

Coffeehouse Crime in the Long Eighteenth Century

Kara Batts

On November 6, 1792, John Frost, a London attorney, attended an annual dinner located above the Percy Coffeehouse, at the corner of Rathbone Place and Percy Street, north of Covent Garden.¹ Frost reunited with an old acquaintance, Matthew Yateman, a successful pharmacist listed in London's directories as a gentleman. During their vociferous discussion, several of the coffeehouse patrons stated that Frost adamantly and loudly repeated, "I am for equality and no king," and "No king; there ought to be no king." One patron recorded Frost's words as he spoke them, planning to collect signatures as evidence of this occurrence, while others intervened in Frost's conversation. Several patrons issued formal complaints in regard to Frost's words, and by early December, while in France, Frost received notice of a warrant for his arrest. Upon his return to London in February, Frost surrendered to the authorities in response to an indictment for seditious words. Shortly thereafter, Frost received a trial in which the jurors found him guilty, and sentenced him to six months in prison and time at the pillory.²

Kara Batts is from Tuscola, Illinois. She completed her BA at EIU in 2009, with a major in History with Teacher Certification and endorsements in English/Language Arts and Middle Level Education. She is currently in her last semester of graduate school. She wrote "Coffeehouse Crime in the Long Eighteenth Century (With an Examination of the Years 1690-1730 and 1790-1799)" for Dr. Newton Key's summer 2013 Crime and Punishment in Early Modern London graduate seminar.

¹ Map from "Cary's New and Accurate Plan of London and Westminster the Borough of Southwark and parts Adjacent: viz. Kensington, Chelsea, Islington, Hackney, Walworth, Newington," Map and Plan Collection Online, last modified 1, May 2013, accessed 30 July, 2013, <http://mapco.net/cary1795/cary.htm>

² Story of John Frost found in John Barrell, "Coffeehouse Politicians," *Journal of British Studies* 43, no. 2 (April 2004): 206-210.

The anecdote of John Frost and his charge for sedition demonstrates the contemporary fear as well as historians' assumptions about the seditious nature of coffeehouse conversations in early modern London. After the emergence of the coffeehouse in London during the 1650s, Londoners recognized coffeehouses as centers that sanctioned political and religious debates, news sharing, and communication via broadsides, mercuries, and advertisements. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, coffeehouse popularity exploded; however, because Londoners frequented coffeehouses for political and religious conversation, the government's agitation concerning the connections between coffeehouses and sedition intensified, as evident in the case of John Frost. The most eminent government-supported coffeehouse intervention occurred in December 1675 when King Charles II issued a Proclamation for the Suppression of Coffeehouses. Although widespread public support for coffeehouses led to the withdrawal of this proclamation, the government continued regulating coffeehouses in order to suppress any perceived threats against the government.³ Historians have pointed to sedition as the archetypal coffeehouse crime. This paper does not seek to discount cases like that of Frost, but it does seek to evaluate their typicality by examining the range of criminal activity associated with the coffeehouse at the beginning and the end of the 18th century, specifically between 1690 and 1730 and then between 1790 and 1799.

Historians of coffeehouse culture in early modern London have examined a number of different issues; however, most strongly focus their attention on the relationship between coffeehouses, sedition, and monarchical intervention. Lawrence Klein, an eighteenth century British historian at Emmanuel College, states that "in its early decades the coffeehouse had an overwhelmingly bad press," due to its ill-reputed portrayal as a center for sedition.⁴ In affirmation, David Cressy, a social historian on early modern

³ Robert O. Bucholz and Joseph P. Ward, *London: A Social and Cultural History, 1550-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 194-195.

⁴ Lawrence E. Klein, "Coffeehouse Civility, 1660-1714: An Aspect of Post-Courtly Culture in England," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (1996): 32.

