotions—a circumstance not then remembered. Mourning-hearses attended, to take away the bodies of Cox and Sterling; and the others were delivered to their friends. The concourse of people on this occasion, and the awfulness of the scene, were unparalleled.

**ROBERT POWEL**  
*Executed for Forgery, 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 1772*

This unhappy victim to the violated laws of his country was a native of Merioneth, in North Wales. His parents were poor people, but were distinguished by the honesty and regularity of their conduct. They educated him as well as their circumstances would permit them; and then sent him to London, in the hope that he might be able to advance himself in life. Powel had not been long in town before he obtained the place of a shopman, in the service of a tradesman of reputation. In this station his behaviour was so unexceptionable, and there was so much of gracefulness in his person and manner, that his master soon raised his wages, and sought every opportunity of promoting his interest: indeed every person in the family was pleased with the decorum that appeared in all his behaviour; which was laid down as a rule of conduct that ought to be observed and copied by the other servants. By an even and steady course of frugality Powel saved money enough to embark in business for himself; and, on the death of his master, he courted the sister of Mr. Taylor Barrow, who held a place of some importance in the Custom-house. Mr. Barrow, exclusive of his place, carried on a considerable business; and Mr. Powel, having engaged in trade, was as successful as the most sanguine of his friends could have wished him to be; and, in general, was looked upon to be a young man in a thriving way of business. In fact, he was soon in very flourishing circumstances, and his success induced him, contrary to the advice of his friends, to take a large farm a few miles from the metropolis; which took up more of his time and attention than it can be presumed a tradesman could spare from his business; so that the wonder will be less that ruin should ensue.

Having involved himself by undertaking too many concerns, he was reduced in circumstances, and determined on the commission of that forgery which cost him his life. His brother-in-law, Mr. Taylor Barrow, was possessed of very considerable property in the East-India stock. Powel being apprized of this, and knowing that stock bore a very high price at that time, forged his name to an order for the selling out four hundred pounds. This being done, he went to a coffee-house, and inquired for a broker. The master of the house recommended him to a Mr. Portis, who was largely concerned in the brokery business. Mr. Portis, being sent for, attended Powel to the East-India House in Leadenhall Street, where the latter declared that he was Taylor Barrow, the proprietor of the stock, which he transferred by imitating the hand of his brother-in-law with so much art, that no suspicion arose of the forgery. On the day the stock was transferred Portis sold it to a third person, and, gave the produce to Powel, who immediately quitted his family, and went into Wales, on a visit to his relations. It was not long before a discovery was made of the forgery, and a large reward was offered for the apprehension of Powel; but Portis being totally unacquainted with his name, and none of his friends or relations conceiving that he could have been concerned in such a transaction, no suspicion of his guilt arose for a considerable time.

In the meantime Portis exerted his utmost diligence to discover the offender: but all his endeavours proved fruitless, till a circumstance, merely accidental, occasioned his apprehension. Powel continued in Wales till he presumed the affair was forgotten in London, where he was received in the most affectionate manner by his relations, who had no idea of what had passed; for, if they had, they would

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

undoubtedly have advised him to consult his safety in flight. Powel now lived on Dowgate Hill; and, about a month after his return to London, he went to Cheapside on business, and after that to Lombard Street, when Mr. Portis met him near the Post-office. Powel happened at this time to be dressed in the same clothes that he wore when the forgery was committed; and Mr. Portis immediately recollected his person, but was unwilling to take him into custody till he was fully convinced that he was not mistaken in the man. Powel, observing that Portis regarded him with some attention, turned his face aside, from a consciousness of guilt, and to prevent the other from having a full knowledge of him. Mr. Portis passed him, but immediately turned back, and took a second, and afterwards a third view of him; when, no doubt remaining in his mind that he was the real offender, he took him by the arm, and begged him to accompany him to the coffee-house where they had first met. Powel pretended not to have any knowledge of the other party; but Portis resolutely insisting that he should go with him, the latter complied with as much grace as he could, to prevent any disturbance happening in the street. They no sooner got to the coffee house than the master and one of the waiters, at the desire of Portis, paid an attentive regard to Powel, and averred that he was the man who had asked for the broker to sell the stock. On this the prisoner was taken before the sitting alderman at Guild hall, and, his person being positively sworn to, the magistrate committed him to Newgate, in order to his being tried at the next sessions at the Old Bailey.

When the trial came on the culprit produced a number of people to prove that he was in the country at the time the forgery was committed; but the jury, not being satisfied with their testimony, brought in their verdict that he was guilty. When he was taken to the bar to receive sentence of death, his counsel moved that the judgment might be postponed, 'on account of some informalities in the record;' and the Court, ever attentive to the laws of humanity, acceded to the motion. The consequence was, that in Michaelmas term, 1771, the case was learnedly argued before the judges, who were unanimously of opinion that Powel had been guilty of the forgery; whereupon sentence was passed that he should undergo the judgment awarded by law.

After condemnation his behaviour was highly proper for a man in his unhappy situation. He was earnest and regular in his devotions, made every proper preparation for death, and resigned himself to his fate with the composure that became a Christian, who placed his hopes on a better world than that, to a longer residence in which he had forfeited his title. He was indulged with a mourning-coach to the place of execution, where his conduct was such as proved him properly affected by his situation. He appeared sincere and ardent in his devotions; and after he was turned off, and his body had hung the usual time, it was delivered to his friends for interment. Robert Powel suffered at Tyburn on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of January, 1772.

In the case of this offender we see the almost absolute impossibility of concealing a guilty transaction. His name was unknown to Portis; his crime was a secret even from his relations; and he remained in Wales till he thought the affair was forgotten: yet he had been but a short time in London before he found himself in Newgate for the commission of that very crime which he flattered himself had been effectually concealed; and an ignominious death followed. Mysterious are the ways of Providence, and past finding out. Who that reads this story will scruple to admire that divine wisdom and jus tice which cannot be comprehended? If Powel could have been contented with his situation he might have lived in credit and reputation. The keeping of farms near London has been the ruin of many a tradesman. A regular attention to

## SUPPLEMENT 2

one branch of business is generally productive of more profit than the embarking in a variety of schemes; and as such we would recommend it to all our readers who are engaged in the mercantile line.

**JOSEPH GUYANT AND JOSEPH ALLPRESS**  
*Executed for Robbing the Mail, 8<sup>th</sup> July, 1772*

The first-mentioned of these offenders was a native of Essex, descended from honest but poor parents, who gave him as good an education as consisted with their circumstances, and then bound him apprentice to a smith, with whom he served his time with fidelity, after which he laboured as a journeyman in his own profession. Quitting the county of Essex, he repaired to Edmonton, near London, where he married, and commenced business on his own account.

For a considerable time he was as successful in trade as could be reasonably expected, but at length sustained a loss to which he attributed all his future misfortunes. Guyant, having been out receiving money from several people who employed him, was stopped on his return to his own house by two footpads, who robbed him of above sixty pounds, and then bound him to a tree. This loss was a matter of great importance to him; but it was much aggravated by the consequences that followed it: for, as the robbery happened, in the day time, he was advised to sue the county, to indemnify him for the loss; but, failing to adduce the necessary proofs, he lost his suit, and was involved in still farther difficulties by the consequence. The expense of the suit being considerable, Guyant was arrested, and sought refuge in a prison. In consequence of a subscription among his friends, he removed himself to the Fleet, where he continued till an act for the relief of insolvent debtors enabled him to obtain his liberty. He had at this time a family which was in want of the necessaries of life; but, during his imprisonment, he had acquired such a habit of idleness that he was still less disposed to provide for them than before.

It will be now proper that we say something of Joseph Allpress, the person concerned with Guyant in robbing the mail. Allpress was a native of St. Ives, in Huntingdonshire, and, like his accomplice, had served his apprenticeship to a smith. After his time was expired he laboured a considerable time in draining the fens in the Isle of Ely; and then his ill fortune led him to Edmonton, where he contracted an acquaintance with Guyant, which ended in the most fatal consequences; for Guyant, having now lost all relish for a life of industry, persuaded the other to be concerned with him in deer-stealing. This proposal was but too well relished by Allpress, who, without reflecting on the dangerous tendency of such a practice, embarked in the scheme with Guyant, and they robbed the parks of several gentlemen in the neighbourhood.

Encouraged by what they deemed success, because they remained undetected, they broke into the church at Edmonton, and carried off some of the communion plate; but it was not known who were the offenders till after they were convicted of robbing the mail. A very little time had passed after the sacrilege, when Guyant proposed to Allpress the fatal scheme which ended in the destruction of them both; intimating, at the same time, that their fortunes might be made by the putting off the bank-notes. Allpress declared that he had never seen a bank-note in his life, and confessed that he was very illiterate; but, overborne by the persuasions of the other, he at length agreed to be concerned in robbing the mail. This shocking resolution being made, they lost no time in the attempt to carry it into execution, the first step to which was the preparing an axe, hardened to such a degree as to cut iron. Having thus resolved on their plan, they waited in the road, at a place called Houndsfield, for the arrival of the northern mail. At length the post-boy arrived, and had with him a person

## SUPPLEMENT 2

named John Thomas, to whom he had given a lift on the road. Guyant stopped the horses of the mail-cart, and threatened instant destruction to Thomas and the driver, unless they immediately got down. This threat was too terrible not to be complied with; on which the post-boy was ordered to drive his carriage into an adjacent field, and Thomas was compelled to attend him. The robbers now bound the other parties to a tree, and then demanded the key of the mail-cart; but, finding that it was not in possession of the driver, they took the cart across the field, broke it open with their axe, and then took out some of the bags, and buried a number of the notes in the earth.[Note: This circumstance first appeared on the examination of the prisoners at Sir John Fielding's, when the writer of this account was present, and saw the notes, discoloured by lying in the ground.]

The driver of the mail-cart, and his companion, remained bound to the tree till morning, when the latter happily freed himself, and then gave liberty to the other. On searching for the horses, they found them grazing in the field, and discovered that the cart had been broken as above mentioned. The post-boy instantly drove to London, and gave proper notice of the injury that had been done. The secretary of the General Post-office immediately advertised a reward of two hundred pounds for the discovery of the offenders; but nothing transpired for some months, till at length Allpress ventured to London, to procure the acceptance of some of the stolen drafts; the worst scheme that could possibly have been devised: for, the payment of these drafts being previously stopped, Allpress was taken into custody; and, being carried before Sir John Fielding, he immediately confessed the fact, on which he was committed to prison, and some officers of justice sent in search of Guyant, who soon found him, and discovered several bags in a yard behind his house, in which were a number of letters which had been stolen from the mail. Both offenders were lodged in Tothill Fields' Bridewell, and at the proper time removed to Newgate, in preparation for their trials at the Old Bailey; where they were convicted on the fullest evidence, and received sentence of death.

After conviction, and indeed long before it, they exhibited the truest penitence that perhaps was ever observed by illiterate men in their unhappy situation. They were exceedingly attentive to the instructions of the Ordinary of Newgate, and made the devoutest preparations for their fatal exit. On the morning of execution they received the sacrament with every mark of the sincerest contrition, and made a solemn declaration of their hope of eternal bliss through the merits of the Redeemer of mankind. On their way to the place of execution they behaved with the utmost decency, and, when arrived at the fatal spot, Guyant was so weak that it was necessary for two men to support him while the executioner fixed the halter round his neck; yet he was fervent in his devotions, notwithstanding his weakness. Both the malefactors begged the spectators to take warning by their fatal exit, and, having finished their devotions, suffered the sentence of the law; after which their bodies were cut down, and carried to Finchley Common, where they were hung in chains. Joseph Guyant and Joseph Allpress were hanged at Tyburn on the 8th of July, 1772.

In the case of the malefactors before us we see a remarkable in stance of the progressive nature of vice. Guyant and Allpress were first deer-stealers, then guilty of sacrilege, and at length ventured on the horrid plan of robbing the mail. Those who do not see, in this instance, the absurdity of encouraging the first emotions to vice, will not be convinced by any arguments that we can offer. We shall, therefore, drop the subject, to make a remark which is new in a work of this kind. When these unhappy

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

men were examined at the public office in Bow Street, there appeared a degree of contrition in their countenances and behaviour, that no language can describe. They solicited it as a favour of Sir John Fielding that they might be re-committed to Tothill Fields' Bridewell; alleging as a reason, that the devotions at that place were more regularly performed than at other prisons; and this we have good reason to believe to be the fact. The governor of that prison is a religious man, and laudably exerts himself in the instruction and edification of the unhappy people who fall under his care. This is a rare instance, which cannot be sufficiently applauded, and we trust that Mr. Smith (the governor) will pardon the liberty we have now [Note: in February, 1779] taken in mentioning his name on an occasion which is intended, and ought, to do him honour. Happy would it be if every keeper of a prison was equally zealous to promote the eternal welfare of the unhappy persons committed to his care. But, while we say this, we must in common justice remark, that the prisons throughout England were never managed with a stricter regard to the laws of decency and regularity than at present.

**JOSEPH COOPER*****Executed for Robbing his Master, 30<sup>th</sup> June, 1772***

This man's crime and ingratitude, as far as respects the robbery, is precisely the case of George Barnwell. Cooper, like him, unhappily became the dupe of a second Milwood, and through her instigation he was worked up to rob his benefactor. Surely no servant who has even seen the representation of Lillo's fine tragedy, founded on a fact, would ever dare to venture upon the commission of so foul a crime.

Joseph Cooper was the son of very poor, but honest, parents: his father died when he was but seven years of age, and his mother, thus deprived of a protector, was reduced to take in washing for the maintenance of herself and three helpless children, of whom Joseph was the eldest. Through some friends, who pitied her distress, this boy was admitted into a charity school, where he continued till he was fourteen years of age, when Mr. Beaumont, a cutler in Redcross Street, took him as an apprentice, in mere compassion to his destitute situation of life. Mr. Beaumont was a man in a very extensive way of business; so that the youth had an opportunity of becoming a complete master of his profession; and such was his diligence and good behaviour for a considerable time, that perhaps no lad in such a situation as he was ever acquired a better character, or was more esteemed by the neighbours and others who had connections with his master. Mr. Beaumont, observing this excellent disposition, treated him with the utmost kindness, with a view to inspire him with a resolution of continuing in the practice of that duty which was so likely to be productive of his present and future happiness. Unhappily, however, for Cooper, this gentle treatment had not its desired effect; yet he served out his apprenticeship with fidelity, and afterwards lived some time with his master as a journeyman. Mr. Beaumont still continued to treat him with his usual kindness; and so generous was his behaviour towards him, that the least attention to his own interest would most probably have preserved him from ruin, and enabled him to have made a very creditable figure in life.

Unfortunately for himself, Cooper got acquainted with a number of young fellows of dissolute character, who frequented a public house in Golden Lane, where they spent their time in scenes of riot and dissipation, equally calculated to destroy their health of body and peace of mind. Cooper's former principles of virtue were all unhinged by an association with such obnoxious companions, and his mind was soon contaminated with ideas that led with rapid and certain progress to his destruction. At length, through the instigation of his companions, he frequented houses of ill-fame, which introduced him to the company of women of abandoned character; one of whom he became intimately acquainted with, and cohabited with her at a house of an infamous description in Denmark Court, in the Strand

In the conversation between Cooper and his girl, the latter advised him to rob his late master, as the readiest way to raise a supply to support their present extravagance; and this scheme was thought the more practicable as Cooper, having lived several years in the house, knew all the avenues to it, and every part of which he was well acquainted with. Cooper at first appeared to be shocked at the simple idea of so basely injuring a man who had protected him in the early part of life, and had, on all occasions, proved himself a disinterested friend; and he actually, for some time, refused to have any concern in such an ungenerous transaction: at length the arguments of the girl prevailed, and he resolved on the commission of the crime

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

which terminated in his destruction. It was Mr. Beaumont's custom to spend his evening at a public house in Old Street; and on his return home he carefully locked his doors, and observed that every other place of possible entrance was made fast, in order to prevent the admission of robbers: yet his vigilance proved fruitless, for Cooper, whom of all men he would have least suspected, became the ungenerous infringer on the property of his benefactor. Mr. Beaumont, having seen his house secure at night, retired to rest; but about two o'clock the next morning he was awakened by a noise that seemed to be in his room. Terrified in a high degree by this unexpected visit, he was for some time afraid of venturing out of his bed; but at length, hearing that some person had gone out of his chamber, and shut the door, he got up, and discovered that his bureau had been broken open, and a hundred guineas stolen from it. He likewise observed that the lock of the chamber door, and the chain which confined it, had been forced open by means of a chisel.

As it was presumed that the person who had committed the robbery could not be at any great distance, Mr. Beaumont alarmed the watchmen, who made an immediate pursuit; and, though they did not overtake the robber, they presumed that they were near him, from hearing the trampling of feet hastily moving in the street, as those of a person flying from a pursuer. The circumstances attending this robbery made it almost evident that the person who committed it must have been intimately acquainted with the avenues of the house; and Mr. Beaumont was induced to suspect that Cooper was the thief, from what he had then lately heard of his abandoned course of life. Mr. Beaumont therefore sent for a constable, and at seven o'clock the following morning Cooper was taken into custody at the house where he resided in, Denmark Court in the Strand. He at first denied having had any concern in the robbery; but, being conveyed to his master's house, the precise money lost, except one guinea, was found on him. Mr. Beaumont sent for a neighbour, named Dyson, to advise him how to act, and expressed, with tears, his aversion to the thought of prosecuting him. Mr. Dyson told him it would be unsafe to discharge him; on which he was conveyed to the Compter, and, on his examination before the sitting alderman, such strong evidence of his guilt appeared, that he was committed to Newgate, to take his trial at the next Old Bailey sessions.

After a fair and candid trial the jury brought in a verdict of guilty, but joined in recommending him as an object of the royal clemency; and Mr. Beaumont, his master, signed a petition in behalf of the wretched convict; but, after the report was made to the king, he was included among those who were ordered for execution. He behaved in the most contrite manner at the fatal tree, where he confessed that he had merited that public and ignominious death which the law had justly awarded for his crimes. He suffered at Tyburn on June the 30th, 1772.

**LIEUTENANT-GENERAL WILLIAM GANSEL**  
*Tried for Firing a Pistol at John Hyde, 8<sup>th</sup> September, 1773*

General Gansel, having greatly impaired his fortune by a life of gaiety, had been several years under great pecuniary embarrassments, from which he was using his utmost endeavours to extricate himself at the time when the transaction happened which gave rise to the trial, of which it is our present business to relate the particulars.

In the forenoon of the 26th of August, 1773, Mr. Lee, an eminent surgeon, applied to John Hyde to arrest General Gansel for a debt of a hundred and thirty-four pounds. They went to the proper office, and obtained a special *capias*; after which the officer applied to his brother, Thomas Hyde, Henry Feltus, William Sleigh, and Richard Reeves, to assist in the intended capture. Between two and three in the afternoon Mr. Lee met the bailiff and his assistants, and, accompanied by John Hyde, went to the house of Mr. Mayo, in Craven Street, Strand; the other men being appointed to wait at some distance. The street door being open, they went into the parlour, and Mr. Lee asked Mrs. Mayo whether General Gansel lodged in her house. Being answered in the affirmative, Hyde went into the street, and, having beckoned for his companions to come up, attempted to go towards the general's apartments; but on the stairs he was opposed by two boys, who were brothers, and servants to the general. At this time the other bailiffs entered the passage, and John Hyde having struck a knife from the hand of one of the boys with a walking-stick, and thrown it out of the window, he and his brother were soon overpowered, and bolted in the yard. John Hyde deposed that, when the boys were in the yard, he proceeded towards the second floor, and observing the general, with whose person he was well acquainted, upon the landing-place, hastened towards him, and placed his knee between the chamber door and the wainscot, and endeavoured to force into the room, when the general discharged a pistol, the ball from which passed through the upper panel of the door, towards the hinge, and struck the wainscot on the staircase; that he then got into the room, and, clapping the general on the shoulder, said 'Sir, you are my prisoner;' when the general, with his left arm over his right shoulder, pointed another pistol at his face; but that, by suddenly stooping his head, he fortunately escaped the ball, which passed through the hat of Henry Feltus; that the general was then with much difficulty forced downstairs, and put into a hackney-coach, which conveyed him to a lock-up house kept by a sheriff's officer, named Armstrong, whence he was soon afterwards removed to Newgate. Feltus produced the hat through which the ball of the second pistol had passed; but neither his evidence, nor that of Thomas Hyde, Sleigh, or Reeves, materially differed from that of the first witness.

The general said that, though he was not wholly unused to speak in public, his ill state of health, and other circumstances, had given rise to an apprehension that he might be incapable on the present occasion to do justice to his cause in an *ex tempore* address, and he had therefore reduced his defence to writing. He then read the defence, which, among other matters, set forth, that being informed by his servants, Henry and James, that the house was surrounded by armed ruffians, and, presently after, hearing a violent uproar at the head of the stairs, he locked himself into his chamber, against the door of which he placed an elbow chair; and, the uproar increasing, he fired off a pistol, pointed to the upper part of the door, with a view of deterring the assailants, who soon broke into the room, the forcing the door throwing him down, and the second pistol going off without design, while he was falling. He

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

said that, from a perusal of 'Blackstone's Commentaries,' he was taught to believe that an Englishman's house is his castle, and that a room hired for a certain time was to be considered as his castle; that he paid for his apartments by the year; and that he had occupied them eight-and-thirty years, sixteen of which Mr. Mayo had been his landlord; and that he conceived he had an undoubted right of defending himself in his own habitation. In the course of his address the prisoner mentioned several persons whom he desired might be examined on his behalf. Several witnesses swore that the bolt of the lock belonging to the general's chamber door had been strained, and the screws of the receiver of the bolt forced out of the wood; and they likewise deposed that, from a very particular examination, they were confident the ball must have took a different direction, had the pistol been fired when the door was open; adding that, when the door was open only three inches, they perceived that the impression made by the ball on the wainscot of the staircase was not nearly in a right line with the hole in the panel in the door, but that, when the door was perfectly closed, there was an exact correspondence between the hole through which the ball passed and the mark where it afterwards struck the wainscot. Mrs. Mayo swore that from the time the transaction happened the premises had not been seen by any person but in her presence, and that no alterations whatever had been made.

The above is a faithful abstract of the evidence adduced for and against the prisoner, on an indictment for feloniously shooting at John Hyde: the first count charging him with firing off a pistol held in his right, and the second with firing at the same man another pistol held in his left hand. After the jury had remained out of Court some time, they brought in their verdict, 'Not guilty.' The general was arraigned on two other indictments: one for feloniously shooting at Thomas Hyde; and the other for feloniously shooting at Henry Feltus: but the counsel for the prosecution informed the Court that, 'as the general was acquitted on the merits, he should waive proceeding on the two last indictments.' General Gansel was tried at the Sessions House in the Old Bailey on Wednesday, the 8th of September, 1773.

It was imagined that the principal matter for the decision of the Court would have been 'Whether the law would justify a man in opposing a forcible entry into his place of habitation, and how far the character, office, and authority of the assailants were to be considered in mitigation of a violent attack?' but the question took a turn very different from what was expected.

The evidence of John Hyde and his associates set forth that the door was partly open when the general fired; but the contrary appeared from the depositions of other witnesses. It does not seem that the first pistol was pointed immediately at any person; for the hole in the door was considerably higher than the head of the tallest man; and it is very probable that the second pistol went off while the general was falling. Thus the matter seems to have been understood by jury. Nothing but the last extremity of danger can justify the use of fire-arms, or other desperate weapons. There is something extremely shocking in the idea of taking away the life of a fellow-creature when he is unprepared for eternity, Let our readers remember that, if it should prove their misfortune to labour under injury and oppression, the most eligible means of obtaining redress will be by an application to the legislative power.

**ISAAC DARKING, Alias DUMAS**  
*Executed for Highway Robbery, 16<sup>th</sup> April, 1761*

Tins malefactor was born in Eastcheap, where his father carried on the business of a cork-cutter. While very young he gave pregnant proofs of his attachment to what is called pleasure: a life of gaiety and dissipation had too many charms for him; and he was hailed among the young rakes, and even the ladies of the town, as a youth of very superior qualifications. His attachment to women was remarkable; and this leading him into great expense, he had recourse to the highway to support his extravagance; the consequence of which was that he was apprehended, and, being tried at Chelmsford, was capitally convicted, and received sentence of death; but, being then very young, the judge respited him till the following assizes, when he obtained a pardon, on the condition of transportation for fourteen years. Previous, however, to his being transported, the prisoners had formed a design of murdering the keeper, turnkey, &c. in order to effect their escape; and Darking having obtained some knowledge of the secret, he made a discovery of it; the consequence of which was that his sentence of transportation was remitted, on the terms of his serving as a soldier in the plantations. Hereupon he was conducted to the Savoy prison in London, whence he made several efforts to escape; but, not succeeding, he at length sailed with many others, and was put on shore at Antigua; but the life of a soldier being highly disagreeable to him, he determined to quit the service without permission us soon as possible. He had not been long on the island before he ingratiated himself with the captain of a ship, to whom he promised a large reward if he would land him in England. Hereupon the captain took him on board, and concealed him in the hold of the ship; so that, though diligent search was made after him, he escaped undiscovered.

On his arrival in his native country he renewed his depredations on the highway, and committed a variety of robberies in the western counties, and in the middle of the kingdom; but, apprehensive of the consequences that might ensue, he entered on board the *Royal George* man of war, in which he was rated as a midshipman. In the summer of the year 1760 the ship lay at Portsmouth; and Darking, getting leave of absence for some weeks, employed this interval in committing a variety of robberies, of which the most remarkable was the following:—

Lord Percival being travelling the Bath road on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of June, Darking met him near the Devizes, and presented a pistol, demanding his money on pain of instant death. The highwayman had a crape over his face. Lord Percival gave him thirteen guineas; but, dissatisfied with that sum, he insisted on having more; on which his lordship was so provoked that he forced the pistol from his hand, and, pulling him to the ground, leapt from the chaise to take him into custody. Darking now ran away, and Lord Percival pursued him. The highwayman turned about, presented a pistol, and demanded his purse: but his lordship declaring he had no more money, Darking mounted his horse, and rode off, having first desired that Lord Percival would not appear against him if he should be tried.

Being apprehended on the following day, he was committed to prison, and brought to trial at the next assizes held at Salisbury, when he was acquitted, because Lord Percival would not swear positively to his person: yet the circumstances against him were remarkably strong; for the money found on him agreed with what Lord Percival had been robbed of, a pistol was in his possession which appeared to match with that his lordship had lost, and a piece of crape was found in his pocket. In

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

consequence of questions asked on this trial, Darking said that he was born in the West Indies, and was quite a stranger to this country; that, on his way from Bath to Portsmouth, he had lost his road; that, on the approach of night, he went to a village to refresh himself; and that, when he was apprehended, it could be no wonder that a benighted traveller should appear confused. He owned that he had friends in England; but they did not live near enough to do him any service on that occasion. He declared that he had purchased a pair of pistols, one of which he had lost on the road, and was probably picked up by the person who committed the robbery with which he was charged. He said that the confusion he appeared in when taken arose from his being accused of a crime of which he was innocent; and accounted for the crape found in his possession by saying it was what he had worn as a neckcloth, having been in the king's service at the taking of Guadaloupe. Darking was no sooner acquitted than he asked for some money which had been taken from him on his apprehension, which the Court directed to be delivered to him; and then the judge dismissed him, having remarked on the generosity of his prosecutor, and advised him to leave off such dangerous practices as those in which he had been concerned. Being told he was now at his own disposal, he seemed full of anxiety till his fetters were knocked off, and then he immediately set out for London in a post-chaise.

During his confinement at Salisbury his genteel accomplishments were much the subject of tea-table conversation; and he was visited by the ladies, who seemed delighted with his discourse. These circumstances gave rise to the following lines, which were published in the newspapers on his acquittal—

'Joy to thee, lovely thief! that thou  
Hast 'scaped the fatal string;  
Let gallows groan with ugly rogues  
Dumas must never swing.

Dost thou seek money? to thy wants  
Our purses we'll resign;  
Could we our hearts to guineas coin,  
Those guineas all were thine.

To Bath in safety let my lord  
His loaded pockets carry  
Thou ne'er again shall tempt the road,  
Sweet youth! if thou wilt marry.

No more shall niggard travellers  
Avoid thee;—we'll insure 'em:  
To us thou shalt consign thy balls  
And pistols;—we'll secure 'em.

Yet think not when the chains are off,  
Which now thy legs bedeck,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

To fly; in fetters softer far  
We'll chain thee by the neck.'

Darking was so distinguished by the gracefulness of his person that he was the favourite of unthinking women wherever he came; and it is probable that, after this escape at Salisbury, he might have married some woman of fortune if he could have divested himself of his unhappy turn to extravagance, which led him to the highway whenever he wanted a supply. Soon after his return to London he commenced his former practices, infesting the roads round the metropolis for more than six months, spending at bagnios, gaming-houses, and taverns, what he acquired by his lawless practices. His robberies near town had been so numerous that he became apprehensive of detection, and therefore retired farther into the country, where he continued to rob some time; but at length returned to London. Having hired a horse in Piccadilly, he travelled to Oxford, where he slept; and the next day, returning towards London, he stopped a gentleman, named Gammon, near Nettlebed, and robbed him of his watch and money. Darking now turned back; but the gentleman proceeded towards town, having first stopped at an inn, and left a description of the highwayman. Mr. Gammon had not been gone more than two hours when Darking called at the same inn, and gave the landlord two letters directed to women in London; saying that he should not go to town for two or three days, and begging that the letters might be forwarded. From the description that Mr. Gammon had given, the landlord concluded that Darking was the robber: yet, as he carried pistols, he did not choose to secure him; but no sooner was he departed than the landlord enclosed the letters in a cover, and sent them to London by the post, directed to Mr. Gammon. These letters giving a knowledge of Darking's lodgings, Mr. Gammon applied to Sir John Fielding; in consequence of which proper measures were taken for the apprehension of Darking, who was found in bed, some days afterwards, with a woman of the town. He made an attempt to escape out of the window, but was soon secured and lodged in Newgate.

On the approach of the assizes he was removed to Oxford by a writ of *habeas corpus*; and, being tried before Baron Adams, was convicted on the clearest evidence. When he was brought to the bar to receive sentence of death he besought the clemency of the judge, petitioning to be transported for life: in answer to this petition his lordship addressed him as follows:

'Young man, you have been arraigned upon an indictment for a robbery on the king's highway, and have been found guilty after a fair and candid trial. From your youth, you might have expected to have lived many years; and, from your education, might have been a comfort to your friends and relations, as well as a service to your country; but your engaging in vicious and immoral courses hath at last brought you to this untimely end. A day of this sort you could not but have expected, and it hath now overtaken you. Happy would it have been for you that your former deliverance, in a situation such as this, had been a memento to you to have altered your conduct. I hope your present circumstances will have a better effect upon you, and induce you to repentance. Make proper use of the time you have to live, in endeavouring to make your peace with God, for you will soon be in another world: your application to me for mercy is quite in vain; it is not in my power to grant it; from the king alone it is to be expected, of which, however, I can give you but little, very little, hope.'

During the time this malefactor was in prison he frequently diverted himself with reading *The Beggars' Opera*. He likewise drank freely; nor did he seem to entertain a proper sense of the horrid situation to which his vices had reduced him. On

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

the day of execution his behaviour was remarkably intrepid; and, at the place of his death, he fitted the halter to his neck, and threw himself off with great appearance of determined resolution. This criminal was hanged at Oxford on the 16th of April, 1761. After the pathetic address delivered by the judge to this convict it will be the less necessary to make any particular remarks on his case. Those whose vices may have tempted them to the commission of crimes within the cognizance of the law, and who have not enough of virtue remaining to take proper warning, and reform after conviction and conditional pardon, deserve the fate they meet; and ought to die unpitied, as they have lived enemies to the repose of their fellow-creatures!

**SAMUEL MALE**  
*Executed for Robbery, 25<sup>th</sup> March, 1773*

The short life of this culprit was remarkable for producing two surprising instances of the uncertainty of identity.

On the 4th of September, 1772, he was arraigned at the bar of the Old Bailey, for robbing Mrs. Ryan, at which time, in a note taken of the circumstance, he was called 'the unfortunate barber's boy,' being then very young. The prosecutrix, and other evidence, swore positively that the prisoner committed the robbery on the 17th of June then last past. The Court consequently supposed conviction would follow; but, being called on for his defence, he said he was innocent, and that the books of the Court would prove where he was on the day of the robbery. Reference was immediately made to the records; and strange, yet true to relate, that, on the very day and hour sworn to, Male was actually on his trial, at the bar where he then stood, for another robbery, when he was unfortunate enough to have been mistaken for the robber. He was consequently acquitted, and his case greatly commiserated.

We might reasonably conclude that these escapes, when innocent, would have deterred him from guilt; but the inside of Newgate will very soon contaminate the youthful mind, and, though discharged with honour, he came out a determined thief. His career of villainy was short indeed; for in six months afterwards we find him expiating his crimes at the gallows. He was at length charged with a real robbery, committed by him on the person of Mrs. Grignon, and, being unable longer to prove an alibi, as he had hitherto done, he was found guilty. The circumstances of his acquittals, which might have proved advantageous, now militated against him. Mercy could not be extended to one who, in defiance of all warning, would turn robber. He suffered at Tyburn March the 25th, 1773, along with Matthew Doyle, for robbing Mr. Lewis Herne; Joseph Richardson and Jonathan Brannon, for burglary. The ages of these four malefactors did but just outnumber the scriptural number of the years of one man; yet it was said, 'though young in years, they were old in iniquity.'

A very remarkable instance of personal similitude happened at New York, in North America, in the year 1804. A man was indicted for bigamy, under the name of James Hoag. He was met, as was supposed, in a distant part of the country by some friends of his first wife (for there, as well as in our own country, there can be but one real wife), and apprehended. The prisoner denied the charge, and said his name was Thomas Parker. On the trial, Mrs. Hoag, her relations, and many other creditable witnesses, swore that he was James Hoag, and she swore positively that he was her husband. On the other side, an equal number of witnesses, and equally respectable, swore that the prisoner was Thomas Parker; and Mrs. Parker appeared, and claimed him as her husband.

The first party were again called by the Court, and they not only again deposed to him, but that by stature, shape, gesture, complexion, looks, voice, and speech, he was James Hoag. They even described a particular scar on his forehead, by which he could be known. On turning back the hair, the scar appeared. The others, in return, swore that he had lived among them, worked with them, and was in their company, on the very day of his alleged marriage with Mrs. Hoag; Here the scales of testimony were balanced, for the jury knew not which party to give credit to. Mrs. Hoag, anxious to gain back her husband, declared he had a certain more particular mark on the sole

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

of his foot. Mrs. Parker avowed that her husband had no such mark; and the man was ordered to pull off his shoes and stockings. His feet were examined, and no mark appeared.

The ladies now contended for the man, and Mrs. Hoag vowed that she had lost her husband, and she would have him. During this strife a justice of the peace from the place where the prisoner was apprehended entered the Court, and turned the scale in his favour. His worship swore him to be Thomas Parker; that he had known, and occasionally employed him, from his infancy: whereupon Mrs. Parker embraced and carried off her husband in triumph, by the verdict of the jury.

**JOHN CHALLENGOR**  
*Executed for Parricide 23<sup>rd</sup> August, 1773*

Of all murders, the shedding the blood of a parent—stopping the very fountain from whence flowed our life—is the most shocking. It is a matter of horror to reflect how dreadfully human nature can be debased; yet already, far too often, has duty tortured our feelings in recording such abominable cases. To endeavour to amend the heart, and to deter others from crime, is the intent of this Calendar—the very end of punishments.

This parricidal monster was a labourer, brought up to his father's employ, and had, during life, toiled by his side. They were at work together in a wood near Stone, in Staffordshire, and, some hasty words having passed between them, the ingrate seized an iron pot, in which he had just cooked their dinner, and threw it with such vengeance at his devoted sire, that one of its feet entered the old man's skull; and of the wound he languished, in extreme agony, three days, and then expired. The murderer was immediately committed to gaol, where he showed little remorse at his fell deed; and seemed alone anxious for his father's recovery, from the dread of being hanged for the murder.

This John Challenor was of a ferocious revengeful disposition: he treated his wife and children with great cruelty. Once, upon a trifling occasion, he aimed a blow at his wife, which killed his child, an infant in her arms; but, the brutal deed being attributed to accident, he, for a while, escaped his deserved punishment. Being now brought to trial at Stafford assizes, the deposition of his deceased parent, with other corroborating circumstances of his guilt, being adduced, the jury found no hesitation in pronouncing him guilty; on which he was executed, August the 23d, 1773, amid the execrations of an incensed multitude, and his body was ordered to be hung in chains near the spot where he committed this most foul deed, which was accordingly done.

On the same day on which he suffered, another murderer, of the name of Ambrose Cannon, was executed at Horsham, in Sussex, for a murder in which he had joined one Thomas Green, to whom he had been apprentice above sixteen years before. These two villains barbarously killed one Thomas Cole, and they both immediately fled from justice, and escaped to parts beyond the sea. During thirteen years had Cannon struggled with his conscience; which at length (as sooner or later it ever will) became so tortured with remorse, that he could no longer remain in satisfaction out of his own country: in short, his mind could afford him no rest, and he yearned to throw himself upon his fate. He returned even into the same county where he had joined in the murder, and settled at Hastings, under a feigned name, married, and had three children. At length he betrayed himself, was seized, and, sufficient proof being adduced, though more than sixteen years had intervened, found guilty, and hanged.

Another most detested parricide, of the name of Thomas Hitchcock, was tried, convicted, and executed at Oxford, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March, 1778, for the cruel murder of his venerable father. It is a melancholy reflection that such unnatural and horrid ideas should enter the mind of man.

**CHARLES MILLS AND JOHN PUGH**  
*Executed for Highway Robbery, 7<sup>th</sup> November, 1774*

These offenders were born of poor parents, and received little or no education. In the winter they acted as porters on the wharfs of the Thames, and in the summer employed themselves as haymakers; but at length associating with abandoned company of both sexes, who lived in Chick Lane, and such places, they lost those fair characters they had hitherto supported. Distressed in circumstances by their own vices, they determined to supply their wants by robbery; but, their appearance being too mean to permit them to think of hiring horses, they determined to commence footpads, and committed a number of robberies in the fields north of London, frequently ill-treating those whom they robbed. Their success for some time was trifling, but, being sufficient to furnish them with several offensive weapons, their depredations became more frequent, and their booties were spent, as those of thieves generally are, in the company of abandoned women. They commonly met at an alehouse in Tottenham Court Road, and, having flushed themselves with liquor, sallied forth to assault the unoffending passenger.

We now proceed to mention the fact, the commission of which cost them their lives. On the 10th of August, 1774, they met, according to custom, at the alehouse, and, having drank themselves into spirits to undertake daring exploits, they went into the fields near Primrose Hill, between London and Hampstead, when a violent shower of rain falling, they took shelter under a hedge. In the interim a gentleman named Gilson, who had been reading in a book as he strolled over the fields, came to the same spot, to avoid the violence of the shower. When the rain abated Mr. Gilson was going away; but the villains threatened his instant death if he hesitated to deliver his money. In the meantime Mills rifled his pockets, where finding only a few shillings, the robbers blasphemed in a horrid manner; and Mr. Gilson, apprehensive of fatal consequences, then delivered his watch, with a guinea and some silver, which he had till then concealed. Ten days afterwards Mr. Gilson was again near the same spot, and, sitting down to read, observed the identical robbers approaching him. Knowing them well, he applied to a manservant belonging to farmer Wellings to assist him in taking them into custody. The man hesitated, as doubting if the gentleman had been really robbed; but Mr. Wellings, being informed of the affair, directed two men to go in search of the footpads, who were soon taken, conveyed before a magistrate, and lodged in Newgate.

At the next Old Bailey sessions they were convicted, and sentenced to die. After conviction they sent to some of their former companions in iniquity; but not one would attend them. For a short time they entertained hopes of being respited; but these hopes soon vanished. Pugh behaved penitently; but Mills much more so, answering explicitly all the questions that were asked him, confessing his guilt, and wishing for life only in the hope of making reparation to those who had been sufferers by his crimes. They were admitted to the sacrament on the morning of their execution; and, when their irons were knocked off, Pugh seemed almost abandoned to despondency, and at the place of execution he acknowledged the justice of his sentence. Mills, also, confessed that he had committed many other robberies, the result of his attachment to women of abandoned character. Charles Mills and John Pugh were hanged at Tyburn on the 7th of November, 1774.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

The most remarkable circumstance in the case of these malefactors is, that, after conviction, their former abandoned acquaintances would not visit them. Thus were they left in the utmost distress in the hour of the greatest extremity Hence young people should learn the extreme ill consequence of keeping bad company; and that the true way to be happy is to associate with those who have more wisdom and virtue than themselves.

**WILLIAM HAWKE**

*Executed for Highway Robbery, 1<sup>st</sup> July, 1774*

This was another depredator of considerable notoriety, and of so desperate a mind as to appear dauntless of death. He was born at Uxbridge, in Middlesex, in the neighbourhood of which town he committed many highway robberies. His father dying when he was but a boy, he came to London, without any friend to direct his steps, and hired himself as a pot-boy—that is, a drawer of porter to a low public house—where were constantly before him examples which might lead any unprotected youth from the paths of virtue. He soon connected an acquaintance with abandoned people who frequented an alehouse in St. Giles's, and was persuaded to join them in committing depredations upon the public. Hawke at length commenced highwayman, and became an accomplice of William Field, [the particulars of whose life we have already mentioned](#). Field and Hawke were transported to America; and, returning to England nearly at the same period, they again became associates in committing robberies upon the highway. Hawke and Field being apprehended together, the former escaped from Tothill Fields' Bridewell, and got over to France; but the other suffered the sentence of the law.

Upon his return to England he committed a surprising number of most daring robberies; and several months elapsed before the thief-takers knew him to be the man by whom the roads about London were so dangerously infested. Information being given to Mr. Smith, the keeper of Tothill Fields' Bridewell, that Hawke's wife had been to Uxbridge on a party of pleasure, he sought the driver of the coach in which she was conveyed, and learnt from him that Hawke lodged in Shoe Lane. The following morning Mr. Smith, Mr. Bond, Mr. Leigh, and some other persons in the service of Sir John Fielding, went to Shoe Lane. Bond, going up two pair of stairs, entered the front room, and there discovering Hawke slumbering in bed, threw himself across the highwayman, who, twisting the sheet round Bond's head, reached at a pistol that was under the pillow, at which instant Smith entered, and caught hold of his hand. With much difficulty Hawke was secured; and, being put into a coach, he said that his misfortunes were in some measure alleviated by the consideration that no life was lost, for he was provided with several loaded pistols, and had formed the resolution of firing upon every man who should attempt to take him into custody. Being conveyed to the public office in Bow Street, a great number of persons were bound to prosecute, and he was committed to Newgate.

At the next sessions at the Old Bailey he was arraigned on an indictment for robbing Mr. Hart of a small sum of money; and the following are the most remarkable circumstances adduced in evidence:—

Mr. Hart and Captain Cunningham were stopped in the Fulham stage, a little beyond Knightsbridge, by the prisoner, who demanded their money. The captain refused to resign his property; and Hawke threatened to fire, and, pointing his pistol at the captain, he said 'Fire away, and be damned!' on which the robber discharged his pistol, and the ball passed between the captain's shoulder and his coat. Mr. Hart then delivered a few shillings; and Captain Cunningham, getting out of the coach in the interim, seized the bridle of the highwayman's horse, when he discharged a second pistol. He then remounted, but did not ride away for some minutes, during which interval the captain employed himself in picking up stones, and throwing them at him. At the time of Hawke's trial Captain Cunningham was abroad; but Mr. Hart's evidence

## SUPPLEMENT 2

was so positive, clear, and circumstantial, that no doubt remained as to the guilt of the prisoner, who was therefore sentenced to be executed. While Hawke was under sentence of death, in Newgate, his behaviour was such as may be called decent, rather than penitential. While his irons were knocking off, on the morning of execution, one of his acquaintance addressed him thus: 'How do you do, Billy? will you have some flowers?'—Hawke replied, 'I am pretty well, I thank you. How is Harry Wright? he has been ill of late, I hear,' meaning one of the turnkeys of Tothill Fields' Bridewell. And then, while the man held the nose gay, he picked out a flower, and, with great composure, placed it in a button-hole of his coat. When the cart was preparing to be driven from under the gallows he threw off both his shoes; and, when he found it move, he collected his utmost strength, and leaped up, so that his neck was instantly dislocated. He suffered at Tyburn, July the 1st, 1774.

**WILLIAM FARMERY**

*Executed for the Murder of his Mother, 5<sup>th</sup> August, 1775*

We have reluctantly shown, in more instances than one, the unnatural brutality of men murdering their fathers; but, while we sketch the more shocking crime of this monster, we have some consolation in observing that, in our long researches into the wickedness of mankind, he is the first we have met with who, with long lurking malice, shed the blood of his mother. A subject so strangely horrid and unnatural we shall dismiss by a bare recital of the shocking circumstance. It appears that, among other undutiful acts, he had one morning given offence to his parent, for which he was justly reproached, on which he went out of her house, took his knife from his pocket, and deliberately whetted it till quite sharp. Then returning with the murderous instrument in his hand, he found his unfortunate mother in the act of making his own bed. Without uttering a word, he threw her down, and, as a butcher kills a sheep, he stuck her in the throat, and there left her weltering in her blood, of which wound she died.

On his examination he confessed the fact, and said that he had determined upon his mother's death three years ago; for that he had treasured up malice against her since she had corrected him for some trifling fault when a little boy. In the prison of Lincoln, called the Round-house, he declared that, when asleep there, he felt something move within him (the tyrant Conscience), and that when he awoke he saw his mother's ghost upbraiding him for his foul deed. He suffered at Lincoln, August the 5th, 1775, amidst the execrations of a multitude of indignant spectators.

'Even you yourself to your own breast shall tell  
Your crimes, and your own conscience be your hell.'

**MESSRS. RUMBOLD AND SYKES**  
*Members of Parliament for Hindon, in Wiltshire, Imprisoned  
for Bribery, in the Year 1776*

"Where honour ought to have the fairest play, you'll find  
"Corruption, envy, discontent, and faction,  
"Almost in every band."  
OTWAY.

This offence is a main link in the chain of corruption which has long been a grievance to the people, and loudly calls for reform. When Mr. Pitt, early in his political career, was *out of place*, he was a strenuous advocate for such reform; but from the moment of his appointment to the chancellorship of the exchequer, he lost sight of every abuse. Thus, we find it, as Sir Robert Walpole used to say, "Every man has his price." Since those times corruption has made rapid strides, and bribery at elections a common practice.

The present state of the representation of the British Empire, may be seen from the following sketch of a recent meeting in London, on the subject, taken from the newspapers of the day.

"On the first of May, a numerous meeting, convened by advertisement in the London newspapers, was held at the Crown and Anchor, in the Strand, for the avowed purpose of entering into resolutions, in order to effect a reform in parliament. It was attended by the two members for Westminster, and many other independent representatives of the people in the present parliament.

"Sir Francis Burdett was called to the chair, from which, in a speech most elaborate and elegant, he opened the business upon which they were convened. The resolutions were presented by Major Cartwright. The most prominent of them were,

- "That in a petition presented to the House of Commons, on the 6th of May, 1793, it was offered to be proved at the bar, that 154 individuals did, by their own authority, appoint or procure the return of 307 members of that House, exclusive of those from Scotland, who were thus enabled to decide all questions in the name of the whole people of Great Britain.

- "That in 1782, it was declared by Mr. Pitt in the House of Commons, that seven or eight members of that House were sent there by the nabob of Arcot, and that a foreign state, in enmity to this country, might procure a party to act for it under the mask and character of members of that House.

"Mr. Maddox, member for Boston, made the following statement of the representation of the people in the House of Commons: -

26 Burgage tenures, private property, returning  
members:  
52  
51 Boroughs at about 50 Voters each  
100  
23 Boroughs at about 100 voters  
each 45  
28 Boroughs at about 200 voters

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

each 56  
2 Boroughs at about 30 voters  
each 4  
Making 1175 voters, who return a majority to the House of Commons of  
257

"In 1793, Seventy-five peers returned 167 members to the House of Commons. Since 1793, Eighteen new peers have been created, who had influence of 39 commoners, and six baronets, who had influence over eleven. Thus, in all, there are 206 members in the House of Commons, under the influence of peers, created during the present reign. In Ireland they had the disposal of upwards of 200 borough votes in the House of Commons, besides the influence they had in counties, of which he could name at least thirty, represented by the sons and brothers of peers. The treasury returned 167, and the borough faction 91. Of all these the number was 306, to which adding 21 returned by 17 boroughs, of 150 voters in each, made 327 English members under this influence, which deducting from the total number of 513, left only 186 uninfluenced members of the House of Commons. The result is, a majority of 141 in favour of this borough faction. "Can you conceive," continued Mr. Maddocks, "that any good effects could be derived from a parliament so constituted, even leaving out of your view all the influence of the crown, from places, pensions, and the 178,000*l.* a year paid for sinecures,"—to people for doing nothing at all.

Messrs. Rumbold and Sykes had obtained seats for the borough of Hendon, and it appearing to the commons that they had been guilty of bribery, the attorney-general was directed to prosecute them.

On the 14th of March, 1776, their trial came on in the court of King's Bench, and after a very long hearing, they were both found guilty. On the 8th of June following, Messrs. Rumbold and Sykes were brought before the court of King's Bench, in order to receive sentence on their conviction of bribery, at the late general election; when Sir Richard Aston, one of the judges, observed, that the crime of which they had been guilty, was aggravated by the tendency it had to lead the ignorant and unwary, to the commission of that horrid and foul sin, PERJURY, the only barrier between God and man. From these and other reasons, equally forcible, he inferred the necessity of an exemplary punishment; and therefore he ordered each of them to pay a fine of 1000 marks (666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*) to the king, and to suffer six months imprisonment; and at the expiration thereof, should enter into a recognizance of 1000*l.* each, and two sureties, in 500*l.* each, for their good behaviour for three years, One of the electors thus bribed, was pilloried for perjury, two days after the late members had been sentenced, and again, the next week, at Hindon; where he was brought for that purpose, from the King's Bench prison.

During the confinement of Sir Francis Burdett, for what was conceived a contempt of this supposed virtuous House of Commons, the Electors of Westminster met to celebrate the anniversary of their free election of their present patriotic Representatives. Lord Cockrane and Sir Francis Burdett. On this occasion Mr. Jones Burdett, the brother of the imprisoned Baronet, in contrasting the impunity allowed to such men as Lord Castlereagh and Percival, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, bartering a seat in Parliament for a Cadetship, with the severity shown to poor offenders, who were often punished, with death for stealing a few shillings—with Hunt, Williards, Jones, and others, public defaulters, to the amount of hundred of thousands of pounds, quotes the following lines from Shakespeare's tragedy of King Lear:-

## SUPPLEMENT 2

"Through tatter'd clothes small vices do appear,  
"Robes and furr'd gowns hide all, plate sin with gold,  
"And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks;  
"Arm it with rags, a pigmy straw doth pierce it."

About this time a Member of the same House, a creature of Government, named Hunt, representative of an insignificant borough, controlled by the Minister of the day, called Queenborough, in Kent, ran off to America, with 93,817*l.* 14*s.* 5*d.* of the nation's money, wrung from the industry of the patient yeomen; while dire distress-nay, the calls of hunger, which, by holy writ we are taught, "Will break through stone walls," have impelled the wretched to use force in order to compel the rich and the monopolisers to lower the price of provisions, are adjudged guilty of rioting. Hence a prison dirge, with too much truth, thus concludes:

"And yet in vogue  
"Lives the great rogue;  
"While small rogues are by dozens hang'd."

**JOHN MADDY, or MANNING**  
*Another Case of Adultery*

In the twenty-third year of the reign of Charles II. John Maddy, or Manning, was indicted at the assizes for the county of Surrey, for the murder of one Mavers, to which he pleaded not guilty. Judge Twisden directed the jury to find the following special verdict, in order to have the opinion of the twelve judges, viz. "That John Maddy, coming into his own house, found Mavers in the act of adultery with his wife, and with a joint stool he struck and killed Mavers; and that there was no precedent malice in Maddy towards Mavers."

The record was moved by writ of *certiorari* into the court of King's Bench, and by the opinion of the Judges, this was but manslaughter, and he was gently, that is, with an iron hardly warm, burnt in the hand.

This precedent has since been, in such cases, adopted, and Venables was found guilty of manslaughter, and in like manner punished. This is a mere pretence of conformity to the law; and we hold it abundantly sufficient for the punishment of a villain who defiles the marriage bed.

About this time a silk mercer on Ludgate-hill, suspicious of his wife's fidelity, gave out to his family, that his business called him to a distant part of the kingdom. His wife, while she put a change of linen into his saddle bags, feigned infinite sorrow for his departure. He had been apprised of her misconduct by a faithful servant, and to him he communicated his real intent; which was, to proceed on his horse (in those times tradesmen rode on horseback, now they sport a phaeton or curricle) a few miles, and return at night. Accordingly his door was secretly opened to him, while his guilty wife and her paramour were regaling in the parlour. He cautiously, in the dark, went to his chamber, and taking his sword, secreted himself in a closet. The guilty pair soon followed, and in the very act of defiling his bed, he plunged his sword through them both. No jury would take cognizance of the cause of their deaths. Let all adulterers thus perish.

**FRANCIS DAVID STIRN**  
*Convicted of Murder, but Poisoned Himself in Newgate, 12<sup>th</sup>*  
*Sept, 1760*

Public conversation on the fate of Lord Ferrers, was not at an end, when the remarkable case of another malefactor interposed. This was the unhappy fate of Francis David Stirn, by birth a German; a man of erudition, and unfortunately possessed of passions great as that unhappy lord. The circumstances which gave rise to this melancholy tale, are as singular as the last, and will be contemplated with nearly equal interest, by the reader.

Francis David Stirn was born in the principality of Hesse Cassel, about the year 1735. His father was a minister, and his brother is now a metropolitan minister at Hersfeldt, having the superintendance over the Calvinist clergy of a certain district. At a proper age he was sent to a public grammar-school in Hesse Cassel, where he made a considerable progress, and was then removed to a college at Bremen, which is endowed with professorships, as a university. While he was here, he preached some probationary discourses, according to the custom of the place, and though he was scarce twenty years of age, became tutor to the son of one Haller, a doctor of laws, and burgomaster of the city. But he soon forfeited the favour both of Mr. Haller and his wife, by a suspicious and supercilious disposition, which broke out into so many acts of indecorum, that he was dismissed from his employment. He was then taken home by his brother, who soon after placed him at the university of Hintelin, belonging to Hesse, where he pursued his studies from the year 1756 till the middle of the year 1758. During this time he improved his knowledge in the Latin and Greek classics to an uncommon degree; he also acquired a very considerable skill in the Hebrew, and became a great proficient both in vocal and instrumental music, dancing, fencing, and other polite accomplishments.

About this time, the French having made an irruption into Hesse, and impoverished the inhabitants by raising exorbitant contributions, his brother was no longer able to support him, and therefore sent him to England with very strong recommendations to a friend, who is in a station of great honour and interest. This person received him kindly, and promised to procure him an appointment that should be agreeable to his friends: but as no opportunity immediately presented he offered himself as an assistant to Mr. Crawford, who keeps a school in Cross-street, Hatton Garden, and was received, upon the recommendation of the Reverend Mr. Planta, who had himself lived with Mr. Crawford in that station, and left him upon his having obtained a place in the Museum. It was also proposed that he should assist the German minister at the chapel in the Savoy, where he preached several probationary discourses; but as he made use of notes, he was not approved by his auditory; Stirn, however, with the suspicion natural to his temper, imputed his disappointment to some unfriendly offices of Mr. Planta, and some unaccountable combination between him and the people.

He then turned his thoughts towards a military life, in which some offer of advantage seems to have been made him; but his friends here were so well apprized of his infirmity, that, knowing it would be impossible for him to submit to the subordination established in any army, they earnestly dissuaded him from it, that he might not incur the censure of a court-martial, or bring himself into other inextricable difficulties. He then formed a design of entering into one of our universities; and

having communicated it to his friends, he obtained the interest of several clergymen of considerable influence: but some new sally of his jealous and ungovernable temper, disgusted his friends and disappointed his expectations. But instead of imputing his disappointment to himself, he threw out many threats against those whom he had already offended by his petulance and ill behaviour.

In the meantime, he continued in Mr. Crawford's family, where he gave frequent and mortifying instances of his pride and indiscretion; one of which is too remarkable to be omitted. He set out one day with Mr. Crawford, and a Prussian gentleman, to dine with Mr. V—, a Dutch merchant at Muswell-hill; in his way thither he quitted their company, and, by crossing the fields, got to the house before them. When he came there, he took such offence at something Mr. V— said, in some trifling dispute which happened between them, that he called him Fool, and proceeded from one outrage to another, till Mr. V— ordered his servants to turn him out of doors, which was done before his companions, Crawford and the Prussian, got there. Yet Stirn, when they came back in the evening, fell into another fit of rage against them, and charged them with having got to Mr. V—'s before him, and concealed themselves in another room, to enjoy the injurious treatment which Mr. V— was prepared to offer him; insisting that he had heard them rejoicing and laughing at his disgrace.

While he lived with Mr. Crawford, he became acquainted with Mr. Matthews, a surgeon in the neighbourhood, who advertised the cure of fistulas, and disorders of the like kind. Matthews is said to have insinuated to Stirn, that, though Crawford professed great friendship to him, yet his intention was only to keep him in a state of poverty and dependence, and to render his abilities subservient to his own advantage, without giving him a valuable consideration, telling him, that it was in his power to provide much better for himself. From this time, Stirn's behaviour to Mr. Crawford was very different from what it had been before, and Mr. Crawford was proportionably less satisfied; so that, though he still continued with him, yet Crawford says, that he now kept him merely from the regard he had to him and his family. Soon after this, Matthews made him a proposal to come and live with him, offering him an apartment ready furnished, and his board, upon condition that he should teach Mrs. Matthews and her daughter music, and Matthews himself the classics. This proposal Stirn inclined to accept; but Mr. Crawford, hearing of it, endeavoured to persuade Matthews to retract it, telling him, that Stirn had failings which would render him a very troublesome inmate. Matthews, who seems to have had neither a good opinion of Crawford, nor good-will to him, immediately told Stirn that he had been attempting to persuade him to go back from his proposals, and mentioned also the reasons he gave for so doing. This threw Stirn into a rage, and he expressed his resentment to Crawford in strong terms, and a boisterous behaviour. Stirn soon after accepted Matthews's proposal, and Matthews offered to secure him a continuance of what he had offered for twelve months, by writing; but Stirn refused the obligation, saying, that his honour was sufficient. Crawford having failed in persuading Matthews not to receive Stirn, now endeavoured to prevail upon Stirn not to go to Matthews; and, therefore, though he says he would not have kept him so long, but in regard to Stirn himself and his friends, he now offered to raise his salary, that he might keep him longer, at greater expense. But this offer was refused, and Stirn took possession of his apartment at Matthews's house; a very little time, however, was sufficient to show that they could not long continue together.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Stirn's pride, and his situation in life, concurred to render him so jealous of indignity, and so ingenious in discovering oblique reproach and insult in the behaviour of those about him, that, finding one evening, after he came home, some pieces of bread in the dining room, which had been left there by a child of the family, he immediately took it into his head, that they were left there as reproachful emblems of his poverty, which obliged him to subsist on the fragments of charity. This thought set him on fire in a moment; he ran furiously upstairs, and knocking loudly and suddenly at Mr. Matthew's chamber-door, called out, Mr. Matthews! He was answered by Mrs. Matthews, who was in bed, that Mr. Matthews was not there; but he still clamorously insisted on the door's being opened, so that Mrs. Matthews was obliged to rise, and having put on her clothes, came out, and asked him what he wanted, and what he meant by such behaviour; he answered that he wanted Mr. Matthews, and that he knew he was in the room. It happened that at this instant Mr. Matthews knocked at the street door, and put an end to the dispute with his wife. The moment Mr. Matthews entered the house Stirn in a furious manner charged him with an intention to affront him by the crusts; Mr. Matthews assured him that he meant no such thing, and that the bread was carried thither by the child: Mrs. Matthews also confirmed it, and Stirn was at length pacified. He seems to have been conscious of the strange impropriety of his conduct, as soon as he had time for reflection; for the next morning he went to Mr. Crawford, and expressed a most grateful sense of Mr. and Mrs. Matthews's patience and kindness in suffering, and passing over, his fantastic behaviour.

It is however probable, that, from this time, they began to live together upon very ill terms; Matthews soon after gave him warning to quit his house, and Stirn refused to go. What particular offences had been given on each side does not appear; but they had been carried to such lengths, that Crawford consulted Mr. Welch, a Middlesex justice, about them, on Stirn's behalf. What directions he received are not known; but, on Wednesday the 13th of August, Stirn having been then in Mr. Matthews's family about two months, Matthews went to a friend upon Dowgate hill, whose name is Lowther, and telling him that Stirn had behaved so ill he could no longer keep him in his house, and that he had refused to quit it, requested his advice and assistance to get rid of him. Mr. Lowther then went with Mr. Matthews to Mr. Welch, who finding there was no legal contract between them, told Matthews he might turn Stirn out when he pleased, without notice. Matthews then determining to turn him out that night, Mr. Welch desired he would be cautious, and advised him to get a couple of friends to be with him; and when Stirn came in, first to desire him to go away peaceably, and, if he refused, to lead him out by the arm. Matthews then said, he was a desperate man, and if he should offer any rudeness to him, would make no scruple of stabbing him. He was then advised to take a peace officer with him.

And having now received sufficient instructions, he went away with his friend, determined to put them into execution. While Matthews and his friend were at Mr. Welch's, Stirn was making his complaint to Mr. Crawford, whom he met at Bartlets-Buildings Coffee-house, near Holborn. He told him, with great emotion, that Mr. Matthews had villainously and unjustly charged him with having alienated the affection of his wife, and, by her means, having had access to his purse. Mr. Crawford, who appears to have known that Matthews had warned Stirn to be gone, and that Stirn had refused to go, advised him, as the best way of removing Matthews's suspicions, immediately to quit his house. Upon this he started up in a violent rage, and told him, if he spoke another word, he would — and muttered something else to

himself, which Mr. Crawford could not hear. But the next moment he told him, that he and Mr. Chapman (a surgeon in the neighbourhood) had conspired with Mr. Matthews to ruin his character, and oblige him to quit England with infamy. After some farther altercation, he sat down, and appeared somewhat more composed; but on a sudden, started up again, with new fury in his look, and said, his honour was wounded, his character ruined, and his bread lost; that, under such circumstances, he could not live; and that, if Matthews scandalously turned him out of his house, which he seems to have threatened, he would be revenged. Mr. Crawford attempted some farther expostulation, but finding it in vain, and it being now near 11 o'clock, he accompanied him to Mr. Matthews's door, and there left him. But though he was in a temper that made expostulation hopeless, yet, he says, he left him, as he thought, in a disposition to do as he advised him.

Matthews, in the meantime, had got two friends, of which Mr. Lowther was one, and a constable; and having removed all that belonged to Mr. Stirn out of his room, into the passage, they were waiting for his coming in; Matthews having determined to turn him into the street at that time of the night, and leave him to get a lodging where he could. When Stirn knocked at the door, it was opened to him by Lowther; and upon entering the passage, and seeing his clothes and other things lying in it, he cried out, with great passion, "Who has done this!" Matthews replied, "I have done it—You told me, you would not leave my house but by force, and now I am determined you shall go." Stirn then reproached Matthews with being a bad man, and told him that he was a coward, and would not have dared thus to insult him if he had not procured persons to abet him and assist him. Some farther words passed on both sides; after which, Matthews desired Stirn to take a glass of wine, there being then wine and glasses upon the table; and said, "let us part friendly." Stirn then said, he would not go till he had played his last tune; and there being a spinnet in the room, he went and struck it five or six times: then he said, "I want but half a guinea; you may do what you will with my clothes and books." Matthews replied, "if you will tell me what you want with a half a guinea, and have not so much, I will lend you the money." Stirn then put his hand in his pocket, and taking out some money, looked at it, and said, "No, I have as much money as I want, I have spoke to a man today who will write my life and yours." "Have a care," said Matthews, "what you say; you have before said enough for me to lay you by the heels;" "Why, what have I said before," said Stirn. "Why, you have said," replied Matthews, "that Crawford might thank his God he had got rid of you in the manner he had; but that you would have your revenge of me." Stirn then desired Matthews to give him his hand, and Matthews stretching it out, Stirn grasped it in both his, and said, "I have said so, and here is my hand, I will have revenge of you." After this, a good deal of opprobrious language passed between them, and then Stirn went out of the house with the constable, though not in his custody.

Where this forlorn and infatuated creature passed the night, does not appear; nor is anything related of the transactions of the next day, Thursday the 14th, except that Mr. Chapman endeavoured to procure a meeting of the parties with himself and Mr. Crawford that evening, to bring about a reconciliation, but without success, Mr. Matthews being unfortunately from home, when he called to make the appointment. It appears, however, from divers circumstances which happened afterwards that, on that day, Stirn bought a pair of pistols, and that, having loaded them, he sent Mr. Matthews a challenge, which Matthews refused to accept; and it is probable, that from this time, he resolved upon the murder, no other means of revenge being left him.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

On Friday morning, the fifteenth, Mr. Crawford, hearing that Stirn was in great anxiety and distress of mind, gave him an invitation to dinner. This invitation he accepted, and behaved with great propriety and politeness till after the cloth was taken away; but just then he started up, as if stung by some sudden thought, and uttered several invectives against Matthews; saying, that none but an execrable villain could impute to him the horrid character of a thief and adulterer. He said this, without any mention having been made of his own situation, or of Mr. Matthews's name, and soon after went away. About half an hour after five, the same evening, as Mr. Crawford was going down Cross-street, Stirn overtook him. Crawford at this time discovered such an expression of despair in his countenance, that he suspected he had formed a design to destroy himself, especially as it was said he had made an attempt of that kind six months before. Stirn turned the conversation principally upon the point of honour, and the proper means of maintaining it. Crawford, who saw him greatly moved, so as frequently to start, and change colour, turned the discourse to religion; but observing he gained no attention he hoped to soothe his mind by mentioning the prospect he still had of doing well, but Stirn then hastily interrupted him: Who, says he, will entertain a person under the horrid character of an adulterer and a thief! No, Sir, I am lost both to God and to the world. Mr. Crawford then told him, that if he should fail of success here, he would assist him with money to return to his brother. "To my brother!" says Stirn, in an agony; "neither my brother nor my country can receive me under the disgrace of such crimes as are imputed to me." As he pronounced these words, he burst into tears; and Mr. Crawford, not being able longer to support the effect of such a conversation upon his mind, was obliged to take his leave.

Mr. Crawford, in order to recollect himself, went out into the fields, where he could not help musing on what had passed; and finding his suspicions, that Stirn intended to destroy himself, grow stronger and stronger, he determined to return, and endeavour to find him out a second time.

It happened that about half an hour after eight o'clock he met with him at Owen's coffee-house, where the conversation upon his quarrel with Matthews was renewed though with much more temper than before; yet Stirn often started, saying, he expected that everyone who opened the door was Matthews. While he was at Owen's Coffee-house, he called for a pint of porter and some potatoes, which he devoured ravenously, though he had supped before, and drank a pint of porter, and three gills of wine. About ten o'clock he got up, and said, he would go to Mr. Pugh's; Pugh keeps an alehouse, the sign of the Pewter-platter, in Cross-street, Hatton Garden, next door to Crawford's school, where Crawford, Matthews, Chapman, and other persons in the neighbourhood, frequently met to spend the evening.

Mr. Crawford endeavoured to persuade him to go home to his lodgings, upon which Stirn, without making any reply, caught him by the hand, and pressed it with such violence as almost to force the blood out at his fingers' ends. They went together to Mr. Pugh's door, where Mr. Crawford left him, and went home. Stirn went into the neighbour's room, at the Pewter-platter, where he found Matthews, who had been to see Foot's farce, called the Minor, in the Hay-market, and with him, Mr. Chapman and Mr. Lowther; several other persons were in the room, but not of the same company. Stirn sat down at the same table with Matthews and his friends; but Chapman perceiving by his gestures and countenance, that he was in great agitation, called him out, and admonished him, not to do anything that might have disagreeable

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

consequences either to himself or others. After this Stirn returned alone into the room, and Chapman went home. Stirn walked about the room by himself, and in the meantime Mr. Crawford came in, having heard who were in company, and fearing some fatal effect of Stirn's passion, which he hoped he might contribute to prevent.

Stirn, after some time, applying himself to Mr. Matthews, said, "Sir, you have accused me of theft and adultery." Matthews denied the charge; but said, if his wife's virtue had not been more to be depended upon than *his* honour, he did not know what might have been the consequence. After some mutual reproaches, Matthews called him a dirty fellow, and said he ought to be sent into his own lousy country: Stirn, after this, took two or three turns about the room, without reply, and then took a small piece of paper out of his pocket, and held it some time in his hand, with a design that Matthews should take notice of it; but Matthews not regarding it, he held it in the candle till it was burnt; he then walked about the room for a few minutes more, and Crawford observing uncommon fury and desperation in his looks, desired the company to drink his health; Mr. Lowther immediately did so, and, as he thinks, so did Mr. Matthews too; after which Stirn still walked about the room, but in a few minutes came and stood at Mr. Crawford's elbow, Mr. Lowther sat next to Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Matthews next to Mr. Lowther. He then went and stood between Mr. Lowther and Mr. Crawford and having continued there about a minute, or a minute and a half, he drew out the two pistols he had procured for the duel, wrapped up in a piece of paper, and stretching his arm across the table before Mr. Lowther, he discharged one of them at Matthews's breast, who gave a sudden start, and then falling forward, died instantly, without a groan. Stirn, almost at the same moment, discharged the other at himself; but, by some accident, the ball missed him, without doing any other damage. As soon as the smoke was dissipated, and the company recovered from their first astonishment and confusion, Stirn was seen standing as it were torpid with amazement and horror. As soon as he saw the attention of all that were in the room turned upon him, he seemed to recollect himself, and made towards the door; but a person in the room, whose name is Warford, seized him, and after some struggle pulled him to the ground. Lowther immediately went up to him, and Stirn cried out, "Shoot me, shoot me, shoot me, for I shall be hanged." Somebody then saying, Matthews is dead, Stirn replied, "I am not sorry, but I am sorry that I did not shoot myself."

After his commitment he obstinately refused all kinds of food, with a view to starve himself, that he might avoid, the infamy of a public death by the hands of the executioner: he persisted in this abstinence till the Friday following, the 22d of August, being just a week, drinking only a dish or two of coffee, and a little wine; this conduct he endeavoured to justify, by saying, that his life was forfeited both by the law of God and man, and that it was not lawful even for the government to pardon him; and what does it signify, says he, by whose hands this forfeit is paid. The ordinary indeed told him, in answer to this argument, that his life was not in his own power, and that as he did not, and could not, give it to himself, so neither had he a right to take it away; it is indeed pity that upon this occasion the ordinary was master of no better argument, for the argument which he used against Stirn's right to take away his own life, would prove, that his life could not be lawfully taken away by any other; for if Stirn had not a right to take away his own life, because, he did not, and could not give it to himself, the hangman, as he could no more give life than Stirn, had no more right to take it away. He was, however, urged to eat, by arguments addressed to his passions; for he was told, that he would incur more infamy by suicide

## SUPPLEMENT 2

than by hanging, as his body would be dragged like that of a brute, to a hole dug to receive it in a cross-road, and a stake would be afterwards driven through it, which would remain as a monument of disgrace. These arguments, however, were without effect, for he never eat any solid food, till he had, by the assistance of some who visited him, procured a quantity of opium sufficient to answer his purpose by a nearer way.

On Wednesday the 10th of September having then in some degree recovered his strength, he was brought to the bar and arraigned; he was then decently dressed in a suit of black cloth, but, contrary to the general expectation, he pleaded not guilty, and requested that his trial might be put off till Friday the 12th, which was granted. On the 12th he was brought to the bar again, but, instead of his suit of black, he appeared in a green night gown; he had been advised to feign himself mad, but this advice he rejected with disdain. During his trial, which lasted about four hours, he was often ready to faint; he was therefore indulged with a seat, and several refreshments; when sentence was passed upon him he quite fainted away, but being recovered by the application of spirits, he requested the court that he might be permitted to go to the place of execution in the coach with the clergyman; upon which the court told him, that was in the sheriff's breast, but that such a favour, if granted, would be contrary to the intention of the law, which had been lately made to distinguish murders by exemplary punishment; upon this he made a profound reverence to the court, and was taken back to prison.

About six o'clock, the same evening, he was visited by the ordinary, who found in the press-yard a German, who said he was a minister, whom Stirn had desired might attend him: The ordinary therefore took him up with him to Stirn's chamber, he having been removed from the cells by the assistance of some friends. They found him lying on his bed, and as he expressed great uneasiness at the presence of the ordinary and a prisoner that had been set over him as a guard, they withdrew and left him alone with his countryman; soon after this, an alarm was given that Stirn was extremely ill, and supposed to have taken poison; he was immediately visited by the sheriff, and Mr. Akerman the keeper of the prison, who found him in a state of stupefaction, but not yet convulsed; a surgeon was procured, and several methods tried to discharge his stomach of the poison, but without effect; he was then let blood, which apparently rendered him worse.

About nine o'clock he was pale and speechless, his jaw was fallen, and his eyes were fixed, and about five minutes before eleven he expired. It does not appear what reason Matthews had for charging Stirn with an attempt upon his wife, but Stirn solemnly declared in his last moments that there was none. He expressed many obligations to Mr. Crawford, who often visited him in prison with great kindness and humanity; and perhaps if he had been in a situation more suitable not only to his hopes, but to his merit and his birth, he would have been less jealous of affronts, and, conscious of undisputed dignity, would have treated rudeness and slander with contempt, instead of pursuing them with revenge.

He spent his life in perpetual transitions from outrage and fury, to remorse and regret; one hour drawing his sword upon his dearest friends, to revenge some imaginary affront, and the next lamenting his folly, and entreating their pardon with contrition and tears. How many are they whose keen sensibility, and violence of temper, keep them nearly in the same situation, though they have not yet been pushed to the same excess; let such remember, that no human being can say to the passions of

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

the mind, any more than to the waves of the sea, "hitherto shall ye go, but here shall ye be stayed."

If, by this mournful example, some of these shall be warned gradually to weaken their vehemence of temper, by restraint, instead of giving it new force by habit, neither Stirn nor Matthews will have died in vain; they will have reason to say, upon this occasion, "that God, in the midst of judgment has remembered mercy; and, that by the stripes of others they have been healed."

"O shame to all that God design'd below!  
"Shame to the wretch who flies from human woe!  
"Shame to the wretch who aims th' empoison'd dart  
"At the proud feeling of a gen'rous heart!  
"Yet slaves there be, who in misfortune's bowl  
"Mix bitter draughts, to agonize the soul;  
"Whose bosoms gladden at another's woe;  
"And joy to see the grief-swoln eyes o'er flow."  
PRATT.

**WILLIAM ODELL, A SOLDIER, AND JOHN DEMPSEY,  
A SAILOR**

*Executed at Tyburn, September 15, 1760, for Murder*

WE find no particulars of the lives of these men; yet, the singularity of a soldier and a sailor, each dressed as when they served their country, being carried in the same cart, through the most public streets of London, to suffer an ignominious death, for the commission of the foulest of crimes, induces us to give a distinct head to their case. Their offence is certainly attended with every circumstance that can rouse our indignation at such inhuman, cowardly, deeds, as those for which they so justly suffered.

A soldier, whose profession teaches him courage, and inculcates the principle of protection to the weaker sex, to barbarously turn the weapon entrusted to him to defend his country, upon his wife, is a dreadful reflection. Nor are we less mortified, in finding a British sailor, whose courage and generosity is proverbial, like a dastard assassin, and with a deadly weapon of the most diabolical construction, attack an unarmed man, and murder him.

The name of this disgraceful soldier, was William Odell. It was proved upon his trial, and with much reluctance do we promulgate the heads of the evidence against him, that he first strangled his wife, then with his sword, cut her almost piecemeal; and then threw her mangled body in a clay-pit. John Dempsey, the sailor, was condemned for murdering John Perry, near Ratcliffe-highway, by striking him on the head with a large stick, through the end whereof was driven long nails, which penetrating the skull, proved instant death.

The body of the soldier was delivered to the surgeons, for dissection; but that of the sailor was hung in chains, near Ealing.

**THE MAYOR OF BODMIN, IN CORNWALL**  
*Barbarously Executed in the Reign of Edward VI*

THE tyranny by which our hardy ancestors suffered themselves to be governed by the alternate victorious houses of York and Lancaster, was, by the revolutionists who chose William of Orange for their king, regarded with a mixed emotion of pity and contempt. Their descendants, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, though aided by the strong light of reason, seem, if not actually, to have bared their backs to the rod of tyranny, and have surely fitted their necks to the yoke of oppression. Well may it be observed: that like the Romans, who had passed their zenith, Britons are degenerating into the subjection of "a junto of little lawyers," as the patriot Whitbread calls them, who, while they accumulate burthens upon us, make us dance and sing in jubilee rejoicing for the long reign that has wrought so wonderful a change in the very nature of Englishmen.

The case now introduced, we by no means consider as a deviation from the original design of this Work; on the other hand, we anticipate the increased approbation of our readers, on their being presented with whatever may convey information on any branch of the extensive and perilous subject on which we are pledged, not only to show examples of its pains and punishments, but to add and explain the authority and power by which they are inflicted.

In the reign of King Edward VI. a rebellion happened on account of the alteration of religion, and the rebels being defeated, Sir William Kingston, Provost Marshal, was cruel enough to make a jest of men in misery, by virtue of his office. One Bowyer, Mayor of Bodmin, having been among the rebels, not willingly, but by constraint, Sir William sent him word, he would dine with him on a certain day, for whom the mayor provided an hospitable entertainment. A little before dinner the provost took the mayor aside, and whispered in his ear, that there was to be an execution that afternoon, and ordered him to have a gallows set up over against his own door. The mayor obeyed his command; and after dinner the provost took the mayor by the hand, and desired him to lead him to the place of execution, which, when he saw, he asked him, "If he thought the gallows was strong enough?" "Yes," says the mayor. "Well then," replied Sir William, "get up and try, for it is provided for you!" "I hope, Sir," answered the mayor, "you are not in earnest?" "By my troth," says the provost, "there is no remedy, for you have been a busy rebel." And accordingly, without delay, or liberty to make a defence, the mayor was executed.

A miller, near Bodmin, at the same time, who had been very active in the rebellion, hearing the provost was at Bodmin, and fearing lest he should visit his house, told a stout young fellow, his servant, that he had occasion to go from home, and if any gentleman should enquire for him, he should tell him, that HE was the miller. The provost, not long after, came and asked for the miller; the servant came out and said as he was ordered; upon which the provost commanded his myrmidons to seize him, and hang him up. The poor fellow hearing this, cried out, "I am not the miller, but the miller's man." "Nay friend," says the provost, "I will take thee at thy word. If thou art the miller, thou art a busy knave, and a rebel, and deservest to be hanged; if thou art not the miller, thou art a false, lying knave, and canst never do thy master better service than to hang for him." And he ordered him instantly to be hanged on the next tree.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Many reigns after this period, we find in the page of history, that France was governed by a monarch of a far different disposition to those of the sanguinary houses of York and Lancaster. The circumstance we allude to is as follows: Chabot, admiral in the reign of Francis I. of France, was nobly descended, had done his country great service, and was highly in favour with his prince; but decaying in time, and the king having charged him with misdemeanors of a long service he had done in Piedmont, and in the defence of Marseilles against the emperor, gave his royal master some indecent language, and dared him to try him by law, for all the offences he alleged against him. Hereupon the king issued out a commission to the chancellor Poyet, as president, and to others, judges, to bring the admiral to a trial for his life, upon an information, and indictment preferred against him by the royal advocate. The chancellor was a man of unlimited ambition; and hoping to please the king in these proceedings against the admiral, inveigled some of the judges, by artifice and cunning, others by threatenings, and the rest by fair promises; and though nothing could be proved against the admiral, that merited the king's displeasure, yet the chancellor subscribed, and by his arts procured others to subscribe, to the confiscation of his estate, the forfeiture of his offices, and his liberty, though he could not prevail on them to the taking away his life. The king, abhorring falsehood in so great a magistrate, and though to any that should complain of hardships put upon the admiral, he might be answered, that he was tried as he desired, by the law and customs of his country, and by the judges of parliament; yet the king made all his passions give way to justice, and restored the admiral to his honour, his estate, his offices, and his liberty; and caused the wicked chancellor Poyet, to be indicted, arraigned, and degraded.

**JAMES NICKOLSON**

***Murderer, convicted fifteen years after the murder***

Another remarkable discovery of murder, after the crime had been committed more than fifteen years, was in the case of James Nickolson. This man murdered one Edward Jones, a blacksmith at Lewisham, in Kent, then fled from justice, and enlisted as a soldier. He went abroad, and served in that capacity, until the year 1766, when, being discharged, he returned direct to the very place where he had committed the murder; but the circumstance appeared to have died away in the public mind.

Nickolson left a wife, and on his return found her married to another man, after having received a legacy of one hundred and fifty pounds, bequeathed him by his brother, as his supposed widow. Nickolson did not claim his wife, but insisted upon having part of the legacy, as it was left soley on his account which she refusing, a quarrel arose, and in revenge, this woman disclosed the circumstances of the murder, on which her husband was hanged.

**COUNTRY RIOTS, OWING TO THE HIGH PRICE OF  
PROVISIONS IN THE YEAR 1766**  
*With an Account of The Execution of Some of the Rioters*

"Ill fares the land, to fated ills a prey,  
"Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.  
"Princes or lords may flourish or may fade,  
"A breath can make them, as a breath has made;  
"But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,  
"When once destroyed, can never be supplied."  
Goldsmith's Deserted Village.

