

## *Criminals or Victims?*

MANY MIDDLE-CLASS Victorians were worried by the squalor, immorality and criminality to be found in the midst of growth and prosperity. There were deep fears that the (ill-defined) ‘dangerous classes’ might sweep away the prosperity and civilization that marked out mid-Victorian society. The denizens of this ‘other’ world were described in demonic, almost apocalyptic terms, but who were the criminals of Huddersfield? What lives did they live? And what light do their lives throw on the nature of the economy and society of this expanding, prosperous mid-Victorian town? Contemporary fears of a criminal class threatening the fabric of society were misplaced. Many crimes were mundane – non-violent thefts – and most criminals were ordinary working-class men and women. In so far as they were habitual criminals, this was a product of economic insecurity and social marginalisation. They tended to be the ‘losers’ in society – the men and women, who for a variety of reasons, often beyond their control, were unable to make a living in a prosperous town that was at the forefront of industrialisation and urbanisation.

Crimes of violence exercise a particular fascination. There are many studies of Victorian murderers but the pre-occupation with such criminals, especially when their crime was particularly gruesome, gives as reliable a guide to criminality as an episode of *Midsomer Murders* or *Inspector Morse*. Non-violent crimes against property dominated the statistics of serious (indictable) offences tried at assize or quarter sessions and, even among petty offences, assaults were a minority of the cases that were heard by local magistrates. In 1863, for example, exactly 5 per cent of all persons charged

with crime in Huddersfield were accused of an indictable offence. There were no cases of murder or manslaughter in the town; no robbery with violence and in the one case of burglary the thief had made off with a few bottles of porter.<sup>1</sup> Superintendent Hannan, having served for several years in Middlesbrough, repeatedly stressed the absence of serious crime in the town. This is not to say there was none – there were beerhouse brawls that led to fatalities and manslaughter charges on more than one occasion – but these were the exception rather than the rule.<sup>2</sup> The emphasis in this chapter will be upon the less dramatic offences and those who perpetrated them. The men and women who became before the town's magistrates and who, (on being found guilty) became criminals, defy easy categorization. Even if it were possible to establish accurate crime-specific gender, age and occupational profiles, such generalizations obscure important variations. As other studies have shown, there was no such thing as a criminal class – though there were people who relied heavily upon criminal activities – and there is little evidence of criminality running in families from generation to generation. Persistent offenders were a minority but even among this group heterogeneity is the striking feature. As Godfrey *et al.*, have argued there was 'a continually varying cohort of individuals ... rather than an easily categorized group of like-minded people capable of undermining the cohesion of society'.<sup>3</sup>

***John Sutcliffe, 'The King of Castlegate', Henry 'The Burton Slasher' Wilson and Other Notorious Local Criminals***

Although the evidence does not indicate the existence of a criminal class in Huddersfield there were a number of individuals, and their coterie of associates, who, while retaining a 'legitimate' exterior, were clearly involved in a variety of criminal activities. In the 1840s the most notorious figure in Huddersfield was John Sutcliffe, a Castlegate beerhouse keeper, the self-styled 'King of Castlegate'. The 1841 census lists him simply as a beer retailer but he had a hand in a variety of illegal activities. His beerhouse achieved notoriety as 'the rendezvous for thieves and prostitutes of the lowest grade'.<sup>4</sup> It was a centre for coiners, targeting nearby villages, while robberies were planned and some even carried out there, but despite a number of brushes with the parochial constables no charge was brought successfully against him. Such was his success that he was able to

purchase the beerhouse and build in its yard 'a barracks', rooms in which he rented out to certain 'members of the frail sisterhood'.<sup>5</sup> His relationship with the constables is undocumented but his sobriquet – the Castlegate's Jonathan Wilde – is suggestive.\* Whatever the reasons, his good fortune held until late 1848. His downfall is interesting for a number of reasons, though the actual crime – robbery and assault – was not uncommon, especially in Castlegate. James Speight 'an old man from Askern Spa near Doncaster' visited Huddersfield and after 'he got fresh [drunk] somewhere in the town and rambled down into Castlegate ... he went into a public house, but he did not know which one ... he went into the yard shortly after and was there seized by three or four men, who lifted him off his feet and placed him across the channel. One of them placed his hand over his mouth ... and another took the remaining sovereign from him'.<sup>6</sup>

The initial outcome was equally predictable. Sutcliffe and an accomplice were arrested and identified by several witnesses. Speight did not help his cause by admitting that he was so drunk at the time that he was unable to identify the beerhouse in which he was robbed. However, the defence were able to call an array of witnesses who claimed that Speight had been robbed in the street while Sutcliffe had been quietly minding his business in his beerhouse. The fact that one of these witnesses was the 'protector' of one of Sutcliffe's female tenants did not prevent the magistrates from dismissing the case. At this point events took a different course. The determination of the new superintending constable, Thomas Heaton, and of one of the town's parochial constables, Abraham Sedgwick, led to the discovery of further evidence, including a stolen handkerchief, which greatly strengthened the case against Sutcliffe. Equally determined was James Speight, who walked some thirty miles from Askern to pursue his case in court. This time Sutcliffe (and his younger accomplice Joshua Armitage) were committed for trial at the York Assizes, where, in a session dominated by the trial of the Chartist leaders, they were both found guilty and sentenced to ten years' transportation.<sup>7</sup> 'Old Sut's' barracks were demolished a year later and there is no further record of him in Huddersfield for almost twenty years.<sup>8</sup>

---

\* Jonathan Wilde, or Wild, the notorious eighteenth-century thief-taker, escaped the law for many years because of his ruthlessness in prosecuting some (but not all) thieves for whom he had acted as receiver of stolen goods.

