

Historia Placitorum Coronæ.

THE
HISTORY
OF THE
Pleas of the Crown.

By SIR MATTHEW HALE,
LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COURT OF KING'S BENCH.

PUBLISHED FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS
BY SOLLOME EMLYN, of Lincoln's-Inn, Esq.
FOR THE WITH *
ADDITIONAL NOTES AND REFERENCES TO MODERN CASES CONCERNING THE PLEAS OF THE CROWN.

By GEORGE WILSON, SERJEANT AT LAW.

A NEW EDITION.

AND

AN ABRIDGMENT OF THE STATUTES RELATING TO FELONIES
CONTINUED TO THE PRESENT TIME, WITH NOTES
AND REFERENCES,

By THOMAS DOGHERTY, Esq.
OF CLIFFORD'S-INN.

In Two Volumes.

VOL. I.

London.

Printed by E. Rider, Little-Britain,

FOR K. PAYNE; H. L. GARDNER, W. OTRIDGE, E. AND R. BROOKE AND
J. RILEY, J. BUTTERWORTH, W. CLARKE AND SON, R. FRENCH,
J. GUTHRIE, J. WALKER, J. BAGSTER, AND R. BICKERSTAFF,

1800.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE former Edition of this truly valuable Work, by Mr. SERJEANT WILSON, having been long out of print, induced the Publishers, to send it again to the press. The additional notes and references to modern cases concerning the PLEAS OF THE CROWN, which were inserted in the margin of the former Edition, are placed at the end of each Chapter in the present; and an Abridgment of those Statutes relating to Felonies, which have been enacted since the first publication of the Work, to the present time, is introduced after the Addenda in Notis, at the end of the first volume, in order to prevent any derangement of the original paging.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR JOSEPH JEKYLL, KNT.

MASTER OF THE ROLLS,

And One of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy-
Council,

SIR,

AS it is to you that the Public are indebted for rescuing this valuable work from the obscurity wherein it hath long lain, the preparing of which for the press you were pleased to commit to my care, I thought it became me to inscribe your name on that, to which you are so justly entitled: nor know I any to whom it could with greater propriety be addressed, than to one who bears so near a resemblance to the Author, in those great and good qualities for which he was so deservedly esteemed.

An unblemished integrity and upright conduct in every character of life, whether as a private person, a senator, or judge; a generous frankness and open sincerity in conversation; an unalterable adherence in all stations to the principles of civil and religious liberty, accompanied with a serious regard to true piety and virtue; a firm attachment to our constitution in times of the greatest difficulty and danger; a disinterested zeal for the welfare of mankind, manifested by

THE DEDICATION.

unwearied labours for the public good, uninfluenced by the spirit of a party, or any sinister motive, are excellencies which no less eminently distinguish you than they did the author of this treatise ; and as they procured him such a lasting veneration and esteem, so while the same causes are productive of the same effects, they will in like manner transmit your memory to after-times with honour and renown.

To enlarge upon this subject, how agreeable soever to others, would, I know, be offensive to you, who are more regardful of the approbation of your own mind, than any outward applauses, and while you are intent upon really being and doing good, are no less studious to avoid all ostentatious shews of it. I shall, therefore, only add, that I am,

S I R,

With great respect,

Your Honour's,

Most obedient,

Humble Servant,

SOLLON EMLYN.



THE following treatise being the genuine offspring of that truly learned and worthy judge Sir *Matthew Hale* (a), stands in need of no other recommendation, than what that great and good name will always carry along with it.

Whoever is in the least acquainted with the extensive learning, the solid judgment, the indefatigable labours, and above all the unshaken integrity of the author, cannot but highly esteem whatever comes from so valuable an hand.

Being brought up to the profession of the law, he soon grew eminent in it, discharging his duty therein with great courage and faithfulness; and tho he lived in critical times, when disputes ran so high between king and parliament, as at last broke out into a civil war, yet he engaged in no party, but carried himself with such moderation and evenness of temper, as made him loved and courted by all.

It was this great and universal esteem he was then in, that made *Cromwel* so desirous to have him for one of his judges; which offer he would willingly have declined. Being prest by *Cromwel* to give his reason, he at last plainly told him, that he was not satisfied with the lawfulness of his authority, and therefore scrupled the accepting any commission under it; to which *Cromwel* replied, that since he had got the possession of the government, he was resolved to keep it, and would not be argued out of it; that however it was his desire to rule according to the laws of the land, for which purpose he had pitched upon him as a person proper to be employed in the administration of justice; yet

(a) He was born at *Widderley*, in *Gloucestershire*, Nov. 1, 1609.

Was entered at *Magdalen Hall*, in *Oxford*, in the 17th year of his age.

Admitted of *Lincoln's Inn*, Nov. 8, 1629.

Made a judge of the court of *Common Pleas*, 653. 2

Lord Chief Baron of the Court of *Exchequer*, Nov. 7, 1660.

And at last Lord Chief Justice of the court of *King's Bench*, May 18, 1671.

Which place he resigned Feb. 20, 1675-6.

And died the *Christmas* following, Dec. 25, 1676.

if they would not permit him to govern by red gowns, he was resolved to govern by red coats.

Upon this consideration, as also of the necessity there at all times is, that justice and property should be preserved, he was prevailed with to accept of a judge's place in the court of common-pleas, wherein he behaved with great impartiality, constantly avoiding the being concerned in any state-affairs; and tho for the first two or three circuits he sat indifferently on the plea-side, or the crown-side, yet afterwards he absolutely refused to sit on the crown-side, thinking it the safer course in so dubious a case.

But notwithstanding his dislike to *Cromwel's* government, yet this did not drive him, as it did some others, into the extremes of the contrary party; for upon the restoration, of which he was no inconsiderable promoter, he was not for making a surrender of all, and receiving the king without any restrictions; on the contrary, he thought this an opportunity not to be lost for limiting the prerogative, and cutting off some useless branches, that served only as instruments of oppression; for which purpose he moved, as bishop *Burnet* relates (b), "That a committee might be appointed to look into the propositions that had been made, and the concessions that had been offered by the late king, and from thence to digest such propositions, as they should think fit to be sent over to the king."