England at Ohio State University, and Steve Pincus, a seventeenth and eighteenth century British and European history professor at Yale University, link the seventeenth century coffeehouse's reputation to government scrutiny. As early as 1666, the Earl of Clarendon believed coffeehouses allowed, "the foulest imputations [to be] laid upon the government"; furthermore, the Earl believed that Londoners exploited the coffeehouse as an arena in which to speak freely on all matters, without consequence.⁵ Eventually, by 1675, the government enacted measures of reform, as Brian Cowan, associate history professor at McGill University, states:

As the numbers of coffeehouses in the Stuart kingdoms grew...they began to look suspiciously like centres for the 'spreading of false news, and licentious talking of matters of state and government' and Charles II's Restoration regime began to consider various means for either suppressing the coffeehouses or at least regulating the discussion of political matter within them.⁶

Historians of coffeehouse culture in the latter half of the eighteenth century focus on the effects of government intervention on the coffeehouse and on Londoners. John Barrell, an English professor at the Centre for Eighteenth Century Studies at the University of York, discovered that the suspicious activities authorities associated with London's coffeehouses throughout the eighteenth century compelled the government to plant and conceal spies in coffeehouses, in order to monitor the conversations of patrons.⁷ Barrell asserts that government suppression led coffeehouse patrons to seek more private avenues for discussion and debate. "By the third quarter of the century...the coffee house declined...both in numbers and importance."⁸

⁵ David Cressy, *Dangerous Talk: Scandalous, Seditious, and Treasonable Speech in Pre-Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 210.

⁶ Brian Cowan, "Publicity and Privacy in the History of the British Coffeehouse," *History Compass* 5, no. 4 (2007): 1185.

⁷ Barrell, "Coffee- House Politicians," 228.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 212.

Batts

1. **John Ewers, Royal Offences > seditious libel, 27th May 1691.**

... proved. That he shewed it to one Mr. Sparkes in a **Coffee** House, which he Testified in Court against the Prisoner: and the Prisoner made no material Defence, so he was found Guilty , and Fined 200 Marks , to That he shewed it to one Mr. Sparkes in a **Coffee House**, which he Testified in Court against the Prisoner: and the Prisoner made no material Defence, so he was found Guilty , and Fined 200 Marks , to find ...
2. **Leonard Po-Jenner, Royal Offences > seditious libel; Attbut Remington, Royal Offences > seditious libel, 31st May 1693.**

... nt . The Witness swore, that he being at Clench's **Coffee** house in Mitre Court , in November last, when the Parliament first sate, comes Mr. Jenner, and pull'd out the Libel, and askit him if he had seen it, e Witness swore, that he being at Clench's **Coffee house** in Mitre Court , in November last, when the Parliament first sate, comes Mr. Jenner, and pull'd out the Libel, and askit him if he had seen it, and ga ...
3. **Thomas Brayne, Royal Offences > seditious libel, 5th April 1769.**

... onest man. William Macock . I am a servant at the **coffee** house in St. Paul's church yard. I was servant to Mr. More the time the prisoner was. Mr. More told me the prisoner's wages were 14 s a week. Mr. Mor an. William Macock . I am a servant at the **coffee house** in St. Paul's church yard. I was servant to Mr. More the time the prisoner was. Mr. More told me the prisoner's wages were 14 s a week. Mr. More came ...
2. **William Spencely, Royal Offences > seditious words, 26th April 1693.**

... words were spoken in the Prisoners House, being a **Coffee** house near Wild house, on the first of May last, and that the Prisoner had a Commission to Act in carrying on the design, and that there were 36 Batt o England; the words were spoken in the Prisoners **House**, being a **Coffee** house near Wild house, on the first of May last, and that the Prisoner had a Commission to Act in carrying on the design, and that th ...
3. **WILLIAM HUDSON, Royal Offences > seditious words, 4th December 1793.**

... at Glasgow, in Scotland. Q. Was you in the London **coffee** house of the evening of the 30th of September last? Yes. Q. Did you see Mr. Hudson and Mr. Pigot there? I did. Q. About what time did you first obser gow, in Scotland. Q. Was you in the London **coffee house** of the evening of the 30th of September last? Yes. Q. Did you see Mr. Hudson and Mr. Pigot there? I did. Q. About what time did you first observe the ...

An extensive research of the records of Old Bailey online is useful in researching seditious indictments due to libel or spoken word that occurred in seventeenth and eighteenth century London coffeehouses. In my investigation of Old Bailey's online records, I looked for the following: 1.) How often did late seventeenth and early eighteenth century governments indict Londoners for seditious in coffeehouses?, 2.) What other crimes occurred in coffeehouses during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?, 3.) What can the records of coffeehouse crime suggest about London during this time period?, and 4.) Did coffeehouse crime indictments decrease by the 1790s, perhaps verifying Barrell's statement regarding coffeehouse decline by this time?