Sutcliffe's departure was not an end; rather, it opened the way for others to take over the mantle of most notorious criminal in town. The man who made the strongest claim in the early 1850s was Henry Wilson, also known as 'the Burton Slasher' or simply 'Slasher'. A pugilist with a reputation for violence, who turned beerhouse keeper, he was involved in a variety of criminal activities. His career appeared to be living proof of the validity of local magistrates' analysis of crime. During his mid-twenties, in a six-year period (1852–57), he appeared in court on some forty occasions. He was fined for being drunk and disorderly on five occasions, for fighting on seven occasions (including a vicious assault on a woman) and for gambling a further four. He was found guilty of seven licensing offences (including permitting gambling (twice) and harbouring prostitutes (three times)). He was also found guilty of theft on six occasions, the sums involved varying from 8s (40p) to £91 and four further offences involving dogfighting, while he was also charged with passing bad coin and attempting to bribe or intimidate a jury. To make matters worse he was married to a well-known prostitute, who herself was involved in a number of robberies, and the beerhouse they ran, the *Gypsy Queen* in Kirkgate, was notorious as a meeting place for known criminals. Not all of his offences were petty. In the winter of 1855/6 he and his wife and associates faced two charges of highway robbery. The first took place in Moldgreen. The victim, Christopher Smith, of Jockey Hall, had been drinking in a number of beerhouses in 'the bottom of town' and was followed before being knocked down and robbed of nineteen sovereigns and sixteen shillings (£19-80) by 'Slasher' and two other men at the gateway to his house.<sup>9</sup> The second 'garotte robbery'<sup>\*\*</sup> took place in similar fashion but this time on Kilner Bank. A local butcher, Richard Poppleton, who had been drinking in 'Slasher's' beerhouse, was followed home and robbed of £91 in gold, notes and bills. Wilson and three others were arrested and brought before the town's magistrates. Identification proved difficult and ultimately only one man, William Pitchforth, stood trial at the York Assizes, where he

---

<sup>\*\*</sup> The sensationally-named garotte robberies generally took the form of an attack from behind in which the victim was held round the neck. There were 'moral panics' surrounding such attacks – particularly in London in the early 1860s. See G Pearson, *Hooligan: A History of Respectable Fears*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1983, chapter six and Rob Sindall, *Street Violence in the Nineteenth Century*, Leicester University Press, 1990.

was found guilty and sentenced to eight years' penal servitude.<sup>10</sup> Wilson was able to prove his *alibi*, though not for the first time there was a suspicion that 'hard-swearing' [perjury] was involved.

'Slasher's' lifestyle revolved around drinking, gambling and fighting and, while he made some money from the legitimate beer trade, his income was clearly supplemented by earnings from prostitution and theft. He moved within a relatively small circle of like-minded individuals.<sup>11</sup> The same names crop up either as fellow spectators, attending (and gambling on) dogfights and footraces, or as partners in crime. The inter-relationship between these activities is well illustrated by a case from 1855 when Wilson and two others were charged with stealing £15 from Arthur Warburton in the *Dolphin* beerhouse, Castlegate.<sup>12</sup> Entertained by 'Butter Moll', the keeper's wife, Warburton revealed to her the contents of his purse as he went to purchase cigars. Within minutes Wilson and two colleagues appeared and after some 'milling practice' by Wilson, Warburton was knocked into a corner and relieved of two £5 notes and five sovereigns (£5). The three made their way immediately to 'Malley Pashley' at Dogley Lane, where they spent the afternoon gambling away the money on a dogfight.

Wilson led something of a charmed life in court, managing 'to elude the penalties of the law'.<sup>13</sup> Nonetheless, he was successfully prosecuted on a number of occasions and it is striking that, more often than not, his fines (which could run to as much as £20 when costs were included) were paid immediately. Furthermore, Wilson had the money to ensure that he (or his wife) was properly represented when the need arose. Nowhere was this more clearly seen than when his 'paramour', Sarah Sutcliffe, was charged with stealing a gold watch from James Brook in Hull. Brook, a preacher amongst the New Connexion Wesleyan Methodists, had met Mrs. 'Slasher', as the papers reported it, on a steamboat from Goole to Hull and was aware that she was married and her husband at home in Huddersfield. Nonetheless, he bought her a drink and a meal at a cook shop in Hull before retiring with her to an upstairs room in the *Victoria Hotel*. Meanwhile, 'Slasher' took an adjoining room. Brook, claiming no immoral intentions but merely wanting a rest, was duly robbed. Brook later identified Sarah Sutcliffe, who was eventually tried at the quarter sessions, where she was defended by the well-known legal figure of Digby Seymour.<sup>14</sup> 'Slasher's' reign collapsed rapidly and mysteriously soon after. By 1858 he was charged with being a vagrant and found himself facing

trial for passing counterfeit coin while purchasing muffins. He was sentenced to three months' imprisonment at Wakefield, 'a decision which appeared to afford great satisfaction to a crowded court'.<sup>15</sup>

Sutcliffe and Wilson were exceptional but there were other men, and a few women whose lifestyles were not that dissimilar. Many were keepers of various beerhouses and they inhabited that borderland between legality and outright criminality. Men like John Conroy, James Cayford, John Ashton and another 'low beerhouse keeper', Richard 'Big Dick' Ramsden, regularly appeared in court and their careers bring out the harsh realities of life for certain sections of the working classes.<sup>16</sup> Infringements of the licensing laws and permitting (or taking part in) fighting on the premises were the most common offences, but there were others, not least receiving stolen goods and buying pawn tickets for stolen goods, that hint at an informal/illegal economy whereby they and their customers could offset their poverty.<sup>17</sup>

By the time he fell foul of Superintendent Hannan in 1863, Ramsden had been charged twenty-five times and convicted thirteen times since first being granted a licence for the *Forge* beerhouse in Castlegate in 1861. He was part of the beerhouse-brothel trade and, no doubt shockingly for respectable readers, he had 'the most lascivious prints of the French school' on his walls and 'everything ... which pander to vice and lust'.<sup>18</sup> In fact, his criminal career extended back at least until 1855. He was well-known for his violence against both men, women and the police and was arrested for criminal damage in several town drinking establishments.<sup>19</sup> Like 'Slasher' Wilson, 'Big Dick' also had the money to hire the best defence. In another assault case, brought by Mary Waddington, he was defended by the distinguished 'miners' counsel', or 'Mr Roberts of Manchester' as he was widely known.<sup>20</sup> Equally violent was John Conroy, who at various times in the late-1850s and 1860s was the keeper of beerhouses in Castlegate, Kirkgate and Old Street. When one of his assault victims appeared in court his 'face was covered with bandages and plasters and he presented a very sorry spectacle'.<sup>21</sup> In another incident it was alleged that he had 'danced on the head' of a labourer as he shouted 'I'll poise [kick] the eye out of ye'.<sup>22</sup> But not all violent beerhouse keepers were men. One of the most formidable figures in town was Hannah Armitage, 'a woman of gigantic breadth' who weighed more than twenty stone and was more than capable of holding her own in a fight. When William France's taunts provoked

her, she gave him such a beating that he appeared in court some days later with a 'shockingly disfigured' face.<sup>23</sup>