This motion was seconded, and tho through general *Monk's* means it failed of success, yet it shewed out author's tender regard for the liberties of the subject, and that he was far from being of a mind with those, who looked on every branch of the prerogative as *jure divino* and indefensible.

But notwithstanding this attempt, which shewed he was not cut out for such compliances, as usually render a man acceptable to a court, yet such was his unblemished character, that it was thought an honour to his majesty's government to advance him first to the station of Lord Chief Baron, and afterwards to that of Lord Chief Justice of the king's Bench; nor indeed could so great a trust be lodged in better hands.

When he was first promoted, the Lord Chancellor *Clarendon*, upon delivering to him his commission, told him, among other things, "That if the king could have found out an honest or fitter man for that employment, he had not advanced him to it, and that he had therefore preferred him, because he knew none that deserved so well (c)."

(b) *Burnet's hist. of own times, Vol. I.*

(c) *Burnet's life of Hal, Edit. 1682: p. 53.*

He behaved in each of these places with such uncorrupt integrity, such impartial justice, such diligence, candor, and affability, as justly drew the chief practice after him, whithersoever he went; he constantly shunned not only the being corrupt, but every thing which had any appearance, or might afford the least suspicion of it; he was sincerely bent on discovering the truth and merits of a cause, and would therefore bear with the meanest counsel, supply the defects of the pleader, and never take it amiss, when summing up the evidence, to be reminded of any circumstance he had omitted; for being in a high degree possessed of that qualification so peculiarly necessary to a judge, I mean patience (without which the most excellent talents may become insignificant), no considerations of his own convenience could prevail with him to hurry over a cause, or dispatch it without a thorough examination; for which reason he made it a rule, especially upon the circuits, to be short and sparing at meals, that he might not either by a full stomach unfit himself for the due discharge of his office, or by a profuse waste of time, be obliged to put off, or precipitate the business that came before him.

He was a great lamenter of the divisions and animosities which raged so fiercely at that time among us, especially about the smaller matters of external ceremonies, which he feared might in the end subvert the fundamentals of all religion: and tho he thought the principles of the non-conformists too narrow and strait-laced, yet he could by no means approve the penal laws which were then made against them; he knew many of them to be sober, peaceable men, who were well affected to the government, and had shewn as much dislike as any to the late usurpation, and therefore he thought they deserved a better treatment; besides, he looked on it as an infringement on the rights of conscience, which ought always to be held sacred and inviolable, and therefore used to say, that the only way to heal our breaches was *a new act of uniformity*; for which purpose he concurred with Lord Keeper *Bridgman* and Bishop *Wilkins*, in setting on foot a scheme for the comprehension of the more moderate dissenters, and an indulgence towards others, and drew the same up into the form of a bill, altho by a vote of the house of commons it was prevented from being laid before the parliament.

Tho by this means he was hindered from obtaining a repeal of those laws, yet could he never be brought to give any countenance to the execution of them. I have heard it credibly related, that once when he was upon the circuit, there happened to be a grand jury, who thought to make a merit of presenting a worthy peaceable non-conformist, that lived in their neighbourhood, upon this occasion our judge

judge could not avoid reprimanding them for their ill-placed zeal, which vented itself this way, while no notice was taken of the prophaneness, drunkenness, and other immoralities, which abounded daily amongst them; in short, he told them, that if they were resolved to persist, he would remove the affair to *Westminster-Hall*, and if he could not then prevail to have a stop put to it, he would resign his place; for he had told the king, when he first accepted it, that if any thing was pressed upon him, which was against his judgment, he would quit his post.

He always retained a serious impression of religion, and in particular was a punctual observer of any vow or engagement he had laid himself under. Having in his younger days on a particular occasion made a vow never to drink an health again, he could never be prevailed on upon any consideration to dispense with it, altho drinking healths was then grown to be the fashionable loyalty of the times.

And thus in every character of life he was a pattern well worthy of imitation: in short, he was a public blessing to the age he lived in, and not to that only, but by his bright and amiable example to succeeding generations; for as a pattern of virtue and goodness will always be a silent, tho sharp reproof to those who deviate from it, so to noble and generous minds it will not fail of being a mighty spur and incentive to the imitation of it, and by that means leave a real and lasting, tho secret, influence, behind it.

As he justly merited the esteem of all, so in particular he has well deserved of the profession of the law, to which he was so shining an ornament; he contributed more by his example to the removal of the vulgar prejudices against them, than any argument whatever could do.

The great Archbishop *Usher* had entertained some prejudices of that kind, but by conversation with our author and the learned *Selden*, he was convinced of his mistake; our author declaring, "That by his acquaintance with them, he believed there were as many honest men among the lawyers proportionably, as among any profession of men in England."

Never was the old monkish maxim, *Bonus Jurista malus Christianus*, more thoroughly confuted, than by his example. He demonstrated by a living argument, how practicable it was to be both an able lawyer and a good christian; indeed he saw nothing in the one that was any way incompatible with the other, nor did he think, that an unaffected piety sat with an ill grace on any, be his station never so high, or his learning never so great; for tho he diligently applied himself to the business of his profession, yet would he never suffer it so to engross his time as to leave no room for matters of a more serious concernment, as may

may appear from the many tracts he has wrote on moral and religious subjects.

For this reason, when he found the decays of nature gaining ground upon him, he could no longer be prevailed with to suspend the resolution he had taken to resign his place; that after the example of that great emperor *Charles V.* he might have an interstice between the business of life and the hour of death (*d*).

No wonder then that one so great, so good, should be loved and esteemed while living, should be revered and admired when dead; no wonder the king should be loth to part with him, who had been such a credit to his government; tho had he held his place some few years longer, such a scene of affairs did then open, as in all likelihood would have greatly distressed him how to behave, as well as the court how to get rid of one, who could not have been removed without great reproach, nor continued without great obstruction to the violent measures that were then pursued.

But it is time to stop, for I mean not to write the history of his life; this would require a volume of itself, and is long ago performed by an able hand (*e*); I shall therefore only subjoin his character, as drawn by that learned prelate, and other eminent contemporaries, by which it will appear, that future times cannot outgo his own in the veneration and esteem they bore him.