An Old Bailey search between the years 1675 and 1800 with the keyword “coffee house,” and the offenses of “seditious libel” and “seditious words” only produces five seditious cases with six individuals indicted. Furthermore, exactly 50% of these indictments resulted in the verdict “not guilty.” The amount of evidence necessary in convicting an individual of seditious libel proved difficult for authorities. This perhaps accounted for the lack of actual indictments despite the fact that literature on the subject suggests that coffeehouses posed a serious threat to the government. For example, attestants in the case of William Spencely, indicted for speaking seditious words in the Prisoner’s Coffeehouse in 1693, testified that Spencely said “that there were 60000 Armed men that were to come with the Late King James to make a Descent into England;” however, the jurors exonerated Mr. Spencely, believing that “the Evidence was not very positive.”⁹ In a similar case, that of Leonard Po-Jenner and Attbutt Remington, both Po-Jenner and Remington were indicted for the royal offense of seditious libel at Clench’s Coffeehouse in Mitre Court in 1693. The jury again absolved the case due to insufficient evidence.¹⁰

On the other hand, in the case of William Hudson, indicted for the royal offense of speaking seditious words at the New London Coffeehouse in 1793, four witnesses testified, including the coffeehouse owner. The attestants affirmed that Hudson proposed several toasts in favor of monarchical abrogation and expressed admiration in favor of the French Revolution. The evidence against Hudson led to numerous punishments, including “two years in Newgate [prison], fined 2001...and two sureties in 1001 each, and to be imprisoned til the fine [was] paid.”¹¹ The details of this case demonstrates the harsh penalties imposed on

⁹ *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 02 August 2013), April 1693, trial of William Spencely (t16930426-84).

¹⁰ Map 2 : “Hollar’s ‘Exact Surveigh’ of the City of London, 1667”, *Leake’s survey of the city after the Great Fire of 1666: Engraved by W. Hollar, 1667*, British History Online, last modified 2013, accessed 2 August, 2013, <http://www.britishhistory.ac.uk/lmap.aspx?compid=16597&pubid=58&currbuff=2&slice=383&root=30&buffer=2&x=410&y=305>

¹¹ *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 02 August 2013), December 1793, trial of William Hudson (t17931204-54).

individuals accused of government insurrection; however, an Old Bailey search actually reveals very little about early modern London coffeehouses and sedition as “sedition” is rarely listed in case records. Therefore, a more extensive search of all crimes in coffeehouses, not just sedition, proves necessary in order to determine whether coffeehouses served as centers of crime, whether the authorities had justifiable reasons for monitoring the coffeehouse, and to determine whether or not coffeehouse popularity declined by the late eighteenth century.

In order to examine crime in coffeehouses, I searched Old Bailey online with the keyword “coffee house” with all verdicts and all offenses between 1690 and 1730. This time-frame allows for an appraisal of crime in London’s coffeehouses during both the Stuart and Hanoverian regimes, but also during the years of most active government intervention, as indicated by the secondary literature on London coffeehouse culture. Furthermore, this forty year period evaluates what many historians consider the “golden age of the coffeehouse,” designated as the years between 1689 and 1713.¹² Historians, such as Barrell, consider it necessary to examine coffeehouse crime during the 1790s, due to the perceived decline of the coffeehouse at this time; therefore, I also searched Old Bailey records with the keyword “coffee house,” with all crimes and verdicts between the years 1790 and 1799. As Cressy asserts, an examination of this decade proved beneficial; in 1789 the Hanoverian ruling class became anxious and concerned about sedition in the coffeehouse due to the French Revolution. Hence, the government kept a more watchful eye on coffeehouses and the activities occurring inside during this time, as demonstrated by King George III and his issuance of a 1792 proclamation which targeted “all wicked and seditious writing...printed, published, and industriously dispersed.”¹³ These time periods, 1690-1730 and 1790-1799, allow for an examination of London’s coffeehouses during the same time period as the secondary sources reflected in this paper. Pincus, Klein and Cressy research the coffeehouse

¹² Bucholz, *London*, 195.

¹³ Cressy, *Dangerous Talk*, 244.

during the late Stuart regime (roughly 1660- 1714), and Barrell and Cowan examine London's coffeehouses during the 1790s. Although these two time frames do not allow for an inspection of coffeehouse crime in the mid-eighteenth century, a noticeable decline or increase in crime from the first time frame to the second can suggest a number of trends.