Not all violent men were beerhouse keepers. Daniel Gillerlane lived off Castlegate in Post Office Yard, and from his late-teens onwards, was involved in a number of vicious assaults. His violence might have been channelled differently had he made a success as a soldier but he absconded from the West Yorkshire Rifles, soon after joining as a twenty-year old in 1855. He resumed his assaults in Huddersfield and increasingly focused his anger on the police.<sup>24</sup> After one particularly vicious attack on Sergeant Kaye, the *Leeds Mercury* described him as 'a truculent vagabond' and the *Chronicle* as 'a brutish-looking fellow' responsible for several 'savagely attacks both on the police and other people'.<sup>25</sup> Also involved in petty theft he was imprisoned in Wakefield for periods ranging from one to eight months, but the theft of a purse in Tierney's beerhouse brought him a sentence of seven years' penal servitude.<sup>26</sup> Similarly Andrew Dearnley spent time in and out of Wakefield prison for a variety of assaults, but he was also involved in several incidents of theft.<sup>27</sup> Violence was not confined to the semi-criminal fraternities that men like Gillerlane and Dearnley frequented. George Dyson, on the surface at least, was a moderately successful man, a butcher, living and working in the Shambles; but he was a violent man. On at least eleven occasions between 1859 and 1867 he was found guilty of fighting or committing an assault. On four occasions the fight was with fellow butchers and another involved a lawyer's clerk, who was bringing Dyson his expenses for a court appearance. His cohabitee was knocked down and kicked insensible in Kirkgate and he also threatened the landlady of the *Bull and Mouth Inn* with violence, though the threat was never carried out.<sup>28</sup> Dyson did not win every fight. Indeed, so badly was he beaten in 1865 that Superintendent Hannan withdrew the case against him on the grounds that he had been punished enough.<sup>29</sup>

Acts of violence were very much a part of mid-century Huddersfield life. Some were unequivocally criminal but others less so. It was commonplace for working-class men (young but also old) to settle disputes with their fists. Although this could lead to a court appearance the 'offence' was viewed with ambivalence, unless it was a blatantly unfair fight. Another problematic area was domestic violence. It was commonly held that men had the right to physically chastise their wives, children and (if they had them)

servants or apprentices. As Victorian masculinity was re-defined in the mid-nineteenth century, such actions were increasingly condemned and prosecuted, though the provisions of the law were often woefully weak in terms of punishment. The town magistrates were increasingly vocal in condemning 'the disgusting prevalence of the cowardly offence of wife-beating' though the police were often reluctant to intervene, not least for fear that the fighting couple (and even neighbours) might turn on them.<sup>30</sup> Many cases were brought by the victims themselves, 'praying for sureties of the peace', and reveal the often wretched lives led by these women. Many assaults took place after lengthy drinking sessions and over many years, involving beatings and kickings, even strangulation. Furniture was broken, windows smashed and clothes torn, often before the eyes of children and neighbours. The economic insecurity of the women was also very apparent. Elizabeth Haigh, 'like most wives was unwilling that [her husband Thomas] should go to prison' but sought an escape from violence via separation and support for her and her children.<sup>31</sup> There was a clear class dimension to the condemnation of domestic violence both nationally and locally, but it was not simply middle-class magistrates and reformers who condemned 'wife-beating'. When the co-workers of William Horsfall became aware of 'his habit of severely beating his wife ... they burnt him in effigy to show how deeply they execrated his inhuman conduct'.<sup>32</sup> There were other acts – large-scale and planned thefts, for example – which were clearly criminal, but it is to a different range of offences and offenders that we now turn.

### *Drunks, Whores and Beggars*

There was a growing demand for 'order and decorum' in public spaces but while the emphasis on civilizing the streets says much for largely-elite Victorian values, the cases that came into court also tell much about the lives of overwhelmingly poor, working-class 'criminals'.<sup>33</sup>

Working-class drunkenness was a problem that exercised the minds of many respectable Victorians (working-class as much as middle-class) and Huddersfield, with a strong temperance presence, was no exception. Letter-writers to the local press regularly condemned the extent of inebriety in the town and, in 1867, there was an unpleasant row among the Improvement Commissioners



and the superintendent of police over the 'supposed extraordinary prevalence of drunkenness in Huddersfield'.<sup>34</sup> Huddersfield, or so it seemed, was the fifth worst town in England in terms of drunkenness per head of population and little better than such notorious places as Liverpool and Middlesbrough. In fact, the analysis was fundamentally flawed as recording practices varied considerably from town to town, as Superintendent Hannan forcefully pointed out to his critics.<sup>35</sup> Unlike in many other towns every case of drunkenness brought to the attention of the police was recorded. Although the problem of under-recording was not entirely eradicated – not all drunks came to the attention of the police – the local figures give a reasonable approximation to the scale of the problem. Hannan defended Huddersfield's position but his figure for the number of residents charged with drunkenness (203) in 1866 was equivalent to one person in every hundred of the town's population.<sup>36</sup> Further, he claimed that two-thirds of the cases were associated with the 'low beer-houses' in town.

Drunkenness presented a range of problems to the police. At the most basic level incapable men and women had to be removed from the streets or alleys. This was not always easy. James Beaumont was 'in such an incapable condition that a wheelbarrow had to be got to convey him to the lock-up'.<sup>37</sup> Likewise, Susannah Gibson.<sup>38</sup> People put themselves in danger. Sarah Beasley was found in Horseshoe Yard able 'neither to stand nor walk ... in an exposed state with a large number ... around her'.<sup>39</sup> In some cases drunks fell into the canal and drowned. John Wagstaff was one of many who, the worse for drink, fell into the canal basin at Aspley and drowned, though some, like James Duffy, were fortunate enough to be rescued.<sup>40</sup> In other cases they collapsed in the streets or nearby fields. Elizabeth Shaw, 'compelled to obtain a living by plain sewing', even though she was seventy-one-year-old, spent an afternoon and early evening drinking in Castlegate before setting off home in the dark. Between 7 a.m. and 8 a.m. the next morning she was found in a field 'running down from the New George into Northumberland Street ... in a state of utter exhaustion'.<sup>41</sup> She died less than three hours later. Others deliberately attempted (and in some cases succeeded) in ending their lives. Thomas Driver, a seventy-year-old shoemaker 'well known for his intemperate habits' returned to his home in Manchester Street where he attempted to slit his throat while Mary Padley, also inebriated, threatened to slit her throat or jump out of her bedroom

window – drink and desperation were a powerful combination.<sup>42</sup> What drove people to excessive drinking is not always clear. There was a culture of heavy-drinking among many working-class men and women for whom it provided an escape, however brief or costly, from the harshness and apparent hopelessness of their lives. However, in some cases there was a more immediate and tangible cause. John Lunn was arrested for being drunk and disorderly in King Street (a second such offence in a matter of days) but it transpired that his son had recently been run-down and killed in Quay Street.<sup>43</sup> Mary Cryan was found drunk and smashing windows in Swan Yard. When she appeared before the magistrates the following day she explained that she had been deserted by her husband and that the windows were in to the house of a local prostitute, Mary Rowe, with whom he was now living. The magistrates thought the ‘circumstances sufficiently mitigatory’ to dismiss the charge.<sup>44</sup>