The Bishop expresses it in short thus: "That he was one of the greatest patterns this age has afforded, whether in his private deportment as a christian, or in his public employments, either at the bar or on the bench (*f*);" having given it more at large (*g*) in the words of a noble person, whom he styles one of the greatest men of the possession of the law (*h*): "he would never be brought to discourse of public matters in private conversation; but in questions of law, when any young lawyer put a case to him, he was very communicative, especially while he was at the bar: but when he came to the bench, he grew more reserved, and would never suffer his opinion in any case to be known, till he was obliged to declare it judicially; and he concealed his opinion in great cases so carefully, that the rest of the judges in the same court could never perceive it: his reason was, *because every judge ought to give sentence according to his own persuasion and conscience, and not to be swayed by any respect or deference to another man's opinion*: and by this means it happened

(*d*) *Inter vitæ negotia & mortis dism
oporere spatium intercedere.* Strada ac bello
Bellgico, Vol. I. sub annu 1555.
(*e*) Bp. Burnet.

(*f*) p. 218.

(*g*) p. 172.

(*h*) Supposed to be the then earl of
Nottingham.

"sometimes,

“ sometimes, that when all the barons of the Exchequer had delivered
 “ their opinions, and agreed in their reasons and arguments, yet he
 “ coming to speak last, and differing in judgment from them, hath ex-
 “ pressed himself with so much weight and solidity, that the barons have
 “ immediately retracted their votes, and concurred with him. He
 “ hath sat as a judge in all the courts of law, and in two of them as
 “ chief; but still wherever he sat, all business of consequence followed
 “ him, and no man was content to sit down by the judgment of any
 “ court, till the case was brought before him, to see whether he were
 “ of the same mind; and his opinion being once known, men did
 “ readily acquiesce in it; and it was very rarely seen, that any man
 “ attempted to bring it about again; and he that did so, did it upon
 “ great disadvantages, and was always looked upon as a very con-
 “ tentious person; so that what *Cicero* says of *Brutus*, did very often
 “ happen to him, *Etiam quos contra statuit, æquos placatosque dimisit.*

“ Nor did men reverence his judgment and opinion in courts of law
 “ only; but his authority was as great in courts of equity, and the
 “ same respect and submission was paid him there too; and this ap-
 “ peared not only in his own court of equity in the Exchequer-chamber,
 “ but in the Chancery too, for thither he was often called to advise and
 “ assist the lord chancellor, or lord keeper for the time being; and if
 “ the cause were of difficult examination, or intricated and entangled
 “ with variety of settlements, no man ever shewed a more clear and
 “ discerning judgment: if it were of great value, and great persons
 “ interessed in it, no man shewed greater courage and integrity in
 “ laying aside all respect of persons. When he came to deliver his
 “ opinion, he always put his discourse into such a method, that one
 “ part of it gave light to the other; and where the proceedings of
 “ Chancery might prove inconvenient to the subject, he never spared
 “ to observe and reprove them: And from his observations and dis-
 “ courses, the Chancery hath taken occasion to establish many of those
 “ rules by which it governs itself at this day.

“ He did look upon equity as a part of the common law, and one of
 “ the grounds of it; and therefore, as near as he could, he did always
 “ reduce it to certain rules and principles, that men might study it as
 “ a science, and not think the administration of it had any thing arbi-
 “ trary in it. Thus eminent was this man in every station, and into
 “ what course soever he was called, he quickly made it appear, that
 “ he deserved the chief seat there.

“ As great a lawyer as he was, he would never suffer the strictness
 “ of law to prevail against conscience; as great a chancellor as he was,
 “ he would make use of all the niceties and subtilties in law, when it
 “ tended

“tended to support right and equity. But nothing was more admirable
 “in him, than his patience: he did not affect the reputation of quick-
 “ness and dispatch, by a hasty and captious hearing of the counsel: he
 “would bear with the meanest, and gave every man his full scope,
 “thinking it much better to lose time than patience: in summing up
 “of an evidence to a jury, he would always require the bar to inter-
 “rupt him if he did mistake, and to put him in mind of it, if he did for-
 “get the least circumstance: some judges have been disturbed at this as
 “a rudeness, which he always looked upon as a service and respect
 “done to him.

“His whole life was nothing else but a continual course of labour and
 “industry and when he could borrow any time from the public service,
 “it was wholly employed either in philosophical or divine meditations:
 “and even that was a public service too, as it hath proved; for they
 “have occasioned his writing of such treatises as are become the choicest
 “entertainment of wise and good men, and the world hath reason to
 “with that more of them were printed. He that considers the active
 “part of his life, and with what unwearied diligence and application of
 “mind he dispatched all mens business which came under his care,
 “will wonder how he could find any time for contemplation: he that
 “considers again the various studies he past thro, and the many col-
 “lections and observations he hath made, may as justly wonder how he
 “could find any time for action: but no man can wonder at the exemp-
 “lary piety and innocence of such a life so spent as this was, wherein as
 “he was careful to avoid every idle word, so it was manifest he never
 “spent an idle day. They who came far short of this great man, will
 “be apt enough to think that this is a panegyric, which indeed is a
 “history, and but a little part of that history which was with great truth
 “to be related of him. Men who despair of attaining such perfection,
 “are not willing to believe that any man else did ever arrive at such a
 “height.

“He was the greatest lawyer of the age, and might have had what
 “practice he pleased; but tho he did most conscientiously affect the
 “labours of his profession, yet at the same time he despised the gain of
 “it; and of those profits which he would allow himself to receive, he
 “always set apart a tenth penny for the poor, which he ever dispensed
 “with that secrecy, that they who were relieved, seldom or never knew
 “their benefactor. He took more pains to avoid the honours and pre-
 “ferments of the gown, than others do to compass them. His modesty
 “was beyond all example; for where some men who never attained to
 “half his knowledge, have been puffed up with a high conceit of them-
 “selves, and have affected all occasions of raising their own esteem by
 “depreciating

“depreciating other men, he on the contrary was the most obliging man that ever practised. If a young gentleman happened to be retained to argue a point in law, where he was on the contrary side, he would very often mend the objections when he came to repeat them, and always commend the gentleman, if there were room for it; and one good word of his was of more advantage to a young man, than all the favour of the court could be.”