THE above prophetic and immortal lines ought to be written in letters of gold, and prefixed over the door of the house of Commons, constantly to remind that very important branch of the constitution, how much it is their duty to attend to the interest of the lower orders of society for, from want of paying due attention to those most useful classes of men, the small farmer and peasant, great part of the distressing evils we now experience has originated.

It is almost the unanimous opinion of the nation, that the monopoly of farms is the first great leading cause of the immoderate advance in the price of all the articles of life; for, by throwing the bulk of the land into comparatively few hands, opportunity is given to speculation: an evil, especially on objects of the first necessity, exceeds all calculation. By permitting farmers to hold large tracts, it is impossible the land can be so well attended to; and for want of abundance of manure on the tillage land, a very great quantity has been taken from under the plough, and thrown into pasture, consequently this had been the means of a vast decrease in the growth of all kinds of grain. The reduction in the number of farms in England would hardly be credited, was it not, unfortunately, too well proved—not one county in the kingdom has more than half the number of farms it formerly had; most counties are reduced one third; and one county in particular has not the fourth part of the number it had a few years ago.

It is this cursed monopoly, more than war itself, which impoverishes the mass of the people, and which will, we greatly fear, in a very few years more, reduce them to the dependence of the Russian peasantry—slaves to their lords.

In the year 1766, a short time previous to the dreadful commotions in London, denominated Wilkes's Riots, and which we shall particularly name, the country people rose in a tumultuous manner, in various parts of England. The cause of the dreadful outrages, was the high price of corn, and the following extract from the King's speech to both houses of parliament thereon, will show some reason for discontent.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

"The high price of wheat, and the defective produce of that grain last harvest, together with the extraordinary demands for the same from foreign parts, have principally determined me to call you thus early together, that I might have the sense of parliament, as soon as conveniently might be, on a matter so important, and particularly affecting the poorer part of my subjects.

"The urgency of the necessity called upon me, in the meantime, to exert my royal authority for the preservation of the public safety, against a public calamity which could admit of no delay.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

"I have therefore, by and with the advice of my Privy Council, laid an embargo on wheat and wheat flour going out of the kingdom, until the advice of my Parliament could be taken thereon.

"If further provision of law be requisite or expedient, with regard to the dearness of corn, so necessary for the sustenance of the poorer sorts, they cannot escape the wisdom of parliament, to which I recommend the due consideration thereof.

"At the same time, I must with concern take notice, that notwithstanding my cares for the people, a spirit of the most daring insurrection has, in divers parts, broke forth in violence, of the most criminal nature.

"Necessary orders have been given for bringing such dangerous offenders to condign punishment and speedy justice; nor shall vigilance and vigour on my part be wanting to restore obedience and reverence to the law and the government."

A special commission was issued for the trial of the offenders, in the different counties, where these riots had mostly prevailed, which, it was observed, would cost the country ten thousand pounds! Before we proceed to the particular offences then committed, let us take a view of the price of bread, that threw the country into commotions, compared with the present price, which the people pay without a murmur; and thus we may judge of the calamitous state of the British empire

On the 28th of October, 1766, when the insurrections on account of its enormous price was at their height, the assize for the peck loaf of 17lb. 2oz. was two shillings and eight-pence for wheaten, and two shillings for household bread; which is eight-pence the quartern loaf. In the present year, 1810, the quartern loaf of wheaten bread is one shilling and five-pence, more than double at the time of the general outcry; and eight or nine years ago, when the people endured with patience their distress, it was at the enormous price of three shillings.

"Bread for my children, give me bread: she cries,  
"E'en now, by hunger struck, my husband dies;  
"His wife must follow fast; yet save, O save,  
"These little ones, for whom that bread I crave;

"And this poor babe now starving on my breast.  
"Her pray'r is scorn'd, her sorrows made a jest,  
"The jest of that proud plunderer who braves  
"The poor man's curse, nor heeds when famine crave."

PRATT's Cottage Pictures.

In viewing the bad consequences resulting from this national clamour for bread, our feelings are roused at the reflection of thousands and tens of thousands in this great empire, still wanting the common necessaries of life, while a few hundred privileged men of fortune, and dignified clergy, are rolling in luxury. But, saith the law, bread must not be obtained by force of arms; and the mischiefs which we shall adduce, shows the wisdom of the law; yet ought the poor to have food to support nature, as well as the lord, whose luxuries, having never indulged, they covet not.

The principal flagitious acts, committed in this scarcity of corn, we have carefully selected from the different periodical publications of the day; and which, for the convenience of our readers, and consonant with our plan, we have arranged in chronological (*sic*) order.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

At *Aylesbury* the people rose, and seized a quantity of bread and butter in the market. The magistrate caused the ringleaders to be seized. They were tried, convicted and imprisoned.

*Austle, St.* The tanners rose, and compelled the butchers to lower their prices.

*Bath.* The mob rose, and did much mischief in the different markets before they dispersed.

*Barnstaple, (Devonshire.)* The poor joined in a body, and compelled the farmers to sell wheat at five shillings per bushel.

*Bewdley.* The mob lowered the price of wheat, meat, and butter.

*Beckingham, near Bath.* A miller and his son procured firearms, and fired upon the people, killing a man and a boy, and desperately wounded others, which so exasperated the rest, that they set fire to the mills, and burnt them to the ground.

*Berwick-upon-Tweed.* The people were in commotion on account of the vast quantities of corn bought for exportation.

*Bradley, near Trowbridge.* A mill was destroyed by the populace, who divided the corn found therein among themselves.

*Birmingham.* A vast mob rose on the fair-day, and sold the bread and cheese at their own prices. An affray happened between them and the peace officers, and some of the ring-leaders were sent to gaol. The bakers, in order to appease the people, agreed to make a quantity of household bread at one penny per pound.

*Bradford, in Wiltshire.* The provision warehouses and shops were plundered; one man concerned in this riot was hanged.

*Bromsgrove, in Worcestershire.* They obliged the farmers to sell their wheat at five shillings per bushel, and the butchers their meat at twopence-halfpenny per pound.

*Colton, Great, in Warwickshire.* They rose, traversed the country, and did considerable damage, till, being met by the military, they were attacked and dispersed, and eight of them were killed.

*Coventry.* The mass of the people rose, and were joined by the colliers from the neighbouring coal-pits. They began their outrages by plundering the warehouses of cheese, and selling the same to the poor at low prices: They then took whatever provisions they met with by main force.

*Crediton, in Devonshire.* The poor being in great distress, and on the point of rising, means were taken to supply their wants.

*Dennington.* The mob rose, and first plundered a warehouse of cheese, which was defended by eighteen men in arms; they were afterwards pursued by the owner, and a large party of his friends, but to no purpose; the mob defended themselves by throwing stones, and drove back their pursuers

*Derby.* They rose in great numbers, attacked a party of light-horse, severely pelted them with stones, and wounded the commanding officer. Then they plundered a warehouse of cheese; in doing which thirty-four of them were apprehended, pinioned, and carried to gaol. The remainder, soon afterwards assembled, and attacked an armed boat, on the river Derwent, which they plundered of cheese to the value of three hundred pounds, and distributed it among the poor. They paid no regard to the magistrates, and were restrained alone by the military, from doing greater mischief.

*Evisham, in Worcestershire.* A mob suddenly rose and seized a quantity of butter, which they sold at sixpence a pound. They intended to pull down the corn mills, but were persuaded to desist.

*Exeter.* The people broke open a cheese warehouse, and sold it at a low price. They were intimidated from proceeding to further extremities by the military.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

*Gloucester.* In order to appease the clamours of the poor, the most considerable farmers from the hills, agreed to supply the market with wheat at five shillings a bushel, and actually sold large quantities at that price.

*Hampton, in Gloucestershire.* They rose in considerable numbers, but were timely opposed by the military; yet not before they had pulled down some houses containing provisions, and some lives lost.

*Henley-upon Thames.* The people rose, and in a tumultuous manner called for bread at a reasonable price; but upon the magistrates reading the riot act, they dispersed.

*Honiton, in Devonshire.* They rose and seized sacks of wheat, lodged by the farmers in public-houses, brought them into the market, and sold it at five shillings and six pence per bushel. They returned the sacks to the owners.

*Kidderminster.* The populace obliged the farmers to lower the price of wheat to five shillings per bushel.

*Leicester.* The people seized three waggon loads of cheese, and divided it among themselves.

*Ludlow, in Shropshire.* The colliers from the Cleehill, near this town, assembled in a body, and pulled down the still-house in that town. They went in a very orderly manner, and returned without doing any further mischief. The magistrates promised that the still should not be worked; but nothing could divert them from their determined purpose.

*Maidenhead, in Berkshire.* A number of bargemen entered this town, on account of the high price of provisions, and, committed several outrages, in seizing provisions, &c. but were opposed by the civil power, and the ring-leaders seized and sent to Reading gaol—three of them were hanged.

*Malmsbury.* The people rose in great numbers, seized on all the corn they could find, and sold it at five shillings per bushel, but were honest enough to give the farmers the money.

*Marlow, Great, in Buckinghamshire.* A mob of bargemen rose, and extorted money from the gentlemen and farmers in that neighbourhood, with which they purchased spirituous liquors, and intoxicated themselves, and in that state were very mischievous.

*Nottingham.* A mob entered this town on the fair-day, seized upon all the cheese the factors had purchased, and distributed the same among the poor; leaving the farmers' cheese unmolested. Here the military were called into the aid of the magistrates, and a skirmish took place, in which a farmer was killed.

*Newbury, in Berkshire.* A great mass of people assembled on the market-day, ripped open the sacks of wheat exposed for sale, and scattered the corn on the ground, seized the butter, meat, cheese, and bacon, in the shops, and threw it into the streets. They so intimidated the bakers, that they sold their bread at two-pence the peck loaf. From Newbury the mob proceeded to Skaw-Mill, where they threw the flour into the river, broke the windows of the house, and did other considerable damage there, to the amount of near a thousand pounds. A poor man named Parker, one of the mob, was killed, leaving a wife and five small children; and another man had his arm broke.

*Ottery St. Mary, in Devonshire.* The flour mills were destroyed by the mob.

*Pagenwell, near Stroud, in Gloucestershire.* The mob committed outrages, in order to lower the price of bread. Mr. Chandler, a shopkeeper, shot one of them dead, who was breaking into his house in the night; whereupon they set fire to his house, and burnt it to the ground. Mr. Chandler surrendered himself, was tried, and honourably acquitted, of killing the rioter—three hanged.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

*Paulton, in Devonshire.* The colliers joined the poor, and did great mischief.

*Redruth, in Cornwall.* The tanners rose, and intimidated the butchers to reduce the price of their meat, and the farmers their wheat.

*Salisbury, in Wiltshire.* The risings of the people here were very numerous, and great mischief was apprehended; but the prudent measures taken by the magistrates, and the farmers lowering the price of wheat, danger was happily averted. Some of the ring leaders were, however, apprehended and committed to prison—one hanged.

*Setbury.* The warehouses containing cheese and bacon, were forcibly entered. The former the mob sold at three-pence, and the latter at four-pence per pound.

*Sidbury in Devonshire.* The mills of this place were destroyed by the mob.

*Stourbridge, in Worcestershire.* The people rose in great numbers, and compelled farmers, butchers, and dealers, to lower the price of meat, wheat, butter, &c.

*Tipton, in Devonshire.* A number of poor people assembled, pulled down the flour mills, and did much other damage.

*Thame.* The bulk of the people assembled together, and insisted on the prices of the articles of life being lowered.

*Wallingford.* The people rose in one body, and regulated the prices of bread, cheese, butter, and bacon.

*Welton, in Devonshire.* The poor were joined by the colliers, in order to lower the price of provisions.

*Wincanton, in Devonshire.* The poor rose and did considerable damage, seizing the wheat and meat.

*Wolverhampton, in Staffordshire.* The people rose and compelled the farmers to sell wheat at five shillings per bushel, and butchers their meat at twopence-halfpenny per pound.

In various other parts of the kingdom did the poor thus riotously cry for bread; and seized provisions wherever they could be found. We have merely given the sketches of the most desperate cases. Parliament at length sought to remedy the evil, and granted some temporary relief to the distress of the people.

The Special Commission issued by government, for the purpose of bringing the riotous poor to punishment, for offending the laws, in their cry for bread, were opened by the judges of the different superior courts of record, in the early part of the month of December, when numbers of misguided, half-starved wretches were condemned to death, and some of them actually executed.

At *Reading* several were tried, and sentenced to death, three of whom were hanged, viz. Daniel Ecland, William Simpson, and John Skelton.

At *Salisbury* four received sentence of death, one of whom was executed.

At *Gloucester* nine were condemned, and three executed; and at several other towns where the Special Commission was opened, numbers were condemned, some executed, and others pardoned, whose names do not appear; nor, indeed, can they be of any import to the reader; their offences being against the same statute, and attended with nearly the same circumstances.

During these very serious commotions of the people, numbers of threatening letters were received by wealthy farmers and contractors, who had long played into each other's hands, and by that means the grain was exported. Several advertisements appeared in the *London Gazette*, offering rewards for the discovery and conviction of

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

the writers. To give them all, would far exceed the limits of our plan; we shall therefore deem it sufficient to extract the following, which was described to have been received by Mr. Rabley, of Birmingham:

"This is to acquaint the public, that there is a very large body of us at Kidderminster and Stourbridge, and by G—d will go through the work now, or die. We have sworn one another in, and if any poor man will come to Stourbridge, and be sworn in, we will maintain him and his family too. We have a large body, already upwards of two thousand, sworn and already armed. There shall be no hanging in the case now, we will have all the gaols and prisons down before us, as we have sworn, and be damned if we won't. Mr. Rabley, we desire you to put in the Birmingham Gazette, or you have a friend about your house if you do not gazette it, upon our word we will have it down.

"So no more, your's,

"Already armed at Stourbridge,

"U. B—."

Having now, by unwearied pains, presented the reader with the dreadful effects produced by the high price of provisions, which the rich never feel: we have only to add, that in the present year, 1813, the articles of life are double, and in many things treble, the price of the year 1766, with taxes, increased more than four-fold; yet the people now show no other resentment than a little grumbling, while they empty their pockets to tax-gatherers!

**EDWARD AND JANE M'GINNIS**  
*Brother and Sister Executed at Tyburn, July 18, 1766, for  
Burglary*

These two miserable children of most unhappy parents, broke into the dwelling-house of James Adair, Esq. in Soho-Square, and stole thereout a quantity of plate, jewels, and wearing apparel, to a large amount.

We find nothing further worthy of note in their case, except the conduct of the lower order of the country people of the malefactors (the Irish) in consequence of their execution. It is a singular national character of these people, in whatever part of the world they are thrown upon together, they associate, riot, and fight for each other, which they deem the only mode in which their supposed grievances can be redressed. They are ever the very worst subjects out of their own country. The seaport towns in the United States of America, contain a vast quantity of Irish emigrants; and this is not to be wondered at, when, upon a moderate calculation, half a million of the lower class of that distressed country, within the last twenty years, have emigrated to that unhealthy climate, where at least one fourth fall a victim to the burning heat of summer, which, since that rage for emigration began, and not before, the yellow-fever, like a plague, sweeps off the inhabitants, particularly new comers, in great numbers. These imported citizens are the most impudent and troublesome of the new world. The jailer of the extensive prison of Philadelphia, declared, that his crew consisted generally of nearly one half Irish, while a quarter were negroes, and the remainder disorderly Americans, and the others Europeans.

In the evening, after the execution of M'Ginnis and his sister, a great number of low Irishmen assembled before the house of one Hart, a Jew, broke all his windows, and did him other damage, on pretence of his being an accessory by receiving the goods of which the malefactors had robbed Mr. Adair; but, in point of fact, the attack was made upon the Jew, in revenge for his being the principal means of their conviction. The villains merited being hanged upon the spot of their riot and spoilation.

**ISAAC LONG**  
*And Other Sham Doctors*

Quacks and mountebanks are impostors extremely dangerous to society; for they not only cheat under the most plausible pretences, but very often poison credulous people with their nostrums. This species of fraud has, however, we are happy to observe, greatly decreased within the last thirty years. In that time the progress of literature has been rapid, and impositions become thereby more readily detected.

The deceptions used by these artful villains were various. When they had stuffed down the pill, the powder, and the tincture, which were to cure all disorders, they had recourse to sham-lotteries, where articles made with base metal, and of inferior work, which they pretended was standard gold and silver, were the vaunted prizes; but even those comparatively worthless articles seldom came to the gaping crowd; for the quacks generally took care that their wheel should contain no numbers affixed to them, so that the deluded people, under this additional imposition, for their money, often purchased their destruction.

A cheat of this description, who called himself Isaac Long, a Jew, in the year 1771, was upon his circuit through Wiltshire, at each town practising his frauds, and disseminating his poison, when the justices, much to their credit, ordered him to be taken from his stage, and committed to gaol, as a vagabond. To punish him effectually, they caused informations to be exhibited against him for offences against the lottery act. When the Doctor was brought to trial, he attempted to evade conviction, by pretending, that he sold his medicines and gave away his plate. This brings to mind the old method of propagating treason, libels, or obscene prints, and still practised in Ireland. A few years ago the editor's affairs called him to Londonderry, and having never before been in Ireland, the manners of the lower class of the wretched inhabitants aroused the emotions of pity and amazement; in fact, they sometimes beg in crowds; and almost at every corner is posted a beggar. He was particularly struck with an old woman, who in one hand held some straw, while ballads were in the other. With the voice of a boatswain, and in a most vernacular brogue, she perpetually roared out,

"Who'll buy my straw?  
"Who'll buy my straw?  
"I dare not sell my book,  
"But I'll sell my straw.  
"I don't offer rye or oat,  
"But my real barley-straw.  
"For the Budget's broke open,  
"And the butter's come out,  
"Of our Stir-a-bout."

Her ballad was a jargon of nonsense and obscenity. This sort of evasion, would not, however, suit the purpose of Doctor Isaac Long; for it was too evident that the poor duped people threw up to him their money, under the sole hope of obtaining the tinselled prize. The jury convicted him on two penalties of 200*l.* each; which the cunning Israelite, such had been the monstrous credulity of the people, found means to pay, rather than lie longer in prison.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

These murderous wretches, Quack Doctors, who pretend to cure every disease, by one specific, by which the credulous, who swallow their poison, soon linger into the grave, were formerly severely punished. Stow records an exemplary punishment that was inflicted on an empiric who pretended to medical skill, in the reign of Richard I. When his presumptuous lyings could no longer be faced out, says this old historian, he was led on horseback through the city of London, with his face turned to the tail of the animal, and with a *collar of Jordans*, to which was affixed a *Whetstone*, tied round his neck, while the populace greeted him with shouts, and *rung him with basins*. In the reign of Edward VI. also, one Greig, a poulterer, who had acquired the reputation of being skilful in curing the most inveterate maladies, was, on examination, proved to be a crafty deceiver, and was ordered to be set in the pillory, in Southwark, where he publicly asked pardon of the lord mayor and aldermen, who were present, as well as of all the citizens, for the impositions he had practised.

This most dangerous of all descriptions of impostors, in the present day, we are of opinion, should, for the first offence, that is to say, for the first they killed, be pilloried; for the second, fined and imprisoned; and for the third, sentenced to the gallows.

**JAMES FRITH**

***Convicted of Robbing His Master's House, in the Dead of the Night, and Transported in the Year 1772***

James Frith was a servant to an aged wealthy farmer, of the name of Marsh, residing at Beckingham, near Gainsborough, in Lincolnshire. Frith had an excellent place; for his master, almost past the time of labour, confided in him, and gave him extraordinary indulgencies. There certainly are people in this world so truly restless for worldly pelf, who will not endure kinder treatment than is commonly given to those in a similar situation of life. So did it prove with the ungrateful J. Frith. In the dead hour of night this treacherous domestic, unseen, stole to the bed-chamber of his master's daughter, a widow, of about forty years of age, where the father deposited his ready cash and his plate. He had provided himself with a rope, on which he made a noose, and before the victim could make resistance, or give the alarm he put it round her neck, drew it tight, until he thought she was strangled. Conceiving her dead, he took up the trunk, and carried it off, but in a quarter of an hour, recovering her senses, she alarmed her aged father, and the remainder of the family, but the thief was fled. Pursuit was, however, immediately made, and he was overtaken at Matlersey, five miles from Beckingham, with the trunk and its contents, amounting to one hundred and fifty pounds, besides plate, &c. He was carried before John Dawson, Esq. a Justice of the peace, who committed him to Nottingham gaol. Evidence to this effect being given on his trial, he could only be found guilty of privately stealing, and his sentence was transportation to America for seven years.

The expense to the nation of transporting each felon, on the most moderate calculation, is two hundred pounds. The plan recently adopted in employing them in public works, for our national defence against a deadly foe, whose ambition knows no bounds, and whose means of gratifying that accursed passion are bounded alone by our fleets and our insular situation, is a measure of some wisdom: the other, to the nation's sorrow, has been proved misplaced security. By persisting in transportation of felons, within a century, a far distant country, like the American colonies, would be peopled; and like them, ungratefully renounce all allegiance and connection.

Men who violate the well-known laws of their country, and who, instead of following an honest avocation to earn their bread, plunder the industrious, ought to atone for the injuries they have done; and the public, upon whom they had long preyed, has a right to insist, for that end, upon the services of the convicted. If, instead of planting a colony, twice the distance of America, from which we found ourselves already too distant to keep the offspring of our transported felons in subjection, we turn their forfeited term of years to services at home, the nation may receive considerable benefit. It will make a difference at least of 350*l.*, per man, allowing his seven year's servitude worth no more, clear, to the state, than 150*l.* [Note: This estimate will not admit of Contractors, Agents, or any other description of Governmental Birds of Prey, who hovered round even the convicts on the Thames, after the revolt of America.] The first eight years of the Botany Bay mania, 5765 men and women were transported thither, and 93 children. The females, at first, were few in proportion to the males; but of later years, cargoes of them have been shipped for the purpose of propagation. Supposing, therefore, that in eight years our sapient rulers, by neglecting their services at home, the country lost, in expenses and wages, 155,000*l.* There can be neither calculation nor allowance made of the smallest benefit

## SUPPLEMENT 2

to this country ever accruing from New South Wales. America was ever an expense to the mother country; she did not, in many instances, pay her own governors and public officers; and when matured by the fostering arm of the mother country, the moment her energies would have become serviceable, she rebelled, and ever since has remained, in her heart's core, the bitter enemy of the British empire. But this, it will be remembered, is the calculation of eight years only, ending with 1789; and from the increase of felons transported at that rate, millions of money may be lost in this second experimental colonization.

In resorting to the old plan of employing the convicts at home, I am willing to allow, that we had better send them away, at double the sacrifice of money to that already submitted to. An ingenious commentator on the penal laws, [Colquhoun] has given the expenses and the earnings of the convicts, at Langston Harbour, Portsmouth, and Woolwich Warren; and extracting therefrom only three years balance, will stand thus:

CONVICTS, DR.	£.	s.	d.
Cash paid out of the Exchequer for their expenses for the 1789 year	62,656	15	5
Ditto for the year 1790,	46,865	4	6
Ditto for the year 1791,	43,480	9	0
	153,002	8	11
 CONVICTS. CR.			
By 653,432 days' work performed at Langston harbour, Portsmouth, and Woolwich, estimated at 9d. per day is	24,503	14	0
By 260,440 days' work at Woolwich Dock Yard, chiefly by artificers, at 1s. per day, is	13,022	0	0
	37,025	14	0
Balance being the Money paid by the Country for maintaining Convicts for two Years	115,477	14	11

The effect produced by this plan of employing convicts, it must be allowed widely differs from mine; but I will show the reader that my observations are not altogether visionary or speculative, for I know a nation (once colonies) which makes convicts useful to society, as they had before been a pest. This may be found in "Janson's America," a work of much information, and which we offer as our authority. Mr. Janson, (who it will be remembered resided fourteen years in the United States, practising as a Counsellor at Law) on the subject of convicts there, says, [Note: See "The Stranger in America," page 182]

"The punishments annexed to criminal convictions, in all the American States, are worthy of imitation. The many public executions which take place in England, after every jail delivery, are a subject which strike Americans with horror.

"Though both the penal and common laws of England are generally adopted in the United States, the punishments differ materially; but it will be admitted that

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

they are sufficiently proportioned to the crimes. In very, few cases, indeed, in any State, is the punishment of death inflicted. Legislative bodies consider, that the laws of man should seldom extend to the extermination of that life which was given by the Almighty.

"In Pennsylvania, capital punishments are remitted in all cases except treason, or murder in the first degree; and in the latter case death is seldom inflicted; but the culprit is sentenced to solitary confinement in a dark cell for several years, or perhaps for life. In the second degree, light is admitted into the cell of the prisoner, and his confinement is limited to seven or fourteen years. For burglary, which rarely occurs, the punishment is also solitary confinement.

"Such as are under conviction of theft and petty-larceny, are made to work in their cells, at the trade to which they were bred. Prisoners for inferior misdemeanours, midnight disturbers, vagabonds, and such as are detected fighting or begging, are kept at labour together.

"It is curious and pleasing to reflect upon the various useful occupations, these people, hitherto dangerous to society, are obliged to follow, in the prisons of America, Manufactures of most kinds are there carried on. Tailors, Shoemakers, and persons of other trades, have separate rooms; and such of the prisoners as have not followed any useful branch in particular, are instructed in making nails, by machines, of which quantities are constantly manufacturing. *The produce not only maintains the prisoners, but leaves considerable profit to the state.* Thus, prisoners who are a great expense to the English nation, living in idleness, and plotting and teaching each other mischief, and new methods and devices for plundering the public, are there rendered valuable members to society.

"The punishment, so far from hardening them in turpitude, reforms them, and they generally, on their liberation, return to those habits of industry, which, from compulsion, have become second nature. The task assigned to them is so moderate, that each individual can, with ease, earn a daily surplus; and in this case, an account is taken of it, and it is delivered in cash to the respective claimants, on liberation. Thus, the most industrious, often accumulate a sufficiency to enable them once more to begin an honest business."

This mode of reclaiming criminals has stood the test, with increasing advantage, both to the nation and the individual, for more than twenty years. Though we have the same resource, yet it may be said we cannot avail ourselves of the advantage, like the Americans. It is true, she is not annoyed by ambitious placemen, or hungry pensioners. There we find no saucy contractors, or craving agents. A gaoler, and half a dozen turnkeys, inspect the whole business of a thronged but working prison. Occasionally, a parish-officer, nay, an unofficial householder, will pay a visit through the wards, and report what he may see amiss; but in fact this is seldom wanted. There, prisoners are dismissed, generally reclaimed; here, the man who enters the walls with but a little roguery about him, comes out a finished villain, ready to commit depredations, which, till then, he had never contemplated.

Instead of ballast heaving, cannot the tailor be made to work on army-clothing, since wars we are doomed perpetually to groan under? In like manner the shoemaker, weaver, hatter, button-maker, and, in fine, every mechanic; cannot they, we say, be confined for the same? The women could make up linen, and knit soldier's stockings, while those brought up to no mechanism, the lazy, and the incorrigible, might be kept to ballast-heaving, or repairing forts and harbours. Instead, therefore, of the enormous expense to the public in maintaining the convicts, they might, by honest means, be made a public benefit. Some Englishmen will not trouble themselves to think of these

## SUPPLEMENT 2

things; and those whose eyes are open, will only shrug their shoulders, and pay the next year's increased taxes.

The many millions expended in Spanish knight-errantry, or for a peep into Antwerp, honest John Bull clearly sees, and yet seems to freely pay; and, let our sage men plan expedition after expedition, still will John pay, and hope the next piece of Quixotism will, in fame, out-do the last.

Wherever we have found an opportunity of gleaning from detached observations on the cases and lives of notorious criminals, which have never been moulded into a regular report, we lay hold of them with avidity; in this we hope for credit, in according to us a pre-eminence over all other reporters.

**WILLIAM KELLY**  
*Executed near Gloucester, and His Body Hung in Chains,  
September the 28th, 1772, for Murder*

IN the case of this man, we find little more said than that he was, on the clearest evidence, convicted of the murder of Richard Dyer, except that he long persisted, with the most wicked imprecations, in his innocence of the charge against him. In this manner he continued, until the moment the cart which carried him to execution passed the spot where the murder was committed, when the Almighty smote his conscience. He turned pale, and trembled, and while calling God to witness his innocence, his voice suddenly faltered, and he began to confess his guilt, in an agony of mind.

The cart was stopped, when viewing the place with distorted features, he said, "Just there I killed poor Dyer; I overtook him, and walked with him in friendly conversation, until in getting over that stile," pointing to it, "I struck him on the back of the head with a hedge-stake, and repeated the blow, he fell dead at my feet." He farther confessed, that on coming up with the deceased, he had no intention to hurt him, but that the devil whispered him to commit murder and robbery; but when he saw his bloody work, he was deprived of the, power of robbing, and ran away, like Cain, the first murderer, struck with horror.

The unfortunate wretch left a wife and children to lament his sad fate, and was but just twenty-two years of age.

"Think, timely think, on the last dreadful day,  
"How you will tremble there, to stand expos'd,  
"The foremost in the rank of guilty ghosts,  
"That must be doom'd for murder! Think on murder!  
"That troop is plac'd apart from common crimes;  
"The damn'd themselves start wide, and shun that band,  
"As far more black, and more forlorn than they."  
DRYDEN.

**WILLIAM WELCH AND PETER CONWAY**  
*Two Boys, the first fourteen, and the latter nine years of Age,  
 Tried at the Old Bailey, for a Highway Robbery on the Person  
 of a Female Infant, still Younger*

WE hardly think that the combined turpitude of mankind, pictured in almost every page of our voluminous work, exhibits such a scene of the debasement of human nature, as came out on the trial of these most miserable children. This abomination could hardly have proceeded from the parties already described: from whom then, inquires the astonished reader, or how could greater baseness arise? From a bawd we answer—it generated in a female breast!

"I charge you, in the name of chastity,  
 Tell me no more; how ugly you seem to me!  
 There is no wonder men defame our sex,  
 And lay the vices of all ages on us,  
 When such as you shall bear the name of woman:  
 If you had eyes to see yourselves, or sense  
 Above the base rewards you earn with shame!  
 If ever in your lives you heard of goodness,  
 Tho' many regions off, as men hear thunder;  
 If ever ye had fathers, and they souls,  
 Or ever mothers, and not such as ye are,  
 If anything was ever constant in you,  
 Beside your sins!  
 If any of your ancestors  
 Dy'd worth a noble deed—that wou'd be cherished!  
 Soul-frighted with this black infection,  
 You would run from one another's repentance,  
 And from your guilty eyes drop out those sins  
 That make you blind and beasts."  
 LORD ROCHESTER'S VALENTINIAN.

Thus we have quoted a noble author upon sin; but we question whether he, well acquainted as he was with human nature, ever heard of such baseness in a matron's breast, as that which we now, reluctantly, discover in the annals of crimes.

The wretched children, Welch and Conway, were indicted at the Old Bailey, the second of March, 1787, through the procurement of one of those most dangerous pests to society—the early corrupter of the morals of both sexes—a bawd: who kept an infamous brothel, or stew, as called in old times, in Coventry-court, St. Giles's, London. The accused, as well as Mary Davis, the child said to have been robbed by them, had all been seduced by this abandoned woman; who, hoping to gain more by the conviction of the boys, than by longer keeping them, appeared, in order to take their lives. She swore to their robbing the little girl, Mary Davis, of a bundle of linen; the whole most likely planned by this cruel, infernal, and diabolical woman. The penetrating eye of the Recorder of London, before whom the boys were tried, saw some lurking villainy in the evidence, and he proceeded to sift it from her.

After much labour he brought her to acknowledge, that she had long made a practice of seducing children from their parents, or to steal them in the streets, and by

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

a regular course of instruction, to train them up in every species of villainy and debauchery, first destroying, as a preparatory step, all sense of shame and decency, by putting many of each sex into beds together, locking them naked in the same room, and encouraging scenes too painful to relate.

The learned and humane judge directed the boys to be taken care of; and ordered the bawd to confinement in Newgate, for perjury. A prosecution was commenced by the parish against several houses in the infernal neighbourhood, where every species of crime was engendered; but had the magistrates been active in their duty, under the authority of the vagrant act alone, many unfortunate children might have been rescued from infamy, passed to their respective parishes, and thus have become useful members of society; while the keepers of such hellish depositaries would have been handed over to the strong hand of Justice.

**NICHOLAS MALLARD**

***Sentenced to Three Years Imprisonment, for an Assault  
Committed in a Singular Attempt to Commit a Robbery on the  
16th Of April 1774***

This most ungrateful and daring transaction, though no robbery was effected, we deem fitting a place in our Chronology, in order to caution people against admitting strangers into their houses, of equivocal character.

On the 24th of January, about eleven o'clock in the morning, Mr. Cator, an eminent attorney at law, in Lincoln's-Inn, was intruded upon by a man, who afterwards appeared to be one Nicholas Mallard, a Frenchman, who began a long story of his distresses, and prevailed upon Mr. Cator to give him a small sum of money. Still the object of his charity did not appear satisfied, upon which Mr. Cator, having at that time no clerk in his office, pretended he had business out, and must lock the chambers.

While turning for his hat, the infernal villain knocked him down, and with a stone, brought for the purpose, repeated the blows, with such sudden violence, as to render resistance in vain. Concluding him dead, the assassin began to rifle the chambers; but, while thus employed, the wounded man recovered his senses, and opening the window, soon raised the whole inn, in consequence of which the Frenchman was seized, in attempting to make his escape, though before that could be effected, he had almost reached the gates of the square.

No stolen property having been found upon the prisoner, and as he did not burglariously enter the chambers, Mr. Cator laid his indictment merely for the assault; though it is a matter of doubt, whether it would not have been held upon the black-act, which we have already explained.

He was sentenced to be imprisoned in Newgate for three years; a poor satisfaction to the prosecutor, who was beat about the head with such violence, as to have some of his teeth knocked out; and in many parts was badly wounded.

**WILLIAM CARR**

***Convicted in the Ecclesiastical Court for Slander, May 4, 1774,  
and Sentenced to be Imprisoned Four Years***

WE introduced this case, for the purpose of showing, that our constitution recognized courts, yet severer, according to the limits of their power, than the Old Bailey or Westminster-hall. These are Ecclesiastical Courts, or the tribunals of the dignified clergy; from which we most seriously warn our readers to beware, for though small may be the crime, great will be the punishment.

We have already given, the definition of "The Benefit of Clergy." When the rapacity of the priests arrived to the pitch we have stated, and it became necessary to check their impositions, they had resort to these Bishop's Courts, where, for an unguarded oath, or the slander of passion, laymen, like ourselves, may be liable to a gloomy imprisonment for so long a time as four years.

For offences far more injurious to community than the crime of William Carr, the court of King's Bench has sentenced offenders to only three month's imprisonment. That court, the pride of our laws, is merciful. It admits men to bail, for the purpose of allowing the accused, until the forms of law call for his appearance, an opportunity of earning bread for himself, and perhaps, as was the unhappy case of Carr, for a wife and three children. This court never, except in cases of flagrant breaches of the peace, or some enormous offence against the government, or perhaps a scandalous libel; in short, hardly in any case inferior to felony, does it sentence a man four years imprisonment! And now mark, reader, another difference between courts civil and ecclesiastic. The tender mercies of the church, as priests call their actions, will take no surety but the body that offends against its dignity, and there it must lie, without bail or mainprize, the number of years which a bishop, in his meekness and humanity, order the devoted layman to linger in a gloomy prison.

We are highly gratified at finding the case of Thomas Carr, noted by the philanthropic Howard, in his researches into the haunts of misery. Could we make our bishops into Howards, what a blessing would they prove to the land! Then would humanity, generosity, meekness, pity and comfort, be found in each prelate, going about, like Howard, searching the wretched out, and administering to their misfortunes. Howard—and if ever mortal was immortalized, it surely must be Howard—in his State of Prisons, contains the following observation on the case of William Carr: —

"In the old prison of Rothwell, in Yorkshire, I saw, both times I was there, one William Carr, a weaver: he had given a bad name to a woman, who, it is said, did not deserve a good one: She cited him to the Ecclesiastical Court and he was imprisoned. He had a wife and three children."

We shall conclude this hard case, with the singular curiosity of a copy of the formal part of the Ecclesiastical Writ, which deprives a layman of his liberty, without bail or mainprize; and, perhaps, for no other crime, as Mr. Howard insinuates, than telling a strumpet that she was a whore.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

"Forasmuch as the Royal Power ought not to be wanting to the holy Church in its complaints. Attach William Carr, until he shall have made satisfaction to the holy Church, as well for the contempt, as for the injury by him done to it."

Mr. Howard adds, that this victim to the offended church, was released only by the insolvent act.

**STRICTURES ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF MR.  
HOWARD**

*Respecting Prisons, and the Treatment of Prisoners*

Each line of the pen of this great philanthropist is, worthy a plate of gold. So disinterested and active a friend to his fellow-creatures in distress, as Mr. Howard, no other nation can boast: thus, particularly the poor prisoner, all men must revere his memory. The singular example of disinterested patriotism and public spirit here displayed, in behalf of some of the most miserable, but unseen, unknown, and therefore disregarded, part of our fellow-creatures, demands the particular attention, and sincere acknowledgement of all who have the feelings of humanity.

The subject more immediately attracted our author's notice, when he was sheriff of the county of Bedford in 1773, on many innocent, or acquitted, and unprosecuted prisoners, after having been confined for months, dragged back to gaol, and locked up again, for sundry fees to the gaoler, clerk of assize, &c. More scenes of calamity, which he was anxious to alleviate, on further enquiry, presented themselves to his view; and, to gain more perfect knowledge of them, he visited most of the county-gaols in England. To inspect the bridewells, which had before escaped him, he travelled a second time into all the counties, examining houses of correction, city and town gaols. In many of them, as well as in the county gaols, he beheld a complication of distress; but his attention was principally fixed by the gaol-fever and the small-pox, which he saw destroying multitudes, not only of felons in their dungeons, but of debtors also. [Note: In the year 1772, the gaol-fever raged in Old Newgate to so alarming an height, that many persons who had business there died of infection. In consequence, a new ventilator was made, and other precautions used to prevent its again spreading. Among those was a pipe to carry the fumes of vinegar into the Sessions-house during the trial of the prisoners. A malignant fever broke out in Dublin, 1776, occasioned by a criminal infected with the gaol-distemper, being brought into the Court of Sessions without cleansing, produced very fatal effects, and alarmed the whole city. Among others who fell victims to the violence of the contagion, were Fielding Ould, Esq. High Sheriff; the Counsellors Derby, Palmer, Spring, and Ridge; Charles Caldwell, Esq. Messrs. Bolton and Ereven; with several attornies and others, whose business it was to attend in Court]

On this subject he was examined by the House of Commons, in March, 1774, and most deservedly received their thanks; an honour which reflected on themselves. To this were owing two humane bills, brought in by Mr. Popham, and which passed that session, "For the relief of prisoners who should be acquitted, respecting their fees;" and "For preserving their health, and preventing the gaol-distemper." But as there are still many disorders that ought to be rectified, and the gaol-fever is not yet totally eradicated, Mr. Howard now submits the results of his enquiries to the public, hoping that he "shall not be deserted in the conflict," and that the present Parliament will finish what the last had so laudably begun, Their attention encouraged him to extend his plan, repeating his visits and travels over the kingdom; at first, no doubt, with great danger of infection, from which vinegar and change of apparel (with God's blessing) happily preserved him; but afterwards with less hazard and caution, partly from use, and from the alterations made in some gaols by the last of the forementioned acts.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

The distress in prisons, which our author justly imputes to the inattention of sheriffs and magistrates, originates, he observes,

First, from want of necessary food, some bridewells having no allowance at all, and finding twelve debtors only in all England and Wales, (Middlesex and Surrey excepted,) who had been able to obtain their groats. [Note: Or aliment, to which they have a right from their creditors by the 32d of Geo. II. but the means of procuring it is so very expensive, as to be generally out of their reach.]

Secondly, from the demands of gaolers, &c. for fees.

Thirdly, the extortion of bailiffs.

Fourthly, the defect of water and air.

Fifthly, the want or offensiveness of sewers.

Sixthly, to their being in many gaols and in most bridewells, no straw allowed for prisoners to sleep on.

These evils affect their health and lives. Among those which are pernicious to their morals, the complaints of debtors and felons, men and women, young beginners and old offenders, being confined together; and in some few gaols idiots also and lunatics. [Note: viz. Hull and Swaffham Bridewells, and Lancaster gaol.] No one, therefore, will wonder at the havoc made by the gaol distemper, of which many dreadful instances are here enumerated; or, at the general spread of wickedness, by the confined and discharged. The same humanity with which we treat our prisoners of war Mr. Howard wishes us to extend to our own unhappy countrymen. This part of his subject naturally leads him to mention the dreadful hardships he himself suffered at Brest and Morlaix, when he was taken prisoner in a Lisbon packet, in the last war; and his own sufferings, as he observes, on that occasion, probably increased his sympathy with other prisoners. To the above grievances he adds several bad customs prevalent in gaols, and these are, the demand of garnish or footing, "pay or strip;" the frequency of gaming; the loading prisoners with heavy irons; the varying the towns where quarter-sessions and assizes are held, so that prisoners must walk in irons, and sometimes to towns that have no prison; [Note: At Wells there are assizes and no prison; at Ryegate there is no prison, yet quarter-sessions; and the quarter sessions of Surrey are held at four different towns, Ryegate, Guildford, Kingston, and Southwark] gaol-delivery being in some counties but once a year (at Hull it is only once in three years; it used to be but once in seven) the fee still demanded by clerks of the assizes and of the peace, [Note: Some of these gentlemen (in particular the clerks of the western circuit) have started a new demand for the Judge's certificate of acquittance] and for which acquitted prisoners, contrary to the express words of the act, are still detained; the non-residence of gaolers, debtors crowding the gaols with their wives and children; and some gaols being private property. Of all these complaints instances are given.

The whole number of prisoners in England and Wales, in the spring of the year 1776, was, "Debtors, 2437, Felons, &c. 994, Petty Offenders, 653; total 4084." To these adding twice the number of dependents (the usual average,) the whole number of the distressed is 12,252. To obviate all the grievances, Mr. Howard discusses the proper situation, plan, structure, and management of prisons, which, he insists, should be airy, and built, if possible, near a river or brook, or else on an eminence, raised on arcades, &c. But for further particulars, important as they are, we must refer to his plan and books, observing only, that we hear with concern, that New Newgate has "some manifest errors," not specified indeed, and it is now too late, save only that "the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

prisoners, without more than ordinary care, will be in great danger of the gaol-fever;" and that that Chelmsford new gaol seems to exceed in splendour, but in other articles, more essential, to fall short of his ideas. Of the opulent county of Essex we must add, with as much pain as Mr. Howard observed it, that "there had been no Divine service for above a year past, but to condemned criminals;" of Cornwall, that "the chaplain's salary has been lately reduced from 50*l.*, to 30*l.*;" and of Huntingdonshire, that "Mr. Brock, the late chaplain, who officiated constantly twice a week, and had a salary of 20*l.* was dismissed. He would have continued his attendance without the salary, but an order was made expressly forbidding it." Can these Worshipfuls be men or Christians! If they are either, they would recollect, that by an act of the 13th of his present Majesty, each county is empowered to appoint a chaplain, "with a stipend not exceeding 50*l.*" Little did Parliament foresee that any gentleman would be so mean as to retrench, or rather withdraw, a much smaller pittance, and even refuse gratuitous duty.

The other county-gaols which have no chaplains ought also to be specified; they are Westmoreland, Cambridgeshire, Rutland, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Sussex, Monmouthshire, and five Welsh counties. Are these counties poor in purse, or poor in Christian spirit? Yet one of them boasts a University.

We must add, that though the act 32d of Geo. II. expressly requires a table of fees, signed by the justices, and confirmed by the judge, &c. should be hung up conspicuously in every gaol, and declares all other fees illegal, and the demand punishable by a penalty of 50*l.* to the person injured; yet no less than fifty-seven instances are mentioned, in which this is neglected: though the act 24th Geo. II. in like manner requires the three clauses against the use of spirituous liquors, to be also hung up and renewed, under the penalty of forty shillings every default; this, too, is neglected in forty-two gaols; and fifty-seven instances occur, where water, so essential to health and comfort, is not accessible to prisoners. In many places, notwithstanding the late act, there has been no amendment, no cleaning, white-washing, &c. To show what misery prevails in some prisons, particularly in such as are private property, and also to give a specimen of the author's manners, we beg leave to quote the following:

"Chesterfield gaol, for the hundred of Scarsdale, is the property of the Duke of Portland, to whom, or to his steward, the gaoler pays 18*l.* 12*s.* a year. Only one room with a cellar under it, to which the prisoners occasionally descend through a hole in the floor. The cellar had not been cleaned for many months. The prison door had not been opened for several weeks when I was there first. There were four prisoners, who told me they were almost starved: one of them said, with tears in his eyes, "he had not eaten a morsel that day;" it was then afternoon. Their meagre sickly countenances confirmed what they said. They had borrowed a book of Dr. Manton's; one of them was reading it to the rest. Each of them had a wife; and they had in the whole thirteen children, cast on their respective parishes. Two had their groats from the creditors, and out of that pittance they relieved the other two. No allowance, no straw, no firing: water, a halfpenny for about three gallons, put in (as other things are) at the window. Gaoler lives distant." As the noble proprietor is also humane, when he knows the evil, he will doubtless redress it.

Waiving, at present, farther particulars, we must now observe, that in pursuit of his grand object, this son of benevolence has travelled not only these three kingdoms, but also France, Flanders, Holland, and Germany, twice, together with

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Switzerland. Of everything peculiar to the prisons of these countries he gives an account; and in them nothing seems more striking than the cleanliness of most of them, and the utter exemption of them all from our gaol distemper. Dr. Tissot, at Lausanne, expressed his surprise at it, and added, "It was not to be found in Switzerland, nor had he heard of its being anywhere but in England." And Dr. Haller, at Bern, ascribed it to "our gaols being overcrowded." No French prisoners were in irons; no new prisons abroad have under-ground dungeons; all the German prisons are near rivers; they are exemplary in their care of legacies and donations; in most of them each criminal is alone in his room; all the felons have somewhat more to live upon than bread and water; and, on the whole, such are their cleanliness, industry, health, and decorum, as sometimes to put the visitor to the blush for his native country, and fully to prove that the design of reforming our own prisons is not chimerical.

We shall dismiss this important work for the present, with our author's conclusion, which may serve as an epitome of his design:

"If this publication shall have any effect in alleviating the distresses of poor debtors and other prisoners, in procuring them clean and wholesome abodes, and thereby exterminating the gaol-fever which has so long spread abroad its dreadful contagion, in abolishing, or at least reducing, the oppressive fees of clerks of assize and of the peace, and checking the imposition of gaolers, and the extortion of bailiffs, in introducing a habit of industry in our bridewells, and restraining the shocking debauchery and immorality which prevail in our gaols and other prisons. If any of these beneficial consequences should accrue, the writer will be ready to indulge himself with the pleasing thought of not having lived without doing some good to his fellow-creatures, and think himself abundantly repaid for the pains he has taken, and the hazards he has undergone. Nothing effectual will, I am persuaded, be done in reforming the state of our prisons, till a thorough parliamentary enquiry concerning them be set on foot, in which may be grounded one comprehensive statute, for their general regulation. Should this be undertaken (relying still upon that KIND HAND, which has hitherto preserved me, and to which I desire to offer my most thankful acknowledgments,) devote my time to one more extensive foreign journey, in which the Prussian and Austrian territories, and the most considerable free cities in Germany, would probably afford some new and useful light on this important national concern."

Rome, who decreed a civic crown to the citizen who saved a single life, would certainly have rewarded the unprecedented labour of love, with a statue in the forum. But Britain has not been ungrateful. Mr. Howard has received from our legislators the greatest honour they can confer, in common with our Marlboroughs, our Hawkes, our Nelsons, and a long list of heroes. But vain and trifling are all human praises, when compared with the self-approbation of conscience, the blessings of many that were ready to perish, and the reward which this true and faithful servant shall receive from that KING OF GLORY, whom, in the person of the poor and destitute, he visited and comforted, when "sick and in prison."

**CHARLES PIPKINS**

*Executed at Tyburn, October 23, 1776, for Burglary*

This was a villain of the lowest and worst description of thieves. In order to carry on his depredations he vagabondised through the country, as drummer to a puppet show, and in this character he gained information where and whom to plunder.

In the night of the 7th of August, 1776, in company with another vagabond showman, who escaped justice, he broke open the house of Mrs. Watson, of Finchley, near London. That lady was suddenly awaked from her sleep, by the screams of her maidservant, who slept in the same room, and immediately by the light of one of the lamps used to dance the puppets with, which Pipkins had in his hand, perceived him entering at the chamber window, from which he descended and came to her bed-side, with horrid imprecations, demanding her money. Another ruffian followed, calling out, "Damn her, blow her brains out." She entreated them not to use her ill, and offered her money. They took from her sixteen guineas, and then examined every part of the chamber, taking what articles were most portable, and among them a gold watch, with which they went out the way they came in. Both Mrs. Watson and her maid having seen Pipkins drumming up the ignorant to attend the paltry show, immediately knew him, and giving information at the public office in Bow-Street, he was soon apprehended, with part of the property, brought to trial, condemned, and executed.

At the same time with Pipkins, there suffered William Wood, for breaking into the house of the late Solomon Fell, Esq. in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, in the absence of the family, who were then in the country, and robbing it of a quantity of silver plate, wearing apparel, &c, and Robert Walker, for coining.

Wood appeared full-dressed; Pipkins, in a beggarly suit: and Walker, as became his unhappy situation. Wood addressed the spectators, wherein he acknowledged his guilt, and warned them to avoid evil company, who had brought him to his ignominious death.

**HYMAN ISAACKS**  
*An English Jew, Executed at Ostend, in the year 1777, for  
Forging on the Bank of England*

Forgers on the Bank of England are pursued in their fancied refuge on the continent of Europe. Let no man, therefore, who has committed this crime, hope to evade the punishment of death.

In the year 1777, one Hyman Isaacks, otherwise called Hyman Baron, a Jew, had committed forgeries on the Bank of England, and when he had passed as many as he could in the British dominions, without being taken, the fear of the officers of justice urged his flight to France. There, and in other different parts of Europe, he continued to circulate his spurious paper, for Bank of England notes, throughout the civilized world, bearing their intrinsic value. At length he was seized by order of the King of Prussia, and executed at Ostend. Every court of Europe had issued orders for his apprehension. He had circulated forgeries to the amount of several thousand pounds.

**JOSHUA CROMPTON**

*Executed at Gangly-Green, near Guildford, in Surrey, July 31,  
1778, for Forging Bank of England Notes*

IT would seem, from the manner in which this man was brought to justice, that forgery, a crime so dangerous in a commercial county, like murder, is not to remain long unpunished.

After committing the very worst species of forgery, that of counterfeiting the notes of the Bank of England, he made his escape to France, from the prison to which he had been committed, on suspicion. From whence he was allured to return to England by a false friend, who had assured him of safety. He was immediately betrayed, and again committed to gaol. His trial came on at Guildford, on the 31st of July, 1778. His indictment contained two charges of forgery, and he was convicted on the following:

"For forging, and uttering the same, knowing it to be forged, a certain instrument in writing, purporting to be a note of the Bank of England, dated the 5th of May, 1773, marked K, No. 56, payable to Thomas Harris, Esq. or bearer, on demand, signed by the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, and subscribed Thomas Grant."

The testimony of several witnesses leaving little doubt of his guilt, he was condemned to death. He behaved becoming his unhappy situation. At the gallows he acknowledged his crime, and prayed the forgiveness of man, observing that he had firm reliance on, and that he had made his peace with, God. He prayed to God to forgive his false friend, who, he said, artfully drew him back to England, and was the means of hanging him for ten guineas. His unhappy fate was much lamented, while the surrounding crowd heaped execrations on the head of his betrayer. Of such a man, though his treachery tended to the public weal, we might almost be tempted to repeat, from Shakespeare,

"Why, I can smile, and murder while I smile;  
"And cry content to that which grieves my heart,  
"And wet my cheeks with artificial tears,  
"And frame my face to all occasions."

## FRANCES PEARCE

### *Convicted of Privately Stealing, in October Sessions, 1778, at the Old Bailey, and Sentenced to be Imprisoned for Three Years*

THE following case, though not capital, we insert in order to show that, as well as the numerous gangs of men depredating upon the public, females also associate for the same purpose. This woman, along with Ann Arrogany, and Catherine Davis, were tried for robbing Henry Kitchen, Esq. of bank notes to the amount of 550*l.* and other bills and securities to a considerable amount.

Mr. Kitchen deposed that he was passing on foot along the Strand, about ten o'clock at night, and that near the New Church he was surrounded by three women, who picked his pocket of his pocket-book, containing bank notes, and other securities, to the value of 14 or 15,000*l.* He saw four hands held up; he cried Watch and Stop Thief! and instantly secured Peace, but did not see the pocket-book in her hand. The other women ran away.

Elizabeth Mills, an unhappy woman of the town, deposed, that she saw Simpson and Arrogany near Mr. Kitchen; that there were one on each side of him. This deponent saw there only two women at that time. When Mr. Kitchen came near the New Church, Davis ran away, and the other fell down in attempting to run off, Mr. Kitchen cried out, "Stop thief—I am robbed." Five or six women standing near the church, he seized one of them, and said, "I have got you; I have got you." On the cross-examination, this evidence said, that the woman had walked with Mr. Kitchen from St. Clement's church-yard, arm in arm; and that when he came near the New-Church, five or six women were standing together; and he said, "I have got you all." To invalidate the testimony of this witness, Samuel Price a bailiff, was sworn, who deposed, that he had known her ten years, and that he did not believe she was such a woman as deserved credit on her oath. Mary Hayes likewise deposed, that she was a very abandoned woman, that she had assumed several names, and ought not to be believed even under the sanction of an oath. Amelia Burchell swore, that she saw the prosecutor seize Pearce, and that he said he was robbed; and Elizabeth Thompson deposed, that she had likewise heard him say that he was robbed; that she saw Davis having hold of his arm; that Arrogany was four yards behind him, but at what distance Pearce was she did not know.

The jury having considered the whole evidence, acquitted Arrogany and Davis, and found Pearce guilty of the charge, in consequence of which she received sentence to be imprisoned three years.

The notes thus stolen from Mr. Kitchen were passed into the hands of some Jews; but, by the diligence of the peace officers, about half of them were recovered.

**WILLIAM FLINT**

***A Pick-Pocket, Twice Sentenced to Hard Labour on the River Thames, for Privately Stealing***

This man's crimes were marked with singular ingratitude. He had been capitally condemned, and received a pardon on condition of working for the public on the river Thames, for a limited time. In consequence of a favourable report having been made of his good behaviour and apparent contrition for his past crimes, he was soon released on a general pardon.

No sooner had this most ungrateful wretch regained his liberty, than he commenced a still worse course of life. For this purpose, having been himself brought up to a mechanical business, he took several boys as apprentices; but instead of instructing them in his branch, he taught them to way-lay other apprentices, and errand-boys, and to rob them of the goods with which they might have been entrusted. Out of this plunder he rewarded them.

Mr. Tookie, silversmith, deposed before Mr. John Fielding, that he had sent a parcel, in which was a quantity of gold manufacture and other valuable articles, to a customer in the Borough, by his errand-boy, a lad of thirteen years of age, and by the way he was met by Flint's apprentice, who, entering into conversation with him, gave him two-pence to do a pretended errand for him, promising to take care of his parcel until his return, and on the errand-boy's questioning him, he pulled out an handkerchief, and gave it to him as a security, which satisfying the boy, he parted with his parcel, and never saw it more. Other charges of a similar nature were made against Flint, and he, with his apprentices, were committed to prison. A man who lived in high style and kept a country house, supposed to have been the receiver of the stolen goods, gave bail for their appearance, but proof could not be adduced to convict them.

Such practices, however, could not long be carried on under the strict police then established in London; as we find that, at the sessions held at the Old Bailey in September, 1778, William Flint was indicted for stealing a silver watch, value 40s, the property of Aaron Coats, privily from the person of the said Aaron, on the 16th of August. Mr. Coats deposed, that being at a fire in Nicholas-lane, on the evening of the 16th of August, he staid about half an hour from motives of curiosity; and that on coming from the fire he felt for his watch in Lombard-street, and missed it: but he owned that he had not seen the prisoner at the fire. Mr. Coats advertised his watch for four days afterwards, and soon learnt that the prisoner was at Sir John Fielding's, charged with that and other offences: on which he went to Bow street where his watch was produced to him. William Adley, a pawnbroker in Cow-cross, deposed, that the prisoner brought the watch to him, to offer it in pledge; that he asked him two guineas, that he lent him a guinea and a half on it; and Flint took a duplicate of it in his own name. Moses Morant, one of Sir John Fielding's officers, deposed, that he went to apprehend Flint, two boys, and another person; that in Flint's parlour he found the duplicate of Mr. Coats's watch, an old seal which had belonged to it; and the watch being produced, was sworn to by the prosecutor. The prisoner, by way of defence, said that a person had given him the watch to pawn for him; but the jury gave no credit to this assertion, and found him "Guilty of stealing the watch, but not guilty of stealing it privily from the person." Flint was put to the bar at the close of the sessions, to receive his sentence, which was, "That he should work at ballast-heaving

## SUPPLEMENT 2

five years." He was a manufacturer in the silver branch, and lived in West-Smithfield. He had two apprentices whom he trained up to the art of thieving.

**WILLIAM MEYER, ESQ.**  
*Executed at York, April, 6 1781, for Murder*

Whether to condemn most the act of madness, which prompted this man to call for his pistols, or the woman who brought them to him, we leave to the determination of the reader. Men, who by imprudence throw themselves in the jaws of bailiffs, are seldom in a calm or settled state of mind, and little fit to be aggravated or given the means of doing mischief.

It appeared on the trial of Mr. Meyer, who was of a most respectable family in Yorkshire, that he had been arrested for debt, by an officer of the sheriff named Joseph Spinke, in whose custody he remained till the morning after the caption was made, when the officer, by Mr. Meyer's request, was to go to Kirkhammerton, the seat of his father, for bail or money to pay the debt. About ten at night, after the prisoner and his wife had whispered together, she went out and brought in a pair of pistols under her apron, and gave them to her husband, saying, "There are your pistols, to fulfil your foolish humour." He ordered them to leave the room; which they refusing to do he fired and shot Spinke in the neck, the ball went through the windpipe. Thomas Meyer instantly said, "Now, Mr. Meyer, you have done for yourself." The servant-maid, on hearing the pistol, ran upstairs, and met her mistress, who exclaimed, "By the Lord God, here is a man killed." Meyer was secured: Spinke died in a few hours, forgave the prisoner and his wife, but laid his death to their charge.

They were both tried for this fact at York assizes, March 20, 1781, when William Meyer, Esq. was sentenced to die for the same on the 22d of the same month; but afterwards obtained a respite, which did not avail him long, being hanged on the 6th of April.

His behaviour to the last was very unsuitable to his awful situation: he severely accused his wife, and thought his sentence hard: nor had he such an affecting sense of his crime as to repent of it as became him, but wasted his few remaining moments in a light and trifling manner.

**JOHN LEE, ESQ.**

***Who, from the Honourable Post of Captain in the British Army, Degenerated into the Humiliating Employ of a Strolling Player, wherein he Committed Forgery; and for which he was Executed at Tyburn, on the fourth of March, 1784***

THE fate of this unfortunate gentleman calls for our pity. He was bred a soldier, and was captain of a company, when he became fascinated by the lures of a stage actress, and actually fell so deeply into her snare, as to marry her. Among the many females brought up to this scandalous way of life, how very rare is it to find one possessed of worth and modesty. Their morals, with continual examples of profligacy before them, soon become corrupted, for there is not upon earth, a more debauched set of lazy people, than strolling players.

Captain Lee soon felt the effects of his imprudence. His pay, ample for himself, was very inadequate to the additional expense of such a wife; but the die was cast, he was under the necessity of selling his commission, and when the product was dissipated, to have recourse to the stage. As a player, the captain, now the humble Mr. Lee, commenced a vagabondizing life, strolling from town to town, the mockery of kings, queens, and heroes; and anon, as lovers, substituting the belly's pain, from long want of food, for the pangs inflicted by some cruel fair, the mimic mistress of a pining heart.

There is no profession that requires so many accomplishments, both of nature and art, as that of an actor; and yet there is none that the idle and dissolute youth, of both sexes, think themselves so well qualified to practise with success. By this fatal error society is deprived of many who might have been useful and happy in the employments for which they were designed, and who became the most contemptible, and at the same time the most wretched vagabonds, that at once injure and disgrace the community. It may, perhaps, prevent some vain, unthinking, dissipated, and ignorant wretches, from increasing the number of these out-casts, to acquaint them that, the life of a stroller is less eligible than that of a sifter of cinders at a shilling a day; that they are dissolute and undone, without virtue, and without friendship, not allied even by that kindness and fidelity which is found among other associates in misfortunes, not excepting even beggars and thieves. Their exhibitions expose them to the derision of mechanics and clowns; their distresses excite not pity, but laughter, and frequently, instead of being treated with tenderness, they are committed to prison. Those who live by chance are always improvident of casual supplies; so it happens, that those people who are frequently without victuals, are yet frequently drunk. When this happens on a night when their performance is to be exhibited, one of the company is obliged to perform two characters, that ought to be on the stage together. Yet, so many are the graces, even in this mimic life, that some of its female votaries have become in reality, the ladies whom erst, in well-glossed petticoats, tinselled all over, spangled with tin, and daubed with foil, they oft had counterfeited. The humble girl who first acted the character of Polly Peachum, in Gay's Beggar's Opera, became Duchess of Bolton; and the Misses Farren and Brunton are now Countesses. Kemble, the meaner offspring of a strolling company, is now announced in the London papers among the men of rank, fashion, and consequence, who regale at each other's

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

overflowing board, while his many old contemporaries are starving on a crown a week and an inch of candle!

Such was the life this unfortunate officer was reduced to pursue. When, with his wife, he had struggled through many miseries, and had strolled so far as Aberdeen, the Scotch took pity on them, and patronized Mrs. Lee so far as to promote an establishment for her, as governess of a female seminary of education. Thus settled, for a while they left the stage; but Lee's habits of expense and idleness contracted in the army, led him into many expenses which his income could not support. Happily for his partner in misery, she died at Aberdeen, a year or two after being so patronized; and he left the town, to join again the first strolling players he could find.

This unfortunate man could never rise to any perfection in the mimic art; and his failing, in getting neither applause nor money, to supply the necessaries of life, soured his temper, and rendered him desperate. He had last been with the Portsmouth strollers, and from that town came to London, without a penny in his pocket, and actually starving. Too proud to beg, he boldly went to a tavern, where he had formerly spent large sums, and dined. He then asked the landlord for the loan of a guinea and a half, and as security, he deposited with him a forged bill of exchange on the ordnance office, for which he forfeited his life.

**JOSEPH RICHARDS**

***A Most Ungrateful and Barbarous Villain, Executed at  
Kentish Town, near London, February 27, 1786, for Murder***

THE excellent fable of the husbandman who took the adder from the snow, and fostered it in his bosom, until the treacherous reptile, gaining warmth and strength, stung his benefactor, is, in this case, fully verified. The young wretch acted the fatal part of the adder, by murdering his kind and indulgent protector. May we never again have to record such dreadful and unheard-of ingratitude!

Walter Horseman, a milkman, at Kentish Town, several years before took pity on a poor orphan boy, who was half starved, for the want of both food and raiment. He was put to do such services for his kind protector, as were fitting to his years, but he did not appear to possess any sense of gratitude. At length his behaviour growing from bad to worse, Mr. Horseman turned him away.

In revenge, the remorseless wretch entered the house of his late employer, in the dead hour of night, and arming himself with an iron window-bar, he advanced to his chamber, where he slept with his little daughter, of four years of age, by his side; and, shocking to relate, beat him about the head, until his skull was split asunder, and one of his eyes beat out; and then made his escape. Mr. Horseman's wife, with a sick child, was on the next floor; and his son, two men, and a boy, on the same floor where the murder was committed. In this most dreadful state the miserable man lingered eight days before death came to his relief. So inhuman a murderer could not long find shelter—the fell deed was done on the 11th of February, and he was hanged near the spot on the 27th, at eighteen years of age, amid the execrations of a multitude of spectators.

## THE MILKMEN OF LONDON *And Their Impositions upon the Public*

In the environs of London, so great is the consumption of milk in the metropolis, that milk-men and cow-keepers are rich. Willan, a man of this description, has acquired a lordly fortune. His wife, once a low uneducated woman, by many years selling out milk, now rolls about in her carriage, proud as any lady; and had she still practised a little of what she had been taught in adversity, and remembered to whom she was of kin, she might have been hailed "Queen of the Milk-maids." Among the abuses and frauds committed upon the public, that practised in the article of milk loudly calls for regulation. On this subject we shall quote the observation of Mr. Middleton, who has exposed a number of impositions upon the public:

"Among the number of petty frauds," says this author, "may be included the adulteration of milk in the metropolis, which not merely affects the pockets, but the health, of the inhabitants of London.

"The number of milch cows kept for the purpose of supplying the metropolis with this article is stated, after very diligent enquiry, at 8,500, and each cow is supposed to afford nine quarts of milk per day. When the families of fashion are in London for the winter season, the consumption, and consequent deterioration, of the milk are at the highest; during the summer months, when such families are for the most part in the country, the milk may probably be of rather a better quality. The milk is always given in its genuine state to the retail dealers; and as it is sold to them by the cow-keepers after the rate of two-pence and 1/8th of a penny per quart, and is retailed by them at three-pence halfpenny per quart, the profit is surely so large, as ought to prevent even the smallest adulteration. But when it is considered how greatly it is reduced by WATER, and impregnated by WORSE ingredients, it is much to be lamented that no method has yet been devised to put a stop to the many scandalous frauds and impositions in general practice, with regard to this very necessary article of human sustenance. It is certainly an object well deserving the particular consideration of the legislature. It cannot be doubted that many persons would be glad to make some addition to the price now paid for it, high as that price is, provided they could, for such advanced price, procure so useful an article in domestic economy perfectly genuine.

"Not satisfied with the profit here stated, which, considering the difference of measure, is above one hundred per cent, it is a common practice, with the retailers of this useful article, to carry the milk first home to their own houses, where it is set up for half a day, when the cream is taken from it, at least all that comes up in that time, and it is then sold for new milk. By which means, what is delivered in the morning is no other than the milk of the preceding afternoon, deprived of the cream it throws up by standing during that time. By this means a farther considerable profit accrues to the retailer, and the milk is greatly reduced in point of strength and quality. This cream, poor as it is, they again mix with flour, chalk, and perhaps other more baneful ingredients, and yet it finds a ready market in the metropolis.

"Five or six men only are employed in attending three hundred cows. As one woman cannot milk above eight or nine cows twice a day, that part of the business would necessarily be attended with considerable expense to the cow-keeper, were it not that the retailer agrees for the produce of a certain number of cows, and takes the

## SUPPLEMENT 2

labour and expense of milking on himself. Every cow-house is provided with a milk-room (where the milk is measured and served out by the cow-keeper) and this room is mostly furnished with a pump, to which the retail dealers apply in rotation; not secretly, but openly, before any person that may be standing by, from which they pump water into the milk vessels at their discretion. The pump is placed there expressly for that purpose, and, indeed, is very seldom used for any other.

"A considerable cow-keeper in Surrey has a pump of this kind, which goes by the name of the *Famous Black Cow*, (from the circumstance of its being painted black) and is said to *yield more than all the rest put together*. Where such a pump is not provided for them, things are much worse, for in that case the retailers are not even careful to use *clean* water. Some of them have been seen to dip their pails in a common horse-trough. And what is still more disgusting, though equally true, one cow-house happens to stand close to the edge of a stream, into which runs much of the dung, and most of the urine of the cows, and even in this stream, so foully impregnated, they have been observed to dip their milk pails.

A cow-keeper informs me, that the retail milk dealers are for the most part the refuse of other employments, possessing neither character, decency of manners, nor cleanliness."

**ROBERT JAQUES**

***Convicted at the Old Bailey, July 11, 1790, of Being a Party in  
a Conspiracy against the Warden of the Fleet Prison, and  
Sentenced to be Imprisoned and Pilloried***

This was a crime of so public a nature, so very artfully planned, and so daringly attempted to be carried into execution, that in order to give the reader a general view of the transaction, we shall transcribe, verbatim, from the sessions-paper, the speech of Mr. Silvester, then leading counsel for the crown, and now recorder of London; and which was very clearly and fully proved in evidence, on his trial, which began at eleven in the morning, and lasted till eight at night. The case was thus opened by Mr. Silvester, as follows:

*"May it please your lordship, and you, gentlemen of the jury.*

"This indictment has been stated to you, charging several persons with a conspiracy, Robert Jaques, John Tronson alias James Smith, Richard Bailey, Elizabeth Tronson, and Francis Shanley. The conspiracy is, that these persons conspired to charge the warden of the Fleet with a sum of one thousand three hundred pounds, he being answerable in case of the escape of any of his prisoners.

"The prosecutor is the warden of the Fleet: the defendant, Mr. Jaques, is a person whose character, perhaps, you have heard of, if not you will find it recorded in the several commitments and records of the several courts of justice in this kingdom: the defendant, Mr. Tronson, was originally a servant, he then became apothecary, afterwards a perfumer, and last of all a quack doctor; the next defendant, Richard Bailey, is the brother-in-law of Jaques, keeping a public house in Lime Street, a man in great distress; Elizabeth Smith, otherwise Tronson, is the mistress of Mr. Tronson, who I described to you before; and Francis Shanley, alias Loftus, is a young man, an Irishman, who having spent most of his fortune, and spent great part of his time in the several prisons of this metropolis, and the last we hear of him is in Newgate, where Tronson was confined for debt.

"The question is, whether they are or are not concerned in one of the foulest conspiracies that ever was invented? Jaques, the prime mover and planner of the conspiracy, applied to the warden of the Fleet that he might be admitted to the place of clerk of the papers, stating that there was nothing against him but his character, particularly that there were men like him, who had been guilty of the worst offences, and had afterwards become useful officers; we have his letter to the warden, in which he writes as follows: 'Whoever you engage with let it be a man that knows the world, that he may be able to guard against the tricks which your situation subjects you to.' Jaques then, perfectly aware that the situation of the warden of the Fleet subjected him to many tricks and contrivances, and he, being that person of experience, knew very well his power, upon which Jaques having been offended with the warden locking him up, having broke through the rules, the first thing he does is to apply to a person of the name of Abbot, to get some person who was willing to be arrested, that he might escape, and the warden to be fixed with the debt; Abbot refused: the next was a man of the name of Kane; he told him it was a matter very easily managed, if he could get any one person that was willing to be arrested, that whatever was the debt, they would fix the warden and divide the money. Kane refused: the next person he applied to was Tronson; Tronson, the friend of Jaques, was applied to, to get a proper person,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

who from his appearance might impose on the turnkey, and escape disguised; Tronson recollecting that his friend Shanley, with whom he had spent his time in Newgate, was of a fair complexion, small, and likely to be disguised as a woman, applied to him; he was the man fixed on to be the prime mover in this transaction, of which Jaques was the planner: the way to do it was to have two warrants of attorney; upon which Alder, the relation of Tronson's mistress, was to be the plaintiff in one, that was four hundred and fifty pounds; Tronson, to carry this into execution, applied on the 5th of August to Mr. Crossley, the attorney; he told him that he wished to arrest a person for a friend of his, a Mr. Alder, a gentleman who was a money-broker, one of those people who lend money to distressed officers, living at Chelsea, in Sloane Street: he lent a sum of money to an extravagant young man, and they were afraid he was going to Ireland; upon which a warrant of attorney was produced, and he was directed particularly, immediately to arrest Shanley: Shanley was described as a young gentleman of character and fortune, a dressy man, known by being dressed in blue and gold; upon which a particular direction was given to Mell, the officer, that this Shanley was to be arrested: he was arrested on the 15th of August, and carried down by Mell, the officer, to Simpson's house; Tronson was continually there, and it created some little suspicion in the officer, and likewise in the attorney, that the man who was so active to arrest the defendant that they should be in habits of intimacy together; but so it was, Tronson was continually with Shanley while he was there; having given this description of Alder, the plaintiff, that he was a money broker, and it turning out afterwards that Mr. Alder kept a little register office in Fetter-lane, only having a back room, so distressed that he had not a bed to lay on, forced in the summer to work at hay-making, and obliged to live for three days on the produce of a pair of nut crackers; but, says Mr. Tronson, he has offered to pay part of the money; Mr. Crossley went to the officer's where he saw Mr. Shanley in custody; he admitted the debt was just and true: you see by this means Tronson had got Shanley into the custody of the officer; this was on the 15th of August.

"The next thing is, Jaques comes; and therefore it is necessary his warrant of attorney should be for a more considerable sum; he has a warrant of attorney likewise for eight hundred and sixty-nine pounds; the plaintiff upon that is Bailey, the brother-in-law of Jaques, keeping this public-house in Lime-street, a distressed man, his goods having been seized, and himself ruined; Jaques writes to Price, his attorney, and sends him the warrant of attorney with this letter: 'Sir, I have sent you a warrant of attorney, which I shall be obliged to you to enter up, and take out execution on immediately; as the defendant is in custody at Simpson's, in Brook-street, and I am told he will settle the matter, you may depend on this being a straight forward business: you see I have not taken the warrant in my own name, nor never will any more; but you will see, by the indorsement on the back, that it is in truth for me; if you have any offer of settlement you may take half down, and a warrant of attorney for the remainder, but not otherwise; I have sent two guineas per bearer, for money out of purse: you need only lodge the writ in the Sheriff's-office; in the other writ you sent me there is a mistake, therefore I shall not serve it till I see you. I am, Sir, your humble servant, Robert Jaques.-Pray send me an answer by the bearer. The witness to the warrant of attorney is my brother.' So that the supposed plaintiff is my brother-in-law, the supposed witness is my brother Jaques, but I, Mr. Robert Jaques, am the real plaintiff in the business.

"Having thus got him arrested, and charged in the office of the Sheriff, the next thing is to get him into the Fleet; how is that to be done? Jaques knew that is to

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

be done by habeas corpus; who should be the attorney? there are a number of attorneys, and we will open the book and see how many there are of one name; it turns out there are two Mr. Martins: Martin is the man; there are but two Martins, and they will not know which of the two it was; now it turns out to be neither of them, for they are both here; so that from the beginning to the end it is a complete fabrication; now the next thing was how to get him out of the Fleet; that was to be done; because unless that could be done it would not do, the warden would not be charged with the debt.

On Saturday the 22d, I think he was brought to the Fleet: on the Sunday they dined together; the company consisted of Mr. Robert Jaques, and his lady, Mr. John Jaques, and his wife, who from her size and appearance might very well pass for a man, and Mr. Shanley being from his appearance to pass for a woman, the transition was easy; Mr. Robert Hopper, and his wife, Mr. Shanley, and Mr. Tronson; Mrs. Hopper and Mr. Hopper coming in about four o'clock on the Sunday: Mr. John Jaques, with his lady Mrs. Jaques: they transferred their appearances, Mr. Shanley placed his blue and gold coat round his waist, to make some hips, and with a gown of Mrs. Jaques's he walked out; Mrs. John Jaques was left in company with Mr. Robert Jaques, Mr. Shanley went out of the gate between eight and nine in the evening, in the very same gown, in the very same dress and appearance that Mrs. John Jaques came in about four; they led a child out with them. Unfortunately Clipsom the turnkey (now whether Jaques knew this before) had been sent for to his mother, in the country, and therefore the door was kept by an under-turnkey; he had not the least suspicion; was not on his guard: the next day it was found that Mr. Shanley had escaped out of prison, and he was traced by some means or other to the lodgings of Mr. Tronson, in Sloane-street: they took coach directly, and went there; Mrs. John Jaques sent for her clothes, and they were returned; the next thing was to get Shanley out of the kingdom; because if he was here he might be taken by an escape warrant, and the whole would be discovered; he therefore the next day took a post chaise and went to Dover, and in company with Mr. Shakeshaft, a person he met with on the road, took boat, and went to Calais. They went to Tronson's the 29th; Tronson's lodgings was in the most miserable situation, scarce a table or a chair: Clipson charged him immediately with having aided and assisted in the escape; Tronson was exceedingly angry at it, and being told that he should be charged with a conspiracy, said, he did not care, that as to going to the Fleet again, he never would put his foot there again, for now he had got his friend out that was all he wished; he had his ends, therefore he did not care a penny about it.

"Gentlemen, upon this Tronson wrote a letter, and sent it to a friend of his, of the name of Alder, who was the plaintiff in that business; now in that letter he writes in these words: 'Dear Frank, I have this moment received yours; and have only time to inform you that there has been six men here searching for you this moment. Matters are arrived to such a height, that I can neither call on Jaques, nor can he send to me at present, therefore I must request you will defer drawing, till you hear from me again. Rely upon it, I shall either call or send to him as soon as I can with safety. They have threatened to indict us all for a conspiracy. I must once more request you will live as saving as you can: God bless you. Yours sincerely, James Smith.' Here Tronson takes the name of Smith, and writes to his friend, Frank Shanley, at France, 'You must direct no more at Chelsea, as follows: Mr. Smith, 97, Fetter-lane, Holborn,' (that being the place where this man, Alder, had a place for a register office.) 'I hope you will have the goodness to excuse this this scrawl, for by G-d, nothing but Botany-bay

## SUPPLEMENT 2

stares us in the face. Do not doctor me over any more in your letters." This letter is directed to Monsieur Loftus, Calais, France.

"This letter was afterwards produced; and by that means it was found that Shanley was in France, under the name of Loftus. Many letters afterwards passed from one to the other, from Shanley to Tronson, and from Tronson to Shanley; those directed from Shanley were directed to Mr. Smith, Fetter-lane; those from Tronson were directed to Mr. Loftus, in France. The next correspondence is a letter from Jaques; and I will just read one of them to you, (for there are more than one;) for Jaques who not only is a very good manager, but a very good actor, not only can plan, but can execute very well, either in his own hand or in a feigned hand sometimes, which this day will be proved to you; for some of those letters are in a feigned hand; but his tricks are so well known, that it will be proved to be his own hand writing.— 'Dear Sir, if this meets you, our friend Tom (Thomas Hopper) will have seen you, and informed you that villain, Clipson, the turnkey, set off for Calais this morning to you, to get you to do some wicked act against your friends, they all rely upon you with the greatest confidence. You will have heard that some of your letters fell into the enemy's hands, in consequence of a traitor; but all will yet be well, so you are safe, and out of Old England. October 16th, 1782,' directed to 'Monsieur Loftus, Calais.'

"Then there is another letter to his friend Tom, which says,—'Dear Tom, if this should meet you, it is just to inform you that Clipson set off for Calais, to endeavour to find the same person you went in search of, to persuade him into something: I think some step might be taken to punish the villain; you have nothing to fear from us; everything here goes on to your satisfaction: particulars I cannot relate. I wrote to L—s, that is Loftus. Yours, sincerely, you know who.' This is Mr Jaques's letter likewise.

"Now, Gentlemen, these letters, you will say how came we into the possession of them because application being made to the Secretary of State's office, these letters were intercepted. Mr. Jaques I see had not heard of this before; he now hears of it; and he will see the letters produced, and proved to be his hand-writing. Gentlemen, the information he gave, was perfectly true and correct; for having learned that this man was in France, that Shanley was in France by the name of Loftus, on the road he met with Mr. Thomas Hopper, who went by the name of Johnson, and said he was clerk to Lady Loftus, in France. Clipson came and found at the French hotel there Mr. Shanley under the name of Loftus; Shanley being accused of this, went before a magistrate, and has made a full and clear discovery of the whole transaction; he has discovered how the plot was laid by Jaques; he has discovered how he escaped out of prison; and he, in short, has related every fact, and how he escaped.

"Gentlemen, that will be read in evidence before you; for he is one of the defendants in this very conspiracy; you will therefore have not only what has passed between Tronson who is not here (though he ought to be here, having given notice of his trial,) but you will have what passed between Shanley and the persons concerned, during the transaction of the persons being in pursuit of Shanley. Jaques was not idle: Tronson was not asleep: it was necessary, if possible, to recover the money; and therefore instructions were to be given by Tronson to Mr. Crossley, to sue the warden for the debt due to Alder; and Jaques applied to his attorney, Mr. Price, to sue the warden for the debt due under the warrant of attorney.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

"Gentlemen, this scheme would have taken place; the actions would have gone on; but the iniquity was so full, the acts came out so strong that the attorneys who were applied to, gave up their papers, and gave every information in their power.

"Gentlemen, Tronson having applied very frequently to Mr. Crossley, giving intimation to a lady, a Miss Brooks, who lived in London, that he had escaped, telling her to come abroad to him, desiring Mr. Crossley, to proceed on it; by way of imposing on Crossley, to bring the action, clothes were sent by Tronson to Mr. Alder, for the purpose of dressing himself up to go to Mr. Crossley, to desire him to go on with the action. Alder was out; he had been passing the day with Tronson; he returned, and complained of being ill (for he began to be shocked at the idea of the iniquity); he soon died; he died, and then application was made to the widow, with an offer to her, if she would stand in the shoes of her husband, they offered her two hundred pounds; the clothes which he had to dress himself in were returned to Tronson. Jaques, with in a very few days after the escape, was the first person to carry the intelligence; to be sure he was the person that knew it better than anybody; he applies to Price, and desired him to proceed to recover the money, which was eight hundred and sixty pounds, anxious to get it on, thinking if he could get the money, he should be able to put it into his own pocket, or share it among them.