As can be seen from the Cryan case, drunkenness was often associated with disorderly behaviour. Verbal and physical abuse in the streets was a recurrent feature. The involvement of men in acts of violence has been commented on and analysed extensively but less attention has been paid to disruptive women.<sup>45</sup> Irish rows were a regular feature of working-class life in Huddersfield and many involved women rather than men.<sup>46</sup> Many of the women involved were described as prostitutes (though in a number of cases this probably meant that they were cohabiting and not married) and it is clear that there was a significant number of women whose life experiences and lifestyles led them into various forms of criminal behaviour. Reconstructing the lives of these women is difficult given the limited and often biased evidence that survives. However, an analysis of local press coverage combined with the use of census material enables a picture, albeit partial, to be drawn of these women.

Prostitution, the great ‘social evil’, was a major concern in the mid-nineteenth century, not least because of the frightening revelations about the prevalence of venereal disease among soldiers and sailors fighting in the Crimean War. Huddersfield was not a designated area under the Contagious Diseases (CD) Acts but there was considerable local concern about the moral and health threats posed by prostitution in the town. Technically, prostitution itself was not an offence but women could be arrested for being ‘lewd and disorderly’, ‘drunk and disorderly’ and for importuning. However, it is clear that the term ‘prostitute’ was used in a subjective

manner, labelling women who did not conform to mid-Victorian standards of female behaviour. However, matters are confused by the plethora of terms used – ‘fallen woman’, ‘unfortunate’, ‘soiled dove’, ‘member of the frail sisterhood’, ‘nymph of the *pavé*’ and so forth – sometimes for the same individual. It is not clear if such terms were interchangeable or reflected some form of hierarchy based on the permanence, or otherwise, of the individual’s involvement in prostitution. Describing a woman as an ‘unfortunate’ or a ‘soiled dove’ suggested a degree of sympathy; calling her a ‘fallen woman’ carried a more explicit moral judgement while using the term ‘nymph of the *pavé*’ and even ‘frail sisterhood’ implied both a lifestyle choice and an ‘otherness’, apart from respectable society. Our knowledge of Victorian prostitution and prostitutes owes much to Walkowitz’s classic study, which exposes the inadequacies of contemporary explanations of prostitution.<sup>47</sup> Prostitutes, she argues, tended to be heavily drawn from the daughters of the poor; for many, particularly before the CD Acts, it was a temporary phase into and from which young women moved; and the motivation for becoming a prostitute was to be found in lack of skill/education and poverty. More recently, Lee’s work on prostitution in Kent argues for a more complex pattern of behaviour and has stressed the degree of agency exercised by the women involved.<sup>48</sup> To what extent was this the case in Huddersfield?<sup>49</sup>

Press accounts were profoundly influenced by contemporary attitudes. Men were portrayed as the innocent victims of immoral temptresses.

Many decent men might go into one of these [beer]houses with the best intentions, only to get a glass of beer as numbers of respectable working-men did, without knowing the temptation therein, but the moment they were sat down one of the girls was placed besides him; he was led to ruin and his family to destitution.<sup>50</sup>

Accounts of arrests combined titillation and moral shock. Sergeant Townend proved remarkably adept at arresting women ‘in an improper position behind the Cloth Hall’, Detective Partridge caught a couple ‘in an act of prostitution’ while strange sounds led PC Worsnip to the shooting-gallery booth in Lord Street where he found Mary Ann Preston ‘with two men in a shamefully disorderly position’.<sup>51</sup> Even when the women are accorded their names

they are either dehumanized or distanced, as an unnatural ‘other’. Mary Ann Pearson was a ‘social evil’ while Ann Ashton became ‘a notorious “social evil”’; Catherine Hopkins, likewise, ‘a well-known social evil’.<sup>52</sup> There was something voyeuristic in the description of Mary O’Neil as a one-armed drunk and something unnatural in the description of Mary Kaye as ‘a masculine looking Irish woman’.<sup>53</sup> Other descriptions, emphasizing famished and cadaverous looks, dishevelled appearance and diseased condition, reinforced the image of ‘the prostitute’ as a ‘threatening other’. And the importance of appearance was also highlighted in the rare (or rarely reported) case of a wrongful arrest. When Susannah Dent appeared in court, accused of an act of indecency, she was described as ‘respectably-attired and rather ladylike’ and suffering ‘great mental anguish’. The case was dismissed after her father, a respectable old man, gave evidence of her good character.<sup>54</sup>

Looking beyond these comforting fictions one can see a more complex reality. Men, rather than being innocent victims, knew full well what was on offer in a large number of the town’s beerhouses. They may have acted foolishly – as the magistrates reminded them on occasions – but they actively sought out the delights of Castlegate or the *Cambridge*, be they farmers coming to market, youths coming from outlying villages or residents of the town. There were victims, most notably the young girls, brought in from other towns and villages on the promise of a job as a servant, only to find that they had to pay for their board and keep through prostitution. Others may well have made a conscious choice but were still victims of poverty and lack of opportunity, particularly for unskilled women. It is no coincidence that many of these women were either domestic servants, hawkers, or the wives of hawkers and labourers, or widows. It is also striking that several had either been abandoned by their husbands or ill-used; unsurprisingly many of them were repeat offenders, preferring to be in the Wakefield House of Correction – for security and medical reasons; and a significant minority attempted suicide. It is not possible from the surviving evidence to determine how many women moved out of prostitution to become ‘respectable’. ‘Slowit Hannah’ (Hannah Armitage) had by her own confession led a dissolute life as a young woman when first in Huddersfield in the mid-1840s but by the late 1850s she was the wife of James Armitage, who kept the *Dog Inn*, on the corner of Kirkgate and Old Street. Unfortunately, the *Dog Inn*

was a well-known centre of prostitution but she was very much the exception in Huddersfield.<sup>55</sup> Many of the repeat offenders clearly never escaped a life of prostitution, though there were a number of reported one-time offenders for whom prostitution may have been a short-term expedient.