Upon the promotion of lord chief justice *Rainsford*, who succeeded him in that office, the then lord chancellor expressed himself thus: (i) “The vacancy of the seat of the chief justice of this court, and that by a way and means so unusual, as the resignation of him, that lately held it, and this too proceeding from so deplorable a cause as the infirmity of that body, which began to forsake the ablest mind that ever presided here, hath filled the kingdom with lamentations, and given the king many and pensive thoughts how to supply that vacancy again.” And then addressing himself to his successor: “The very labours of the place, and that weight and fatigue of business, which attends it, are no small discouragements; for what shoulders may not justly fear that burden, which made him stoop, that went before you? Yet I confess you have a greater discouragement than the mere burden of your place, and that is the unimitable example of your predecessor. *One-resum est succedere bono principi* was the saying of him in the panegyric, and you will find it so too, that are to succeed such a chief justice, of so indefatigable an industry, so invincible a patience, so exemplary an integrity, and so magnanimous a contempt of worldly things, without which no man can be truly great; and to all this a man that was so absolute a master of the science of the law, and even of the most abstruse and hidden parts of it, that one may truly say of his knowledge of the law, what *St. Austin* said of *St. Hierom's* knowledge in divinity. *Quod Hieronymus nescivit, nullus mortalium unquam scivit.* And therefore the king would not suffer himself to part with so great a man, till he had placed upon him all the marks of bounty and esteem, which his retired and weak condition was capable of.”

To this the new chief justice, speaking of his predecessor, answered in the following words.

“——— A person in whom his eminent virtues and deep learning have long managed a contest for the superiority, which is not decided to this day, nor will it ever be determined, I suppose, which shall get the upper hand: A person that has sat in this court many years, of whose actions there I have been an eye and ear witness; that by the

"greatness of his learning always charmed his auditors to reverence and attention: A person of whom I think I may boldly say, that as former times cannot shew any superior to him, so I am confident succeeding and future time will never shew any equal. These considerations, heightened by what I have heard from your lordship concerning him, made me anxious and doubtful, and put me to a stand how I should succeed so able, so good, and so great a man. It doth very much trouble me, that I, who, in comparison of him, am but like a candle lighted in the sun-shine, or like a glow-worm at mid-day, should succeed so great a person, that is and will be so eminently famous to all posterity; and I must ever wear this motto in my breast to comfort me, and in my actions to excuse me,

"Sequitur, quamvis non passibus æquis."

Mr. Baxter, with whom our author was very intimate towards the latter part of his life, describes him in these words (*k*), "Sir Matthew Hale, that unwearied student, that prudent man, that solid philosopher, that famous lawyer, that pillar and basis of justice, who would not have done an unjust act for any worldly price or motive, the ornament of his majesty's government, and honour of England, the highest faculty of the soul of Westminster-Hall, and pattern to all the reverend and honourable judges; that godly serious practical christian, the lover of goodness and all good men, a lamenter of the clergies selfishness and unfaithfulness and discord, and of the sad divisions following hereupon; an earnest desirer of their reformation, concord, and the church's peace, and of a reformed act of uniformity, as the best and necessary means thereto; that great contemner of the riches, pomp and vanity of the world; that pattern of honest plainness and humility, who while he fled from the honour that pursued him, was yet lord chief justice of the king's-bench, after being long lord chief baron of the Exchequer; living and dying, entring on, using, and voluntarily surrendering his place of judicature with the most universal love, honour and praise, that ever did English subject in this age, or any that just history doth acquaint us with, &c. &c. &c."

Thus far for the author.

As to the work itself, if any of our author's performances might challenge the precedence of the rest, this seems to have the justest claim to it, as being a favourite work, which he often reviewed, and was at vast pains and charge in furnishing himself with proper materials for

(*k*) Baxter's notes on Lord Hale's life, p. 43:

His compassionate concern for the lives and liberties of mankind on the one hand, and for preserving the public peace and tranquility on the other, had possessed him with an opinion of the high importance, that the pleas of the crown, especially those relating to capital offenses, should be reduced to certain rules, and those rules clearly and plainly understood, that so there might be as little room left as possible either for erring in, or perverting of judgment.

It was this led him to make the crown law his principal study, to which he applied himself with great assiduity; for as bishop Burnet speaking of this treatise informs us (1), "It was by much search and long observation he composed that great work concerning it." The same author acquaints us (m), that he had begun his collections relating hereto in the reign of King Charles I. "But after the king was murdered he laid them by; and that they might not fall into ill hands, he hid them behind the wainscotting of his study, for he said, *there was no more occasion to use them, till the king should be again restored to his right*; and so upon his majesty's restoration he took them out, and went on in his design to perfect that great work."

Hence it appears highly probable, that he intended this work for the public, altho the business of his station did not afford him leisure to publish it during his life; however, about four years after his death, the house of Commons took singular notice of it, and thought it a work of such consequence, as to pass a vote (n), desiring his executors to print it; and appointed a committee to take care thereof: but that parliament being soon after dissolved (o), this design dropt.

Some years since there was published a treatise, intituled, *Pleas of the Crown* by Sir Matthew Hale; but this was only a plan of this work, containing little more than the heads or divisions thereof, concerning which the editor in his preface expresses himself thus, "He [our author] hath written a large work upon this subject, intituled, *An History of the Pleas of the Crown*, wherein he shews what the law anciently was in these matters, what alterations have from time to time been made in it, and what it is at this day. He wrote it *on purpose to be printed*, finished it, had it all transcribed *for the press* in his life-time, and had revised part of it after it was transcribed."

It is therefore to be hoped, the publication hereof will not be thought any way to interfere with the direction of his will, *That none of his MSS. should be printed after his death, except such as he should give order for during his life*, his intention for printing it being so apparent, as may well amount to an order for so doing.

(1) p. 90.

(m) b. 39.

(n) Nov. 29, 1680.

(o) Jan. 18, 1680.