An examination of Table 1¹⁴ demonstrates a number of trends pertaining to coffeehouse crime in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. First, four indictments for seditious libel and one for seditious words occurred in the 1690-1730 time period; no indictments for seditious libel and one for seditious words occurred in the 1790- 1799 time period. Therefore, despite the secondary literature's insistence on linking coffeehouses and sedition, indictments for seditious libel and/or words were actually quite rare in early modern London, especially in comparison to other crimes. Also, as previously stated, half of the sedition indictments resulted in "not guilty" verdicts due to a lack of evidence needed for conviction. On the other hand, theft in coffeehouses occurred with more frequency than sedition during both time periods. Table 2 illustrates the different types of theft that occurred during both timeframes, and Table 3 defines these different categories of theft.

As illustrated in Table 2, of the four types of theft that occurred in coffeehouses during the 1690-1730 and 1790-1799 timeframes, grand larceny occurred most frequently, accounting for 60% of thefts between 1690 and 1730 and for 83% of thefts between 1790 and 1799. Theft from a specified place accounted for 30% of thefts during the 1690- 1730 time period, and roughly 6% of thefts during the 1790s. Jurors had difficulty distinguishing between grand larceny and theft from a specified place when deliberating a coffeehouse theft case. Numerous Old Bailey proceedings suggest that coffeehouses in early modern London often furnished a set of rooms, either in the back of the coffeehouse or upstairs, for lodging purposes. Most coffeehouse thefts categorized as "theft from a specified place" involved an individual stealing items from the lodging areas of coffeehouses, as in the

¹⁴ Tables 1-3 are found at the end of this article.

example of Lionell Lias in 1730. John Shotan testified that, while dining downstairs in Rudd's coffeehouse, "a Jew [Lias] came in," trespassed upon his lodging area, and stole his sword.¹⁵ On the other hand, thefts categorized as "grand larceny" were defined as the stealing of property from patrons, such as a cloak or shawl, while in the dining area of the coffeehouse, or as the theft of property, such as a silver spoon, from the coffeehouse owner. For example, in the trial of Edward Haycock, several patrons inside the Turk's Head Coffeehouse, in addition to the waiter, testified that Haycock stole the silver spoon served with his soup and left a pewter one in its place.¹⁶

Lesser theft crimes that led to conviction during both time periods, represented in Tables 2 and 3, included pocket-picking and burglary. The courts rarely prosecuted individuals for pocket-picking, as evident in Table 2, most likely due to the difficulty the victim had in discerning which individual in the bustling coffeehouse committed the crime, once the victim even realized the offense. In the trial of Grace Prior, the keeper of the Prisoner's Coffeehouse, a patron, Lewis Clifton, claimed that Prior overserved him, offered him lodging, and stole all the silver from his pocket while in his inebriated state. The court most likely found Clifton's testimony weak, as his inebriated state clouded his memory and judgment, and the jury found Prior "not guilty," deeming her coffeehouse "of no ill Repute."¹⁷ In seventeenth and eighteenth century English courts, an individual's status "of ill repute" or "of no ill repute" weighed heavily in the court's conviction. Courts most likely considered citizens of good reputation as being incapable of committing such illegalities, as illustrated in the trial of Grace Prior. Similar to pocket-picking, burglary, which entails breaking and entering, specifically during the nighttime with the intent to steal, also proved difficult for the

¹⁵ *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 02 August 2013), January 1730, trial of Lionell Lias (t17300116-23).

¹⁶ *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 02 August 2013), April 1786, trial of Edward Haycock (t17860426-109).

¹⁷ *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 03 August 2013), October 1715, trial of Grace Prior Lewis Clifton (t17151012-47).

courts to convict. In the single coffeehouse burglary case recorded during these two time periods, Peter Hough entered the St. Paul's Coffeehouse in St. Paul's Church Yard around two in the morning.¹⁸ The prosecutor claimed that Hough removed several serving utensils from the establishment, including numerous spoons, ladles, and strainers.¹⁹ Hough's guilty verdict rested on the fact that the prosecutor was adequately able to prove, despite the dark environment, that Hough was in fact the individual who entered the coffeehouse and pocketed the aforementioned items.