These broad socio-economic characteristics confirm the view that those women for whom prostitution was a longer-term option, were drawn from the poorest strata of society and lived lives of considerable hardship and danger. The complexities of their lives can only be fully appreciated by looking at specific case studies. In February 1861, under the sub-heading, 'Shocking Death' the *Chronicle* carried an account of the coroner's inquest into the death of Isabella Taylor, aged thirty-nine, and 'for a long time one of the frail sisterhood'. Her body had been found at the foot of the cellar-kitchen steps of the *Croppers' Arms* beershop at 7.30 a.m. one Tuesday. In tracing her last steps, it was ascertained that at 1 a.m. that day, she was seen struggling with a farm labourer, James Cotton, who was trying to drag her into the *Rose and Crown* dram-shop. That was the last time she was seen alive. The coroner's conclusion was that

having no place of abode, and knowing the beerhouse well had wandered there with the intention of going to the water-closet at the bottom of the steps and that she either accidentally fell down, or was pushed down by the iron gate which hangs only on one hinge and falls too heavily.<sup>56</sup>

The jury, it should be said, also recommended that 'the iron gate ... should be put in a proper state of repair'. Nothing more was said about the woman but what little is known about her life is instructive. Born in Kendal in 1823, she had come to Huddersfield as a young woman, probably in the late 1840s. In 1851 she was recorded as being single, a lodging house keeper, living in Rosemary Lane. Soon after she was known to be living as man and wife with John Stock, who was fined 5s (25p) for assaulting her. By 1852 she was described as being 'of notorious bad character' and was variously charged and imprisoned for importuning and theft from the person. She was assaulted on at least two occasions by punters as she eked out a livelihood from prostitution and petty theft. In April 1860 she appeared once again at the Wakefield Quarter Sessions charged with the theft of a handkerchief. Unfortunately, the grand jury threw out

the bill and, instead of being sent to the relative safety of prison, she was free to return to Huddersfield where she met her tragic death.<sup>57</sup>

Equally instructive is the case of Elizabeth Long. She had come to Huddersfield from Cumberland (precisely when is unclear) and by 1851 was thirty-four years old, married to a man almost twenty years her senior, with a young child, and living in Spring Street. Three years later, and still married, she was found guilty of 'being lewd and importuning passers-by on Sunday evening' but she was discharged early from Wakefield 'for behaving well in gaol and her extreme destitution'.<sup>58</sup> Later that year she appeared in court, labelled one of the 'fair and free nymphs of Castlegate', though the theft charge against her was dismissed. The following year, now described as 'an impudent looking wretch' she was sentenced to two months at Wakefield for 'wandering abroad in Kirkgate ... for the purpose of prostitution'.<sup>59</sup> By now 'a character well-known to the police', in July 1856 she became the 'keeper of a house of ill-fame in Castlegate' and later that year she was sentenced to eight months imprisonment at the Leeds Quarter Sessions for the theft of a sovereign (£1) from a solicitor, Thomas Leadbetter, in a beerhouse in Old Street.<sup>60</sup> In the next two years she appeared in court at least five times on charges of theft from the person. Now in her mid-forties, she was described as 'a miserable looking dirty woman ... [and] a miserable specimen of depravity'.<sup>61</sup> Apparently still a prostitute (her 'bully' rescued her on one occasion) she was trapped in a life of criminality. In October 1861 she was sentenced to four years' penal servitude for the theft of clothes and, almost immediately on release, stole a shawl from off a washing line. This time her sentence, at the Bradford sessions, was seven years' penal servitude.<sup>62</sup> She was released on a ticket-of-leave and returned to Huddersfield, living in Duke Street. Her reputation went before her and she was arrested 'for prowling about at four o'clock in the morning', though the case was dismissed. Later that year the 'unfortunate and returned convict' was found guilty of the theft of 18s 6d (92½p) and, at the age of fifty-four, was sentenced to a further ten years' penal servitude at the Wakefield intermediate sessions.<sup>63</sup>

Other lives are even less well documented but the fragments point to very similar conclusions. Mary Ann Hilton was married to an ex-soldier, who was unable to find employment. Their relationship was troubled and she was assaulted by other men as well. 'So frequently [had she been] committed to Wakefield that she could not tell the number of times'.<sup>64</sup> Like Elizabeth Long, her sentences lengthened

as her criminal career continued. After a number of short sentences in Wakefield, Hilton was sentenced to five years' penal servitude in 1865 and, having been released early, to ten years' penal servitude in 1868.<sup>65</sup> Mary Kelly (of Castlegate), 'a somewhat massive member of the "fair and free" circles inhabiting Rosemary Lane', as an old woman, after a lifetime of often violent petty crime, attempted to commit suicide by throwing herself into the canal.<sup>66</sup> It was not just the old who tried to end their lives. Emma Edwards, a prostitute aged twenty-five, tried three times to commit suicide by drowning, only to be rescued by PC Partridge.<sup>67</sup> Others sought a short-term break. When Julia Carney was committed to the Wakefield House of Correction for the thirty-fourth time, the *Chronicle* flippantly called it 'a singular instance of prison infatuation', failing to grasp that prison was a place of refuge for these women.<sup>68</sup> Mary Curtis knew well what she was doing when she smashed the windows in the house of PC Wilson in Castlegate. It was not because she hated the police but, as she told the magistrates, 'in order that she might be sent to prison'.<sup>69</sup> The oft-convicted Bridget Killarney was even more explicit: 'I would rather be in Wakefield [House of Correction] than out'.<sup>70</sup> It was a simple but eloquent statement, born of an awareness of the limited opportunities for poor, unskilled women and of long knowledge of the harsh realities of the prostitute's life.

In his annual report for 1857 Superintendent Beaumont told 'the inexperienced ... [but] innocent sympathisers ... that the greatest portion of crime is committed directly or indirectly by [vagrants]'.<sup>71</sup> He was wrong, but many contemporaries shared his beliefs and, as a consequence, much police time was devoted to dealing with beggars and other vagabonds. This was another ongoing problem. In 1847 the *Leeds Mercury* noted that 'the number of beggars has lately increased in Huddersfield to an alarming extent, many of whom are destitute Irish'.<sup>72</sup> It was not, however, a problem confined to recently-arrived Irish migrants. Eighteen-year-old Elizabeth Scott was arrested for begging in John William Street, having come from Leeds to look for work but was 'sadly in want of the common necessaries of life'. She was discharged on condition she left town at once. Such was her plight that a woman in court came forward to pay her fare back to Leeds.<sup>73</sup> A decade later, Sarah Thompson found herself before the magistrates for begging but it transpired that, having recently arrived from Carlisle, she had been deserted by her husband and to support herself and her five month-old child she tried 'earning