Besides,

Besides, as bishop *Burnet* observes (*p*), this prohibitory clause in the will seems in some measure to be revoked by his codicil, wherein he orders, *that if any book of his writing should be printed, then what should be given as a consideration for the copy should be divided, &c.* a kind of implication, that he had left the printing thereof to the discretion of his executors.

The above-mentioned writer further observes (*q*), that his unwillingness to have any of his works printed after his death, proceeded from an apprehension, lest they should undergo any expurgations or interpolations in the licensing them; for *this*, he said, *might in matters of law prove to be of such mischievous consequence, that he was resolved none of his writings should be at the mercy of the licensers.*

But as there is no such thing required by the laws now in being, that reason is at an end, and the reader may be assured, that the edition here offered to the public is printed faithfully from the author's original manuscript.

This manuscript consists of one thick folio volume, all in our author's own hand-writing, from whence it was transcribed in his life-time, and the transcript has since been bound up in seven small volumes in folio.

It had been by him revised as far as *Chap. 27.* in the first part, *viz.* about the middle of the third volume, as appears from many interlineations and additions in his own hand; the corrections in the remaining part are in another (very modern) hand, and in some places not very agreeable to the scope of the argument.

This transcript, therefore, so far as revised and corrected by our author (and no farther), may be deemed the original finished and perfected; but since even in this part there are in some places leaves taken out, and others inserted in their room in a different hand, unauthenticated by our author, and sometimes quite disturbing the coherence and connexion of the discourse, it was not thought warrantable to consider such interpolations as a part of this treatise; for as it cannot be doubted but great regard will be always paid to the performance of so esteemed an author, it is a piece of justice due both to the author and the public, that nothing should be herein inserted, but what is undeniably his, and carries evident marks of being by him intended as part of this work.

The title hereof was named by our author himself *Historia Placitorum Coronæ*; for he intended, as appears from the *Proemium*, to have taken in the whole body of the crown-law, as well in relation to matters civil, as matters criminal; for which purpose he once designed to have added two more books upon this subject, the one concerning offences not

capital, the other touching franchises and liberties; but to the great detriment of the public, neither of these appears ever to have been composed by him; so that, as it now stands, it treats only of offenses capital, which is indeed the most important branch of the crown-law, being what most nearly affects the life and liberty of the subject; besides, in treating hereof, he has unavoidably explained many incidental matters equally applicable to offenses not capital."

The first part of this work relates to the nature of the offenses, viz. the several kinds of *treason, heresy* and *felony*, the second of these, heresy, being an offense of a spiritual nature, of which it was not our author's purpose to treat, was at first wholly omitted by him; but afterwards considering, as I suppose, that by its being circumscribed by act of parliament, viz. 1 *Eliz.* it became an offense of temporal cognizance, he thought proper to insert a chapter upon that head.

The second part relates to the manner of proceeding against offenders; wherein are considered the jurisdiction of the several courts; the manner of apprehending, committing, bailing, and arraigning offenders; their several pleas, bringing them to trial, judgment, and execution.

Having thus given some general account of the author and the work, it will be proper, in the next place, to acquaint the reader with the part I have had in this edition, which has been to supervise the printing thereof, that it be agreeable to our author's manuscript, which being written in a very obscure hand, might, by one wholly unacquainted with the law, have been frequently mistaken.

To make this work the more authentic, the several references herein made to the records have been compared with the originals at the respective offices in the *Tower* and *Westminster*.

I have also carefully examined the several quotations from the year-books, reports, &c. many of which being quoted without folio or page, or else mis-quoted, have with no small trouble been supplied and rectified; for our author, not having always had leisure to consult the books themselves, has frequently copied from the mis-printed quotations in the margin of lord *Coke's* third volume of his *Institutes*.

As it cannot be expected, but in the writing so large a manuscript, some words must, *currente calamo*, have been omitted or wrong written, I have in some few places taken the liberty to add or alter a word or two to preserve the sense; but have been particularly careful to distinguish such addition or alteration within crotchets, that I might not impose my judgment on the reader, but leave him to judge for himself, whether the drift of our author's reasoning do not require it.

I have likewise subjoined a few notes, containing some observations from the records; as also remarking, where the law hath been since explained

explained by later resolutions, or altered by subsequent acts of parliament; but as these acts are sometimes very long, consisting of many clauses, the reader is desired to use the same caution here, which is recommended by our author (r) with regard to those recited in the work itself, viz. "that he rely not barely upon the abstracts thereof here given, but peruse the statutes themselves in the books at large."

I am sensible many slips and omissions must needs have happened in the supervising so large a work of so critical a nature, but hope that will plead my excuse, ~~at~~ least to those, who consider the wide difference between perusing it in a fair print and in a difficult manuscript.

(r) Part I. p. 261.

March 30,
1736.

S. EMLYN.

A

T A B L E

OF

THE SEVERAL CHAPTERS

CONTAINED IN THE

FIRST PART.

Chap. I.	<i>C</i> ONCERNING capital Punishments	Page 1
	Chap. II. <i>Concerning the several incapacities of persons, and their exemptions from penalties by reason thereof</i>	14
	Chap. III. <i>Touching the defect of infancy and non-age</i>	16
	Chap. IV. <i>Concerning the defect of ideocy, madness, and lunacy, in reference to criminal punishments</i>	29
	Chap. V. <i>Concerning casualty and misfortune, how far it excuseth in criminals</i>	38
	Chap. VI. <i>Concerning ignorance, and how far it prevails to excuse in capital crimes</i>	42
	Chap. VII. <i>Touching incapacities or excuses by reason of civil subjection</i>	43
	Chap. VIII. <i>Concerning the civil incapacities by compulsion and fear</i>	49
	Chap. IX. <i>Concerning the privilege by reason of necessity</i>	52
	b 4	Chap. X.