"Gentlemen, in this state of the case, it will appear to you clearly, that these two warrants of attorney are fabricated: the witness to one, is a Mr. Brown, who will not appear to prove his signature. The situation of Alder was such, that he could not lend Shanley a farthing. In regard to Jaques's warrant of attorney, he confesses it was his own; he writes to his attorney; it is his own, though taken in the name of his brother; and the witness, his brother, John Jaques, who I believe he will not call, I wish to see him here; I wish to examine him. Then as to Mr. Bailey; Bailey is a brother-in-law of Jaques; so distressed, that he borrowed money before he went to the public house in Lime-street: so distressed, that he borrowed it of his brewer and of his distiller; and before he borrowed that money, he assigned all his effects over to Jaques his brother; this is the man he made use of as the plaintiff in the charge; and Mr. Bailey being applied to for money, says, why says he, I shall not be able to pay you now; but the moment we can recover some money from the the warden, I shall be able to pay some of my debts; so that he is to have some share in the concerns.

"Gentlemen, these are the facts I am instructed to lay before you; I have endeavoured to state them to you as shortly as I possibly could; because a case like this requires no comment; it requires a mere narrative of facts in the plainest way it possibly can; and I am sure if I prove them in evidence, there cannot be a doubt in the mind of any man that hears me, that a fouler conspiracy could not enter the mind of man. Jaques knew perfectly well from his situation, that the warden of the Fleet was answerable for the persons in custody; he knew very well the warden was answerable for the escape; the only question therefore was, how he was to get this money in his pocket; that was to get fictitious plaintiffs and fictitious defendants; and to get a man that would look like a woman, and dress him in the habits of a woman, and impose upon the poor turnkey.

"Gentlemen, a fouler conspiracy I believe never came before this court, and any jury. I have not opened a circumstance which I am not instructed I shall prove: these facts in my mind are irresistible; they prove the connection between Jaques and Tronson: they prove the connection between Jaques and Shanley; they prove that Shanley was sent to France after the escape had been contrived.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

"Gentlemen, so accustomed is Mr. Jaques to prisons of this kind, so hardened in iniquity, that he has not done it for the first time; but this is a common trick.

"Gentlemen, I do not wish that the character of Jaques, infamous as it is, should have any weight on your minds at all; judge him on the facts I have opened to you; and if he is as guilty as I am instructed he is, you will have no difficulty in pronouncing your verdict. As to Tronson, his character is not so black as Jaques's, but black enough of conscience. Shanley, if he is a gentleman, has disgraced himself by associating himself with these people: as to Bailey, a relation of Jaques's, I shall say nothing of. I set down perfectly satisfied, that I shall prove such facts, such connections, between the parties, as not to leave the least doubt in the mind of any man, but that they are all guilty of this charge; and it is high time that justice should overtake these delinquents."

The prisoner conducted his own defence, and cross-examined the witnesses with some ingenuity. He addressed the court with considerable ability; and when his case was going to the jury, he exclaimed, "For God's sake, Gentlemen, consider my family; I have a large family." He was however, without hesitation, found guilty of the conspiracy. He then made the following appeal to the Bench:

*Mr. Jaques.* My Lord, can I ask on which account I am found guilty?

*Court.* Yes, you may ask that certainly.

*Mr. Silvester.* Third and fifth.

*Mr. Jaques.* My Lord, I trust your lordship will, in passing sentence, have some consideration as to my family: I have a very large family entirely dependent on myself.

*Court.* It is not my province to pass the sentence; but now you have brought it to my mind, I find by the evidence, you had it in contemplation to bring an action against the worthy Recorder; if he therefore has any difficulty in passing the sentence, I shall solicit the assistance of my brother Wilson, and pass it for him.

*Mr. Jaques.* My Lord, if I had been indicted under the act for effecting the escape of a prisoner, you know the punishment that is inflicted under that act; if you will suffer me to transport myself from this country; or otherwise I should be glad if sentence of death could be passed upon me.

SENTENCE.—"Robert Jaques, the offence of which you stand convicted is one of the foulest crimes which man can commit; it is so extensive in its consequences, and so dangerous in its example, that at all times the Court are bound to inflict a very heavy and severe punishment for it: in your case it has been attended with every circumstance than can aggravate so black a crime as this; and therefore in passing the sentence upon you, which the court in their discretion think the case requires, I cannot make any allowances for any supposed mischiefs or inconveniences, which may arise from what you have yourself stated to have been your former situation of life: you have deprecated of the jury, that they would not incline against you, because your life hitherto has been very bad: it is a strange defence to come out of the mouth of any person: perhaps you may have heard that it did succeed here in one case better than it ought, and therefore might succeed again in blinding a jury. The fact has been clearly proved against you beyond all possible doubt: and the offence is of that enormity, that the Court think themselves bound to inflict that punishment which the justice of the case requires, and they must rely on the officers of the Court that the sentence is executed with proper severity. The

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

sentence of this Court is: that you be *Imprisoned in his Majesty's gaol of Newgate for the space of three years, and that during that time you be once set in and upon the pillory at the Royal Exchange for the space of one hour, between the hours of twelve and two o'clock.*"

During Jaques's imprisonment, in pursuance of this sentence, Sir James Saunderson was robbed to a considerable amount in cash and notes. Part of the latter were brought into Newgate, (that receptacle of stolen property.) and Jaques contriving to get possession of them, under pretence of raising money thereon, gave immediate notice to Sir James, who, by this means, recovered the principal part of his property. We are not, however, to believe, that this was a spontaneous act of virtue in Jaques; he saw in it a gleam of hope, in prevailing upon Sir James, in return, to do him the kind office of getting, at least, the more hateful part of his sentence, the pillory, remitted. In this he succeeded; Sir James was a man of influence, and Jaques was pardoned. Yet, it seems, that this fortunate escape was not warning sufficient to Jaques, who often appeared at the criminal bar; for we find him, shortly afterwards, convicted of wilful perjury, from which he fled to parts beyond the seas.

**JAMES WATTS**  
*A Quaker, convicted of Robbing his Employer, at the  
Manchester Quarter Session for 1787*

It is not often that we find Quakers' names on the criminal dockets. Their frugal habits, added to much cunning, and considerable industry, commonly secure them from the necessity of committing depredations on the public, through distress. We have, however, already introduced Quaker Watts to the reader, not, indeed, as the ROBBER, but as the man ROBBED; and now we must reverse his character, and bring him criminally to view.

It will be remembered, in our [report of the case of Abraham Durnford and William Newton](#), that a banker's clerk was decoyed into an empty house, No 21, Water lane, Fleet-street, under the pretence of being paid the amount of a bill of exchange, due to the Quaker bankers, Smith, Wright, and Gray, robbed of his pocket-book, and narrowly escaped being murdered, for which Durnford and Newton were hanged, as we have already laid before the public. That very banker's clerk was the identical Watts there described, who, upon the trial of the robbers, would not, according to the tenets of this singular set of puritans, swear—and on a trial affecting life, nothing but oaths will convict.

Quakers assume that which no other description of men arrogate to themselves, viz. the privilege of exemption from taking an oath according to the law of the land. A Churchman is bound to swear upon, and kiss the holy book, whereon he tenders his oath, with his head uncovered. A Quaker will tell you, "I will not doff my beaver, neither will I bend my body," and thus stiffly do they affirm (for they call their affirmation swearing) before their God, with their hats on, and their body upright. In regard to James Watts, we shall show, that though he would not swear, yet he would steal. It appears, that he left the employ of the London bankers, and went to Manchester, where he also got employment. At the quarter sessions of the peace, held in that town, in the year 1787, the said James Watts, and another villain of the name of Andrews, were convicted of robbing their employers, and sentenced to two years imprisonment in the castle of Lancaster.

**JOHN MEAD**

***The Boy Incendiary, Executed before Newgate, August 31,  
1791, for Setting Fire to his Master's House***

A very few weeks had but just elapsed since [the execution of Wood and Underwood](#), and on the very next day of execution in London, another boy, scarce sixteen years of age, was brought to the gallows. This wretched young creature was a pot-boy to a public-house, and named John Mead. Such places are the sure road to the ruin of those children whom misery has placed amid the most reprobate class of society, who waste their time, and impoverish themselves and families in public-houses.

Though nature requires so little drink, and when she calls, pure water is the most wholesome, and, in fact, let drunkards deny it as they please, the pleasantest beverage, yet we find, melancholy as is the sight, every bench in every small pot-house, at night filled with sottish fellows, while often at home their children are crying for food. It is, then, little to be wondered at, that the boys and girls employed to draw beer for, and to wait upon such characters, come to an ignominious end.

John Mead was employed by Walter Cavardine, who kept the sign of the Wheat-sheaf, in Redlion-street, Holborn, London. Having been reprimanded for neglect of his business, the graceless lad determined upon revenge. He found that no mode presented itself so easy and effectual, as that of burning his master's house, and therefore he burnt it in the night of the 5th of July, 1791. To commit an act of villainy is easy; but to conceal it, very difficult. This wicked youth conceived that he had nothing more to effect, than lighting a torch, and running off; but suspicion instantly fell upon him. He was pursued and apprehended; when, in terror, he confessed his crime. This confession was read in court upon his trial, and such a number of corroborating proofs of his guilt was adduced, that the jury, however reluctant, found little doubt upon his case.

His youth could not preponderate in the scale of mercy, against the atrocity of his crime. He was executed along with the following malefactors:

Thomas Godfrey and John Smith, for robbing Mr. John Mazinjay on the highway, near Enfield.

John Finch, Joseph Hunt, and David Rango, for robbing Mr. Isaac Gillet, on the highway in Newgate street, of a pocket-book, containing notes, &c. They beat Mr. Gillet so unmercifully, as to break his leg. They were a part of another gang of pick-pockets and foot-pads.

**HOLDERNESS, THE WATERMAN**  
*Convicted and punished for Ill Treatment to his Fare, 1792.*

AN unlucky suitor in the court of King's Bench entered an adjoining coffee-house, and vented his chagrin upon the law and the lawyers. He paced the room in rage, and left no disgraceful epithet unuttered against the profession. A young counsellor sat unobserved, in a corner-box, conning over his brief, in another cause, and was thus unseasonably interrupted. A moment's consideration sufficed to rid himself of the intruder. Rising, therefore, in an assumed rage, great as that of the losing suitor, he vociferated, "Who is he that abuses the law—ha! is it you. Sir: you, who at this very moment are more indebted to the law than any man living!" "How so," returned the astonished client, "for I have just lost a good cause." "But since you have saved your life," continued the barrister, "you have degraded the law, and were it not for the respect I have for the law, I would kill you; therefore avaunt! lest I make of you a grim spectre." The now doubly distressed suitor left the lawyer to his studies.

If, reader, we were not protected by the law, against the evil machinations of watermen and hackney-coach men, the first might drown us, and the latter break our necks, and both grossly impose upon us.

Of this description of watermen, was Holderness. He plied a few gentlemen, who went into his wherry: when seated, and as he pushed off, he asked the usual question of the men of the oar, "Up or down;" they answered, "Down," on which he swore he would not carry them. The company insisted that he should; he swayed the boat, and in a few minutes filled it, and sunk it in fourteen feet water. If a life had been lost, should not this fellow have been hanged? Though, fortunately, they escaped a watery grave, yet were they brought little better than half drowned, on shore, by a vessel passing at the time of the outrage.

The injured gentleman complained to the Waterman's Company, who dismissed them on the ground that no sculler was obliged to go farther down than Cuckold's Point, nor farther up than Vauxhall, as below or above those places there were no settled fares. They were, however, of opinion, that no waterman, plying for passengers, could demand where they would be landed, or endanger their lives. Yet they awarded no satisfaction to the party aggrieved; but thanks to the laws of the land, this "Jolly young waterman" was, at the quarter-sessions, Westminster, sentenced a year's imprisonment in Newgate.

**JOHN BURKITS**

*Sentenced to Twelve Months Imprisonment, for Dog Stealing,  
October 13, 1789*

STILL find we novelty in the black art of thieving; still is the reader, far as we are advanced in our work, presented with new instances of wickedness and cruelty.

"The devil behind him, pleas'd and grinning,  
"Patting this fell savage on the shoulder,  
"Declaring nought was ever bolder,  
"Admiring such a novel mode of sinning."

Most true it is, that as well as horse-stealers and sheep stealers, we have in our London catalogue of rascalions, a set of cruel men, prowling about, to rob families of their most faithful domestic—their dog; for the base inhuman purpose of killing him, for the price of his skin!

The dog is the most intelligent of all known quadrupeds, and the acknowledged friend of mankind. It seems beyond the power of ill-usage to subdue the faithful and constant qualities inherent in him. The dog, exclusive of the beauty of his form, his swiftness, and his vivacity, possesses all those internal qualifications that can endear any creature to man. In his domestic state, his sole ambition and desire is to please. With a kind and affectionate humility, he crouches before his master, and is happy to offer his strength, his courage, and all his useful talents, for his service. He waits his orders, and implicitly obeys them. He is friendly without interest, grateful for the slightest favours, and sooner forgets injuries than benefits. His only pleasure is to be serviceable, his only terror to displeasure. He licks the hand just raised to strike him, and disarms resentment by submission. Ever assiduous in serving his master, he is also a friend to his friends, and indifferent to all the rest. The dog is the only animal whose fidelity is unshaken. When the master is attacked, the dog will defend him to the utmost of his power; and when his master dies, he laments his loss; some have been known to pine away, and others to follow the corpse to the grave. There are, therefore, few species of domestic property which men more delight in than their dog; and no animal in the brute creation repays his kindness with more gratitude, and obedience, than his faithful dog. All the day he toils in the field, in the chase, or guards his master's flocks and herds; and at night he defends him from attack of ruffians, in the shape of man.

We could recount, at least, a hundred instances of the affection, perseverance, and resignation, of the canine race—of the lives they have saved; the property they have rescued from destruction; and their being at all times ready to risk their lives in defence of their master's. Men followed by their dog, oft have met fatal accidents, by sudden death, and when their bodies were found, the affectionate animal was apparently watching his master's sleep, and guarding him from intrusion

The late earl of Harcourt was found in a well in his own domains. He had fallen in head-foremost, in the act, it was conjectured, of stooping for a little water for his dog, which had followed him. The water was not deep, but the bottom being muddy, the unfortunate nobleman stuck fast by the head, and his feet alone remained above, upon which, some few hours after life had fled from the man, the dog was found, looking with anxiety to the bottom, for the remainder of his beloved master.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

"Stooping to drink, the hermit found a grave:  
"All in the running stream his garments spread,  
"And dark damp verdure ill concealed his head;  
"The faithful servant of that fatal day,  
"Watch'd the lov'd corpse, and hourly pined away;  
"His head upon his master's cheek was found,  
"While the obstructed waters mourn'd around."  
PRATT.

It would require a separate volume to fully describe the excellent qualities of that faithful animal, which such villains as John Burkits, the detested subject of this essay, seek to kill, for the paltry price of his skin. Dogs of high breed bear a valuable proportion to the racer, and often sell for twenty, and even fifty guineas, or more; while the owners of others would not, by gold, be tempted to part with them. Yet, for a paltry half-crown did Burkits, and many other cruel scoundrels, kill such beautiful and faithful animals.

The method used to get possession of the dog, is of a piece with the finishing blow; they have recourse to treachery, for no open means could prevail upon the betrayed creature to suffer the ruffian's hand to touch them. These dog-stealers have a paste, wherein is a certain drug, the flavour of which, as the oil of rhodium will draw rats, dispels every other object, and they irresistibly follow the person carrying the deceitful composition.

The case of Burkits will fully apply to this observation. On his trial, in the hopes of escaping with a trifling punishment, he confessed, that the dog which he was charged with stealing, followed him from the Haymarket, and that he hung him in a field leading to Hampstead; that he had hung several dogs, and that he followed the practice for a living; that the skin of a common sized dog would fetch 1*s.* 6*d.*—for a degree larger, 2*s.*—and for a very large one, from 2*s.*6*d.* to 3*s.*6*d.*; that he always sold them to a tanner in Long-lane, in the Borough, who asked no questions. He was fined, and sentenced twelve months' imprisonment.

Note: "As to friendship," says Montaigne, "the beasts sometimes have it, without comparison, more lively and constant than men have. King Lysimachus's dog Hyracan, his master being dead, lay upon his bed, obstinately refusing either to eat or drink; and the day that his body was burned (the custom of the time) he took a run, and leaped into the fire, where he was consumed. As also did the dog of one Pyrrhus; for he would not stir from his master's bed from the time that he died; and when they took his master away, suffered himself to be carried with him, and at last leaped into the pile, where they burnt his master's body.

"There are also certain inclinations of affections which sometimes spring in us, without the consultation of reason, and by a fortuitous temerity, which others call sympathy, of which beasts are as capable as we. We see horses take such an acquaintance with one another, that we have much difficulty to make them stir or travel, when separated: We observe them to fancy a particular colour in those of their own kind, and, where they meet it, run with great joy and demonstration of good will; and have a dislike or hatred to some other colour."

**JOHN HORNBY MORELAND**

*Convicted at the Lent Assizes 1790, at Bury, in Suffolk, For  
Bigamy*

THE crime of bigamy is a serious offence against the law; and contrary to the order of society among Christians. It is the offence of marrying again, in the lifetime of the first, who is in fact the only wife, because the law admits not of two; and by an act of Parliament, passed since the conviction of this man, is punished with transportation.

This was not the first time of his being arraigned for bigamy, for we find him indicted at the Old Bailey, and tried at the January sessions preceding his conviction at Bury. He was there arraigned for feloniously marrying Mary Symmonds, on the 25th of September, then last past, he being before married to Ann Chapman, who was then living.

The evidence adduced on the part of the prosecution was perfectly satisfactory; but Mr. Garrow, counsel for the prisoner, took two exceptions upon a point of law, to the evidence of the two marriages, both upon the same grounds, namely,—“That in both marriages, being by licence, the female being under age, and no consent of either parents or guardians, they were informal, and of course void, by the statute of the 26th Geo. II.” The court ruled, that in regard to the objection to the prior marriage, it would not hold, inasmuch as the proof of the want of consent either of the parent or guardian, lay upon the defendant. With respect to the latter marriage, it was admitted, because the father of Mary Symmonds, had he been consulted, would have totally disapproved of it. The court was therefore under the necessity of acquitting the prisoner; but ordered him to be transmitted into Yorkshire, to stand his trial for the prior marriage, he being before that married to a former wife.

Thus we find a strong suspicion of his having three wives; but before he was carried into Yorkshire, we find him at the bar of justice at Bury, and found guilty of marrying Mrs. Hardcastle, of Ipswich, and Miss Lambeth, near Richmond, in Yorkshire. He was sentenced to be burnt in the hand with a red hot iron, which was done before he left the court, and to be imprisoned twelve months, in the gaol of Ipswich, during which time his head was to be shaved, to wear the habit ordered for criminals, and on his feet wooden clogs. He was farther ordered to be kept, during the time, in close confinement, except two hours each day, when he was allowed to breathe the fresh air.

**PIERRE AUGUSTINE, ALIAS PETER AUGUSTINE,  
 ALIAS PETER CHUMLEY, ALIAS PETER CHAPMAN,  
 ALIAS PETER DEVAL**

*Executed before Newgate, August 31, 1791, For Robbing his  
 own Countryman*

WE have already adduced instances of too many foreigners violating the rules of hospitality, in plundering the people of this country, while under their protection. When a traveller finds himself hospitably received in a foreign land, and more especially when he is there enabled to support himself by his industry, it is ingratitude, in the worst degree, to violate the laws of his adopted country, for the purpose of plunder. It is a trite saying, that British subjects, in a distant land, protect each other, but how often have we shown, that Frenchmen in England prey upon each other; even before the visionary rights of equality were attempted to be enforced. We have shown a Mercier murdering his patron, and plundering his effects; a Le Maitre, robbing a public museum, where he was generously admitted, and other daring violations of our laws by Frenchmen, who existed alone under their protection, and a Mallard, after receiving charity, attempted to murder Mr. Carter.

The treacherous foreigner, whom we now bring forward, had long continued his depredations on our unsuspecting countrymen; which may be readily conjectured from the numbers of feigned names assumed, and under all which he was indicted. Monsieur Alexander Delarade was a French gentleman of fortune, and in the time of peace between his country and Britain, paid a visit to London. There he became acquainted with the subject of this report. Monsieur Delarade, speaking English imperfectly, employed him as interpreter, and for this he made him his confidential friend. He had, it appeared, long contemplated to rob his countryman and benefactor; and for this purpose, one evening, when he had attended him to the play, pretending an excuse, he returned to Monsieur Delarade's, and robbed them of property to the value of two thousand pounds. These effects, consisting both of money and goods, he carried off in a hackney coach; but the number being fortunately taken by a neighbour, who suspected some foul play, he was traced thereby to Bristol, and seized, with the greatest part of the property, at the instant of his embarking to a distant land. This being fully proved, he was convicted and executed.

**THOMAS DUNN**

***Convicted, Pilloried, and Imprisoned, at Lancaster, September 2, 1794, for Perjury***

This perjured man appeared as a witness against Mr. Walker of Manchester, a gentleman in high estimation, and nine other innocent men who were put upon their trials on a charge of high treason.

Mr. Sergeant Cockell, Counsel for the prosecution, entered very fully, and with great feeling, upon the nature of the charge, which contained no less than ten different perjuries imputed to Dunn, the Defendant. Taking advantage of some local circumstances and prejudices in the town of Manchester, this man had accused several innocent and respectable individuals of the greatest crime known to the law, viz. High Treason. Two witnesses, however, being required to every treasonable act, they were indicted only for a misdemeanour; but had the Jury who tried them believed the diabolical fabrication of this Prisoner, (then a witness,) the effects must have proved ruinous and destructive to these parties and their families. And if any second person could have been found equally detestable with him, Mr. Walker and nine of his other fellow subjects must have forfeited their lives and properties, and have suffered public execution, although totally free from any offence whatever.

It pleased one of the magistrates of Manchester to accept this Dunn as a fit person to be evidence against these gentlemen, who upon his examinations, (not once only, but repeatedly taken before him,) were tried and acquitted as above. But previous to their trial, Mr. Paul, one of them, had been committed for treason, and lingered for more than two months in Lancaster Castle. During this interval also Dunn felt the sharpest compunction for the accusation he had made, and voluntarily sought occasion to see Mr. Walker, who admitted of this with all possible precaution, having persons of character present during the whole time of his stay, and never being alone in his company. Dunn, in their hearing, begged pardon for the injury he had done to Mr. Walker; said that he had been bribed to do what he had done, and that he had sworn falsely when before the Grand Jury.

At Mr. Walker's trial, being questioned as to these confessions, he answered, that no such thing ever passed. The record of Mr. Walker's trial being read, Mr. Gurney, who took notes of it at the time, read from them what Dunn had sworn on his evidence for the Crown, and on his cross-examination. To prove the falsehood of the facts sworn to by Dunn, various witnesses were called; and first as to his reading and writing. The Rev. Mr. Griffith, the Magistrates before whom Dunn's informations were taken, and who upon them issued warrants against Mr. Walker, Mr. Paul, Mr. Jackson, and several others, for high treason, swore that he had seen Thomas Dunn write his name, and that he had no doubt of his being able to read and write. This was confirmed by his clerk, Mr. Painter, who had seen Dunn write his name, and had also seen letters which he believed to have been written by him. Two other witnesses deposed to the same effect.

Mr. Ridgeway and Mr. Jones stated that they saw Dunn at Mr. Walker's, house, on the 18th of March; that he fell upon his knees, and begged Mr. Walker's pardon; said that he had injured his character, that he had accused him falsely, and that he had been bribed to what he had done; and that when Mr. Walker refused to be alone with him, he threatened him, and said, that it should be worse for him. Several

## SUPPLEMENT 2

other witnesses were called, who corroborated the above facts. Mr. Scarlet made an able and ingenious defence for the prisoner. Mr. Justice Rooke then summed up the evidence in a very full and perspicuous manner, and the Jury returned their verdict—GUILTY. He received the judgement of the Court, that he should be confined two years in Lancaster gaol, and stand once within that period in the pillory.

**WILLIAM TILLEY, JOHN CROSSWELL, GEORGE  
HARDWICK, JAMES HAYDEN, JOHN HAWDEN,  
SIMON JACOBS, JOHN SOLOMONS, JOHN PHILLIPS,  
AND JOHN HENLEY**

*Convicted at the Old Bailey, July 1, 1795, of a Conspiracy, and  
Sentenced to Transportation.*

(A Singular piece of Jewish Iniquity)

A most desperate attempt was made on the fourth of April, 1795, in the morning, between one and two o'clock, to rescue Isdwell, a Jew, who stood charged with being concerned in a forgery on the stamp Office, but who in the scuffle lost his life in the following manner: Isdwell, who was confined in New Prison, Clerkenwell, persuaded two of the turnkeys that an aunt of his, who was very rich, then lay at the point of death, and that he had been informed, that, could she see him before she died, she would give him a thousand pounds; and therefore, if they would let him out, and accompany him to the place, he would give them fifty guineas each for their trouble; and that the matter might be effected without the knowledge of the keeper of the prison, or any other person, they having the keys of it at night, and the time required being very short.

To this proposal the turnkeys agreed; and accordingly about one o'clock in the morning, the gates were opened, and Isdwell, with his irons on, was conducted in a hackney-coach by one of them, armed with a blunderbuss, to the place directed, which was in Artillery-lane, Bishopsgate-street, where they gained immediate admittance on ringing a bell; and, enquiring for the sick lady, were ushered up one pair of stairs. Isdwell went in to the room first, on which several fellows rushed forth and attempted to keep the turnkey out; but not succeeding in that respect, they put the candles out, wrested the blunderbuss out of his hand, and discharged it at him; at this instant, it was supposed Isdwell was endeavouring to make his escape out of the door, as he received the principal part of the contents of the blunderbuss in his back, and fell dead; the turnkey also fell, one of the slugs grazing the upper part of his head; and the villains, by some means finding their mistake, though in the dark, beat him in so shocking a manner with the butt end of the blunderbuss, while he lay on the ground, as to break it to pieces, fractured his skull in two places, and bruised him dreadfully about the body; the noise which the affair occasioned brought a number of watchmen and patrols to the house, who secured ten persons therein, mostly Jews.

There is every reason to suppose, that they would have completely murdered the turnkeys, had not timely assistance been afforded. They were all examined on the fourth, before the above magistrate; as also the turnkeys, who related the foregoing story, and who, as well as the others, were ordered to be committed for further examination. The plan of Isdwell's escape appeared to have been formed by the widow of the late notorious Laurence Jones, she having taken the lodgings in Artillery Lane, and though in reality aunt to Isdwell, had cohabited with him ever since her husband's death. The bed in the room where the business happened was decorated with all the paraphernalia of a sick person; a number of phials standing on an adjoining table, and to make the farce (which in the last act proved a tragedy) more

## SUPPLEMENT 2

perfect, the image of a woman's head, with a cap on, appeared just above the bed-clothes.

The parties supposed to be concerned in this assault and murder were tried at the Old Bailey, on the 21st of April, and after a trial which lasted from eleven to half past one next morning, acquitted; the darkness of the deed excluding the possibility of full proof; but they were detained, on an indictment for a conspiracy.

Day, one of the turnkeys, related the story of his and Crosswell's agreeing to let Isdwell go to Artillery Lane; that Tilley and Jacobs frequently came to the prison; and on Good Friday the former said to Isdwell, that Moses Solomons (who was confined in Bridewell upon the same charge) was to be suffered to go home and keep the passover with his family. This had some weight in inducing the witness to consent, and at night he accompanied him to Artillery Lane, in which he met Tilley, but did not go in to the house where he was so dreadfully beat, and Isdwell was shot.

Moses Solomons was a servant of Isdwell, and, as on the former trial, gave a detail of the circumstances of Jonathan Jones taking the lodging in Artillery Lane; of Isdwell's being expected that night; that the trick of a sick aunt was to be played off on the turnkey; that Isdwell did come; that most of the prisoners were there; and that after the accident, he, and all the rest, were taken into custody. Mrs. Cumming, who kept the house, and a little boy, her son, proved that they had seen Hardwick, Jacobs, and Hayden, come to Mrs. Isdwell.

Ray, Spencer, and Brummel, were the persons who apprehended all the prisoners but Tilley, Jones, and Crosswell, in and about the house; and they were all particularly sworn to by Day and Moses Solomons, as being in some way concerned, except Delaney, who was no otherwise identified than as being taken in the house.

In their defence, Tilley said he was employed by the Isdwells, as their attorney: and as the two brothers were confined in two different prisons, the going backwards and forwards from one to the other, occasioned his seeing them oftener than he otherwise should. He denied that he ever made use of the expression about Moses going out, as sworn to by Mr. Day, or that he had the smallest knowledge of any intention of an escape.

John Crosswell left his defence to the council.

Jonathan Jones, also indicted, did not deny that he had taken the lodging for Mrs. Isdwell, but he had not done it secretly; for, on her husband's being taken up, she sent for him to come to town from Gosport; he did so; and as she was obliged to leave her house at St. Mary Axe, he had taken this lodging for her; and in so doing, thought he did no more than his duty for a niece. Before the accident happened, he had returned into the country; all of which was admitted to be true by the witness Solomons.

George Hardwick stated himself to have been employed as a porter, to assist in carrying the goods to the lodging, and not having been paid the whole of his demand, had gone that night, and was waiting to get the remainder.

— Hayden said, his wife washed for Mrs. Isdwell; and that she being lame, he had gone to Mrs. Isdwell's with some things that night, and was staying for some money. John Hayden had been out drinking, not being able to work from its being Good Friday, and was so much intoxicated, that he could not say how he came into the house.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

Henry Delaney, also in the same indictment, said, he was passing by the door, just after the accident, that he stopped to see what was the matter, that he was pushed in by the mob, and had not been in the house before.

Simon Jacobs described himself to be a brother-in-law to Isdwell, that he was constantly going backwards and forwards to him; and that by his desire, he passed most of his time at their lodgings. He had no doubt but Day was the man who shot his brother. He then entered into a long and vehement attack upon the keepers of Clerkenwell, both for their conduct to Isdwell and to himself, after he was taken; drawing a conclusion with respect to the former, that the governor, lieutenant-governor, and turnkeys, were principals in the escape; and that he and his fellow prisoners, even had they intended to assist, could only be accomplices; and that it could not be just to punish accomplices before the principals; nay, more, he insisted the escape was made the moment he was out of prison, and consequently long before they could be concerned with it.

John Phillips and John Solomons related the same story, namely, that upon a promise of a reward of two hundred pounds, they were endeavouring to get the dies from Mrs. Isdwell, by which the stamps had been forged; and upon their making her some promises, she had appointed them to come that evening. John Henley said, he had called upon Mrs. Isdwell, that night, respecting a watch he had bought, and which had been stopped. A great number of very respectable witnesses were then called to their different characters. Mr. Justice Buller summed up the evidence with much attention and perspicuity; after which the jury went out for near half an hour, and then returned a verdict of guilty, against the nine already named, acquitting Jonathan Jones and Henry Delaney. They received sentence of transportation.

**GEORGE COLLEY, MICHAEL BLANCHE, AND  
FRANCIS COLE**  
*Murderers and Pirates, Executed at Execution Dock, January  
22, 1796*

This was the shocking case of a motley set of desperadoes composing the crew of an American ship, rising and murdering their commander, in order to possess themselves thereof. This desperate gang consisted of seven villains of different countries, viz.

Samuel Dearbon, Archibald Hart, and John Cassado, American citizens of the United States;

Francis Cole, an American Savage of the Cherokee nation;

George Colley, an Irishman;

Emanuel Batha, and Michael Blanche, Spaniards;

and who were apprehended in the Isle of Wight, on a charge of having murdered William Little, and possessed themselves unlawfully of the ship called, "The American Eagle," upon the high seas, and within the jurisdiction of the admiralty of England. They were brought to trial at the admiralty sessions in the Old Bailey for 1796, and thereon Dearbon, Hart, and Cassado, were admitted evidence for the crown.

It appeared from their depositions, that the murder of William Little, the captain of the American Eagle was committed at twelve o'clock at night, of October 27, 1795, within three days' sail of the chops of the channel, and the command of the vessel was then taken by George Colley, who before had been appointed mate, in consequence of the death of Richard Little the original mate. The circumstances attending this murder were truly horrid and diabolical. Cole, the savage, was the chief murderer, Colley the director, and the two Spaniards, Blanche and Batha, the assistants. Between one and two o'clock the witness Dearbon was alarmed at the cries of the captain, who called out murder, while some one was saying, "Rub him down, d—n him, rub him down well;" he then was heard to say, "I am not dead though you think me so," and in a short time after exclaimed in a faint voice, "Cook, for God's sake let me lie down and die quietly;" these last words must have been addressed to Cole, as he acted in the capacity of cook. Michael Blanche then came down from the deck, and attempted to murder the witness Dearbon, who was lying in his hammock; when a scuffle ensued, and the witness got upon deck and begged his life of Colley, who then directed the body of the captain to be drawn up from the cabin and thrown overboard. During this operation, Cole said, I can haul him up with a hearty good will; and when the body was drawn up and thrown overboard, Colley said, "There, let him go to hell and be damned;"—the body had no covering but a shirt, pair of stockings and drawers: the trousers having been stripped off by Cole who kept them. Colley then took possession of the captain's effects, among which were 245 dollars, which were afterwards sold by him at Cowes, and divided between the witnesses and the others, together with the clothes of the deceased. Colley the mate had entered in the log-book that the deceased died on the 27th of October, of a yellow fever: on the ship's arrival in the Isle of Wight Colley attempted to make an alteration of the entry of the death he had recorded before, and place it at a former period.

A variety of other circumstances appeared, which tended to prove that the part the witnesses took in this horrid transaction was entirely through fear, and that the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

origin seemed to have been set on foot by Colley. Blanche and Batha being Spaniards, and unacquainted, with the English language, had an interpreter who explained every circumstance of the evidence to them: they, denied being actually guilty of the murder, though they acknowledged they knew of its being done. Cole said it was perpetrated by Colley, and Colley said it was done by Blanche and Cole, but did not say who directed it to be done. The manner of the murder was exceedingly barbarous, a knife and an iron tea-kettle being used to effect it.

Batha, in his defence, delivered a paper, translated from Spanish, which was as follows-"I, Emanuel, declare before God, that I am innocent of having any share whatever in the death of Captain Little. I was at that time at the helm, and could not have concerted with any one as I cannot speak English at all, and my language is that of the Bay of Biscay." Foreigners appeared to his character, one of whom said he was an angel of God, meaning a good man. The jury acquitted Batha, and found the rest Guilty. Blanche expressed much astonishment at the verdict.

Sentence was immediately passed by Sir James Marriott on the prisoners, to be hanged on the ensuing Monday at Execution Dock, and afterwards dissected and anatomized. Sir James Marriot afterwards respited the execution of the three prisoners to the following Thursday, on account of the tide, but desired they might be told not to flatter themselves on that account with any hopes of further time. On that day, pursuant to their sentence, they suffered at Execution Dock. The concourse of spectators who attended to witness this act of justice was immense. Cole laughed and behaved in the most indecent manner. He and Hart (the witness) were Americans of colour. Colley was an Irishman. They would make no confession, but remained obstinate and sullen. Their bodies were brought back to Surgeon's Hall, and publicly exposed.

**MICHAEL COX, ROBERT M'LAURIN, JOHN  
SULLIVAN, MARTIN EALEY, AND WILLIAM  
MORRISON**

***The Mutineers of the Grand Fleet, Executed at the Yard-arm  
of the Defiance Man of War, March 8, 1796***

ON the morning of that day, the signal gun was fired by the Defiance, while the yellow flag of death was hoisted, for the execution of the above disloyal seamen, who had been sentenced to death by a general court-martial. A lieutenant, in a boat manned and armed, was immediately sent from each ship to witness the awful scene. The crews of the respective ships were called on deck, and the articles of war read to them by their captains, who afterwards warned them to take example from the fate of the unhappy men about to suffer.

The Rev. Dr. Hatherhall, chaplain of the Sandwich, (who has constantly been with the prisoners since their condemnation) administered the sacrament to all of them, except Michael Cox and Martin Ealey, who were Roman Catholics; after praying with them until near eleven o'clock, they were brought on deck; and the ropes fixed around their necks, when John Flint, George Wythick, John Lawson, and William Handy, were made acquainted, that His Majesty had been pleased to pardon them. Handy, who had a wife and child on board, immediately ran down and fainted in her arms; Lawson, addressing the clergyman, said, "I am afraid I shall never again be so well prepared for eternity."

At a quarter past eleven the signal for the execution of the remainder, was made by firing a gun, when Michael Cox, Robert M'Laurin, John Sullivan, Martin Ealey, and William Morrison, were launched into eternity. After hanging the usual time, their bodies were sent on shore to the agent at sick quarters for interment. This awful spectacle had a due effect upon the several ships companies, who behaved in a very proper and becoming manner on the occasion.

**VALLERIE COFFRE**

***A Frenchman, Executed at Winchester, July 11, 1766, for the Murder of his Fellow-Prisoner***

IT is a melancholy reflection on the state of human nature, to find men under the misery of imprisonment in a foreign land quarrelling with each other, to a height ending in murder. That men, side by side, fighting the battles of their country, and by the fortune of war made prisoners by their enemy, in their confinement, to begin to murder each other is a dreadful reflection.

Vallerie Coffre was a French prisoner of war, confined with a number of his countrymen, at Portchester Castle, in Hampshire. He quarrelled with his countryman and fellow-prisoner, Nicholas Chartier, and by a secret stab with his knife, an instrument all Frenchmen carry about them, chiefly for the purpose of cutting their food, deprived him of life. This was fully proved on his trial. He pleaded intoxication, and behaved with great contrition. He was a well made young man, and only twenty-two years of age. He was attended by a catholic priest, and was very earnest in his devotions. The whole of the French prisoners were guarded to the place of execution, to witness the dreadful example. He signed a confession, according to the custom of his country, acknowledging his crime, and the justice of his sentence, and asking pardon for it. The priest who attended him, just before he was turned off, read the paper to the prisoners assembled, which it is hoped had a good effect on them. The following is a correct copy of the paper above mentioned:

"In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.—

Fatal drunkenness! without which I should not have killed my friend, since I loved him, and regret him sincerely, and with all my soul. Truth obliges me to say, to the end, that I have no knowledge of that which I did then, so much were my senses lost; nevertheless I have committed a great crime—I acknowledge the justice of my condemnation—I entreat pardon for it from my friends, from all those who were witnesses to it, and above all, from God, who is the Father and the Saviour of all men, and to whom I recommend my soul, trusting myself to the merits of Jesus Christ, and blessing his divine bounty. I die a member of the Apostolic Roman Church.

Vallerie Coffre."

Witness, Delabaye.

After execution his body was immediately delivered to the surgeons for dissection.

Note: At French tables, knives are seldom laid with each plate. A carver is sometimes found near the dish of roast meat, but there is little occasion for this; their victuals, being always cooked, as we would express it, to rags. Thus they easily pull it to pieces with their three-pronged forks. With one of these and a knife, the latter each individual takes from the pocket, aided occasionally by their fingers, they consume an enormous quantity of salad, greens, and bread; with no small allowance of overdone animal food. Of this part of their aliment, stews, ragouts, and soups, are excellent, but no Englishman can relish their roast beef, their steak, or their leg of mutton.

**JAMES O'COIGLEY**  
*Executed on Penningdon Heath, June 7, 1798, for High  
 Treason*

THE solemn, impressive, dying declaration of this unfortunate gentleman, must certainly create a distressing pause in every reader. We have frequently shown, that obdurate and ignorant criminals have died in a declaration of innocence, when crimes have been proved against them, beyond the very shadow of doubt; but when a man, born and educated a gentleman, a scholar, and receiving the last sacrament of his religion, appeals to his God, before whom, ere a few minutes of life to him remained in this world, solemnly avows to the surrounding multitude, gathered together to witness his untimely end, his perfect and entire innocence of the crime for which he has been convicted, charity will force us to question his guilt.

The times in which he suffered were dangerous to the constitution of the kingdom. There were then, both in England, Ireland, and Scot land, many disaffected men, the leaders of parties assembling for purposes inimicable to the public weal. Many had been apprehended, and several had already suffered death, acknowledging their crimes; and others, by all ranks deemed guilty. In cases of this nature, the public mind is in a state of alarm, and all accused stand condemned by individuals; thus those charged of joining in a plot against the nation, an inward detestation against them is felt in every loyal breast; and hence the minds of jurymen must feel a strong bias against their fellows, arraigned for their lives, on which they are to determine. These are the irresistible workings of nature; and it might so unfortunately have turned out, that Mr. O'Coigley was a victim. We offer these observations as a tribute of charity for the departed man, yet we truly hope, dreadful as the alternative in thought may be, that he died fairly convicted of the crime for which he suffered. His best friends must certainly admit that suspicion might well fall upon any man thus connected with Arthur O'Conner, an apostate Irishman, who certainly attempted to sell his country to the foe; and is now high in rank in the service of the tyrant Buonaparte. Such was the ill fate of O'Coigley; who, together with the above-named O'Conner, John Binns, John Allen, and Jeremiah Leary, were arraigned at the Lent assizes for Kent, in the year 1798, of whom O'Coigley alone was found guilty; sufficient proof, however guilty the remainder in conscience were, not being adduced to convict them.

The indictment was read by Mr. Knapp, who afterwards stated the charges it contained in a summary manner. He said there were three distinct species of treason charged in the indictment, and seven overt-acts. The first treason was compassing and imagining the death of the king: the second, was adhering to his enemies: the third, was compassing and imagining, inventing, devising, and intending to move and stir certain foreigners and strangers, that is to say, the persons exercising the powers of government in France, to invade this kingdom. The first overt act was, conspiring to levy war at Margate, in the county of Kent: the second overt-act, sending intelligence to the enemy: the other overt-acts were, attempts to hire vessels, and to leave the kingdom. The trial lasted two days. A pocket-book had been found in O'Coigley's great-coat, in which a paper was found addressed to the Executive Directory of France, from the Secret Committee of England.

O'Coigley, in his defence, addressed the jury as follows: "It is impossible for me to prove a negative; but it is a duty I owe to you, and to myself, solemnly to

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

declare, that I never was the bearer of any message or paper of this kind to France, in the course of my life. That paper is not mine; it never belonged to me. It states that it was to be carried by the bearer of the last; this is something which might have been proved, but it is impossible for me to prove the negative. There is also in this paper an allusion to secret committees and political societies. I declare that I never attended any political society whatever. With these considerations, I consign my life to your justice; not doubting but that you will conduct yourselves as English jurymen ever do, and that your verdict will be such as shall receive the approbation of your own conscience, your country, and your God."

The jury, after about half an hour's consideration, found O'Coigley "Guilty," and acquitted the other prisoners. Mr. Justice Buller, in an address to O'Coigley, which he read from a written paper, previous to his passing the sentence, observed, that he had been clearly convicted of the most atrocious crime which could be committed in any country—that of meditating the destruction of a Sovereign, who was one of the best, the most just, upright, and amiable of princes that ever graced a throne; and he could not conceive what were the motives which could actuate any man, even to wish for the death of such, who had ever been the father of his people. The prisoner was also found guilty of conspiring to overturn the constitution of these kingdoms; a constitution which, from the experiment of years, had been found to be the best calculated of any that ever existed in the world, to insure the liberty, security, and happiness, of the people who lived under it. These atrocious crimes became still greater from the manner in which they were intended to be perpetrated—that of inviting a foreign enemy to come and invade, and conquer these countries. Those people, who had thought such an event a desirable one, ought to think seriously what the consequences of it would be, provided it was possible to be accomplished. Did they suppose that, (desperate as their present situation might be) their condition would be bettered by having their country put into the possession of people who were—holding out the delusive hopes of what they called liberty to other nations? Could such persons hope that they themselves should enjoy liberty, even supposing the conquerors to have enjoyed as free a constitution as any in the world? No, they would become suspected, be despised, and destroyed by them. A celebrated writer (Montesquieu) very justly observed upon this subject, that a country conquered by a democratic nation always enjoyed less liberty, was more miserable, and more enslaved, than if that country happened to have been conquered by a nation whose government was monarchial. But if there was any illustration of this observation wanting, one had only to look to the conduct of the French at this moment towards Holland, Italy, Switzerland, and every other country they had conquered. His Lordship believed that the prisoner might have been actuated by motives similar to those which used formerly to induce many people to think that the killing of men of a different religion would give them a claim to canonization. But though the motives might be similar, the subjects connected with them were very different. In the present times, he did not believe that any person entertained such sentiments about religion. On the contrary, he was sorry to find that religion was too much neglected, and that the peace and tranquillity of numbers of people were destroyed in consequence of having lost all belief of the existence of a Divine Providence, and totally abandoned all hopes of a future state. He was afraid that the prisoner had been infected with this infidelity, and if he was, he (the Judge) prayed that the Almighty God, in his infinite mercy and goodness, would change his heart, and cause him to repent of his sins.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

His lordship then, in a solemn and awful manner, passed the following sentence: "That the prisoner be taken from the bar to prison, and from thence to the place of execution; there to be hanged, but not until he be dead, to be cut down while yet alive, and then to have his heart and bowels taken out and burnt before his face; his head to be severed from his body; and his body to be divided into four quarters." Mr. O'Coigley listened to this address and sentence with attention, but at the same time with the greatest coolness. He bowed his head when the Judge concluded; his countenance expressing at once resignation and firmness.

Immediately after the sentence was passed on O'Coigley, Mr. O'Conner, supposing himself at liberty, attempted to withdraw, when a warrant was served on him on another charge of high treason, signed by the Duke of Portland, and dated March 22. On this some swords were drawn, and a general confusion ensued, when Mr. O'Connor addressed the Court to this effect: "My Lord, I am surrounded with drawn swords,—I am prepared to die; and it would be better for the Court to doom me to death at once, than that I should linger out my life in a gaol—Have the goodness to send me to the dungeon where my brother is in confinement, after having been acquitted on a charge of high treason in Ireland. At all events, will your Lordships order that my agent may be permitted to come to me?" The Court said they could make no order—their commission ended with the trial.

O'Coigley on Wednesday, June 6, 1798, between four and five in the afternoon, received information that he was to die next day, without apparent emotion. He spent the evening very calmly. He had but one thing, he said, on his mind which created any anxiety; that was, an apprehension that he might be misrepresented after his death. He was anxious to be faithfully reported, and that was all he wanted. On Thursday, at a quarter past eleven o'clock, O'Coigley left the gaol. He was dressed all in black; his hair was cropped and powdered, his shirt-collar open, and he wore no neck-cloth. His elbows were tied behind with ropes, and over his shoulders was the rope with which he was executed. He stepped into the hurdle, and on his sitting down a chain was put round his waist to fasten him. The executioner sat opposite to him. He had nothing on his head. He continued all the way earnestly reading a prayer-book. Mr. Watson, the gaoler, followed the hurdle, which was surrounded by above 200 of the Maidstone Volunteers. The deputy sheriff, and the Rev. Mr. Griffiths followed. The whole was preceded by about 20 javelin-men. The hurdle was drawn up close in front of the gallows, on Penningdon-heath, and the horses were taken out. The military formed a small square. The prisoner being unchained, he rose up and stood in the hurdle, and read two prayers, one of them aloud in Latin. He then took out of his pocket an orange, and also a pen-knife, but being unable to cut the orange, from his hands being bound, he gave it to a friend, whom he beckoned to come near him, saying, "Open this orange with my pen-knife; it has been said, they would not trust a pen-knife, lest I should cut my throat; but they little knew that I would not deprive myself of the glory of dying in this way." He desired his friend to keep the pen-knife for his sake, and to hold the orange, several pieces of which he eat. After finishing his devotions, the clergy man gave him absolution, to whom he returned the prayer book; and having ascended the platform, he took farewell of the gaoler, thanking him for the many civilities he had shown him. On his being tied up to the gallows, he made the following speech: "I shall only here declare, that I am innocent of the charge for which I suffer. I never was in my life the bearer of any letter, or other paper or message, printed, written, or verbal, to the directory of France, nor to any person on their behalf; neither was I ever a member of the London Corresponding Society, or of

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

any other political society in Great Britain; nor did I ever attend any of their meetings, public or private—so help me God! I know not whether I shall be believed here in what I say, but I am sure I shall be believed in the world to come. It can scarcely be supposed, that one like me, in this situation, going to eternity, before the most awful tribunal, would die with a falsehood in his mouth; and I do declare, by the hopes I confidently feel of salvation, and happiness in a future state, that my life is falsely and maliciously taken away by corrupt and base perjury, and subornation of perjury, in some cases proceeding from mistake, no doubt, but in others from design.—Almighty God forgive all my enemies!—I beg of you to pray that God will grant me grace—for I have many sins to answer for, but they are the sins of my private life, and not the charge for which I now die." (raising his voice) "Lord thave mercy on me, and receive my soul!" A white night-cap was then drawn over his face, and he made a signal by dropping a handkerchief. The board was then let down, as at Newgate, and he remained suspended for twelve or thirteen minutes; he was then taken down, the head taken off by a surgeon, and the executioner held up the head to the populace, saying, "This is the head of a Traitor!" Both head and body were then put into a shell, and buried at the foot of the gallows.

## SAMUEL BURR

### *Convicted of a Forgery, in the year 1787*

Though this is a very extraordinary case, yet we have met with similar instances of men being so very weary of life, as to commit a crime, in order that their lives might be taken by the law! and thereby prevent them from becoming their own murderers. Such an instance was the following:

On the fourth of September, 1760, when North America entirely belonged to our country, a Mr. Robert Scull, with several gentlemen, were playing at billiards in Philadelphia; when Captain Bruluman, late of the Royal American regiment, came into the room, and without the smallest provocation, levelled a loaded gun, which he had brought with him, and shot Mr. Scull through the body, just after he had struck his ball, for which murder he was tried and executed.

This desperate man had been brought up a silversmith, which business he left to enter the army, where he was an officer in the Royal American regiment, but was broke on being detected in counterfeiting or uttering base money. He then returned to Philadelphia, and growing insupportable to himself, and yet unwilling to put an end to his own life, he determined upon the commission of some illegal crime, for which he would certainly be hanged by the law. Having formed this design, he loaded his gun with a brace of balls, and asked his landlord to go a-shooting with him, intending to murder him before his return, but the landlord being fortunately particularly engaged at home, escaped the danger. He then went out alone, and on the way met a man whom he was about to kill, but recollecting that there were no witnesses to prove him guilty, he suffered the man to pass. He then went to a tavern, where he drank some liquor, and hearing people playing at billiards in a room above that in which he sat, he went up-stairs, and entered into conversation with the players, in apparent good humour. In a little time he called the landlord, and desired him to hang up the gun. Mr. Scull having struck his antagonist's ball in one of the pockets, Bruluman said to him, "Sir, you are a good marksman, now I'll show you a fine stroke." He immediately took down his gun, levelled it, deliberately took aim at Mr. Scull (who imagined him in jest) and shot both the balls through his body. He then went up to the dying man, who was still sensible, and said to him, "Sir, I have no malice or ill-will against you; I never saw you before, but I was determined to kill somebody, that I might be hanged, and you happen to be the man; and I am very sorry for your misfortune."

Mr. Scull had just time left in this world, to send for his friends and make his will. He forgave his murderer, and, if it could be done, desired he might be pardoned. Bruluman died on the gallows, exulting in his fate.

The same volume from which we make the above extract, contains another of the like nature, and, if possible, more extraordinary. We shall, therefore, before we give the particulars of Samuel Burr, add this fatal precedent for the commission of the deed by which he sought his own death.

A youth of the name of David Williams, who, when about fifteen years of age, was one day, against his wish, detained from school, by his father-in-law, who greatly wanted his assistance on the farm. While thus employed, a log rolled on one of his legs, which injured it to such a degree, that it became nearly useless; and by another accident he soon after hurt the other limb, so that he was rendered almost a cripple, before he had attained the years of man. At these misfortunes he continually repined,

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

blamed his step-father for keeping him that day from school, whereby he received his first injury; and, mortified at his appearance among his comrades, some of whom, he said, ridiculed him, he became weary of the world, and determined to end his misfortunes with his life. For this end, suicide and murder presented themselves. The first he thought the most eligible, but then it brought to his mind, the horrors of appearing, by his own violence, before God, he would not be pardoned; and therefore he was induced to abandon that for the latter, which would afford him a better excuse to the Almighty; besides, death, by hanging by any other hands than his own, he found most desirable.

He familiarised himself to this act of desperation, by continually thinking of it; so that in time it became a pleasing subject of contemplation. The consideration of the grief which it must occasion his mother, at times, almost unbent his resolution; but then the idea of its proving a sweet revenge on his father-in-law, bore down every other consideration. Thus determined, the next step of this unhappy young man was, to select a proper subject on whom the deed should be committed. A grown person or a child was the question. The former, he concluded, must be under sin and guilt: therefore, by sudden death, and thus unprepared, his damnation might be chargeable to him, and he be double guilty; the latter, being innocent, he might avoid that charge, and therefore resolved upon murdering some child. Now, the particular object for this horrid purpose, was the next thought; but he confessed, that though he thought of it more than six months, yet none occurred, until within five minute of his committing his long-determined and bloody deed. All the morning of the fatal day, he said that he felt an unaccountable and far stronger desire to commit murder, than before, to use his own words, "Something like hankering after fruit." At this unfortunate moment he chanced to spy a little boy, named Ira, the son of Mr. Lane, a neighbour, gathering plums, and finding the parents absent, determined on seizing the opportunity and subject. He instantly seized a gun, fired at, and slightly wounded the child in the side of the abdomen. Finding his victim yet alive, he limped to him, led him to the house, placed him upon a bed, and took a station at the door. Poor, devoted little Ira had strength left to get from the bed, in order to see "whether his father was coming to cure him." Williams answered, that his father would come by and bye, and bid him go to bed again, and lie still. Again the murderer listened for the dying groan of the boy, but finding his work incomplete, (horrid to relate) he took an axe, went to the bed, looked upon the innocent child, and while it held up its little hands for help, the monster struck it on the head, and by repeated and accursed blows, chopped it in pieces. The wretched murderer was a youth of extraordinary mental talents for his years, until the fatal gloom over spread him.

After the horrid deed was done, he spoke of it with calmness, observing, that though he had often considered the grief he should bring on his own mother, it never occurred to him, the distraction it must cause her who bore the murdered child. His whole intent was to get himself hanged. He supposed that the perpetration of the murder, under so many palliating circumstances, would excite the pity and forgiveness of the Almighty. He farther admitted in the account he gave of himself, that the example of a pious mother, and an affectionate and good brother had no influence over his determined purpose; that he had an evil temper, soured ever since his father-in-law took him that unhappy day from school; but that he had never committed a bad crime before. He was, in the eye of the law, considered a lunatic, and as such treated.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

The immediate subject of the present enquiry, Samuel Burr, was a young man of fair character, but who laboured under so great a depression of mind, as to render him weary of life. He did not, however, seek death at the hands of the law, by shedding the blood of his fellow creature; he pursued a still more effectual plan, as he conceived, knowing that though the crime of murder, under particular circumstances, has found mercy, but forgery is unpardonable. Yet, in this he did not succeed, for when his determination to die was known, the executive power would have him live, and in pursuance, from time to time, his execution was respited. That such was his fixed determination to die, will be proved by his address to the Bench, on receiving sentence; and that he was possessed of superior abilities, will be seen by the style of his speech. Having been convicted of forgery, when the Recorder of London called him by name, in the usual manner, to know what he had to say, why sentence of death should not be passed upon him, he thus replied;—

"My Lord, I am too sensible of the crime I have committed, and for which I justly deserve to suffer; not to know that my life I have forfeited, and wish to resign it into the hands of Him who gave it. To give my reasons for this, would only satisfy an idle curiosity; no one can feel a more sensible heart-felt satisfaction in the hopes of shortly passing into eternity; wherein, I trust, I shall meet with great felicity. I have no desire to live; and as the jury and court in my trial thought proper to recommend me to mercy, if his Majesty should, in consequence thereof, grant me a respite, I here vow, in the face of heaven, that I will put an end to my own existence as soon as I can. It is death that I wish for, because nothing but death can extricate me from the troubles which my follies have involved me in."

We did not find any note of his being executed, therefore conclude, that in pity to his mental derangement, he finally received a pardon. The last time he is named, was in these words, "Samuel Burr, the unhappy youth, who, under a depression of mind, abhorring the guilt of suicide, committed a forgery in order to suffer death by the law, was respited."

**WILLIAM GRANT (A Negro)**  
*In whose Conviction we shall Introduce a Sketch of the  
Pawnbroker and the Jew*

Already are our readers in possession of the mode of deception, and the petty depredations of the lower tribes of Israel, in London. As Judaism is marked on every Hebrew visage, so are their avocations alike in every quarter of the globe. The meaner sort are pedlars in trinkets, purchasers of second hand articles, and receivers of whatever may be brought to them. They are, in fact, for their sins and cruelties to the blessed Jesus, a wandering unlicensed race upon the earth.

But in London we have a set of privileged receivers of goods, and acting under the law, they can consequently do nothing, save what is lawful; yet, we can safely add our opinion, that it would be more for the general weal, was the act of parliament which they have obtained, abrogated. This fraternity are that proud, insolent, and unfeeling set of men, y'cleped, "Pawnbrokers." It is proverbial, that "Had we no receivers, we should have no thieves;" it is equally true, that "had we no Pawnbrokers we should have less distress." These men, under no chartered restrictions as a trade, so late as thirty years ago, conceiving themselves out of the statutes against usury, demanded what rate of interest they pleased upon pledges, generally worth double their pawn. In those times, every man who could muster cash, could open a shop for receiving pledges; and many, very many thousands of poor families, owe their ruin to these pawntakers.

About the date already mentioned a young man of ancient family, to supply his extravagance, had pledged a quantity of plate and other articles with Parker, then of Princess-street, Haymarket, but since Pawnbroker to the notorious Mrs. Clarke, while under royal protection. The gay young gentleman, again in funds, wished to redeem the ornaments of his sideboard, which, certainly had laid in Parker's strong room several months; but applying for that purpose, the demand of Mr. Pop, (we are sure Parker will pardon our familiarity, because he knows we write from record) was so enormous, that it alarmed the simple owner.

It happened that the attorney for the young man, (since succeeding to his title) was Mr. William J'anson, of Bedford-row, than whom a man of greater ability never practised in the courts of Westminster. To this gentleman, was the case stated, who in due terms of law, brought Parker, Priestman, and other pawnbrokers, into Westminster-Hall, where he recovered against them the penalty of the statute of Elizabeth, against "directly, or indirectly," taking more than lawful interest for money lent. The fraternity of usurious money-lenders were in alarm. They who had for years hoarded contrary to law, and on the miseries of mankind, were compelled, wherever an action was brought, (and the minor attorneys soon followed the tract of J'anson,) to disgorge their ill-gotten pelf. Thus defeated, the body of Pawnmen consulted together, and procured an act of parliament for the regulation of their dealings, which limits their interest to twenty percent, and orders them, in case the pledges are not redeemed within a year, to sell the same by public auction, and return the surplus to the persons who pawned the same. This part of the act is shamefully evaded. They give a colour to a sale, it is true, but we never yet heard of a single miserable individual who benefited by it. Thus the grievance advances in this unfeeling traffic; the number of pawnbrokers increase rapidly, and the evil will continue, unless we find another J'anson, to keep them within the strict letter of the law.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

William Grant was a native of the Coast of Africa, a region of black men, but little known to Europeans. A few of this nation, and we could wish the British dominions purged of them, find their way among us. This malefactor (like most of his colour, when taken from their burning clime) was a thief. He was convicted of robbing his master, Captain Ball, of a ruby ring, which cost ninety guineas. The thief sold it (for so says the account) to one of these human sharks, a pawnbroker, for four guineas; and he parted with it to a Jew, for six! Modest, but ignorant pawnbroker: The son of Israel, somewhat more cunning in his dealings, sold it to jeweller for fifteen; and thus we see the progress of this kind of iniquity in the degradation of man—the Negro, the Pawnbroker, the Jew, and the Jeweller. But of all these, the jeweller was the greatest knave; for he best knew the value of the precious stone, and it was surely worth, even four times the purchase of the Jew. It is a vulgar adage, that "Tricking is fair in love and war" but we hold it despicable in trade. The ruby was traced to the dealer in stones; he was obliged to yield it up, and black Bill was sentenced to transportation at the Old Bailey, on the 22d of September, 1787.

**JEREMIAH READING**

***The Scape-goat of Swindlers, Convicted of Forgery at the Old Bailey, the Judgment Arrested, and the Condemned Pardoned***

(A very intricate Case.)

The forgery for which this man was tried was supposed to have been committed by two swindlers, John King, and one White. There was much hard swearing to bolster up a respectability to the character of the former, but the learned Judge seemed to be of opinion, that the prisoner was, to use his own words, "a scape-goat in their hands."

Jeremiah Reading was tried for forging the name of John King, as an acceptance to a bill of exchange for 30*l.* with intent to defraud William Dolben and Richard Brown, linen-drapers, in Bishopsgate-street.

William Dolben being sworn, deposed, that in the month of February, 1792, the prisoner, who had been for a considerable time indebted to them in 9*l.*, applied to him, saying, he had now the means of discharging the arrears, having received a note, which he wished to have discounted. For that night he wished to receive only 10*l.*, which he had immediate occasion for. He described White, the drawer of the bill, to be a reputable merchant in Bristol; and King, the acceptor, a man of opulence, who resided in a large house in Berkeley-street, Portman square, and kept a carriage, livery-servants, &c.

The witness remarked, that the acceptance in the bill appeared in the place where indorsements are usually made. To this the prisoner replied, that when he took the bill he made the same observation; but that Mr. King assured him he always accepted his bills in that way, and that it should be regularly honoured when it became due. He then gave him 20*l.* for which he took his receipt. The prisoner not returning for the remainder of the money, excited suspicion, and induced the witness to make enquiry after the drawer and acceptor. The result was, that White had once resided in Bristol, but had disappeared for two years; but as to King, no such person was to be found in Berkeley-street. The witness having occasion to pay a visit in the King's Bench, found Reading a prisoner there, and brought him on his trial.

A servant in the prosecutor's house corroborated this testimony; and the collector of the taxes said, that no person of the name of King was a yearly housekeeper in Berkeley-street, otherwise he must have known him. This was the scope of the evidence for the prosecution.

In defence, one Clark appeared, who swore, that he lived as clerk in the house of White, in Bristol, and recollected having copied the note in question, and its being forwarded to King in Berkeley-street. The witness underwent an examination of two hours, in which he was required to give an account of himself. This he did in a very extraordinary manner, beginning at the time when he was only three years old; but it was found impossible to extract from him the manner in which he employed himself for the last eighteen months.

Allen, a hair-dresser, deposed, that he lived near Soho-square, in good business; and that, in the year 1792, he dressed a Mr. King, in Berkeley-street, Portman-square. He recollected, that about the end of February, the prisoner came to Mr. King, while he was dressing him, and presented a bill, which he accepted. He

## SUPPLEMENT 2

added, that all that conversation took place relative to the extraordinary mode of indorsement, &c. which was related by the prisoner when passing the bill upon Dolben. He also stated a circumstance of King's receiving a letter addressed to him under the name of Nugent.

Several witnesses gave the prisoner a good character, amongst whom was a Miss Davies, whose mother's house in Berkeley-street he frequented for three years.

Mr. Justice Grose summed up this very intricate evidence in a very able and circumstantial manner. He commented upon all the points; and when he came to that which regarded King's passing by the name of Nugent, Miss Davies requested the liberty of interrupting him. She said, that the mention of the name of Nugent called a circumstance to her remembrance, which, as it may affect the case before the court, she thought it her duty to state, though she could not have done so in her direct evidence; the whole having been suggested by the testimony of another witness. She then related, that a person of the name of Nugent had taken lodgings at her mother's, and refused to give any reference for character, saying, there was no occasion for it, as he was a regular man, and would pay weekly. He afterwards absconded in the night; and, on sweeping the room one morning, she found a pawnbroker's duplicate of an article pledged in the name of John King. Having never seen a pawnbroker's ticket before, she showed it to a gentleman, and their mutual curiosity led them to pay a visit to the pawnbroker. The latter told them, that he had directions to stop any person who should apply with the ticket; and that the instruction was given by the person who deposited the pledge. On the affair being explained, the pawnbroker gave a description of the man, which perfectly corresponded with the person of Nugent. She was desired to produce the ticket; but said, that having no idea that such a circumstance would apply in evidence to this case, she had not brought it with her, as she otherwise would have done.

The learned judge, after a short hesitation, proceeded to his charge. He remarked, that what they had last heard went in a great measure to confirm the evidence of Allen. If the jury should be led to attribute the whole to a foul and fraudulent conspiracy of White and King as an expedient for raising money, and that the prisoner was only a scape-goat in their hands, it was not a forgery, as charged in the indictment, and they must of course acquit him. They were not to convict upon doubt, inference, probability, or conjecture. The question to be considered was, whether the prisoner uttered this instrument knowing it to be forged? If they believed the evidence of Allen and Clark, corroborated by that of Davies, the charge was fully rebutted; if not, the other evidence was sufficient to convict him.

The jury, after retiring for a considerable time, returned with a verdict, finding the prisoner guilty on the second count of the indictment "Guilty of uttering the bill, knowing it to be forged."—Death.

The learned judge, however, thought proper to reserve the case for the opinion of the Judges; and accordingly, at the Sessions-House in the Old Bailey, 1794, the judges were of opinion, that as the indictment stated the bill to be directed to John King, by the name and description of John King, and as there was no such person to be found as John King, that their description was erroneous, and repugnant to the precision the law required in the form of indictments, and that therefore the judgment ought to be arrested. The case, however, being of great public importance, the judges were of opinion that the prisoner ought not to be discharged, as the prosecutor was at

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

liberty to prefer a new indictment against him, The prisoner was of course detained in custody. However, on the succeeding month, March, he received his Majesty's free pardon.

**JOHN DAY**

*The Most Execrable Murderer of Father, Mother, and their  
Servant*

"—My heart sinks in me,  
"And every slacken'd fibre drops its hold,  
"Like nature dropping down the springs of life"  
DRYDEN

This inhuman monster, having been one night in bad company, especially of lewd women, surfeiting in drunkenness, came home, swearing and cursing vehemently, requiring money of his sorrowful, terrified parents, who laboured to pacify him with good words, entreating him to go to bed, and sleep that night; and if it appeared in the morning, when he awaked, that he wanted money, he should have it: little thinking that they nourished a viper in their bosom, to sting them to death.

About midnight this graceless son, being come a little to himself, got up with a murmuring mind, and getting softly into the bedchamber of his parents, drew a large knife out of his sheath, and cut his aged father and mother's throats. After which desperate wickedness he remembered the servant-maid, who lay in the loft above, and that she might not come as a witness against him, he went softly up, and finding her asleep, ravished her, and then cut her throat from ear to ear. Then musing upon the horrid villanies he had committed, the devil put it into his head to set the house on fire, when he had plundered what he thought fit, that the dead bodies being consumed, it might be thought to have been by accident, and he not be suspected. But God, who never suffers such monsters in wickedness to go unpunished, even in this world, brought the discovery to light: for though he denied to have been at home that night, and seemed wonderfully sorry at the surprising misfortune, as he termed it, yet living very profusely, and having spent all his money, he was forced to sell the plate he had stolen, which being stopped, upon examination, he confessed the fact. Upon which he was sent to gaol, where he remained very sorrowful; and he affirms the ghost of the murdered persons appeared to him in frightful shapes, pointing to their ghastly wounds, and, in a threatening manner, summoning him to appear at the dreadful tribunal of Almighty God, to answer for their innocent blood, that cried for vengeance against him.

After he had sometime lain in this sorrowful condition, his trial came on; when he pleaded guilty to this indictment, saying, his youthful sins had brought this heavy judgment upon him, declaring, before his sentence, he desired to die, as not being fit to live.

The court exhorted him to a serious repentance of his sins, and to pray to God to deliver his soul from blood-guiltiness. He promised to do what in him lay: and a minister was ordered to attend him, and give him ghostly consolation, the short remainder of the time he had to live. The minister who visited him prayed earnestly with and for him, that God would look down in mercy upon him; and wash his sin-polluted soul from blood-guiltiness in the precious blood of the Lord Jesus. The same minister attended him to the place of execution, which exhibited a very affecting scene: here he burst into tears, and advised all young persons to beware of Sabbath-breaking, drunkenness, swearing, and whoredom, as they valued their peace here and

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

hereafter. He was executed on Kennington-Common, about the middle of September, 1792, and afterwards hung in chains near the bloody spot.

**WILLIAM WINTERBOTTOM**  
**A Dissenting Preacher, Fined and Imprisoned for Preaching**  
**Seditious Sermons**

This factious priest, convicted before Mr. Baron Perryn, at the assizes for the county of Devon, for preaching a seditious sermon at Plymouth, on the 5th of November, 1792. In the course of this discourse, the defendant talked a great deal about the revolution in 1688. He was sorry to see the laws so much abused as they were at present. He also spoke of the French Revolution, and he did not doubt but that would open the eyes of every Briton. He asked, why the streets were so crowded with vagrants, the workhouses with beggars, and the gaols with thieves? All this, he said, was to be attributed to our oppressive taxes. It was high time for the people of this country to stand forward and assert their rights. He made mention of the national debt—he denied that any part of it was paid off; it was only like taking money out of one pocket, and putting it into another. He said, His Majesty had no more right to the throne than the Stuarts, if he did not maintain the laws and established rules of the country. He urged, that the Revolution in France was wisely calculated for spreading the gospel through twenty-five millions of people.

The defendant was also indicted and convicted at the same time, for preaching at Plymouth another seditious sermon, on the 18th of November, 1792. He took his text from Romans xiii. 13. viz. "The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light." In the course of this discourse, the defendant introduced several strong observations. After the evidence on both sides had been heard, the jury, without hesitation, found the defendant difficult. Judgment having been prayed by the king's counsel, Mr. Justice Ashurst thus addressed the defendant:

"William Winterbottom, you have been found guilty of preaching two seditious and atrocious sermons. The first act of this daring profligacy you committed on the 5th of November, and the second on the 18th of the same month. It has been stated, that you are a dissenting preacher: of what sect of religion you are, I know not: but I can collect from your preaching, that you are not at all connected with the Christian religion; for the Christian religion, after first regarding the duty of God, teaches and inspires love for, and obedience to the established government; but the tendency of your doctrine is to overturn all order, religion, morality, and government, and to introduce anarchy and confusion.

"Your doctrine goes to the abuse of that toleration by which it is meant, that every man may be at liberty to reverence God in the way that his conscience may dictate. But your conscience dictates no such principles; therefore the means that you have taken is a double aggravation of your guilt, and merits a two-fold punishment.

"In one part of your sermon, you approve of the revolution of France. As to your first proposition, it is sufficient that the pernicious designs intended to have been executed, are frustrated. As to your second opinion, that the French revolution would open the eyes of the people of England, there I agree with you, it does open the eyes of the people—it has taken the veil from off the hackneyed system of liberty and equality. All practical equality consists in the affording equal protection. This chimerical project has been tried in a neighbouring nation, the lamentable effects of which will be handed down with sorrow to the latest generation. This system, which

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

has been tried must press upon the mind of men, and must operate more forcibly than a volume of arguments.

"As to your second proposition, it is impossible to be justified; you have alleged that the present form of government is a scourge on the people; but that the yoke of bondage will be soon broken; that persecution is near its end, and that every man will soon have to boast of EQUALITY. As to your saying that the French revolution will open the eyes of the people, I trust it will also open your eyes, and be a scourge to those who wish to introduce anarchy and confusion.

"This court having taken the malignity of your offence into their serious consideration, do consequently order and adjudge that for your first offence, you pay a fine of 100*l.* to the king, and that you be imprisoned in the New Prison, Clerkenwell, in the county of Middlesex, for the term of two years; and that for your second offence, you pay a fine of 100*l.* to the king, and be imprisoned in the New Prison, Clerkenwell, for the term of two years, to be computed after the expiration of your first imprisonment; and that at the end of your imprisonment, you give security for your good behaviour for the term of five years, yourself in 500*l.* and two sureties in 250*l.* each."

The defendant then wished to address the court; but Lord Kenyon told him, "The court cannot hear you now. It would have been the duty of the court to have heard you, if you had offered anything before sentence was passed: notwithstanding the source of mercy is open to you."

The defendant was immediately taken into custody.

The itinerant declaimers from the pulpit to ignorant auditors, are often, not only a nuisance to society, but, as in the case of Winterbottom, dangerous to the state. Let preachers of the gospel stick to their creed; when they dare to dabble in politics, with which they have no business, we hope to see them follow the disaffected subject of this enquiry, into a prison.

**CHARLES TALMAGE**

***Convicted along with Mary Mallet, of Burglary, and Hanged  
at Winchester, March 12, 1794***

The latter escaped for a time her punishment, under the plea of pregnancy. This is a plea, granted by a very old statute, to females convicted of felony, in arrest of judgment; in order that the living fruit of the womb should not perish for the mother's sins. In such cases a jury of women, called by the law, Matrons, that is, females who have themselves borne children, are sworn, who, upon their several and respective oaths, swear, after personal examination, whether the condemned female is "quick with child."

In the instance of Mary Mallet, the jury of matrons were impanelled, and brought in their verdict in confirmation of her plea, in consequence whereof her sentence was respited until the next assizes. This woman, along with Charles Talmage, were convicted at the Lent assizes held in the city of Winchester, 1794, for burglariously entering the house of Elizabeth Imber, of that city, and stealing thereout a large amount in cash, a considerable quantity of plate, and other valuable effects.

On the 22d of March, in pursuance of his sentence, Charles Talmage was conveyed in a cart to the usual place of execution. He manifested, throughout the whole of this trying scene, a great degree of firmness; acknowledged that he had committed many offences; but solemnly protested his innocence of the crime for which he suffered. A label, containing the following words, was affixed to his breast;—"Be thou my Judge, O Lord, for I am innocently betrayed." Talmage was a well-looking young man, aged twenty-seven, a native of Winchester, where he left a father, mother, and other relations.

**ROBERT WATT and DAVID DOWNIE**  
*Convicted of High Treason, at Edinburgh, with Particulars of  
the Execution of a Traitor in Scotland*

WE are now arrived at an alarming period at the modern history of our country. Just engaged in the ruinous war with France, which continues with increasing obstinacy, to the very hour in which we write. Perplexed by treason at home, and threatened with invasion by our enemy, the nation was in a critical situation. Confederate bodies of dissatisfied men, were formed, from London to Edinburgh, pursuing a systematical course of treason, and corresponding with each other, until Government stretched out its powerful arm to crush the traitors. Many writers charge the ministry with oppression, but at such a time as this, better, surely, to support the constitution, corrupt as may be its administration, than suffer its subversion, and see ourselves thrown into that anarchy and confusion, sought for by such men as we shall soon bring before the reader.

Watt and Downie were principals in the Scottish Conspiracy, and were convicted of the crime of high treason. Their trial brought to light the particulars of the plot, to overthrow the constitution of Great Britain; and from which we shall, therefore, make a copious extract.

Their trial came on before the High Court of Justiciary, at Edinburgh, on the 3d of September, 1794, when Mr. Anstruther stated the case on the part of the Crown. He began, by observing, that such was the peculiar happiness of this country, that we had been unacquainted with the law of treason for nearly half a century. It was not his intention, if he possessed the powers, of inflaming the passions of the Jury against the prisoner: his object, was to give a plain, a dry narrative of the facts, and a succinct statement of the law.

The laws of treason were now the same in England and Scotland, and the duty of the subjects of both kingdoms should be the same. Scotland, in this instance, had reaped much benefit by the Union, as her laws of treason, previous to that period, were much more severe. The act of Edw. III. stated three distinct species of treason: 1. Compassing and imagining the death of the king; 2. Levying war against him; 3. Assisting his enemies. He would not trouble the Court or Jury with the two last: the single species of treason charged in the present case, was the compassing and imagining the death of the king; which was defined by the conceiving such a design; not the actual act, but the attempt to effect it. But the law which thus anxiously guarded the sovereign, was equally favourable to the subject: for it does not affect him until that imagination is fully proved before "men of his condition." An overt act of treason is the means used for effectuating the purpose of the mind: it is not necessary to prove a direct attempt to assassinate the king: for the crime is the intention, and the overt act the means used to effect it. He wished not that these sentiments might be held as the opinion of counsel: they were founded on the construction of the ablest writers, Chief Justices Foster, Hale, &c, and, whatever could be proved against the prisoners, which may endanger the king's person, was an overt act of high treason, in the language of the ablest writers. After explaining more fully the distinct species of treason which applied to the present case, Mr. Anstruther said, he trusted that if he could prove any design whereby the king's person is in danger, that was an overt act; if he was wrong, the judges would correct him. He would now state the facts on which these principles of law were to be laid.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

The present conspiracy was not that of a few inconsiderable individuals: it had risen, indeed from small beginnings; from meetings for pretended reforms. It had been fostered by seditious correspondence, the distribution of libellous writings, and had, at last, risen to a height, which, but for the vigilance of administration, might have deluged the country, from one end to the other, with blood. The proceedings of these societies, calling, or rather miscalling themselves Friends of the People, were well known; their first intention was apparently to obtain reform; but this not answering their purpose, they proceeded to greater lengths. He meant to detail the general plans and designs formed among the seditious, and then to state how far the prisoners were implicated in them.

The first dawning of this daring plan was in a letter from Hardy, Secretary to the London Corresponding Society, to Skirving, the Secretary to the Friends of the People, here. He writes, that as their petitions had been unsuccessful, they must use separate and more effectual measures. Skirving answered, and admitted the necessity of more effectual measures; that he foresaw the downfall of this government, &c. Here also was the first notice of a convention; a measure which it is no wonder they were fond of, when they saw its effects in a neighbouring kingdom (France.) They meant not to petition Parliament, but to proceed in their own plan, and supersede the existing government of the country; and, in that case, the king's life was put in danger.

Soon after, a convention, a body unknown to the laws of this country, met; and in this there would have been little harm, had their views been peaceable; but their objects were avowedly unconstitutional, and their intention to carry on their plans by force, and thus virtually to lay aside the prerogative of the king. This convention accordingly met, using all the terms, regulations, &c. adopted by the convention of another country, in which it might be said there was in reality little harm, but it was surely a marking proof of their designs. They meant not to apply to Parliament; for whenever that was mentioned, they proceeded to the order of the day. They resolved to oppose every act of Parliament, which they deemed contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, and were determined to sit, until compelled to rise by a force superior to their own. The Convention, indeed, was dispersed by the spirited conduct of a magistrate, (Provost Elder,) whose merit everyone was forward to acknowledge, and to whose active exertions the country was so much indebted; but another Convention was attempted to be called, who were to frame their own laws, and to be independent of the legislature; or, as they say, independent of their plunderers, enemies, and oppressors, meaning the King, Lords, and Commons: their resolutions will prove that they meant to create a government of their own, to do away the authority of what they called hereditary senators, and packed majorities; all which prove the intention of putting the king's life in danger.

But what, it may be said, is all this to the prisoner at the bar? who, surprising as it may appear, about two years ago wrote letters to Mr. Secretary Dundas, offering to give information as to certain designs of the Friends of the People. These letters were answered by that right honourable gentleman with that propriety which has ever, marked his public conduct. The prisoner then corresponded with the Lord Advocate, the particulars of which would appear, as his lordship was subpoenaed. Since September 1793, this correspondence has ceased. Previous to that period, the prisoner was not a member of the Society of Friends of the People, nor of the British Convention; but his accession since to its measures, and the calling of another Convention, could be substantiated.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

The Convention, indeed, though dispersed, did not cease to exist. In fact, a Committee of Correspondence, of which the prisoner was a member, was instituted, the object of which was to carry into effect the views of the last British Convention, and to elect delegates to a new one. Mr. Watt attended this Committee, and coincided in its measures, which were expressly to supersede the legislature: The prisoner had moved for a Committee of Union; and another was appointed called the Committee of Ways and Means, of both which he was a member. This last was a Secret Committee, kept no minutes, was permanent, and empowered to collect money to support "the great cause." Mr. Downie was appointed treasurer, and it was to be the medium through which all instructions and directions were to be given to all Friends of the People throughout the kingdom, and was to procure information of the number of those that would spare no exertions to support the great cause. They corresponded with Hardy, respecting the calling of a new Convention, which was to follow up the purposes of the old one; and, as the prisoner was present, he was in this way coupled with the British Convention.

Their next attempt was to debauch the minds of the soldiers, and to excite them to mutiny; for which purpose a paper was printed, and circulated among a regiment of Fencibles then at Dalkeith. This paper, which was evidently seditious, would be brought home to the prisoner, for the types from which it was printed were found in his house, and a copy traced from him into the hands of a soldier.

The next charge to be brought against the prisoner, and the Committee of which he was a member, was a distinct and deliberate plan to overturn the existing government of the country. The plan proposed was this:- A fire was to be raised near the Excise Office, (Edinburgh,) which would require the attendance of the soldiers in the castle, who were to be met there by a body of the Friends of the People, another party of whom were to issue from the West Bow, to confine the soldiers between two fires, and cut off their retreat; the Castle were next to be attempted; the judges (particularly the Lord Justice Clerk) were to be seized; and all the public banks were to be secured. A proclamation was then to be issued, ordering all the farmers to bring in their grain to market as usual; and enjoining all country gentlemen to keep within their houses, or three miles from them, under penalty of death. Then an address was to be sent to His Majesty, commanding him to put an end to the war, change the ministers, or take the consequences. Such was the plan of the Committee of Ways and Means, as proposed by the prisoner.