her living by selling a few needles on the road', while Mary Ann Reynolds, 'a miserable looking creature with a child in her arms' was found guilty of begging from door to door.<sup>74</sup> In hindsight many of these cases appear to be nothing more than the criminalization of poverty but the magistrates could be more sympathetic. Mary Walker, a tramp, arrested at 2 a.m. in the company of two men, having 'tearfully pleaded her utter desolation and destitution' was freed on promising to leave town immediately.<sup>75</sup> Similarly, Thomas Kilroy, when charged with begging, received a caution but was allowed 2s 6d (12½p) from the charity box once he explained that illness had 'reduced [him] to absolute want'.<sup>76</sup> Others were less fortunate. Jane Grey and George Berry were sentenced to seven days in Wakefield House of Correction for sleeping in a cart in Brierley's Yard, King Street; Sarah Jones, a sixty-three-year-old seamstress, to fourteen days for sleeping in the open air, and David Beardsall and Robert Burns, to a month for sleeping in a tenter store in Armitage & Kaye's Yard in Quay Street.<sup>77</sup> One of the most attractive places for rough sleeping, and therefore the most likely place to be arrested, was the lime kilns at Aspley. In 1861 James Green was given an hour to leave town (the alternative being a month in prison) for sleeping there.<sup>78</sup> It was a risky matter, especially as many rough-sleepers fortified themselves with several drinks. When PC Marsden went to arrest a drunk, 'sleeping close to the mouth of the Aspley lime kilns', he was unable to do so immediately because the man's 'clothes were too hot to handle', but less fortunate was David North, a forty-year-old coal-heaver, who died as a result of sleeping too close to the fire.<sup>79</sup> These were men and women who, for a variety of reasons, did not have a permanent place to sleep, nor have the money to find accommodation for the night. As such they were victims of laws that penalised those who were the economic losers in a seemingly prosperous town such as Huddersfield.

One final group of 'criminals' remains to be considered: suicides and attempted suicides. Again, it is difficult to categorise the people who fall into this group but a number of common themes emerge. Older men were vulnerable. James Dearnley, a weaver living in Northgate, hanged himself, three weeks after the death of his wife, to whom he had been married for thirty-eight years.<sup>80</sup> But Michael Boyle was only twenty-nine when he tried to kill himself in Old Post Office Yard, being 'very despondent ... owing to the faithless conduct of his wife who [had] abandoned him and left



Castlegate



Old Cottages,  
Denton Lane





The Old Shears  
Inn, Beast Market



Upperhead Row





Honley, Town Gate



Marsden

him disconsolate'.<sup>81</sup> A second cause for men was physical frailty, which undermined their sense of masculinity. Seventy-one-year old John Schofield, a veteran of the battle of Waterloo, also living in Northgate, suffering from depression brought on by concern with increasing bodily frailty, hanged himself when left alone by his wife.<sup>82</sup> Similarly, Henry Lindsay, although only fifty, was depressed by the fact that he was 'too old to work' and strangled himself in the Model Lodging House.<sup>83</sup> But there were also younger men who took their lives. Joseph Sewell, an out-of-work plasterer, first took to heavy drinking before killing himself at the age of thirty-six.<sup>84</sup> Of the women who committed (or tried to commit) suicide, personal problems predominated. Mary Manning drowned herself in the canal after Christmas Eve Mass, when she discovered that her husband, to whom she had been married for thirty-three years, had been having an affair with a neighbour in Back Buxton Road for over two years.<sup>85</sup> Emma Walker, pregnant at eighteen, was abandoned by the father. She too ended her life in the canal.<sup>86</sup> Sarah Sutcliffe (not related to the woman of the same name mentioned previously), also eighteen, drowned herself after 'some unpleasantness ... between her and her mother with reference to love affairs'. The coroner returned an open verdict, noting simply that she had been 'found drowned'.<sup>87</sup> All suicides/attempted suicides were tragic but in some cases the tragedy was compounded by macabre black-humour of the incident. The stableman Joseph Hirst, known as 'Deaf Joe', tried to commit suicide by jumping into the canal but he became stuck in the mud, the water was insufficiently deep to cover him and he was found exhausted by his efforts to force his head under water.<sup>88</sup>

### *Conclusion*

This chapter has not attempted to provide a comprehensive (let alone statistical) analysis of crime in mid-Victorian Huddersfield. Rather it has sought to bring out the diversity of criminal behaviour and to set these actions into a broader social and economic context, thereby throwing light on the society in which these crimes took place. A number of broad themes stand out. Although Huddersfield did not experience a high level of crime – particularly indictable offences but also petty crimes – there were a substantial number of offences involving violence, drunkenness and prostitution. These need to be considered in a wider context. First, there was a growing demand

for 'order and decorum' especially in public spaces. There was less tolerance of certain types of behaviour than a generation earlier. The casual poor, in general, were subject to greater scrutiny and control; street prostitutes, in particular, more so. Terms such as 'prostitute' or 'beggar' were not neutral but were labels that carried strong (and negative) moral overtones and had the effect of creating a distant 'other', perceived to be a threat to 'normal' and 'respectable' society. The introduction of the new police both reflected and strengthened these new expectations. Second, and in many ways cutting across these wishes for greater respectability, was the existence of an economy characterised by considerable inequalities – reflecting occupational, gender and racial differences – and a society with relatively few institutions to alleviate poverty. There was a grey economy, which was criminal in formal, legalistic terms, but was less obviously so from the perspective of those who benefitted, for example, from the sale and purchase of stolen foods and goods. It was also, particularly for single or abandoned women, a makeshift economy in which people struggled to devise survival strategies, cobbled together from ill-paid, casual work, begging, charity and petty crime. Thus, there were many 'criminals' who were as much victims as criminals. This was particularly true of unskilled, working-class women, especially those from an Irish background. Prostitution, on a part- or full-time basis, was for many of these women the best of a bad set of options: high-risk in a variety of ways – short-term, violence and disease; longer-term an inescapable life of crime – but bringing in more money than being a hawker, a servant or even a factory hand. And then there were those who occupied an ambivalent middle ground. Hannah Armitage and Sarah Sutcliffe were both victim and perpetrator.