A TABLE OF THE SEVERAL CHAPTERS

Chap. X. <i>Concerning the offense of high treason, the person against whom committed, and the reason of the greatness of the offense; and touching alligiance</i>	Page 58
Chap. XI. <i>Concerning treason at the common law, and their uncertainty</i>	'16
Chap. XII. <i>Touching the statute of 25 E. 3. and the high treasons therein declared</i>	87
Chap. XIII. <i>Touching high treason in compassing the death of the king, queen, or prince</i>	91
Chap. XIV. <i>Concerning levying of war against the king</i>	130
Chap. XV. <i>Concerning treason in adhering to the king's enemies within the land or without</i>	159
Chap. XVI. <i>Concerning treason in counterfeiting the great seal, or privy seal</i>	170
Chap. XVII. <i>Concerning high treason in counterfeiting the king's coin, and in the first place touching the history of the coin and coinage of England</i>	188
Chap. XVIII. <i>Concerning the adulteration or impairing of coin, and the antient means used to remedy it</i>	205
Chap. XIX. <i>Concerning the counterfeiting of the king's coin, what it is, what the penalty thereof antiently, and what at this day</i>	210
Chap. XX. <i>Concerning treason in bringing in false money</i>	225
Chap. XXI. <i>Concerning high treason in killing the chancellor, &c.</i>	230
Chap. XXII. <i>Concerning principals and accessaries in treason</i>	233
Chap. XXIII. <i>Concerning forfeitures by treason</i>	239
Chap. XXIV. <i>Concerning declaring of treasons by parliament, and those treasons that were enacted or declared by parliament between the 25 E. 3. and the 1 Mar.</i>	258
Chap. XXV. <i>Concerning treasons declared and enacted from 1 Mar. till this day, viz. 13 Cap. 2.</i>	307.
Chap. XXVI. <i>Concerning the judgments in high treason, and the particulars relating therunto, and to attainders</i>	342
Chap. XXVII. <i>Touching corruption of blood, and restitution thereof, loss of dower, forfeiture of goods, and execution</i>	354
Chap. XXVIII. <i>Touching the crime of misprision of treason and felony, &c.</i>	371
Chap. XXIX. <i>Concerning petit treason</i>	377
	Chap. XXX.

CONTAINED IN THE FIRST PART.

Chap. XXX. <i>Concerning heresy and apostacy, and the punishments thereof.</i>	Page 383
Chap. XXXI. <i>Concerning homicide and first of self-killing, or felo de se</i>	411
Chap. XXXII. <i>Of deodands</i>	419
Chap. XXXIII. <i>Of homicide, and its several kinds, and first of those considerations, that are applicable as well to murder as to manslaughter</i>	424
Chap. XXXIV. <i>Concerning commanding, counselling, or abetting of murder or manslaughter</i>	435
Chap. XXXV. <i>Concerning the death of a person unknown, and the proceedings thereupon</i>	447
Chap. XXXVI. <i>Touching murder, what it is, and the kinds thereof</i>	449
Chap. XXXVII. <i>Concerning murder by malice implied presumptive, or malice in law</i>	455
Chap. XXXVIII. <i>Of manslaughter, and particularly of manslaughter exempt from clergy by the statute of 1 Jac. cap. 8.</i>	466
Chap. XXXIX. <i>Touching involuntary homicide, and first of chance-medley, or killing per infortunium</i>	471
Chap. XL. <i>Of manslaughter ex necessitate, and first se defendendo</i>	478
Chap. XLI. <i>Concerning the forfeiture of him that kills in his own defence, or per infortunium</i>	492
Chap. XLII. <i>Concerning the taking away of the life of man by the course of law, or in execution of justice</i>	496
Chap. XLIII. <i>Of larciny and its kinds</i>	503
Chap. XLIV. <i>Concerning the diversities of grand larcinies among themselves in relation to clergy</i>	517
Chap. XLV. <i>Concerning petit larciny</i>	530
Chap. XLVI. <i>Of robbery</i>	532
Chap. XLVII. <i>Concerning restitution of goods stolen, and the confiscation of goods omitted in the indictment or the appeal</i>	538
Chap. XLVIII. <i>Of burglary, the kinds and punishments</i>	547
Chap. XLIX. <i>Of arson, or wilful burning of houses</i>	566
Chap. L. <i>Concerning felonies by the common law, relating to the bringing of felons to justice, and the impediments thereof, as escape, breach of prison, and rescue; and first touching arrests</i>	575
Chap. LI. <i>Of felony by voluntary escapes, and touching felony by escapes of felons</i>	590
Chap. LII. <i>Of negligent escapes</i>	600

A TABLE OF THE SEVERAL CHAPTERS, &c.

Chap. LIII. <i>Concerning rescues of prisoners in custody for felony</i>	Page 606
Chap. LIV. <i>Concerning escapes and breach of prison by the party himself, that is imprisoned for felony</i>	607
Chap. LV. <i>Of principals and accessaries in felony, and first of accessaries before the fact</i>	612
Chap. LVI. <i>Of accessaries after the fact</i>	618
Chap. LVII. <i>Concerning the order of proceeding against accessaries</i>	609
Chap. LVIII. <i>Concerning felonies by act of parliament, and first concerning rape</i>	626
Chap. LIX. <i>Concerning the felony de uxore abductâ five raptâ cum bonis viri, super statutum Westm. 2. cap. 34.</i>	637
Chap. LX. <i>Of felony by purveyors taking victuals without warrant</i>	639
Chap. LXI. <i>Concerning the new felonies enacted in the times of E. 2. E. 3. and R. 2.</i>	620
Chap. LXII. <i>Concerning the new felonies enacted in the times of H. 4. H. 5. H. 6. E. 4.</i>	644
Chap. LXIII. <i>Concerning the new felonies enacted in the times of R. 3. H. 7. H. 8. E. 6. and Q. Mary</i>	656
Chap. LXIV. <i>Concerning felonies newly enacted in the time of Q. Elizabeth, K. James, and K. Charles I.</i>	681
<i>Felonies enacted in the times of K. Charles II. K. James II. K. William III. Q. Anne, K. George I. and K. George II.</i>	
Chap. LXV. <i>Certain general observations concerning felonies by act of parliament</i>	703

Felonies enacted since the last edition of this book in the year 1778 728

THE

PROEMIUM.

The METHOD of the WORK intended.

HAVING an intention to make a full collection of the *Pleas of the Crown*, I shall divide those Pleas into two general Tracts.

The *first*, concerning pleas of the crown in matters *criminal*.

The *second*, concerning pleas of the crown in matters *civil*; namely, concerning franchises and liberties.