Previous to this, it should have been mentioned, that all the Friends of the People were to be armed; for which purpose, one Fairley was dispatched round the country to levy contributions, and disperse seditious pamphlets; for which purpose, he got particular instructions from the prisoner. Reports were spread through the same channel, that the Goldsmith's Hall Association were arming, and that, it was necessary for the Friends of the People to arm also, for they would be butchered either by them or the French. It would be proved, that the prisoner gave orders to Robert Orrock to make 4,000 pikes; and also orders to one Brown for the same purpose. These were to be used for completing the great plan; and Fairley's mission was to inform the country of these intended proceedings. Another representative body was also formed, called "Collectors of Sense and Money," who were to have the distribution of the pikes, and to command the different parties. In one instance, a person had been desired to carry some pikes to the Collectors; who made answer, that he could not do it, for the Collectors were not to be trusted yet.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Mr. Anstruther then recapitulated shortly the different heads, and concluded an elaborate and most clear and distinct pleading, of more than two hours and a half, by requesting the jury to lay no farther stress on what he had said than it should be proved, as it was meant merely as a clue to the evidence which should be brought before them.

The first witness called, was Edward Lauzon, a king's messenger. Upon being asked if he was employed last summer to search the house of one Hardy, in London, Mr. Hamilton, counsel for the prisoner, objected to the question, and insisted that, before proving any other matter whatever, some direct overt act committed by the prisoner must be proved. Mr. Anstruther answered, that, before proving the prisoner guilty of being concerned in a particular plot or conspiracy, it was surely necessary first to prove that such plot or conspiracy existed. In the trials in the year 1745, before any particular overt act was attempted to be proved against any of the accused, there was always evidence adduced to prove the existence of a rebellion. The Court overruled the objection. The witness then swore, that he seized several papers in Hardy's house, particularly a letter signed by one Skirving, and several others: also a printed circular letter, signed, "T. Hardy, Secretary." These letters the witness produced. Mr. William Scott, Procurator Fiscal for the shire of Edinburgh, gave an account of the seizure of Skirving's papers in December, 1793, and of the after-disposal of them. He produced several of these papers, particularly one intituled, "Minutes of Debate in the General Committee;" also several papers that were found in the lodgings of Margarot, Gerald, and Sinclair. Mr. Scott swore to his being present at the dispersion of the Convention. The letter by Skirving and Hardy being authenticated by Mr. Lauzun, who swore he found it in Hardy's possession, was then read.

John Taylor, of Fleet-street, London, was then called. He swore he was a member of the London Corresponding Society, and was acquainted with Mr. Hardy, who was Secretary to that Society. Being shown several letters and papers, he believed them to be Hardy's hand-writing. The Society consisted of several divisions, about fourteen, he thought, in number; there were several Committees, particularly a grand one, which consisted of a member from each division, a Committee of Secrecy, and a Committee of Emergency. The latter was formed in May last. He attended a general meeting of the society at the Globe Tavern, on the 20th of January last, about one thousand were present. So great was the crowd, that the floor gave way, and the meeting adjourned to the Assembly Room, where the secretaries read the resolutions, which were afterwards printed. An address, founded on these resolutions, was afterwards carried by a show of hands. One of the resolutions was, that the motions of Parliament were to be watched over; and if troops were to be brought into the country, or the Habeas Corpus Act suspended, &c. that force ought to be repelled by force. The witness produced a copy of these resolutions, which he got from a person of the name of Moir, in the presence of Hardy. He saw several other copies about the room. The witness was also present at another meeting, held at Chalk Farm (about two miles from London) on the 14th of April last. The meeting was of the same nature as the former; there were about three thousand persons present, and, among others, Mr. Hardy.

Henry Goodman, clerk to Mr. Wickham, London, was present at the meeting at Chalk Farm, and heard the resolutions read. The resolutions now shown to him were, as far as he recollected, the resolutions passed at the meeting. He understood that it was the intention of the society to arm themselves, to protect the members in

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

the same way that the National Convention of France had been protected by the citizens of Paris; that he heard this talked of in different meetings.

Alexander Atchison was a member of, and Assistant Secretary to the British Convention, and wrote part of their minutes: he deposed, that the papers now shown in Court to him, he had often seen before; that he took down the minutes as accurately as he could; that he recollected Mr. Callandar making several motions in the Convention; and particularly an amendment to a motion which was referred to a Committee. This amendment was read: it related to the agreement in the Convention to continue permanent, and watch over the motions of Parliament, &c. &c. that he knew Mr. Watt, the prisoner; and was, together with him, a member of the Committee of Union. That Committee met in January last, the Convention being previously dispersed in December—The purpose of this Committee was to keep up a spirit of union among the Friends of Reform, and that he was sent there by the Division of Cannongate. The great object of the Committee was to obtain the same kind of reform sought for by Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond, about twelve years ago. That he was a member also of the Committee of the Ways and Means which was instituted for the purpose of paying past debts, and to defray the expense of future delegates to another Convention, to be held somewhere in England, which second Convention was meant for the same purpose as the British Convention, namely, obtaining the Reform first proposed by Pitt and Richmond; that he has often had conversations with different persons on the subject of Reform; that he recollected having seen a pike in the house of George Ross, in the presence of several blacksmiths, which was shaped like the head of an halbert. Being asked whether he ever gave a different account of what he had now sworn at any other place, he believed he never did; if he did it, it must be contrary to truth, and this he should say, though he should be gullotined for it.

Mr. W. Erskine, also counsel for the prisoners, here stopped the witness, who was removed. He said, that it was an established point in the law of Scotland, that a witness could not be affected by anything he had before said relative to the present subject of his examination; nor could it hurt him in any degree. Mr. Anstruther said, that this did not exist in the law of England. The Lord President observed, that it appeared to him there was really a discrepancy in the law in this respect. Mr. Anstruther here said, that to put an end to the dispute, and, as Atchison had conducted himself in such a manner, he would, so far from laying any stress on his evidence, request the jury to throw out of their minds every syllable he had used.

George Ross authenticated the minutes of Convention, and other papers; knew the prisoner at the bar, and had seen him at his own house.

Mr. Sheriff Clerk deposed as to the pikes being brought from Watt's, and the fount of types, of which he had got an impression taken in the precise state they came from Watt's house.

[Paper read—An Address to the Fencibles.]

James Sommeville, a printer, deposed as to the casting off the impression from the types.

William Watson, of Dalkeith, once saw Watt at his own house, but could not say whether the prisoner at the bar was the man. Remembered a Fencible regiment in Dalkeith, which was about the time he met with Mr. Downie, who carried him to

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Watt's, to get a hand-bill about the Fencibles, which he had heard of, and was curious to see, but could not get it there; and went to one Kennedy on the South Bridge, from whence he received several copies.

The Lord Advocate said, that, except those (Downie and Stock,) against whom bills were already found, he meant to bring no other person to trial for treason.

Arthur M'Ewan, weaver, of Leith, a member of the British Convention, and also of the Committee of Ways and Means, of which last Watt was a member, deposed, that, at one of their meetings, Watt read a paper, proposing to seize the judges, bank, &c. to decoy the soldiers by a fire, &c. but did not know what was to be done with the persons seized, nor whether it was to be done in the day or night. Commissioners were to be appointed to take charge of the cash, but knew not what was to follow this. Deposed as to the proclamation to corn-dealers, and country gentlemen, and the address to the king to put an end to the war, &c. Watt asked him to accompany him to Orrock's, to whom he (Watt) gave orders to make pikes as fast as he could, as he had 4000 to send to Perth, besides what he had to distribute in Edinburgh. Orrock made a draft of one: a gentleman's servant asking what was their use, was told, that they were for mounting a gate. Knew that Fairley was sent into the country, and had visited a number of places; that he reported Paisley to be in a state of great readiness, but did not know what that meant. The witness disapproved of these proceedings, and would consent to nothing that would disturb the peace, or shed the blood of his countrymen; and he thought the plan proposed would have that tendency. Watt produced, at one of the meetings, a paper containing what was called fundamental principles, which he knew but little of. William Bonthorn was a member of the Society of the Friends of the People, but had resolved to withdraw, as things had passed he disapproved of. Watt, at one of their meetings, read a paper, of which he did not remember the particulars, as it confused him. The paper contained something about seizing the castle, raising an alarm by fire, &c. upon the supposition that numbers could be got to assist them. Remembered nothing of particular persons being intended to be seized; but thought the bank was mentioned; this paper frightened him much; it mentioned also the seizing the guard-house; recollected no numbers that were mentioned to carry this plan into effect. M'Ewan showed an opposition to it. The circular letter of the Committee was written by Mr. Stock.

Mr. Sheriff Clerk deposed as to the finding sundry papers in Watt's house, one the drawing of a pike, and the paper sworn to by Atchison, in the Sub-Committee.

John Fairley, of Broughton, a delegate to the Convention, deposed, that his constituents met after the dissolution of that body. Heard that pikes were making, and Watt informed him of this, or rather showed him one. Watt said, that they were only intended for self-defence, and that none were to get them but those who applied and paid for them. Measures of government might drive them to despair, and cause bloodshed; but Watt said, he hoped there would be none, as the obnoxious or active against the cause of the people would be imprisoned. The soldiers would be glad of freedom, and deputations might be sent them. Watt proposed to show the arms to the collectors, which the witness objected to, as hazardous. In going to the West country, a parcel was left for him by Watt, containing paper for distribution, which he left at Stirling, St. Ninion's, Kirkintulloch, Glasgow, Paisley, &c. On his return to Edinburgh, he went to the Committee of Ways and Means; that Watt, Downie, and M'Ewan were there, to whom he reported the result of his journey, Returned the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

instructions to Watt; they mentioned, he recollected, something about a plan, and Britain being free, Downie paid him the expenses of his journey.

Dr. Forrest, at Stirling, gave an account of Fairley's calling on him, showing him his written instructions, &c. In these instructions there was a blank, which he supposed was to be filled up "arms." Showed him the figure of a weapon like a halbert, which was preparing for defence, and that these weapons could be furnished by a person who he understood was about Edinburgh. Something passed about arming the people, and disarming the soldiers.

Robert Orrock, smith, first heard arms mentioned in G. Ross's house in March last. In April Watt applied to him to make a pike, and he brought one to Ross's, where Watt and other members of the committee were, and he left it at Watt's desire. In May, Watt desired him to make more of that pattern, and some of a different kind. While making them, a person (Martin Todd) called and showed a form of a pike, which he refused to make. Brown also called, and told him he was making pikes for Watt, and that 1000 were wanted: but spoke of this as a secret, which alarmed the witness. The extent of his order was five dozen which were ordered by Watt, but paid for by Downie. He was told, if enquired about, to say they were for the top of a gate: never had an order for pikes before; but had made one for his own defence, without being employed by any person.

Martin Todd, smith, deposed as to calling on Orrock, to enquire about the pikes.

William Brown, a smith, said one Robertson called on him to bespeak several spears of a particular shape, for Watt; and at another time, he made fourteen spears for Mr. Watt, like mole spears. Recollected the conversation with Orrock, but did not say that such a number of pikes would be wanted.

John Fairley was re-examined, at his own desire. He recollected Watt saying, that the banks and public offices were to be seized. The most active against them were to be imprisoned, and couriers sent to the country to announce this. The Magistrates of Edinburgh were particularly spoken of.

Walter Miller, Perth sent money to Downie, for relief of distressed patriots in the cause of reform; never had authority for supposing that the new Convention had any object but reform by legal means.

Here the evidence of the Crown was closed.

### *Defence of Watt.*

Mr. W. Erskine, junior counsel for the prisoner, said, that as the Court had sat so long, he would not trouble them with many words. He would rest his defence upon the correspondence carried on between the Right Hon. Henry Dundas, the Lord Advocate, and the prisoner, by which it would appear, that he had attended the meetings of the Friends of the People, with no other view than a design to give information of their proceedings. A letter from the prisoner to Mr. Secretary Dundas was read, which stated in substance, that, as he did not approve of the dangerous principles which then prevailed in Scotland, and was a friend to the Constitution of his country, he thought it his duty to communicate to him, as a good subject, what information he could procure of the proceedings of those who styled themselves

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Friends of the People. From an acquaintance with several of the leading men among them, he flattered himself he had this in his power; and then went on to mention some of the names of those leading men in Perth, Dundee, and Edinburgh. In the first of these places, he said, he had been educated, and had resided in the two last for a considerable number of years. It concluded with enjoining secrecy.

To this letter an answer was returned which was also read. It acknowledged the receipt of Mr. Watt's and, after expressing a hope that things were not so bad as he represented, desired him to go on, and he might depend upon his communications being kept perfectly secret. Another letter from Mr. Dundas to Mr. M'Ritche, the prisoner's agent, was next read, in answer to one from Mr. M'Ritchie, requesting of Mr. Dundas what letters he had of the prisoner's. The answer bore, that all the letters he had received from Mr. Watt had been delivered to the Lord Advocate.

Mr. Sheriff Clerk authenticated the letter of Mr. Dundas.

The Lord Advocate being sworn, in exculpation, he gave a distinct account of the transactions which he had had with the prisoner. He had conversed with him several times at his own lodgings; and he had at one time given him some information which he thought of importance. This was respecting the disaffection of some dragoons at Perth, which upon enquiry, turned out to be ill-founded. In March, 1793, his lordship said, an offer had been made to him to disclose some important secrets, provided he would give the prisoner 1000*l*. This he absolutely refused. However, sometime after, the prisoner having informed him that he was much pressed for money to retrieve a bill of 30*l*. his lordship, who was then in London, not wishing he should be distressed for such a small sum, sent him an order for the payment of it. All this happened previous to the meeting of the Convention; since which time, at least since October last, he did not recollect seeing or having any connection with the prisoner.

Mr. Hamilton contended, that the prosecutor had failed in bringing the most criminal part of it home to the prisoner. He dwelt long on correspondence between Mr. Dundas and Mr. Watt. He said, the prisoner had not deserted the service in which he had engaged; but had not had an opportunity of exercising it until the very time he was apprehended. He contended, that he was a spy for government; and it was well known that a spy was obliged to assume not only the appearance of those whose secrets he meant to reveal, but even to make part in their proceedings, in order to prevent a discovery. He alluded to spies in armies, and mentioned a melancholy circumstance which happened to one last war, a gentleman with whom he had the honour of being acquainted. A spy in an army, he said, was obliged not only to assume the uniform of the enemy, but even to appear in arms; and it would be exceedingly hard indeed, if taken in a conflict, that he should be punished for discharging his duty. He concluded with hoping the jury would bring in a verdict, finding the charges not proved.

The Lord President, after clearly defining the laws of treason, summed up the evidence, narrating and explaining the various parts with much candour; leaving it entirely to the jury to return such a verdict as their judgment should direct.

The jury withdrew about half-past five o'clock in the morning, and in about five minutes, returned with a verdict—Guilty.

The trial lasted nearly twenty-two hours. The jury were upwards of forty minutes considering the case of Downie: the majority agreeing among themselves that

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

he was guilty, they reconciled themselves to this verdict a last, by unanimously consenting to recommend him to mercy, which they did in a very strong manner. Shortly after the following awful sentence of the court was passed upon these unfortunate men.

"Robert Watt and David Downie, you have been found guilty of High Treason by your Peers. The sentence of the Court is, therefore, that you be taken from the place, whence you came, from thence you shall be drawn on a sledge to the place of execution, on Wednesday, the 15th of October, there to hang by your necks till you are both dead; your bowels to be taken out, and cast in your faces; and each of your bodies to be cut in four quarters, to be at the disposal of his Majesty: and the Lord have mercy on your souls!"

The unfortunate prisoners received the dreadful sentence with much firmness and composure, and were, immediately conducted to the castle. Robert Watt was ordered for execution, but a respite came for David Downie: as soon as it was intimated to Downie, he started, as from a dream, and exclaimed, "Glory to God, and thanks to the king, for his goodness: I will pray for him as long as I live." After which tears of gratitude flowed. He was transported for life.

About half past one o'clock on the 15th of October, the two junior magistrates, with white rods in their hands, white gloves, &c., the Rev. Principal Baird, and a number of constables, attended by the town officers, and the city guard lining the streets, walked in procession from the Council Chamber to the east end of Castle-hill, when a message was sent to the sheriffs in the Castle, that they were there waiting to receive the prisoner. The prisoner was immediately placed in a hurdle, with his back to the horse, and the executioner, with a large axe in his hand, took his seat opposite him, at the further end of the hurdle. The procession then set out from the Castle, the sheriffs walking in front, with white rods in their hands, white gloves, &c., a number of county constables surrounding the hurdle, and the military keeping off the crowd. In this manner they proceeded, until they joined the magistrates, when the military returned to the Castle, and then the procession was conducted in the following order:

The City Constables;  
Town Officers, bare-headed;  
Bailie Lothian and Bailie Dalrymple;  
Rev. Principal Baird;  
Mr. Sheriff Clerk and Mr. Sheriff Davidson;  
A number of County Constables;  
THE HURDLE,  
Painted black, and drawn by a white Horse,  
A number of County Constables.

The city-guard lined the streets, to keep off the multitude.

When they had reached the Tolbooth door, the prisoner was taken from the hurdle, and conducted into the prison, where a considerable time was spent in devotional exercise. The prisoner then came out upon the platform, attended: by the Magistrates, Sheriffs, Principal Baird, &c. Some time was then spent in prayer and singing psalms; after which the prisoner mounted the drop-board, and was soon launched into eternity.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

When the body was taken down, it was stretched upon a table, and the executioner, with two blows of the axe, severed off the head, which was received into a basket, and then held up to the multitude, while the executioner called aloud, "There is the head of a traitor, and so perish all traitors." The body and head were then placed in a coffin, and removed. Never was any execution conducted with more solemnity and order. The procession advanced with slow step, and the prisoner exhibited a most melancholy spectacle. He held a bible in his hand; his eyes remained in a fixed posture, upwards, and he was not observed to make one movement, or cast a single glance upon the multitude. He was much emaciated, and his countenance so pale, that, while on his way to the place of execution, he appeared almost lifeless; but, when he came upon the platform, he seemed to be somewhat revived, and behaved himself, during the awful solemnity, with due resignation and humble fortitude. The impression the situation had made upon himself seemed truly astonishing, as those who had ever seen him before, declared, they could not have known him to be the same person. His appearance was dirty, muffled up in a great coat; and he showed signs of peculiar agitation and remorse for the crime for which he was then going to suffer.

The surrounding multitude, during the execution of the awful proceeding, did not discover any other emotion than is usual upon occasions of any other executions. The town-guard, attended by the constables, lined the streets.

Robert Watt was born in the shire of Kincardine, and was, at the time of his execution, about thirty-six years old. He was the natural son of a Mr. Barclay, a gentleman of fortune and respectability; but like most other children of illegitimate parentage, he was brought up and educated under the name of his mother. He was, at about ten years of age, sent to Perth; where he received a very good education. Being sixteen he engaged himself with a lawyer at Perth; but being of a religious disposition, he was disgusted at this profession, and soon withdrew from the desk of his master. Soon after he went to Edinburgh, and engaged as a clerk in a paper-warehouse, where he lived happily and respectably for some years. His only complaint was a deficiency of salary. Having a desire to share in the profits, as well as the toils, of the business, he wrote to his father, and prevailed upon him to assist him with some money, to enable him to procure a partnership with his master. He then made proposals to the above purpose; these were, however, rejected by his employer. Being provided with money, he entered into the wine and spirit trade. His success in business continued very promising, until he was almost ruined by the commencement of the war. At this period, his acquaintance with the Friends of the People commenced.

Several other leaders of this conspiracy in Scotland were seized. Of those where convicted, the Reverend T. Fische Palmer, William Skirving, Thomas Muir, Maurice Margoret, and Joseph Gerald, who were transported to Botany-bay. Numbers, to avoid the avenging arm of justice, fled to the United States of America, where, with impunity, they disseminated their treason, and poured out volleys of abuse against their native land. These renegadoes were no sooner landed in a new world, than they rallied round the footstool of faction there, by commencing editors of, and scribblers in, newspapers, which swarm in that boasted land of liberty. In their filthy columns, they extolled the murderous revolutionists of France, and laboured to incense Americans against their own injured country. It is fit these apostates should be pointed at. John Thompson, of Scotland, printed one of these inflammatory sheets, at Richmond, in Virginia: Matthew Duane, of Ireland, another in Philadelphia. John

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

Dinmore, late an apothecary, at Walton, in Norfolk, planted his literary annoyance in Columbia, the seat of the American government, and, for his extraordinary scurrility against England, the Gallic-American President, Jefferson, made him State Printer, and, heaven forefend, a Justice of the American Peace. This inflammatory sheet he called "The Expositor." In order to give the reader an idea of the infamy of the abandoned scribblers, we shall quote a note from Mr. Janson's History of America. Speaking of Denmore, says Mr. Janson, "Among the vile scurrility of his Expositor, last summer, was the following: After noticing the introduction of the American minister, Mr. Monroe, to the king, he adds, 'For once an honest man had appeared at the Court of St. James's.'" Another paper, printed by Mr. S. Snowden, at the same place, and preferring England to France, makes this observation upon the paragraph, "It is, no doubt, difficult for an honest man in the Doctor's (apothecary Dinmore's) estimation of the word, to get admission there; yet, he cannot have forgotten, that he himself was within a cable's length of having his name announced to his Britannic Majesty—not by Sir Stephen Cotterell, but by the Recorder of London, and Ordinary of Newgate, as joint Masters of the Ceremonies."

Cooper, the bosom-friend of the hoary apostate, Priestley, the bitterest foe we had in the new world, so greatly misused the press, that the country of his adoption threw him into a prison.

Inferior scribblers against Britain, are almost without number.

**EDWARD COOKE AND HENRY PARISH**  
*Soldiers in the Oxfordshire Militia, Condemned at a General  
 Court Martial, and Shot at Brightelmstone (i.e. Brighton),  
 June 12, 1795, for Mutiny*

As we have already described the nature of Courts Martial we shall immediately proceed to show the solemn ceremony of a military execution.

From the hour of four in the morning of the day of execution the whole line of encampment were ordered to hold themselves in readiness: at five, however, in the evening the officers were given to understand, that the execution of those two unfortunate men, Edward Cooke and Henry Parish, was countermanded for that day. The cause of the short respite was attributed to the absence of the Prince of Wales's 10th regiment of light dragoons, which did not march into the town till nine o'clock this morning, and of course could not pitch their tents till late in the evening.

When this regiment were seen on the march to their station, all hopes of an expected reprieve seemed entirely to vanish; the most respectable people, however, of the place, took this opportunity of one day's delay to repeat their petitions in favour of the two men; but all proved ineffectual; for early on the 13th the Oxfordshire Militia (the regiment to which the mutineers belonged) began their march from the barracks at Blachington to this place to be made awful spectators of their unhappy comrades' punishment, and to be their executioners!

At four o'clock the whole were ordered to accompany them from the ground to Colestoun Bottom, at which place they arrived about five. The six men (for there were 13 mutineers) that were sentenced to be flogged proceeded afterwards in a covered waggon guarded by a strong escort, which was composed of select men, picked from every regiment in the line: the two condemned to be shot followed in the rear in an open cart, attended by the Rev. Mr. Dring, and guarded by a second escort, under the command of Captain Leigh, of the 10th regiment of light dragoons, and one of the captains belonging to the Lancashire Fencibles. When they arrived, however, at the winding road which leads to Colestoun Vale, and which is surrounded by an eminence, both the escorts were commanded to halt. The six men sentenced to be flogged were then taken from the covered waggon, and having been marched through the whole line, who were under arms to receive them, they were brought back to a whipping-post which were fixed in the centre of the different regiments. The drummers selected to flog them were men belonging to their own corps. Three of them received three hundred lashes each; this was all the number they then received, as, from their long durance, and consequent weakness, the surgeon of the regiment pronounced that they could suffer no more. The fourth was then stripped, and, after being tied to the flogging-post, was reprieved; as were his two other comrades. This part of the distressing ceremony being gone through, the two unfortunate men condemned to be shot were taken from the cart, and marched, as the others had been, up the line, with this difference only, of being conducted also through part of the outer one, which was composed of the prince's regiment, the Lancashire and Cinque Port Fencibles; they were then marched to the front of the Oxfordshire Militia, where their coffins stood to receive their bodies; the artillery being planted on the right, with lighted matches, in the rear of the Oxfordshire, to prevent any mutiny, if attempted, and the whole height commanded by 2000 cavalry.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

Cook and Parish being conducted to the fatal spot, exchanged a few words with the clergyman, and then kneeled with the greatest composure and firmness on their coffins: the first time, however, they kneeled, it was done the wrong way: but being placed in a proper situation, they put the caps over their eyes, and received their death from a delinquent platoon of twelve of their own regiment, at the distance only of six paces. One of them was not quite dead when he fell, and was therefore shot through the head with a pistol. This, however, was not the last awful ceremony the line had to experience; for, to conclude the dreadful tragedy, every regiment on the ground was ordered to file off past the bodies before they were suffered to be enclosed in their coffins. The whole scene was impressively awful beyond any spectacle of the kind ever exhibited. No disturbance whatever resulted from the above melancholy affair: everything was conducted with the greatest solemnity and order: the awe and silence that reigned on the occasion, infused a terror, mingled with an equal degree of pity, that was distressing beyond conception. The Oxfordshire Militia naturally experienced more afflicting sensations than any other regiment on the ground.

Cooke and Parish were both young men, and behaved with uncommon firmness and resignation; they marched through the lines with a steady step, and regarded their coffins with an undaunted eye. The former was called Captain Cooke, from his having headed the Oxfordshire soldiers, at the fatal period of the mutiny.

**TIMOTHY DUNN, EDWARD JONES, MATTHEW RILEY,  
AND DENNIS CONROY**  
*Soldiers, Executed March 21, 1796, for Murder*

This, among numberless other mischiefs entailed upon the titular saint of Ireland, is an instance of the dreadful licentiousness of the lower order of that country, when heated with strong drink. The 17th of March is St. Patrick's day, and so copious are the libations of his votaries on each eve of this their festival, that in all parts wherever the lower class wander, they contrive to get drunk; and then fall upon unguarded strangers; and beat, and often murder them. These outrages, they will tell you, were committed for the honour of St. Patrick; and so deeply rooted is this vile habit in them, that while under the accursed influence, it must end in what they call "A Row;" and if that cannot be effected among strangers, they generally fall upon each other.

The unfortunate Irishmen, the subject of this enquiry, were soldiers, and had lately returned from a four-year's service in foreign parts. The regiment to which they belonged, was ordered into winter quarters, in Leicestershire, Loughborough, Ashby de-la-Zouch, and towns adjacent. On the evening of St. Patrick's Day, in the year 1796, in a state of intoxication, they sallied out, and attacked every one they met, whom, without any cause being shown, they beat without mercy. At length they met a poor boatman, of the name of Henry Hutchinson, whom they murdered!

They were apprehended next day, the 18th, the judges being on the circuit at Leicester, they were tried on the 19th; and on the 21st, executed; thus allowing them but three days for repentance.

A short time before they were taken out of prison for execution, a remarkable circumstance happened to Timothy Dunn: A regiment of dragoons passing through Leicester, one of the private troopers, of the name of Dunn, hearing that his namesake lay under sentence of death, was led, through curiosity, to see the culprit. On being admitted into the condemned cell, what must be his astonishment and grief, on finding a brother, whom he had not seen nor heard of for many years! The whole of these unfortunate soldiers died repenting their crime, and imploring forgiveness of the Almighty. We cannot dismiss the subject, without exhorting our fellow-subjects, born in Ireland, to observe moderation, on this day. Their excesses serve only to make them enemies, to disgrace their saint, and offend their Maker.

**ELIZABETH HALL**

***Convicted, Fined, and Imprisoned, for Cruelty to her Female Apprentices***

We have now before us another woman of the demoniac disposition of Mother Brownrigg, and who like her might have satiated the utmost extent of her ferocity, had she not been detected while the children yet lived. She was prosecuted by the parish of St. Mary Magdalen, Bermondsey, at the quarter sessions for Surrey, for assaulting Jane Bray and Sophia Ingreen, her apprentices.

Jane Bray deposed, that she was bound apprentice to Elizabeth Hall, a pin header on the 5th of April, 1796. [Note: Some of our readers will be surprised to hear that there are several different branches of business in the making of a pin] The prisoner for a little while used her and Sophia very, well, but after some time began to beat and kick them about, and would drag them up and down stairs, making use of the most horrible expressions. She always kept a rod soaking in brine, with which she used to beat them on their bare skin, when they were undressed to go to bed: if she could not find the rod immediately she would beat them with her fist, and sometimes with the kettle ladle. They both did as much work as they could, but their mistress made them begin at four o'clock in the morning, and continue close at it until ten or eleven at night, always beating them for no particular cause, and very frequently going out without leaving them either a dinner or supper; they never had a belly-full; sometimes they had nothing all day long but six potatoes and a little salt for their dinner.

Ann Harland served her apprenticeship to Hall, and wrought there three or four weeks with the children. She described them as very good girls, but rather weakly, and said, they earned their mistress from 1s. to 14d. daily, which was as much as she could do when she had served twelve months of her time. She corroborated the evidence of the child as to the beating and hours of labour, which she said, were unusually long, as the custom of the trade is to work only twelve hours.

Catherine Heman worked also for Hall, and generally carried her work home to the shop. On calling one day, the [prisoner] was out, as she learned from the children, drinking. When she came to the door and knocked, the children begged her for God's sake, to go to the door, as their mistress would knock them down as she came in. The witness accordingly went to the door, and as soon as the prisoner was admitted, she knocked the witness down. She then went down stairs, and brought up a board, with which she beat the children very severely. Bray had a large lump on her shoulder, and the little girl Ingram's arms and hands were so bruised by continual beating, as to be scarce able to hold her work.

The beadle of Bermondsey deposed, that he found the children straying in the Street between nine and ten at night; he took them home to the prisoner; on his going to leave them there the children cried, and said they should be murdered. The mistress then said she would not take them in at all as that was the case. He then took them to the master of the workhouse; and the parish, much to their credit, instituted the present prosecution.

The evidence is given as it relates to both, though the assaults were tried separately, as the same witnesses were on both. Jane Bray was only eleven years of age, and Sophia Ingram only nine.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

The jury found the prisoner guilty of both indictments, and the Chairman passed sentence, that she should pay a fine of 3s. 4d. and be imprisoned in the House of Correction six months for each offence: too lenient a punishment.

**MARTIN LAAS**  
*A Norwegian, Executed at Maidstone, for Murder*

Villains, lurking in secret, ready to fall upon men, in order to rob them, often commit murder. The horrid impulse generally arises from the fear of opposition, of the dread of an appearance against them, when arraigned at the bar of justice. But when we find that a man, cowardly and brutally embues his hands in the blood of an unoffending, defenceless woman, our nature is appalled, and we vent our most bitter execrations on the monster who commits so foul a deed.

At the assizes at Maidstone, in Kent, not yet a year after the fatal calendar of Newgate, at the sessions when the Recorder of London gave his learned and humane advice to the condemned malefactors, one hundred and fourteen prisoners were tried for felonious practices, and fifteen sentenced to death—a greater number, we are told, than ever before appeared at that bar of justice. The most infamous of those was Martin Laas, a subject of the king of Denmark, born at Bergen, in Norway. He was a sea-faring man, and, when a boy, came to England in a Danish trading ship. Deserting the service of his employer, he entered on board the British fleet, and had served as an able seamen several years, two of which we find, was on board the *Fame*, of 74 guns, one of the fleet under the command of the gallant Rodney, in the West-Indies.

In this culprit we have another deplorable instance of dismissing seamen, often penniless, at the end of that war, in which they often have conquered. When foreigners enlist under our banners, and having served our purpose, ought not government, at least, to send them back to their own homes? But such traits of common justice are forgot, amid the more mighty concerns of our ministers. Where, then, in such cases, is Humanity to beg her boon?

Such was the case of Martin Laas; he was a distressed foreigner, who had fought our battles, and his services no longer wanted, misfortune overtook him, but hunger, which the proverb truly says, "will break through stone walls," needs not to impel cruelty. It appeared in evidence, and from his own confession, that the prisoner was sitting on the side of the public road, when a beautiful young country woman passed him near the Halfway-house, near Sandwich, of the name of Mary Bax. At the instant, the devil, he said, whispered him to kill and rob her. He therefore followed her, and had proceeded near half a mile, when he asked her the road to Sheerness. The unsuspecting maid courteously answered, that it was a great way to Sheerness. He then said, he had no money, and must have some to bear his expenses; to which the deceased answered, that she had none. He then walked by her side, and on passing a ditch, pushed her into it, and jumped upon her, into mud and water up to his middle, and thus smothered her. He then took a bundle which she carried in her hands, and her shoes from her feet, with which he made off through the marshes, across the country towards Dover. Some of the articles which he had taken from the unhappy woman, were found upon him. During his trial, he behaved with unparalleled audacity, insulting the witnesses, and mocking the court.

When the jury found him guilty, he gave three cheers, and became so riotous that the judge ordered him to be seized and chained to the floor, until the time arrived for his execution. He showed no remorse when he confessed his barbarous crime. He was executed with John Huntley, for murdering his wife on Wistwell Downs, whose body was dissected; but that of Laas was burned under the gallows, as the surgeons

## SUPPLEMENT 2

would not accept of it. Eight more, committed for capital offences, died in prison; and William Hill Fairchild, for horse-stealing, murdered himself.

**EDWARD POWELL**

***Master Mast-maker of his Majesty's Dock-yard, at  
Portsmouth, Executed near Winchester, for Murder***

THE unhappy fate of Mr. Powell, serves to confirm the old saying, "Never interfere between man and wife." This unfortunate man's situation, under government, was very respectable, yielding an income of between four and five hundred pounds per annum. He married the daughter of Mr. Frampton, of Portsmouth, a gentleman much respected, and with her, for a short time only, were his prospects of happiness. The young wife, too inexperienced, perhaps, for the marriage state, and too giddy for the sober and experienced years of her husband, had, it seems, been reprov'd by him, on this head, of which she, still more unadvised, complained to her father, who taking her part, the husband sought revenge.

It appeared, he had long brooded on the destruction of the man, though her parent, who interfered between him and his wife. Accordingly, meeting Mr. Frampton on the Common Hard, at Portsmouth, he pulled a pistol from his pocket, and fired at him without effect. Finding his devoted subject unhurt, he took out another, and shot him dead on the spot.

This horrid deed he was condemned at Winchester. He was carried to the place of execution along with Gregory Bentham, quarter-master of the Scipio man of war, for shooting with a pistol, in a scuffle, William Barnes, coxswain of the said ship. The deceased, in this case, had been sent after Bentham, who had exceeded his leave of absence, and refusing to return, on the coxswain's proceeding to enforce his orders, was shot. They were executed on a temporary gallows, near Winchester.

**REBELLIONS IN IRELAND IN 1803**  
*Their Rise and Progress—Assassination of the Lord Chief  
 Justice and his Nephew.—Particulars of the Lives and  
 Executions of the Principal Rebels*

In 1790, a confederacy, calling themselves "The United Irishmen of Belfast," was formed in the north of Ireland; on the 9th of November, 1791, the Society of United Irish men of Dublin commenced their meetings, choosing for their chairman the Hon. Simon Butler, second son to Lord Viscount Mountgarret, and for their secretary the celebrated James Napper Tandy, who at that time was a citizen of a considerable interest and political influence in Dublin, and a member of the Whig Club. This extraordinary demagogue was afterwards convicted of high treason, pardoned, went into France, and died at Bordeaux, a general in the service of Bonaparte.

After a recapitulation of grievances, they say, "In the present great era of reform, when unjust governments are falling in every part of Europe: when religious persecution is compelled to abjure her tyranny over conscience; when the rights of men are ascertained in theory, and that theory is substantiated by practice; when iniquity can no longer defend absurd and oppressive forms against the common sense and common interests of mankind: when all government is acknowledged to originate from the people, and to be so far only obligatory as it protects their rights and promotes their welfare; we think it our duty, as Irishmen, to come forward and state what we feel to be our heavy grievance, and what we know to be its effectual remedy." This declaration then states several resolutions, complaining of the English influence in Ireland, the necessity of an equal representation of all the people in Parliament, the rejection of a place bill, of a pension bill, and of a responsibility bill; the sale of peerages in one house; the corruption avowed in the other; the borough traffic between both, symptoms of a mortal disease which corrodes the vitals of the constitution, and leaves to the people in their own government but the shadow of a name.

The society then specially resolves "that the weight of English influence in the government of Ireland is so great, as to require a cordial union among all the people of Ireland to maintain that balance of power which is essential to the preservation of liberty, and the extension of their commerce. That the sole constitutional mode by which such influence can be opposed, is by a complete and radical reform of the representation of the people in Parliament; and that no reform is practicable, which shall not include Irishmen of every religious persuasion."

From the above resolutions it is clear, that a principal object of the society was completely to emancipate the Irish Roman Catholics, and to admit them into the House of Lords and Commons; and, indeed, a great majority of the society were of that religious persuasion; and since its origin, the Catholic claims have been unceasing. Mr. Emmet, and a few others, had, however, two different objects—first, to separate Ireland from England; and, secondly, to establish a republic. This party formed a private society among themselves, and with them originated the system of insurrection which in 1798 broke out into a rebellion, in which several thousands lost their lives, and many of the promoters suffered on the scaffold, before it could be suppressed.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

England now charged Ireland with disaffection—Ireland replied, that beyond endurance, was she oppressed by her elder sister; and brooding on her complaints, a well digested conspiracy against the state (with which government was not acquainted till nearly the moment of explosion) in 1803, threatened the city of Dublin with the most serious calamities.

At an early hour on the evening of July the 23d, a variety of inflammatory proclamations were distributed in every part of the town, calling upon the people to unite as before, in opposition to English oppression, &c. and at so early an hour as eight o'clock, a large party forced into the Lord Mayor's house, and seized all the arms and pikes which were in the house; and about ten o'clock, a general engagement took place in the neighbourhood of James street, Thomas street, and in every part of the Liberty.

One of their early acts was the murder of Lord Kilwarden (the Chief Justice of the King's Bench) a healthy man, and about sixty years of age, and his nephew the Rev. Mr. Richard Wolf. Miss Wolf, the daughter of Lord Kilwarden, was with them in the post-chaise. They were returning from his Lordship's country seat, drawn from thence, as reported, by a forged message. Just as the carriage came along the market house in Thomas-street, Lord Kilwarden was soon recognized, and a mob hitherto concealed, rushed upon it in every direction, armed with guns, blunderbusses, pikes, swords, &c. Some seized the horses by the head, and dragged the postillion from his seat; while others rushed on each side of the carriage, and opened the doors. Miss Wolf sat between her uncle and brother, who were dragged out by inhuman fiends from her side, one from each door. In a state of distraction at this inhuman proceeding, and terrified by the horrid banditti, who surrounded the carriage, Miss Wolf jumped out, and was received in the arms of one of them, who carried her through the crowd, unhurt, to an opposite house, where she remained secreted, until four o'clock on Sunday morning, when she was conveyed to the Castle.

Major Swan, with a strong detachment under his command, was ordered by Government to repair to Thomas street, the principal scene of the insurrection. A small part of the military had already skirmished there with the rebels, and a considerable number of the latter were killed and wounded. When the Major arrived there, he saw several lying dead in the streets, and one man only with a pike who was fired at.

Lord Kilwarden had been carried to the watch-house, in Vicar-street, where Major Swan saw him lying on the guard-bed, dreadfully lacerated; his nephew, Mr. Wolf, was killed on the spot. His Lordship, although near expiring at the time, knew the Major, and appeared perfectly in his senses. He eagerly enquired as to the fate of his daughter; and, being assured by the Major of her safety, he exclaimed, with an emotion of gratitude to Heaven, "Thank God" A military gentleman present, naturally filled with indignation, observed, that every man taken with a pike in his hand, ought to be instantly hanged: which Lord Kilwarden overhearing, turned to Major Swan, and most impressively exhorted him "to let no man be hanged without being brought to trial." A detachment of the military, under the command of Colonel Brown, who with Mr. Edmiston, and Mr. Parker, of the Liberty-rangers, lost their lives in this most disagreeable of all services, attacked a large body of the disaffected, in Francis-street, and dispersed them, but not without a shocking scene of slaughter. The unfortunate Chief Justice lingered in excruciating pain, about two hours, and expired a martyr to his profession. He was a great lawyer, and, what is more meritorious, a truly good

## SUPPLEMENT 2

man. It was said, that he had frequently expressed a presentiment, that he should fall by the hands of the assassin.

Dublin now became a scene of confusion and horror. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, and the military were left uncontrolled by the Civil Power. At length peace was somewhat restored, and large rewards were offered for the apprehension of the principal actors in this rebellion. We therefore proceed, without further comment, which indeed our limits will not allow, to the trial of Emmet, the chief of the rebellion.

**ROBERT EMMET, ESQ**  
*A Counsellor at Law, and Chief of the Irish Rebels, in 1803;  
for which he was Executed*

This unfortunate young gentleman was the son of Dr. Emmet, a physician, in Ireland, a man of republican principles. At College, he was distinguished as an orator, particularly in the Historical Society; but his bold promulgation of democratic principles raised him many enemies in the University; and at length being suspected of disaffection to the British government, to avoid a prosecution, with which he was threatened, he fled into France, in which country his brother, Thomas Emmet, at that time resided. Early in 1803, Robert Emmet returned to his native land, where he joined a band of conspirators, who had escaped in the rebellion of 1798, and who had determined upon seizing the castle of Dublin, and making the Lord Lieutenant prisoner. On the 23d of July, 1803, this conspiracy broke out into an insurrection about nine at night, and was completely quelled before morning. Lord Kilwarden, the Chief Justice of Ireland, was murdered in his carriage by a banditti, as already stated; and Emmet, to adopt his own expression, instead of finding himself a leader of a formidable insurrection, found himself without any influence or command, in the midst of a ruffianly mob. With a few adherents, he escaped into the mountains, but returned in a few days, was taken near Dublin, tried for high treason, convicted, and executed, being not more than twenty-four years of age.

This unfortunate youth had early imbibed, under the tutelage of his father, those political doctrines, which caused his ruin. The object of his enthusiastic mind was to separate Ireland from Great Britain, and this he hoped to accomplish without any interference or assistance from France, as appears from his address to the Court after his conviction. These are his words:—"God forbid that I should see my country under the hands of a foreign power. The French should come as a foreign enemy, Oh! my countrymen! meet them on the shore with a torch in one hand, a sword in the other—receive them with all the destruction of war; immolate them in their boats before our native soil shall be polluted by a foreign foe! If they proceed in landing, fight them on the strand, burn every blade of grass before them as they advance, raze every house; and if you are driven to the centre of your country; collect your provisions, your property, your wives, and your daughters: form a circle around them—fight while but two men are left; and when but one remains, let that man set fire to the pile, and release himself, and the families of his fallen countrymen, from the tyranny of France!"

As Robert had then recently returned from France, and from communing with his brother, it is but fair to conclude, that on this point, they coincided in political sentiments.

From the conduct of this youth, he appears an enthusiast in politics, heated by a sanguine mind even to a degree of insanity, which, though it may not excuse, must palliate, his offences. His oratorical abilities were considerable; and his conduct at that awful moment, when death stood before him, inexorable and inevitable, proved his courage. He directed the executioner in the preparations necessary to deprive him of life; and did all in his power to impress on the minds of the spectators, that even in the violent manner, in which he was about to lose his life, there was neither fear nor terror—"making a virtue of calamity"—and leaving the world without a tremulous nerve.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Robert Emmet was tried and convicted in Dublin, before Lord Norbury, and a respectable jury, on Monday, September 19, 1803.

After the evidence, the provincial proclamation was read, to show the object of the insurrection, and the resolution proscribing the yeomanry, and other loyal subjects. The prisoner desired, that a part of it should also be read, by which it was decreed, that no man should suffer death, by court-martial, but for mutiny, until the pleasure of the provisional government should be known: it was read accordingly.

The proclamation addressed to the citizens of Dublin was also read. The prisoner's counsel accounted for the intimate knowledge he had of the provisional proclamation, by saying that it had appeared in other publications. The following papers were then read:—

No. I. (found in his lodgings by Major Sirr) was nearly as follows:—"It may seem strange that a person avowing himself to be an enemy of the present government, and engaged in a conspiracy for its overthrow, should undertake to suggest an opinion on its conduct, or expect that advice from such a quarter should be received with attention. The writer of this, however, does not mean to offer an opinion upon a point, in which he feels difficulty—on which his candour might be doubted; his attention is to confine himself to points on which he feels with the merciful, and as an Irishman; with the English part of the present government, he will communicate, in the most precise terms, the line of conduct which he may be hereafter compelled to adopt; and which, however painful, would be doubly so, if he did not try to avoid it by the most explicit notification.

It is not the intention of the undersigned, to do more than state what the government must acknowledge, that of the conspiracy he knows nothing; and instead of creating terror in its enemies, and confidence in its friends, it will serve, by the scantiness of its information, to furnish new grounds of conviction, to those who are too ready to accuse it for the want of that intelligence which no sagacity could enable it to maintain. If then, it is unable by a display of its discoveries, to evince its strength and vigilance, it cannot hope to crush the conspiracy by the weight of its power. It is only now that men have to learn, that entering into a conspiracy, exposes them to be hanged. . . . . Can it hope to injure the body of the conspiracy, so imperceptibly woven as the present, by merely cutting off a few of the threads? . . . . . No system can change the conduct which the U[nited] I[rishmen] will adopt for effecting the emancipation of their country."

No. II. found on the prisoner's person.—"I wish particularly to know how matters stand, if you are not afraid. What hopes there are from abroad, and what they mean to do; and whether, if they pay us a visit, we shall not be worse off than we are? . . . . . He is very desponding, and says the people are incapable of redress, and unworthy of liberty; that he is confirmed in this by the late transaction, which must have succeeded but for their barbarous desertion and want of unanimity. He thinks that the invasion will not take place at all, but that it is the plan to wear down the English by the expense of frequent preparation."

No. III found in the desk in Thomas-street.—"I have but little time to look at the thousand difficulties between me and the completion of my wishes; that they would succeed I have ardent, and I trust, rational hopes; but if that should not be the case, I thank God for having gifted me with a sanguine disposition, so that I run from reflection; and if my hopes are without foundation—if a precipice be opening under

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

my feet, from which duty will not suffer me to depart, I am thankful for that disposition, which leads me on to it, and hurls me down, while my eyes are raised to the visions of happiness which my fancy has formed in the air."

No. IV. was the manuscript of the Proclamation of the Provisional Government, found in the desk in Thomas Street.

When this unfortunate young man was called upon to know if he had anything to say why sentence of death should not be passed upon him, he addressed the Court and Jury nearly in the following terms:

"I am asked if I have anything to say why sentence of death should not be pronounced upon me. Was I to suffer only death, after being adjudged guilty, I should bow in silence; but a man in my situation has not only to combat with the difficulties of fortune, but also the difficulties of prejudice; the sentence of the law which delivers over his body to the executioner, consigns his character to obloquy. The man dies, but his memory lives; and that mine may not forfeit ail claim to the respect of my countrymen, I use this occasion to vindicate myself from some of the charges advanced against me.

"I am charged with being an emissary of France-'tis false! I am no emissary—I did not wish to deliver up my country to a foreign power, and least of all, to France.—No, never did I entertain the idea of establishing French power in Ireland—God forbid! On the contrary, it is evident from the introductory paragraph of the Address of the Provisional Government, that every hazard attending an independent effort was deemed preferable to the more fatal risk of introducing a French army into the country. Small would be our claims to patriotism and to sense, and palpable our affectation of the love of liberty, if we were to encourage the profanation of our shores by a people who are slaves themselves, and the unprincipled and abandoned instruments of imposing slavery on others.

"If such an inference be drawn from any part of the proclamation of the Provisional Government, it calumniates their views, and is not warranted by the fact. How could they speak of freedom to their countrymen? How assume such an exalted motive, and meditate the introduction of a power which has been the enemy of freedom in every part of the globe; Reviewing the conduct of France to other countries, could we expect better towards us? No! Let not, then, any man attain my memory by believing that I could have hoped freedom through the aid of France, and betrayed the sacred cause: of liberty by committing it to the power of her most determined foe: had I done so, I had not deserved to live; and dying with such a weight upon my character, I had merited the honest execration of that country which gave me birth, and to which I would have given freedom.

"Had I been in Switzerland, I would have fought against the French—in the dignity of freedom, I would have expired on the threshold of that country, and they should have entered it only by passing over my lifeless corpse. Is it then to be supposed, that I would be slow to make the same sacrifice to my native land? Am I, who lived, but to be of service to my country, and who would subject myself to the bondage of the grave to give her independence—am I to be loaded with the foul and grievous calumny of being an emissary of France?

"My lords, it may be part of the system of angry justice, to bow a man's mind, by humiliation, to meet the ignominy of the scaffold; but worse to me than the scaffold's shame, or the scaffold's terrors, would be the imputation of having been the

## SUPPLEMENT 2

agent of French despotism and ambition; and while I have breath, I will call upon my countrymen not to believe the guilty of so foul a crime against their liberties and their happiness.

"Though you, my lord, sit there a judge, and I stand here a culprit, yet you are but a man, and I am another. I have a right, therefore, to vindicate my character and motives from the aspersions of calumny; and, as a man, to whom fame is dearer than life, I will make the last use of that life in rescuing my name and my memory from the afflicting imputation of having been an emissary of France, proclamation of the Provisional Government, it calumniates their views, and is not warranted by the fact. How could they speak of freedom to their countrymen? How assume such an exalted motive, and meditate the introduction of a power which has been the enemy of freedom in every part of the globe? Reviewing the conduct of France to other countries, could we expect better towards us? No! Let not, then, any man attain my memory by believing that I could have hoped freedom through the aid of France, and betrayed the sacred cause of liberty by committing it to the power of her most determined foe: had I done so, I had not deserved to live; and dying with such a weight upon my character, I had merited the honest execration of that country which gave me birth, and to which I would have given freedom.

"Did I live to see a French army approach this country, I would meet it on the shore, with a torch in one hand, and a sword in the other—I would receive them with all the destruction of war! I would animate my countrymen to immolate them in their very boats; and before our native soil should be polluted by a foreign foe, if they succeeded in landing, I would burn every blade of grass before them, raze every house, contend to the last for every inch of ground; and the last spot on which the hope of freedom should desert me, that spot I would make my grave! What I cannot do, I leave a legacy to my country, because I feel conscious that my death were unprofitable, and all hopes of liberty extinct, the moment a French army obtained a footing in this land."

After some farther matter, he concluded thus:—"My lamp of life is nearly expired—my race is finished: the grave opens to receive me, and I sink into its bosom. All I request, then, at parting from the world, is the charity of its silence. Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man, who knows my motives, dare vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them; let them and me repose in obscurity and peace, and my tomb remain undescribed, till other times and other men can do justice to my character."

The foregoing is a faithful report of this unfortunate young man's exculpation of himself from the charge of co-operating with the French in any design to invade this country; and whether voluntary or involuntary, it is an evidence against the character of the common enemy, which, coming from such authority, ought, and we trust, will have the most salutary effect upon all who may have participated in his principles or his treasons.

Whether the sincere conviction of his mind, or the imposition of pride, anxious to rescue his memory from the foul shame of having sought to deliver his country up to a foreign and a cruel enemy, he is entitled to equal credit; and if anything were inscribed on his tomb, most honourable to himself, and atoning to his country, it is the character which he has given of the arch foe to the peace and liberty of mankind.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

The court listened to him with a great deal of patience; and although indignation was visible in the countenance of every person in court, at this public avowal of his guilt, yet not a murmur was heard. Lord Norbury, after a salutary remonstrance to the prisoner, and paying a handsome compliment to some of the respectable members of the family to which he belonged, pronounced the awful sentence of the law in cases of high treason.

Mr. Emmet, after his trial, was taken to Newgate, where dinner had been prepared for him. He there requested to see Mr. MacNally, one of his counsellors in his defence. To him, it is generally rumoured, he made a full disclosure of all the means he had used to effect the late insurrection, and authorised him to make it known to government. He declared himself the chief mover and instigator of that attempt to effect a revolution, and solemnly denied having any associates in this country of either property or respectability. He accounted for the expenses incurred in preparations for rebellion, by stating that he had received, on the death of his father, 3,500*l.* and that he had expended of that sum 2,500*l.* in purchasing the arms found in the depot in Marshalsea-lane.

He also denied having solicited or received any assistance from the French government, and protested, were this country invaded by Frenchmen, from his information of their principles and conduct wherever they went, that he would be one of the most zealous in the expulsion of such treacherous, rapacious, and sanguinary miscreants, At the place of execution he expressed the same sentiments.

**EDWARD KEARNEY, alias CARNEY; THOMAS  
MAXWELL ROCHE; OWEN KIRWAN; JAMES BYRNE;  
FELIX ROURKE; JOHN KILLIN; JOHN M'CANN  
HENRY HAWLEY; JOHN M'INTOSH; THOMAS  
KEENAN; DENNIS LAMBERT REDMOND and THOMAS  
RUSSEL**  
*Other Rebels of 1803*

EDWARD KEARNEY, alias CARNEY, was tried by a Special Commission, at Green-street. The Attorney General addressed the Court and Jury, in a speech, which lasted nearly one hour and a half, on the nature of treason, and how the Act of the 25th of Edward the Third applied. He explained the nature of the transaction of the 23d of July; that it was a business of much narrower limits than those engaged in it were willing to admit; that it was a visitation of Providence to rouse the people to a greater exertion of loyalty, to make them put on the armour of war; he dwelt with peculiar energy on the difference between the governments of France and England. He then called the attention of the Court to the conduct of government to the traitors in 1798; some paid their lives as the forfeit of their crimes, some were transported, and some escaped for want of legal evidence to convict them. Many of them have changed from their former conduct, but others have returned to disturb a constitution, the envy and admiration of the universe. He read a part of the rebel proclamation, and contrasted it with their conduct.

Patrick M'Cabe, who had turned approver for the crown, admitted, that he was concerned in the rebellion of 1798: that he was informed of the present business the day before the rebellion; he proved the general circumstances of the transaction, but he did not prove the identity of the prisoner.

The principal evidence against the prisoner was a lieutenant, and Adjutant Brady, of the 21st regiment, who proved the finding him in arms on the night of the 23d: this was confirmed by a private in the same regiment, though there was some trifling difference in the evidence. The prisoner's defence consisted of a speech of considerable length, from his counsel, who endeavoured to excite doubts in the minds of the jury, and on those doubts to decide a verdict of acquittal. He paid many compliments on the moderation of the government, and appealed to a similar principle in the minds of the jury. The prisoner he represented as a poor, but honest and industrious hawker of skins, who had been that fatal evening pressed into the service of the insurgents. Certain evidences were adduced to prove an alibi for him, and others to give him a good character: he was, notwithstanding, after the jury had retired for a few minutes, found guilty.

Lord Norbury, previous to recapitulating the evidence, which he did very minutely, laid down the law of high treason, and stated, from several eminent law reports, the different mode of practice adopted by the courts in England. His lordship was peculiarly affecting in pronouncing sentence of death on the unhappy prisoner, whose levity of manner, in the meantime, bordered on insanity, while aiming to exculpate himself.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

His execution was fixed for the following Friday, (September 2,) when he was executed in Thomas-street, where he was apprehended perpetrating his crime, and nearly on the spot, where the barbarous butchery of the late Lord Kilwarden took place. He was taken from the gaol to the place of execution, about one o'clock, escorted by a strong military guard, and behaved in the same intemperate manner which distinguished him on his trial. He was one of the lower rank of society, and what is termed a skin-jobber by profession, (a dealer in dry calf skins), and seemed to be between forty and fifty years of age. It will be conceived that penitence had made no impression upon him, when it is stated, that a short time before he left the gaol, he swore by his Maker, he was not guilty. The Rev. Mr. Archer and the Rev. Mr. Gamble took much pains in exhortation, to bring him to a proper sense of his awful situation; he read a Catholic prayer book for a short time before he left the prison; but, alas! not with that coolness and resignation which evince sincere repentance. The unfortunate malefactor had been much given to intoxication in the course of his life, and which, no doubt, had been his bane; he candidly acknowledged such excess, and was most impressively entreated by Dr. Gamble, if he would make no other acknowledgement, at least to do that to the multitude of the lower class at the place of execution, and warn them against such ruinous vice, and which this malefactor promised to do. He seemed to pay more attention to the fate of his body than his soul, having several times inquired before he left the prison, what was to become of it after his death. At the fatal spot, however, he behaved with much fortitude; and, addressing the crowd in a distinct voice, warned them to return to their allegiance.

After he was hanged, his head was cut off by the executioner, who held it up in his hand to the spectators, according to the law against his crime, saying, "Behold the head of a traitor." His remains were brought back in a cart to the prison, and afterwards interred in the yard of Newgate. Notwithstanding the threat in the Rebel Proclamation, "that the execution of the first man, who should suffer as a traitor, should be the signal for a general rising," the sentence was carried into effect without exciting the smallest disturbance.

THOMAS MAXWELL ROCHE, an old man, about sixty years of age, and by trade a slater, was the next brought to trial, September 1. The evidence afforded nothing new, or materially differing from that adduced on the trial of Kearney; like him, Roche was found in arms in Thomas street, by Lieutenant Brady, and the party of the 21st regiment under his command.

Some time before this hoary malefactor left the gaol for execution, he persisted in declaring he was not guilty, but it appeared equivocation; for on being exhorted in a most becoming manner, by a reverend gentleman present, not to be dissembling in the presence of the Supreme Being, adding to his crime, he at length declared at the place of execution, that he was guilty of the crime for which he suffered. From a discharge which he produced as to his character, it appeared that he also, in his life time, had been addicted to inebriety, that demon of destruction to the lower class. He suffered also in Thomas-street.

OWEN KIRWAN, an old clothesman, was the third person indicted. Benjamin Adams, a silk-weaver, in Plunket-street, swore, that he knew the prisoner for ten or twelve years, who lived nearly opposite to him; he recollected the night of the 23d; saw the prisoner leaning over his door; also saw him go up repeatedly from his house to Thomas street, with a green bag filled with something; saw him between eight and nine o'clock going into his house, he was then at the window on the third floor; beheld

## SUPPLEMENT 2

a rocket in the air go across the street over the prisoner's house; prisoner then said, "There is the rocket, my boys!" he then turned into his shop, put on a green coat, and went out; his wife followed him, and made him come back, and put on a cotton jacket. Prisoner put a pike on his shoulder, and said, "God's blood, boys! the town is our own tonight." He then said, "Any man that does not turn out to-night will surely be put to death to-morrow. The prisoner then and his party ran up Plunket-street, and turned into Thomas-street. The party were all armed with pikes, and the prisoner at the bar had also a pike; in about half an hour afterwards the witness saw a parcel of armed men pass down Plunket-street, towards Patrick street; in about a quarter of an hour after, sixty or seventy persons came down Plunket-street: some of them stopped at the prisoner's door, and some lower down; they got beer. Kirwan's wife had something prepared for them. In about half an hour he heard a firing from the Coombe.

The prisoner called several persons, who gave him the character of a sober industrious man, and one who they never heard was concerned in any rebellious affair. The jury, however, found him guilty. The next day (Friday, September 2,) he was brought up to receive sentence of death, which was pronounced upon him with peculiar solemnity by Baron George; who also addressed the prisoner in an affecting speech of some length, concluding in nearly the following words:

"Do not suppose that the cause you engaged in, and for which you have forfeited your life, is popular, and will rescue your memory from the deserved odium which must attach to it, in proportion as you die obdurate or unatoning. No! wretched man! your mad atrocities, your horrible assassinations, will only be remembered, and the detestation of posterity feature you in the blood you have shed. In the last rebellion it was to be lamented, that wicked men made use of arguments to mislead the weak, and to palliate treason; but has any human creature said a single word in favour or palliation of the insurrection to which you have been so actively assisting? No! its sole object has been blood and desolation; and the fate of him who could promote, in conspiracy or in action, such an object, can never be attended with popularity. Discharge, therefore, such a wicked and dangerous delusion from your mind, if you should be so unhappy as to entertain it; think only of your salvation, as a contrite Christian should, and do not leave the world with a lie in your mouth, and go before your Maker, swaggering in vain and boastful guilt. Believe me, unhappy man, that to disclose all you know, and thus make your injured country and offended God all the atonement in your power, will prove an inexpressible consolation to you in your last moments, and infuse into your soul that sweet consciousness of right, which can alone sweeten the bitter draught you are about to take, and justify a hope of future pardon and happiness. You were told that a rocket would be the signal of insurrection. You knew of the mischief to be done; you were evidently deep in the dreadful secret; and therefore again I exhort you, as you value your eternal salvation, not to leave this life until you do justice to your country, and make what return you now can for the crimes with which you have disgraced it. But while I thus urge you to the disclosure with which your duty should suggest, do not think I am authorised to hold out any hope to you, or that any disclosure will be an atonement to the law: but under any consideration of your interest or duty, you must act in opposition to both, whether in this world or the next, by denying the truth and justice of the verdict pronounced upon you, and persisting in a frame of mind incorrigible to repentance and atonement."

This unhappy culprit was executed September 8, in Thomas-street, on the same gallows where his partners in rebellion and assassination expiated their crimes.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

His conduct was decent, and he acknowledged the justice of his sentence, and the impartiality of his trial.

JAMES BYRNE, who had been bred up to the baking business, which he had successfully carried on for some years in the neighbourhood of Naas, in the county of Kildare, was, September 2, found guilty on charges of high treason, and the next day received sentence of death from Baron Daly.

On the 5th (two days after) he was executed opposite the King's stores, in Townsend-street, where a temporary gallows was erected for the purpose. There was an immense concourse of spectators, whom he addressed in the following very few words: "Gentlemen, I hope my fate will be a warning to you all." He was a large man, and his weight extended the rope by which he hung to such a length, that his feet reached the ground; and, for want of any species of machinery to ease him, the executioner was obliged to bend his legs backwards, and tie them to his thighs. He hung for some moments, apparently in great torture. After hanging twenty-three minutes, he was cut down, and his head severed from his body.

On the 6th of September, FELIX ROURKE, a rebel officer, was also convicted of high-treason. This man was a colonel in the rebellion of 1798; previous to which he was serjeant to the Coolock yeomanry corps, and joined in a conspiracy to murder Captain Ormsby, and some other officers of the corps: a man of the name of Clinch was executed for his crime. Rourke afterwards turned strolling player; but, failing in that pursuit, he again turned his thoughts to real scenes of human bloodshed, in which he acted a principal part. He, with JOHN KILLIN, and JOHN M'CANN (two other convicted rebels) was brought up on the 9th, and received sentence of death.

On this occasion, Baron George addressed the prisoners in a most feeling manner, but particularly Felix Rourke, to whom he represented the aggravation which his crime received from the part which he took in the insurrection; not only committing treason himself, but seducing others to a similar crime.

Before sentence was passed, Rourke addressed the Court in language calculated to convey an impression that he was superior to the vulgar herd: he, however, negatively admitted that he was a leader of rebellion on the evening of the 23d of July, but solemnly protested that he was never concerned in the spilling of blood. Few, however, of those who heard him, believed that he was so in any respect, whether of intention or action, free from the massacre of that dreadful night.

Rourke, on his leaving gaol on Saturday, September 10, for execution, endeavoured to affect fortitude, and to baffle a shivering that he was seized with. Being asked, was he, easy in his mind? he said he was perfectly composed: he went in a smart pace from the gaol into the cart, and sat on the side going to the gallows, and as he went from the prison, bowed his head to those he saw in the windows, signifying farewell to his comrades: on his way he looked much about him in the town, instead of paying attention to his book. He was escorted by a strong party of horse, and the adjacent yeomanry corps were assembled on the spot, to prevent any attempt to rescue the prisoner. Notwithstanding his assumed boldness, and his protestations of innocence, he met his fate with the most abject cowardice; and at the gallows confessed the justice of his sentence, and recanted his bravado assertions of innocence. He was executed in Rathcoole, in the neighbourhood of which he lived;

## SUPPLEMENT 2

this town, at the time of his execution, seemed to have been deserted by its inhabitants, there being not one in coloured clothes to be seen.

The following Monday, Killin and M'Cann were executed in Thomas-street: they conducted themselves with apparent penitence, and acknowledged the justness of their conviction, and of their punishment.

HENRY HAWLEY, another of these traitors, and who seemed to have somewhat of a better education than any of the rest, (except Emmet,) was a native of Roscrea, in the county of Tipperary, and had been so active in the rebellion of 1798, that he was wounded in an attempt to plunder a house, in that neighbourhood, of arms. When John Hanson, the keeper of the tower, in the castle, went to arrest him, this desperate man immediately fired at and shot him; for this crime he was not indicted, but for that of high treason, September 27. The fact of his having been employed in the manufacture of pikes was proved by evidence similar to that produced on former trials; and no attempt being made to rebut the charge, the jury, without going out of the box, pronounced the verdict of guilty.

After a solemn appeal to the prisoner, on the enormity of his offence, Baron George pronounced sentence of death on him. This wretched man was executed September 29, 1803, according to his sentence, at the front of the New Prison. Before the rope was adjusted, he requested leave to address the people. The extreme contrition and repentance which he expressed induced the sheriffs to yield to his desire: he accordingly came out upon the platform, and raising his voice so as to be heard to a considerable distance, said nearly as follows:—

"Good people, pray for me, and pray that I may be forgiven my sins, which I heartily repent of. Good people, you see to what a situation I am brought by my own folly, and by bad advisers. Good people, love each other, and forget all animosities—relinquish your foolish pursuits, which, if you continue to follow, will, in the end, bring you to the situation in which I now stand." He confessed that he had, with his own hand, murdered Colonel Brown, of the 21st regiment, on the night of the rebellion. He appeared fully sensible of the enormity of his crime, as well as that of the murder of Hanson, and exhibited an appearance of the deepest remorse, entirely different from that sullen and ferocious apathy with which so many of his accomplices had met their fate. His whole conduct excited a degree of compassion, which it required the full recollection of his crimes to overcome. He returned from the platform; and, having prayed for a short time, was again led forth, and the trap falling, he died without a struggle.

On the first of October, JOHN M'INTOSH was tried before the special commission, on the same charges of high treason with those whose trials preceded him. It appeared that the prisoner, a carpenter by trade, had rented the house, No. 26, in Patrick-street, where the explosion of gunpowder took place on the Saturday previous to the insurrection. On that occasion he would not accept of the assistance of his neighbours, but locked up the place, telling a man living next door to him, who was more particular in his enquiries, that the explosion was in consequence of an experiment tried by silk-dyers. Mr. Wilson, a chief peace-officer, went to the house the following evening, and ascertained the explosion to have been that of gunpowder; a parcel of which he found in an unfinished state, and some saltpetre. He also found in a chest about fifty fresh-cast musket-balls, a volume of De Volney's *Ruin of Empires*; and in the house were about two hundred pike handles, shorter than those with which

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

he had afterwards become more familiar; but, in an adjoining house, he found a parcel of bayonets, with the sockets filled with wood, and as if they had been sawed from off the handles, which were in the first house. It appeared that, after the explosion in Patrick-street, the prisoner went immediately to the depot, in Mass-lane, where he continued until the 23d of July, preparing for the insurrection, which broke out on that evening. When the insurrection took place, he was actively engaged in it: he was one of those who fired at the trooper who was killed; he was also among those infernal assassins who stopped Lord Kilwarden's carriage; and stood by while that lamented nobleman and his nephew were piked to death. It did not appear that he inflicted any of the wounds, which were all given with pikes, he having been armed with pistols and a blunderbuss. After the defeat of the insurrection, he fled; and, as he was passing through Arklow, in the county of Wicklow, he was arrested by Mr. Coats, a magistrate, to whom he said that his name was Magrath; that he was a mill-wright by trade, was going to Waterford, had been working at Mr. Jones's, in the county of Wicklow, and had not been in Dublin for three weeks previous to the 23d of July.

There was no tenable defence set up. Some persons were adduced to character; and the jury, without retiring, returned a verdict of "Guilty."

This culprit suffered October 3, 1803, in Patrick-street, opposite the house where he had been manufacturing the powder for rebellion.

On the day of M'Intosh's execution, THOMAS KEENAN was tried on the same charges of high-treason. It was proved that he was an associate of M'Intosh, and was arrested along with him in the town of Arklow, whither they had fled after the 23d of July. Like M'Intosh, he assumed a feigned name and occupation, when questioned by Mr. Coates the magistrate; and also said that he had been at work some time before the 23d, and on that day for a Mr. Jones, of Kilnecary, in the county of Wicklow.

It was proved by two witnesses, Fleming and Finerty, that he had been in the rebel depot, in Mass-lane, in the course of the week previous to the insurrection, at work as a carpenter, making pike handles, &c.; and Fleming swore positively that he was one of those who piked Lord Kilwarden. The jury, after five minutes' conference, returned a verdict, "Guilty." Sentence of death was immediately pronounced. The prisoner did not deny his having been one of the conspiracy, but positively denied having been one of the murderers of Lord Kilwarden. He was executed on the 4th of October, 1803, in Thomas-street.

DENNIS LAMBERT REDMOND, a very principal person in this insurrection, was tried for high-treason, October 5th. His trial was intended for September 3d, on which morning, just before he was sent for, the prisoner shot himself with a small pocket-pistol, which he had, for some time about his person, concealed in his pantaloons. The city-surgeon immediately examined his wound, and reported it not dangerous. Previous to this, he had offered to give information to government of all persons concerned in the late horrid insurrection, together with their plans and connections. This proposal, after having been well weighed, was rejected: the charges against the prisoner, who was not one of the deluded mob, being of such a nature as to make him, if found guilty, a peculiarly fit subject for an example. The double shame of guilt and treachery hastened the commission of this rash act, which drew a veil between him and the publication of his crimes. This wretched man,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

instead of accelerating his death as he intended, only procrastinated it by having thus postponed his trial and execution.

Pat M'Cabe, the accomplice, was the principal witness, who proved the conspiracy to levy war, on the 23d of July, in Company with Allen, who was tried along with Arthur O'Connor, at Maidstone, and acquitted. It was also proved, that he employed carpenters in his house to make pike-handles; and that a number of those weapons, bayonets, &c. were found concealed in his house, in the Coal Quay, particularly pikes under a part of the flooring, and more in three cases, formed to resemble beams of timber. After the 23d of July, the prisoner fled in a vessel, the Tarleton, James Murphy, master, bound to Chester, but was put into Carlingford by a storm, in which the vessel was like to have been lost: there he was taken, and transmitted to this city; and, on his examination, gave a false account of some circumstances, and which falsehoods were strongly corroborative of his guilt. The jury, in about five minutes, returned a verdict of "Guilty."

Being asked why judgment should not be pronounced against him, he addressed the court with tremor, and under such strong agitation, as frequently deprived him of speech for minutes. In his address, he alleged, "that the conduct proved against him by M'Cabe had been exaggerated, though in part true; that in his conversation with Mr. Read, in Drogheda, Mr. Read gave the king's health, which he drank, and then gave General Bonaparte; that on Mr. Read's speaking hardly of Bonaparte, he used his best arguments to support the character of the then Chief Consul, alleging that he had a right so to do, as respectable persons in London had been prosecuted for speaking against him. [Here he was stopped by agitation.] He then, after a pause of some minutes, went on—"I will, now that the halter is about my neck, and the axe ready to sever my head from my body, confess, that I held an official situation under the Provincial Government; and that the great object of my heart was to promote the views of that government—[Here again he stopped]—and every act which I have done in forwarding that government, I should be" [Here his voice utterly failed]—and after a long pause Baron George, with that benign humanity, which marks his every act, said, that if the prisoner had anything more to say, the court would wait as long as he desired. The prisoner said, "he would give no further trouble;" and the baron, after the most impressive lecture on the fatal consequences of treason that ever was given, pronounced the terrible sentence of the law.

This unfortunate man was about twenty-five years of age, in his person tall and athletic, and rather a handsome long countenance. He was executed on the 6th of October, 1803, in the Coal Quay, opposite his own door, about half past two o'clock. He was dressed very genteelly, his hair *à la crop*, and a large cravat, very high about his chin. The remains of the wound he inflicted on himself by the pistol-shot were covered with a black plaster, very neatly. He quitted the gaol about one, and was brought over Carlisle-bridge, and through College-green, Dame-street, Parliament-street, &c. &c. He behaved, during his passage, with much composure and recollection, and seemed to take notice, rather particularly, of any little stoppage or noise in his progress, as he would often turn his head round to the front of the cart, in which he sat on its floor, with his back to the horse, and would salute his acquaintance as he passed them. He seemed to look on the different houses and public buildings, with which he was more intimately acquainted, with a sort of farewell expression in his countenance. On his arrival at the place of his execution, the female part of the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

spectators received him with quiet expressions, and signs of grief and pity: their eyes and countenances alone proved their feelings; but, to do them justice, they cursed most heartily those who had seduced their friends to the paths of disloyalty; in short, every one pitied the man, but execrated his principles. Very little time was necessary to complete his business. He mounted the ladder with steadiness and resolution, and without the smallest levity, though there was a sort of indignant behaviour about him, which was most fully exemplified in his answer to the clergyman who attended him when he was asked, "Do you die in peace with all mankind?" he answered, "'Tis no matter, I must die, whether or no." He remained on the platform for above five minutes alone, when he gave the signal which launched him into eternity. He fell with great force, and died without showing symptoms of much pain; indeed, the fall was so great, he almost never stirred. Thus died, an ignominious death, a man who had every prospect in this world to become a useful and honourable member of society, at least if property could influence; he having come into above 300*l.* per annum about a year before.

We shall conclude our account of these insurgents with that of THOMAS RUSSEL, (the only leader of note after Emmet,) who, under the title of the general of the Northern District, under the Provisional Government, issued a proclamation to that district on the 23d of July.

This man had been long distinguished for superiority of talents, particularly as a military character. He had served both in the East and West Indies, and in the latter with great credit in the same regiment with General Knox, with whom he went to Ireland, and was very attentively treated by the Northland family, through whose interest he was appointed a magistrate of the county of Tyrone, and he lived for some time at Dungannon; but in consequence of a difference with the Northland family, entirely arising from politics, he removed to Belfast, where he resided until the year 1792, when he was arrested, with Samuel Nelson and others, and conveyed to Newgate, Dublin: there he remained a prisoner until 1798, when he was sent, with Arthur O'Connor and others, to Fort St. George in Scotland.

At the conclusion of the last peace he was, with the other prisoners, liberated, and he proceeded to France. He lived in Paris during the peace, and was observed to be intimately acquainted with many of the members of the French Government, and with several of the first generals in France. Immediately subsequent to the declaration of war, he was missed from Paris, and found his way to Ireland. His malpractices having been discovered by government, one thousand pounds were offered by proclamation for his apprehension, but his arrest was not produced in consequence of that offer. It was owing to a Mr. Emerson, of the attorney's corps. He had received information, which was obtained through the vigilance of the Divisional Inspector of the District, that a stranger of suspicious appearance was observed in the house of a Mr. Muley, gun-maker, in Parliament-street. This circumstance Mr. Emerson immediately communicated to Mr. Secretary Marsden, by whom he was referred to Major Sirr. Mr. Emerson accordingly called upon the major, and, accompanied by him and Lieutenant Minchin, with a detachment of Captain Green's corps of Yeomanry, under the command of Lieutenant Beton, proceeded to the house in question about ten o'clock that night, where in a garret room, they discovered the person whose conduct had excited suspicion.

On their attempting to examine him he drew forth two loaded pistols, which he snapped at them; but both of them missed fire. Being recognised by Sirr, as Russel,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

the rebel general, he was seized and taken to the castle. He represented himself as Mr. Thomas, but Sirr had recollected him since he was a prisoner in Newgate; and, upon being taken to the castle, he was immediately identified by an old acquaintance of his, the Hon. Captain Knox, son of Lord Northland, under whose patronage Russel once was, until he had forfeited it by his political principles. Other northern gentlemen, who were at dinner with Mr. Wickham, also knew Russel. After he had acknowledged his real name, he avowed his purpose in coming to the country, and spoke in the boldest language of the "glorious cause" in which he was engaged—"It is that," said he, "for which I would meet death with pleasure, either in the field or on the scaffold."

His trial came on October 19, 1803, before a special commission at Downpatrick, Ireland: it occupied the attention of the court from ten in the morning, till past eight in the evening. One very important fact came out in the course of his trial: that, with all the influence which he possessed at one period among the lower orders; with all the exertions which he made, aided by the manners of a popular leader, he was unable to raise anything like a formidable body of insurgents. Individual adherents he met with; but the great body of the people showed no disposition to espouse his cause. The prisoner, having been asked if he had anything to say why sentence of death should not be passed, upon him, addressed the court in an eloquent and energetic, though rather a somewhat unconnected speech, of about twenty minutes in which he took a view of the principal transactions of his life for the last thirteen years; and on a retrospective view of which, he said, he looked back with triumph and satisfaction. He endeavoured to vindicate his conduct from the criminality attached to it, by asserting that in all he had done, he had acted from the conviction of his conscience; and anxiously requested that the court would make him not only the first, but the only life which should be taken on the present occasion; mercifully sparing to their families and friends the lives of those men whom it was asserted he had led astray.

The Hon. Baron George, after a pathetic address of some length, then pronounced the awful sentence of the law, which the prisoner listened to with the greatest composure—bowed respectfully to the court, and then retired in the custody of the sheriff. This unfortunate man was executed Oct. 21st (Friday,) and suffered with a degree of fortitude worthy of a better cause.

He was very liberally educated; and, in some pamphlets written by him upon the state of Ireland previous to 1798, he manifested considerable genius and information. He was about six feet high, of a very noble mind, a remarkably well-proportioned stature, and very marked countenance. His mind seemed strong. His conversation was very interesting, where he was disposed to be communicative; but he was in general reserved. His manners were highly polished. On the whole, he appeared to be amazingly well calculated to conciliate attachment, and ensure obedience.

**FRANCIS FINLAY**

***Convicted at the December Sessions, at the Old Bailey, in  
1802, and Executed for Forgery***

HERE shall we find verified the old proverbs, that, "Honesty is the best policy," and that "Idleness is the root of all evil." This unfortunate man, who possessed the most gentlemanly appearance and address, and was connected with several families of respectability and fortune, was a native of Boston, in Lincolnshire, where his father, being a man of credit and easy fortune, was enabled to gratify the strong ambition which he felt, to give his son a polite and liberal education. Mr. Finlay passed through the rudiments of his education with *éclat*, and executed the tasks assigned him by his masters with a promptitude and accuracy, that seemed to justify the most sanguine expectations of his delighted parents and friends. At a very early age he betrayed a strong attachment to a military life. The father, though with the greatest reluctance, at last was persuaded to indulge the ruling passion of his son; and accordingly, at the commencement of the last war, procured him an ensign's commission in a marching regiment. This regiment was soon after ordered abroad, where his bravery and good conduct gained him the esteem and affection of his companions, and caused him to be promoted to the rank of lieutenant. When his regiment returned to England, Mr. Finlay was ordered upon the recruiting service; and from this period may be dated the commencement of that career of vice which at last rendered him amenable to the laws of his country.

Idleness, that rock upon which so many have been wrecked, called forth his latent propensities with irresistible violence. Possessing an uncommon flow of animal spirits, he was extremely alive to the pleasures of society; and, having contracted an intimacy with several persons of a dissipated turn of mind, he entered into all their excesses with eagerness. It may be easily imagined, that his lieutenant's pay was very inadequate to support a life of excess and libertinism. But the force of habit became unconquerable: his commission was disposed of to recruit his finances, and to enable him a little longer to indulge a violent propensity to gaming, which he had contracted in the society of his fellow libertines. This could not hold out long, and he was at last hurried to the adoption of the most unjustifiable and desperate measures to maintain his credit with his associates. About this period he married the daughter of a respectable shopkeeper; but his wife's fortune was inconsiderable, and was, therefore, soon dissipated in his favourite pursuits. Deprived of every honest resource of supplying his ruined finances, he was at length, in a moment of desperation, driven to the commission of forgery; for which he was apprehended, and brought to trial at the Old Bailey, December 3, 1802, before Lord Alvanley.

He was indicted for feloniously forging and uttering the same, knowing it to be forged, a certain paper, purporting to be a bill of exchange, drawn by Capt. W. Foote, of the Royal Navy, on James Sykes, Navy Agent, of Arundel street, and accepted by him. It appeared in evidence, that the prisoner went to a Mr. Earnshaw, a watch-maker in High Holborn, on the 26th of September, and bespoke a gold time piece, which was to be got ready for him in the course of a week, and for which he agreed to pay sixty-five guineas: accordingly, on the 16th of October, he called again, when the time piece being ready, it was delivered to him, and he paid for it with two bills, one of which was that laid in the indictment. Soon after Mr. Earnshaw sent the bill to Mr. Sykes, when it was instantly discovered to be a forgery. The next day

## SUPPLEMENT 2

(which was on the 17th of October) the prisoner offered the time-piece as a pledge to a pawnbroker, William Burkitt, who seeming to doubt its value, the prisoner produced Earnshaw's receipt; and in consequence of Burkitt intimating that he would advance the money, if upon enquiry he found it to be of that value, the prisoner agreed to call again in an hour. Burkitt sent to Earnshaw's in the meantime; consequently the forgery was detected, and the prisoner, on his return, was taken into custody.

The prisoner, in his defence, set up the plea of insanity, and called one witness, the Chevalier Ruspini, who gave him a good character. There being no evidence in support of a deranged mind, the jury pronounced him guilty; but, on account of his excellent character and meritorious services, recommended him to the mercy of the sovereign: there were, however, fourteen other similar indictments against him. Finlay's demeanour, during his trial, was not marked with that impudent levity which distinguish the Bond-street bucks, nor tinctured with that despondency to which weak minds are generally subject in such a situation: it was a demeanour of modest dignity, which bespoke a consciousness of his crime, without any appearance of being appalled at the fate to which he was consigned by the violated laws of his country. When his sentence was pronounced, he listened with a degree of calm resignation, and the air of a man who was prepared to suffer deserved punishment for a crime of which he was conscious to himself he was guilty.

This unhappy man was only 57 years of age, and was both a husband and a father. After his death-warrant was signed by his majesty, the little time that intervened between that and his execution, was employed in a manner the most exemplary, in preparing for that awful and ignominious crisis when he should be separated from everything that was dear to him on this side eternity. He never attempted to palliate his crime, but displayed the deepest contrition for his guilt, and the most penitent resignation. He was attended almost constantly by the Rev. Mr. Crowther, rector of Christ Church, Newgate-street, and in the absence of that gentleman, by one of his fellow-prisoners, of the name of John Manley, who humanely administered all the consolation his unfortunate situation admitted of, read to him, and joined him in prayer. A gentleman, who did not disdain to be considered as the friend of the unfortunate man, visited him daily, and assisted him with money, and other necessaries.