While tables 1 and 2 demonstrate the criminal activities that took place inside coffeehouse walls, historians can also use the tables in order to determine whether London's coffeehouses entered a period of decline in the late eighteenth century, a topic of much debate, as demonstrated in the historiography of coffeehouse culture in London. Barrell and Cressy assert that coffeehouse popularity declined throughout the mid-late eighteenth century; Londoners infrequently visited coffeehouses due to the fear of government-subsidized spies and informers consigned to the coffeehouses. Perhaps then, a dramatic decrease in coffeehouse crime throughout the eighteenth century can demonstrate a decrease in coffeehouse patronage. However, according to Tables 1 and 2 more crime occurred in coffeehouses in the ten-year period from 1790-1799 than in the forty year period between 1690 and 1730. Twenty-five cases of coffeehouse crimes were recorded in the decade of the 1790s, whereas roughly five to six cases of crime occurred in coffeehouses per decade between 1690 and 1730. Yet, historians must consider the population of London during both time periods before utilizing these numbers to demonstrate an increase or decrease in crime and patronage. By 1690, Gregory King, a British demographer, estimated London's population at 527,000. By 1801, the first modern census of London estimated its

¹⁸ Map 3: "Cary's New and Accurate Plan of London and Westminster the Borough of Southwark and parts Adjacent: viz. Kensington, Chelsea, Islington, Hackney, Walworth, Newington," Map and Plan Collection Online, last modified 1, May 2013, accessed 30 July, 2013, <http://mapco.net/cary1795/cary.htm>.

¹⁹ *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 03 August 2013), September 1795, trial of Peter Hough (t17950916-46).

population at 1,096,784.²⁰ Hence, the increase in crime does not necessarily demonstrate an increase in coffeehouse patronage, but instead demonstrates the exponential growth of London during the eighteenth century. Using these numbers, historians discovered that the crime rate in coffeehouses circa 1690 rested around 9%. By 1790, the crime rate in coffeehouses, despite an increase in actual crimes, only rested around 2%. Perhaps Barrell and Cressy's assertions that the London coffeehouse entered a period of decline in the late eighteenth century holds true. Instead, historians must take other factors into consideration, such as the policing habits of London's authorities at this time or even any changes in the legal framework regarding crimes.



Figure 3: Hogarth, "A Midnight Modern Conversation," 1732

Historians such as Cowan insist that Londoners did not frequent coffeehouses any less by the 1790s than in previous decades, rather "the age of the coffeehouse had ended," only in the sense that "the coffeehouse as a collective conversational experiment was finished."²¹

²⁰ "A Population History of London," The Proceedings of the Old Bailey, London's Central Criminal Court, 1674-1913, last modified April 2013, accessed 16 October, 2013, <http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/static/Population-history-of-london.jsp>.

²¹ Cowan, "Publicity and Privacy in the History of the British Coffeehouse," 1182.

During the 1790s, “coffeehouse politics remained controversial,” often defraying coffeehouse proprietors from hosting political and religious debates.²² Evidence of the transformation of the coffeehouse during the eighteenth century can be found in depictions and images from this time. “Whereas the coffeehouses of the previous century [late Stuart and early Hanoverian periods] were more often than not noted for their gregarious company, the...late Georgian coffeehouses were remarkable for their taciturnity.”²³ As demonstrated in Illustration 1, late seventeenth and early eighteenth century artists portrayed coffeehouses as places of conversation, public news dissemination, disorder, and misconduct.²⁴ Yet, the number of patrons frequenting coffeehouses did not decline by the late eighteenth century, but instead, according to Cowan, coffeehouses transformed from a place of sociability and conversation to a place of tranquility and personal reflection, as demonstrated in Figure 2.²⁵ Perhaps, the crime inside coffeehouses yielded much higher rates in the 1690-1730 time period due to the unrestrained and disorderly nature of the coffeehouse. The more relaxed and placid environment by the 1790s may not have been an ideal atmosphere for criminal activities. In fact, records suggest that by 1739, over 550 coffeehouses lined the streets of London, an increase from 82 coffeehouses in 1663.²⁶ Cowan notes that by 1840, London featured between 1600 and 1800 coffeehouses, demonstrating their continued popularity, despite a perceived decline.

²² Cowan, “Publicity and Privacy in the History of the British Coffeehouse,” 1192.

²³ Cowan, “Publicity and Privacy in the History of the British Coffeehouse,” 1195.

²⁴ Figure 1: Hogarth, “A Midnight Modern Conversation,” 1732 (London: Baldwin, Cradock & Joy, 1822) copper engraving, from http://www.artoftheprint.com/artistpages/hogarth_william_amidnightmodernconversation.htm and http://www.michaelfinney.co.uk/catalogue/category/item/index.cfm?asset_id=5625.