The former will be the subject of the first and second books, the latter of the third book.

First, therefore, I shall begin with the several kinds of *crimes*, that make up the subject matter of my first and second book.

Crimes that are punishable by the laws of *England*, are for their matter of two kinds,

1. *Ecclesiastical*.

2. *Temporal*.

The *former* of these, namely, such crimes as I call *Ecclesiastical*, are of ecclesiastical cognizance; and though all external jurisdiction, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, is derived from the Crown of *England*, and all criminal proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts, are in some kind *Placita Coronæ* suits for the king, and such as he may pardon or discharge, as being his own suits, yet these I shall not meddle with at this time.

The

THE PROEMIUM TO

The *second sort, viz. Temporal crimes*, which are offenses against the laws of this realm, whether the common law or acts of parliament, are divided into two general ranks or distributions in respect of the punishments that are by law appointed for them, or in respect of their nature or degree: and thus they may be divided into capital offenses, or offenses only criminal; or rather, and more properly, into

Felonies and

Misdemeanors,

because there is no capital offense but hath in it the crime of felony: and yet there be some felonies, that are not in their nature capital, whereof hereafter.

Crimen capitale, or felony, in this acceptation is of two kinds, namely,

That which is complicated, and hath a greater offense joined with it, namely *Treason*, and

That which is simple *Felony*.

Touching the former of these, namely *Treason*, it is that capital offense, which is committed against some special civil obligation, of subjection and faith more than is found in other capital offenses, and therefore it hath the denomination of *proditio*, and the offense is said to be done *proditorie*:

This offense of *Treason* is of two kinds, namely,

That which is against the highest civil obligation, namely, against the king, his crown and dignity, which is called *High-treason*.

Or against some other, to whom a civil obligation of faith is made or implied, which is called *Petit-treason*.

The offenses of high-treason are of two kinds, *viz.*

Such as were treasons by the *common law*, or,

Such as were made so by special *acts of parliament*.

The offenses of simple felony are likewise of the same distribution, namely,

Such as were felonies at *common law*, and,

Such as are by *act of parliament* put into the degree, or under the punishment of felony.

And the same distribution is to be made touching *misdemeanors*, namely they are,

Such as are so by the *common law*, or

Such as are specially made punishable as misdemeanors by *acts of parliament*.

This

HISTORIA PLACITORUM CORONÆ.

This is the general order and distribution of the first and second book of this tractate, namely, concerning the matters of the Pleas of the Crown in criminals; or those crimes, which come under the cognizance of the laws of this kingdom, wherein the prosecution is *pro rege*, or in his name or right; as the common *vindex* of public injuries or crimes.

The particular enumeration of these several offenses is much of the business of those charges, that are given to the grand jury by the justices in their several sessions; and they were for the most part heretofore contained in certain articles or heads of inquiry delivered out in writing to the several inquests, and were often stiled *Capitula Placitorum Coronæ*; such were those of R. 1. mentioned by *Hoveden*, p. 744, 783. which were delivered to the inquisitors in every wappentach or hundred, and to the justices itinerant to make inquiry upon, and by them to the grand inquests; and such were those *Articuli itineris* declared by *Bracton*, *Lib. III. de coronâ, cap. 1.* and printed in the old *Magna Charta* for the justices in eyre to make inquiry upon, which I shall not here repeat at large, but shall take them up as I shall have occasion to use them.

The order which I shall observe in these *Pleas of the Crown* will be this:

I. In the first book I will consider* of capital offenses, *Treason and Felonies*; which book will be divided into two parts:

1. The enumeration of the kinds of treasons and felonies as well by common law, as by acts of parliament.
2. The whole method of proceedings in or upon them.

II. The second book will treat of matters criminal, that are not capital; and,

III. The third book will be touching franchises and liberties (*).

* That which is here offered to the public, is only the first of these books, consisting of two parts; the other two

books having, as I have been credibly informed, never been composed by our author.

HISTORIA PLACITORUM CORONÆ.

PART I.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Capital Punishments.

BEING to treat concerning capital offences, it will not be amiss to premise something touching capital punishments.

Laws, that are introduced by custom, or instituted by the legislative authority for the good of civil societies, would be of little effect, unless they had also their sanctions, imposing penalties upon the offenders of those laws.

These penalties are various according to the several natures of the offenses, or the detriment that comes thereby to civil societies; some are only pecuniary; some corporal, but not capital, such as imprisonment, stigmatizing, banishment, servitude, and the like; others are capital, *ultimum supplicium*, or death; and that death sometimes accompanied with greater, sometimes with less degrees of severity.

So that, altho offenses against the good of human society be many of them prohibited by the laws of God and nature, yet the punishments of all such offenses are not determined by the law of nature to this or that particular kind, but are for the most part, if not altogether left to the positive laws and constitutions of several kingdoms and states.

And therefore, altho most certainly the penalties inflicted by God himself among his ancient people upon the breach of their laws were

with the highest wisdom fitted to that state, and all laws and instituted punishments should come up as near to that pattern, as may be; yet as to the degrees and kinds of punishments of offenses in *foro civili vel judicio* they are not obliging to all other kingdoms or states, but all states, as well christian as heathen, have varied from them.

And therefore it will not be amiss to instance in the various kinds of punishments inflicted by the several laws of several countries, especially in those two offenses of *homicide* and *theft*, which are the most common and obvious offenses in all countries.

By the antientest divine law, that we read, the punishment of homicide was with death. *Gen. ix. 6. Whosoever sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed (a).*

And the judicial law given by *Moses* was pursuant to it, with some temperaments and explanations. *Exod. xxi. 12, 13, 14. He, that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death. And if a man lie not in wait, but God deliver him into his hand; then I will appoint thee a place, whither he shall flee. But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbour to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him away from mine altar, that he may die. And v. 18, 19. And if men strive together, and one smite another with a stone, or with his fist, and he die not, but keepeth his bed; if he rise again, and walk abroad upon his staff, then shall he that smote him, be quit; only he shall pay for the loss of his time, and for his cure.*

And what this delivery by God of a man into his neighbour's hand is, is best expounded *Deut. xix. 4, 5, 6, 11, 12. Whoso killeth his neighbour ignorantly, whom he hated not in time past, As where a man cleaveth wood, and the ax flieeth from the helve, and killeth a man,*

[3] *he shall fly to the city of refuge (b), lest the avenger (c) of blood pursue, and slay him while his heart is hot; whereas he was not worthy of death, in that he hated him not in time past: But if any man hate his neighbour, and lie in wait for him, and rise up against him, and*

(a) This law being given to *Noah*, from whom all men are derived, is not peculiar to the *Israelites*; but, as our author observes below, is binding on all mankind.