On the morning previous to his execution, he was visited by his wife and child in prison, along with the gentleman to whom we have just now alluded, and the prisoner Manley. The scene that passed may be more easily imagined than described. The reader may picture to himself the anguish of a wife and mother, who had been nurtured in all that delicacy and tenderness that gives double acuteness to the feelings, upon the eve of losing a beloved husband, by the hands of the common executioner. She was then about the age of thirty-two, a woman of the most elegant manners, and handsome form. The child was about eight months old. The sensations of the unfortunate criminal, were of the most agonizing sort, when he reflected upon that infatuated course of life, which had not only brought himself to an ignominious end, but had also left his beloved wife exposed to all the horrors of poverty and disgrace. Upon a promise from the gentleman beforementioned, to protect this wife and child, and screen them from the miseries of want, and the sneers of an un pitying world, he became more composed. She lingered with him till four o'clock, when it became absolutely necessary to separate. Unable to bear the emotions of agony by which she was agitated, she fainted in her husband's arms, and was carried by two men to a

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

hackney coach, in a state of insensibility. Even the turnkeys, "albeit unused to the melting mood," did not behold this scene unmoved. Mr. Finlay, for a few minutes after his wife's departure, seemed to be agitated, but at the same time resigned. He walked about his cell with hurried steps, clinched his hands, turned his eyes towards Heaven, and at last overcome by his feelings, exclaimed, "She is gone, and I shall never see her more on earth!" But soon recovering his composure, "I am now happy," he said, "and prepare to die, my friends cannot look coolly upon her; alas! she will have no friends but them."

The Rev. Mr. Crowther, as usual, passed a few hours with him in earnest supplication to the Divine Mercy for the pardon of his sins, and particularly the crime for which he was to suffer.

On the morning of his execution, February 9, 1803, he seemed to look forward to his fate, not only with resignation, but satisfaction. He dressed with the same neatness and attention to cleanliness as usual. He eat his breakfast with the utmost composure, at five o'clock in the morning, with his faithful friend Manley. About six o'clock Mr. Crowther appeared, who passed an hour with him in fervent devotion. At seven o'clock he took the sacrament, and his irons being knocked off, the sheriff came, to whom he was delivered by the keeper of the prison. At half past eight o'clock he mounted the scaffold, with his hat and gloves on. He wore his hair cropped, half-boots, grey stockings, web pantaloons, brown coat, and waistcoat, with an outside coat of the same colour. He appeared calm and collected, and spoke for about a minute to the clergyman. The executioner then stepping forward, took off his hat, unloosed his neck-handkerchief, and fastened the fatal noose. The cap being pulled over his eyes, after he had remained about five minutes on the scaffold, he was launched into eternity. No man ever behaved with more resignation and manly fortitude in such a situation. He seemed to be in agony for the space of three minutes, after he was turned off, during which time he held a white pocket-handkerchief in his hand, but afterwards dropped it.

The body was cut down after it had hung the usual time, and carried to Newgate prison. At one o'clock, a hearse attended to convey it away; but, upon being inspected by the Sheriffs, it was found to be still warm, though it had been cut down three hours before. The sheriffs thought it their duty to keep it for some time longer, on account of this extraordinary circumstance, and ordered that it should be called for at four o'clock, which was accordingly done.

Yet o'er his fall, may pity drop a tear,  
Rememb'ring the wretchedness of the times;  
O think on his disgrace! his dying fear!  
And in his punishment forget his crimes.

## LAWRENCE INNIS

### *A British Seaman, Executed on Pennenden-Heath, January 21, 1803, for Murder*

IN action against the enemies of his country, how courageous is the British seaman; and when his foe has yielded to superior valour, compassion and generosity possess his noble heart. In peace, and deprived of the element which habit had rendered most natural to him, he considers the shore alone fit for recreation and idleness. His mind inactive, he oft becomes sullen and discontented; and having no natural enemy to combat, he quarrels with, and falls upon, his own messmate. In the present unfortunate case, both the murder and the murdered, had been seamen in the British navy, and both were pensioners in Greenwich Hospital.

Lawrence Innis was tried at Maidstone Lent assizes, 1803, for the wilful murder of John Price. John Miller, a witness for the prosecution, deposed, that he was a Greenwich pensioner, and his berth was in the Clarence Ward: his cabin was next to that in which the deceased slept. On Tuesday night, the 20th of January, just as he was in bed, he heard the prisoner and the deceased come up the gallery together; they were talking; the deceased said to the prisoner, "Go to bed, and then there will be no more on't." The prisoner replied, "I won't." The prisoner then went away to the fire-place in the hall, but soon returned to the cabin-door of the deceased, and cried out, "Price! Price! Jack! Jack!" to which the deceased did not answer. The prisoner then went away, but shortly after returned a second time, and called out as before. The deceased then answered him, and said to the prisoner, "You will prepare to appear before the captain of the month to-morrow; I have you upon the complaint, for striking me to-day at the Tyger's Head, in London-street." To this the prisoner replied, "Then you have done me, have you? but d-n you, I'll do you in return." The prisoner accompanied these words by a blow, which knocked the deceased down. The deceased called out. "Murder!" upon which the witness jumped out of bed, and the prisoner was secured; and the next morning he was carried before the committee, and mulcted two months' tobacco money for his ill-behaviour. This was the morning preceding the night of the murder. As he came out of the committee-room, he said to the witness, "Miller, you have borne false witness against me, but I hope to God I shall live to seek revenge."

On the same evening he did not see the prisoner till eleven o'clock; he then saw both Price and Innis go to their cabins. After he had been in bed a short time, he heard the prisoner come out of his cabin, and go to the cabin of the deceased. From that he went to the fire-place in the hall as fast as he could go. He returned a second time to Price's cabin. He stayed a second or two, and then again went to the fire place, and once more returned to Price's cabin. In a little time he heard him shut the door softly, and thought no more of it till about a quarter of an hour afterwards, Bryan came to him, and told him for God's sake to get up, as the boatswain, Price, was murdered.

John Hawford, another pensioner, corroborated the above account.

James Bryan gave evidence as follows:—"I lay in the same cabin with the deceased; we were talking together not ten minutes before he was murdered. The prisoner's cabin was nearly opposite to ours. I heard the prisoner open our door softly, and he looked in; we appeared both asleep. As soon as he looked in, he went away

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

towards the hall fire-place. He had on a great coat and two night-caps. He came back, and when he came in our cabin, he looked at me attentively. He again went away, and returned with the poker. He turned round, and gave me another attentive look, and immediately after struck Price four or six heavy blows on the head. At the first blow his head crashed, but I don't know whether the others hit him. As soon as he had done it, he again turned and looked at me, but I lay still as though asleep. He then went out, and hauled the door softly after him, but did not lock it. As soon as he was gone, I got up and gave the alarm, and the prisoner was secured."

James Curran, another pensioner, described the state in which he found the deceased.

The prisoner's defence was, "that the witnesses were in a conspiracy against him;" but the jury instantly found him guilty. He was executed, and his body dissected in the Hospital.

## STEPHEN STILWELL

### *Executed on the Top of the New Gaol, Southwark, March 26, 1803, for the Murder of His Wife*

STEPHEN STILWELL, a publican at the Three Jolly Gardeners, at Mortlake, was tried for the murder of his wife, September 28, 1802, at the Surrey assizes held at Kingston, before Mr. Justice Heath, Thursday, March 24, 1803. Mr. Nolan, who appeared as counsel for the prosecution, stated, that the prisoner at the bar stood indicted for a crime, which must be the offspring of a most abandoned and cruel disposition. He had for some time lived as a gardener in the family of a gentleman at Mortlake; and the woman, whom he had murdered, also lived as servant in that family; he therefore had every opportunity of being acquainted with her temper and manners previous to his taking her for his wife. They were married from that place, and took a public-house at Mortlake. It would not be regular for him to detail the various instances of cruelty which he had exercised towards his wife, except as connected with the present charge; but he should prove that he frequently declared he would murder her.

On the 28th, he quarrelled with his wife, and turned her from the kitchen to the bar, telling her that was her place, and added, "It was no matter, for she had but a few days to live." On the 27th, in the evening, they were seen together, by two lodgers in the house, sitting in the bar, and apparently in amity; but the next morning he perpetrated the horrid crime. It would also appear that he had attempted another mode of death, for a loaded pistol was found lying by her, the lock of which was down, as though the trigger had been drawn, and it had missed fire. The learned counsel dwelt upon the aggravated circumstances of this crime, in which the foul crime of murder was rendered more heinous, by being against a wife whom he had solemnly sworn at God's altar to cherish and protect.

John Ward deposed as follows: "I am a baker, and live near Stilwell's house. On the 28th of September, 1802, about five o'clock, I got up to work. I was disturbed with a noise, and I went to the gate. I heard a noise in Stilwell's room. I heard his voice. He was saying, "Come, get up, your time is expired." I stood a little time, and heard a scream. Mrs. S. said, "My dear Stilwell, don't murder me." When I heard that, I went to an opposite window where I knew a soldier lay, and called him up. In about ten minutes I saw the prisoner come out of doors at the front door; but, before I saw him, I heard a stamping on the floor of the prisoner's room. Soon after I saw the prisoner run out of the front door. He ran away, and I followed him. In about a minute I came up. Knight, a man I had called on passing by, first laid hold of him. His hands and clothes were sprinkled with blood. We bound him with a cord, and I left him in custody of Benjamin Knight. On cross-examination the witness said, that when he heard the stamping, he also heard the prisoner exclaiming, "that he had gained his liberty;" and when he came out, he said, "D-n that house, set it on fire," (meaning his own house.)

Benjamin Knight deposed—"I was called by the last witness; I was going by the house, and listened at the window. I heard two of three groans, and heard the prisoner saying, that 'he had gained his liberty.' I then went into the yard; and, as there was a table under the window, I got upon it, in order to look in at the window; and then I heard a person quit the room, and run downstairs. I immediately went round, and saw Stilwell come out of the front door; his clothes were all bloody. I and another

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

man went upstairs, and saw the deceased on the ground. The floor was over my shoes in blood, near the deceased's head. I immediately ran down, and pursued the prisoner. Mr. Ward came to my assistance, and we overtook him. He struck me several times: when we found him, he appeared collected. He asked me to slack the cords, and not to hurt him."

Charles Barwood said, "he was a carpenter, and lodged at the prisoner's house. On the 28th of September, in the morning, he heard a noise in the prisoner's room: the witness slept in a room not far from the prisoner's room. He heard the noise of a person apparently singing. He then heard Mrs. Stilwell screaming out, "Oh, Stilwell, dear Stilwell!" then he heard a loud knocking, and the prisoner singing, "You have given me such liberty." He dressed himself, came down, and was going out at the back-door. "I saw," said he, "Stilwell at the foot of the stairs, but I did not observe his dress at that time. As I went round the house, I saw him come out of the front door; his face was bloody, and he said, "d—n, do you set fire to that house." I went upstairs with Benjamin Knight. Mrs. S. was lying on the floor, with her head all beat to pieces. A pistol was lying near. I saw the prisoner and his wife about eight or nine o'clock the preceding evening in the bar together, and they seemed very comfortable."

William Bardolph lodged in Stilwell's house, and slept with the last witness; he heard the noise on the morning of the 28th. It came from Stilwell's room: he heard him singing, and presently after the woman screaming out. Stilwell was singing, "I have gained my sweet liberty." We went down, and Stilwell came down swearing after us. We went out (said the witness) at the back door: he went out at the front door, and said, "Set the house on fire." He accompanied the last witness to the room, and described the state of the deceased as the last witness had done.

John Davis, a surgeon at Mortlake, stated that he was sent for in consequence of the murder of the deceased. He examined the body, and found she had been killed by several violent blows which she had received; a great portion of her brains had been forced out on the right side of her head. He found a pistol, the handle of which was broke, and covered with blood and brains—(here the prisoner fainted away.) It was produced in court.

Elizabeth Carter, servant of the prisoner, had lived with him three weeks on the day of the murder: he appeared always sensible, but frequently said he would murder her. The prisoner, in his defence, only said, that he did not know what he did; his mind was very much distressed by her aggravating temper.

Mr. Serjeant Best, for the defence, called one witness of the name of Brown. He stated, that the week before the murder, he was with Stilwell in his garden. He did not then seem to know what he was about: he cut down his French beans, and pruned away all his rose trees. Brown asked him to go and have a pint of porter with him; but Stilwell said, he would not drink, and he never wished to go into his own house again, for they all made him miserable.

Mr. Justice Heath said, the only question for the jury was, whether they could possibly infer insanity; for that was the defence insinuated by the last witness. It appeared to him, that the prisoner had worked himself up to a frenzy of passion, so as not to know what he was about; but that was not insanity. Men must restrain the turbulence of their passions, or answer the consequences. It seemed that the galling yoke which had wrought him to the commission of this desperate deed, was the unhappiness of domestic circumstances; but that was not insanity. Insanity was a

## SUPPLEMENT 2

bodily disease, and did not originate in ill temper and passion. If, therefore, they found that the fact arose from a criminal indulgence of the passions, they must find him guilty. The jury, without any hesitation, returned a verdict of guilty.

The greater part of the trial the prisoner was perfectly calm; but just as the verdict was given, he became dreadfully agitated, and could scarcely be supported. The learned judge, observing that the prisoner was not in a condition to profit by admonition from his agitation, immediately passed sentence.

At nine o'clock he came on the scaffold, preceded by the under-sheriff and the gaoler. As soon as he came up, and saw the fatal beam, he fell on his knees in a state of the utmost agony. The executioner immediately proceeded to do his duty, in affixing the halter round his neck. On being addressed by Mr. Winkworth, the chaplain, he seemed to resume his fortitude, and prayed for near a quarter of an hour. At the departure of the clergyman, the cap was pulled over his eyes; when he fervently exclaimed, "Lord be merciful to me, a sinner;" which he continued repeating till the fall of the drop put an end to his existence. He had previously taken the sacrament in the chapel, and conducted himself in the most penitent manner possible, acknowledging the crime for which he suffered, and hoping that his death would be a warning to others not to give way to their passions. After hanging the usual time, his body was cut down, and delivered to the surgeons for dissection.

**JOHN THOMPSON, ALIAS KELLY**

***A Mean and Cowardly Robber, Executed at Newgate, October 6. 1803, for Robbing and Ill-Treating a Poor Defenceless Old Woman***

This offender, who was a person of a most ferocious appearance, aged forty-two, was indicted at the Old Bailey, July 6, before Mr. Justice Lawrence, for assaulting Mary Hurst, widow, whose very appearance was enough to excite commiseration; and robbing her of a wicker basket, containing a set of knitting-needles, books, ballads, cotton laces, pin-cushions, &c. by the sale of which she gained her livelihood.

The object of this man's brutal behaviour, was a poor miserable woman, upwards of eighty years of age, palsied in every part of her frame, and unable to move a step without assistance. Her story, part of which delicacy obliges us to conceal, was as follows: "On the 27th of May, at eleven o'clock at night, I was going to Hertford. I came from Turnham-green, was short of money, and wanted to follow the waggon for company. There was a man up against the pales, by a bush, of a dark complexion, dressed in a jacket, who knocked me down with his fist, and beat me as long as he could"—(the prisoner now took great liberties.) "I cried murder! he threatened to pull my tongue out if I cried out any more. He struck me everywhere—My head was as big as a peck, and he stamped upon my stomach. He then ran away with my basket, and did not leave me a halfpenny worth to sell. No creature came near me. I crawled upon my hands and knees till I met a watchman, who guided me to an ale-house."

Richard Gibbs, the watchman, corroborated the poor old woman's story. He declared she was in a very piteous condition: the blood ran out of her mouth; her eyes very much swelled; her hands bloody all over: in short, she was quite frightful for anyone to see.

Matthew Wells, the ostler, at the Chaise and Horses, at Hammersmith, swore, that between twelve and one o'clock the prisoner was at the Chaise and Horses; no one was with him: he staid about half an hour, and he had the basket at that time, which stood upon the table before him. After he was gone, about an hour and a half, the watchman brought in the old woman; and in consequence of what they told him, the witness, about a quarter before three o'clock in the morning, rode with Mr. Rutter, a butcher, in Oxendon-street, in pursuit of the man.

The witness then went back into Piccadilly, and met the prisoner (with a basket) three doors on the other side of Air-street. It rained very hard, and the witness having accosted him, asked if he was not wet. He said only a little wet at his back. Witness then remarked, he had not come far; but the prisoner confessed he had come from Brentford. The witness then invited him to take some purl with him; and when they had got about one hundred and twenty yards, Wells seized him by the collar, and told him he was his prisoner. The watchman was in his box, and they took him to Wine-street watch-house, where the witness took the basket from him, and delivered it to the constable of the night.

Charles Luppino, constable, said, that he asked the prisoner when brought to the watch-house his name, and he told him it was John Kelly, but the next morning, at the office, he said his name was John Thompson, and that John Kelly was the man

## SUPPLEMENT 2

who had beat the woman. This witness produced the basket, which was sworn to by the prosecutrix. He also said, that the prisoner was dressed in a blue jacket when brought to the watch house; and that the next morning, when the old woman saw him, she exclaimed, "that is the villain."

The prisoner in his defence said, that a sailor in Piccadilly gave him the basket to hold, while he did a little job for himself. He denied ever being at the Chaise and Horses.

The prisoner's guilt, having been fully established, the jury, without any hesitation, returned a verdict of guilty. His condemnation appeared to give universal satisfaction. This hardened wretch was ordered for execution on Wednesday, Sept. 21, 1803; but, having been respited for fourteen days, he did not suffer till Thursday, October the 6th. He was brought out of Newgate on the platform in the Old Bailey, a few minutes after eight o'clock, and, after spending a short time in fervent prayer, he was then launched into eternity.

**MARY PARNELL**

*Executed at Newgate, July 12, 1804, for Forgery*

THE mischief attending forgery is still greater in the hands of a female of address, than of the greatest adept of the other sex; because in putting off the counterfeit, she is less suspected. When we came to the case of Anne Hurle, we did not, indeed, expect so soon to bring forward another woman guilty, even in a greater degree, of the same mischievous offence. Ann Hurle made her attempt upon a weak individual; but Mary Parnell took the public at large to impose upon, to the ruin of many a poor family.

Mary Parnell was, according to her own account, an unfortunate girl, aged twenty-three, who was indicted at the Old Bailey, July 12, 1804, for feloniously forging, on the 9th of the preceding March, a certain Bank of England note, value 5*l.*, with intent to defraud the Governors and Company of the Bank of England. There were several other indictments of a similar nature.

Charles Baddeley, a shoe maker, in the Strand, swore, that the prisoner came to his shop, March 9, and purchased two pair of shoes: they came to twelve shillings and six-pence: the prisoner tendered him a 5*l.* note. Having looked at it, and compared it with another, he did not think it was a good one, and asked her where she had taken it. She said she could not tell. She took another bank-note out of her pocket, which appeared a good one. This, however, he returned, and said he would keep the first that she tendered, and take it to Bow street, or the Bank, on Monday morning, desiring her to come on the Monday morning, when she should either have the note or the change. The prisoner never called on the appointed day. This witness was particular in identifying the person of the prisoner: as she held her pocket-book in her hand, he observed, that one of her fingers was cut across: it was an old sore.

William Wilmot, foreman to Mr. Baggett, shoe-maker, Cranbourne-alley, Leicester-fields, said, that the prisoner came to his master's shop, March 9, about eleven o'clock in the evening, and asked for two pair of shoes, one pair of double soles, and one pair of single; the price was eleven shillings and six-pence. She tendered a 5*l.* Bank of England note: it had no name whatever on it: it was quite new. She drew it from a little red pocket-book: she seemed to be confused while doing this, and appeared to have more notes in the pocket book. The witness had not change enough in the till, and his master was not at home; he went, therefore, to Mr. Perkins, linen draper, next door to Mr. Baggett's, and procured change for the note. On his return, his master came in: he gave the change to him, and Mr. Baggett gave it to the prisoner, who took it and the shoes. William Perkins, linen-draper, corroborated the testimony of this last witness; and William Smith, a Bow street patrol, said, he found a pair of shoes in the prisoner's lodgings, and showed them to Wilmot, who thought they were the shoes he sold to the prisoner: they were double soles, and of the same size and description.

Ann Levermore, who keeps the Pewter Platter, St. John-street, West Smithfield, said, that the young woman at the bar, came to her house some day between the 19th and 24th of March, for a quart of brandy, the price six shillings: she said she had nothing smaller than a 5*l.* note, which she took out of her pocket-book. The witness went upstairs for change, and a friend of hers, Elizabeth Walter, who was sitting in the bar, saw her very much agitated. The witness gave her the change, and

## SUPPLEMENT 2

she asked the price of the bottle, which was three pence. She told her to take sixpence for it. The witness gave the note to Mr. Harris, the collector of Mr. Hanbury the brewer. She knew the note by the paleness of the Britannia, and the figures, 4 and 8, being larger than the others. Elizabeth Walter confirmed the above. She suspected the note was a bad one, from the agitation of the prisoner; and when she was going away with the brandy, she desired her friend to send her little girl out, to watch where she went to.

James Cook, an apothecary, residing in Bridge Road, Surrey, said, that the prisoner at the bar came to his shop in the middle of April, to purchase a bottle of Gowland's Lotion. She offered a 5*l.* note, and not having change, he directed his boy to get change for the note—She seemed anxious for the boy's return, and wished to get out, to see where he was gone. She was afraid, she said, the boy had lost the note. He was only gone about five or ten minutes. On his return, he gave her the remainder of the change. She had on a gown, with a white ground, and a chocolate spot. Robert Godyere, the boy, (twelve years old,) said, he went to the next door, as ordered by his master, to get change; but the shop being shut up, he went to Mr. Gower, who keeps the Red Lion, Globe-place, who gave it to him. William Gower confirmed the boy's testimony, and identified the note.

John Willats, a cutler, in the Poultry, said, the prisoner came to him on the 3d of May, and purchased a dozen knives and forks, which came to thirty-three shillings. She offered a 5*l.* note in payment, and gave her address, Ann Brown, No 57, Wood street, which name and address he wrote on the note. Stephen Walker, who lived two years at No. 37, Wood street, Cheapside, said, that no person of the name of Brown, nor the prisoner at the bar, ever resided in the house since he lived there.

The inspector of bank-notes of the Bank of England, and the engraver to the Bank, proved Mr. Baddeley's note, Mr Bagget's note, Mrs. Levermore's, Mr. Cook's and Mr. Willats's forgeries:—they were signed also with names, which did not exist in the Bank as cashiers.

Edward Crocker, one of the Bow-street patrols, who searched the prisoner's lodgings, in company with Mr. Bliss, found a gown, (which the prisoner acknowledged to be hers,) and a bottle of lotion. Mr. Cook said, that the bottle was like that which he sold, and the gown like that which the woman had on that purchased it. The prisoner, in her defence, said, she was a very remarkable person, and it was very odd they could not give a better description of her. She had a particular cut on her hand, as well as on her finger, and she had but one eye, which had not been observed by any of the witnesses. As for the Gowland's Lotion, a gentleman, she said, made her a present of it, with a shawl. She had no witnesses in her behalf, and the jury found her guilty. She was executed as above-mentioned.

**ELIZABETH LARGHAN**

***Executed at Chelmsford, March 21, 1804, for the Murder of  
her Female Infant Child***

THIS wretched woman was tried on the 8th of March, 1804, before Mr. Baron Hotham, at the Chelmsford Assizes; she was the wife of James Larghan, a private in the 18th light dragoons. This was not the usual case of the murder of a bastard child. The facts were very few, and very conclusive; they were proved by the woman who kept the Sawyer's-Arms public-house at Colchester, and her servants. James Philbrick, the surgeon, stated, that he was called in on the 13th of July last; he was shown the child, which, from appearances, he undertook to say, had been born alive. A string was tied round the neck, by which the vessel of the head was very turgid, and the eyes much blood-shot. The ligature had also caused a livid mark all round the neck. The bag was very much blooded, which would not have been the case if the child had been dead-born. She then told him, that her husband had often upbraided her with his being reproached by his comrades, that she was with child before he married her, and that the child of which she was pregnant, was none of his; and that, in order to keep the secret of her delivery from her husband, she had tied the string round the infant's neck to prevent its crying.

Mr. Baron Hotham addressed the jury with his usual humanity on behalf of the accused, and observed, that this was not the case which usually occurred, of the death of a bastard child: but it was one in which the indictment charged the prisoner with the murder of her child, without those motives which sometimes leads to the commission of that crime. He told them, that before they found a verdict of guilty against the prisoner, they must be convinced in their own minds that the child was born alive, and that it perished by the wilful act of the prisoner; for if it was born dead, or came by its death accidentally, though the prisoner was not aware of its death, and applied the string meaning to destroy it, yet if she did not in fact perpetrate that intention, they must acquit her. The jury deliberated about half an hour, and then returned a verdict of Guilty.

The learned judge, in a short but feeling address, passed the sentence of the law upon the prisoner, that she should be hanged on Saturday morning next (March 21st,) and afterwards her body to be dissected and anatomized. The prisoner was a very decent looking woman apparently about thirty years of age. During her trial she was much agitated, and after the verdict seemed nearly insensible: at the place of execution she behaved with penitence and great resignation.

**GEORGE KENNEDY, MARTIN MOODY, AND RICHARD  
BARTON**

*Soldiers of the Foot Guards Convicted of a Robbery, Attended  
with Circumstances of Cruelty*

These men, to the disgrace of the character of the soldier, were indicted for assaulting and dangerously wounding, on the 14th of November, 1804, on the King's highway, between Sandwich and Deal, George John Piercy Leith, and feloniously robbing him of a quantity of bank notes, a silver watch, and some money.

Mr. Leith deposed, that he lived at Walmer, and on the 14th of November he had been at Sandwich-market: in the evening he was returning home to his house, which was about six miles from Sandwich. It was a fine evening, and the moon shone very bright. When he came to Shouldham-Downs, where the road turns off towards Fowlney chalk-pit, he observed three soldiers walking before him; one was in a red jacket faced with blue, the uniform of the guards; and the other two had foraging dresses. When he came up with them he received a violent blow on the left cheek, which knocked out one of his teeth, and swelled his eye so as to blind him. At the same instant, the man who gave the blow called out to the other in red, "Comrade, stop him." His horse started out of the road, and went a little way over the ploughed ground, but the bridle was seized by the man in a round frock. One of them said, "Your money;" another said, "Yes, and soon." Whether he received another blow at this instant he could not tell, or whether he was pulled off; but, he fell from his horse, which ran away. They left him for a moment as he lay upon the ground; but, seeing them approach him again, he put his hand in his pocket, and gave them the bag containing the notes and money. One of them, with great dexterity, put his finger into his fob, and hooked out his watch, which he wore without a chain. They then all ran away. The prosecutor got up, and saw the moon, shining very bright on the turnpike-road: he soon after met a James Wyburn, and, with his assistance, got home. He would not swear to the persons of any of the prisoners, but he thought that Barton was the man in red, and Kennedy the one who stood at the head of his horse. He had that day at Sandwich received sixteen five-guinea and sixteen one-guinea notes.

Serjeant John Rutter, of the third battalion of the first regiment of guards, deposed, that Barton and Moody belonged to the same company as himself, and Kennedy to the same regiment. On the Thursday, the fifteenth of November, as the witness was visiting the quarters of the married men who lived out of the Barracks, he saw Moody come into a public-house in Deal. Moody asked another soldier if he would drink, and offered to treat him with half-a-pint of gin if he would go out with him. The serjeant said, he had seen the hand-bills that morning, which gave an account of the robbery, and he knew that Moody had no money the day before, because the witness had lent him a shilling. Finding that he was apparently flush of money, it raised his suspicion: he, however, said nothing, but went home to the Barracks. Barton had been sent to the guard-house that evening, for coming drunk to the parade; and, about eight o'clock, Moody came in, and asked, "If all was well?" The witness supposed he meant to ask, whether he was home in time, and answered, "Yes." He then enquired why Barton was in custody, and was told, for being drunk at parade. He next asked the witness, if he had any objection to let a comrade sing a song, as they were undressing; the serjeant replied, that as it was not nine he had no objection to the song. He watched Moody as he was undressing, and observed him to

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

take the jacket from under the head of his bed-fellow, who was asleep, and substitute his own, putting Austin's, the other man's, under his own head. The witness was obliged then to leave them to attend the roll-call of non-commissioned officers. He then concerted with Serjeant Young, and it was agreed that the latter should come into Moody's room, and say, that he had orders to search all men in liquor. In consequence of this plan, Serjeant Young came in shortly after, and searched Moody's bed: he took his jacket from under Austin's head, and between the cloth and the lining they found the watch, and three one-guinea notes, answering the description in the hand-bill.

Serjeant Aylesbury deposed, that Barton was committed to custody that day for being drunk at parade. Moody came in that day about four, and he observed that he had some private talk along with Barton. At about a quarter before nine, the witness received orders to search Barton, which he did, and between the lining and cloth of his jacket-sleeves, he found several bank-notes, all of which corresponded in number and value with those described in the hand-bills, advertising the robbery. He delivered them all over to Serjeant-major Colquhoun. The serjeant-major was called, who corroborated the testimony of the last witness, and deposed, that he delivered them over to the constable in the presence of the magistrate.

Thomas Simmons, a victualler at Walmer, deposed, that the morning after the three prisoners were taken into custody, he went to the guard-room about half-past seven, to carry the serjeants on guard some beer. Moody complained that he was uncomfortable, and begged the serjeant to take his hand-cuffs off for a little while, that he might tighten himself up. The serjeant said he could not do that, but if he would sit upon the table he would button his gaiters and jacket for him. He did so; and as he was buttoning his jacket about the breast, he said, "Moody, you have no collar on." Moody replied, "Never mind, we shall soon have a hempen collar that will fit us all." Barton said, "If you have one, I shall have one too, for I stopped his horse," Kennedy joined, and said, "But it was I who demanded his money; and as he did not give it, I brought him down with a topper of my bludgeon: I thought the horse had stamped upon his head when he was down." [Note: This confession somewhat savours of that of the three wicked fellow crafts in Masonic history, Jubela, Jabels, and Jubelum; who murdered their grand master Hiram Abiff, the widow's son, because he would not disclose the master mason's sign and word before they had become entitled to the sublime parts of that most ancient order.] They then said, that after he was down, they robbed him of a handful of notes, his watch, a half-guinea, and a crown-piece. Barton said to Kennedy, "I am sorry you beat him: when we went out I ordered you to rob but not to murder." They then described what they had severally done after the robbery. They had all made the best of their way to the Barracks, passing Deal-castle, and they buried the notes that night under a large stone between the Castle and the Beach. Moody and Barton said, that they went home to bed. Kennedy said he went to the Canteen, where he got a roll, a herring, and a pint of beer to refresh himself.

Serjeants Aylesbury and Young both corroborated this account of the last witness; and said the prisoners described what they had done in a kind of bravado manner, William Wyburn, the constable, produced the notes and watch, which was sworn to by Mr. Leith; and he added, that he had also lost half-a-guinea and a crown-piece, as stated by the prisoners, although they were not stated in the indictment.

Mr. Hodgson, a partner in the Sandwich-bank, examined the notes, and comparing them with his book, deposed, that they were all paid by him to Mr. Leith,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

at Sandwich, on the day of the robbery. The jury found all the prisoners guilty. Barton, who was a very handsome man, pleaded much, with the judge for his life: and from it having appeared that he was the least cruel of the three he received a respite, and was sent to serve his country the remainder of his life in some distant settlement, but Kennedy and Moody were executed.

**SAMUEL WILD MITCHELL**

***Executed before Newgate, January 14, 1805, for the Murder of  
his Infant Daughter***

IN pity to the memory of this wretched old man, we are inclined to hope that a sudden fit of frenzy alone hurried him to the commission of this most unnatural, horrid, and cruel murder. Samuel Mitchel was a weaver; and the very day before he had murdered his daughter, a separation had taken place between him and his wife, and the child, Sally, went that night to the lodgings which her mother had taken for herself. On the next morning the little innocent returned, and was employed in quilling (i.e. putting silk on a shuttle for her father to weave with,) when the inhuman parent took a razor, and cut the child's throat from one ear to the other: the wound was four inches in length, and two inches in depth. He then left the house, confessed his guilt to an acquaintance, and then wandered about the streets till evening, when he found his way to his son-in-law's house, and was there apprehended. The officers went to his room, where the razor was found open, and covered with blood, within four or five feet of the unfortunate deceased: and, at the time the child was found, the blood was actually warm. After this had taken place, and the coroner had done what his duty required him to do, the prisoner was taken before a magistrate; and, after every merciful warning from the magistrate, he voluntarily chose to depose, and did confess the whole of this horrid transaction.

His trial came on at the Sessions-House, in the Old Bailey, Jan. 12, 1805, before Sir Archibald Macdonald, Knight, Lord Chief Baron of his Majesty's Court of Exchequer. The appearance of the prisoner, when brought to the bar, was squalid and wretched in the extreme: his hair was grey, and his head was covered with an old miserable night-cap.

William Godby deposed, that he had been married to the daughter of the prisoner for more than eight years; that the prisoner lived, on the 18th of December, 1804, in Wheeler-street, almost opposite Flower-de-luce court, Spitalfields, in the parish of Christ-church; that the prisoner was a married man; that he lodged in the top room of the house; his wife, and his child Sally, the deceased, had lived with him, but he and his wife had been separated the day before this horrid transaction. The prisoner at the bar was a weaver, and Sally, the deceased, used to be employed in winding quills for her father. He saw the prisoner at nine o'clock in the morning of this transaction, and did not see him again on that day, till about ten o'clock at night: he saw the prisoner at the house where he, the witness, lodged, and he told him he should not come into his room. About half-past twelve on the same day, after he had been to the warehouse with his work, he went up to see him; and, when he came into his room, he saw the child, Sally, lying in her blood, but did not notice the wound, he was so alarmed: he went down to the room under the prisoner's, and told Mrs. Nicholls, who lived in that room; he then went away: he had some of his master's property about him, and that he carried home: he returned a second time, and went into the room again, and saw Mr. Kennedy, the officer, there.

Mrs. Nicholls said, that she lived in the room immediately under the prisoner; that she was at home on the 18th of December, and said that the prisoner's wife had been with him that morning; that she had a light of her (to light his fire) before eleven o'clock; and that she heard Sally, the deceased, go upstairs, on her return from Spitalfields' charity-school, about twelve o'clock; she knew it was the little girl by the

## SUPPLEMENT 2

step, and that when she got into her father's room, she heard the quill wheel go, and she heard the prisoner's loom make a noise, which it usually did when he was weaving; shortly after she heard a woman go downstairs, and after that she heard a man's foot, but did not see either of them; that the prisoner had previously called out to her, a little before twelve, to know what o'clock it was; and that Godby, the former witness, came to her in about half an hour after she heard the quill wheel go, and the noise of the prisoner's loom when he was weaving; that she went up with him, and saw Sally, the deceased, lying in her gore of blood; that she saw nothing of the wound, was afraid of going into the room, and called out to the landlord, "murder!" upon which he came up.

William Byron deposed, that he was on the 18th of December, the landlord of the house, No. 24, Wheeler street, but had since removed, and that the prisoner, at that time, lodged in the garret. That on the alarm of murder, he went upstairs, and took the child by the hand; then putting his feet across the body, he lifted her up by the waist, when her head fell back, and the gash appeared to him; he then gave the alarm, that her throat was cut, and desired them to go for a surgeon, and for her father, who he supposed was at the Elder-tree public-house, just by: he then looked round the room, to see he could find any instrument, but could not. He observed the quill-wheel was bloody, and the track of blood about the room; her cap was bloody, lying in the room, and she was all over blood, and so was he.

Edward Dellafour, a journeyman broad-silk weaver, saw the prisoner on the 18th, between the hours of twelve and one, at his apartments, No 26, Skinner-street, Shoreditch. He was at work, and the prisoner knocked at his door, upon which he let him in. The prisoner asked him to go down stairs with him, as he had something particular to communicate. He refused to leave his work, unless he would tell him his business; the prisoner then said, something had happened that day, which never had happened before, and that he should go to Newgate. Seeing him in that violent perturbation of mind, he reluctantly left his work; the prisoner having gone down stairs; and, anxious to know the cause of it, he followed, and found him at the street-door; they went about 50 yards from the witness's door; the prisoner then, with a countenance full of grief, turned round to him and said, "Ned, I shall die!" The witness asked him what had happened, or what was the matter with him; the prisoner said directly to him, "I have killed my Sally." The witness asked him if the child was dead; the prisoner said, "Yes, I have cut her head half off." It was a very severe morning, and the prisoner was shivering with cold; the prisoner desired the witness to go with him into a public-house, that he might warm himself, and have something to drink; they went into the first public-house they came to, which was the Cock and Magpie, in Worship-street, and had a pot of beer; the prisoner called for it, and a pipe of tobacco. There were three men and a woman there, entire strangers to the witness. The prisoner then said to the witness in the tap room, "Sit down, I have something to say to you." Seeing the strangers in the room, the witness thought it imprudent to speak before them, and desired the prisoner not to say it there; in about a quarter of an hour they went out. The witness asked the prisoner where he was going, and what he meant to do with himself. He said he was going to Shadwell to see two friends of his who were rope-makers, who would, when he was in prison, allow him a shilling or two; he then asked when the sessions would begin—the witness told him; he said, he would give himself up to justice, and suffer, with this remark, "it would make no odds to him if they cut him in a thousand pieces, for that when he went hundreds would at the same minute." The witness told him he should not have killed his child. The

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

prisoner looked him in the face, and said, "I know that—do not you retort on me now it is done." The witness accompanied him as far as Whitechapel church, then shook him by the hand, and saw him no more till he saw him at the office; the witness said, the magistrate sent for him, and he gave the same account at that time as he now gave. When in the public-house with him, he observed a small quantity of blood on one of his hands.

Thomas Grice, a watchman of Bethnal-green, said that two men came to their watch-house, and gave information that the prisoner was in Hare-street, at his daughter's, and there the witness apprehended him, and took him to Bethnal-green watch-house, and then went and delivered him up to the officer of the Spitalfields watch house; as soon as he saw the prisoner, the prisoner said, he was the man that was guilty of the murder, and resigned himself up.

James Kennedy, an officer of Worship-street, received information of the murder about one o'clock in the afternoon, and went with Bishop into the prisoner's room, and there saw the deceased lying with her head towards the door, with no cap on, and her throat cut quite through the windpipe; she had done bleeding when the witness saw her, but the blood lying on the floor was warm. On the block of the quill-wheel there was a quantity of blood, and a track of blood from the wheel to where the body lay. Near the quill-wheel there was a low stool, and at the side of it he found a razor open. It was covered with fresh blood at that time. [This he produced in court, and a cap of the deceased, stained with blood, that had fallen from her head.] He, seeing there was no prospect of restoring life, with the assistance of Bishop, put the people out of the room. About twelve at night they received information that he was in Spitalfields watch-house. Armstrong and he went there, to satisfy themselves, and saw the prisoner sitting by the watch-house fire. He turned his head round, and saw the witness. He said, "Kennedy, I have given you much trouble today in searching after me." Armstrong said to him, "What do you mean by that? Is your name Mitchell?" He said it was. Armstrong again asked him, did he know he was charged with murdering his own daughter; and said, he had found a cap and a razor in his room. The prisoner then answered, with that razor he had often shaved himself, and with that razor he committed the horrid deed.

Joseph Moser, Esq. the magistrate of Worship-street office, stated, that the prisoner was brought before him to be examined on Wednesday, the 19th of December: he took down the whole confession of the prisoner in writing, telling him the consequences in every point of view, and the use that would be made of it after he had signed it: he repeated it over to him several times, said it was true what he had signed, and signed it in the magistrate's presence. The prisoner's examination, being now read in court, was as follows:

"Public-Office, Worship Street.

"The voluntary confession of Samuel Mitchell, weaver, for the wilful murder of his child, aged nine years, taken by Joseph Moser, Esq. December 19, 1804.

"I, Samuel Wild Mitchell, weaver, late of the parish of Christ-church, Middlesex, now standing at the bar of the Public office, Worship-street, being fully apprised of the nature of my situation by the magistrate, and through him made perfectly sensible of the nature of this acknowledgment, do make this free and unbiassed confession, which is taken by my own desire:—That I had a daughter named Sally, and my wife had a daughter named Elizabeth, who at one time did live with me, but whom I afterwards took to my apartment, where I instructed her in the art of weaving, and we lived all together; this said daughter of my wife's caused some

## SUPPLEMENT 2

uneasiness, as I thought: and I thought my wife was more indulgent to her faults, and favoured her more than she ought, which was the reason of our separation on the 17th of December last; my wife also took with her Sarah Mitchell, whom I loved with the most ardent affection, which vexed me a great deal, as I saw there would be a continual dispute. I could not bear the little girl coming to see me, as coming on a visit. I resolved that neither my wife nor me should possess her. I seized the moment of the mother going away: the child was sitting by the fire winding quills. I took the razor from the drawer; my affection made me almost lay it down again; but my resolution overcame that. I turned round, and cut her throat. I was too resolute to make a faint attempt; the child was dead in a moment; she neither made noise nor resistance. When I had done the deed, the child fell. , As I went out, I saw her blood; then I ran downstairs. After this act was done to my child, Sarah Mitchell, I went to a man named Bell, where I had lived, and left word for him to run and secure my master's work; then I went to Mr. Delafour, and my friends at Wapping

This acknowledgment is free, and made by my own desire.

Signed SAMUEL WILD MITCHELL.

Dec. 19, 1804.

JOSEPH MOSER."

The prisoner having been now called on for his defence the wretched man addressed the court and jury in a manner above his rank or appearance. His defence was nearly as follows:

"My Lord, and Gentlemen of the Jury,

"I stand in this place to-day, an awful spectacle of guilt and disgrace; but I will endeavour to be as collected in my reason as possible, though at certain times and seasons I am particularly under heavy pressure of mind, which my wife well knows, and was well aware of; that I have committed the horrid deed laid to my charge I have no wish to deny, any more than I have to avoid the dreadful punishment that awaits my guilt; to that I am resigned; nor was it my wish from the unfortunate moment of my crime to evade justice; but that I committed the deed maliciously against my poor child, who was the victim of my fatal passion, I solemnly deny. Malice I had none. I declare in the presence of God, before whom I stand and make this declaration, and before whose awful tribunal I must shortly appear, instead of bearing to her malice, I loved her most tenderly. I had kind love to the child, and wished her not to be from me, and to that love, strange, and perverse as it may be seem, is owing chiefly the sad cause that brings me here this day. I am married to a second wife, by whom this child was an only daughter: we had long known each other before our marriage, when I was in better days, and when she and I were the wife and husband of others. I thought I could be happy with her; but I found her temper incompatible with my happiness or her own. I found the friends and the family with which she was connected thought her marriage to me degrading to her. Disputes and controversy, for ten years, frequently took place between us; in which, unhappily, both were in fault, too much so; those disputes were often carried to a pitch of fury (and may this sad spectacle that I now stand be a warning to others, that if they meet with double families to have more love to their duty); and what tended still more to exasperate me and aggravate our dissensions was, that those she called her friends always sided with her in everything, whether right or wrong; and many of them, I am sorry to say, who were strenuous professors of religious principles, were always more ready to lend a hand to the creating of mischief, than to the promotion of charity and peace:—may the Lord forgive them and take me to himself. Our disputes at last ended in a mutual agreement to separate, and the child I so tenderly loved was to go with her mother: this my

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

unhappy temper and feeling could not bear, which led me to the fatal resolution that neither she nor I should have the child, by committing the horrid deed, by putting an end to her life in the manner I have done! I pray God Almighty to forgive me, and to direct you in your decision upon me this day; and though here I stand an object of sin and misery, yet I hope my unhappy fate will prove an awful example to those who form second marriages, with children on both sides, against giving way to intemperate disputes, that may lead them, as they have done me, to acts of desperation and vengeance, beyond the control of reason or reflection. If my wife was present, she could vouch and prove that it was impossible I could ever have deliberately executed such an act. She could testify that my disposition was not cruel; and that when I have been the most resolute to good purposes, unfortunately, under agitations of mind, or provocations of temper, such has been my weakness, I am not always the same man; and, under such circumstances, I have very frequently been led into excesses of frenzy, which, in cool moments, have astonished me. Once in particular, urged by distress, when I had no work, I applied for relief at my parish work-house. I had come too late in the day, when, wound up by disappointment to madness, I broke as many windows as cost the parish four pounds for the repair; and yet the parish-officers, though they might have punished me, did not, knowing that my act was the result of a mind deranged.—May the Lord forgive me, and take me to himself! I must die a spectacle of sin and horror!"

The learned judge observed to the jury, "That the fact of a person's being overcome by any sudden paroxysm of passion to commit a deed of so flagitious a nature operated as no justification of the crime. If God afflicted any man with a temporary or occasional want of reason, that was a different question. There, from the mere occasional suspension of the reasoning faculties, the crime might have been committed; but such could by no means be compared to the case where the dereliction of the reasoning faculties had been occasioned, either by the contemplation of a circumstance, by which alone the mind was affected, or by which, after its completion, the mind could be supposed capable of being agitated. Here a strange mixture of affection was discernible amidst the cruelty which had prompted the perpetration of the deed; but he could see nothing in the case to induce him to point out to the jury any distinction between this case and the various other cases of a similar kind which presented themselves."

After the Lord Chief Baron had made his remarks, the prisoner requested permission to speak again, which was granted immediately by the court. "There is one single point I have to say, which my wife could attest, if she was here, as she was well acquainted with my misery, as well as my mother's, who would frequently go into the same way: she was a very sensible woman; she would frequently ask me to cut her hair, for, unless her hair was kept cut in a very particular close manner, her weakness was upon her. So it has been with me."

The jury having found him guilty, the prisoner was asked, what he had to say for himself, why sentence of death should not be passed according to law. The prisoner distinctly replied, "I have nothing to say." The awful sentence, that he was to be hanged the succeeding Monday, and his body afterwards dissected and anatomized, was immediately pronounced by the Recorder; which the prisoner heard without any visible emotion. The court was crowded in every part, and particularly with ladies; and not only the women, but even the jury, the counsel, and nearly all present, were melted into tears. During the whole trial the prisoner appeared calm, but not

## SUPPLEMENT 2

insensible. He was very attentive to the evidence, and declined asking any questions of the witnesses. He appeared frequently to utter a low ejaculation.

On the morning after his trial, this unhappy man expressed a desire to see his wife, that they might exchange mutual forgiveness. The day following (Sunday), she came to visit him in Newgate, but so ill, that she was obliged to be brought in a hackney-coach, supported between two friends. As soon as the distressing interview was over, he applied himself devoutly to prayer, in which he continued nearly the whole of the day. On that day he was extremely solicitous to obtain Dr. Ford's promise to publish to the world that he died in the faith of the Church of England; and he was the more anxious it should be done, as it had been generally understood that he belonged to the sect denominated Methodists. At half past six o'clock, Mitchell's cell was unlocked, and the Ordinary attended him to the chapel to prayers; which being concluded, he returned to the press-yard, and there walked for some time, holding two friends by the arms; meanwhile his mind was occupied with his unhappy situation: he begged of all around him to pray with him. He first put up a prayer to Heaven for his own soul; next invoked a blessing on his wife, his two daughters by a former marriage, his son and daughter-in law, in the most pathetic manner. The unhappy man blessed the memory of his murdered child, and trusted the sacrifice he was about to make would, in some degree, expiate his crime in Heaven, which he did not despair to see. Then, in language which would have done credit to the pulpit or the bar, he besought God to grant His Majesty health and long life; to endue his ministers with wisdom, that it might be applied to the happiness and prosperity of his country, which, notwithstanding the convulsions by which it was surrounded, he prayed might endure under its present form of government till time shall be no more. He then expressed his gratitude to the magistrates, and to Mr. Newman, the keeper of the prison, for his humane consideration of him. He expressed himself most gratefully to Dr. Ford, for the consolation he had afforded him by his admonition and counsel, and repeatedly acknowledged, that he felt more comfort in the prospect of death, than he should in life, were a reprieve offered him. His last petition was to the Sheriffs, to request that, after the surgeons had practised upon his body, his mangled remains might be given to his daughter, for burial; which request the Sheriffs promised should be complied with.

On Monday morning, January the 14th, at a very early hour, every avenue leading to the Old Bailey was crowded by persons of various descriptions, all eager and anxious to witness the last moments of this unhappy man; indeed a greater crowd was seldom seen on any similar occasion; the houses then erecting in front of Greenharbour-court, St. Sepulchre's church, the pump, and the various lamp-irons, were all filled with the anxious multitude. About five minutes past eight o'clock the wretched delinquent came out of Newgate. His demeanour was perfectly calm, and he appeared most completely resigned to his fate. He was attended by the ordinary, who stood before him until the drop fell.

Mitchell seemed to attend with much earnestness and fervour to the admonitions of the clergyman, and he was seen to clasp his hands together the instant the rope was fixed. He was not allowed to remain long on the scaffold, as he was tied up almost on the instant after he came up. After the drop fell, he exhibited several times the appearance of feeling great pain, as he swung round twice, which was occasioned by the violence of the convulsive struggles he sustained. His body was, after hanging the usual time, cut down, and taken to St. Bartholomew's Hospital for dissection.

**JOHN ROGER TURNER**

*Executed at the Old Bailey, May 5, 1805, for Forgery*

This malefactor had been clerk to Messrs. Stonard and Ryland, Corn-factors in Mark-lane, for several years, who were in the habit of purchasing stock for their country correspondents. By this means he knew that Mr. Waltham had 10,000*l.* stock in the 3 per cent. reduced. He informed a Mr. H. Engell, that he wanted to sell out 7000*l.* stock, requesting that Mr. Engell would recommend him a broker, the one that sold for him having run away. He was accordingly recommended to Mr. John Sherrott, a stock-broker, in Ratcliffe Highway, whom he called on, on the 8th of January, 1805, and gave him orders to sell out 7000*l.* stock. Turner was accompanied by another person, who afterwards proved to be his father-in-law, Mr. Price, a shoe-maker. Mr. Sherrott said he would have the business done the next day. They accordingly went to the 3 per Cent. Reduced Office, and the necessary proceedings for setting out were resorted to. Turner gave Mr. Sherrott a receipt for the value of the 7000*l.* stock, for which he was to receive a cheque. The receipt was in the usual form, and a blank was left for the attestation of the clerk at the Bank, after the transfer should be completed. Mr. Sherrott informed Turner, that before the transfer could be completed, the clerks must be convinced of his identity. He said, that he knew no person near the 'Change since his late broker had fled, and he therefore requested that Mr. Sherrott would satisfy the clerks on this head. Mr. Sherrott, however, fortunately declined identifying the man, whom he was a stranger to; when it was agreed that he should meet Mr. Sherrott at the Bank, the next day, with a friend, who would identify him. He, however, failed in the appointment; and Sherrott did not see him till half past four that day, when he came to his house, where he said that he had been in search of a Mr. Thomas Rutt, who had purchased stock for him, in order to clear up any doubts; but that he could not see him till the next day. Mr. Sherrott expressed great displeasure at the disappointment; for the stock had rose 2 per cent. and he was obliged to sell the stock at the price agreed for. Being hurt at the thoughts of paying these two pounds out of his own pocket, he was a little warm. During this interview, a Mr. Robinson, corn-chandler, in Ratcliffe Highway, who knew Mr. Turner, came in, and addressed him by name—"How do you do, Mr. Turner?" Turner pretended that he was mistaken in his person and name. When Mr. Robinson said, "Pray, don't you live as clerk to Stonard and Ryland?" Sherrott saw that he was confused; and told him, "as you said that your name is William Waltham, and it is not, I think it my duty to take you into custody:" and accordingly he charged an officer with him.

On Friday, February 22, he was indicted at the Old Bailey, before Mr. Justice Le Blanc, for forging, uttering, and publishing, as true, a certain instrument, purporting to be a receipt for the sale of 7000*l.* of reduced 3 per cent stock, the property of William Waltham. During the trial, the above particulars were sworn to, and the receipt read, viz.—

"Reduced 3 per cent. Annuities.

"Received this 9th day of January, 1805, of Joseph Lightfoot, the sum of four thousand and seventy-seven pounds ten shillings, being the consideration for seven thousand pounds stock or share in the capital or joint stock in the 3 per cent. Reduced Annuities, consolidated by Act of Parliament, in the 22d of George II. and 25th of George III, and other subsequent Acts, charged to the sinking funds, transferable at the Bank of England, by me, this day transferred to the said Joseph Lightfoot.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

"Witness my hand,  
"W. WALTHAM."

The prisoner's counsel asserted, that, as the receipt had not been signed by the witnessing clerk, it could not have the effect of forgery; but this objection was overruled by the Court, who observed, that this indictment was for forging a receipt—it had nothing to do with a transfer.

The jury found the prisoner guilty. On Wednesday, May 8, 1805, this unfortunate culprit suffered the sentence of the law on the scaffold, opposite the Debtor's door, at Newgate. He was a young man of prepossessing appearance and gentlemanly manners, fat and florid, and about thirty-four years of age. He was dressed in a black coat and waistcoat, white plush breeches, and boots. In place of having his hands tied with a rope, as usual, he produced a new muslin handkerchief, and for his girt, a silk twist, which were substituted. When he mounted the scaffold, the rain fell, almost in torrents, and at his own request he was instantly tied up, and launched into eternity. He left a wife, children, and an aged mother, to bemoan his untimely fate.

**JOHN HARDING**

*Executed before Newgate, November 13, 1805, for Forgery*

Various as we have already described the commission of this crime, yet we find in this man's case a new species of forgery. He was indicted at the Old-Bailey, September 21st, for forging, fabricating, uttering, and publishing, as true, a stamp on the ace of spades of a pack of cards.

The attorney General opened the case on the part of the prosecution, in a very long speech, in which he stated to the jury the outline of the prisoner's transactions. The first witness called on was Mr. Hockley, the printer of the legal spade ace at the Stamp-Office. He had (in consequence of the suspicions entertained at the Stamp office, on account of the small demand the prisoner there made for stamps, and the extensive business which he seemed to carry on) very frequently made purchases of packs of cards of the prisoner, as had also his apprentice, and the stamps on the aces of spades were all forgeries. These purchases, which were very numerous, took place in the month of May, 1804. It appeared by the evidence adduced on the part of the prosecution, that the prisoner kept two shops, where these packs of cards were sold, the one in Hereford-street, Oxford street, and the other in North-row, near Grosvenor-square. On the 27th of May, Mr. Hockley ordered five dozen packs of cards to be sent to No. 74, Edgware-Road, which were accordingly sent, and the person who carried them, Vincent Jackson (as he also deposed), gave a receipt for the money (10*l.* 5*s.*) in a fictitious name (B.A. Bates); Harding having desired him to give the receipt in any name he pleased.

The prisoner's apprentice, Stephen Lepine, deposed, that he saw his master making cards on one occasion, and observed him to paste labels on them, which he gave a gloss to by putting some liquid on them. Witness also proved, that the prisoner occupied premises behind the house of Mr. Skelton, Green-street, Grosvenor square. A body of evidence was adduced to prove that the prisoner had employed a seal-engraver of the name of Leadbeater to execute aces of spades for him. Leadbeater dined with the prisoner two years since, when he asked him if he could engrave on copper. On being answered in the negative, the prisoner requested he would find some trusty artist in that branch. Leadbeater recommended a youth of the name of White, who, the prisoner was informed, could be depended on. Four duty aces were given to Leadbeater for White to imitate as closely as possible: and if he was asked any questions, he was to say they were for a foreigner at Hamburgh. White, however, was timid, and declined the task, so that all negotiations with him were abandoned. In six or seven months after, the prisoner pressed on Leadbeater to learn the art of engraving on copper, adding, that he would be at the expense of a master. Mr. Woodthorpe, a respectable engraver in Fetter-Lane, was applied to, and the witness was placed under his tuition. The prisoner's visits to Leadbeater were very frequent, and one day he showed him an old plate of the spade ace, which he wished to be touched up. Witness was unable to do the job, and an apprentice of the name of Bunning was employed, under the impression that the plate was for Mr. Shepherd, at the Stamp office. It was also proved, in evidence, that the prisoner had large dealings with Mr. Skelton for spirits, &c. for which he gave waste paper; that is, packs of cards, which Mr. S. sold at a profit. Rivet, Miller, and Carpmeal, searched the premises occupied by the prisoner, at the back of Mr. Skelton's house. They found a quantity of forged stamps of the spade ace, and also a quantity of forged plates for fabricating the stamps, which were

## SUPPLEMENT 2

concealed underground. In the counterfeit ace, in the word, "Dieu," in the motto, the letter R. was substituted for the letter E.

Mr. Justice Heath addressed the jury, and observed, there could be no doubt in the case. The jury found the prisoner Guilty, and he suffered accordingly. He was a genteel man, thirty five years of age: on the day of his trial he was dressed in black, and full powdered.

**WILLIAM HONEYMAN**

***The Young Swindler; Convicted of Forgery at the Lent Assizes, 1806, for Kent, and Executed upon Pennenden Heath***

Seldom have we presented a case with a malefactor so young, and yet so consummately artful. This young adept was born at Portsmouth, of creditable parents, and who, after giving him a good education, placed him as midshipman in the royal navy. However, he had not been long on board the man of war to which he was appointed, then stationed at Sheerness, ere he deserted, and began his career of vice at a tavern called the Silver Oar, at Rochester, before he had completed his sixteenth year. There he was invited by some gentlemen to partake of their dinner, which was no sooner over than they perceived he had no money, and appeared dejected, and upon interrogation, he confessed his name and needy circumstances; the company, much to their credit, agreed to supply him with money, and he was kept there till his friends were made acquainted with his situation; when, according to their desire, he was forwarded to London. He returned some time after to the Silver Oar, saying he had been to sea, ordered a dinner, and treated his former friends.

Afterwards he took a route to the West of England, following his nefarious practices. However, on the 18th of November, 1805, under the name of Alexander Innes, captain in the navy, he was brought to Marlborough-street Police-office, in custody of an officer belonging to Surrey, to answer a charge preferred against him by a Mr. Jeff, a liveryman, in Silver-street, Golden square.

Mr. Jeff stated that the prisoner called at his stables on the ninth day of November, representing himself as the person above described, and residing at No 49, Howland-street, and hired a chestnut mare to go to Richmond. The mare was never returned to her owner; and after a week had elapsed, Mr. Jeff suspected he had been swindled. He consequently went to the given address, and had there further cause of suspicion; for the house was a brothel, and he was only known to have slept there one night.

In consequence of some information Mr. Jeff had received, he went to the house of an eminent tradesman in the Borough, where, it was said, the prisoner was known, having drawn money by bills, &c., Mr. Jeff was there informed of the circumstance alluded to, and that Capt. Innes had sent thither a mare from the country, which had been attended with unpleasant circumstances. The parties, however, said, they knew but little of the prisoner. He was detected by calling at the Gloucester Coffee house, Piccadilly, which house he had frequented with a person of the name of Kennesley, who left it without discharging his bill. The prisoner called to enquire after his friend, and on leaving the house, two of the waiters followed him, suspecting him to be the person advertised by Mr. Jeff. At a convenient spot near Vauxhall, the waiters gave him in charge of an officer.

It was stated to the magistrates, that the prisoner had been at the Castle, at Richmond, where the waiter was refused his bill; but, by assistance, the visitors were detained, and a watch was left as security for the bill. Mr. Jeff had never heard of his mare, but it was reported she was at Andover, Hants. When at Richmond, on Sunday, at the Castle-Inn, he was informed that a mare, answering the description of the one hired, was sold on Wednesday last, at Croydon, to a butcher at Richmond; but he had not an opportunity of seeing her, the butcher being from home. On the prisoner being

## SUPPLEMENT 2

questioned respecting what he had done with the mare, he merely answered, he had spoken to Mr. Jeff on that subject. He was dressed in the first style of fashion, and his person was very well known in the lobby at the Theatres.

The next day the concourse of people that assembled at Malborough-street Office was immense. Several naval officers attended, for the purpose of proving that there were only two captains in the navy of the name of Innes; they are brothers, and gentlemen of the highest respectability; the one Alexander, is now captain on board the Eurus frigate, in the Cove of Cork; and the other, John, is a prisoner in France, having been taken in the Ranger. Several persons intimated their intentions of exhibiting charges against the prisoner on the next examination, which took place November 21. Numerous fresh charges were adduced against him; and it appeared by the evidence, that an insinuating confident address, with a commanding person, had enabled him to enter the circles of gentlemen, whom he is said to have defrauded, as well as trades-people, inn-keepers, &c. in town and country.

The horse he hired of Mr. Jeff had been traced to George yard, Drury-lane. John Rich, ostler to Mr. Cartwright, Camden-place, Piccadilly, stated, that the prisoner hired a brown gelding six weeks since, in the absence of his master. He said he resided in St. James's-street; that he merely wanted to ride out for two or three hours, and on his return he would send the horse home by his servant. He, however, never returned, nor had the horse ever been heard of. A person in the office (Mr. Nuns) informed Mr. Cartwright, that a horse, answering the description he had given, was left at his Livery-stables, Vauxhall, on the 14th of October, and he believed by the prisoner. He hired a horse and chaise of Mr. Nuns, and left the horse in his care, until he should return, which event never took place. The prisoner said his name was Becket, and that he resided at Gravesend. Mr. Nuns, finding the prisoner did not return, went to Gravesend, and Mr. Becket proved to be a banker, who informed him, that a person answering the description of the prisoner, had forged on his bank. Mr. Nuns had travelled three or four hundred miles after his horse and chaise; and at length, by an advertisement, he received a letter, stating, that the horse was at Alton, in Hampshire, and the chaise was at Honiton, in Devonshire, the prisoner having left the horse as he had done at other places, and hired a fresh one.

It was proved by another witness, that the prisoner had committed depredations in the West of England, by representing himself as a Mr Pigeon, son of Mr. Pigeon, belonging to a distillery firm in the Borough. By this imposition, affecting to be travelling on account of the firm he was very successful in obtaining money, by swindling bills, &c. In this part of the country he drove about in a post-chaise and four, associated with the best company, joined their hunting parties, and became the complete man of fashion. At Exeter he drove through the city a week before the news of the victory over the combined fleets, as a naval officer with dispatches from the fleet. The gentlemen belonging to a subscription-house, and the leading men of the city, desirous of hearing good news, politely requested to be informed if the news was good. The prisoner, who represented himself as the son of Lord Mulgrave, assured them it was good news, and that it was from the hero, Nelson. The gentlemen were desirous of further information; but fearing to put the question too pointedly, they asked, if it equalled the business of the Nile? The prisoner replied, "The Nile is a fool to it;" and he immediately drove off, having diffused joy throughout the ancient city of Exeter.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

A number of other charges were preferred against him. A gentleman positively proved the prisoner to be an impostor, in representing himself as Capt. Innes. The prisoner said his name was Innes, and he was addressed as a captain by naval characters. On being questioned by the magistrates, if he was ever in the navy, and what rank he held the prisoner replied, "He was a midshipman in the *Magnanime*, of sixty-four guns, but he had not been in the service since the last war. He was before that in the *Active*, of thirty two guns." He was remanded again, to give country people an opportunity to attend and on the day appointed, the office was crowded so excessively, that many who repaired thither to take a view of the prisoner were disappointed.

Among other circumstances, Hamilton, the officer, said, that he was authorized by the gentlemen of the Gravesend Bank, to state a circumstance that recently occurred there, the complainants being unable to attend this examination; the prisoner, in the name of Charles Young, presented to them a bill of exchange for eighty pounds, purporting to have been drawn upon Simmons and Co. at the Canterbury Bank, for which he received cash and notes, and it was soon afterwards discovered to be a forgery.

There was also another serious charge against the prisoner, for a transaction during his tour in the West of England. It had been stated, that the prisoner diffused joy throughout the city of Exeter, by proclaiming a victory, said to have been gained by the departed hero Nelson, a week before that of Trafalgar. He also, it appeared, represented himself as the bearer of the joyful tidings, when the glorious victory was obtained. Being on the Portsmouth road when Lord Fitzroy was traveling to the Admiralty, with the important news, and having obtained some slight information respecting it, or at least that his lordship was going with dispatches to town, he immediately ordered a post-chaise and four, and was driven after the messenger at full speed. On his entering the town of Basingstoke, his chaise was surrounded by the multitude, who were more ready to be imposed on, a ray of hope having spread itself that a victory had been gained. In the habit of a naval officer, the prisoner went to the Bank, called himself Lord Fitzroy, drew 100*l.* in his name, and gave a forged draft. He apologized to the gentlemen of the Bank for the sudden intrusion, and alleged that his cash was insufficient to carry him to the Admiralty. This imposition was soon detected, the prisoner was followed, and the money recovered. On his being asked, if he had anything to say, he replied, "he had not, in his present disagreeable situation."

The magistrate observed, that it would be necessary to remand the prisoner again, in order to give time to the people from the country to attend, when a gentleman from the Gravesend Bank attended, and the prisoner was fully committed to take his trial, and soon after removed to Maidstone (the forgery having been done in Kent), where he was indicted March 18, 1806, for feloniously and falsely making, forging, and counterfeiting, and feloniously uttering and publishing, as true, at Gravesend, a certain false, forged, and counterfeited bill of exchange, for the sum of eighty pounds, purporting to have been drawn by one Charles Young, and to be directed to Messrs. Simmons, Poley, and Co. at Canterbury, with intent to defraud John Brenchly, Charles Becket, and George Rich, of Gravesend, aforesaid. He also stood indicted upon the oaths of John Rich, and others, with stealing one brown gelding, the property of Edward Cartwright. He also stood indicted upon the oath of Richard Nuns with stealing at Lambeth, in the county of Surry, one black mare, a chaise, and harness, his property.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

On the first indictment, it appeared he came to the Gravesend Bank, and represented himself as a person under the tuition of Mr. Stevenson (steward to the Earl of Darnley), for a knowledge of agricultural improvement, which afterwards proved to be false. The fraud on the Bank being substantiated by the clerk, the jury after a little deliberation, found the prisoner guilty; and being found guilty upon the first charge, the judge would not try him on the others. From the time of the judge's passing sentence on him, and informing him he could not expect any mercy, the crime being so great an offence, he became much dejected, and behaved himself in a very becoming manner.

On the 28th of March, the unfortunate prisoner wrote a letter from the cell to the Gravesend Bank, acknowledging the crime laid to his charge, thanking the prosecutors for their humanity in recommending him to the Judge for mercy, and requesting they would sign a petition to the King; which had been done before, but which the prisoner was not aware of. He stated in his letter, that he was deranged at the time of committing the fact. He also said, it had ever been his father's wish to train him in the world to friendly society.

He made the following speech at the place of execution, from a written paper, which he gave to a friend, upon his request:-

"For my own part, I confess, with the greatest contrition, the crime which has brought me to this horrid place, and admit the justice of my sentence, while I am sinking under its severity; and I earnestly exhort you all, my fellow prisoners, and young men at liberty, to acknowledge the offences you have been guilty of, and to bequeath to your country that confidence in public justice, without which there can be neither peace nor safety in this world.

"As few of you suffer for the first offences, it is necessary to enquire how far confession ought to be extended. Whatever good remains in our power we must diligently perform. We must prevent, to the utmost of our power, all the evil consequences of our crimes. We must forgive all who injure us. We must, by fervency of prayer, and always praying to God, in constancy and meditation, endeavour to repress all worldly passions; and generate in our minds that love of goodness, and hatred of sin, which may fit us for the society of heavenly minds; and finally, we must commend and entrust our soul to Him that died for the sins of men, with earnest wishes and humble hopes that he will admit us with the labourers who entered the vineyard at the last hour, and associate us with the thief whom he pardoned on the Cross.

"Thus, we humbly trust, our sorrowful prayers and tears will be acceptable in his sight. Thus shall we be qualified, through Christ, to exchange this dismal body and these uneasy fetters, for the glorious liberty of the sons of God, and then our legal doom upon earth be changed into a comfortable declaration of mercy in the highest heaven, and all through the most precious and all sufficient merits of the blessed Saviour of mankind.

"I wish you all the happiness that this land affords, and the enjoyment of life in all its branches. You, my brothers and sisters, will, I hope, take caution of so young a man as I am, whose years are only eighteen, and to think that I should suffer this ignominious and awful death before so many of you. Our happiness or misery only begins when we die.

"It is but your sins that can make you afraid of dying. It concerns us more than our lives is worth, to know what will become of us when we die."

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

This speech, which was spoken in a manly and distinct tone, made a deep impression on an unusual number of spectators (many of whom were soldiers). Shortly after he seemed to reflect on the jury, and the severity of the laws of this country, by saying "So young a man as he was, might have been useful by being sent abroad;" because the petition had been presented, and interest made, in vain, to his Majesty, to save his life. He behaved, however, with the greatest decorum at the place of execution, praying in the most penitent manner, till the platform fell from under him.

"Be thy pursuits, then giddy youth  
"The paths of industry and truth;  
"For those who follow wicked ways,  
"With shame must terminate their days.

Along with the unfortunate Honeyman, the following unhappy men also underwent, the final sentence of the law:-  
**James Danes**, convicted of burglariously breaking and entering the dwelling-house of the Rev. Joseph Andrews, at Marden, in the county of Kent, and stealing therefrom twenty shirts, 20*l.* in money, and other articles, to the amount of 150*l.* **Samuel Clarke, alias Hagger**, convicted of breaking into the shop of John Elliott, watchmaker, at Ashford on the 25th of January, and stealing therein divers watches, chains, seals, &c., and of having the same in his possession. **John Staines**, who was found guilty of stealing two Welsh heifers, the property of Edward Back, of Mershaun. Danes had been a smuggler, well known in the county of Kent, having lived at Trottescliffe, where he left a wife and four children. Clarke, whose friends lived at Rochester, had been master's mate on board a man of war; his character was notorious, having, it is said, returned from transportation he declared himself, however, innocent of the charge for which he was condemned. Staines likewise made the same declaration.

These four malefactors died sincere penitents.

**ANDREW AKOW**  
*A Chinese Sailor, Executed at Execution-Dock, July 18, 1806,  
 for Murdering his Countryman*

The trial of this foreigner came on at the Admiralty Sessions, July 11, 1806 before Sir John Scott and Judge Le Blanc.

James Robert Oliver, second mate of the Travers East-Indiaman, stated, that on the 24th of May the vessel was in the East India docks; he had charge of the watch at twelve o'clock, that night; the prisoner, who was taken on board at Bengal, was in his watch. The murdered man was named Anguin, a Chinese, who entered on board the vessel with the prisoner, and he officiated as cook. About two o'clock on the morning of the 25th, witness heard a crying noise forward, which seemed to come from the fore-castle, but on going thither he found it proceeded from the fore-hatchway. Witness sent down two officers to see what was doing, when one of them shortly after called out, "Murder has been committed." Witness called up the surgeon, and on going below himself, he observed the prisoner in custody of the officers he had sent below. He was covered with blood, and on seeing the witness, he exclaimed, "Me kill Anguin; Anguin tell me lie, to-morrow you hang me Chinese fashion;" and he gave himself up to witness with the utmost composure. After having secured the prisoner, the witness proceeded to the fore-hatchway, where he observed the deceased lying, with his head nearly severed from his body, near to his hammock. He had also many dreadful wounds in different parts of his body; and he expired immediately. Witness had not missed the prisoner more than five minutes before he heard the cries of the deceased. The deceased was of an entertaining disposition, and greatly beloved by the whole ship's company. This testimony was corroborated by a number of witnesses, and the jury found the prisoner "Guilty." He was sentenced to be executed the Monday following, but was respited till Friday, July 18, by Sir William Scott, in order that the opinion of the Privy Council, might be taken on his case. It having been the opinion of the Privy Council, that this malefactor should suffer according to the sentence of the English law, on Friday, the day appointed for the execution as above mentioned, he was accordingly conveyed in a cart from Newgate, for execution, at Execution Dock, pursuant to sentence. The wretched criminal was scarcely able to support his fate, and looked as if life had forsaken him previous to his arrival at the place of punishment. He was dressed in a seaman's jacket and trowsers, and red cap. One of his countrymen supported him in the cart, and apparently imparted every consolation his dreadful situation demanded. After hanging the usual time, the body was brought back to Newgate, and delivered to his friends; the remainder of the sentence, that his body be dissected, &c. having been remitted.

**PHILIP MATSELL**

***Executed August 22, 1806, at Birmingham, for Firing at and Wounding T. Twyford, a Watchman of that Town***

This notorious culprit was convicted of maliciously firing at and wounding T. Twyford, a watchman, in the Snow hill end of Great-Charles-street, Birmingham; and for which offence he was hanged on a scaffold erected near the spot where he committed the offence.

The awful scene drew an immense concourse of spectators; but, by the active exertions of the police, assisted by a detachment of the king's own dragoons, the utmost regularity and good order were preserved. With regard to the unhappy criminal, we are sorry to state, that his conduct, from the time of his being apprehended up to the fatal moment of his punishment, exhibited no signs of repentance. When passing through the town to the place of execution, his countenance manifested the utmost indifference, and frequently was marked with a sneering smile. When arrived at the gallows, he resisted every endeavour to draw from him a confession of his guilt, declaring that he was not the man, but that he knew who was. He refused for a long time, to join in prayer with the clergyman who attended him; but at length selected a prayer from the communion service. Addressing himself to the wife of his brother, who was extremely distressed on the occasion, he asked her, abruptly, "What she cried for?" and when the executioner (who had also been condemned, but reprieved, and who was much more agitated than Matsell) was fixing the rope, Matsell desired him to be cautious how he placed it, as one side of his neck was rather sore. The time of preparation being expired, he gave the signal by throwing up his handkerchief, when the waggon on which the platform was erected, drew from under him, and he was launched into eternity.

**EDWARD M'ELROY**  
*Indicted for Setting Fire to a Car-house*

This case presents one of the most extraordinary instances of cross swearing ever witnessed, and so positive was it on each side that the jury were unable to determine which party was entitled to credit, and actually separated without giving any verdict.

Edward M'Elroy, a coarse country lad, about twenty years of age, was capitally indicted, on the 12th of March, 1823, for setting fire to a car-house, belonging to David Woods, of Carduffkelly, near Carickmacross, in the county of Monaghan, in the preceding month of February. David Woods deposed to the circumstances attending the burning of his car-house, which took place about 12 o'clock at night, when the family were all in bed. Being awoke, he heard a noise outside his house, as of some persons stumbling, in consequence of which he was induced to rise out of bed; and on going down stairs and opening the hall-door, which he did quietly, he beheld his car-house on fire, and distinctly saw the prisoner (M'Elroy) urging the flames towards the dwelling-house. Thomas Woods, son to the prosecutor, stated, that, on hearing his father call out that the car-house was on fire, he ran out naked, and saw the figure of a man at a distance, running from the flames. He could not say who that person was.

This was the case for the prosecution. In defence, Charlotte Woods, aged 18, the daughter of the prosecutor, appeared. She denied that any attachment subsisted between her and the prisoner, and then gave the following account of the transaction, in coming forward to declare which, she said, she was actuated solely by a regard for truth, and a desire to save an innocent life. On the evening in question, all the family, excepting herself and a servant girl, whom she called Ellen, went to bed between 9 and 10 o'clock. She usually slept in a small bed-room on the ground floor, off the kitchen; the servant girl, who slept in the same room, having some articles of wearing apparel to mend, sat up for that purpose, unknown to her master and family, and she (the witness) remained in the kitchen assisting her, until about half-past 11 o'clock, when, hearing her father cough and make a noise as if rising, she and the servant hurried into their bed-room, extinguished the candle, and began to undress; for she was afraid of her father knowing that they had been sitting up, as he had expressly prohibited any of the family from doing so. She and the girl had just knelt down to their prayers, when she heard a stool fall, and her face being turned towards the kitchen, into which a small window looked, she observed her father approaching the fire, from which he took a lighted turf; she then beckoned the servant to watch her father, and the two followed him to the door, where they remained concealed, and actually saw him with his own hand set fire to the car-house, he having first carefully loosened the calf and pig, and set them at liberty. On witnessing such extraordinary conduct on the part of her father, she and the servant hastily returned to the room, and crept into bed. She then heard him close the kitchen door and go upstairs, where he remained about a quarter of an hour, and then came down and gave the alarm of fire.

In addition, she related the particulars of a conversation between her two elder brothers, which she overheard a night or two after the burning. One of them remarked to the other—"It (speaking of the burning) was a good plan to put M'Elroy out of the way:" on which he replied, "Yes, but I doubt my father will go too far—he must perjure himself." She also said, that, some days previous to the burning, her father

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

accused her of being intimate with M'Elroy, and told her that he would not suffer any person of such condition to come near his house, or have any acquaintance with his daughter. Being cross-examined on this point, she declared that she had no particular regard for the prisoner; that there had been no intimacy between them, nor had he ever taken improper liberties with her; that she always addressed him as a servant, and looked on him only as her father's servant. She admitted that she now lived under the protection of the prisoner's relations, having left her father's house about a fortnight previously, at which time she and the maid-servant, who accompanied her, gave information of the foregoing facts to a neighbouring magistrate.

The servant-girl corroborated, in every particular, the statement given by Miss Woods.

A tailor was examined to prove an alibi for the prisoner. He swore, that, on the night on which the burning was said to have taken place, the prisoner came to his house to get a pair of small-clothes mended; and that the prisoner remained in his house from sun-set to sun-rise.

After the examination of these witnesses, the counsel for the prosecution called George Woods, son to the prosecutor, who said, he had heard what was stated by his sister, relative to a conversation between him and his brother Thomas; he swore positively that no such conversation, nor any such words, ever passed between them. Witness stated, that an intimacy had subsisted between his sister and the prisoner, whom he discovered together one day, in a back room of a house in Carrickmacross, in such a situation as left no doubt on his mind of their improper intimacy.

Thomas Woods was then examined, relative to a conversation sworn by his sister to have taken place between him and his brother George. He swore positively that no such conversation had ever taken place.

A girl, named Collins, also in the service of the prosecutor, was examined. She stated, that she was in the kitchen on the night in question, in company with Miss Woods and the servant Ellen, and swore positively, that they did not remain there more than half an hour after the family went to bed; that they merely washed their feet, and did not sew or mend any part of their clothes. She said, that Miss Woods, Ellen, and herself, then went into the bed-room off the kitchen; that they had all three undressed, and were in the act of praying, when the alarm of fire was given by her master. She denied all that the two others had sworn respecting the conduct of her master; nothing of the kind took place that she saw, nor could it have taken place without her seeing it. Charlotte Woods and the girl Ellen were confronted with the last witness, and both adhered firmly to what they had previously sworn. The judge proceeded to sum up the evidence.

The jury remained closeted during the night, and until the afternoon of Thursday, when, not having agreed on any verdict, they were conveyed to the verge of the county, and there discharged in the usual way.

**EDWARD WILLIAM ROBERTS, DAVID MAITLAND,  
AND SAMUEL COLE**  
*Convicted at the Lent Assizes for Hertford, 1809, and Pilloried  
for a Conspiracy*

IN [our account above](#), our readers will find the leader of this gang of swindlers upon the pillory at Charing-cross, along with one Brown, another of his disciples. Edward William Roberts, the adept above named, David Cole, the brother of Dorothy Cole, who cohabited with Roberts and passed as his wife, and David Maitland, acting as servant to Roberts, were indicted for a conspiracy to defraud Frederic Norris upholsterer of Cheshunt.

Frederic Norris deposed, that in the month of July, Cole and Roberts came to his house at Broxbourne, and desired that he would come over the next morning, which was on Saturday, to take measure for the carpets, curtains, &c. He accordingly went the next day, and sent in about 20*l.* worth of furniture. He then thought it prudent to ask for a reference. Mr. Cole mentioned the names of several Lords and Earls, but said you may as well go to my solicitor, Mr. Crawford, No. 1, Charles-square, Hoxton; he has six or 7,000*l.* of mine in his hands, and will give you satisfaction. He accordingly went there, and Mr. Crawford confirmed this statement, observing that Mr. Cole was a man of large landed property. Cole afterwards gave the witness a draft for 50*l.* on his attorney, Crawford, which was dishonoured; and in fact, the goods were all moved off in the night, and Roberts was apprehended the next day in the London Road.

By the testimony of Mary Little, and other witnesses, it appeared that the goods were carried to a court near Nelson-street, in the neighbourhood of Shoreditch; some were pawned by Maitland, and others sold to a person of the name of Clarke, by the directions of Cole, in the name of Lidyard. Trott, the police officer, stated, that being upon the watch in Baltic-street, where he knew Cole lodged, he met Roberts going to his lodgings.

The case of the prosecutor being finished, the prisoner Roberts addressed the jury in a very long, and certainly a very able speech, in which he urged with great ingenuity all the topics that he could make in his favour. He concluded by stating that he most poignantly felt his degraded situation; that he had been born to the expectation of independency; that he had been liberally educated, and was a member of an honourable profession; but that finding his talents not adequate to his profession, he had turned his attention to the quiet pursuits of literature, in which he had produced several works that had met the approbation of eminent men; particularly "Considerations on the Laws of Debtor and Creditor," which had been quoted by Lord Moira with approbation. His wife too was a woman of an accomplished mind, and had produced literary works which had been very favourably noticed by ladies of the most exalted rank, who had not only afforded her their protection, but received her at their houses, and themselves repaid her visits. He could mention two in particular, "Delmer" and "The Mysterious Mothers." [Note: By "His wife" meaning the said Dorothy Cole, who received her education in the bar of the Magpie Inn, on Hounslow Heath, formerly kept by her father. Roberts had long abandoned his wife and several children. Of these alleged "literary works" the first only was published. It was the wild effusions of his own brain, to which he tacked the name of Dorothy Roberts. It

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

should have had the alias, Cole; who hawked it from door to door, through the squares and best streets of the west end of London, teasing the rich into subscriptions, under various pretences and pleas of distress. As to the "Mysterious Mother," the same game was played over again. Numerous subscriptions were again paid to her; but Roberts, as it must be seen, was otherwise engaged than to enter upon a development of his announced volumes of mysteries. Roberts received a very liberal education, was bred to the bar, and actually admitted a counsellor at law. — "*O tempora! O mores!*" ]

Of late, however, his fate had been sadly reversed; the hands of oppression had fallen heavily upon him. In June last his wife died; and himself, from the enjoyment even of the luxuries of life, had been dragged to the damp of a cold and solitary dungeon in the Coldbath fields prison. This had produced disease, and the loss of the use of his limbs. From that period he had languished a miserable existence in the sick ward of Newgate, where he had experienced all the grinding oppression to which the unhappy inmates of a prison are necessarily subject. But the only cheering hope which ever entered those walls was now realized, namely, the day that he could face a jury of his fellow-countrymen; that day was now arrived, and he trusted the justice of their verdict would relieve him for further sorrow.