There are problems with the use of the term 'victim', not least the danger of perceiving certain people as powerless, having no choice and unable to influence their lives. To deny any sense of agency to the people discussed in this chapter would be wrong. There were choices to be made. Lee has argued that, because some poor women chose to resort to prostitution and others not, there was a degree of agency that is denied by labelling such women as victims.<sup>89</sup> There is force in such an argument, albeit more so for a Hannah Armitage than an Isabella Taylor, and it could be extended to include those who committed (or attempted) suicide but there is a danger of overstating the degree of freedom (real or perceived) and minimizing the desperation that many such people felt and the

dilemmas that such a course of action (be it prostitution or suicide) created. Further, it overlooks similar problems for those who, for whatever reason, chose not to adopt such a course of action but were still faced with the threat to life of self and family of, in Acton's phrase, 'cruel, biting poverty'.<sup>90</sup>

Third, there remained a 'rough' working-class male culture in which physical prowess, including heavy drinking, was paramount. There was also a sub-culture that tolerated more, but not all, violence than many in the 'respectable' classes would do and, finally, and this is a theme that will be explored more fully in the conclusion, there was a complex relationship between these criminals and the agents and agencies of the criminal justice system. Beerhouse keepers were prosecuted as were bullies and beggars but there was no simple 'hunter/hunted' distinction. Beerhouse keepers called the police to clear their houses of unwanted and truculent customers; women went to court to prosecute troublesome neighbours, even violent partners. Further, though more exceptional, some of Huddersfield's most notorious criminals called upon distinguished legal figures to defend them in court. Conversely, the police often turned a blind eye to crimes – discretion literally being the better part of valour in certain cases – and the magistrates threw out cases or inflicted nominal fines to mitigate the harshness of laws, if strictly applied. Such was the complex and at times contradictory world of law and order in mid-nineteenth century Huddersfield.

### *Endnotes*

- 1 Superintendent Hannan, Annual Report, 1863 *HC*, 14 November 1863.
- 2 In 1861 Thomas Norton was charged with the manslaughter of Joseph Smith, following a fight in the *Black Lion* beerhouse in Upperhead Row. The Grand Jury at York returned a verdict of 'Ignoramus' and Norton was set free. *HC*, 9 February 1861 and *LM*, 9 February & 12 March 1861. Similarly, in 1865 Michael Hayley was charged with manslaughter, after a fight led to the death of John Mylett. This was a classic case of manslaughter, starting in a dispute in the Marble Masons beerhouse again in Upperhead Row after a lengthy drinking session and resolved by a fight in nearby Marsh Delph. Mylett died when he fell back from a punch by Hayley and struck his head on a stone. Hayley was tried at Leeds and (again) the case was dismissed. *HC*, 22 April 1865.
- 3 B S Godfrey, D J Cox and S D Farrall, *Criminal Lives: Family Life, Employment and Offending*, Oxford, Clarendon, 2007, p.166.
- 4 *LM*, 4 November 1848.
- 5 *Ibid.*

- 6 *Ibid.* For a similar case see the arrest and subsequent transportation of 'Lindley Lyd' Clay for robbery from the person (two £5 notes) in the Green Dragon, Castlegate. *LM*, 16 August 1845. See also 31 July 1848 for another violent robbery from the person in Castlegate.
- 7 *York Herald* 23 December 1848. In February 1849 Sutcliffe was taken from York Castle to Millbank prison London to await transportation. *Ibid* 24 February 1849.
- 8 In 1864 James Sutcliffe of Castlegate, referred to as 'Old Sut' was tried, along with five other men, for robbery, though this may have been John Sutcliffe's son. *HC*, 13 February 1864.
- 9 They stood trial at York and were acquitted, a verdict which 'created some surprise' given the strength of the evidence. *HC*, 1 & 17 November & 15 December 1855.
- 10 *HC*, 26 January & 22 March 1856.
- 11 Certain names, for example George Broadbent, William Stancliffe, Daniel Byram and Charles Kendal, crop up regularly in the court reports.
- 12 *HC*, 26 May 1855.
- 13 *LM*, 30 January 1858.
- 14 *HC*, 9 August 7 25 October 1856 and *Hull Packet*, 24 October 1856. Sarah Sutcliffe was eventually found guilty (the jury was evenly divided and the decision depended on the foreman's casting vote) and she was sentenced to twelve months' hard labour. It was not uncommon for people from Huddersfield to take a train and boat day out to Hull. The train was taken to Goole and a steamboat from Goole.
- 15 *HC*, 30 January 1858.
- 16 Ramsden, also known as 'Long Dick' on account of his height, should not be confused with 'King Dick' who was a chimney-sweep, living in Old Street!
- 17 See for example *HC*, 25 November 1854, 21 April 1855 and 14 November 1863. Almost all were fined at one time or another for having faulty measures and several were also prosecuted for using their houses as lodging houses without a licence.
- 18 *HC*, editorial, 24 October 1863 and *HEx*, 6 & 27 December, 1862.
- 19 See for example *HC*, 24 November 1855, 19 April 1856, 7 March & 13 June & 21 November 1863.
- 20 Roberts played a prominent part in the trial of the Honley rioters. For details see chapter nine.
- 21 *HC*, 20 February 1864, Conroy was fined 10s (50p) and ordered to pay £1-10s (£1.50) to his victim whose face he had slashed with a broken glass.
- 22 *HC*, 28 July 1866. Another fine of 10s (50p) was imposed, though the total costs took the figure to £2-4s (£2.20).
- 23 *HC*, 10 October 1857.
- 24 See for example *HC*, 27 August 1853, 30 May 1857, 29 December 1860, 13 July 1861, 8 August & 12 December 1863 & 10 August 1867.
- 25 *LM*, 12 November 1859 & *HC*, 12 November 1859.
- 26 *HC*, 11 February 1865.
- 27 See for example *HC*, 27 May 1854, 26 June 1856, 4 July 1857, 5 October 1861, 21 November 1863, 30 January & 10 September 1864. *HEx*, 27 May 1854.