²⁵ Figure 2: Cruickshank, “The Silent Meeting,” etching and engraving with hand colouring, (London: Laurie and Whittle, 12 May 1794), Courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University, found in Cowan, “Publicity and Privacy in the History of British Coffeehouses,” 1196.

²⁶ Bucholz, *London*, 194.



Figure 2 Cruickshank, "The Silent Meeting," 1794.

As Henri Misson stated in his memoirs from the late seventeenth century, coffeehouses were "very numerous in London [and were] extremely (sic) convenient. You have all Manner of News there; You have a good Fire, which you may sit by as long as you please."²⁷ Misson's statement reveals much about coffeehouse culture in early modern London—its popularity and its notoriety as a center for news and conversation. However, due to its reputation, many secondary sources suggest that the government attempted to shutdown coffeehouses or tried to suppress political and religious communication and debate, seeing such activities as harmful and threatening to the monarchy. Furthermore, historians such as Barrell and Cressy assert that coffeehouse popularity declined by the end of the eighteenth century, as Londoners sought new arenas for public conversation and debate due to the threat of spies and informers sent to monitor coffeehouse activities. On the other hand, Cowan argues that coffeehouses retained their popularity throughout the eighteenth century; however, the environment shifted from boisterous and loud to quieter and more reflective in nature, demonstrating the decrease in coffeehouse crime by the turn of the nineteenth century. As evident in Tables 1 and 2, the

²⁷ Henri Misson, *M. Misson's Memoirs and Observations in his Travels over England*, Written originally in French (1698) and translated by Mr. Ozell for D. Browne, etc, (1719), 39-40.

number of coffeehouse crimes increased from the 1690-1720 time period to the 1790-1799 period; yet, when considering the population, the rate of crime in coffeehouses declined from 9% in the 1690-1730 time period to 2% during the last decade of the eighteenth century. Nonetheless, a more extensive survey of Old Bailey and the Newgate proceedings may prove necessary in order to examine London's coffeehouses, crimes occurring within them, and government responses to them. The transformation of the coffeehouse in early modern London will prove a fruitful subject for further research.

<p style="text-align: center;">Coffeehouse Crime During the Long Eighteenth Century With an Examination of the Years 1690-1730 and 1790-1799</p> <p>*Theft-> All includes grand larceny, theft from a specified place, pick-pocketing, and burglary *Numbers reflect "guilty" and "not guilty" verdicts</p>									
Table 1	Royal Offense> Seditious Libel	Royal Offense> Seditious Words	Royal Offenses> Coining	Deception> Fraud	Deception> Forgery	Misc.> Other	Breaking the Peace> Assault	Theft> All*	TOTAL
1690- 1730	4	1	2	1	2	1	1	10	22
1790- 1799	0	1	3	0	3	0	0	18	25

Coffeehouse Theft During the Long Eighteenth Century With An Examination of the Year 1690-1730 and 1790-1799						
Table 2	Theft> Grand Larceny	Theft> Specified Place	Theft> Pocket- Picking	Theft> Burglary	TOTAL	
1690-1730	6	3	1	0	10	
1790-1799	15	1	1	1	18	

Table 3	Coffeehouse Theft Definitions ²⁸
Grand Larceny	“This is the most common offense...It involved the theft of goods of the value of 1 shilling or more but without any aggravating circumstances such as assault, breaking and entering, stealing “privately” or taking from a series of specified locations such as a house.”
Theft from a Specified Place	“Included in this general category are thefts from warehouses, ships, manufactories, churches, lodging houses, and domestic houses (where no breaking and entering took place...This category...also includes removing fixed material from a building.”
Pocket-Picking	“Until 1808, this crime involved “privately” stealing from the person of another, which meant without their knowledge, goods worth more than a shilling...From 1808 the definition of the offense was loosened to include any theft from the person.”
Burglary	“Defined as breaking into a dwelling house at night with intent to commit a felony (normally theft) or actually doing so...”House in this context could also include attacked buildings, shops, and warehouses.”

²⁸ Definitions from “Crimes Tried at the Old Bailey,” Old Bailey Proceedings Online, last modified April 2013, accessed 30 July, 2013, <http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/static/Crimes.jsp#theft>