The jury found a verdict of Guilty, and he was ordered twelve months' imprisonment, and to stand in the pillory. On the pillory at Hertford, though this cheat was nearly on a par with that which we have already told, he was handled somewhat less roughly by a country mob; but the populace vented their indignation more through hissing and hooting than by rotten eggs, decayed vegetables, and the kennels' filth.

It must have been noted that a professional name was implicated in the foul transactions which came out on this trial. The gentleman so named, a few days after the conviction we now record, published the following vindication of his conduct, in the form of a letter addressed to the editor of the London Morning Advertiser:

"It appeared in your paper of last Monday, on the trial of Roberts and Maitland, for a conspiracy with one Cole, that he referred a Mr. Norris to me, saying, "that I had 7000l. in my hands, and that upon his applying to me, I confirmed that statement." I absolutely deny ever having authorized Cole to make any such assertion; and I also deny ever having confirmed any such statement. When Mr. Norris applied to me with a draft drawn by Cole, I informed him, that I had not a farthing of Cole's money, nor ever had; that Cole had applied to me to attend him to the Commons to examine his father's will; that by it, it did appear considerable property had come to him in consequence of his mother's recent death, who, it appeared, had been entitled to the rents of the estate for her life. Having known Cole, as a carpenter, who had five or six men working under him about six years ago, and he having frequently informed me, that whenever his mother should die, he would, under his father's will, be entitled to an estate of three or four thousand pounds' value, and he having always said, that, whenever that event happened he would employ no other professional man than myself, I certainly did feel satisfied, that what he informed me of were truths: accordingly, when applied to by Mr. Norris, I told him, that I was authorized to sell or mortgage the estate in order to pay his debt, as well as any other debt which Cole might contract, and that I had no doubt but Mr. Norris would be paid the amount of the bill which he had against Cole.

Maitland I never saw or heard of until after he was taken into custody, and that was by the public prints. Roberts I never saw or heard of, in any way whatever, until introduced to him by Cole, who informed me Roberts had lately married his

## SUPPLEMENT 2

sister. Roberts said he was a gentleman, who lived at Streatham, and was very desirous of assisting his brother-in-law, Cole.—That it was very inconvenient for him then to do it; but that about a fortnight after last Michaelmas-day, the rents of his estate would be coming in, between 3 and 400*l.* half yearly; and that if I would, in the meantime, assist Cole with 50 or 100*l.* it would be of great service to him. From this representation, and with the sole view of doing what I thought an act which one man frequently does for another, I accepted a bill, and afterward others for Cole.

Almost every time I saw him, I plagued him for the title deeds. The answer was, "They are in the hands of a gentleman at Windsor, who lent my father 200*l.* upon the estate. I'll procure an abstract of the title."—I told him Mr. Norris had applied to me for the money, and another tradesman, and that an abstract, at least, should be had, otherwise I should be in a most awkward situation. The next time he called at my house, he showed me a letter purporting to have been sent to him from Sir J. Hippesley, stating that he, Sir John, had considered the offer of Cole, respecting the sale of that part of his estate which lay contiguous to Sir John's; and that, if Cole would instantly employ a proper land surveyor on his part, he, Sir John, would do the like, and the money, whatever might be the amount, would be immediately paid. A few days after this letter was shown me, Roberts was taken into custody by Mr. Norris, and proved to be a common swindler. Afterwards he was released on bail.

Warrants having been issued against him for other offences, I endeavoured to find him, did so, and took him into custody. I went to the place at which the estate lay, a few miles beyond Hounslow, found that Cole's father had died possessed of considerable property, that his mother was dead, and that Cole had sold the estate. To the truth of the above narrative I am ready to swear. I most solemnly declare in whatever I have said to others, or done myself for Cole, it was neither from motives of profit nor interest. I mean that right where right was due would have followed; neither directly nor indirectly have I received a farthing, for Cole owes me at this day 17*l.* upon an old balance; I trust, therefore, after this explanation, the public, and particularly , that part of it which compose individuals to whom I may be personally known, will not think that knowingly I have acted so improperly as to have my name in public prints joined with such names as Cole and Roberts; but will look to the *quo animo* it was done.

I am, sir, your humble servant,  
CRAWFORD.

West-Place,  
City Road,

March 16, 1809."

Note: Swindling has of late years become so common a practice in the metropolis, that writers for diurnal papers frequently amuse themselves in relating adroit performances of this nature, in burlesque, pun, and hyperbole. One of these scribbling wits thus makes merry with a silly tradesman, on being fiddled out of his money.

"SWINDLING SET TO MUSIC.—A country-looking man lately called at a haberdasher's shop, with a fiddle under his arm; and after purchasing and paying for some trifling articles, which he pretended to want, asked to be allowed to leave his purchase and his fiddle, till he did some other business through the town. He had scarcely gone out, when in comes an accomplice, (as it turned out) who observing the fiddle, takes it up and tries it, and is quite charmed with it. "This is the most charming fiddle I have ever met with; is it for sale?—I'd give fifty guineas for that fiddle." He was told it was not for sale, but belonged to a countryman, who had just left it there

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

till he should make some other calls.—"When he comes back for it, try and buy it from him—make the best bargain with him you can for yourself; but whatever you buy it at, I promise to give you fifty guineas for it, and I will call again by-and-by." By-and-by back comes the countryman for his fiddle. "Will you part with that fiddle," says the haberdasher, "I have taken a fancy for it?" The man answered, he had no intention of parting with his fiddle, for he knew it to be a very good one, and did not know if he could get such another. "I'll give you fifty shillings for it," said the haberdasher. "No, no," "Five guineas for it," said the haberdasher. "I'll not take twenty," said the countryman.—In short, after a great deal of chapmanship, the haberdasher got the fiddle at forty guineas; and a happy man was he, as thinking he had made ten guineas by the bargain. But he has been allowed to keep the fiddle, to solace himself for the loss of his money. The fifty-guinea merchant never returned."

"On the 13th of October 1809, a most infamous act of swindling was practised on eight poor infirm widows in the alm-houses, near the New Grove Road, Mile End Road, by a well-dressed man, about 5 feet 2 inches high, stoutish made, hair tied, and light green coat. He went to one of the poor pensioners' houses, and thus addressed them, "You are all widows—a lady has left you eight pounds;" he then took their names down, and inquired who would go with him, saying, the minister and gentlemen were waiting for them, that they must bring 23 shillings in silver to give change, or they could not be paid. One of the poor women borrowed the money, at a neighbouring public-house, and a young woman went with him to Stepney Church; he told her to wait at the porch, while he went and spoke to the clerk, which she saw him do, and supposed all was right; but he told the clerk he wanted to put up the banns of marriage, and the clerk desired him to come when the service was over. He came out, told the girl all was right, and she must go with him; he then asked the unsuspecting girl for the 23 shillings, and decamped with the money. The girl went back to the clerk, where she soon was informed of her mistake, to the no small grief of the poor disappointed pensioners."

## RIOTS OF THE MANCHESTER WEAVERS

### *The King against Hanson, Lancaster Lent Assizes, 1809*

This important trial came on before Sir S. Le Blanc and a special jury. The defendant, Joseph Hanson, Esq. was indicted for having unlawfully encouraged a number of persons to riot.

Serjeant Cockell addressed the jury on the part of the crown. It appeared that the weavers assembled in great numbers on the 24th of May, near Manchester; that the next morning they again assembled, much increased in numbers; that Mr. Starkie, the Borough-reeve, strove to persuade them to disperse, but in vain. In the afternoon, they were increased to about ten thousand; and the magistrates, preceded by a party of the 4th dragoons, came to the ground, and the riot act was read. About this time the defendant arrived on horseback, attended by his groom; he went up to Capt. Trafford, who commanded the dragoons, and asked, if he might speak to the people? Capt. Trafford said, Not unless he could persuade them to depart peaceably; but he thought his (the defendant's) presence would irritate them; and he told him, he would oblige him if he would leave the field. This he did not immediately; but as he rode along, the people huzza'd, and he pulled off his hat, and spoke to them. The witnesses for the prosecution swore that they heard him use expressions to the following effect: "My lads, your cause is good—be firm, and you will succeed. I will support you as far as three thousand pounds will go; and if that will not do, I will go further. Nadin and his faction shall not drive you from the field this day. I am sorry your hill is lost—My father was a weaver, I am a weaver, and have got my money by your industry—and I am the weaver's friend." He afterwards left the field, and rode towards his own house. To prove this, a serjeant, and two corporals, of the 11th dragoons, and two constables, were called.

Mr. Raine made a most eloquent speech for the defendant; and said, he should call many respectable witnesses to prove that he, on that day, was constantly advising the people to be peaceable, and retire to their homes. The groom, who attended the defendant the whole of the time, said he never heard his master make use of the expressions sworn to by the other witnesses: that when the dragoons drew their swords, his master's horse becoming restive, he slipped off, walked a little way, and then mounted the groom's horse and rode off.

Mr. Stennett, Mr. Norris, Mr. C. Sattarthwaite, Mr. Brierley, and a number of others, deposed to the defendant's exhorting the people to refrain from mischief. None of these witnesses had heard him make use of any of the other expressions ascribed to him. Serjeant Cockell, in a warm and animated speech of an hour and ten minutes, observed upon the evidence for the defendant; and insisted, that, with the exception of the groom's, it corroborated that given by the witness for the crown: as they deposed as to the defendant's conduct and speeches after he had been heard and seen by the witnesses for the prosecution. He said, he had no doubt of what his intentions were; if they were as peaceable as they had been represented, why did he not join and assist the magistrates?—instead of which he addressed the people (although requested not by Capt. Trafford) who became more unruly, huzzaing when he spoke, and he returning the compliment. . The jury, after a few minutes' consideration, returned a verdict of Guilty; which subjected the defendant to fine and imprisonment.

**ANNE LEAK**  
*A Horse Thief, Eleven years old*

The following case, extracted from the reports of criminal cases in London (1811) is a most extraordinary instance of juvenile depravity. "Ann Leak, a girl of about eleven years of age, underwent a second examination before the magistrates at the public office, Worship-street, being charged on suspicion of having stolen a horse, saddle, and bridle, the property of some person unknown. She was taken into custody in the neighbourhood of Bethnal-green, where she was leading the horse. On her being questioned by a tradesman who the horse belonged to? she answered, that it was the property of her father; which the tradesman doubting, she was taken to the above office; where being questioned by the magistrates, she still continued in the same story, when she was searched by one of the officers, who found a brass collar with a padlock round her neck, with the name and place of abode of her father, who, it appears, is an honest industrious man, living in the neighbourhood of Grosvenor-square. The mother of the girl attended, who stated the reason of her having the collar round her neck, she having frequently absconded from home, and was for the purpose of her being brought back. No person appearing against the prisoner, nor any person claiming the property, she was discharged, upon her mother promising to take proper care of her, so that she should not commit any farther depredation."

Another printed report of criminal charges before the Lord Mayor of London, a very short time after her discharge from Worship-street office, says, "Ann Leak, the little girl, about eleven years of age, who has been already taken up twice for horse-stealing, being caught in the act of riding away horses, the property of strangers, was brought up to the Mansion house, last Friday, upon a charge of driving cattle in the city on Thursday night. She appeared, as she has been already described, with a brass collar fastened round her neck with a padlock, with the following words and figures engraved upon it:—"Ann Leak, No. 92, Green-street, Grosvenor-square.—Flog me home." The Lord Mayor sent for her parents, and her mother and brother attended. They stated that they could not keep her from running away; that she had made her escape from a woman to whose care they had intrusted her, and that they wished much to get her into the Institution of the Philanthropic Society. They did not, in fact, know what to do with her, and related several instances of untoward and extraordinary behaviour, when at a boarding school. The Lord Mayor advised the mother to remove the collar from her neck, and take the best care of her their circumstances would admit. In the course of the examination the mother said the child had been examined by a doctor, who gave it as his opinion she was not deranged."

## THOMAS LUCAS and SARAH WELLS

### *Christians Prosecuted by Jews*

Though these cases are not marked with the deepest dye of wickedness, yet they contain that which induces us to give them a place in our catalogue of crimes. They may, at least, serve to dissipate the melancholy which the preceding facts must have created in the mind of every reader. At the first sessions in the year 1809, for Westminster, **THOMAS LUCAS** was indicted for assaulting Hart Levy, a Jew clothesman. From the evidence of the prosecutor it appeared, that he was pursuing his business, and dealing with some of his customers, near a stand of hackney coaches, in Charles-street, Covent-garden; when the defendant, who is himself a gentleman of the whip, but not a member of the Whip Club, assailed the prosecutor, and, in language not most decorous, but the most flippant, charged him with being a common cheat and notorious swindler, at the same time cautioning the customers not to deal with him. Whereupon the Hebrew threatened him with an action of damages for slandering his fair fame and reputation. This not being much relished by Jarvis, he vowed he should have some reason to take him to Westminster-hall; and, leaving his coach and horses, retired to a public-house for a few minutes, on his return from whence he served the poor Jew with a dexterous *facer* under the wheels of his coach, and, mounting his box, drove off. This was proved by another witness.

The defendant endeavoured to justify the assault, by stating that the prosecutor had spit in his face; to prove which another hackney coachman was called; but as Moses recognized in him an old customer whom he was recently obliged to summon to the Court of Conscience for the value of an old coat he had sold him some time ago, his testimony got very little credence, and the defendant was found guilty. The court sentenced him to a short imprisonment.

**SARAH WELLS** was indicted for stealing a shift, the property of Isaac Hart. The prosecutor, a Jew clothesman, gave his testimony nearly as follows:—"I *wash* going down Charing-cross about my business, and turned in a little court (Angel court), *ven* I heard somebody call '*cloash!*' I looked up, *ven* I saw a *voman*, who I thought called, and she beckoned me to come up; I went upstairs, and she *axed* me if I had e'er a *goot* petticoat to *shell*. I had a very *goot von*, so help me *Got*, *vorth four shillin*. I showed it to her, but she would not come up to my price; I could not afford to give it less, so I *wash* going down stairs, going away, *ven* four or five, or many more *vomen* (so help me *Got*, I never saw so many), got about me; (they had been eating their dinner or breakfast, or *someting*, for the cups and saucers were on the table) *ven*, as *Got* would have it, and to my *misfortin*, there was a *leetle* hole in the bottom of my *ba-ag*, and two very nice new shifts hung out of it, *ven* the *vomen* began to pull me about, and did drag them out, and ran *away vid* my shifts. The prisoner took *von* of them, for I did see her take it. I then *vent* and *fetcht* a constable, and took this *von wid* my nice new shift, the *oter* girls, they all ran *away*, and I never since could get my *oter* shift."

The prisoner, in her defence, said that the prosecutor had agreed to go to bed to her, and she was to have the shift for her trouble.

*Prosecutor*—"It's a lie, so help me *Got*, it's a lie. I never did no such a *ting!*" The jury returned a verdict of guilty, and the court sentenced her to one month's imprisonment.

**JACOB LITTLEBOY, WILLIAM GLADMAN, AND  
WILLIAM PENN**  
*Convicted at the April Sessions for Middlesex 1809, of Stealing  
a Dead Body out of the Grave*

THERE is, perhaps, no crime, though not punished capitally, at which our nature revolts more than at the idea of the dead being pursued by the thief into the peaceful grave. Such sacrilegious, unconscionable villains, however, cannot be too often held up to public detestation.

The two former were grave-diggers, which greatly increases their crime, and the third a porter in St. Thomas's Hospital. They were indicted for a conspiracy to take away dead bodies from the church-yard of St. Mary's, Islington; and in another court they were charged with taking away the dead body of a man named Jacob Hart, on the 6th of February last. It appeared, that on the 4th of February last, the deceased was found drowned in the New River, and from thence carried to the vault of St. Mary's church, Islington, for interment. The coroner's inquest having sat upon his body, he was consigned to Littleboy, the grave digger, and generally supposed to have been interred, the coffin having been put into the ground, and the funeral service performed by the minister. On the 6th of February, in the evening, however, one of the Bow-street patrol met the prisoner Penn on the Islington-road, wheeling a barrow, laden with a basket apparently full of clothes. He felt the outside of the load, and discovered the shape of a man's head; upon which he ordered the defendant to go with him immediately to Bow street, where the basket was examined, and found to contain the body of the deceased; and upon searching the grave where the deceased was supposed to have been buried, the coffin was opened and found to contain nothing but earth and rubbish.

Suspicion immediately fell upon the defendants, Littleboy and Gladman, and they were taken into custody. The jury found the defendants Guilty of taking away the body in question, but not of the conspiracy. The court sentenced Penn to pay a fine of 5*l.* and the other defendants to a fine of 3*s.* 4*d.* each.

**HANNAH, ALIAS DIANA CONOLLY, CATHERINE  
HANDLEY, AND ELIZABETH COX**  
*Convicted (Separately) for concealing the Delivery of a Child,  
and Sentenced to Imprisonment*

**HANNAH, ALIAS DIANA CONOLLY**, was indicted for the wilful murder of her male infant, by drowning it in a tub of water. This case, though short, leaves vast scope for conjecture as to the guilt of this woman on the capital part of the bill of indictment found against her. It also comprises a curious surgical case.

It appeared that the unhappy woman lodged at a house in Brick-lane, Old-street, and was met by Mrs. Horn, her fellow-lodger, upon the staircase leading to her apartment, apparently very much indisposed. The prisoner asked Mrs. H. to get her something to drink, and Mrs. H. left her for that purpose. On her return she found the prisoner in bed, and from the observations she made, concluded the prisoner had delivered herself of an infant child. She interrogated the prisoner as to the fact, but she denied it. Her suspicion, however, being increased, Mrs. H. searched the bed, and beneath the pillows found a male child, but newly born, and lifeless. She also perceived a tub in the room, the water in which was discoloured. Mr. Evans, a surgeon, was called in, who ascertained that the child's lungs were inflated; but in his evidence he would not take upon himself to swear that the child had been born alive. The inflation of the lungs, he said, was not decisive of the fact of the child's being born alive. Dr. Hunter has doubted whether the same symptoms might not appear, though the child had died before it came into the world; and consequently it would be very presumptuous in him to speak with certainty. The judge submitted to the jury, whether it would not be better to acquit the prisoner of the murder, and by their verdict say whether the prisoner had not endeavoured to conceal her delivery from the world. This the jury found, which by a recent Act subjected the party to twelve months' imprisonment, and she was sentenced accordingly.

**CATHARINE HANDLEY** was also indicted by the overseers of the parish of St. Giles in the Fields, for exposing and deserting her newly born illegitimate child, in Bowl-yard, in that parish. It appeared in evidence that the prisoner had been delivered of the child on the 29th day of July, about the hour of five in the afternoon; and between eleven and twelve at night of the same day the child was discovered tied up in a dirty cloth with its legs confined under it, laid in the carriage-way of Bowl-yard, which is a narrow place, there being little more than sufficient room for a carriage to pass through. She was found by the vigilance of the midwife, who attended her at her delivery, in a house in Church-lane, St. Giles's, a considerable distance from the place where she was delivered. The jury, without hesitation, found her Guilty, and the court sentenced her to twelve months' imprisonment.

**ELIZABETH COX** was convicted of a similar offence to the two last mentioned, about the same time, and sentenced to the same punishment at the Summer Assizes for Essex. This unnatural mother was indicted for the wilful murder of her bastard child.

James Cockle, a surgeon, deposed, that the prisoner lived servant with a Mrs. Martha Salmon, in the neighbourhood of Colchester. In the month of May last he was sent for to the house, as it was suspected that the prisoner had been delivered of a child. In her bed-room he discovered circumstances that induced him to look further;

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

and, on searching the prisoner's box, he found the dead body of a child, tied up in an apron. The string was twisted five times round the neck, and tied with a hard knot. The child appeared full grown and perfect. He opened the head, when the vessels appeared tinged as they would have been if the child died of strangulation. The lungs floated in water; but this, he said, was a fallacious experiment. His belief was, that the child was born alive, though he would not undertake to swear that it was.

Martha Salmon, the mistress, next deposed, that she had suspected the girl was with child, and had taxed her with it; but she denied it for some time. She observed her very ill one day, and advised her to leave off work. The girl seemed very unwilling, and asked, if she went away for a few days, whether she should be allowed to return to her place: The witness said her bed-room was near the prisoner's, and if any child had cried she must have heard it. She corroborated the surgeon as to the finding the body of the child. Mary Cutting and Martha Finch said they had suspected that the prisoner was with child; but as she was a short thick girl, they thought it might be her make: they were present when the body of the child was found in the prisoner's box.

Lord Ellenborough, in summing up, told the jury, that however painful their duty might be, yet they must do it firmly; and if they were of opinion the child was born alive, and had been strangled by the prisoner's tying the apron strings round its neck, they must pronounce her guilty of the murder. The jury found her Not Guilty. The learned judge then directed them to say whether they were of opinion that the child was born a bastard, and whether she had endeavoured to conceal its birth. They found her Guilty of the concealment, and she was sentenced to one year's imprisonment.

**JOSEPH SMITH AND CHARLES MEYRICK**  
*Convicted of a Burglary in Breaking into Bagnigge Wells, The  
 Noted Tea Gardens near London*

THESE men were indicted at the Old Bailey for breaking and entering the dwelling-house of T. Davis, and stealing a dial, a blunderbuss, several bottles of wine, and other articles. The prosecutor keeps the house and gardens known by the name of "Bagnigge Wells."

One night the cellar under the long-room was locked up. In the room called "Nell Gwynn's room," the fire-arms were deposited, and the wine in the cellar beneath. About eight the next morning, the cellar door was discovered to have been forced, and the wine missed; and two quart and two pint bottles of wine were found in the garden; and a variety of bottles were found broken, and the liquor lying about the cellar. The prisoners were first seen by a watchman, named Parker, at two in the morning, in School-house-yard, when they were concealing behind a board a blunderbuss and a musket. He instantly gave notice to the other watchmen; and by the direction of Simpson, the constable of the night, they were ordered to leave their watch boxes, and conceal themselves in different stations. Just as the day light appeared, the two prisoners, and another man (escaped) came to the spot from Aylesbury-street. They looked round with great circumspection; and, conceiving the coast to be clear, were about to stoop, in order to gather up the fire-arms, when they were assailed by the watchmen. Two of them ran off towards School-house-yard; and the third along Aylesbury-street, and was seen no more. Smith was secured in the passage leading from Clerkenwell-green to St. John's-square; Simpson, brandishing his hanger, told him he would cut his head off if he did not surrender, when he walked very quietly to the watch house. Meyrick was brought to the same place, but not until after an obstinate resistance. When the prisoners were secured, the watchmen repaired to the place where the fire-arms were seen; but they had been removed. They, however, found a bottle corked; it was opened in court, and proved to be full of port wine; and the neck of another bottle, thrown away by Meyrick in the pursuit, was produced; the neck was also corked.

Simpson confirmed these facts. The prosecutor said, that, to the best of his belief, a dozen bottles of wine had been stolen from his cellar, six of port, and six of Madeira; he also identified the fire-arms. Smith, in his defence, denied any knowledge of the robbery. He was going to the west end of the town, to borrow a horse to carry one of his friends to Fairlop Fair, when he was unexpectedly seized, and threatened by Simpson with his naked hanger. He, therefore, had yielded quietly, conscious of his innocence.

Meyrick justified the resistance he had made, as he had been charged with a crime of which he had no idea whatever. He asked the man who took him what distance he (the prisoner) was from him when he saw him throw away a bottle of wine. The answer was, five or six yards, and he was confident the prisoner was the man.

The lodgings of both parties were searched, and on their wives the officers found skeleton keys for opening locks of drawers. The Common Sergeant summed up, and the jury found both the prisoners Guilty—Death.

**MICHAEL CONNOR, JAMES KELLY, AND JOHN CARR**  
*The Two Former Convicted of Highway Robbery, February  
1809, and Sentenced to Death*

These men were capitally indicted for assaulting Mr. Samudie, on the highway, and forcibly taking from his person his watch and money. It appeared that Mr. Samudie was returning to Clapton on Thursday evening last, in a single-horse chaise, when he was stopped by five footpads, of whom he believed the prisoners to be three. They bade him deliver his money, which he immediately did, to the amount of 3*l.* and upwards. This not satisfying them, they demanded his watch, which he also surrendered. They were armed with pistols, and threatened his life unless he immediately surrendered his property. Mr. Samudie gave information of the robbery a short time afterwards, and some officers went in search of the footpads.

On coming to Newington-green, they fell in with three individuals who answered the description Mr. Samudie had given of the footpads, and they endeavoured to take them into custody. They succeeded, however, in securing only Connor and Kelly:—the third person, whom the officers believed to be Carr, made his escape across the fields, having first fired a pistol at the officers. Upon searching Connor they found a parcel containing grocers' currants, which he said he had picked up in the road: the highways, however, were at that time extremely muddy, and not the smallest dirt appeared on the parcel.

Mr. Samudie, on being showed that parcel, said it was in his chaise at the time he was robbed, and that he had brought the currants with him from a grocer's in town. He was sure the parcel had not fallen out of his chaise, and he had no doubt of the identity of Connor and Kelly. The other prisoner, however, proved, that at the time of the robbery, he was drinking tea with some of his friends, at such a distance from the spot, that, if the alibi was a true statement, it was sufficient to exonerate him from the charge. There was, however, much suspicion about his case; but the jury acquitted him, and found the other two Guilty.

**JOHN SPEED, ESQ.**  
*A Lieutenant-Colonel in the British Army, Convicted at the  
 Lent Surrey Assizes, 1809, of Bigamy*

This officer was indicted for marrying Ann Thorn, his former wife being still living. Mr. Bolland, as counsel for the prosecution, stated, that the prisoner at the bar, in the year 1785, was an ensign in the marines, and then became acquainted with a Miss Nelson, whose father was then an Alderman, and had been a mayor of London. After some interval of courtship he married that lady on the 14th of September, 1785, at the parish of Furneux Pelham, in the county of Hertford. He continued with his wife for some years, and had children by her; but, in consequence of impropriety of conduct on his part, she was compelled to seek refuge with her father, and in the year 1792 articles of separation were signed between them.

The prisoner was abroad for some time, and in the year 1799 he was recommended to lodge in the house of a Mr. Thorn, a respectable market-gardener, near Putney. He soon found means to insinuate himself into the favour of his second daughter, and she was persuaded to marry him. He represented himself as lieutenant-colonel in the army, and as one having the best expectations. They had not, however, been married but a very short time when he went to Germany, and from thence Miss Thorn received a letter from him, saying she must not look to him for protection, as he was already married, and his wife was still living. In short, having lived with her but a very little time, he wholly abandoned her.

The register of his first marriage was put in, and his identity proved. By this it appeared that he was married to his first, Miss Nelson, on the 14th of September, 1785, at Ferneux Pelham, in Hertfordshire, and a witness proved that his wife was still living.

Miss Thorn deposed, that the prisoner came to lodge at her father's on the 6th of October, 1799, and she married him in the November following. After he had lived with her about five months he went to Halifax, and left her pregnant. He never contributed to the support of the child. The prisoner being called upon for his defence, said, he should merit the severest punishment of the laws if he had wilfully offended; but he hoped the court would believe, after they had heard his case, that he had erred through ignorance. It was true he had married Miss Nelson, as was stated, and he had lived with her until they had six children. His means were then unequal to the support of so large a family. Three of the children died; his mother took the eldest, and his wife at that time had an employment which produced her two guineas a week. She agreed to provide for two children, and after some time a deed was brought to him to sign, which he understood was to secure to her own separate use those two guineas a week. No sooner had he signed it than his wife refused any longer to take care of the children, and he understood he had been deceived into signing a deed of absolute separation from his wife. After this he instituted a suit in the Ecclesiastical Court, either to compel his wife to return to him, or to get an absolute separation; and, in a motion which was made in the King's Bench for a prohibition, Lord Kenyon had said from the bench, that after that deed he was as free as air.

Thinking himself thus free from restraint, he did marry Miss Thorn, and continued with her until his military duties called him abroad. On her discovering his former marriage she refused any longer to live with him; and when he solicited her to

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

it, her reply was angrily, that she could hang him if she liked it. He stated that he had suffered great hardships in prison; he had been shut up in a damp and solitary dungeon, which had brought on him a rheumatic fever; and, by an order of the Commander-in-Chief, that no officer in custody of the law should receive his pay, he had lost all his pay during his confinement. He protested that he never meant to offend the laws, which he had fought to protect, in all ranks, from an ensign to that of lieutenant-colonel, and in what he had done he had been misled by error of judgment.

The Lord Chief Baron told the jury the fact was proved unquestionably, and he expressed some indignation at the language represented to have come from Lord Kenyon, the absurdity of which every attorney's clerk could have told him. The jury found him Guilty—Transportation.

**PHILIP FACEY**

***A Singular Case of Bigamy, of which he was Convicted at the Summer Assizes for Surrey, 1809, Fined and Imprisoned***

IN this case the prisoner got into his awkward situation rather curiously. His first wife had also married again; and her last husband finding she had been married before, and wishing to get rid of her, discovered the prisoner, and took him to Union Hall, as a witness against his former wife; when the whole secret coming out, the tables were turned, and he was himself committed for the bigamy.

Philip Facey was indicted for bigamy in feloniously marrying a second time, his former wife being still living. Mr. Curwood, as counsel for the prosecution, observed, that the crime of which the prisoner stood charged was one which in its consequences was the most injurious to civil society, as it went to destroy the sacredness of the marriage contract, out of which all the other relations of society grew. The facts of the case must necessarily be short. The prisoner married a young woman, of the name of Griggs, at Bury St. Edmunds, in Suffolk, in the year 1783. He left her a short time afterwards, and in the year 1795 he again was married to a widow, who kept a small shop in the Borough. He left her to go with his regiment to Ireland, he being a sergeant in the army; and lately he was discovered residing in the Park as one of the keepers with a third family. The registers of the two marriages were then put in and proved, and that the former wife was still living.

For the prisoner, an officer in the West Suffolk militia proved that the prisoner had always borne a most exemplary character, that he was promoted to be a quarter master in the regiment, and Lord Euston, in consideration of his uniform good behaviour, had appointed him a Park-keeper; that his wife had been drummed out of the regiment, and had not been heard of for many years.

The prisoner declared, that he believed his first wife to be dead, not hearing from her many years, and knowing she was in the habit of excessive drinking. The learned judge observed, that the extent of his offence was that he had acted with too little caution in not making more accurate inquiries after his first wife. He should therefore sentence him but to a mild punishment, which was that he should pay a fine of one shilling, and be imprisoned for one month.

**RICHARD COSTELLO, JOHN SAYLOR, and JAMES  
MACLALLEY**

***Soldiers in the British Army, Convicted at Chelmsford, in  
March Assizes, 1809, of the Murder of a Fellow Soldier***

Soldiers, engaged in the same great cause, the defence of their country, one would suppose, would rather act a brotherly part than fight with each other; and more especially at a time when every arm was wanted to repel the tyrant of Europe. In the present instance, (and we trust no more of the kind will come before us,) we find a party of the 4th regiment of foot disgracing those fine battalions, in fastening a quarrel upon another corps, which ended in murder. Richard Costello, John Saylor, and James MacLalley, three soldiers of the 4th regiment of foot, were indicted for the wilful murder of W. Wrach, a soldier in the North Lincoln militia.

It appeared by the evidence of several soldiers in the North Lincoln militia, that they were at the Woolpack public-house, in Colchester, on Christmas-eve last, drinking and amusing themselves; they had not long been there, when a party of the 4th regiment of foot came in, and demanded a place at the fire, which was granted them. Not content with this, they afterwards proceeded to abuse the Lincoln men, as militia men and feather-bed soldiers. This abuse the militia men bore a long time, and at last attempted to retire, but the men of the 4th regiment being more violent, they proceeded to assault the others, and Costello was noticed to be particularly forward in the affray, having seized the poker, and dealt blows about him. He was particularly stated to be the person who knocked the deceased down with a blow, which appeared to have fractured his skull, and of which he died.

On the contrary, on behalf of the prisoners, several witnesses from the 4th regiment were called, who stated that the provocation came from the Lincoln men, and that there was a general row amongst the whole party; that they got to fighting in the house, and all came fighting into the street. The jury, after considerable deliberation, found the prisoners guilty of murder.—Death.

## THE SCALE OF ROGUERY EXEMPLIFIED

### *From the Earliest Stage of Human Depravity*

"He who at his early years  
Has sown in Vice, shall reap in Tears."

From the meanest petty larceny to the swindler in his phaeton, who assumes the name of Colonel, Lord, or Duke, there is a gradation of pride which supports each class, with a certain *quantum* of contempt for its inferior—and sometimes with an *honest* ambition to reach a higher rank, and instead of being huddled among the trials not worth recording, be stared at by a crowded Old Bailey, and honoured by a portrait in the print shops. The filcher of *door-mats* and *scrapers* looks up to the superior adroitness of the pickpockets, and the pickpocket longs for the day when, associating with the servants of some indulgent master, he may break into the house and the bureau, and supply the melting shops with bullion. The housebreaker, emboldened by success, would display his courage on the highway; and the highwayman, tired of a contest in which it is possible he may be either shot or hanged, devotes his leisure moments to the study of commerce, forms connexions at Liverpool, Bristol, and London, and issues his paper in hopes that when he obtains the discount he may hear no more of it; and, to prevent his name from being injured, very judiciously supplies himself with a commodity of various names and firms. At length, tired of borrowing money, he undertakes to lend it, and becomes a speculator upon a large and extensive scale.

Accuse any one of these, and you will find he screens himself by an appeal to his brethren. *Defendit numerus*. He asks, would you be so mad as to inquire into these petty matters? You will overturn the whole system; no man will be safe, for *all do the like*. Then, as a palliative to their own honour, the swindler tells you he is no highwayman nor footpad; the footpad pleads that he disturbs no man's sleep by breaking into his house at night; the housebreaker is happy to think he never picked a pocket, and the pickpocket thanks God he never descended so low as to steal pint-pots and door scrapers. These examples are taken from the very lowest on this scale. Let us proceed higher, and inquire whether speculation is to be estimated by *quantity* or *quality*, or at what precise sum honesty ends, and *t'other thing begins*.

To exemplify these melancholy observations, and to bring sufficient instances into one point of view, we found occasion to trace the progress of iniquity for a few months only of the time whereof we write. To begin then, at that early stage when we should be found, with satchel on our backs, "Creeping like snail, unwillingly to school."

We find on the records at the Old Bailey, that **BENJAMIN EDWARDS** was put to the bar, being charged with stealing one gallon of rum, and 8*l.* in Bank of England notes, and some silver, the property of John Towston. The prisoner contrived to get himself into the employ of the prosecutor, who is a wine and brandy merchant; but he had not been many hours engaged, when, taking advantage of the short absence of Mr. Towston, who went out about business, told him when he returned that an order came for a gallon of rum, and to bring change for a 10*l.* note. The prosecutor, not suspecting any wrong, gave him the rum to take to the supposed customer, together with the difference between the value of the rum and a 10*l.* note, but he never

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

returned. Being apprehended some few days afterwards for another offence, he was recognised by the prosecutor, who instantly identified him, as did his clerk. He at first denied all knowledge of him, but finding that would not do, he said that he himself was imposed on by a gentleman's servant, and afraid to go back to his master. He was convicted as for larceny; but it was intimated to him, that he was not to expect to remain any longer at large in this country—for it turned out not only that he was a most notorious offender, but that he had actually been tried about three sessions ago for nearly a similar offence in this court.—Sentenced to the house of correction for one year.

**JOHN HAWLEY**, alias **HAMPTON**, and **BENJAMIN RATTEY**, neither of whom had completed their twelfth year, were indicted for stealing various articles, the property of George Chalmers, nurseryman, at Newington. The facts were clearly proved, and the boys were both found Guilty. The court, and indeed every one present, were interested in their behalf, particularly Rattey, whose face was the picture of apparent innocence. The chairman asked Mr. Ives if he knew them, when he shook his head and said Rattey was well known to him, and he wished something could be done for him. An explanation took place, and we understand that he had been five times charged in that prison, that he had been tried for a capital offence; and that his brother, who was tried with him, had been transported, that he had been sent to the Marine Society, from whom he had run away, and had become a professed thief. The other boy was unknown, and he kept a determined silence as to what friends he had, or who were his parents. Not a creature came forward in their behalf, though they were decently dressed, and the court in consequence ordered their sentence to stand over till next sessions. The mother, however, of Rattey, a decent looking woman, was in court, and appeared to be much afflicted. They were sent to the house of correction. From the circumstance of Hawley's having been proved to have used two names, there is reason to suppose that he was vicious, perhaps, equal to his companion.

The next juvenile depredators who were put to the same bar, answered to the respective names of **OGLE**, **HAMILTON**, and **DOYLE**. They were charged with having burglariously broken and entered the house of Thomas Adlington, at Tottenham, in the county of Middlesex, and thereout taking six shawls, and a variety of wearing apparel, the property of Thomas Adlington.

O'Mara (an accomplice) stated, that he and the three prisoners, together with two others not yet taken, met on the evening before the robbery at a public house, when they agreed the next morning to assemble at the Swan in Salisbury-street, Fleet-street, where they breakfasted; that they did so assemble, whence they proceeded into the country with the intention of going as far as Cambridge, and rob all the way there and back; that they first stopped at Tottenham, where he and Hamilton sat down nearly opposite the prosecutor's shop, whilst Ogle and Doyle went in and robbed it; that they also committed another robbery, the booty whereof they likewise shared.

On his cross-examination by Mr. Barry, who was counsel for the prisoner Doyle, he said that he was an apprentice to a printer, had served but three years of his apprenticeship, and left his master; he could give no account how he got his bread, said he met the other boys at a public-house near St. Clement's Church-yard on the 23d, the night before the robbery, when he told them that he had just seen a gentleman's pocket picked by man that he knew was a sheriff's officer, and thereupon they agreed to go the next day out a-thieving. It was the first time that he ever took the other boys, or the prisoners, out with him. He himself had been in custody before; he

## SUPPLEMENT 2

had been once put into custody by his master, and again by an officer of the police, and lastly he was in custody upon this charge, and had the greatest and best part of the booty in his possession when he was apprehended. The rest of his cross-examination was a tissue of the former, and displayed all the hardened villain, a perfect adept in slang and wickedness, though not quite 18 years of age.

After a very able charge from Mr. Justice Heath, who observed, that Mrs. Adlington's testimony did not bring home the burglary to the prisoners, as she could not say whether the door of the shop had been shut or not, they were all acquitted of the capital part, and found guilty of the larceny only.

Doyle had numerous friends, who knew him from his birth (he was not quite 15 years old), and they gave him an excellent character, this being the first time that they ever heard anything dishonest imputed to him. Ogle and Hamilton had also friends who spoke to their characters. They were tried upon another charge of privately stealing three handkerchiefs from the shop of Mr. Wright, and found Guilty of stealing, but not privately; the capital part of the charge was therefore removed, and sentence transportation. The eldest of the three prisoners, viz. Ogle, was but just turned 16 years old.

**JOHN WHEELER**, another boy, was next put to the bar, charged on two indictments, the first with stealing some beef, and four carcasses of lamb, the property of Thomas Powell, and the second with stealing a horse and cart, the property of Marlborough Powell. He was found Guilty upon both indictments. On retiring from the bar, he seized a large leaden inkstand that lay near him in the dock, and was raising his arm to strike one of the witnesses against him, who was passing close by the dock, when his arm being seized he was prevented, and the inkstand wrested out of his hand. This being done in the face of the open court, the judges instantly directed that the keeper of the prison should restrict so dangerous a person even from communication with the other prisoners, and he was ordered to be kept in solitary confinement.

**MARGARET NORTON** was capitally indicted for stealing in the dwelling-house of George Bagshaw, a quantity of plate and other articles, the property of Mr. Scott. It appeared that the prisoner was hired by Mrs. Scott as a servant, from one of the offices in the neighbourhood of Covent-garden; and on the third day after she was hired she absconded. Mrs. Scott, alarmed at her absence, began to look after her property, and presently discovered that all her husband's plate, and divers other articles of value had been stolen. Information was immediately given at the police office, and the next morning the prisoner was discovered sitting upon the floor, at her lodgings in St. Giles's, sorting the plate. The jury, having no doubt but the prisoner committed the robbery, found her Guilty.—Death.

**WILLIAM RAWLINS**, a deaf and dumb lad, apprenticed from the Deaf and Dumb Asylum, was indicted for stealing some wearing apparel in the house where he lived. The peculiarity of this trial was the manner in which the proceedings were brought to the cognizance of the prisoner. An instructor from the Deaf and Dumb Asylum attended, and by signs either of his fingers, or by his lips, conveyed to the prisoner the depositions of the prosecutor and witnesses. The prisoner had been taught to write, and in his written answers evaded the charge with uncommon dexterity. For the most part, however, the instructor interpreted his answers from signs he made, and

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

a sort of hissing articulation from his lips. The larceny, however, was apparent, and the jury found him Guilty.

**WILLIAM BERRY, CHARLES GLOVER,** and **MARY TOOLEY,** were indicted for breaking and entering the dwelling-house of Frances Clarke, widow, in the day time, and stealing therein a pair of stockings, value 14s. The two boys, Berry and Glover, cut the shop window of Mrs. Clarke, haberdasher and milliner, in Great Russel-street, Bloomsbury, between 11 and 12 o'clock in the day, and stole a pair of black silk stockings, which they afterwards handed to Mary Tooley, who went to pawn them. They were watched during the whole transaction by a person of the name of Gerrard, and almost immediately taken into custody. They were all found Guilty, and were sentenced—Death—which, on account of their ages was commuted to transportation; Berry being only 13, Glover 14, and the girl 16.

**JOHN PALMER*****Executed 23<sup>rd</sup> November 1808, for Cutting and Maiming in the Course of a Burglary***

This man was an old offender, though only about twenty-three years of age, and was known to the police officers to be as bad a character as ever was brought to justice. He was indicted at the Old Bailey, before the Recorder, in the September sessions, 1808, for having, on the 8th, feloniously assaulted William Waller; and for having, with a certain sharp instrument, which he held in his right hand, stabbed and cut him, in and upon his head, with intent in so doing to kill and murder him.

William Waller stated, that he was a porter employed by Mr. Kimpton, an auctioneer, to take care of the house and furniture, No. 20, Manchester-square. He was consequently in charge of that house on the 8th of September, 1808. About four o'clock in the afternoon, he shut up the door and the windows, and made them safe. He stayed in the house till about seven o'clock; he went out then, having left the house secured; he returned between the hours of eleven and twelve o'clock the same night. He found it the same as he left it; he opened the door and went in, and locked the door; he put the chain on it; he went upstairs straight forward up in the room as usual. His room was on the right-hand garret. He went straight forward in the room, and pulled the sash down: he returned back to the bed-side, he pulled his coat and waistcoat off, and his handkerchief and shoes; he saw the blankets and the mattress disturbed to what he left it in the morning; he said to himself he did not leave these things in this manner; he turned round and touched the latch of the other garret; he had the latch in his hand, the prisoner at the bar caught hold of his collar. He was between the doors of the two garrets. He immediately laid hold of his collar; witness said, "Lord have mercy upon me." The prisoner said, "Do not speak a word, sir; lie down on the bed; that is all you have got to do: then he shoved witness on his breast to the bed, sideways, and threw him on the bed. He stood over witness, and the other man was behind him, whom he called Joseph. He said, Joseph, d—n him, fetch the pistol, and we will blow his brains out, he will not lay still; with that witness gave him a shove, and darted to the window; then he received a blow on his head immediately, from the same man who had hold of him and pushed him. Witness fell towards the window, and as he fell he lifted up the sash; he put his head out of the window, and hallooed out murder, as loud as he could; the people below hallooed out, Come down and open the door; he hallooed out, He would as quick as he could. He did; he unbolted the top bolt, and unchained it, and the people outside shoving the door so violently to get in, they shoved witness down; they knocked him backwards; he got up and went to the door; and while he stood there, the prisoner was standing there; the watchman had got him; he was outside of the door. Witness saw the prisoner in custody; he knew him directly. He said to him, "You rascal, you are the man that hit me on the head." He never spoke to witness. The blow he received was very heavy, but he could not then tell what it was done with; the constable found it was done with an iron crow; witness bled much, and was very faint. He was attended by a surgeon ever since. He was not yet recovered. He had no doubt but that the prisoner at the bar was the person that struck him; the other person made his escape; witness could not have recollected his person; he only took notice of the prisoner. It was a moonlight night, and he was standing over him when he laid on the edge of the bed; his face was

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

about a foot, or a foot and a half, from him. His voice was particular. He knew him afterwards by his person and his voice.

Henry Dance, a solicitor, living at No. 17, Manchester square, said, that on the 8th of September, about half past eleven, or near twelve o'clock at night, he heard a cry of murder several times repeated. On going into the street, he perceived it appeared at the front garret of No. 20: several persons called out to the man who was crying, "Can you let us into the house?" he said he was bleeding to death, and could not come down, for they would murder him. Four or five of the strongest people began to kick against the door, in order to break it open; while they were doing this, a man appeared behind the area, within the rails; he got over them, and jumped down in the street; immediately witness supposed him to be one of the persons belonging to the house. Witness laid his hands upon him, and said, "What have they been doing to you?" He said, "They wanted to murder the man that is in the house." Witness then said, "Who the devil are you?" He made no answer to that as he heard, and he was therefore seized by a number of people, among whom witness was one, and James Coburn another, and the watchman of their street another; this was close to the threshold of the door; by this time it appeared that the people had burst open the door, and amongst them was William Waller in his shirt, bleeding very much indeed. Witness asked Waller if any person belonged to the house but himself: he said, No. Witness said, Then this man must be secured. Another watchman of the name of Scofield came up; witness gave him to the watchmen, and examined the prisoner very attentively, in order that he might know him again.

James Cobourn, belonging to the barrack office, and who lives in Shepherd-street, Manchester-square, corroborated this statement. He was one of the persons who burst open the door, in doing which he knocked down the prosecutor. He saw him bleeding, and lying in the passage. He heard Waller say, that the prisoner was the man who struck him. The prisoner was then secured, and delivered to the watchmen.

George Ducas and William Scofield (the two watchmen) swore the prisoner was the man who had been given in charge to them. Ducas challenged him while the gentlemen were kicking open the door. He saw him in the area. Prisoner pretended that he belonged to the house, and that he slept below stairs. Henry Howard, a constable of the parish, said, that the next morning, while the surgeon was dressing Waller's wounds, he searched No. 20, Manchester-square; and on the two pair of stairs window he found an iron crow, which was produced. Witness was desired to look at a red mark on it, which he thought was rust; but the jury were of opinion that it was blood.

Benjamin Baker, another constable, said, he searched the Prisoner, and found on him a bottle of phosphorus, matches, &c. also a paper with the following writing, "No. 13, Edward-street, and a house in Harley-street; No. 30, Oxford-street, and No. 20, Manchester-square,—done:" a pair of snuffers and some picklock keys were also found on him. Waller swore the snuffers was part of Kimpton's goods which he had to take care of.

James Lomon surgeon, said, that the wound on Waller's head was about an inch and a half in length, and about the eighth part of an inch in depth; there was also a small wound upon his left arm. The blow fell slanting upon the head, and came on the arm.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

The prisoner in his defence, said, he was going by at the time of the noise. He found the snuffers and the keys. On his coming up again he was seized by some people, and taken to the watch-house. He was quite unprepared for his trial, or he could have produced witnesses who knew him for years, particularly Captain Rolles of the *Lion*, and Captain Ogle, of another ship, in which he went to the Mediterranean. He declared he had only been seven months ashore. The jury, however, found him Guilty, and he was ordered for execution, on Wednesday, November 23, 1808.

A few weeks before his execution he gave evident proofs of his wicked disposition: he conceived a plan of escape, which would have involved him in the additional guilt of murder, but which he, notwithstanding, determined to pursue. As it was necessary to have assistance, he communicated his intentions to a fellow prisoner in a similar situation with himself, who gave his consent to participate in his danger, in the hope of sharing in his success. It was arranged between them, to attempt their plan on the following Sunday, when the prisoners and the principal turnkeys were attending divine service, (from which Palmer and his associate were to excuse themselves on account of illness.) Their scheme was to assassinate the keeper in the press-yard, in the first instance: and as there was only another turnkey, whose station was on the inside of the outer gate, he was the only person who would interpose between them and their liberty; him they hoped to subdue by threats, and to be able to lock him up in a place of safety; but, in case of resistance, it would be necessary to dispose of him in the same manner as his comrade. In the event of the farther keeper being by accident on the outside of the gate, they were provided with rope ladders to scale the walls, and also with saws to release them from their irons. When they reached the outside, they expected to be received by their friends, with proper means to transport them quickly from their pursuers. The confidant and companion of Palmer not being so hardened in iniquity as himself, communicated in due time to Mr. Newman the scheme in contemplation, when a search was made, and a rope ladder, with several instruments, were found about the bed of Palmer, and proper means taken for his better security.

Finding himself foiled in the object which he had entertained sanguine hopes of accomplishing, his mind was for a time so agitated and disturbed, that he could not apply himself seriously and attentively to prayer. As the period now approached for his execution, he seemed desirous to have the term extended for one week, to the end, he stated, that he might have the more time to make his peace with God, an object he had hitherto neglected for schemes of villainy and wickedness, which had ended in grief and disappointment. Mr. Sheriff Hunter preferred his request to government, but it was refused; he, therefore made the best use he could of the few remaining hours left him. He demeaned himself properly to all about him, confessed the justice of his sentence, and professed to die in charity with all men. In order to atone for the crimes he had committed, he made a full confession of every robbery and burglary he had been concerned in, which threw light upon various transactions that might otherwise have remained for ever unknown.

On passing through the press-yard on Wednesday morning, on his way to the scaffold, he invoked a blessing on all his fellow-prisoners, and requested of Dr. Ford, the ordinary of Newgate, that the cap might not be drawn over his face until the moment it was absolutely necessary. A silk handkerchief which he had in his pocket for the purpose, was, at his earnest request tied over his eyes. He attempted to address the mob from the platform, but his speech failed him. He contented himself with

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

bowing to the populace. His conduct to the last moment on the platform was becoming and proper, and such as fully accorded with the promise he had lately made, that he would die a true penitent.

**RICHARD THOMAS DUDMAN AND EDWARD WOOD**  
*Convicted of a Conspiracy, of the Foulest Nature, at the  
 Middlesex Sessions, and Sentenced to Imprisonment and the  
 Pillory*

Convictions and punishments of this disgusting description we have hitherto excluded from our pages; nor should these monsters be named, were it not to introduce a witness of a novel description, who appeared in behalf of one of the prisoners. It may almost, indeed, be called a phenomenon in a court of criminal judicature.

A Quaker appeared as a witness on behalf of the defendant Dudman, who submitted to be sworn on the Holy Evangelists, contrary to all the known rules of that religious body of men. The object of his testimony was to invalidate the evidence of the youth who prosecuted. The Quaker, whose name is Abraham Braithwaite, swore that he had a conversation with the prosecutor, in which he declared, that so far from the prisoner Dudman having deserved to be charged with so foul an offence, he always conducted himself towards him kindly and well, and he (the prosecutor) added, that he respected him exceedingly.

On his cross-examination he was compelled (for he yielded with great reluctance to the pressing interrogatories of Mr. Alley, counsel for the prosecutor) to name the day when this conversation passed between him and the youth, and he said, some time between the 28th of October, and the 2nd of November; and being still further pressed to say why he fixed so accurately upon that precise period, he assigned, in the most solemn manner, as a reason, because on the 1st of November he had a letter, the subject of which enabled him to know that the conversation he alluded to with the prosecutor had taken place the day before, of course that it must have happened on the 31st of October. He was then desired to state to the court how, and from whom, he learned that there was any such charge made against the prisoner Dudman, and he replied, that he had heard it from a Mr. Ellis, where Dudman lodged.

When he had finished his evidence, Mr. Ellis was called, at the instance of the Rev. H. B. Dudley, one of the magistrates, to ascertain whether he could confirm the account given by the Quaker; but, so far from that, he declared that he himself did not know of any such charge being made against Dudman; nor, in point of fact, was any charge made against him till the arrival in town of the prosecutor's brother, and that not till the 7th of November: of course the thing could not be known to the Quaker on the 31st of October. The jury, after some observations from the chair, found the defendants, to the satisfaction of a crowded court, guilty on both indictments; giving no kind of credit to the tale of the Quaker.

The chairman, after expatiating on the foul and vile enormity of their crimes, sentenced them to two years' imprisonment, and, within the first month of that time, to stand one hour in the pillory; where the mob testified their execrations, by severely pelting them with the offal brought by butchers from Newgate and Fleet Markets.

**THE PARSON'S HORSE AND THE WINDMILL.**  
*A Singular Case*

An indictment was sometime since (1809) tried at Huntingdon which excited no small degree of pleasantry as well as interest in the county: but the issue, perhaps, was the most singular that ever took place:—It was an indictment against a miller for a nuisance for working his mill so near the common highway as to endanger the lives of his Majesty's subjects, by frightening the horses travelling on the road.

The prosecutor was a clergyman residing in the neighbourhood of Huntingdon, a man of considerable property and consequence in the county. The mill in question was an old erection, and stood some time back far out of the high road upon a common; but by a recent act of parliament the common had been enclosed, and the only road left, unfortunately for the miller, passed close under the fly of his mill. The prosecutor, it appeared, was compelled to go this road, and the mill being at work as he passed, his horse took fright and threw him. This happened with almost every horse that passed the mill.

Mr. Justice Grose addressed the jury, and observed, that as the mill now stood, it was unquestionably a nuisance, and the miller must be found guilty. It was, however, no fault of his, he could not move his mill; but the commissioners under the Enclosure Bill, who directed the road to be set out, were most to blame, and he regretted they had not been made parties to the indictment. Neither was the prosecutor to blame, in preferring the indictment. He could go no other way since the enclosure, and his life, as well as those of his fellow-subjects travelling by the mill, was endangered, while the mill remained in its present situation. Under such circumstances he felt himself wholly at a loss how to act: the miller ought not to be punished for that he was innocent of, and yet the prosecutor's convenience and the public safety must be consulted. He thought, however, that the best way of deciding would be to direct the prosecutor to pay the miller 40*l.* and the miller to abate the nuisance, with leave to erect his mill on some convenient spot adjoining. This was accordingly made the judgment of the court. This decision caused much surprise in the county, being the first instance wherein the prosecutor has been made to pay a fine for obtaining justice.

**MUTINY AT MALTA, APRIL 1807***A Caution to Soldiers*

ON Saturday, the 4th of April, 1807, at three o'clock in the afternoon, Valette was alarmed by a most daring mutiny in the regiment of Froberg, consisting of foreigners of every description, quartered in the fortress on the opposite side of the harbour of Valette, called the Ricasoli in the Island of Malta. The adjutant Swartz, on being apprised of the intended mutiny, sallied out with other officers, determined to quell it in its infancy, but did not succeed; himself and Captain Whitfield fell victims in the attempt—the major and others were wounded.

In the fortress, on duty, was a party of the Royal British Artillery, commanded by Capt. Fade, who were immediately disarmed, and remained under the control of the mutineers, and compelled by them to load the cannon and mortars, and point them towards the city of La Valette, or wherever otherwise they thought proper to order them. The soldiers of the regiment, who were not of the number of the mutineers, embraced the opportunity that offered to effect their escape, and a great number accomplished it, though many of them were shot at by the mutineers in making the attempt; several of these unfortunate men were wounded, and others shot dead.

The ring-leaders on the third day, possibly with a view to get supplies of provision, opened the great gates of the fort, placing sentinels in the usual order, of which opportunity on the 5th day, about 300 availed themselves, taking with them the major of the regiment wounded, in a litter, and all the officers, together with Captain Fade, and the artillery men, and all the English women with their children. The two sentinels attempted to oppose this party, who were immediately shot dead by them.

In this fortress was a large powder magazine, containing about 500 barrels of gunpowder, at which an artillery man was placed sentinel, from whom the mutineers demanded entrance into the magazine, which he boldly refused at the expense of his life, as they instantly put him to death. The numbers of the mutineers in the fort, in consequence of continual desertion, was reduced to a very few, and on Friday the 10th of April, at six o'clock in the afternoon, fired two bombs on this city, which happily did no injury. It was resolved to storm the place at daybreak the next morning, and take them by surprise, ere they could have time to put in execution their threatened purpose of blowing up the powder magazine. The walls were scaled, but a dog giving the alarm, frustrated the plan. Six of the eight remaining retired to the magazine; the other two were cut off from the magazine. They, however, fired two bombs towards the city, which providentially did no injury. On Sunday evening, at ten o'clock, the six resolved to blow up the magazine, in order to make their escape, which they effected. In the magazine were from 4 to 500 barrels of gunpowder, which made a most tremendous explosion; fortunately, the plan was suspected, and only a small number of troops were therefore placed in the fort to watch their motions and prevent their escape, and to surprise them if any opportunity offered: happily, therefore, only three soldiers became the victims, and two or three wounded. The shock of the explosion did infinite damage to the windows.

The mutineers fled into the interior of the island, and were afterwards taken. The last of them taken was a black disguised in women's clothes, on whom fell the lot to blow up the magazine. A court-martial was held at the Town-house, on twenty-five

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

of the mutineers, supposed to be ring-leaders; one of whom at the gallows was respited, the others executed; ten hanged, and fourteen shot.

**JOHN TROY*****Executed before Newgate, for Forgery, 3<sup>rd</sup> July 1805***

THE untimely fate of this young man greatly adds to the too numerous lists of unfortunate youths who have suffered for the crime of forgery, and whose case (though destitute of anything remarkable or novel) shows the necessity of bearing a good character; for had this culprit (who was about twenty-six years of age) been able to have called two or three respectable witnesses to attest his integrity, his defence, which was certainly plausible, would doubtless have had some effect upon the Jury.

He was indicted for uttering a counterfeit 5*l.* bank of England note, knowing the same to be forged. It appeared that the prisoner had offered the note in question to a Mr. Rhodes, a hosier, in Holborn, in order to pay for a pair of stockings, which he had agreed to purchase at the rate of twelve shillings. Mr. Rhodes suspected the note to be a bad one; and, pretending to go out to get change, consulted a gentleman in his neighbourhood, who confirmed his suspicion. He then procured a constable; and, returning to the shop, the prisoner was taken into custody. The note was proved to be a counterfeit; and it was also proved that the prisoner had passed two other forged notes of the same fabrication. To one of these persons, Thomas Thompson, linen-draper and hosier, in New-street, Covent-garden, he gave the name of John May, Blackbird, Low-Layton.

Elizabeth Shepherd, who keeps the Blackbird, at Low Layton, declared, that she did not know, or ever saw, the prisoner. The other person on whom he imposed, was Ann Pudephat, who keeps a milliner's shop, in Tichbourne-street: she said, that Mary Young, whom she also knew by the name of Mary Thompson, agreed to give her a guinea for a small bonnet, which she promised to send for. The prisoner came for this bonnet, and paid her with a forged 5*l.* note; she gave him four pounds, and he gave her a shilling. Mary Young said, she had been acquainted with the prisoner almost a twelvemonth; and she did commission him to call for the bonnet, but that she gave him cash (gold and silver) to pay for it: at the same time, requesting him to get it if he could for a pound. She did not know that he then had a 5*l.* note in his possession; and she remembered asking him, at that time, to try and pass a bad dollar which she had, when his answer was, "Do you want me to be hanged!" The prisoner in his defence acknowledged that he had uttered these notes, but declared that he did not know that they were forged. He found them, he said, and confessed his dishonesty in not advertising the book in which they were: they did not belong to him; but through his partner's distressing him to the last shilling, he parted with them. "Can it be supposed," added he, "that I, knowing these 5*l.* notes be forged, would have continued in Mr. Rhodes's shop, when he was away a full quarter of an hour! I was left on the other side of the counter, and the door open." Being asked, if he had any witness to call in his behalf, he said, he had not; and accordingly the jury pronounced him—Guilty.

**GEORGE RICHARD WALKER AND CHRISTOPHER  
DODDS**

*Executed before Newgate, for Forgery, 11<sup>th</sup> June, 1806*

These men, together with Thomas Rochester, and Richard Walker, were tried at the Old Bailey, April 19, 1806, for conspiring together and forging a will, with intent to defraud the next of kin to Major Richard Hawkins, of the Royal Engineer corps. The gentleman, on whose property this wicked attempt had been made, died at Trinidad; the persons who were to receive the property did not exist; yet a suit was commenced at Doctor's Commons, for the recovery of the same, by the prisoner, G. R. Walker, who was the executor, although he, on the face of the will, was not to receive the smallest benefit. Allegations were filed in support of the will, by the other three prisoners, as collateral witnesses to the will.

The first witness called upon this singular trial was Major Rowley, an officer of the corps of Engineers, who was very intimately acquainted with the late Major Richard Hawkins, of the same corps. He was captain in the Engineers, but he held the rank of Major in the army. The Major quitted England for Trinidad on the 5th of April, 1803, and witness heard officially of his death on the 10th of July in the same year. Witness went with Lieutenant Hawkins, nephew of the deceased, in October, to the house of Mrs. Bethel, Paradise-row, Lambeth, where he, the Major, had resided, to search for a will, or testimony paper; but they did not find such a paper. Witness received a letter in August, 1804, from the prisoner, George Richard Walker, whom he had formerly seen in the Island of Jersey. This was the first time witness had ever heard of a will of the late Major being in existence. Witness became acquainted with Major Hawkins in 1787, and he had since been very intimately acquainted with him; they had been staff officers together in the corps of Engineers. He had a brother and two nephews, the one an officer in the army, whom he was remarkably fond of, and the other a lieutenant in the navy. He was always on particularly good and affectionate terms with them, and in particular with the lieutenant in the army. Witness had often seen the late Major write, and he was particularly an accurate writer: he never employed an amanuensis with his own official papers. The will was here produced, and proved to be a forgery by the witness, who said there was a resemblance of the Major's hand writing. The will represented the testator as Major of the Engineer corps, when in fact there was no such commission held in the corps. Witness never knew that the late Major had any acquaintance with Elizabeth Hind or a Mr. and Mrs. Browning. Witness never knew of any acquaintance between the prisoner, G. R. Walker, and Major Hawkins; but he had been stationed at Guernsey from 1793 to 1798, where the prisoner lived.

General Moss knew Major Hawkins for the last twenty-five years, having been that time under his command in the Engineer corps, and whose reports, in his own handwriting, he always received. On looking at the will, witness was positive the signature was not the hand-writing of the late Major Hawkins. The designation of himself and his rank, in the will, was very incorrect, and the Major was always a very correct writer.

General Twist had known the late Major forty-four years, and he corroborated the statement of his brother officers, that the will was a forgery. He also knew him to have always been on very affectionate terms with his relatives, one of whom he caused to be educated at Portsmouth.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Sir W. Green, another officer, who knew Major Hawkins very well, also proved the will to be a forgery. William Test, Esq. also corroborated.

Mr. Richard Hawkins, nephew to the deceased Major, and a lieutenant in the army, stated that his family connections were a father, the late Major's brother, an own brother, and two sisters, all of whom were on the most affectionate terms. Witness heard of the death of his uncle at Trinidad in the middle of October, 1804. The will was produced, and the witness swore the signature, &c. was not the hand-writing of his uncle. He never knew the name of Elizabeth Hind, but he had heard his uncle mention Walker's name.

Robert Heddington was called, and he proved the signature of the will, and the affidavits thereto belonging, to have been written by G. Walker, Rochester, and Dodds. He would not swear to the signature of Richard Walker. The will was here read by the clerk of the arraigns, which was signed with the name of G. R. Walker, Esq. Guernsey, executor. The affidavit of Walker annexed to the will as executor went to state that he knew of no other will or codicil of the late Major Hawkins. The allegations relating to the will made by the prisoners were read in Court, and the hand-writings were severally sworn to by several witnesses.

Elizabeth Sadler, who resided in Dartmouth-street, Westminster, stated, that the prisoner, George Walker, and his wife, occupied apartments in her house in July 1803, and they went by the name of Browning. Mrs. Mary Woodford also proved that George Walker occupied apartments in her house 1803, in Brook Street, New-road, Mary-le-bone, in his own name, and also a woman of the name of Browning. Witness knew a man of the name of Heddington, and Walker was deaf. Mr. Hines lodged in the same house, and corroborated this statement.

The next witness, Heddington, who had been privy to all the transactions of the prisoner, and who was a most material witness in this case, had known the prisoner, George Walker, many years. He was employed by government at Guernsey to supply the different garrisons with coals, &c. and witness was his servant. In July 1804, he received a letter (the prisoner Rochester being then out of Walker's employ) to call on him (Rochester) in Wellclose-square, at his house. Witness did so; he was not at home; but a letter was left for him, with one inclosed for G. Walker for him to convey to his older master, in which he was not to fail. Witness delivered the letter to the woman who lived with Walker as his wife, who called herself Mrs. Browning. He was informed by Rochester, on his return to his house in Wellclose-square, that an old intimate friend of Walker's had died at Trinidad; and there was only one subscribing witness to the will, a Mrs. Browning, who had left the country in consequence of an altercation respecting family matters. Two more witnesses were necessary, and Mr. Walker had known him long, and he of course could have no objection to become a subscribing witness. The will was a good one, G. Walker was executor, and no evil could arise from his signature. An appointment was made for a meeting between G. Walker and witness, at the Circus Coffee-house, St. George's-Fields, where witness found Walker and a man of the name of Godson in waiting, who was one of Walker's clerks. Walker was deaf, and they communicated to each other on slips of paper, which were burned. Walker assured witness there was no danger in signing, and they agreed to meet and dine the next day at the house of the prisoner Rochester. They met at three o'clock, and dined together, agreeable to the appointment; the company consisted of Mrs. R. Walker and witness. After dinner, Rochester beckoned witness upstairs, and placed a paper in his hand, which was the will in question. Witness

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

smiled, and observed, the ink was not yet dry. Rochester advised him to sign under the name of Brown, stating that he had been promised three hundred pounds to do so, on his part, and Walker would give him, the witness, one hundred pounds and five guineas to do the same. Witness positively refused to sign the will, and left the house. He saw Rochester again the next day, who informed him the will he had seen was only a copy of the original. Witness saw Dodds, who was an attorney's clerk, the following day, and he acquainted him with what had happened. Dodds begged to be introduced to the parties; for he had seen many good wills, and he was a competent judge of them. It was difficult to prove a will at Doctor's Commons for want of witnesses.

Witness apprised Rochester of what had passed, and an interview was the consequence between him and the prisoner Dodds. Richard Walker, the other prisoner, was heard of, and introduced to the parties by Dodds, at the Saracen's-Head, Snowhill. Dodds was hired to get another subscribing witness to the will, by Rochester. Rochester accused witness with having strange ideas respecting the will, and danger of signing it, which he again observed was only a copy. Mrs. Browning contended that she was the widow of a captain. The will was again produced in the presence of witness, and Dodds took it to the window, and looked at the water mark: he said that a man should not have to do with such things without having had experience. The water mark appeared to him to be plausible. Richard Walker said, he would not sign until Dodds had done so, for he was a man of the law. Witness then saw the whole of them sign, as he was standing by them.

The other part of the witness's statement went clearly to involve the whole of the prisoners in guilt. Several other witnesses were examined, and Lord Ellenborough summed up in a very humane and perspicuous manner: he occupied three hours in his charge to the jury, who withdrew for about twenty minutes, and found George Richard Walker and Christopher Dodds guilty, but acquitted the other two. The trial lasted fourteen hours, and did not conclude till eleven o'clock. The Court was excessively crowded, and many distinguished personages were on the bench with the judges. These two offenders suffered the sentence of the law, opposite the debtor's door, Newgate.

**RICHARD NEWELL**  
*Whipped for Cruelty to his Apprentices*

Richard Newell, hinge-maker, was indicted at Stafford by the directors of the House of Industry, and the Parish officers of Rowley Regis, for ill-treatment towards two parish apprentices he had from Shrewsbury, and was sentenced to six months' imprisonment; at the expiration of which time, to be publicly whipped by the common hangman through Rowley Regis, the town in which he lived. His imprisonment would have been longer; but, in consideration of his large family, the Court was inclined to set him at liberty at the end of six months, that he might contribute to their support.

Newell's extreme cruelty, in beating the boys in the most horrid manner, (frequently with thick wire rods,) called forth the execrations of every person who heard the trial; and the whole Court expressed their satisfaction at the conduct of the parties who brought forward the prosecution, and strongly recommended the example to be followed by all the parish officers and directors of Poor-houses, in similar cases.

**ANN THOMPSON**  
*A Prostitute, Indicted for the Murder of her Keeper, and  
Found Guilty of Manslaughter*

*Another Warning to Females not to Depart from the Paths of Virtue.*

KEPT women and acknowledged courtesans were formerly, and very justly so, denominated infamous; but now they rear their heads in every assembly, and, with unblushing effrontery, stare virtue out of countenance, and mock the ear of modesty. The attention paid to them is a disgrace to polished society, and destructive of polite morals. Their gallants make them the depository of the hear-say scandal attached to the families of rank and distinction; and as every woman, lost to virtue from a congeniality of soul, has in private a confidential friend, lost to honour, the scandal is circulated, and the libeller, thus envenomed, shoots his poisoned arrows abroad, and defames and vilifies the first characters in the land. Of late years these wretches have greatly increased, both in numbers and notoriety; and, under that demi-royal duchess Mrs. Clarke, they have acquired a new title. We now no longer hear of "Kept women;"—the Cyprian Corps are to be henceforth styled, "Under protection." The luxury of a shilling ride in a *Hack* to half price in the upper boxes of a Theatre, gives place to a dashing chariot—malgre the nation's poverty—attended by fellows in laced liveries, who drive and attend the protected harlots to the masquerade, the opera, and the fashionable concert; and, when ruin stares their protector in the face, like the cherished serpent, they turn upon him, and sting him to the worst of deaths.

Ann Thompson was indicted for the wilful murder of Joseph Walker, by giving him a stab in the side with a knife, of which wound he languished a short time and died. A multitude of witnesses were examined in the course of the trial, but our limits will only allow of giving the substance of their evidence.

The prisoner is a woman of dissolute life, and lived in Denmark street, East Smithfield. The deceased was a man with whom she cohabited; who were frequently quarrelling and fighting. On the evening of the 26th of December, 1809, they were both drinking together at a public-house, in the neighbourhood of Denmark-street. The deceased wished to go home with the prisoner, which she refused, telling him she had kept him long enough, and would keep him no longer. The prisoner went to her lodgings, and the deceased followed her.

Some time after, Anthony, a black, who lodged in the same house with the prisoner, heard a violent noise in her room, and a scuffle, as if two persons were fighting. He went to the door of the prisoner's apartment, and looking through the key-hole saw the prisoner standing up with a knife in her hand, and, the deceased lying upon the ground, groaning and complaining. The prisoner was mocking him, and said he only feigned to be hurt. He then fetched a watchman, and on the door being opened the deceased was still lying upon the ground. He then removed the deceased's clothes from the side he said he was wounded on, and discovered an aperture, from whence part of his bowels seemed to have exuded. The prisoner appeared extremely agitated, and exclaimed, "This is the knife that did it; I wish my hand had been off before I had taken it up." She then fell upon the deceased, kissed him, and asked him if it was

## SUPPLEMENT 2

possible he could forgive her? The deceased replied, "Nancy, I forgive you from my heart." A surgeon was then sent for, who advised that the deceased should be immediately taken to the hospital. The prisoner sent for a coach, and assisted the deceased into it. She also stayed with him in the hospital, and conducted herself as a woman of tenderness should do. The deceased died in her arms, and her affliction was extreme.

The evidence in defence proved that the prisoner was determined the deceased should not live with her any longer, in consequence of his having so frequently ill-treated her. On the night of the affray he had beat her, and wounded her knee—her face and eyes were discoloured with blows, and her clothes were torn. She succeeded, however, in getting him out of the house; but he returned by a back way; and, having previously exclaimed, in the hearing of the neighbours, that he would mark her for having shut him out, he rushed with great fury into her apartment. The door was fastened, and the fatal blow was given. The prisoner was also described as a quiet and decent woman, considering her way of life.

Baron Macdonald, in his summing up, observed, that to constitute the crime of murder, there must be either malice propense, express, or implied, from the facts in the case. But if one person struck another, the law would justify a blow in retaliation; and if that blow should occasion death, the law, allowing for the infirmity of human nature, moderated the crime of killing to manslaughter. The jury would therefore look to the evidence in the case before them, and say, whether the deceased had met his death from the pre-determined malice of the prisoner, or whether it was the result of a scuffle, in which the prisoner was defending herself against the violence of the deceased, and unguardedly used the knife in her own preservation.

The jury were of the latter opinion, and found the prisoner guilty of manslaughter; thus escaping with paying a small fine, and suffering a short imprisonment. She was greatly agitated during her trial, from the fear of being found guilty upon the capital part of the indictment; from which she certainly saved herself by her sorrow and contrition for the foul deed.

**JOHN LEONARD WHITE**

*Executed before Newgate, for Cutting and Maiming, 15<sup>th</sup>  
February 1806*

This was a notorious offender, and one of the gang who enticed [George Webb](#) from the paths of virtue. He was connected with villains that had long infested the neighbourhood of Blackheath, who had been tried at the summer assizes in Maidstone 1805, with Webb and Russel, but acquitted for want of sufficient evidence. According to his own account, he was the son of a man of property who had left him 5000*l.* but such was his iniquitous disposition, that he did not long outlive his above mentioned companions, although he then publicly boasted, that the police-officers (whom he well knew) should never capitally convict him, as he would take care that no instrument of house-breaking, or fire-arms, should ever be found in his possession.

It is said, that he and some others, determined to rob a gentleman's house, had got to the back-garden wall, when a conversation took place who should get over the wall first, as there were several servants about the house; when one of the thieves said, "If they come I have poppers" (pistols). Then said White, "You may go and rob yourselves, for I will have nothing to do with it," and he left them. They succeeded, and robbed; and White, it is said, having found out the amount taken, insisted on a share of the produce; for he used to say, he always thought it bad enough to rob without using people ill; yet he forfeited his life on that account; for on his return to London, where he still pursued his former thieving habits (which he had followed for many years), he in company with John Richardson, endeavouring, upon one of those occasions, to escape, cut and maimed a watchman who was about to apprehend him, for which John L. White and John Richardson were brought to trial, at the commencement of the Old Bailey sessions, December 4<sup>th</sup>, 1808, before the lord mayor, Mr. Justice Grose, Mr. Baron Graham, the Recorder, &c.

Eliza Russel, a servant, at No. 36, Lamb's Conduit street, said, that she heard the prisoners in the area, between the 23<sup>d</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> of September, endeavouring to make a burglarious entry into her master's house. She therefore called in the assistance of three watchmen to apprehend them. William Randall, a watchman, and the prosecutor, went with the other watchmen into the area of the house where the prisoners were standing, with the intention to take them into custody; on which White struck him a blow on the head with an iron crow, which laid his skull open; the other also aided in the assault; but they were finally overpowered and secured.

The facts of the case were clearly proved, and the prisoners were found guilty. On Friday, December 6<sup>th</sup>, the prisoners were put to the bar, and Mr. Alley, on their behalf, moved an arrest of judgment. He grounded this motion on two points, first, that the indictment ought to have averred, that the prosecutor intended to apprehend them: secondly, that Richardson, not being present when the blow was given, the evidence ought not to have implicated him. Mr. Justice Grose and Mr. Baron Graham both concurred in opinion, in thinking, that it was entirely a matter for the jury, and that they, by their verdict, had found the facts in the affirmative. Motion refused. John Richardson was, however, respited; but John Leonard White was executed, pursuant to his sentence, at the Old Bailey. He appeared truly penitent.

**ANDREW SCHOSTOCK*****A German Soldier Serving in the King's German Legion,  
Executed in Kent, for the Horrid Murder of a Woman, in the  
Isle Of Thanet, 27<sup>th</sup> March, 1807***

This merciless man was tried at Maidstone assizes, on an indictment charging him with the wilful murder of Thomazin Ward, at St. Peter's, in the Isle of Thanet.

Mr. Gurney opened the prosecution, and he was followed on the same side by Mr. Garrow, who stated the facts attending the case to the jury. The counsel observed, that the prisoner was a private soldier in the King's German Legion, and the unfortunate woman who was murdered was at the time a shopkeeper of respectability, residing in St. Peter's, in the Isle of Thanet. She had taken a walk to Broadstairs, about a mile distant from her place of residence, and not having arrived back again at the time appointed, her husband became alarmed for her safety; and, on search being made, the body was found in a field, about sixty yards from the road. It was evident, the learned counsel observed, that the unfortunate woman had experienced much violence; her body was exposed, and her person had been injured. The prisoner, it would be proved, was seen walking a few yards distant from the deceased a short time before the murder was committed, and it would be proved in evidence that he was absent from his guard without leave from seven to ten o'clock; his shoes were extremely dirty with field-dirt; and it would be proved that he was found in possession of three handkerchiefs, the property of the deceased, which had been taken from her. On being questioned where he was at nine o'clock, the prisoner said he was at the Neptune's Hall public-house, which would be contradicted in evidence; and he said that the handkerchiefs found in his possession had been given him by a stranger. In another conversation the prisoner had said he saw a man knock a woman down, and it was the same man who gave him the handkerchiefs. A ribband was found tied very tight round the neck of the deceased, and it would be proved by her husband that she never wore an appendage of the kind. It would be stated by a surgeon, that by this ribband the deceased was strangled. Under the strong circumstances attending the case, the jury would have no doubt of the guilt of the prisoner.

Henry Blackburn, a carpenter, residing at Broadstairs, stated, that he met a soldier in the regimentals worn by the German Legion, as he was returning home from the village of St. Peter's, about nine o'clock in the evening, and he immediately after met the deceased, with whom he conversed. She was in good health, and was going home. Witness could not swear to the prisoner as being the man whom he met.

Stephen May found the body of the deceased at twelve o'clock at night, in a field about 60 yards from the road, where the preceding witness saw the deceased. She was lying on her back, and her apparel was in a very disordered state, it being mostly torn from her. Her mouth was open, and witness found a handkerchief lying by her side, which was wet, and from appearances it had been stuffed into the mouth of the deceased. A ribbon was also fastened as tight as possible round her neck. Her person had sustained a good deal of injury. There were tracks of two persons having had a scuffle from the road to the field.

Mr. Frome, a surgeon, at Broadstairs, examined the body of the deceased; but there were no external marks sufficient to cause death. There might be a concussion of the brain by a fall, or by other violence, so as not to leave appearances behind.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

Witness had seen the ribband which was tied twice round the neck; and which he believed was the cause of death by suffocation.

Serjeant Frederick Riford, a serjeant belonging to the German Legion, proved that, on the evening of the murder, the prisoner absented himself from the guard without leave, from seven till ten o'clock. In consequence of information given at the guard-room by a Mr. Barfield of the murder, a privy was searched, and two handkerchiefs found therein, which were proved to have belonged to the deceased. Another handkerchief, which had also been taken from the deceased, was found in the crown of the prisoner's foraging cap. The prisoner had informed witness, that the handkerchiefs were given him by a stranger whom he had seen knock a woman down, after dragging her into a field.

Robert Barfield, sub-deputy of St. Peter's, gave information of the murder at the guard-house, in the presence of the prisoner, who appeared a good deal agitated. This gentleman corroborated what was stated by the preceding witness respecting the finding of the handkerchief; and he also stated, that the shoes of the prisoner were covered with field dirt.

The testimony of other witnesses strengthened the case, so as to leave no doubt of the guilt of the prisoner; and one of them proved that he had left the Neptune's Hall at half-past eight o'clock. Another witness proved, that the prisoner pointed out the spot where the murder was committed.

William Ward, the husband of the deceased, who appeared deeply affected, said that his wife had gone to Broadstairs on the evening of the murder to see her daughter, and he proved that she never wore a ribband round her neck.

Judge Heath summed up the evidence, and the jury without hesitation found the prisoner guilty. He was sentenced to be executed, and his body to be dissected.

The prisoner had an interpreter; and after sentence was passed on him, he said, "There is one God, and one heaven," and he had one prayer to make, the judge having informed him he need not expect mercy in this world.

**BENJAMIN PLUMBER, JOHN SPITTLE, CHARLES  
SIFLEET, AND JOHN SAVAGE**  
*Convicted of Burglary at Maidstone Assizes, 27<sup>th</sup> March 1807*

These men were indicted for a burglary in the house of Margaret Baldwin, at Wrotham, in the county of Kent.

Mrs. Baldwin, an old lady, aged 60, said that on the night stated in the indictment five men rushed into her house, after someone had previously knocked at the door. They immediately secured the servants, and put a guard over them. They were all bound together in a chair. They then dragged her about the house, and made her discover her money and plate. While they were doing this her gown sleeve caught fire from the candle, and her female servant exclaiming "she would be burnt," one of the men cried out, "D-n the old bitch, let her burn." Three of them were like soldiers, and they were all disguised, so that she could not speak to the persons of any of them. While they remained in the house they ran backward and forward, so as to lead them to suppose that there were many more outside. They rifled the house, and took away, besides 100*l.* in money, a great quantity of plate.