- 28 For fighting with butchers see *HC*, 15 March 1862, 16 April 1864, 28 April 1866 & 15 August 1868. The assault on his partner was reported 21 November 1863 and the threat of violence 27 July 1867.
- 29 *HC*, 9 September 1865. Among other injuries Dyson suffered a broken arm but this did not end his fighting career.
- 30 *HC*, 11 July 1863. See also 1 June 1861.
- 31 *HC*, 29 June 1861.
- 32 *HC*, 25 January 1856.
- 33 This highlights a problem of evidence. The people who appeared in court are not necessarily a random sample of, say, beggars, drunks or prostitutes. To that extent it is impossible to say for how many begging or prostitution was a temporary expedient.
- 34 *HC*, 7 September 1867.
- 35 *Ibid.*
- 36 *Ibid.* Hannan also drew attention to the larger number (326) non-residents of the town who were charged with drunkenness in the local courts.
- 37 *HC*, 1 October 1853.
- 38 *HC*, 28 April 1855.
- 39 *HC*, 17 November 1855.
- 40 *HC*, 17 March and 10 November 1866. Some deaths were more suspicious. George Clayton was found drowned in the same spot but there was a suspicion that he had committed suicide. *HC*, 2 June 1866
- 41 *HC*, 30 November 1850.
- 42 *HC*, 14 October 1854 & 3 November 1860.
- 43 *HC*, 7 October 1854.
- 44 *HC*, 3 March 1855. This was not the end of the case as Rowe brought a case for damages to which the magistrates acceded. *The Chronicle* was unimpressed, claiming that they ‘fined innocence and threw the mantle of justice over vice’.
- 45 S D’Cruze, *Everyday Violence in Britain, 1850–1950*, London, Longman, 2000, C Emsley, *Hard Men: Violence in England since 1750*, London, Hambledon, 2005, M Weiner, *Men of Blood: Violence, Manliness and Criminal Justice in Victorian England*, Cambridge University Press, 2004 and J Carter Wood, *Violence and Crime in Nineteenth-Century England*, London, Routledge, 2004.
- 46 For examples of such disturbances in Castlegate see *HC* 14 September 1850, 15 November 1851, 7 June 1856, 4 June 1862 and 5 November 1865; for Manchester Street see *HC*, 23 October 1851, 5 February & 21 May 1853 & 23 March 1861; for Upperhead Row see *HC*, 5 February 1853, 16 June 1855, 1 May 1858 & 11 June 59; and for Windsor Court see *LM*, 22 May 1849, 8 November 1859, *HC*, 25 April 1857 & 22 March 1858.
- 47 J R Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, class and the state*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989. See also C Lee, *Policing Prostitution, 1856–1886: Deviance, Surveillance and Morality*, London, Pickering & Chatto, 2013.
- 48 Lee, *Policing Prostitution*, esp. chapter one.
- 49 The following analysis is based on evidence relating to approximately 150 women who appeared in court in the 1850s and 1860s. While this cannot be

considered, in strict terms, as a representative sample, the characteristics that emerge provide an indication of the underlying realities.

- 50 *HC*, 11 March 1865.
- 51 *HC*, 4 October & 27 December 1856 and 29 November 1860 and *HEx*, 17 January 1863.
- 52 *HC*, 28 February 1860 and 24 January & 23 May 1863.
- 53 *HC*, 3 September 1859 and 27 October 1860.
- 54 *HC*, 25 July 1863. In fact, the case appears less straightforward. Several witnesses spoke of Dent's improper behaviour but the case was not well handled by the police. PC Marshall wanted to give further evidence after the verdict had been delivered but the magistrates refused to hear him. Later that year a Susannah Dent, 'an alleged prostitute,' was arrested for a beer-house theft case. It is not clear whether this is the same woman.
- 55 *HC*, 19 July 1862. A crowd of some 1,500 turned out to watch the funeral cortege for what the paper, in a masterpiece of understatement, called 'a most remarkable woman not only in character and conduct but also in size'. The only other woman to have explicitly stated that she had abandoned her dissolute ways since becoming a married woman, Margaret Kelly, was also charged with running a brothel. *HC*, 1 July 1865 & 6 October 1866.
- 56 *HC*, 16 February 1861.
- 57 *HC*, 7 June 1851, 5 June & 9 October 1852, 15 January 1853, 25 March 1854, 18 July 1857, 3 December 1857 & 7 April 1860.
- 58 *HC*, 11 February 1854.
- 59 *HC*, 6 January 1855.
- 60 *HC*, 18 October 1856.
- 61 *HC*, 19 November 1859 & 1 December 1860.
- 62 *HC*, 19 October 1861 & 28 October 1865.
- 63 *HC*, 27 May 1871, 22 July & 26 August 1871.
- 64 *HC*, 26 July 1856.
- 65 *HC*, 21 & 28 January & 25 February 1865 and *B.Obs*, 11 December 1868.
- 66 *HC*, 21 October 1854, 20 October 1866 & 13 March 1869.
- 67 *HC*, 18 June 1853.
- 68 *HC*, 27 July 1850. See also 10 May 1851 for a similar comment. Julia Carney was born c.1815. In 1841 she lived in Windsor Court with the family of John Gannon, labourer. No occupation is recorded for her. In 1851 she was serving time in the Wakefield House of Correction on the census date. This time under occupation is the clear entry 'none'. Her criminal record goes back at least to 1846, probably before, and lasted until 1853, when (not for the first time), she was sent back to Wicklow. This time she appears not to have returned. See *LM* 10 January & 12 September 1846, *B.Obs*, 10 September 1846 and *HC*, 9 November 1850, 10 May 1851, and 30 April 1853.
- 69 *HC*, 26 March 1853. The magistrates obliged with a fourteen-day sentence.
- 70 *HC*, 14 April 1864.
- 71 *HC*, 5 December 1857.
- 72 *LM*, 30 January 1847. See also 6 March 1847 for references to beggars being 'chiefly Irish and Scotch mendicants'.

- 73 *HEx*, 27 May 1854.
- 74 *HC*, 12 February 1859 & 24 September 1864.
- 75 *HC*, 14 April 1855.
- 76 *HC*, 15 January 1853. It helped that he was ‘respectable and apparently well-educated’.
- 77 *HC*, 3 & 17 April 1858 & 6 June 1867, John Delaney was fined for sleeping in a pigsty in Boulder’s Yard but he was also drunk at the time. *HC*, 16 June 1855.
- 78 *HC*, 9 February 1861. See also 30 May & 4 July 1863.
- 79 *HC*, 20 January 1855 & 3 May 1856. An unnamed man was more fortunate, being rescued with his trousers ablaze. *HC*, 24 January 1863. See also the death of John Flood, *LM*, 2 January 1847.
- 80 *HC*, 3 April 1857.
- 81 *HC*, 25 April 1863.
- 82 *HC*, 22 February 1862.
- 83 *HC*, 6 October 1861. See also James Chapman, who killed himself at the second attempt, following a prolonged illness, which resulted in his heavy drinking. *HC*, 31 May 1862.
- 84 *HC*, 1 January 1859.
- 85 *HC*, 5 January 1867.
- 86 *HC*, 9 April 1859.
- 87 *HC*, 20 December 1862. See also Margaret Bell, twenty-eight, who drowned herself, having fallen out with her parents over her ‘late hours and questionable conduct’. *HC*, 7 June 1862.
- 88 *HC*, 30 June 1861.
- 89 Lee, *Policing Prostitution*, esp. chapter two.
- 90 William Acton, *Prostitution Considered in Its Moral, Social and Sanitary Aspects*, 2nd ed., London, Churchill & Son, 1870, p.180.