The principal evidence to convict the prisoners was that of George Hill, an accomplice; and he stated that the above parties having agreed upon the robbery, they met in a wood near Mereworth, and there disguised themselves, and proceeded to Mrs. Baldwin's house, which they entered in the manner she described, and bound four persons they found in the house in a chair; they then compelled Mrs. Baldwin to disclose where her money was, which they carried off and all the plate. Spittle and Sifleet had blue jackets, and the witness had an old soldier's jacket; their faces were all disguised either by blacking or with crape. He stated that Plummer was the planner of the robbery; and it was also proved that Plummer had offered some of the articles of the plate to sell at Gravesend.

The jury found them all-Guilty—Death.

**PATRICK PRENDERGAST**

*Executed before Newgate, the 25th of March 1807, for  
Burglary*

THIS unfortunate man was convicted of a burglary in the house of a Mr. G. Bell, at Edgware at Middlesex. Though the robbery of Mr. Bell was daring, yet his behaviour at the place of execution indicated the greatest contrition. The son and daughter of the malefactor were, most unadvisedly, present at the melancholy end of their depraved parent; and, on his being launched into eternity, became almost frantic, and were conveyed from the agonizing scene in a state of insensibility. We can readily suppose the effect produced by such a shock upon the nervous system as beholding a parent in the throes of death, under the hands of the executioner; for hard must be that heart that can, unmoved, witness such a sight inflicted upon a stranger.

A shocking instance of this happened to Mr. William Boddington, high constable of the Finsbury Division, a few years ago. Mr. Boddington attended, in his official capacity, at the execution of Francis Hubbard, who suffered in Hatton-garden for the murder of Jordan Hosty, near that place; and a minute or two after that malefactor had been turned off, he fainted; and being taken home in a coach, was put to bed, from which he rose no more.

A few years ago, information being made of a disorderly meeting at an ale-house in Turnmill-street, under the name of the Cock-and-Hen-Club, Mr. Boddington was directed by the justices to disperse them: accordingly, attended by other constables, he went to the house; and, upon entering the club-room, the officers were assailed with cutlasses and other weapons, and were all severely wounded. Hubbard was the man who attacked Mr. Boddington, and wounded him so terribly on the head, breast, and shoulders, with a cutlass, that his recovery was for several months despaired of. The injury Mr. Boddington received on the above occasion greatly impaired his constitution, and, it is supposed, contributed towards his premature death, by rendering him susceptible of the most poignant feelings on beholding the dying agonies of a man who had attempted to murder him, and absolutely embittered some of the latter years of his life.

**ALEXANDER DAVISON**

***Convicted of a Fraud to a Large Amount upon Government***

THE following case of enormity will again show, that as well as the crimes of petty thieves whom death awaits for stealing forty shillings, the greatest peculations, in their turn, become subject matter for our pages.

Joseph Hunt, a member of Parliament, fled his injured country with thousands—nay tens of thousands—of its money in his pocket. Williers, and some others, whom hereafter we may more particularly note, became defaulters in immense sums, and followed a somewhat similar course; and should they be brought to the bar of justice, they are, perhaps, fined; and pay their ransom with the nation's money! meantime honest John Bull, hearing all these things, will often exclaim "How are we ruined."

In the case of Mr. Davison, lest we bring down upon us the ire of a great man, we shall confine ourselves to reprinting a regular report of his trial; and merely observe, that we take it from "The News," of the 7th of December 1808.

**COURT OF KING'S BENCH,**

Before Lord Ellenborough and a Special Jury.

THE KING v. ALEXANDER DAVISON, Esq.

This long expected case came on to be tried before Lord Ellenborough and a special jury, when the following gentlemen were sworn:

R. Glasson, Esq.

Roughead, Esq.

Jas. Salt, Esq.

Jo. Jackson, Esq.

Rich. Grace, Esq.

Jo. Peales, Esq.

Jos. Scollier, Esq.

Jo. Sloper

Wm. Horton, Esq.

Jo. Kirk.

Jos. Wilson, Esq.

Jas. Swaine.

Mr. Richardson opened the case on the part of the prosecution.

The Attorney General followed on the same side. The defendant, in the year 1795, became agent for the Barrack Stores, and an agreement was entered into with General Delancy, the Barrack-master-general. His duty was to purchase all the articles which might be required for that department, for which he himself, in his letter of the 10th of January, to the Barrack-master-general, thought that 2½ per cent was fully sufficient as a commission for devoting his whole attention to the business. He continued in this situation, performing the duties of his station; and certainly no fault could be alleged against him, till the year 1798, when he began to manufacture the articles in demand, in large quantities, and charge them to government in the name of

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

George Watson, who, it will appear, was his apprentice, and a young man about twenty years in his own employ; on these goods which he so sold, he directed Bowring, his principal clerk, to manufacture false vouchers, with a view to defraud the Barrack department; he also influenced John Allen, another clerk in his employ, to give receipts for large sums of money, pretended to be paid to Watson, so as to give the whole the appearance of a fair and bona fide transaction. This practice he continued till the change of the administration, in 1801 or 1802, when it was likely an investigation would take place, and it struck him that it would be advisable to change the mode of rendering his accounts, and soon after that he sent them in without charging the commission of 2½ per cent. on the goods he himself manufactured and sold.

The jury would observe, however, that the charge of commission now alluded to was made in nine different half-yearly accounts, in each of which the defendant takes credit for commission on the of the purchase made by him. The same charge was also made in his general accounts, which contained the whole sums specified in all his particular accounts; in all of which, of course, this full commission was charged; and it was not till the year 1800, when the defendant had been questioned on these transactions, and when he found these fraudulent practices pressing hard on him, that he thought of restoring these sums of commission.

He (the Attorney-General) should not have thought of judging so harshly of the defendant if he had not what he conceived a picture of the defendant's own thoughts in his conduct, and in written evidence under his own hand. The defendant, when he underwent an examination before the Commissioners of Military Inquiry, in December 1805, stated, that he had furnished some goods to government himself, but that for these he had charged no commission. This declaration, however, could not apply to the goods here alluded to. Subsequently to the year 1802, the defendant furnished goods to government professedly from his Bedford-street warehouse, and charged no commission on them, because the goods were known to have been furnished by him, were so furnished publicly, and the receipts of Mungo Sheddon, his managing clerk, were given for the price. But should it be said to-day, that he meant this to apply to goods furnished in the name of another person, who, though his own servant, had rendered invoices and receipts in another name? And, after charging commission on these purchases, now say that it was his intention again to credit government with the sums of commission so charged. He should be sorry to hear such a defence set up this day, because it must call from him some observations which he could wish might be spared. But it was said, the defendant intended to debit himself with these sums in another account.

The Attorney-General had stated, that the defendant was examined by the commissioners of Military Inquiry, and was questioned, whether he had not made some overcharges against government, and had also omitted to give items which he had received. On this occasion, finding that these accounts were to be strictly gone into, the defendant had himself made a strict investigation into the state of his accounts, with the object of correcting any mistakes or omissions which might have crept into them, and accordingly on the 15th of May, 1806, gave in a supplemental account, as between himself and General De Lancey, which begins with stating, on the credit side of the account, a former balance due to the defendant of upwards of nine thousand pounds, and then, by giving, on the other side, a variety of sums with which he should formerly have debited himself, but which should have been omitted,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

besides wiping away the balance formerly standing in the defendant's favour, of upwards of nine thousand pounds, produces a balance against him of upwards of six thousand pounds, thereby creating a difference in favour of government of upwards of fifteen thousand pounds. Here was a sum produced to government by the defendant, in consequence of his looking into his accounts with a scrutinizing eye, thinking that he could do so with a better grace himself than by suffering it to be examined by the Commissioners. If any person thought, however, that he (the Attorney-General) stated this with a view to create a prejudice against the defendant, he erred. He only stated it for the purpose of showing, that if the defendant had entertained any idea of restoring the sums of commission alluded to, a fairer opportunity than that he had now mentioned could hardly have occurred; and therefore, that to say it was the intention of the defendant to return these sums of commission, which had been unjustly detained, was an afterthought. He was satisfied the defendant had no such intention till after the discovery, in consequence of which the present action was brought, had been made. And why? because he thought the fraud could not be detected, and that he was fortified by the bill of parcels and receipts which he had produced.—Did the Court and jury require any further evidence that the defendant did not intend to restore this commission? If they did, he should give it them. If he had intended to do so, he would have done it immediately. The Commissioners of Barrack Accounts had asked of the defendant to produce his cash account, which referred to these matters. He refused to do so; but, at the same time, he thought it necessary to state an excuse for this refusal, and what was his reason? Because his accounts had all been tendered, settled, and the balance paid. If he had wished to return the sums in question, here was an opportunity. But such was not in his contemplation. On the contrary, when asked to produce his cash account, he says, "You have no right to look into my accounts. They are all tendered, examined, and the balance paid!" Yet he was to be told to-day, that it was in the mind of the defendant to give credit to government in another account.

Mr. Thomas Bonnar, secretary of the Commissioners of Military Enquiry, produced the agreement, and the subsequent nine half-yearly accounts, with other vouchers rendered to the Barrack Board, wherein he charged large quantities of stores, bought from George Watson, and the different receipts, as proof of payment for the same, signed by John Allen.

William James, clerk to Mr. Lodge, (the packer employed) proved the various returns made by his employer, of the stores forwarded; and that a great part of them came from the defendant's warehouse in Bedford-street, in the name of Mungo Sheddon, who had been manager of Mr. Davison's army clothing concerns. He knew Watson, who was a clerk in that warehouse; and did not think he was, at the time, in any condition to buy or sell goods. He always considered, that they were manufactured at the Bedford-street warehouse, and belonged to the defendant, though the half yearly returns were made in the name of Mungo Sheddon, the manager; and after wards in that of George Watson.

John Allen stated, that he came to Mr. Davison's employ in 1800, as a clerk, and the receipts produced to him, dated in 1798 and 1800, he declared he signed by desire of Mr. Bowring, as receiving large sums of money in the name of George Watson. He never knew Watson till he saw him after he engaged with Davison. He was not in any way of business, nor had any means of doing any; he was merely an apprentice. On cross-examination he said the bedding and towels were the only articles furnished, but there was no secrecy observed throughout the whole

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

transaction; they were all manufactured in the warehouse in Bedford-street. Here the case on the part of the prosecution closed.

Mr. Dallas, for the defendant, made a speech of more than two hours, wherein he appealed to the jury, in very forcible language, on the great propriety of discarding from their minds the abuse which they had been accustomed to read for some months past in the newspapers against the defendant, as his future honour and happiness depended on the impartiality of their verdict. He then took a view of the manner in which the Barrack Department had been conducted previous to the year 1805, when a great variety of frauds had been committed, to the injury of the public; but when General De Lance had been appointed, that evil became the object of his attention. "With a view to remedy the inconvenience, he appointed Mr. Davison sole agent, to buy all the stores, and to transact the whole business, for which he was to have 2½ per cent. commission. In the year 1798 the demand for barrack stores became so great, that the articles could not be procured in the market; and by a new agreement entered into with the Barrack-Master-General, Mr. Davison was ordered to supply them himself. Being an army clothier, he possessed every facility and advantage, and for which he was allowed to charge the commission originally agreed on. These important facts would be proved by General De Lancey, whom he would call, and whose testimony would place his client in a very different light, with respect to his transactions with the public: independent of which he had other witnesses to call, who would also prove that the articles supplied were charged 3 per cent. under the prices charged by others, so that the public gained, instead of losing by the transaction. The defendant employed one thousand workmen, and he acted under a new, positive, and particular agreement; and his reason for making out his accounts in the way that he did, was by the suggestion of his clerk, as conformable to the original agreement, and the Barrack regulation. *Lord Ellenborough*. — "What do you say to the answer to a question of the Military Commissioners, in which Mr. Davison denies the existence of any other agreement than that first concluded; it will be material for you to observe upon that before you sit down, as you will have no opportunity of doing it afterwards." Mr. Dallas said, that he would not overlook that. The General would tell them that there was a second agreement. Supposing the existence of this, the next question would be, whether Mr. Davison was not entitled to commission on what he furnished from his own stores, as well as what he purchased from others. The charge was for frauds and the defendant must be acquitted, if he either was entitled to commission, or had reasonable ground to suppose that he was so entitled.

General De Lancey proved that he appointed the defendant as agent to Barrack Stores in the year 1795; he at the time had no knowledge of him, but meeting him at public offices, where he was considered as a very active punctual man in all his transactions. He acted as agent till 1798, when the demand for barrack stores was so great, that he allowed him to supply the articles from his own stores in Bedford-street. The patterns and the prices were submitted to the witness, and approved of. The whole was, except this deviation, conducted on the principle of the old agreement as to the commission. He had no suspicion of his acting fraudulently; on the contrary, he had the greatest confidence in his skill and activity, and he still thought so.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—Patterns and prices were in most cases sent in and approved of; but he made no enquiries in order to ascertain the prices of the day. He did not make any enquiries among those who had been stated by Davison to have supplied him, about their prices. If the supplies were furnished at a

## SUPPLEMENT 2

reasonable rate, he did not think it material from whom they came. Being asked, whether he thought it immaterial that the checks should be lost? he answered, that if Mr. Davison furnished the stores at the market prices there could be no harm done to the public. Being asked, whether he relied on Mr. Davison's judgment when it became his interest to raise the prices as high as possible he: he replied, that he never considered it as a certain conclusion that Mr. Davison would raise the prices.

Attorney-General.—But it was his interest to raise the prices.

Witness.—I saw no objection to the business, if Mr. Davison did not exceed the prices which others had tendered. Attorney-General.—Mr. Davison checked as an agent; how did you agree that he should charge commission, on his own supplies, as well as on what he purchased?

Witness.—That depends upon the construction that may be put upon the agreement.

Attorney-General.—That won't do, Sir.

Lord Ellenborough.—You must answer the question directly, whether or not you authorised him to charge commission upon the stores furnished by himself.

Witness.—I did not authorise him.

General De Lancey, in continuation said, that he never knowingly passed an account where commission was charged on Mr. Davison's own stores; nor would he ever knowingly, pass such an account. He certainly understood that the second agreement gave Mr. Davison no permission to make such a charge; but at the same time Mr. Davison might have made out a case which would require consideration. If such a case had been submitted to him he would have considered it, or referred it to those under whom he acted. But the case never occurred.

Re-examined by Mr. Wilson.—Nothing was said in the second agreement about commission, as far as he recollected; but he understood that it was not to be charged on Mr. Davison's own stores.

By the Attorney-General.—He knew that Davison must have furnished stores of his own; but he relied on the accuracy of the accountants, and signed the accounts without examining whether double commission had been charged.

Examined by the Court.—He did not authorise Mr. Davison to charge double commission, and if Mr. Davison, had done so, he would have considered it as a breach of the agreement. He never knew of the fictitious merchants, Allan, Watson, &c. nor ever knew that false names, were given in. He would have considered it a breach of public duty if he had knowingly passed accounts under such circumstances.

John Bowring was then called.—He was book-keeper to Mr. Davison at the office in St. James's square. Mr. Davison had various other concerns to a great extent. Mr. Davison began to supply the Barracks in 1795, two or three weeks before he came to him, and from his own stores in 1798.

Lord Ellenborough told the witness that he was not bound to answer any question that might criminate himself.

Mr. Davison directed him to make out the account in the name of Watson. He had said nothing about the matter till the witness had suggested the difficulty. What Mr. Davison supplied was from 2½ to 3½ per cent on the average, below the price at which the same articles were procured from other persons. All that Mr. Davison supplied on his own account was made up at the Bedford-street warehouse, where he

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

had carried on business as an army clothier. In the first half year of 1808 the accounts were drawn up different from that in which they had been made up in 1798 to 1802. The reason was, that in the interval of 1802, when no supplies were delivered, he spoke to Mr. Davison about altering the accounts. He had some doubts, whether the commission would be allowed on the supplies from their own warehouse, and suggested the consideration, whether the charge ought not to be withdrawn. At the outset he thought the charge perfectly regular. But he had some doubts afterwards, and mentioned the subject to Mr. Davison. Upon that Mr. Davison advised him to get the accounts back again, and to make the proper alteration; remarking at the same time, that if he erred, he had rather err on the right side. He applied twice to Mr. Starbank at the Barrack-office, but could not get the accounts back again; but Mr. Starbank said, that the credit might be given in some future account. Mr. Davison desired him to keep it in mind, and credit it in the account current with the Barrack-Master-General. No commission was charged in the subsequent accounts for supplies from the Bedford-street warehouse. A supplemental account was given in, but the credit was not: given, owing to a neglect of his.

Cross-examined by Mr. Garrow.—No memorial was sent in to the Barrack-Master-General, desiring that the accounts might be corrected. Mr. Davison merely desired it to be kept in mind and credited. They had always an open account with the Barrack Master-General. Mr. Davison desired him to get the accounts made out in the names of Watson and Allan, as a matter of form. The first receipts of Allan and Watson had been taken for several half years after the accounts had been delivered in. These receipts were upon stamps, as if they had been regular transactions. When he ceased to charge commission he made Davison debtor to his own house.

Lord Ellenborough.—Is there any reason why the name of Watson should have been used rather than have the account drawn up in the regular way, except for the purpose of getting the commission?

Witness—I do not know any except what I have stated.

Mr. Starbank was next called, who proved that Bowring had called at the office for the accounts, which he had refused to deliver, conceiving it his duty not to part with them. There was a supplemental account given in, in which many errors were rectified.

Mr. Dallas—Your Lordship recollects that the inquiry did not take place till 1805, whereas the application for accounts was in 1803.

Lord Ellenborough—"Yes; but in that very year 1803, other enquiries were going on, which might occasion the dread of detection."

The witness proceeded to state, that he did not recollect that anything had been said by Bowring about improper vouchers. The supplemental account was stated in 1806, and referred back to 1804, the time when General De Lancey left the office.

Lord Moira was called to character. He had known Mr. Davison for a great many years, but was not particularly acquainted with him till he applied to him to accompany the army which he commanded in the last war, as Commissary-General. He had requested this of him as a favour, and his conduct was punctual and delicate, for he often sacrificed emoluments to which he was fairly entitled. He had no suspicion that he could be guilty of any fraud; for if he had, he would not have applied to him to accept of the office of Treasurer of the Ordnance, which was no object to

## SUPPLEMENT 2

him, for by accepting this he lost his half pay as Commissary, and the difference between the full pay of the Treasurer of the Ordnance, and the half pay as Commissary, was only 70*l*.

Sir Evan Nepean, Sir Andrew Snape Hammond, Sir William Rule, the Hon. Wellesley Pole, Mr. John Martin Leake, Mr. Hunter, Mr. John Cowley, Mr. William Smart, Mr. James Davidson, Mr. Black, Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Long, and Mr. Huskisson, also gave the defendant an excellent character, and declared that they would have thought it very unlikely that he should be guilty of a fraud. The Attorney-General in reply regretted as much as the counsel for the defendant, that there had been any calumnies which had gone abroad in prejudice of the defendant's case; but of this he was certain, that no one would impute to the crown the design of assisting in them; for his own part he had not read them, and he was sure the jury would dismiss them from their minds. He concurred also with his learned friend in desiring, that if the jury could have a doubt upon the case, they should incline the balance in favour of the defendant. As to the character which had been just given to the defendant, it could not in such a case have any weight, except in bringing to one's mind the melancholy reflection, that many men, who have maintained the best character through a great part of their lives, do not put a sufficient value upon the preservation of it, and do omit to take the advantage, and often commit offences, especially against government, with the hope of secrecy and impunity, for the sake of some paltry advantage of private gain. Every man finds friends to give him a character till the very moment when he ceases to deserve it; and that moment has now unhappily arrived for the defendant. With respect to the grounds upon which the defendant's counsel had rested his case, he was not inclined to be dissatisfied with them, although they did not appear to be sufficiently comprehensive. In Lodge (the packer's) account, the names of the merchants occur truly, and there stands the article as goods furnished by Sheddan; Watson's name was introduced afterwards in the Barrack-office return; and it is important that in the first account rendered, this name was written upon an erasure, for most probably Sheddan's name was originally inserted there, and the putting in the name of Watson was an after-thought. What reason has been given for this by the defendant's counsel, except that it was for the purpose of enabling him to charge the commission. For this purpose Bowring is brought forward to volunteer a satisfactory account how the mistake arose, and it will be proper to take him through his whole account, reserving that part in which he is flatly contradicted for the last observation. The reason why he substituted this name, is said to be, that he observed how strange it will be for you to appear to sell goods for yourself; and therefore for mere form sake they fabricate receipts, and for mere form put Davison to the expense of stamps, to make it all appear regular. This fabrication happened after the accounts were delivered, and in 1802 there took place a strong investigation into the public accounts, and from that time he renders his accounts Alexander Davison, debtor to the Bedford street warehouse, and the receipt is by Sheddan for the Bedford-street warehouse. As to the reason for this change, and the application to Starbank at the Barrack office, it is obvious that Bowring has built a false story upon that which is perhaps a true transaction; for it is not true that he stated to Starbank that he wanted to deduct the overcharge of commission. There were other gross errors in the accounts to the amount of upwards of fifteen thousand pounds which were ripe for detection; and upon Starbank's refusing to give up the accounts, he did by a supplemental account give credit to government for various items to the amount of 15,479*l*. and one may judge of the correctness of what he states without contradiction, by the falsehood of

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

that in which he is met by another witness. His evidence is nothing, without he can show, that he stated to Starbank what he wanted the accounts back for, and he says, he told him it was to correct the commission account; but Starbank says, most certainly he did not so state it. Starbank recommending him to make allowance for errors in some future account, he says, he told Davison; and he said, bear it in your mind and send it in some future account, instead of which he never sent that in, although from the transaction since he had opportunities of correcting it. He, Davison, is then called before the commissioners—his accounts are questioned, and he swears in express terms that he executed his commission on the terms of his agreement made in 1794, and that there was no new agreement, or anything in nature of an agreement, between him and General De Lancey. Now notwithstanding what De Lancey might have thought of the effect of the supposed subsequent agreement, as to charging commission, if Davison felt that a new agreement for commission upon his own supplies was to be inferred from it, how could he have sworn to this? In truth he never looked forward to his present situation. He thought then, and justly too, that it was not discovered that Watson and Allan were fictitious merchants, and supposed that the fraud never would be detected; and therefore never thought of talking of a new agreement then. If this was a mistake, he had opportunities of rectifying it. To-day I put the case upon the fact, that from 1797 to 1802, he did render goods of his own to government, and charged a commission. I thought it might be said to be a mistake, and prepared myself to meet that case. But it is answered for me by the defendant; for instead of showing that it escaped his attention, he has proved by Bowring that it occurred to him as doubtful whether he could charge it or not; that he bethought himself of the error, and intended to settle it. If that was true, how could Davison himself swear, as he did, in the answer to the 36th question of the commissioners in 1805, that he never did render goods from his own warehouse and charge commission upon them. Does he not rather stand in the situation of a man who had done wrong, and thought himself so armed with false vouchers as to be able to escape detection? A second time he has an opportunity of correcting the error, when on the 23d of November, 1806, he retires behind the trenches of his settled accounts, and makes a balance against himself of 6047*l.* 17*s.* 11*d.* which he pays in about May 1806; and when he is afterwards required to render a cash account, he says, they have no right to call upon him for any inquiry into that account, and holds the commissioners at arm's length, telling them that the account has been settled a long while, and the balance paid. There are, therefore, three occasions on which he had an opportunity of setting the account right, all of which he passes by. What was it that induced him to do this? It must have its true name—it was a gross fraud. It is true, he obtained permission to make "some sort of a change in the agreement" from General De Lancey, which did change his character. By his change of character he took a profit six or seven times greater than his commission. And the additional charge of commission could not be allowed, without De Lancey was imposed upon by false vouchers, which was easily effected. For a general account only is sent into General De Lancey, and there the commission is charged, but it does not directly meet the eye. In the abstract sent to the office, six hundred pounds, supposing that to be the amount of the goods supplied, is charged, and underneath is added fifty pounds for commission; but in the general account it stands as one sum of six hundred and fifty pounds. De Lancey could therefore know nothing of the charge of commission, and Starbank thought all was regular, because he did not know that Watson was not truly a merchant, whose name he saw as the supplier of goods, and not Davison's—This is necessary to be explained, because otherwise De Lancey may be under the imputation, that, notwithstanding he

## SUPPLEMENT 2

was of opinion, that it would be wrong to charge commission, he must have seen commission charged upon the whole account, and also have known that Davison supplied part at least of the goods. One may be well satisfied, said the Attorney General, that this cause did not call for so long an answer, but it is for a cause of very great importance for the public, and it is not a light case as to the effect which it will have in giving security to the public against frauds in public accounts. It may not be easy to trace those effects immediately; but if frauds are permitted to go unpunished, impunity in one instance leads to the commission of many others, and the example of punishment can alone check the evil. In the words of the indictment, it is now clear, that, with intent to procure to himself an undue commission, this defendant did render to the public-office these false receipts and vouchers.

Lord Ellenborough summed up the case very carefully, without attempting to recapitulate all his observations upon the evidence, which would lead us back through the greatest part of the foregoing statement. He dwelt with much impartiality and discrimination upon the principal features of the case, and said it was admitted that the vouchers were false, and that the charge for commission could not be allowed. How false vouchers could be used with an honest intention, could not be perceived. Honest ends seldom, if ever, require dishonest means. As to professed intentions of rendering back the money in some subsequent account, if the fraud was once committed by the production of false vouchers, that would not be a defence; but, still, if there was an honest intention of repairing the error, that would strongly beat an appeal to the hearts of all men. This, however, did not appear; for when the defendant had a *locus paenitentiae*, and might have corrected the error which his recollection brought back to the subject, he did not correct the account. His corrections applied only to 15,479*l.* for other errors. As to the defence upon the right to charge commission under a new agreement, he said he waited for the evidence with great anxiety, because it was not consistent with his own oath, in the answer to the 6th question; and if such an agreement had been proved, it would have been open to great suspicion of a collusion with General De Lancey. The evidence of that gentleman had, however, disproved that part of the case. After his Lordship had gone through the evidence, the counsel for the defendant took an objection to the information, that it stated that Mr. Davison was entitled only to commission upon the sum charged for the goods, instead of which he was to have a commission on all charges of insurance, freight, and other sums advanced. But his Lordship thought this immaterial, as it was only necessary to state what was material to the fact charged, and as it was charged that he supplied goods to a certain amount, and received 328*l.* as commission upon the price of those goods, which was true, it was immaterial whether in fact he made other charges and had other commissions. He said he recollected a case of the name of Yate v.—(Yate v. Willan we believe, in East's Report) in which that point was settled. The jury, between seven and eight o'clock, pronounced a verdict of Guilty.

This trial lasted from nine in the morning until eight at night. He was sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

**SAMUEL DAVIS, JOHN MARRYATT, JOHN LAWRENCE  
BARRON, GEORGE WINDLE, AND SARAH GROVER**  
*Pilloried and Imprisoned, for a Conspiracy*

This was an indictment against the above persons for conspiring together to prevent one John Hathaway from obtaining a certificate under a commission of bankruptcy. Hathaway was a clerk in the bank, to which he added the avocation of a coal-merchant wherein he became bankrupt. Davis was a discounter of bills, and a money lender; the other defendants appeared to have been his agents in the conspiracy.

The substance of the evidence on the part of the prosecution was, that in the year 1800 Hathaway had become embarrassed, that he had got several bills discounted by the defendant, for which he gave him one pound in ten for six weeks or two months; that some time afterwards the plaintiff became a bankrupt, at which time a balance was due to the defendant which he attempted to prove before the commissioners; but Mr. H. having stated the nature of the transaction between them, they refused to allow the claim. Upon this, Davis swore he would be revenged of the plaintiff, and entered into a conspiracy with four other persons who presented a petition to the Lord Chancellor, containing affidavits that Mr. H. had lost ten guineas at a game of put, in the house of Winkle (one of the conspirators), on the twelfth of April preceding his bankruptcy, in order to prevent him from gaining his certificate. It being enacted by the bankrupt laws, that no person should have the benefit of his certificate who had lost by gaming ten guineas at one sitting, within one twelvemonth before his bankruptcy; in the course of the trial, it was proved that on the day the defendant swore he lost the money, he was out of town with two friends. The jury immediately found the defendants guilty; sentence reserved for a future day.

When brought up to receive judgment Mr. Mainwaring the chairman stated, that upon a full consideration of the circumstances, and as an example to others, the sentence of the court was, that all the defendants, except Sarah Grover, should be imprisoned in the house of correction for the space of two years, and that within the first month they shall stand in the pillory in Finsbury-square; and the said Sarah Grover be imprisoned for six months, and then discharged.

**ROBERT WILSON, ALIAS JAMES WOOD**  
*A Soldier, and a most hardened Villain, Executed in the Island  
of Guernsey for Murder*

This cruel infidel murderer was a private in the Royal York Rangers. He entered the house of Michael Perrin, in the Vale parish, on a Sunday, with an intention to plunder. Meeting a defenceless woman of 75 years of age, piously engaged in devotions suitable to the Sabbath, he, in the most deliberate manner, cut her throat with a razor, and nearly severed her head from her body. Immediately after his apprehension, he requested the assistance of a clergyman; and intended, by his apparent contrition, to relax the vigilance of his keepers; but the evening previous to his execution, having lost all hope of effecting his escape, he became outrageous, and would have destroyed even the minister who came to instruct and console him. Venting his fury in terms too shocking to relate, he went to the scaffold despising every religious admonition, and laughing at his awful situation. Fearless and undismayed, he launched into eternity, bidding defiance to human laws, and contemning that Divine Tribunal before which he was about to appear, with the accumulated guilt of a life spent in the perpetration of every species of wickedness.

He had been sentenced to death in England; but, having obtained his Majesty's pardon, he was removed from the hulks into the Royal York Rangers. He was concerned with the notorious Avershaw, whom he called his father, and repeatedly expressed his determination to die game, as resolutely as his other associates in villainy and murder.

**THOMAS JEWETT**

*Executed at York for a Rape on his Master's Daughter*

"Let ignominy brand thy hated name;  
Let modest matrons at thy mention start;  
And blushing virgins, when they read out annals,  
Skip o'er the guilty page that holds thy legend  
And blots the noble work."  
SHAKESPEARE.

THOMAS JEWETT, of Old Malton, in the North Riding, aged 24 years, was charged with violating the chastity of Elizabeth Stabler, his master's daughter, a child under the age of ten.

The counsel for the prosecution stated, that the prisoner was servant to William Stabler, blacksmith, at Old Malton, and lived in the family as an inmate. On Sunday the 27th of July 1807, Mr. Stabler and his wife went to Castle-Howard, leaving the care of his family to the prisoner. The family consisted of five children, the eldest of which was the child on whom the injury was committed, and who was at that time under the age of nine years. The two eldest boys went to a Sunday school, leaving only this girl, the prisoner, an apprentice-boy, and two young children, under four years of age, in the house. The apprentice-boy was sent out of the way to fetch some water; and in his absence the prisoner committed the unmanly crime for which he now stood at the bar.

We shall briefly state the substance of the evidence in this case, without entering into any details of the testimony of the respective witnesses. As soon as the prisoner had got the apprentice out of the way, he proposed to Elizabeth Stabler to go with him into his lodging-room, and he would give her a glass of gin. The girl acceded to this proposal; and the prisoner gave her a glass of the liquor he had promised her, which she drank; he offered her more, which she refused. The prisoner then placed the child upon his bed, and ruin ensued. The child did not complain of his outrage until the following Wednesday, when upon being interrogated by her mother, she related the whole transaction, and whose evidence as to the situation of her daughter, materially corroborated the child's testimony. On the following day a surgeon was sent for, who examined the child, and whose evidence we cannot further notice than by stating that it placed beyond a doubt the truth of the previous testimony of the girl, and proved the actual perpetration of the crime. The prisoner, when charged by Mr. Stabler with the injury done to his child, at first denied it; but afterwards confessed it, so far as to beg forgiveness; but in a few days thought proper again to deny the charge, which so irritated his master, that he had him apprehended.

Many witnesses were examined on the part of the prisoner, who gave him an exceeding good character, but whose evidence no farther affected the charge against him than by proving that the girl had not been so much injured as to prevent her attending school the following week.

The judge in stating the law to the jury, said, "That the statute which took the benefit of clergy from persons convicted of rapes, had made it a capital offence for any man to have what the law calls carnal knowledge of a female child under the age of ten years; and that without any reference to consent or non-consent of the child. His

## SUPPLEMENT 2

Lordship then recapitulated the whole of the evidence. The jury, after consulting for a few moments, found the prisoner guilty, but recommended him to mercy on account of his general good character. His Lordship with the most impressive solemnity said, "Gentlemen, I always listen with pleasure to your recommendation, whenever I can do it consistently with my public duty; but I am afraid I should hand over the young and innocent part of the female sex to the lusts of the depraved part of the other sex, if I should in this instance yield to your suggestion; and it will be my painful duty to leave the prisoner to the unmitigated severity of the law." In passing sentence of death, he observed, "that it would be in vain that the law protected female youth and innocence, with the heaviest penalty against those who outraged them, if the ministers of the law had not courage fully to execute it."

The jury who tried him, though by their recommendation they evinced the quality of mercy, which the immortal bard says; "It is not strained, but droppeth like the gentle dew from heaven," yet they did not exercise the necessity of discrimination in the degree of crimes. Of twelve men, who are always empanelled in matters of life and death, several must have been fathers, and all related to some female of tender years;—how then could such men talk of mercy in this world for him who could first betray his trust, and then carnally assault his master's infant daughter. To such a man, we think, death was a mercy.

**GABRIEL KABLINSKI**

*Executed in France for Murder, Friday 19<sup>th</sup> April, 1811*

A crime of a horrible nature, and under circumstances most barbarous and cruelly unnatural, happened about the same time in France. It was thus related, in the French journals of the day:

GABRIEL KABLINSKI, aged 23 years, born in Russian Poland, convicted of having stabbed Louisa Tolimay, who kept a ready-made linen shop, on the 2d of February 1811, was executed on Friday, at the Greve in Paris. The following are the particulars of this horrible affair, the effects of jealousy it would seem.

On the 3d of February he apprised Louisa Tolimay that he expected her company to dinner, as he was to set out on his return to Russia on the following day. She returned for answer, that she had two persons to dine with her, and that she could not meet him until the evening. Kablinski appeared very dissatisfied with this answer, and desired the person who brought it to tell her, "That he expected her at seven in the evening without fail." After dinner, it appears that Louisa Tolimay went out, and at eight o'clock she alighted from a job coach, with Kablinski, at Hardivillier's, a restaurateur, on the boulevard of the Temple. They were accommodated with a room on the first floor. Kablinski ordered dinner, of which it appears he ate but little, and Louisa Tolimay did not taste a morsel. He then called for coffee, and a half-bowl of rum-punch. Soon after he asked for a half-bowl of wine-punch. This last did not please him, and he had another half-bowl of rum-punch. He pressed Louisa Tolimay to drink, but she refused. About nine o'clock, he asked for pen, ink, and paper, which were brought him. The waiter having gone up soon after found Louisa Tolimay writing.

At a quarter after ten some dreadful shrieks were heard, from the room in which Kablinski and Louisa Tolimay were. The waiter and Hardivillier's two sons ran upstairs. They were obliged to force open the door, a sofa having been placed against it on the inside. On entering they discovered Louisa Tolimay stretched on the floor, shrieking, and the blood flowing profusely from her bosom. She spoke a few words—the only ones that were distinctly heard were "Oh, the monster! the wretch!" She made signs to one of Hardivillier's sons to cut the lace of her gown, which he did, and with the assistance of a soldier he placed her on a sofa. She could only utter the following words, "My dear;" she kissed his hands in testimony of her gratitude, and expired a few minutes after.

Kablinski was in the same room, stretched on his face, and endeavouring to stab himself with a knife which he held under him. He inflicted two wounds upon himself, one of which only pierced the integuments. The other was only thirty millimetres deep, presenting a large orifice, from whence issued a large quantity of blood. He afterwards threw his knife, reeking with blood, at Louisa Tolimay, asking several times if she were dead.

**WILLIAM BRAGGE**

***Convicted at the Lent Assizes, for the County of Durham,  
1809, and Fined and Imprisoned, for Perjury.***

The defendant was captain and owner of a trading vessel, and lived at North Shields. He was tried at the assizes for the county of Durham for perjury, and found guilty. The circumstances of the case were as follow:—

His brother, John Bragge, was impressed from on board his ship, and an application having been made to the Court of King's Bench for a writ of Habeas Corpus to have him discharged from the King's service, into which he had been so impressed, it became necessary that the affidavit should state that he, John Bragge, had not been at sea, or in his majesty's service before; which affidavit was made by the defendant; whereas in truth, and in fact, he, the defendant, well knew that John Bragge had been twice in the royal navy before. This was fully proved, and upon that proof the defendant was found guilty.

Mr. Justice Le Blanc, in the absence of Mr. Justice Grose, in an eloquent manner, wherein he pronounced a well directed and emphatic eulogium upon the value of the writ of Habeas Corpus, pronounced sentence, which was—that the defendant should pay a fine of 50*l.* and be imprisoned in the gaol of Durham two years! Often as we have had occasion, in our former volumes, to mention the writ of Habeas Corpus, thus eulogised by this learned judge—this second Magna Charta—the barrier of the poor man against the oppression of the rich—still have we omitted to give the glorious boast of Englishmen at length. The above case forcibly reminds us of our neglect, while we are pleased to think that it is not yet too late; we therefore now perform that agreeable part of our duty, and recommend every man to imprint each line fully upon his mind.

**THE STATUTE 31st CHARLES II. THUS ENACTS**

THERE having been great delays used by the sheriffs, gaolers, and other officers, to whose custody the King's subjects had been committed, in making returns of writs of Habeas Corpus, &c. whereby many persons had been long detained in prison, in such cases where by law they were bailable; for prevention thereof, and the more speedy relief of all persons imprisoned for any criminal matters, it is enacted,

1. "That whensoever any writ of Habeas Corpus shall be brought and served upon any officer, or other person, for any one in his custody, or shall be left at the gaol with any one of the under-officers, the said officers or their keepers or deputies, within three days after that, (unless the commitment were for treason or felony plainly expressed in the warrant of commitment) on payment of the charges of bringing the prisoner, or tender thereof, to be ascertained by the judge or court that awarded the writ and endorsed on the same, not exceeding 12*d.* per mile, and upon security given by the prisoner's own bond to pay charges of carrying him back, if he be remanded by the court, and that he will not make any escape by the way, shall make return of such writ of Habeas Corpus, and bring the body of the party committed before the judges or barons of the court from whence the writ shall issue, or to such persons before whom the writ is returnable, and shall certify the true causes of his detainer or imprisonment; but if the place of imprisonment be beyond twenty miles, and not above one hundred miles off, then ten days is allowed for the same, and if further, it shall be within twenty days, and no longer.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

2. "Any persons committed or detained for any crime (unless for treason or felony expressed in the warrant as aforesaid) in the vacation time, may complain to the Lord Chancellor or keeper, or any judge, who upon view of the commitment, or oath of its being denied, shall upon request by such persons, or any in their behalf, attested and subscribed by two witnesses, grant a Habeas Corpus under the seal of their respective courts, returnable immediately; and on service thereof, the officer within the times before limited is to bring up such prisoner before the said Lord Chancellor or judges, before whom the writ is made returnable, with the causes of his commitment; and thereupon, within two days after he shall be brought up, the prisoner shall be discharged from his imprisonment, on entering into recognizance with one or more sureties, to appear in the Court of King's Bench the term following, or at the next assizes, sessions, or general gaol delivery, or such other court for the county where the offence is cognizable: into which court the writ, the return, and recognizance aforesaid, shall be certified, unless it shall appear that the party is detained upon a legal process or warrant, for such matters or offences which are notailable by law.

3. "Provided always, that if any person shall neglect to pray a Habeas Corpus for his enlargement, by the space of two terms after he is committed, he shall not have any such writ in time of vacation, in pursuance of this act.

4. "If any officer or officers shall refuse to make their returns, or to bring the body of the prisoner as aforesaid, according to the command of the writ, within the times aforesaid; or upon demand made by the prisoner, or any in his behalf, shall refuse to deliver a true copy of the warrant or commitment, within six hours after demanded, such officers, gaolers, &c, in whose custody the prisoner shall be detained, shall forfeit for the first offence 100*l.*, and for the second offence 200*l.* to the party grieved, and be rendered incapable to hold their offices; the penalties to be recovered by action of debt, bill, plaint, or information, in any of the King's courts at Westminster, wherein no essoin, &c. or stay of prosecution, shall be admitted or allowed.

5. "And no person, who shall be delivered and set at large by Habeas Corpus shall be again imprisoned for the same offence, by any person other than by legal order and process of such court, wherein he shall be bound by recognizance to appear, or other court having jurisdiction of the causes; and if any other persons shall knowingly imprison again the person delivered or set at large, they shall forfeit to the prisoner 500*l.* to be recovered as aforesaid.

6. "Persons committed for high treason or felony, plainly and especially expressed in the warrant, upon prayer in open court the first week of the term, or first day of the sessions of oyer and terminer or gaol-delivery, to be brought to trial, if they are not indicted the next term, sessions of oyer and terminer, or gaol delivery after such commitment, the judges upon motion made in court the last day of the term or sessions, shall set them at liberty upon bail, unless it appear upon oath, that the King's witnesses could not be produced that term or sessions; and if any such persons committed as aforesaid, upon such prayer aforesaid, shall not be indicted and tried the second term or sessions after the commitment, they shall be discharged from their imprisonment.

7. "But nothing in this act shall extend to discharge out of prison any person charged in debt or other action, or with process in any civil cause; but that after his acquittal for his crime, he shall be kept in custody for such other suits

8. "If any person or persons, subjects of this realm, shall be committed to any prison, or be in custody of any officer, for any criminal matter, the said person shall not be removed from the said custody into the custody of any other officer, unless it

## SUPPLEMENT 2

be by Habeas Corpus, or some other legal writ, or where the prisoner is delivered to the constable to be carried to gaol, &c. or when any person is sent by order to the house of correction, or removed from one prison to another in the same county, in order to a trial or discharge; or in case of sudden fire, infection, or other necessity. And persons making out and signing any warrants for removal, contrary hereto, or countersigning the same, and the officers obeying or executing them, shall incur the forfeitures before mentioned, both for the first and second offence, to the party grieved.

9. "And any prisoner may move for and obtain his Habeas Corpus, as well out of the Chancery or Exchequer, as out of the Courts of King's Bench or Common Pleas, and if the Lord Chancellor, or any judge or baron, shall deny any writ of Habeas Corpus required to be granted as aforesaid, they shall forfeit to the party grieved 100*l.* recoverable in manner aforesaid.

10. "And it is declared that writs of Habeas Corpus may run into any County palatine, the cinque ports, and other privileged places of England, and into the isles of Jersey and Guernsey.

11. "No subject of this realm shall be sent prisoner into Scotland, Ireland, or into any parts beyond the seas, which are or may be within or without the dominions of his Majesty, his heirs or successors; and if any of the said subjects be so imprisoned, it is illegal, and every such person shall for such imprisonment have an action of false imprisonment against him by whom he shall be committed, detained, imprisoned, sent prisoner, or transported, and against all persons that shall frame, contrive, write, seal, or countersign, any warrant for such commitment, or shall be advising, aiding, or assisting in the same: and shall have judgment to recover treble costs, besides damages, which damages shall not be less than 500*l.* in which action no delay or stop of proceedings, nor no injunction, protection, or privilege, &c. shall be allowed; and the person or persons so offending as aforesaid, being lawfully convicted thereof, shall be disabled to bear any office of trust or profit within the realm, or dominions thereunto belonging, and incur the pains, penalties, and forfeitures, ordained by the statute of *praemunire* made in the 16th year of Richard II. and be incapable of any pardon from the king, his heirs, or successors.

12. "This act shall not extend to any person who by contract in writing shall agree with any merchant or owner of a plantation, &c. to be transported, and shall have received earnest upon such agreement; nor to persons convicted of felony, and praying to be transported beyond the seas, who may be so transported into any parts notwithstanding this statute; nor to the imprisonment of any person before the time limited for the commencement of the act, or any thing thereto relating, nor to persons resident in this realm, that shall have committed any capital crime in Scotland or Ireland, &c. but that such persons may be sent to receive trial as before this act.

13. "And persons offending against this act shall not be impleaded for any offence, unless the same be done within two years at most after the offence was committed, in case the party grieved shall not be then in prison; and if he shall be in prison, then within two years after his delivery out of prison, or decease.

14. "After the assizes proclaimed for any county, no person shall be removed from the common gaol upon any Habeas Corpus, pursuant to this act, but shall be brought thereupon before the judge of assizes in open Court: but after the assizes are ended, any person detained may have a Habeas Corpus, according to the direction and intention of the act.

15. "If any information, suit, or action, be brought against any person or persons for offences against this law, the defendants may plead the general issue, and give the special matter in evidence; and the said matter shall be as available to all

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

intents, as if they had pleaded or alleged the same matter in bar or discharge of such information, suit, or action.

16. "Persons appearing to be committed as accessory before the fact, to any petit treason or felony, or upon suspicion thereof, which shall be especially expressed in the warrant of commitment, shall not be removed or bailed by virtue of this act, or in any other manner than they might have been before the making of the same."

**JOHN ANNIS**

***A ship broker, convicted of Fraud, 14th of January, 1809***

At the Old Bailey, on Saturday, the 14th of January, 1809, John Annis, an eminent ship broker, was indicted, charged with having fraudulently obtained money from a Mr. Pugh, by falsely pretending that he had paid a sum for export and convoy duties upon goods shipped to the amount of 324*l.* 15*s.* when he had paid the duties upon goods to the amount of 49*l.* only, and thereby defrauding Mr. Pugh. It appeared that Mr. Pugh had employed the defendant to ship goods for exportation to the amount of 324*l.* 15*s.* and the goods were afterwards seized by a gentleman from the Custom-house, the export and convoy duties not having been paid to that amount. It was proved that the defendant had charged Mr. Pugh 13*l.* 8*s.* for the Custom-house duties, which was the regular price, according to the value of the goods, at four per cent., and it was also proved by some witnesses from the Custom-house that the defendant had paid 2*l.* only, he having represented the goods shipped as amounting to something about 50*l.* The defendant accounted for his conduct by pleading the hurry of business, but the jury found him Guilty.—Transportation.

**HENRY GAWLER**  
*A Clerk in the Navy Office, Convicted the 11th of April, 1808,  
of a Fraud*

*(A very shabby sort of Swindling Transaction.)*

Henry Gawler was indicted for fraudulently obtaining, under false pretences, six promissory notes, for the payment of one pound, from Mary the wife of — Spright, on the 22d of October last.

It appeared in evidence, that the prisoner, at the time of this transaction, was a clerk in the Ticket-office, in the Navy-office. The prosecutrix having been informed that the prisoner had interest to procure the discharge of her son (by a former husband), who was serving as a seaman on board His Majesty's ship Active, called at his house in Ossulston-street, Somer's-town, for the purpose of applying to him on the subject. Not finding him within, however, at that time, she left her commands and returned home; in a few days afterwards the prisoner himself called upon her at Kentish-town, and said he understood she wished to obtain her son's discharge, adding, that he could settle the business at once, and that her son might be home at least in the course of two months. The prosecutrix, delighted with the hope of seeing her child, asked what would be the expense. He said it would cost 40*l.* to procure the discharge. The prosecutrix expressed her utter inability to raise such a sum; upon which he said that he would not want the money all at once, but he must have 5*l.* down. She had not the money then in her possession, and the prisoner went away, promising to call again.

In the meantime the prosecutrix received a pressing request from her son, to try every means in her power to obtain his discharge. In two or three days afterwards the prisoner called again upon the prosecutrix, and told her she must contrive to raise some part of the money. She had then procured six 1*l.* notes, and immediately gave them to him, and upon his complaining that that was a very small sum, she promised to send him some more money in a few days. Some time having elapsed, and not hearing any account from the prisoner, she called upon him at the Navy-office, to inquire what progress he had made in the business. He received her with all the affected consequence of an official man; and told her that the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty had not yet given their answer upon the subject. Shortly afterwards Gawler absconded from London, and the prosecutrix did not see him again till he was in custody at Bow-street, upon suspicion of misconduct of a more serious nature.

The case on the part of the prosecution having been clearly made out, Mr. Alley submitted to the court, that, however infamously wicked the conduct of the defendant was in the eye of every honest man, the case had not been made out under the act of Parliament by which he was tried, inasmuch as bank-notes did not come within the meaning of the word monies, which was the term used in the statute. This point he urged confidently, and he contended that no lawyer could correctly contradict him in this position.

The Court, however, after hearing the question urged at length, were clearly of opinion, that if bank-notes did not come within the meaning of the term money, yet,

## SUPPLEMENT 2

as they were money's worth, they were to be recognised as money under this act of Parliament.

The Jury found the prisoner Guilty.—Imprisoned.

**CHARLES LLOYD**

***Convicted of Stealing in a Dwelling House, and Sentenced to Imprisonment***

IT is with some concern that we come to a case like this, because we find our national character as a warlike nation sullied in the soldier, who, after behaving with bravery in the field, fighting his country's battles abroad, debases himself in the commission of a petty theft at home.

Charles Lloyd was tried for breaking into the house of William Usher, and stealing therein a silk cloak, his property. It appeared from the evidence, that the prisoner, a handsome well-dressed young man, was a private in the Guards, who had received permission from his Colonel to act as Drill Serjeant to the St. Sepulchre's Volunteers, in which he was also Serjeant-Major. Esther Usher, the wife of the prosecutor, stated, that she lived in Crown-court, Finsbury-square, London, where her husband rented part of a house, none of which was possessed by the landlord. The apartments the prosecutor occupied were therefore described in the indictment as constituting his dwelling-house. Between twelve and one o'clock in the morning, as Esther Usher was sitting in her parlour, she heard a noise like the creaking of a door, which induced her to go upstairs to see what was the matter. She met the prisoner coming downstairs, who said to her "Good morning, madam." She never had seen him before; but being addressed by him in this manner she took particular notice of his countenance. There were other persons living in the house besides her family. On proceeding farther upstairs, she found the door of the room open, which she understood from her daughter, a child of eight years old, had been locked up by her in the morning. The child, however, was not in Court. When the witness observed the door open, she suspected the prisoner had robbed her, and ran out into the street after him, calling "Stop thief." The prisoner, on his part, ran as fast as he could, and kept waving his hat, and calling out, "No Mainwaring, Burdett for ever." She soon lost sight of him, but the pursuit was continued by other persons. On going back to her house, she missed her silk cloak out of the room in question. The prisoner ran along several neighbouring streets and alleys, and at last entered the house of a hair-dresser; but the witness who kept close to him in the pursuit, was not certain whether he went into the yard or parlour of that house.

Sarah Locker, the wife of the hair-dresser, stated, that the prisoner came into her house, and asked whether he could have a *tete* for his sister of the colour of his hair. He shut the door behind him when he came into the shop, and begged of the witness to give him a chair, as he was very much fatigued. After some conversation (which it is not necessary to detail,) the witness wished to open the door; but the prisoner stopped her, and said, "Don't open it yet, good woman." At this time the man, who had followed close behind the prisoner, was looking about for him in the yard, and the witness could observe through the window that a crowd was collecting about the door. She also observed that the prisoner had a bundle in his hand, which he put into his breeches. He then went out, and was seized, and charged with the robbery. He said to the people who seized him, that he was not the man they wanted; he was a person of consequence; and he wondered how they could suspect him of such a thing. He was a Serjeant Major of the St. Sepulchre's Volunteers.

He was, however, taken into custody; and when searched, a bundle, containing eleven keys, was found concealed within his breeches. The prisoner called several

## SUPPLEMENT 2

witnesses, who gave him a very good character. A serjeant of the Guards joined in this character, and added, that he had always behaved like a brave soldier in the field of battle. The Serjeant also observed, that it was possible the prisoner might have in his possession a number of keys, in consequence of stores belonging to the Volunteer Corps being under his care.

The jury found the prisoner guilty of the single felony of stealing, acquitting him, agreeably to the direction of the judge, of the capital part of the charge, as there was no direct evidence of the room door having been broke open. They also recommended him to the mercy of the Court.

The prisoner was so agitated at the commencement of the trial, that he could not stand at the bar, and he was allowed a chair, in which he fainted the moment he sat down.

## SINGULAR ROBBERY AT THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

### *By a Villain who Escaped Justice*

We have related [a robbery at the Ashmoleum Museum at Oxford](#); a burglary in the house of Lord Chancellor Thurlow, and the stealing from thence the Great Seal of England; but we hardly expected to have found a man base enough to rob our National Museum—the repository of all that is rare and valuable from the time of the Egyptians to the present day; a place, too, opened gratis to the curious. Yet so it was—we find a villain taking the basest advantage of this privilege, and then escaping the arm of justice.

This most ungrateful thief stole from the portfolios, deposited in the above place, rare and curious prints, estimated to be worth at least 1500*l*. From the time many of the articles have been sold to print dealers, this person must have been in the habit of stealing them for more than a year. The circumstance which led to discovery was, the sale of a copied print from the original. Among the many painters' etchings that are eagerly sought after, are those of the celebrated Rembrandt, a single print of whose work has sold for fifty guineas. One of the scarce prints of this master is called the "Coach Landscape;" and a print-seller was induced, from its known rarity, to give twelve guineas for one to an artist and dealer; but, afterwards entertaining doubts of its originality, he showed it to a better judge, who pronounced it to be a copy, and advised him to compare it with two undoubted originals in the British Museum. But, upon application for that purpose, neither could be found; this produced a search, that discovered an amazing deficiency in the works of other artists, and from subsequent inquiry it has been found, that one print-seller has purchased to the amount of 200*l*., another 60*l*. and so in a greater or less proportion.

So ready a market did these rare articles find, that the cheap collector could not find time sufficient to procure and dispose of them too, but was necessitated to employ an agent, whose brokerage, it is supposed, must have amounted, to a considerable sum. The most valuable print recovered is the portrait of "The Burgo-Master Six," supposed to be worth 40*l*. But the "Hundred Guilder" print, and many others of extreme rarity and value, are among those missing. It is said, that a unique set of proofs, the works of Karil Du Jardin, consisting of 50 prints, have likewise been purloined.

The collection from whence the above has been taken, was left to the British Museum by the late Rev. Dr. Cracherode a few years since, and was estimated to be worth 20,000*l*. An Act of Parliament was made to enable the trustees to receive the same without payment of the legacy duty.

The delinquent fled from the hands of justice, but much valuable property has been discovered.

*(Transcriber's Note: His name was Deighton. See The Print Room of the British Museum by "The Ghost of a Departed Collector" (G W Reid)*  
<https://archive.org/details/printroomofbriti00ghos> p. 25)

**JOHN GONDREU*****Convicted at the Court of Criminal Jurisdiction, held at the Criminal Court, of the Town Sydney, in New South Wales, (commonly called Botany Bay,) on the 12<sup>th</sup> of September 1809, and Sentenced to Death for Burglary***

IN consequence of our directions for that purpose near two years ago, we have just received a file of newspapers from the far distant land to which our convicts for many years last past are transported, viz. New South Wales; first and still commonly called Botany Bay. This vehicle of news and advertisements[Note 1] is well printed, and tolerably edited, on half, and sometimes a quarter, of a sheet of paper. The printer and editor is George Howe, sent thither a transport, convicted of a highway robbery. This man was a journeyman printer in London, until he commenced highwayman, and from the number of his escapes both on the road, and at the bar of justice, he was called Lucky George. In the infant state of the colony, it was found necessary to print the different orders of the governor, and the regulations laid down by the government of England. George Howe was the lucky convict who was honoured with the situation of government printer, and which he still retains. His types and office were found by the governor; and in place of working with his brother and sister convicts on the roads, or in the fields, lucky George lived at his ease; and, had he been commonly assiduous and sober, might have accumulated wealth. His career of plunder was indeed of necessity stopped; but he retained his propensity to the bottle, and an incorrigible partiality for laziness.[Note 2]

During the government of Commodore Bligh there were several executions of convicts, for different crimes against the state; but his successors have been extremely reluctant in taking the lives forfeited to the laws, by generally commuting the sentence of death to that of transportation to smaller governments, at a distance from the large town of Sydney.[Note 3] Whilst Colonel Lachlan Macquarie was governor, he entirely dispensed with capital punishments, which was found more beneficial to the colony; such examples tending to harden, rather than terrify men from violent breaches of the law.

At the Court of Criminal Jurisdiction,[Note 4] held at the town of Sydney on Friday the 12th day of September 1809, (in the language of Lucky George the printer) John Gondreu (a convict) was indicted, for having, in company with one Thomas Dobson, burglariously broke and entered the dwelling house of Thomas Harley, a settler at a plantation called "There and nowhere else;" and forcibly taking from thence certain articles of plate, wearing apparel, &c. named in the indictment. Evidence for the prosecution being called—

Thomas Harley (convict, then a settler,) deposed, that on Friday the 17th of June last he went to bed about seven in the evening—that he heard a noise of dogs at a distance upon which a Daniel Fogherty, a stockman, said he overheard some people talking to Richard Broadbent, who inhabited a hut not more than thirty yards from Harley's dwelling—that he then heard some persons beating his dogs, and afterwards heard Fogherty attacked—that the latter begged of him to fire through his door, for he expected to be murdered—that the window of his own bedroom was broken open, and a pistol presented at him through it, by the prisoner at the bar, as he said he had much reason to believe—that Broadbent said they were constables come to search the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

place—that he called Broadbent to his assistance, but he did not come—that he at length opened the door of his house, on doing which he was knocked down and violently beaten—that the prisoner at the bar, to whose person and voice he now positively swore, made use of many threats to him, and compelled him to quit the house, which two of his accomplices remained in and ransacked—that the prisoner at the bar conducted him to the hut of Broadbent, in which the deponents Fogherty and Broadbent were confined about three quarters of an hour—that after the prisoner at the bar and his accomplices had entered into his, the deponent's, dwelling house, seven or eight minutes must have elapsed before he was ordered to leave it, during which interval he had an ample opportunity of identifying the person of the prisoner, as there was a large fire in the room, which gave a strong light—that the face of the prisoner was a little blackened, but not sufficiently to disguise him—that after they had plundered the house they went off with their booty, leaving him utterly distressed;—and that those who had rummaged the house had stripped his daughter of ten years of age stark naked, and obliged her to get under the bedstead out of the way, the villians having emptied the feathers of the bed itself, and taken away the tick.

The next evidence called was Richard Broadbent, (convict) upon whom suspicion having fallen of his having a connection in the robbery, he had been admitted king's evidence. This man had been a convict servant allowed by government to Harley the prosecutor; but being indulged with permission to go upon his own hands, was about to leave his master's premises, and, as already stated by Harley's testimony, occupied a hut, about thirty yards from his own dwelling. This evidence being sworn deposed, that on the evening mentioned he heard a noise which the dogs made about seven at night; and on his going to the door to enquire what occasioned it, he saw three men, one of whom was Thomas Dowling, another, to the best of his belief, was the prisoner at the bar, but that the third he could say nothing of—that one of those men was armed with a blunderbuss, or short gun, and the other with a horse pistol. In other parts of his evidence he merely corroborated that given by the first witness; but incurring the charge of intentional prevarication, he was ordered into custody.

Here the evidence on the part of the prosecution closed; and the prisoner being put on his defence, set up an alibi, in illustration of which, Martin Dogherty (convict) deposed to seeing him almost at sun down, and afterwards at seven o'clock on the evening of the robbery at his own house, which was at the Nepean river, a distance of more than twenty miles.

William Nye (convict) deposed also to his seeing the prisoner at the bar at the Nepean about sun down; but, from a comparison of this man's testimony with the foregoing, a strong contradiction of the evidence of one or the other appeared in point of time. Daniel Fogherty (convict) gave testimony in the prisoner's favour; but it was merely grounded upon opinion, and given in an incoherent manner.

Here terminated the prisoner's defence; and the Court being cleared of strangers;[Note 5] re-opened in about twenty minutes, when a verdict was pronounced—Guilty. The judge advocate addressed the unfortunate man in language suited to the melancholy situation in which, unhappily, his crimes had placed him. The judge expatiated at much length upon the enormity of the offence of which he had been convicted; and exhorted him to apply the remaining interval that might be allowed him in this world to the more essential duties of repentance, from which he could only hope for consolation in the latter moments of existence. As soon as the

## SUPPLEMENT 2

verdict was pronounced, the unfortunate culprit gave evident marks of an affliction not to be described. He repeatedly called for the protection of heaven to the wretched family he was now doomed to leave; and when the awful sentence of condemnation was passed, he shrieked aloud, and fell upon his knees, imploring pity. The scene was very affecting. An unfortunate fellow creature had by his crimes brought himself to the awful verge of eternity; but was not yet quite so callous to the natural feelings of humanity, as to hear, unmoved, a doom which was to separate him for ever from his unhappy offspring! Pity it is that this the strongest of sensations ever should be lulled by the unruly dictates of a vicious inclination, which in the end invariably draws vengeance on itself.

In the case of John Gondreu we have a variety of matters for contemplation. A crime, of the blackest description perpetrated by a man already a felon—transported from his injured country by offending the laws—a robbery on the spot of his banishment. Then we find him tried for his latter offence by a Military Court, which, sitting as judge and jury, convict, and sentence him to death. We see the workings of all powerful nature in a hardened sinner looking at death; and, last of all, we read the moralizing on his fate of his brother convict, the printer, George Howe, alias Lucky George.

We have observed that of late years the sentence of death had not been carried into execution in Botany Bay. Mercy was even extended to Gondreu, upon the condition named in the following

### "GENERAL ORDERS."

"The Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to extend the royal mercy to John Gondreu, condemned to death by the late Criminal Court, on condition of his serving for life as a convict within this territory.

"By command of his Honour,  
"The Lieutenant Governor,  
"JAMES FINUCANE; Secretary."

"Head Quarters, Sydney,  
September 19th, 1809.

Note 1: Of advertisements, we observe many, and some extremely curious; but, generally upon subjects different to that of our work. One however, so forcibly struck us, that we do not hesitate giving it to our readers. It appeared in "The Sydney Gazette, and New South Wales Advertiser," Saturday April 28th 1810.

"Books. Any person or persons, who may have borrowed three volumes of the NEWGATE CALENDAR, from Mr. Nichols, is requested to return them. On the first leaf of each is a COAT of ARMS. If not restored, the person in whose possession either may hereafter be found will be prosecuted."

Note 2: *Darcy Wentworth*, once a famous highwayman on the roads leading to the metropolis, became a Botany Bay ESQUIRE—nay, by virtue of two offices under government. He was surgeon-general, a justice of the peace, and a trustee for the public roads.

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

*Andrew Thompson*, also a convict, was another ESQUIRE, at Hawkesbury.

*Simeon Lord*, a third convict, an ESQUIRE, Justice at Sydney. His worship, Lord, built the largest private house, stores, and warehouses, and was one of the first merchants under the government.

*Isaac Nichols*, transported for stealing a Jack-Ass, was a principal superintendent of convicts, and built himself a house and store-house, nearly equal to his fellow-convict, Lord.

Note 3: This town is above a mile in length, contains several streets, and about two thousand inhabitants. The whole colony can muster eight thousand white souls, all from the British dominions.

Note 4: This Court is held at the will of the governor, as occasion may require. It is composed of officers, one half military, and the other naval, who are both judges and jurors, under the direction of a judge advocate.

Note 5: This is the proceeding of all Courts Martial—the members deliberating, convicting, or acquitting, and pronouncing judgment, with closed doors. In Botany Bay, all are under martial law.

**ISAAC WEST and JOHN DUNCAN**  
***Convicted of Burglary in Botany Bay, 12<sup>th</sup> of September 1809***

At the Court of Criminal Jurisdiction in Sydney, Botany Bay on 12th of September 1809, Isaac West, and John Duncan, (convicts) were indicted; Isaac West for breaking and entering the house of Elizabeth, alias Sarah Hill, on the 17th of August last in the day time, and stealing therefrom articles to the value of twenty-seven shillings; and John Duncan for receiving the said articles knowing them to be stolen. Isaac West was sentenced to receive three hundred lashes on his bare back, and to be imprisoned five years at Fort Dalrymple; and John Duncan to fourteen years' transportation.

Note: Sarah Hill was then a convict, but obtained the indulgence of her own time, giving money in lieu of public work. She took a house, and converted it into a brothel, acting the part of bawd therein; after figuring some time in the character of, what we in London term, "a girl of the town."

We should have concluded that these punishments, if not operating as an example to others in the like case offending, would surely have fully sufficed to have deterred the rogues themselves from committing further depredations; but it seems, like a great part of their fellow convicts, they were incorrigible. We find in the Gazette that ere the back of one of them whipped had ceased smarting from the lashes above mentioned, they had relapsed into their wonted propensity to thieving, as will appear from the following paragraph:

"On Tuesday last West and Duncan, who were lately convicted of robbing the house of Elizabeth Hill, in Chapel-row, were examined before a bench of magistrates on a charge of stealing poultry, which Duncan declared he had found; but as the fact of stealing was too palpable to admit so unpalatable a justification, both were ordered to sleep in the gaol as improper characters."

**JOHN BOULTON**  
*Punished by the Stocks in Botany Bay*

The bench of magistrates in Sydney, Botany Bay, on 12th of September 1809, enquired into the conduct of John Boulton for indecency, "of which," adds our reformed convict printer, "delicacy restrains the mention in a public print." It will suffice to say, that the bench, after a long and patient hearing and examination of numerous witnesses, were fully satisfied with the prisoner's guilt. They sentenced the said John Boulton to be set in the public stocks, on the Green hills, at the Hawksbury, on the following Saturday in the forenoon, there to remain for the space of two hours; then to be removed to the common gaol at Paramatta, and there confined one calendar month.

Note: Paramatta is the town, where Barrington, that prince of pickpockets, finished his earthly career. At the time of his death he was high constable of Paramatta, to which he was appointed for his better conduct as a convict, but it was a place neither respectable nor profitable. Paramatta is sixteen miles from Sydney, the seat of government, and contains about five hundred inhabitants. It is the name given by the natives; Para, signifying the head, matta, a creek, from its situation at the extremity of the water in that part of the country.

**HENRY KELLY**

***Punishment of a Prevaricating Witness in Botany Bay***

The bench of magistrates at Hawksbury, on Saturday the 18th of November 1809, found it necessary to order the corporal punishment to fifty lashes to be inflicted on Henry Kelly (a convict) for gross prevarication in delivering his evidence, and for manifesting a disposition to conceal and disguise the facts within his knowledge, with a view to prevent and defeat the course of justice. The bench declared their determination on every occasion to punish in the most public and exemplary manner every person concerned in practices so injurious to the interests of society, and that were calculated for purposes so scandalous and disgraceful.

Note: Hawksbury, so called after the noble lord who bore that title, is the most distant settlement from Sydney. The town is called "The Green Hills," of which Andrew Thompson, Esquire, late a convict, known by the appellation of Long Harry, was justice of the peace, and little Ben Lara, a Jew, once his fellow convict, kept the principal hotel.

**JAMES HEATH and HENRY WILLIAMS**  
*Sentenced to Death, having Pleaded Guilty to an Indictment  
before the Court Of Criminal Jurisdiction at Sidney, (Botany  
Bay,) Charged with a Burglary*

On Tuesday the 28th of November 1809, says the Sydney Gazette, a Court of Criminal Judicature was convened for the trial of James Heath, and Henry Williams, who were indicted for breaking and entering a mill at Pymont, belonging to G. Blaxcell, Esq. and stealing there from seven canvass bags, containing fifteen bushels of wheat; to which charge both the prisoners pleaded guilty, and received sentence of condemnation.

Upon this awful occasion the judge advocate pathetically admonished the prisoners to repentance, setting before them at the same time the mirror of their transgressions, which arbitrarily demanded the interposition of the legal power. The unhappy men appeared to be much affected at the situation in which their crimes had brought them, and evinced sincere contrition.

A representation of the circumstances having been subsequently made to his Honour the Lieutenant Governor, his Honour was pleased to extend the royal grace and pardon to both the criminals, conditionally on their serving as transports for life within the limits of this territory.

In the same paper we find no bad specimen of Botany Bay poetry; and, as the subject comes within the scope of our work, we present it in this place to our readers.

**THE POOR CONVICT.**

"By fortune discarded- a prison my doom,  
Ah why do I sadly survive,  
But to end an existence, mayhap, in this tomb,  
That's prepared for the wretch while alive.

"If a brother in durance hail freedom's return,  
To transport my heart doth incline;  
But transient's the joy-with impatience I burn,  
And I wish the same blessing were mine.

"Now hope grows too feeble my spirits to cheer;  
Reflection consoles me no more;  
For thought but informs me my lot is severe,  
That I live but new ills to endure.

"From whom shall the convict immur'd beg relief;  
Or who his misfortunes befriend,  
When the wants of his children but adds to his grief,  
And their tears they unheeded expend?

## SUPPLEMENT 2

"Ye generous few, who can kindly bestow  
A mite on the suffering poor,  
Compassionate this my sad story of woe,  
And to liberty open the door.

"Or if by mishap be unheeded my pray'r,  
And I sink beneath usage unkind,  
The grave puts an end to all miseries here  
And in death a true friend I shall find."

### **FORGERY IN BOTANY BAY.**

Some ingenious person or persons, continues this Gazette, having passed several forged bills, written with a pen so as to imitate printing, the public are cautioned against the fraud; and, in order to put a stop to it, are recommended to bring to immediate detection any person from whom any such may have been received, or by whom such future imposition shall be attempted.

### **PROCLAMATION FOR REGULATING THE HOURS OF WORK, OF THE CONVICTS AT BOTANY BAY.**

"Head Quarters, Government House,  
Sydney, 20th January 1810.

"In consequence his Excellency the Governor having been enabled to augment the ration, the hours for labour for working gangs in the employ of government will be as follows,

"From day light till 8 o'clock work; from 8 o'clock till nine, rest. From nine o'clock till 3 in the afternoon, labour, at which time it ceases for the day; and on Saturday, from day light till ten o'clock, at which time the labour ceases until Monday following,

"By Command of His Excellency,  
"JOHN. T. CAMPBELL, Secretary."

**THOMAS HERBERT**  
*Indicted for Assault, 8th December 1809*

At the sessions held at Hick's Hall, for the county of Middlesex, on Friday the 8th of December 1809, Thomas Herbert was indicted for a violent assault on Lieutenant Colonel Vigoreaux. The prosecutor, who has lost a leg in the service of his country, was riding on horseback to Chiswick, when he met the defendant and two others in a gig, and the former committed a most wanton assault, by horsewhipping him as he passed, The prosecutor followed the defendant to the toll bar-gate at Hyde-Park Corner, and requested the gate to be shut against the defendant, when he got out and threatened to pull the prosecutor off his horse. The Colonel followed the defendant to Dowgate-hill, he having refused to give any other address than that he was Captain Herbert of the city. At Dowgate-hill the defendant again threatened to pull the Colonel off his horse, and he assaulted him several times. The counsel for the prisoner made no defence, and the defendant was convicted. After a severe reprimand from the chairman, he was sentenced to pay a fine of 50*l.* and to be imprisoned three months.

**REBECCA LEE**  
*A Cruel Mistress to her Servant Maid*

AS soon as many an innocent buxom lass in the country, through strict frugality, has saved a few pounds out of her scanty wages, she sighs to visit dear Lunnan, where she has been told, many a time, for truth, "that the streets are paved with gold, and the houses studded with diamonds." Let such take heed from the fate of Ann Hayman; a case, cruel as it was, not near so hard, by many degrees, as some which we could adduce; let them further beware lest they fall into the hands of old bawds, who are constantly prowling about, seeking the misery of country girls, by seducing them into the houses of infamy, where,

"Ruin ensues, remorse, and endless shame;  
And one false step for ever damns her fame."

Rebecca Lee was indicted on April the 5th 1810, for assaulting and otherwise ill-treating Ann Hayman. It appeared that the prosecutrix, who was a native of the county of Devon, had been hired there and brought to town by the defendant, as her servant. That after she had been some time in her service, she used her extremely ill, constantly beating her, and treating her with great severity; that on the 9th of June last, she beat her, cut her face, and turned her out of doors, giving her only a seven-shilling piece and a loaf, to take her down to Exeter; that being turned into the street, the neighbours interfered, and she was prevailed on to take her into the house again; but the very next day she repeated the same cruelties to her, beat her, bit her cheek, and cut her face most desperately, and then turned her out of doors. All these facts were proved by several witnesses. The case being gone through on the part of the prosecution by Mr. Gurney, that on the part of the defendant was undertaken by Mr. Alley, who addressed the jury at considerable length ; but, without retiring, they found her guilty; and the Court, after expressing their abhorrence of such conduct, sentenced her to pay a fine of 40*l*.

## THE GEMMEN OF THE WHIP

### *And their Misdemeanours*

ON a retrospect of the various characters who are a pest to society we find none, in a certain degree, more obnoxious than coachmen in and about the metropolis. Impositions upon their employers, and ill-treatment to their horses, is a leading trait in the character of the inferior order of the gemmen of the whip. The depredations, impositions, and insolence, of the drivers of licensed hackney coaches in London are well known to all who occasionally use those vehicles.

These fellows are never wanting to lend a turn to thieves of every description. To detail their abuses would occupy volumes, not a day passing without some complaint against the *Jehu fraternity*; who, nine times out of ten, escape with impunity because their ill-treated fare is either ignorant of the mode of punishing them, or cannot afford time to bring them to justice. Many a time had we suffered the mortification of imposition and abuse from these ruffians, ere we took the resolution of seeking redress. Succeeding therein, we gladly point out the road to our readers.

The first attack they make is, to demand, almost invariably, more than their fare. Should you demur, they generally deal out oaths and curses, by way of supporting their imposition—swearing two miles into three, and an eighteen-penny fare into half-a-crown. As they generally proceed to enforce their exactions let them take it, but under protest that you will summon them to the Hackney-coach-office in the Strand. Now as they calculate the odds at ten to one, that you will not trouble yourself further about them, they, at best, only laugh at you. But, next day, if you would do justice to yourself—in fact, to the public, go to the said coach-office, and, before the commissioners, tender your complaint (remembering the number of the coach, or they cannot fix upon the driver,) and you will convict him of extortion, and be entitled to one half the fine which will be laid upon him. In cases of aggravated ill-treatment, Master Whip is also sent to the House of Correction. The following case respects one of that order who had been promoted to drive a lawyer's coach; and which, of course, will point out the mode of punishment of a *Gentleman Jehu*.

**JOHN SEARLE**, a coachman, in the service of Mr. Richard Dann, a respectable solicitor, was indicted for a wanton and outrageous assault committed on the persons of William Noble and Mary Ann, his wife. Mr. Noble deposed, that he was proceeding along the Hackney Road, going down to his dwelling in the country. It was dark in the evening, and he was in a one horse chaise, when he observed a man driving a coach and a pair of grey horses at a most furious rate, going zigzag from one side of the way to the other; he cried out, but to no purpose; he endeavoured to avoid him, but the coach was driven more furiously towards him: at length, the wheel of the coach took the wheel and shaft of his chaise, and turned it over. He was thrown out, as was his wife; he fell under the horse, and the horse rolled over him and dragged the chaise upwards of 40 yards, pulling Mrs. Noble along, with her head fixed between the splinter-bar and the body of the carriage, and she was lacerated and torn most shockingly, insomuch that she has laboured under the consequences ever since, and must be a cripple the rest of her life. He was found guilty, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment.

A complaint was about this time made by John Robey, a boot-maker, of St. Andrew-street, Seven Dials, against **WILLIAM ROGERS**, the driver of the hackney coach, No. 627; at the instant he was applying for a summons, the same coachman

## SUPPLEMENT 2

and coach drove up to the office door with some prisoners in it; the complainant recognized them, and coachey appeared before Mr. Birnie, the sitting magistrate, when it appeared that the prisoner, in East-street, Manchester-square, drove the pole of his coach against the prosecutor's breast, which knocked him down backwards, and for the instant he was senseless. When he came to himself, he found he was under the horses; when he got up, and was taking the number of the coach, the prisoner flogged him so violently that he cut the flesh off his hands, and with the most horrid oaths and blackguard language, threatened to cut his head off, &c.

The prisoner, in his defence, did not deny the charge. Mr. Birnie told him the less he said the better; and had no doubt if he was indicted, but he would receive a sentence of six months' imprisonment, and ordered him to find bail.

This audacious fellow escaped on making satisfaction to the complainant, after giving bail to answer the charge at the quarter sessions.

A porter of the White Horse Inn, in Piccadilly, (another insolent and imposing servant, whose frauds we shall soon fully expose) was fined by the same active magistrate 40 shillings and costs, for charging eight-pence for a parcel, the distance being under a mile, and sixpence being his fare.

About the same time, **JAMES GRANT**, (a Gentleman Jehu) was sentenced to a similar punishment. The offence with which he stood charged is nightly committed at places of public resort, and it seldom occurs that the offenders are brought to justice. At the close of the performance on the night stated, Mr. Lambert's carriage was drawn up in regular turn at the Bow-street door, his party consisting of Mrs. Lambert (in a state of pregnancy), and three children, besides a gentleman afflicted with the gout. The defendant was out of the rank; and on the prosecutor's coachman attempting orderly to draw off after another carriage, the defendant with full force drove the splinter-bar, or pole, betwixt the horses and the carriage of the prosecutor, and one of the horses was thrown down, whilst the other was driven on the pavement. Neither the remonstrance of the prosecutor, nor the screams of his lady and children, had any effect, as the defendant persisted in flogging his horses until the carriage had several times been nearly upset. The guards interfered, whilst Mrs. Lambert and the party alighted; the carriage having been previously damaged, and so entangled by the defendant's violence, as to render the situation of the parties truly dangerous. The defendant refused to tell whose service he disgraced, but Mr. Lambert waited and ascertained that fact, and prosecuted him.

The same day, at the police office in Marlborough-street, a hackney coachman, of the name of **TWEED**, was fined for extortion, in demanding and receiving three shillings more than his fare from a Mr. Scott and two ladies, whom he drove from the Opera to Paddington. The coachman as usual was plying for fare at the edge of the pavement, and the prosecutor and his friends were handed into the coach by a link-man, but the driver refused to proceed under six shillings. The party did not choose to alight, and Mr. Scott promised to satisfy the coachman, which he attempted to do by paying him two shillings. The coachman, however, demanded five shillings; and the prosecutor, rather than subject himself to insult, paid it, and very properly brought the extortioner to justice.

**FRANCIS MYERS**, a hackney coachman, was capitally indicted for stealing a portable writing-desk, with ten guineas therein, the property of Capt. Hotham. It appeared in evidence, that Capt. Hotham came to town by the York mail coach; that

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

his luggage was transferred into the prisoner's coach, among which was the writing-desk. He was driven to his lodgings in Duke-street, St. James's; and, on alighting, ordered the prisoner to give his luggage to his servant, but he concealed the desk, and drove away with it. On its being advertised, it was found at a cabinet-maker's, to whose house the prisoner himself had taken it, and had it broken open with a chisel, and took the money out. The jury found him guilty of simple felony. Imprisoned. [It is to be hoped that this will prove a warning to hackney-coachmen, and teach them the danger of concealing and appropriating to themselves, as lawful prize, articles of value inadvertently forgotten in their vehicles.]

We shall conclude our long history of the abuses of the "Gemmen of the Whip" with the case of a stage coachman, in the words of the reporter, which will show that they not only meet with punishment for ill-treating and imposing upon their passengers, but that they are liable to answer for their ill conduct to the proprietors

### **MIDDLESEX-SHERIFF'S COURT, Dec. 19, 1810.** **BOLTON AND OTHERS v. HILL.**

The plaintiffs in this case are proprietors of the coaches from the Golden-cross, Charing-cross. The defendant is a coachman lately employed by them in driving one of their stages. It appeared in evidence, that in April last an action had been brought against the proprietors, by a person to recover damages for the injury he had sustained in consequence of their servant (the present defendant) having driven their coach against him while on horseback, whereby he was thrown from the horse and much hurt, and the horse killed; and in which action it being proved that the accident arose through the extreme negligence and improper conduct of the coachman, the person injured recovered damages against the proprietors, who therefore brought this action against the coachman, to recover back the amount of the damages incurred by them through his improper conduct.—Damages for the proprietors, 133*l.* 9*s.*

**JOHN KING*****Convicted the sittings after Michaelmas Term 1810, in the Court at Westminster, of Perjury***

THE Attorney-General stated this to be an indictment against Mr. John King, charging him with wilful and corrupt perjury, committed by him in an affidavit filed in the course of certain proceedings in the Court of Chancery, at his suit, against Mr. Charles Harrison. Mr. Harrison had obtained judgment against Mr. King for 1565*l.* in the court of King's Bench, on which Mr. King filed a Bill in Chancery, to restrain Mr. Harrison from any further proceedings at law; after a certain time, Mr. Harrison having failed to give in an answer to the Bill, Mr. King obtained an injunction on the 6th of April, which he served on Harrison on the 9th; being desirous of locking up Harrison, who it was not convenient for him should be abroad with judgment against him (Mr. K.) to the amount of 1500*l.*; and being aware that the only way in which he could accomplish this object was by swearing that the writ of *fi. fa.* was not issued till after the intimation of the Lord Chancellor's order of injunction or restraint from execution, &c. he, on the 18th of the same month, filed an affidavit, not to the best of his knowledge and belief, but to the absolute fact, consistent with his own knowledge, that the writ of *fi. fa.* in the case alluded to, had been sent out after the 9th of April, the date of the notice of the order, although, in fact, the writ had issued on the 4th of that month, before any application had been made to the Lord Chancellor.

In support of this case there were produced the order of the Lord Chancellor for the injunction, dated the 6th of April, the copy of service of that order on the 9th of April; the affidavit of the defendant in the terms charged in the indictment; and, in contradiction there to, an examined copy of the writ of *fi. fa.*, with an indorsement bearing it to have been issued on the 4th of April.

Charles Harrison, the prosecutor in the indictment, also swore to his having indorsed it on the 4th of April, on which day he also sent it to the sheriff's office by George Smithson. Cross-examined by the Common Serjeant, the witness stated that he wished the execution to have been levied also on the 4th of April, if it could have been done; but it was not made till the 11th, at which time the injunction had issued, and had not been dissolved. G. Smithson said the writ of *fi. fa.* was put into his hands by Harrison, on the 4th of April, to give an officer to get executed. He had great difficulty, however, in finding an officer who would execute it. He did not leave the writ at the office, but carried it away with him, and returned it to Mr. Harrison's clerk. Cross-examined by Mr. Alley, admitting the writ of *fi. fa.* was not left at the sheriff's office, of course Mr. King could have no information concerning it if he had applied there. He knew from Harrison that he had not given it into the office till the 11th of April; therefore it was impossible for any human being to know till then that the writ had issued. Re-examined by the Attorney General, the witness said the date of the 4th of April, as being the date of issuing the writ, would also appear on the back of the warrant, so that any person, curious of satisfying himself on that head, might learn the fact by consulting either the writ or the warrant.

Mr. Common Serjeant, for the defendant, contended that a material averment was wanting in the indictment, namely, that the defendant knew what he had sworn to be false. It was obvious from the evidence of the prosecutor (Harrison) himself, that he had committed a contempt against the authority of the Court of Chancery, in levying on the goods of the defendant, after it consisted with the knowledge of

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

Harrison, that an injunction, restraining him from any farther proceedings, had been issued. The defendant could not have been ignorant of this, and it was an outrage on common sense to suppose, that possessed of such knowledge, and having a well-founded ground of complaint against Harrison, for which he was liable to be committed for a contempt, the defendant should have selected the issuing out of the writ as the ground of his application, had he not relied on the information he had applied for and obtained, as to the period when that writ of *fi. fa.* was issued.

A witness, Smithson, swore the date of the writ of *fi. fa.* was indorsed on the warrant. This he should prove to be false, from production of the warrant itself. He should show also, that on application to the officer, he stated the 11th to be the date of issuing the writ, a fact which he would now certify to the jury on oath. The defendant, therefore, was in bona fide to swear what he had been informed, and he could have no reason to doubt was the fact.

Mr. Carter, from the sheriff's office, produced the warrant, dated 11th of April, in which there was no mention by indorsement, or otherwise, of the date of the 4th of that month.

James Hemp, the officer, stated, that Mr. King had made application to him, both personally and by a boy, desiring to know the date of the writ of *fi. fa.* which he had stated, as he believed it to be, the 11th of April, there being seldom any time allowed to lie over in the execution of such writs.

The Attorney-General was heard in reply. Lord Ellenborough, after recapitulating the evidence, observed that the question for the consideration of the jury, was, if he had been deceived by this information; or if he had contrived the information to warrant the application he meant to make to Chancery, and to be in store for him afterwards. If the jury believed, that after all due and proper means of information had been resorted to by the defendant, he had fallen into error, he was entitled to a verdict of acquittal. But if they were satisfied that he knew or had the means of knowing the fact, and wilfully shut his eyes against it, in that case he was criminally responsible, and was guilty of perjury.

The jury, after some hesitation, found the defendant Guilty.

**HANNAH WHITELOCK ALIAS TAYLOR**  
*Transported for Seven Years, for Stealing Articles from Ready-furnished Lodgings*

This is an old, and most shameful mode of plunder. It is a crime committed through the basest treachery, cheating those by whom the thief is, in a certain degree, protected. Thus the base inmate, without fear of detection in the commission of his ungrateful villainy, at leisure, and little by little, strips the apartment, unsuspected by the owner. It is therefore difficult to convict a thief of this description;—but, when once convicted, we should not be sorry to find a severer punishment awaiting him, than being sent beyond the seas.

The trial of this woman brought to light a double deception; and in the practice of these kinds of cunning, we are sorry to say, our pages oft show that females are more expert than men. She cohabited with one Samuel Whitelock, and such a connection alone, though acquitted of participating in robbing their lodging, was sufficient to blast his character.

This infamous couple were indicted at the Old Bailey in the October sessions 1810, as man and wife, and she pleaded thereto as Hannah Whitelock. It appeared in evidence that they took the lodging above alluded to, very decently furnished; and that in a few days it was stripped of every article which it contained; even the lead was torn from the roof and carried off. It farther was proved that the woman prisoner was not married to the man—on the other hand they had been but a very short time connected, and that she assumed his name—in fine that she, in conjunction with a soldier in the ranks of the Guards, her most favoured lover, committed the robbery in Samuel Whitelock's absence. Of course he was acquitted—the soldier escaped—and the woman, the sole contriver of the base crime—was sent to Botany Bay.

At the same sessions **MARGARET SHIPLEY** was tried for stealing a watch from a young man of the name of Copeley. The evidence went to show this to be one of those cases where very incautious young men are decoyed into dens, which the worst of prostitutes infest. The consequence whereof was, that he was robbed of all the cash he had, and his watch into the bargain. The jury, without a moment's hesitation, found her guilty; and, being recognized as an old offender, she was also sentenced to transportation.

**DIANA JENNINGS**, a noted thief, was convicted of stealing pots, the property of Mr. Burnet, a publican, in Tichfield-street. When apprehended there were several pots belonging to other publicans found concealed about her. Imprisoned.

**MARY FRENCH** was next tried for stealing in the dwelling-house of Mr. Foster, in Old Gravel-lane, several small articles. The only novelty in this case was, the exhibition of a Jewess of the name of Levi, who presented herself in the two-fold capacity of witness for the prosecution and for the prisoner, in the first instance, to produce the property stolen, which she did; and, in the second instance, to prove that the prosecutor had accepted *5l.* not to proceed against the prisoner, in which she failed.

The jury found the prisoner Guilty; and it turned out, that she had been tried in this Court for various acts of theft, within the last three years, several times. Transportation.

**CHARLES DON**

*Convicted at the Summer Assizes 1810, at Chelmsford, and  
Sentenced to Death, for Horse Stealing.*

CHARLES DON was indicted for stealing a cart horse, the property of James Goodeve Sparrow, Esq. of Gosfield. The horse in question had been seen about noon on the Sunday on which it was stolen, and was missed between four and five o'clock the morning following, when persons were sent in search of it. It was taken from the farm-yard of Mr. Sparrow. The prisoner arrived about half past seven on the same morning at a public-house at a considerable distance from Mr. Sparrow's, mounted on the horse without a saddle, and nothing but a halter, when he called for some beer, and said he was going to Cambridge, and offered afterwards to sell the horse, it being, as he alleged, too heavy for him. The landlord, having a suspicion, from his appearance, that the horse was stolen, said he did not himself want to buy him, but would undertake to find a gentleman who would buy him. He went accordingly to General Elwes, a magistrate of the county, who resided close by him, told him his suspicions, and brought the general back with him to his house. General Elwes, being of the same opinion with the land lord, detained the prisoner; and, in the course of the day, those who went in pursuit of the horse, arrived, and identified him, and the prisoner was then fully committed for trial.

On being called upon for his defence, he said he had found the horse wandering on the road about seven miles from the public-house, that he had mounted him and rode him to where he was stopped, that he had never offered to sell him, but on the contrary meant to go forward with him to the end of his journey. Lord Ellenborough remarked on the inconsistency and dishonesty admitted by the defence, and left the facts to the jury, who immediately pronounced him Guilty—Death.

**FOUR NATIVE INDIANS OF BOMBAY**  
*Tried and Punished, 1810, for a Conspiracy, to Murder George  
Cumming Osborne, Esquire.*

This case excited great interest throughout the British territories in the East Indies; while the infamy of the attempt, added to its containing the mode of punishment for such a crime in that distant part of the globe, much concerned the reader, in his native land.

Mr. Osborne was Sub-treasurer of Bombay, who finding frauds practised upon the East India Company, he diligently sought to detect the offenders. To prevent a discovery, the peculator determined upon murdering Mr. Osborne!

From the evidence of many witnesses who were called, it appeared, that the prisoners had been in employments in the Treasury—that they had for a length of time carried on the most flagrant system of dishonesty and speculation. These practices not continuing to be as secure as they were profitable, the best plan which suggested itself for establishing the safety of the prisoners, and retaining them in their situation, was the murder of the Sub-Treasurer, who alone had the means of detecting their villainy. They accordingly promised a large sum of money to a man who undertook the task, but who, repenting the iniquitous design, gave every information against the offenders.

The Recorder, in summing up the evidence, dwelt with peculiar energy upon the deadly malice which had prompted the prisoners, day and night, to seek the destruction of an excellent unoffending man. They were all found guilty. Two of them were condemned to be imprisoned five years, to be placed once a year in the pillory, with labels descriptive of their offence, during their imprisonment to be twice publicly whipped, to be fined ten thousand rupees each, and to be further imprisoned till they pay the said fine. Upon the other two prisoners, sentence of two years' imprisonment was passed, they having been only regarded as wretched tools. The two former were pilloried and whipped the day after the trial, in the presence of twenty or thirty thousand spectators.

**THOMAS WREN**  
*Convicted of Assault at the Middlesex Sessions, December,  
1810*

THOMAS WREN was put to the bar, charged on two separate indictments, in conjunction with James Wren, his brother, of assaulting Leonard M'Nally and Hannah his wife, in a most outrageous manner, in their own house. Mr. Barry stated the case on the part of the prosecution. It appeared that one of the defendants, namely James Wren, did not come in to take his trial. The case, however, as applying to the defendant at the bar, was as follows:—The prosecutors kept a public-house in Wilson-street, Finsbury-square. On the night stated the defendant, who is assistant to his father, a market gardener, but who lives separate from him in Chancery lane, came to the prosecutor's house; and he and his brother staying there till it began to grow late, was requested by Mrs. M'Nally to depart; this he refused, and was desirous of having more liquor, which she peremptorily refused; some noise took place, and he happened to go outside the door, Mrs. M'Nally endeavoured to shut him out, which he resisted; his brother came to his assistance. Mr. M'Nally came to his wife's assistance, and the two cut and beat them both so brutally, that if it had not been for the interference of the neighbours they might have lost their lives. It was urged by the counsel for the prosecution, that as publicans were under the necessity of receiving all guests who came into their houses whilst they held licences, so they were the more entitled than other persons to be protected from outrage and violence.

Mr. Glead for the defendant addressed the jury, endeavouring to impress upon their minds that the cause of dispute and assault arose from the prosecutor's allowing the defendant and his brother to remain drinking in the house, till they became intoxicated.

Mr. Barry replied, and showed, to the satisfaction of the Court and the jury, that even in that case there was no apology for the brutal violence used.—Of this opinion was the jury, and the defendant was found guilty. Mr. Watson pronounced sentence, at the same time admonishing the offender from conducting himself in such an outrageous manner again. He was sent to expiate his offence to the care of Mr. Adkins, the Governor of the House of Correction, Coldbath-fields.

**MARY FORDHAM*****Tried at Hertford, the 18th March 1811, for the Wilful Murder of her Bastard Child, Found Guilty of Concealing its Birth, and Sentenced to Two Years' Imprisonment***

IN the former part of this Volume we have given two cases of this unnatural crime. The following discloses still worse circumstances against the unnatural mother; in fact, in each the criminals deserved severer punishment.

Mary Fordham was indicted for the wilful murder of her bastard child, by giving it a blow on the head with a brick, of which it died on Saturday the 3d of September 1810. The circumstances of the case, in evidence, were as follows:—

Mary Chapman, a girl of 16, stated, that she lived fellow-servant with the prisoner, at a Mr. Whittingham's, at Stevenage, in the month of September last. She had no suspicion that the prisoner at the bar was with child; on the Friday night she slept with the prisoner, who complained all the night of a great pain in her bowels, and was so very restless, that she prevented the witness from getting any sleep.

The next night the witness went to sleep in another bed by herself; and when she got up in the morning she went into the prisoner's bed-room; she was lying in bed, and the floor near the bed-side was disfigured. The witness told her to get up and clean her room, which she did, and went about her work the whole of that day. In the course of the morning the witness acquainted her mistress with what had happened; they searched the garret together, in one of which there was a hole in the floor, about five feet deep, which they put rubbish into. Here they found a stocking of the prisoner's, which was bloody, and lifting up an old bee-hive, they discovered the body of a child lying under it; they did not take up or move the body, but sent for the apothecary.

Mrs. Whittingham deposed to the same effect with the last witness, as to the finding the body of a child in the hole. On cross-examination, she said, about a month before this time she recollected that the prisoner and herself had been both very much frightened by a man in a mask coming into the house. It was one of the labourers did it in a frolic, and the effects of such a fright upon a pregnant woman was very likely to produce a miscarriage.

Robert Jones, the apothecary, stated, that he was called in and saw the child, but he could not undertake to say whether it was born alive or not; it was a full grown child. Upon examining it there was found a contusion on the left side of the head, sufficient to have occasioned its death. He examined the prisoner, and from the state of her breasts he could say that she had been pregnant, but could not determine whether she had miscarried or not. About a foot from the child a piece of brick was found (which was produced,) it had marks of blood upon it, and corresponded with the wound on the child's head.

George Hickes, a surgeon, deposed, that he examined the wound; on opening the scalp, he found four contusions on the bone beneath. On cross-examination, he said the four contusions might have been occasioned by the child's fall on an irregular surface, such as the piece of brick produced; and if it had been thrown down the hole dead, it would have had the same appearance. The learned judge summed up the evidence with great humanity, and left it for the jury to determine. The wound on the

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

head might have been occasioned by the child's being thrown dead into the hole. If they were of that opinion, they would acquit the prisoner; but they would then say whether they found her guilty of concealing the birth of the child. The jury acquitted her of the murder, but found her guilty of the concealment of the birth of the child; upon which she was sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

**JOHN HUGHES**

***Convicted at the Summer Assizes Held at Dolgelly, in North Wales, 1811, and Sentenced to Death for Sheep Stealing.***

Cases frequently occur, where prisoners are sentenced to capital punishment, and yet nothing transpires, the proof of guilt being short and inconclusive, and not of sufficient import to record in our Volumes. Such a trial would this: have proved to us, had it not been for the ignorant officiousness of a juryman. This, alone, induces us to give it a place, under the hope that it will be a lesson to other Jurors.

The proof against the prisoner being full, the judge charged the jury, that if they credited the testimony on the part of the prosecution, they must according to law find the prisoner guilty. It appeared that one of the jurymen, vain of his conceit in such matters, persuaded his fellow jurors that though there was no doubt the prisoner stole the sheep, yet as no one saw him steal them they must find him "not guilty;" and they actually brought in a verdict to the above effect. But after a philippic from the Court, these sages in the law were obliged to alter their verdict. Hughes was reprieved, and his sentence changed to transportation.

At Beaumaris on the same circuit an Irishman was to have been tried for horse-stealing; but Paddy contrived to make his escape just before, and left word that he was by no means desirous of giving the *Jontlemen* any trouble!

**JOHN PURCEL, ESQ. OF HIGHFORT, NEAR  
CHARLEVILLE**

*Extraordinary Defeat of a Desperate Gang of House-breakers*

On the 24th March 1811, the following gallant defence made by John Purcel, Esq. of Highfort, near Charleville [Co. Cork, Ireland], cannot fail of exciting a considerable degree of interest, particularly as Mr. Purcel is upwards of 70 years of age:—

It appears that Mr. Purcel had determined to set apart the evening of the 24th March, for the purpose of arranging some of his accounts; and, as he foresaw that he would be hereby employed until a late hour, he caused his servant to provide supper. The room in which he had supped and slept was inside his parlour, the windows of which latter, after a short interval, were beat in; and scarcely an instant elapsed before he heard several persons, he believed twelve or thirteen, leap in the room in rapid succession; he had but a moment to deliberate; and, although he found himself totally unprovided with any other weapon than the knife which he recollected lay on the table, he, with the most astonishing and unparalleled bravery, resolved on defence.

As there were two doors connecting his bed-chamber with his parlour, he was a while in suspense at which the robbers would enter; but was speedily relieved from his doubts, by hearing them remove a *garde du vin*, which obstructed one of the passages; and thereupon seeing the door thrown in by a violent blow of a sledge, Mr. P. now put his back close against the wall, immediately contiguous to the door. Although the darkness of Mr. P's room rendered him invisible to those without; yet the moon shining brightly through the windows which had been broken, and through which the party entered, gave him an imperfect view of his assailants, and discovered two men abreast, approaching him by the door. Mr. P. at this moment only hesitated to decide whether a back hand, or a right forward blow would be most powerful; and, on preferring the former, he plunged his knife far into the breast of the nearest man, who immediately fell back with a horrible scream, and expired. The captain of the party gave orders to fire, and a musket was thereupon presented at Mr. P. and actually lay against his belly; but, as from its oblique position Mr. P. saw it could not injure him, he pressed against the barrel in order to induce a belief that it should prove mortal, and permitted it to be fired. He then gave this ruffian also a terrible wound, when he retreated; a third fellow, undeterred by these examples, had the temerity to attempt an entrance, but met with a like repulse—the expulsion of the entire gang from the house it was imagined was, by this, effected, with the exception of one powerfully strong villain, who, more successful than his comrades, forced his way into the bed-chamber, which the ruffian presently notified in the loudest and most exulting tone.

During the whole of this most terrific proceeding, Mr. P. had not felt the influence of apprehension, until this, that when greatly fatigued his destruction seemed inevitable; but yet, as a hopeless effect, he determined on continued resistance—he closed on his assailant, and a very fierce struggle ensued—Mr. P. finding that although he frequently stabbed the fellow in the side, he nevertheless persisted in repeating a demand of Mr. P's money, dreaded the point of his knife had been turned and blunted; and such, on feeling it, he found to be the case—he was thus bereft of his only weapon; however, in the encounter he discovered a sword suspended to his opponent, which he now strove to gain; but, during the exertion, the

## SUPPLEMENT 2

wretched man expired in his arms, and thus Mr. P. found that his knife had not failed, until, guided by Providential interposition, it had miraculously and faithfully secured his deliverance.

The remainder of the party were now contented to depart, carrying off the dead and wounded, and Mr. Purcel, dreading the renewal of the attempt with increased numbers, prudently concealed himself between two heaps of culm in an adjoining yard, from whence he issued in the morning completely coated with blood, and whatever else this clammy matter caused to adhere to his body and limbs. It seems a third fellow named Joy, who composed one of this party, died in Newcastle, County Limerick, his wounds not having permitted him to escape further than that town.

**GEORGE KENDRICK**  
*Imprisoned Twelve Months in the Middlesex House of  
Correction, for Pheasant Stealing*

This was an offence, though scarce so scandalous as swan stealing, yet worse than poaching—that dread crime against the pleasures of the great; more unpardonable in them, than the yeoman's killing the partridge on his own land that devoured his corn, or the hare eating the tender plants of his garden. It may be called a *game larceny*, seeing that in this instance, as the Court determined in the case of the swans, the stolen pheasants were not "*ferae naturae*," but tame domestic animals of the barn-yard.

George Kendrick was put to the bar at the Middlesex Sessions on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 1810, charged upon an indictment with receiving eight live pheasants, the property of William Butler, Esq. knowing them to be stolen. Mr. Butler has a seat in the county of Hants, where, as well as in other places, he keeps a considerable number of the most beautiful pheasants, all tamed and bred to the hand. No less than 68 of the finest of them were stolen and carried completely off. By some circumstances he was led, in a about a month after, to suspect that the defendant was in possession of some of them, and he accordingly obtained a search warrant, and, accompanied by Pearkes, the officer, went to his house in Piccadilly. There he saw the defendant, whom he interrogated respecting such pheasants, and respecting a person of the name of Gough; but he denied all knowledge of such birds or of Gough. This did not satisfy Mr. Butler, and he proceeded upstairs into a room where there were about 200 pheasants running about; and seeing also some in baskets, they were searched, and eight of the stolen birds were found. Mr. Butler had marked his pheasants in the feet; and, to remove such marks, the poor birds were "dreadfully cut in the feet, insomuch that the blood was then visible. On this discovery being made, the defendant then acknowledged that he knew Gough, and that he agreed to buy 14 pheasants from him for 1*l.* each, and that Gough had sent them to him for that purpose.

There was other evidence against the prisoner. On his behalf he called a man who was a clerk to him to support his case respecting the 14 pheasants; but in this he failed, and the jury found him guilty. The Court then sentenced him to be imprisoned twelve months in the House of Correction, Coldbath-fields, and at the end of that time to give security to keep the peace for two years, himself in 500*l.* and two sureties in 200*l.* each, and to be further confined till that security be given.

**GEORGE RATCLIFFE**  
*Executed for Rape, 4<sup>th</sup> April 1811*

On Thursday April the 4<sup>th</sup>, 1811, a man of the name of George Ratcliffe, suffered the sentence of the law in Kent for feloniously ravishing Sarah Roberts, at Plumstead, in that county. The prosecutrix was a young girl of the age of little more than 16; she gave the following account of the transaction:—

That she had been to her mother's at Bexley, and was returning home through a field in which the prisoner was at work with his team; the cart stood in her way, and she desired the prisoner to move it, which he did. She had gone on but a little way, when she was overtaken by the prisoner. He asked her where she had been, which she told him. He next inquired whither she was going, which she also told him. He then began some rudeness, which she repelled, but he threw her into the ditch; and, stopping her mouth with one hand, he perpetrated his purpose. She screamed and resisted as much as she could, and immediately as she got from him, she made her complaint to the constable. The prisoner was apprehended about two hours afterwards in the same field. The witness was confirmed in her statement by a woman lying in a neighbouring cottage, who heard her screams, and the constable who took the prisoner into custody. He found him in the field searching for his whip, which he had lost either before or at the time of the struggle.

The prisoner said the girl had been a consenting party to the act. The jury found him guilty, and the learned judge pronounced sentence of death upon him.

**COMBINATION OF JOURNEYMEN BOOT-MAKERS.**  
*A Lesson to Journeymen of every trade*

On the 17th of August 1811, John Stanley, Thomas Jeffry, W. Braine, and William Brunt, journeymen boot and shoemakers, were brought before the Aldermen, Messrs. Scholey and Magney, on an information, charging them with forming a conspiracy, with 36 others, to obtain, contrary to the Statute, an increase of wages from their master Mr. Hale, Boot-maker, Fleet-street.

Mr. Alley, as counsel for the prosecution, stated, that the defendants, under an improper and delusive sense of the law, had illegally held a meeting for the purpose of compelling Mr. Hale to allow them the same prices for work that Mr. Hoby, and other masters at the west end of the town, gave. Mr. Hale had, from motives of humanity, selected a few persons for punishment, rather than the whole of those who had left his employment, and a hope was entertained that his lenity would have had the effect of inducing them all to return to their work, in which case the prosecution would not be followed up; but if on the contrary, they should persist in their refusal to work, justice would take place. Mr. Hale being examined, deposed, that he was informed, while in the country, that his men had struck for increase of prices, and that they had held a meeting for that purpose. In consequence of their conduct he attended their meeting, and he was informed by two they had delegated, the prices they required were contained in a book. The latter contended they were entitled to the price given by Mr. Hoby for boots, jockey-boots, and shoes, which differed from that given by the prosecutor. He refused, on pretence that he gave the same price that others did in the city; and, finding them to persist in their refusal to work for him, he requested a final answer by letter, as he was unwilling to resort to force precipitately. The meeting did not send him any notice, and he applied to a Magistrate, in consequence of which the defendants were taken by warrants.

The brother of the last witness confirmed the preceding statement.

Mr. Spankey, for the defendants, contended, that they had not offended against the statute by merely entering into what he termed a shop association to obtain one of two rates of wages, payable and allowed in the trade. The Magistrates, sitting in their double capacity as judges and jurors, found the defendants guilty, and sentenced them to two months' imprisonment in Newgate, where they were to be allowed, by special order, to work at shoe-making for the support of their wives and families. Watts and Bulger also appeared on the same charge; but the former, by pleading guilty, escaped prosecution; and the latter was acquitted, as it did not appear that he had attended the meeting of the other conspirators. The wives and children of the defendants were present. This decision is of great importance to journeymen, as it decides a question on which they have hitherto entertained very erroneous opinions. The defendants in this case had the power of appealing to the Court or Sessions, but they declined doing so previous to the decision of the Aldermen. The Magistrates had power, by the Penal Act, to commit the defendants for three months to the House of Corection.

**CHARLES BENNETT*****Sentenced to Three Months Imprisonment in the House of Correction, for Defrauding his Employers of Sixpence***

The frauds committed by porters, carters, and errand men, are now become so common, that it is high time to put a stop to such mean frauds. This was, therefore, a most laudable prosecution, and we trust that it will be a warning to servants, intrusted with the property of others.

At the Quarter Sessions held the 25th October 1811, for the city and liberty of Westminster, Charles Bennett was put to the bar, charged under the Swindling Act, with defrauding his employers, Messrs. Broadwood, of Great Pulteney-street, musical instrument-makers, of sixpence.

Mr. Knapp, for the prosecution, stated, that the object of this proceeding against the defendant did not arise from the paltry consideration of the sixpence, mentioned in the indictment, but it occurred from the frequent impositions practised upon the prosecutors, and he trusted this would operate for the benefit of the public, by preventing persons in whom confidence was placed by their employers from committing the like depredations upon them, and from abusing such confidence. The prisoner was employed as a servant by the prosecutors, and was chiefly occupied in conveying their goods in carts, and otherwise, to various parts of the metropolis and places adjacent. On the 5th of last December he was directed to carry a pianoforte to Miller's Wharf, for the purpose of being sent by the then next sailing vessel to Leith, being purchased by Messrs. Gow, of Edinburgh. He conveyed the article accordingly, and on his return to his master's house delivered a receipt, purporting to be a receipt for 3s. 6d. for wharfage, and signed by the clerk of the wharf, Mr. Mackaness, for that sum; he was accordingly paid 3s. 6d. by Mr. Payne, the clerk of Messrs. Broadwood. Mr. Payne proved the foregoing facts, and added, that afterwards, having more accurately examined the receipts, he observed that the 6d. was written in ink very different from all the rest of the receipts; and, having communicated his suspicions, enquiries were instituted at the wharf, and it was discovered that no more than 3s. had been charged or paid for the wharfage of the article.

Mr. Mackaness, the clerk at Millar's wharf, was next called: he proved that no more than three shillings had been paid by the defendant, and that the six-pence added was not his hand-writing; he also produced his waste book of that day, where the entry made was only for 3s.

The prisoner being asked what he had to say for himself, answered, "Nothing." Mr. Mainwaring summed up the evidence with suitable comments, and the jury without hesitation found the prisoner Guilty. He was asked by the Court, whether he had any family. He said a wife and two children. Mr. Mainwaring then addressed him, and in a most impressive manner enlarged on the heinousness of his offence, which, he observed, was greatly enhanced by its adding ingratitude to breach of trust and confidence; but in consideration of his having a family, instead of heavier and more disgraceful punishment, he should sentence him only to three months' imprisonment; and he was so sentenced accordingly.

**WILLIAM M'CORMICK**

*One of those Daring Thieves Called Hustlers, Transported for  
Hustling and Robbing a Passenger in the Borough of  
Southwark*

On a view of our Calendar, now brought down in chronological order for the last one hundred and twelve years, it would almost seem that methods of robbing, as well as fashion, undergo an alteration. The mode of hustling the unwary passenger, was not in use a century ago; when every well-dressed man wore his enormous wig, and a long sword. In the present enlightened days men are exposed to be blinded, through the fashionable assault of pugilism, or overpowered by a gang of hustlers, and rifled of the contents of their pockets. London is now invested with numerous gangs of thieves, who appear in the streets unconnected, from their keeping at a little distance from each other, but are always at hand or within sight of each other. One of these coalesced villains having marked the object of his attack, gives the concerted signal to the others, and then runs against the passenger, as by accident. This is the pretext of the robber in charging him whom he assaulted with an assault—words arise—passengers stop—the gang collects upon the spot—and raise a riot, while they pick the pockets of all around them. This is a common practice in the day time; and, in the confusion, they contrive to make their escape. After dark, they are less ceremonious in their attacks. Two or three can execute a hustle, by first jostling, and then knocking down, their object, swearing he was the aggressor. Sometimes two of the gang, adepts in the boxing art, pretend a quarrel—challenge—strip—and exchange a few rounds. This is esteemed a superior kind of hustle, as the gang being more numerous, they crowd and trample upon the people, searching each pocket of the gaping spectators.

A short time previous to the conviction of M'Cormick, a most daring hustle took place at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket.

Major Morrison and Mr. Wilkins of Red Lion-square, were met and hustled, in the passage on the King's side of the Opera-house, by five pickpockets, as they were going to the Masquerade. Major Morrison received a blow on the head, which knocked his hat off; and, while he was endeavouring to save it, the villains attempted to force his watch out of his pocket; they did not succeed, but broke his gold chain, and made off with that and the seals. Mr. Wilkins also received a violent blow on his temple. On the company retiring from the supper room, several suspected persons were apprehended; among them was James Mackay, whom Townsend recognized as a very old offender, and conducted to St. Martin's watch house. In the forenoon, the watch-house keeper having business out of doors, left the keys of the cell with his wife, when Mackay took an opportunity to knock her down, and effected his escape from the watch-house; but being stopped by the gate at the bottom of the court, which he found a difficulty in opening, he was taken by a butcher, who happened to be passing at the time. At twelve o'clock he was conveyed to Bow-street, where he underwent an examination. Wm. Petherick said he saw the prisoner throw away a watch, as he was passing through the lobby, in custody of some gentlemen who had seized him; and very soon after he saw the prisoner throw away another watch, which was produced.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

T. Robins, Esq. stated, that at the general bustle about pickpockets, he discovered that he had lost his watch, and observed the prisoner close to him, and, as he supposed, in the act of taking his watch: he endeavoured in vain to secure him; and, while in this act, he supposed the prisoner put the watch into his waistcoat-pocket.

Captain Samson, in the East-India service, said, that he saw the prisoner running downstairs, pursued by several people, and observed him throw or drop a watch close to him, which he picked up, having hold of the prisoner at the same time.

Mr. J. Henbury, of Devonshire-street, Queen-square, identified the gold-watch, chain, and seals, produced by the last witness, and said, he missed them between twelve and one o'clock at the Masquerade. The prisoner called himself James Smith; but Townsend begged leave to remind him that his name was James Mackay, by which name he had been convicted in the year 1797, and transported. He then admitted the fact, and that he had returned from Botany Bay about nine months ago. He was found a fit subject to be returned to the same place of transportation.

A system of foot-pad robbery, was at this time also carried to a great length in and about London nightly, and supposed to be one gang, consisting of about thirty of the most desperate villains that ever infested the metropolis. Mr. Elsdon, a builder, was attacked near his own house in Thornhaugh-street, Bedford-square. One of this daring gang stopped Mr. Elsdon's mouth, while another presented a pistol close at his head, which Mr. Elsdon caught at, and wrested it from him—he grappled and fell with them, and they ran off without robbing him, leaving the pistol in the possession of Mr. Elsdon. Mr. Guise, of Acton-lane, was stopped by two of the gang, in a foot-path called the Shrubbery, near Kensington Toll-bar, and robbed of 2*l.* 16*s.* The same gang have committed several depredations in the neighbourhood of Chelsea.

At the October Sessions for Surrey, held the 18th of October 1811, William M'Cormick was charged with hustling Wm. Hill and attempting to steal his hat and handkerchief. The prosecutor stated that he was coming down Tooley-street about half-past ten o'clock, when he was stopped by the prisoner and another person. The prisoner knocked him down and took his hat off, and attempted to run off with it. The prosecutor, however, caught him by the coat, stopped him, and took the hat from him. The prisoner then made a snatch at the prosecutor's handkerchief, and had nearly got it off; the prosecutor, however, seized him, a scuffle ensued, and both fell; the prosecutor then called out the Watch, and the prisoner's companion ran off. The prosecutor succeeded in securing the prisoner, and taking him to the Watch-house. Verdict—Guilty.

The Court, after animadverting on the increase of this species, of depredation, expressed its determination, to punish it with severity. The prisoner was then sentenced to be transported for seven years.

**ROBERT CROWLEY** and **SAMUEL BROWN** were put to the Bar, charged with stealing a quantity of oil, the property of Mr. Barrett, proprietor of Vauxhall Gardens. The prisoners were both found Guilty. Mr. Simpson, who prosecuted on behalf of Mr. Barrett, after the jury had delivered their verdict, addressed the Court, observing, that in consequence of the sorrow expressed by Crowley for his offence, and the readiness he shewed to give all the information in his power towards leading to the detection of the other depredators, he begged leave to recommend him to the mercy of the Court. Crowley was then sentenced to be

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

confined, and kept to hard labour in the House of Correction for three calendar months; and Brown to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for twelve months, and during that time to be once publicly whipped for 150 yards on the Vauxhall road.

At the same Sessions **JOHN LOUBON** was charged with stealing 53lbs. of rope yarn from the yard of Mr. Hill, rope-maker, at Bermondsey. The fact was fully proved against the prisoner. The jury found him guilty, and the Court sentenced him to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for three months, and during that time to be once publicly whipped.

**JAMES FORD**  
*Fined for a Brutal Attack upon a Woman*

The next case worth our notice at these Sessions (October 1811) was the trial of JAMES FORD, for a brutal attack upon a woman. The defendant, a gardener, residing at Rotherhithe, was indicted for a violent assault on the person of Ann Bliss, a poor woman residing in that neighbourhood. It appeared that the prosecutrix resided in a cottage, situate in a road leading to some premises belonging to the defendant. The footpath leading to her door being in extreme bad order, she had purchased about two loads of rubbish to mend it with, this rubbish was shot in the road near her house, preparatory to being spread on the foot path; during the time it was laying there the defendant had occasion to carry some hay to his yard at the upper end of the road; and, on perceiving this rubbish, under pretence that there was not room for him to pass, he directed his son, who was with him, to spread it about the road. Whilst the son was thus employed, the prosecutrix discovering what was doing, came out of her house, and telling the defendant for what purpose the rubbish was collected, requested he would not spread it about. Instead of complying with her request, however, he abused her very grossly, and struck her several violent blows with a shovel which he had in his hand. This statement of the prosecutrix was corroborated by several witnesses. The defendant attempted to prove that the prosecutrix had committed the first assault by striking him. The jury, however, found him guilty, and the Court, after animadverting with severity on his conduct, sentenced him to pay a fine of 20*l.*

**JOSEPH BROWN**

*Executed at York, for the Murder of his Landlady several Years before, in order to Possess himself of her Property*

O power of guilt: How conscience can upbraid!  
It forces us not only to reveal,  
But to repeat what we would most conceal.  
DRYDEN.

This is another instance of the wonderful workings of Providence, in the conscience of a murderer; impelling him to discover his own crime, and to resign himself into the hands of justice.

Joseph Brown was indicted for the wilful murder of Elizabeth Fletcher, at Hensal, near Ferrybridge, by administering poison to her in the month of October, 1804.

Robert Challenger, the first witness examined, lived at Hensal in October 1804, and was a near neighbour of Elizabeth Fletcher at the time of her death; saw her the night before she died, on Sunday, the 21st October when she appeared in good health. Witness was in her house about eight or nine in the evening, and saw the prisoner, Joseph Brown and Joseph Hazlegrove, at supper; at that period they lodged there; recollects Hazlegrove fetching a quart of ale, which he mixed with a quantity of sugar, and then gave it to the deceased, desiring her to drink heartily of it, having previously put the mug to his own mouth to drink; but witness could not say whether he actually drank of it or not. The deceased drank of it freely, and gave it to her sister, who also partook of it. Brown poured some ale unsweetened into a mug, saying he did not like it sweetened, and the whole of the sweetened ale was taken by the deceased and her sister; prisoner and Hazlegrove went to bed about a quarter of an hour after the ale was drank, and the witness returned home about nine in the evening. About eleven o'clock in the morning of the next day, saw Elizabeth Fletcher; she was then dead, and her sister was in a deep sleep, in which she continued till six o'clock in the evening, when she awoke, and took a little refreshment.

Mrs. Longbottom, finding the windows of the deceased closed at a much later hour in the morning than was usual, went, at the desire of Mrs. Hemsworth, into the house; the door was shut, but not fastened. On going into the house, she found the deceased and her sister apparently in a dying state: the sister lay helpless on the floor, and the deceased was extended on the bed. Witness thought at first she was dead; but, on moving her a little, she perceived she was alive, and perceived a quantity of froth at her mouth. Witness remained with her until she died, which was about a quarter before eleven o'clock. The deceased never spoke; she was motionless, and her eyes were closed, though she moved her eye-lids. The witness had seen the deceased on Sunday, the day before her death, and she then appeared to be in a good state of health. Witness said Sarah Fletcher was upon the floor; witness assisted to remove her into a chair; she opened her eyes, but did not speak; it was six o'clock in the evening before she spoke. Elizabeth Fletcher was about 55 years of age.

Rebecca Harrison lived next door to the deceased at the time of her death; went into her house about ten o'clock in the morning on the day she died, and was there also at eight o'clock the preceding evening before supper, and she was then in a

## SUPPLEMENT 2

good state of health; did not see the prisoner there in the morning; found the deceased lying on the bed; she appeared strongly convulsed, and froth came out of her mouth. Sarah Fletcher was subject to convulsion fits, but the deceased enjoyed a good state of health.

Thomas Wheates, constable, knew Elizabeth Fletcher; went to her house the day she died; she was lying upon the bed in a convulsed state; he went to the overseer to get medical assistance, but was informed she was dead before it was procured. Went to Mr. Marshall, of Selby, who was Coroner, was examined before him, but no medical person was procured to examine the body; Brown and Hazlegrove had left their lodgings. Saw the deceased and her sister; when the latter awoke, he asked what had been the matter with her; to which she replied, she did not know; fell asleep again immediately.

Sarah Fletcher being in a state of approaching idiotcy, 4s. per week was paid by the parish towards her maintenance. The deceased was a very endeavouring and industrious woman.

Thomas Thorp lives at Knottingley at present, but in October 1804, lived with Mr. Durham, of Hensal, and was then acquainted with the prisoner, who at that time lodged with the deceased. The prisoner, a short time before E. Fletcher's death, told him he had some thoughts of marrying her, for she had a good bit of money. Witness asked him how much; to which he replied, 50*l.*; it would be a good thing, and set him beforehand. The prisoner said the conversation was false; it could not be true, he said, because he was at that time married, and therefore could not talk of marrying another person. The witness stated, that both Brown and Hazlegrove had represented themselves as single men. The prisoner again repeated his denial of this.

Rebecca Fletcher, sister of the deceased, went to her house on the 22d of October; found her sister Elizabeth dead, and her sister Sarah asleep. Said, that about three weeks before, her sister shewed her box to her; she had then in her box three guinea notes and two pieces of gold; but, on examining the box after her decease, found the lock had been broken open, and the money taken away; the other contents of the box appeared much rumbled. The box was kept in the room where the prisoner and his companion slept. Prisoner asked the witness if she had not before stated that she had found a five-shilling piece in the box; to which she replied, she had not. Her sister Elizabeth, the deceased, had a good state of health for many years, and during that period had not been subject to any kind of fits.

John Carr stated, that the prisoners had been employed to swingle flax, they were to do it by the job, and absconded on the morning of the 22d of October before they had done the quantity they had agreed to do. Both of them had represented themselves as unmarried men.

Mr. William Perkin, surgeon and druggist, of Snaith, stated, that the prisoner came to his shop on the 18th or 19th of October for some laudanum; the witness asked him his name and the use he intended it for. The prisoner said his name was Joseph Fletcher, and that he lived at Hensal, and that the laudanum was for the use of his father, who lived at Cawood, and who was troubled with pain, and could obtain no rest at night. On this representation, the witness let him have six-penny worth, which was rather more than an ounce. Witness never saw the prisoner again until he was examined before the Magistrate on suspicion of having poisoned the deceased, which was about ten days after; but he was perfectly sure as to the identity of the prisoner,

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

and that the prisoner had represented his name as being Joseph Fletcher. The quantity of laudanum bought by the prisoner was sufficient to produce the effect described by the preceding witnesses in a person who had not been in the habit of using laudanum, and to produce death; and that the symptoms described by the witnesses were such as were likely to result from the administration of laudanum; and, from these symptoms, he had no doubt but the deceased died of the poison of laudanum.

Mr. Sewell stated, that he was a Solicitor at the Isle of Wight; that the prisoner was brought by a serjeant of the depot to the office of the Magistrates at his own desire; that no threat, promise, or inducement of any kind, was held out to him to make confession; that he took it down in writing at the time, and when it was fairly written out, it was read over to him distinctly, who said he understood it all, and it was all true. The reason assigned by the prisoner for making this confession was the extreme anguish of mind he suffered from his reflections, which rendered life absolutely insupportable. The confession was dated Isle of Wight, 3d of August, 1808. This confession stated that he had been acquainted with Joseph Hazlegrove upwards of six years; that in the month of October 1804, himself and Joseph Hazlegrove lodged with Mrs. Fletcher, of Hensal, near Ferrybridge, and there formed the design of poisoning her, in order to possess themselves of some property they supposed her to possess; that for this purpose he procured sixpenny worth of laudanum of a Mr. Perkins, of Snaith, which he gave to Hazlegrove, who mixed it with some beer along with some sugar, and gave it to Elizabeth Fletcher and her sister; the former died in consequence of it, and early the following morning they broke open her box, and took out one guinea and a half; that they were afterwards apprehended and examined before a Magistrate, who not considering the evidence sufficiently strong against them, ordered them to be discharged. The confession recited also the commission of various other crimes, particularly that of the murder of Calvert, the Selby carrier; but the Judge would not permit that part of it to be read.

The prisoner being called upon for his defence, referred to a paper which had been delivered to the Judge at his lodgings, but His Lordship said he could take no notice of any papers delivered to him out of Court; but if the prisoner wished it to be read as his defence, he would give it to him, which the prisoner assenting to, it was read by the clerk of the Court. This paper stated, that about seven years ago, he commenced an intimate acquaintance with Joseph Hazlegrove, which had continued unbroken to the present moment; and that in the early part of their friendship a lady of high rank and fortune became enamoured with his friend, and that many interesting meetings took place between them; and as he was employed by his friend to carry messages to the lady, and contrive interviews between them, this gave an air of secrecy and mystery to their conduct, which people represented much to their disadvantage, and insinuated that it was for dishonest purposes that they had their nightly meetings; and to such a pitch of malignity and superstition did their malice arrive, that there was not a murder committed within ten miles which was not attributed to them. This narrative then proceeded to a review of the different prosecutions which had been commenced against them, all of which originated, as he represented, in malice; and that, in consequence of the evidence of a vile man, they were convicted of a burglary; but that the judge was much dissatisfied with the verdict, and their sentence was changed from death to being sent on board the Hulks, and subsequently they were permitted to enter his Majesty's service, where their sufferings were so extreme, in consequence of the odium which even then followed them, that he determined, by a false confession, either to have an opportunity of

## SUPPLEMENT 2

vindicating their characters in a Court of Justice, or of perishing in the attempt; and he knew that no confession which did not include the death of Calvert, would satisfy the gentlemen of Yorkshire; and, as to the death of Elizabeth Fletcher, it was occasioned by a fit, to which she had been subject. This written paper concluded with protesting their entire innocence of the various crimes of which they had been accused, and concluded with a prayer for his enemies and persecutors.

The judge then asked the prisoner if he wished any witnesses to be examined to substantiate his defence, to which the prisoner replied in the negative. His Lordship then proceeded to sum up the evidence, and the jury, without retiring, immediately returned a verdict of Guilty.

His Lordship then proceeded to pass sentence of death upon the prisoner, whom he addressed in the following terms: "Joseph Brown, I am again called upon, in the painful exercise of my duty, to pass sentence upon a person found guilty of one of the greatest offences against society—the crime of deliberate murder. You stand an awful and striking example of the justice of Providence of that punishment, which, sooner or later, never fails to overtake the guilty. You have been compelled by the agonies of remorse, and the upbraidings and tortures of a guilty mind, to furnish that evidence against yourself which was wanting to establish the proof of your guilt, and to supply that link in the chain of evidence which appeared to be imperfect. I trust, that every one who hears of your fate will bear in mind, that a time will arrive, probably in this world, most certainly in another, when guilt will meet with its due punishment. In your unhappy case, that period is already come when you must receive the reward of your crimes. Impelled by the hope of possessing the treasure which you supposed your unfortunate victim had saved from her hard earnings, you deliberately formed the design of destroying her; for this purpose you purchased a deadly drug, which you procured to be mingled in the cup, which you offered to her under the guise of friendship. When the potion had taken effect, you plundered her of her property, though it was much less than your guilty cupidity had suggested. Your crime appeared likely to be perpetrated, as to this world, with impunity; more than four years had elapsed since its perpetration, and the remembrance of it began to fade from the recollection of every one, but the guilty author of the deed; and it seemed probable, that nothing more would have been heard of it, if the consciousness of your crime, more poignant and destructive than the poisoned bowl, had not compelled you to disclose the horrid secret. Chequered as your life has been with crimes, I cannot indulge the hope that anything that I can say will have any lasting effect upon you; but I conjure you to spend the few remaining hours you have to live, in earnest prayer and supplication to heaven for mercy; and may your unhappy fate convince others, that though their crimes may be committed in the darkness of the night, they will hereafter be proclaimed at noon day." His Lordship then passed sentence of death upon the prisoner in the usual form, which sentence was carried into execution on Monday the 20th of March 1809.

**ANN ILLIARD AND HER DAUGHTER**  
*Fined and Imprisoned for Keeping a Brothel*

At the London Sessions held at Guildhall the 10th of April 1809, these scandalous women were indicted by the parish officers of St. Botolph, for keeping a disorderly house.

Mr. Knowles, who was counsel for the prosecution, called a number of witnesses, who proved that the house had been frequented by a vast number of disorderly women for about two years; twenty or thirty couple having been observed to go there daily. The indecencies exhibited in and about the premises, which were within fifty yards of a charity-school for females, in Cavendish court, Houndsditch, compelled the neighbouring inhabitants, from motives of decency, either to block up their windows, or keep their shutters continually closed. The house at length came under the cognizance of the parish officers, who applied to the elder prisoner to shut up her house, and desist from such practices; she refused to comply, saying she had no other means to obtain a livelihood;—they then preferred the present indictment.

Mr. Knapp, for the prisoners, admitted the case to be proved, but argued that the daughter must be acquitted, she being included in the indictment as one of the owners or occupiers of the house, whereas she only acted as the servant of her mother.

The Recorder, in summing up to the jury, stated, that the objections made by Mr. Knapp must go for nothing, as the law in cases of this kind, held a person engaged in the management of a disorderly house equally guilty with the renter, and that if a woman acted under the influence of her husband in such an occupation, the law would punish both equally.

The jury returned their verdict, finding both the prisoners guilty. The Recorder then, with much emphasis and feeling, proceeded to pass sentence upon Ann Illiard the elder, in which he impressed upon her the necessity of reforming her life, as she could not, from her advanced age, have long to live; and desired her to reflect seriously upon the natural consequences of bringing up her daughter to such a scandalous, wicked, and shameful life, merely for the sake of gain. He then sentenced her to pay a fine of 150*l.* and to be imprisoned until it was paid. He then addressed himself to Ann Illiard the younger; and, after a suitable admonition, sentenced her to pay a fine of 50*l.* and to be imprisoned until she had paid it.

The daughter then begged to say a word or two to the Court, in which she declared her innocence; said she had only been to see her mother, whose line of life she lamented; and that she was unable to pay even 50*s.* She added, that the names they went by were not their real names, and that the premises belonged to others, who let them to her mother at a weekly rent, and who had now abandoned her. She then retired, apparently overpowered by her feelings. The mother seemed to be about sixty years of age, and the daughter about thirty; the latter was in deep mourning, as a widow—the mother was also in mourning.

**RICHARD RIPPON and JOHN POLLARD**  
*Sentenced to Transportation, November 1811, for Stealing  
 Jewels*

THE prisoner Rippon proved to be one of those faithless servants, who watch the opportunity of robbing their employers. Pollard was a working jeweller—the receiver of the stolen property. They were indicted, the former for stealing, the latter for receiving, knowing them to be stolen, a box, containing a quantity of jewels, the property of Lady Elizabeth Campbell.

It appeared in evidence, that her Ladyship, in September last, was removing from her house in Brook-street, Grosvenor square, to her new residence in Sloane-street; and that in removing some part of her property, her Ladyship's carriage was employed, and also a hackney coach, of which the prisoner Rippon was the driver. In the course of this business her Ladyship's maid, with the aid of the manservant, had brought down to the hall some trunks of wearing apparel, and other small articles, belonging to her Ladyship, in order to be put into the prisoner's coach, and among the rest a small box, containing some valuable rings and other jewels, which, it was proved by the man-servant, were put into the prisoner's coach, but afterwards were missing. Inquiry for their recovery from the prisoner having been made without effect, they were advertised in the newspapers, and a reward offered for their restoration.

In a short time afterwards, William La Rouche, a journeyman jeweller, then in the employment of the prisoner Pollard who was a working jeweller, and then resided in the vicinity of Soho, as it appeared from the evidence of the former, heard his employer reading the advertisement at his own house, which described the jewels, and offered the reward for them; and very shortly afterwards, on the same evening, the wife of the prisoner Rippon, who lodged in Pollard's house, came down stairs to his workshop, and asked some questions about the value and price of setting certain jewels, answering the description of those mentioned in the indictment; and after she left the room, he saw the prisoner Pollard again reading the advertisement, and heard him remark, "that he believed all those jewels were upstairs," meaning, as he understood, in possession of the prisoner Rippon's wife. He heard no more of them until next day, when he saw in the workshop several of those jewels, together with the gold settings from which they had been taken; and particularly a blood stone, which was afterwards re-set in a gold brooch, for Rippon: and a malachite stone, which Pollard had broken into three pieces, in his endeavours to extricate it from the setting.

William Jones, a dealer in antiques, Castle-street, Leicester-fields, also proved some of the jewels which had been sold to him by Pollard; and, amongst others, a curious antique Cameo-ring, with a relief of Cleopatra's head, surrounded in the gold setting with an asp, the eyes of which were small diamonds, and which he took from that setting, and fixed in another—and for which he gave Pollard two guineas and a half. The other jewels were disposed of by Pollard to other persons, who had sold them, and they could not be produced in evidence.

The Recorder summed up the evidence for the jury, who found both the prisoners Guilty.—Transportation.

**RICHARD LOWE, ALIAS LONG NED**  
*A most Infamous Villain, Sentenced to Hard Labour in the  
House of Correction in Coldbath Fields, for an Aggravated  
Assault upon a Surgeon at Chelsea*

At the Sessions for the county of Middlesex, held the 4th of November 1811, Edward Lowe was put to the bar, charged with an indictment for assaulting Mr. David Eccleton, of Church-street, Chelsea, on the night of the 23d of September 1811.

Mr. Knapp stated, that Mr. Eccleton was a surgeon and apothecary living as above stated. That on the evening of the 23d of September last, he had dined at the Queen's Arms, Nine Elms; about ten o'clock he was proceeding from thence to visit a patient in Ryley-street, in that neighbourhood, where he regularly attended twice a day. Whilst he was walking on the King's-road, and approaching the Man in the Moon public-house there, the prisoner came up to him, and interrupting his progress, laid hold of his arm, and asked him to go and drink with him. Witness made him no kind of answer, but was endeavouring to proceed on his way. This the prisoner completely prevented; and, still holding his arm, at length said he must give him something to drink, using violent language, when Eccleton (to get rid of him) put his hand in his pocket and gave him a shilling. Having done so, he hastened from him as quickly as he was able. Instead, however, of going on to Ryley-street, he turned down Chapel-row, (a contrary way) in his alarm, and desired to avoid so desperate a person as he considered the prisoner to be. After he had gone some way down Chapel-row, he stopped to listen whether the prisoner was following him or not, and not hearing any footsteps, he concluded that he had turned off another road; and then Mr. Eccleton returned back with a view to proceed to Ryley-street, as he had first intended; but as soon as he had again reached nearly to the former public-house, he heard a voice cry out, "There's the villain, take hold of him," and observed a man approach him, and took to his heels again, and ran away as fast as he could, when there was a loud shout of "stop him;" but in running he fell down, when a man came up and laid hold of him: then the prisoner immediately joined them, and having used him with very great violence and barbarity, then, for the first time, accused him of certain abominable propensities. It was in vain he denied the accusation; he was only the more maltreated: at length he got out of their hands, and ran away with all the speed he could; but in leaping over a paling he fell quite exhausted, and they again came up to him, and were proceeding to repeat their barbarity, when a man of the name of Curtis, hearing the noise, ran to the spot from whence he heard it, accompanied by his wife, and there recognized Mr. Eccleton, whom he had known many years. He interfered on his behalf, and having, in conjunction with Mrs. Curtis, rescued him, he at length departed.

It appeared, that when Mr. and Mrs. Curtis came up, Mr. Eccleton told them how he had been treated, and added, that the prisoner had stopped him, and obtained a shilling from him, as before mentioned; to which the prisoner answered, by charging Mr. Eccleton again and again with the foul offence first alluded to.

Mr. Eccleton's testimony was corroborated in various points by the evidence of Mr. and Mrs. Curtis, Mrs. Clark, (who keeps the public-house,) and two persons of the names of Lee and Hurd.

## SUPPLEMENT 2

For the prisoner, Mr. Andrews, in a very ingenious and elaborate address, appealed to the jury, the principal bearing of which went to the improbability of the prosecutor's story—but he called no witnesses.

Mr. Mainwaring summed up the evidence with appropriate and argumentative comments. The jury hesitated some time in their box, and at length they retired and brought in a verdict of Guilty.

Mr. Mainwaring animadverted in strong language upon the vileness of the crime of which the prisoner was convicted. He congratulated the jury upon their verdict, and the county upon the discovery and conviction of the offender, as the punishment of such a miscreant might have the operation of preventing the repetition of such wicked conduct. He lamented that the way in which the indictment was framed prevented him from sending the prisoner at once out of the country.

The sentence of the Court was, that he should be imprisoned one year in the House of Correction, Coldbath-fields, and there kept to hard labour. That at the expiration of that time he should find security to keep the peace for two years, himself in the penalty of 20*l.* and two sureties in 10*l.* each, and to be imprisoned till that security be given. The prisoner was immediately hand-cuffed and removed. It seems he is one of those fellows who work in the brick fields in that neighbourhood; and, according to Gilmore, the officer, goes by the name of Long Ned.

**ABRAHAM WATSON**

***Convicted of a most Daring Assault, and Sentenced to Six Months Imprisonment***

THIS case comprises, not only more infamous behaviour in a hackney coachman, than any instance we have already adduced, but even a riot and rescue, of the above named prisoner by the "Gemmen of the Whip;" against whose tricks, impositions, and ill treatment, the public cannot be too often cautioned.

Abraham Watson was indicted for assaulting Mr. Wayte, a hatter, residing in Panton-street, Hay-market. It appeared that the above named defendant is a hackney-coach driver, and on the day stated in the indictment was employed to convey the mother of the prosecutor from her home to his house. She is very infirm, and requested the defendant to drive his coach slowly through the streets; but instead of so doing, for his mere diversion, lashed the horses to such a degree as to make them go with such speed as to put her in the most excruciating agony. A servant, who was in the carriage with her, repeatedly called to him to drive more moderately, but that only served to increase his speed. At length the defendant stopped at the prosecutor's door, and the old lady, on getting out of the coach, complained of the misconduct of the defendant, who used the most abusive language upon the occasion, and on Mr. Wayte remonstrating with him, he struck him most violently, and cut him most desperately in the mouth, and was proceeding to further violence, when a number of persons, who hearing a noise, and seeing the ferocious behaviour of the defendant, at length interfered, and with considerable difficulty he was secured. It further appeared, that Mr. Wayte had given him no provocation whatever. Mr. Wayte being thus treated, determined to take him to the Sitting Magistrates, at Bow-street, and was proceeding, thither for that purpose; when he reached Leicester square, however, the defendant, by stratagem, contrived to make his situation known to the hackney-coachmen on the stand there, and they instantly assembled, coming down in a body on those who had the defendant in custody, and not only rescued him from them, but used them most unmercifully, beating them to such a degree that they were compelled to fly away in all directions. By great good fortune the defendant was shortly after discovered, and he was brought up to answer for the offence.

The foregoing case was proved, with several aggravating particulars, by several witnesses; and the defendant being called on to say what he had in his defence, he strictly denied the whole, and added, that he was the person assaulted, and not the prosecutor, and that he could bring all the hackney-coachmen that were on the stand in Leicester-square that evening, to prove it. The Chairman here observed, that the Court would consider that as the only retribution he could make for his offences if he did so, as the public would then have an opportunity of knowing who were his abettors, and bringing them to justice for their misconduct.

He was found guilty, and sentenced, after a severe admonition by Mr. Mainwaring, to six months' confinement in Tothill-fields Bridewell.

**DAVID MOORE, AND JOHN WILD**  
*Midnight Guardians of the Peace of London, Imprisoned for  
 Abuse of Office.*

(A Sketch of the Administration of Justice in a Watch-house)

David Moore, the deputy night-constable, and John Wild, one of the parish patrols, in the neighbourhood of Finsbury-square, were indicted at the Middlesex Sessions for a misdemeanour in the wanton imprisonment of Mr. Leonard Pope on the night of Good Friday 1811.

It appeared from the evidence of Mr. Pope, who is a very respectable man, that having spent that evening with some friends, he was going soberly home through Bunhill-row between one and two in the morning; and, on turning aside for a necessary occasion, he was immediately accosted by the patrol, Wild, who, without any pretence or colour of a charge, insisted on taking him to the watch-house. Thither he went. The presiding constable simply asked, "What charge?" The patrol simply answered, "disorderly;" upon which Mr. Moore, the deputy Rhadamanthus of this midnight tribunal, without deigning to enquire into the particulars of the charge, or vouchsafing to hear a word from the prosecutor in defence, or explanation, instantly pronounced the stern decree of "Lock him up," Mr. Pope, however, ventured to rap at the door of his dark prison, and to plead through the key-hole his earnest request to be favoured with an hearing at least before the midnight Magistrate, face to face with his accuser. He was allowed to come forth: and, in solemn mockery, was asked, "What have you to say, Mr. Alderman?" He told them he was a respectable citizen, well known to Sir Charles Price, and intimately acquainted with at least seventeen members of the Common Council, any of whom would come forward and bail him, if he was allowed to send them an account of his situation; but in vain, municipal influence had no weight here; no friendly messenger could be obtained, and Justice Moore once more uttered the dread decree, "Lock him up;" when Mr. Pope was immediately recommitted to his dungeon, and confined there until two o'clock next day when he was discharged by the Magistrate; his family in the meanwhile were in the utmost anxiety for his safety. The jury found both defendants guilty, and the Court sentenced them to two months' imprisonment each.

Note: The late Sir William Addington, when he presided at Bow-street office, went to one of those occult prognosticators, disguised as an old beau; and, having his fortune told in the usual way, begged the old lady to inform him, "whether she had ever read her own fortune?" She cheerfully said she had, and that "she would live an uninterrupted course of life, in her present way, very happily, until the age of 200 years, and that then she should be translated into purgatory for a short time, and afterwards put under the care of Peter."—"Very true," said Sir William, "only you place Peter in the background, who might be in front, and mistake the time, for its fulness is now come; here Peter (to one of the officers) take this Lady under your care, bring her down to the office, and I'll give her a passport to Bridewell, which, I trust, will operate as a purgatory to the old lady's bad living."

**MONTGOMERY BROWN**  
*Captain of a Merchant ship, Executed at Antrim in Ireland,  
27th July 1812, for Murder*

At the Summer Assizes at Antrim 1812, Montgomery Brown stood indicted for the murder of Charles Moore, at Belfast, on the 3d of September 1811. This trial had been put off last Assizes, on account of the absence of a material witness on behalf of the prisoner; and an application was now made to the Court for a similar purpose upon the affidavit of the prisoner, but refused by the Judge.

Counsellor Macartney rose on behalf of the prosecution. He stated, that on the 3d of September, 1811, prisoner was Captain of a vessel then lying at the quay of Belfast; the deceased was a respectable victualler in Belfast, and prisoner came to his shop to purchase some meat; deceased had been married about a year, and a young child, the fruit of such marriage, was then in the shop; and deceased, taking up the child, asked prisoner, "Was not that a fine fellow?" Prisoner answered, "Yes, to be the child of an Irish b—r." Deceased replied, "Why not by an Irish as well as a Scotch b—r?", prisoner being a Scotchman. Prisoner replied, "He would make him repent saying that." Deceased then turned away, not expecting so fatal a result, when the prisoner seized a large knife which lay in the shop, and stabbed the deceased in the back of his loin; of which wound he languished for a few days, and then died. Several witnesses were examined, whose unanimous testimony went to establish those facts.

The Jury, after retiring about ten minutes, returned a verdict of—Guilty. The Clerk of the Crown then addressed the prisoner in the usual form:

"You, Montgomery Brown, heretofore stood indicted for the wilful murder of Charles Moore, for trial of which you put yourself on God and your country, which country have found you guilty: what have you to say, why judgment of death and execution should not be awarded against you according to law?"

Prisoner—"My Lord, if I am guilty of it I know nothing of it; I had no malice to the gentleman; I did not know I acted the crime."

The Judge then addressed the prisoner in nearly the following terms:—

"Montgomery Brown, you have been found guilty of murder, on clear and most satisfactory evidence. It is very true you had no previous malice to this unfortunate man. Your jury have been told so; but they have found you guilty of inflicting a mortal wound, without the slightest provocation. It is proper that the equity of the law under which you suffer should be laid before the eyes of this country. You have been found guilty of plunging a knife into the body of the innocent victim—a deadly weapon—with the utmost malignity of heart, and hurried a young man, recently married, out of the world. A greater crime you could not be guilty of: precipitating him to the grave in the prime of life; depriving his child of a father, and his wife of a loving husband. You have committed that crime which stands marked with the utmost abhorrence of heaven. You stepped between him and that Providence, of that God, who alone has a right to dispose of human life; and you are deprived of the unavailing plea of unconsciousness in the commission of this direful crime, unless your having no provocation is to be considered a proof of your madness. This was the madness of wickedness; and you have given vent to your brutal fury in the sacrifice of this innocent man. I am now bound to tell you, you are to expect no mercy in this

## SUPPLEMENT 2

world; here you have but a short time to live. The law, to mark its abhorrence of your crime, has shortened the period of your existence. That short interval employ in seeking the mercy of Heaven. Let not your mind be distracted with any vain hopes of mercy in this world."

His Lordship then proceeded to pronounce the awful sentence of the law, in the usual solemn terms, viz. To be hanged on Monday, and his body to be delivered to the Surgeons of the County Infirmary for dissection. The prisoner made no reply, but was silently removed to the gaol.

This unfortunate man, from the period of receiving sentence of death, spent his few remaining hours in acts of devotion, in which he was assisted by the Presbyterian clergyman of the parish. His wife was also his companion during these solemn hours of preparation for death. Monday, about three in the afternoon, she was withdrawn from him, as also his daughter. But previous to his leaving the gaol, about half-past five o'clock, they were permitted to have a last interview with him for a few minutes. He was then conducted from the prison to a chaise, in which also the clergyman accompanied him; and, thus attended, he was conveyed to the common place of execution, escorted by the Sheriff, and a very strong guard of the Pembrokeshire sharp-shooters, stationed at Carrickfergus. Having arrived at the fatal spot, he spent nearly half an hour in devotional exercises, and then the necessary preparations were made for the finishing of the law. He ascended a car with the executioner; and, having addressed the surrounding spectators, an immense multitude, he admonished them in a particular manner to avoid the sin of drunkenness, and to guard against passion.

After he had delivered a few words to this effect, he was launched into eternity; and, when the body had been suspended the usual length of time, it was taken down and carried to the Old Court house; where his afflicted family waited to receive it.

**JOHN HUGHES AND JAMES ROBINSON**  
*Imprisoned and Pilloried, for a Conspiracy in Aiding the  
Escape of French Prisoners of War*

It has lately been discovered that the escape of French prisoners has been a system among smugglers, fishermen, and publicans on the coast opposite France. These traitors went to the different depots of French prisoners, and to those on their parole, from time to time, to offer to effect the escape of such as could raise certain sums of money to defray the expenses and rewards payable in this country, whereby many officers have been enabled to break their parole, and have got safe to France, where they have been received by public officers at the ports, who paid the sums agreed upon for their sea-passage.

The discovery was made by the apprehension of eight officers, who left Andover the 1st of October 1812, and were compelled by stormy weather to re-land near Christchurch, on the 12th of October, after having embarked from that neighbourhood in a Weymouth smuggling boat. They had reached the coast, between Christchurch and Lymington, by the skill of their guides, without interruption; but, unable to conceal themselves effectually on their re-landing, notice was given of the suspicious appearance of the parties, to Mr. G. Rose, at Mudeford, by Mr. How, a most meritorious officer in the superior class of the Customs, whose zeal and courage have often been conspicuous, but in no case more so than in this. An active investigation was immediately set on foot by the above-mentioned Magistrate, at whose instance Mr. How was permitted by his Board to assist. Vickery and Adkins were sent for from Bow street; and Mr. Jones, Assistant Solicitor to the Admiralty, was sent to Mr. Rose by the Transport Board. A pursuit after the offenders was then made in various directions, and Calliford (who had been convicted in 1811, of a similar offence before Mr. Baron Graham,) a remarkably desperate man, who was always armed, and who had the leading active share in the conspiracy, was taken in Somersetshire by Mr. How, who, finding him dressing his horse in a stable, broke in upon him, and seized him by the collar with one hand, holding a pistol at his head with the other, and then gave him to the care of Adkins, to be conveyed in irons to Mr. G. Rose, at Mudeford.

At the Assizes for the county of Sussex held at Lewes, the 4th day of August 1812, before the Lord Chief Justice Ellenborough, John Hughes, Inn-keeper and post-master of Rye, James Robinson, a miller near Oswestry, William Hatter, and William Turner, fishermen of Rye aforesaid, were indicted for a conspiracy to aid the escape of Arnaud Phillipon and Philip Auguste Garnier, French prisoners of war, from Oswestry, in Shropshire.

Mr. Serjeant Best opened the case.

Mr. Toosley proved that General Phillipon was a prisoner at Oswestry, and that the last time he saw him was about twelve o'clock on the 30th day of June. Garnier had also been a prisoner about three years. Phillipon was a tall man, about six feet, thin, with a scar over his eye, and usually wore a grey coat, with a blue great coat. Garnier was about five feet six inches, thin and pale, and wore a blue coat, with a brown great coat. The defendant, Robinson, had lately taken a mill within three miles of Oswestry; but had not carried on much business as a miller. On the 30th of June he sent his servant to Shrewsbury, to get a weighing machine, and directed him

## SUPPLEMENT 2

to wait his coming. At length, in the evening, Robinson came, in a gig, and had a pony tied to the shafts; he told the man to go forward to Heygate, with him, and the man rode the pony until they overtook a gentleman on the road, a small man in a blue coat and brown greatcoat. They went to Heygate, which is on the Birmingham road, and there Mr. Robinson bespoke a chaise, and himself with two gentlemen got into it and went away for Birmingham. The post-boys then traced Robinson and the two gentlemen to the Shakespeare Tavern, at Birmingham, where they breakfasted the next morning. The next morning a travelling chariot, with a dicky-box, took them from the Shakespeare.

It appeared that Robinson had passed through Birmingham about ten days before, and had bespoke this carriage at a Mr. Wheeley's, a coach maker at Birmingham; and had agreed at the same time with a post chaise driver, of the name of Yoxall, to go with him as a servant, for which he was to give him a pound a day, and a new hat and coat, and told him to be ready to set off on the first day of July. Accordingly Yoxall came with the carriage to the Shakespeare. He then travelled with them as a servant, and hired the horses, &c. on the road. He did not know the two gentlemen who accompanied Robinson, and he never heard them speak. At length they arrived at Rye, and were put down at a public house, kept by the defendant Hughes.

While they were at Birmingham, Robinson received a letter in the handwriting of Hughes, but signed by Jones, stating, that all was well and ready. Robinson, and the two persons with him, continued at Rye some days. In the meantime the escape of General Phillipon was made public, and a sharp look-out was kept along the coast for any boat going out or coming in from sea; at length, on the 12th July, an open boat was seen rowing into Rye early in the morning, which had Robinson, Hatter, and Turner aboard. Robinson got ashore before the officers could overtake him, and upon their questioning the two other defendants as to who he was, they said he resided in that neighbourhood.

He was traced to the house of Hughes; and, when the officers entered the house, his boots were wet with sea water. He said, upon being questioned, it was so, and that he had been out all night at sea mackerel fishing. Upon this statement, himself, Hughes, and the two other men, were taken into immediate custody; but there was no distinct evidence as to the identity of the persons of Phillipon and his companion; but all the witnesses gave a description of their persons answering to the description given of them by Mr. Toolsey, the Agent at Oswestry.

Upon this evidence the jury found them Guilty.—Sentenced to imprisonment, and the pillory. [Note: In the year 1809, William Hubbersfield, was sentenced to two years' imprisonment in the King's Bench Prison, for aiding the escape of the French General Austin, a prisoner in England, on his parole of honour.]

On Saturday the 29th of August following, Hughes and Robinson were brought out of prison, where they had been confined since their conviction, and placed in and upon the pillory on the sea shore of the town of Rye, opposite the French coast, where they remained one hour, amid the scoffs and execration of every true English spectator. Hughes, on ascending the platform, exclaimed, "Now, Robinson, we shall have a peep at Boney's Tower;" (meaning Bologne where they landed the General) and, indeed, the whole of his conduct, while undergoing the humiliating but just punishment of the law, was such as to prove him a man hardened in vice. They were

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

afterwards remanded to prison, where they are to be confined for the space of two years; a lenient punishment for an offence which the judges have frequently pronounced to be little short of high treason, and which, by a recent act of Parliament, is made felony.

It is thereby enacted, "That any person who shall, from and after passing the act, knowingly aid or assist any foreign enemy of His Majesty's dominions, whether such prisoners shall be confined as prisoners of war in any place of confinement, or shall be suffered to be at large on his or their paroles, to escape from such place of confinement, or from His Majesty's dominions, if at large upon parole, shall, upon being convicted thereof, be adjudged guilty of felony, and liable to be transported for life."

From the passing of this act, we hoped that our degenerate countrymen, would have been deterred from such treasonable and sordid practices; but, in the very face of it, and as soon after its becoming the law of the land, as the 9th of December following, we find, at the town of Shrewsbury, the apprehension of the French General Le Brun, and his aide-de-camp, who had been ordered to Welsh Pool on their parole of honour, and were making their escape, assisted by the son of a well-known Kentish smuggler, and others. All the parties were secured, and lodged in Shrewsbury gaol. Between the scoundrels who conduct, and the scoundrels who are conducted out of this kingdom, we have not much more to say; they are well suited to each other. The flight of the Frenchmen is attended with more danger than they are aware of, and it is fortunate for them to be taken before they quit the kingdom; for, as the wretches who guide them are guilty of a felonious offence, there is no question, that in case they should be pursued at sea by an English cruiser, they would, to avoid detection, throw their unhappy passengers overboard; and many, we have no doubt, have perished this way.

The dishonourable flights of French officers from the English towns where Government, upon the pledge of their honours to remain therein until exchanged, had permitted them to reside; and the daring outrageous conduct of their inferiors under confinement at the different depots, amounting to between twenty and thirty thousand, calls for stricter measures being enforced towards them. In that at Dartmoor near Plymouth, on the 16th September 1812, the prisoners had worked themselves up to the highest pitch of rage at being allowed no more than one pound of biscuit per day. The use of biscuit, it is to be observed, was to be discontinued as soon as the bakehouses had been rebuilt; but the Frenchmen were absolutely deaf to remonstrances. A detachment of the Cheshire Militia, and the South Gloucester Regiment, were drawn up on the walls surrounding the prison; and, although they had loaded their pieces with ball, the prisoners appeared undaunted, and insulted them in the grossest terms: indeed our brave men withstood the contumelious language of the prisoners with a patience beyond all praise. A sentinel on duty, called Jones, had his bayonet wrenched off his piece, yet nobly reserved his fire: an officer, however, followed the Frenchman, struck him over the shoulder with his sword, and brought off the bayonet. The French men even bared their breasts to the troops, and seemed regardless of danger. The number of prisoners is about 7500; and so menacing was their conduct, that an express was sent off to Plymouth Dock, at eleven o'clock on Sunday night, soliciting immediate assistance. Three pieces of artillery (six pounders) were in consequence sent off, early on Monday morning; and on their arrival at the principal gate (iron), the bars of which, of immense size, had been previously broken

## SUPPLEMENT 2

by stones hurled against them by the insurgents, they were placed in such directions as completely to command the whole of the circle which the prison describes. This had the desired effect, and order was restored.

At the Depot at Perth, an attempt by the prisoners in the Depot to effect their escape was discovered and prevented. A mine, on which they had been employed three days, was excavated from within the privy of the prison, allotted to the Petty Officers, and had been pushed as far as the outer wall, on the inside of which the earth gave way, and occasioned a detection of the stratagem. The digging had been carried on through the day; and at night, when the privies are inspected, the stones which had been removed, were so neatly and regularly replaced as to prevent suspicion. The petty officers are confined in the upper story of the prison, through the floor of which they had cut a hole, by which they might pass to the lower. They had cut out the lock of the door which opens to the yard, and consequently to the entrance of their mine.

The French prisoners on board the Sampson at Chatham, about the same time, became very troublesome, on account of their being put to two-thirds allowance, to make up for the expense of repairing the damages done by their cutting the ship, to endeavour to effect their escape; boats manned and armed were sent from every ship; one of the marines of the Buckingham, seeing one of the prisoners in the act of stabbing the officer of marines, he immediately levelled his musket and shot him; several other shots were fired, and before they could be quieted and got below, three were killed and eight others wounded, two of whom are since dead, one of whom was the principal ringleader. The other ships remained perfectly quiet.

There is such an irresistible spirit of gambling among the French prisoners, lately arrived at that port, from Norman Cross, that many of them have been almost stripped naked, having lost their clothes, not excepting even their shirts and small-clothes, to some of their fellow-prisoners; many of them are also reduced to the chance of starving by the same means, having lost seven or eight days' provision to their more fortunate comrades, and who never fail to exact their winnings. The effervescence of mind that this diabolical pursuit gives rise to is often exemplified in the conduct of these infatuated captives, rendering them remarkably turbulent and unruly. A quarrel arose between two of them in the course of play, when one of them, who had lost his clothes and food, received a severe stab in the back with a large knife from his companion, whose anger had been kindled in consequence of the invectives which a run of ill-luck had excited in his adversary.

Two French officers, prisoners of war on parole at Bishops Waltham, having had a dispute, they agreed to decide the affair in an honourable way. A meeting was appointed in a field near the town; but a difficulty occurred in procuring weapons. It appears that the combatants were only in possession of one sword, and a case knife. French ingenuity made a pike of the knife, by confining it to the end of a stick; but the sword being considered the best weapon, they resolved to cast lots who should have it. After the sword and knife had been fairly placed in their hands, the duel commenced, and the swordsman gave his antagonist three wounds. The pikeman gave several dangerous thrusts, and both fell on the ground; they remained bleeding and disabled, until they were discovered by several passengers, who conveyed them to a public-house in the vicinity. The officer who received the cuts from the sabre was not expected to recover. His antagonist is fortunately out of danger.

**JAMES WESTBROOK AND ELIZABETH PHIPPS**  
*Convicted at the September Sessions 1812, and Sentenced to  
Death, for Burglary*

These two persons, along with Susannah Phipps, and Samuel Westbrook, were indicted for breaking and entering the dwelling house of John Covington, and stealing therein 18 gowns, a quantity of petticoats, a piece of muslin, a time-piece, some silver table-spoons, and a variety of other property to the value of one hundred and twenty pound in the whole.

It appeared that the prosecutor, who was a licensed hawker, left town along with his wife, in the way of his business, on the 1st of April last, having previously secured his room-door by means of an ordinary lock and two padlocks. The only lodgers in the house were a person of the name of Corcoran, who lived in the first pair, and the prisoner, Susannah Phipps, who, though unknown to the prosecutor, suffered the other female prisoner, Elizabeth Phipps, her daughter, and James Westbrook, to reside along with her. On the morning of the day on, which the prosecutor left town, Corcoran heard a noise made by Elizabeth Phipps, below stairs, occasioned by the scouring of a tub, while, at the same moment, he heard a different sort of noise upstairs, as if it were of breaking open something in the prosecutor's room. He afterwards saw the prisoner, James Westbrook, carry out a bundle, and Elizabeth Phipps carry out a time-piece in her lap. These two prisoners afterwards took out more bundles, and continued doing so from about seven or eight o'clock in the morning, till about one. The mother, Susannah Phipps, was not present during the time, not having slept at home the preceding night. About eleven o'clock, Corcoran saw Susannah Phipps, the mother, and the other prisoner, Samuel Westbrook, the brother of James, standing together, at the corner of Play-house-yard, when Elizabeth Phipps came up with a bundle, which she handed to Samuel Westbrook, who went away with it. This was all the part he saw either Samuel Westbrook or Susannah Phipps take in the business, Susannah Phipps not having come home till night. Corcoran heard the daughter say, if her mother made any noise about it, she would do for her and for others.

Some of the articles were afterwards traced to a pawnbroker's, with whom they had been pledged, in the name of Elizabeth Smith, and the duplicates were found in the possession of the prisoners, James Westbrook and Elizabeth Phipps, who were apprehended in lodgings, where they lived under the assumed name of Smith.

Sir Vicary Gibbs, who tried the case, recommended to the jury to throw out of their consideration the case of Susannah Phipps, against whom no direct proof had been brought; of the guilt of Elizabeth Phipps and James Westbrook there seemed to be no doubt; and the only remaining point for their consideration was, what part Samuel Westbrook had taken in the transaction? Whether, from the circumstance of his waiting in the immediate neighbourhood to receive the bundle, they saw sufficient to convince them that he was also cognizant of the breaking and entering; in which case he must be held to have been aiding and encouraging, and as such, to be as guilty as the rest.

The jury, after some deliberation, found James Westbrook, and Elizabeth Phipps guilty—Death, and Samuel Westbrook—Not Guilty.

**THOMAS FARNSWORTH THE YOUNGER**  
*Convicted at the Middlesex sessions, of an Assault and Libel  
upon his Father*

THE indictment preferred against this violent and unnatural young man contained several counts, but so incorrectly copied that the objections taken to two of them by his counsel were held to be good by the Court. These were for libels, wherein, considering they came from a child to a parent, there is something peculiarly shocking. This libellous matter was thus read in Court, and the said Thomas Farnsworth was charged with writing the same to his father.

"MURDERER!

"June 5, 1812.

"You forgot the time you committed the act, for you say that I was not at home, and you have procured a sailor to corroborate with you in your story."

On examining the record, it was discovered that *corrobate* had been inserted for *corroborate*, in the two first counts, and as there is no such word in the English language, the indictment could not be sustained on those counts.

The third count recited a letter beginning as follows:

"MURDERER!

"When do you mean to desist from carrying on your cursed plan against the offspring of a murdered woman. You may carry it on till you wish you had come to a conclusion long ago. You are enough to raise the mind of an injured man to do that he would not wish to do. I am I am determined to attend you at Wormley, if you do not settle at home, for I have searched the books every day, and find you will not indict. Curse and damn the day that you ever SAW my mother."

The prisoner's Counsel observed, that in the record the word *say* was introduced instead of *saw*. The prisoner was acquitted.

He was then tried for an assault on his father, on the 4th of May 1812.

It appeared from the evidence of the prosecutor, that he was standing at the door of a house in Well-street, Whitechapel, when his son rushed on him suddenly, and attacked him with great violence.

Mr. Farnsworth retreated into a stable-yard, whither he was pursued by his son, who knocked him down with a broomstick; and, while down, beat him most unmercifully, exclaiming, "I will murder you—blood for blood!" His cries brought several persons to his assistance, who rescued him from his perilous situation. His son had hunted him for several hours through the neighbourhood like a mad dog, and called for a pistol that he might shoot him.

The prisoner denied having committed any assault. He only wanted his property. His father owed him one hundred and ten pounds; and yet, by a false account, (which he handed up to the bench,) he brought him in a debtor to the amount of 9s. 6d.

John Harding deposed, that he ran to the spot, in consequence of the cry of "Murder!" He saw the prosecutor on the ground, and his son beating him with a

## THE NEWGATE CALENDAR

broomstick. He immediately seized his arms, and said, "You villain, are you going to kill your father?" The prisoner answered—"I will murder him! blood for blood!"

The prisoner being called on for his defence, said—"I never struck my father—I came to him with that account in my hand, and said, How can you treat me in this manner—Why should you rob me of my property, as you robbed my poor brother, the night before he was killed in Mile-end ?—I am the surviving son of a murdered mother—Gentlemen, these eyes saw the hands of my father perpetrate the horrid deed, and not content with that, he wishes to exercise his barbarity on my offspring—pointing to a child which stood before him.)—I am thirty-four years of age, and never lifted my hand against my father—I would sooner spill my heart's blood than do so—O God! no person can conceive what I have suffered—I have been cruelly dragged to town by officers. So far from striking my father, when I found I could not get my property; I offered him my pen-knife that he might take my life as he had taken my mother's."—(The manner of delivering this rhapsody savoured strongly of a distracted mind.)

One witness appeared on the part of the prisoner; but he knew nothing of the assault. The prisoner then complained that his most material witness was kept back. To that witness his father had shewed the letter he had written (which was exhibited in the former trial,) and said, that he would take the stain out of his own back, by sacrificing his son.

The jury returned a verdict of Guilty. The Court adjudged him to suffer imprisonment for one year, and at the expiration of that time to find sureties for his good behaviour for two years, himself in 100*l.* and two sureties in 50*l.* each.

**THE END**