(b) Concerning these cities of refuge, see *Exod. xxi. 13. Numb. xxxv. Deut. iv. 41. & seq. Jer. xx. xxi. Selden: de jure naturali, &c. lib. i. cap. 2.*

(c) Who the avenger of blood was, is no where expressed, it is generally supposed that he was the next heir to the

person slain. See *Selden: de jur. nat. Lib. IV. cap. 1. & de successionibus in bona defuncti*; but the truth is, the Hebrew words *Goel ha dam*, here rendered the avenger of blood, should be rendered the next of blood, for *Goel* properly signifies one of the same kindred; it is so rendered *Ruth ii. 20.* and *iii. 9, 12.* and is usually expressed in the Septuagint by *οὐκίστιμος*, which denotes one near of kin.

smite him mortally, that he die, and he flee to one of these cities, the elders of his city shall send and fetch him thence, and deliver him into the hand of the avenger of blood, that he may die (d).

Again; *Exod. xxii. 2.* If a thief be found breaking-up, and be smitten, that he die, there shall no blood be shed for him; if the sun be risen upon him, there shall blood be shed for him; for he should make full restitution; if he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft.

Upon these judicial laws, these things are observable; 1. That by these laws the killing of a man by malice forethought, or upon a sudden falling out, were both under the same punishment of death (e). 2. That the killing of a man by misfortune was not liable to the punishment of death, by the sentence of the judge; but yet [4] the avenger of blood might kill him, before he got to the city of refuge (f) 3. The killing of a thief in the night was not liable to punishment of death; but if it were in the day-time, it was punishable with death. 4. Tho there is no express law touching killing a man in his own defense (g), yet it seems the custom of the Jews, and the

B 2

inter-

(d) If there was no avenger of blood, or if he would not or could not kill the slayer, the slayer was capitally punished by a judicial sentence; and no ransom or recompence was admitted. *Numb. xxxv. 31. Selden: de jur. nat. Lib. IV. cap. 1. in fine*; even tho the person slain should before his death desire that the slayer should be forgiven. *Maimonides More Nevochim, Pars III. c. 41.* for all voluntary homicide was inexcusable, as appears from *Numb. xv. 27. 31.* and the case of David in the matter of *Uriah, Ps. li. 16.* There was one case indeed of capital homicide, wherein a ransom was allowed, viz. If an ox were wont to push with his horn, and it had been testified to his owner, and he had not kept him in, so that he had killed a man or a woman, the owner was to be put to death, he being looked on as the author of the murder, who would not prevent it, when he had warning, and might have done it; however, this being a case of gross negligence, rather than wilful malice, he was permitted to redeem his life by paying the ransom, which was laid upon him. *Exod. xxi. 29, 30.* the price of a servant was thirty shekels of silver. *Ibid. v. 32* and that of a freeman was generally double, viz. sixty shekels. *Maimon. More Nevochim, Pars III. cap. 40.*

This was also felony by the common law of England, for by such sufferance the owner seemed to have a will to kill. *Sam. P. C. 17. Fitz. Cor. 311.*

(e) The law was general, That whoever smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death, *Exod. xxi. 12.* There were indeed

some exceptions from this general law, but, setting aside the case of an house-breaker in the night, they all related to casual involuntary homicides; there is not one exception of a voluntary designed killing, whether sudden or premeditated, whatever interpretations might be afterwards made by the Jewish Rabbis, who made the commandments of God of none effect thro' their traditions, *Matt. xv. 6.* so that there is nothing in the Jewish law to countenance the distinction made by the laws of England between murder and manslaughter; a distinction, which serves to shew, that tho the laws of England be much severer than the other in the case of theft, yet they are much milder in the case of homicide.

(f) Unless he fled to the altar, which was also looked on as a place of refuge, it being probable from *Exod. xxi. 13, 14.* that the altar was the place of refuge before the cities of refuge were appointed. See *Selden: de jur. nat. Lib. IV. cap. 2.* If he did escape to the city of refuge, he was obliged to remain there till the death of the high priest, for the avenger of blood might kill him, wherever he found him out of the borders of the city. *Numb. xxxv. 25—32. Selden: ubi supra & de Synedriis, Lib. II. cap. 7.* But after the death of the high-priest, he was a liberis to go where he would; for upon hereof see *Maimonides More Nevochim, Pars III. cap. 40.* and *Ainsworth's Jews xxxv. 25.*

(g) This was a plain justifiable by the law of nature, that it needed no positive law; however, the permission to kill

interpretation of the *Jewish* doctors, excused that fact from the punishment of death (*h*). 5. That the usual manner of the execution of the sentence of death was stoning, and sometimes strangulation (*i*).

Now I will consider some of the laws of other nations in reference to *homicide*; wherein tho there is a great analogy in many things between the laws of the *Jews*, and the laws of other countries; so that a man may reasonably collect, that these judicial laws of the *Jews* were take up by other nations, as the grand exemplar of their judicial laws; yet in some things they departed from them in the particular constitutions and customs of other countries.

Among the *leges Atticæ* collected by Mr. *Petit*, *Lib. VII. tit. 1.* these were many of the laws concerning homicide.

[5] *Senatus Areopagiticus jus dedit de cæde, aut vulnere, non casu, sed voluntate inflicto; de incendio item, & malo veneno hominis necandi causa dato.*

Thesmothetæ in homicidas animadvertunt.

Si quis hominem sciens morti duit, capital esto.

Qui alium casu fortuito necasset, in annum deportator, donec aliquem è cognatis occisi placarit; revertitor vere peractis sacris & lustrationibus.

Si quis imprudens in certaminibus alium necasset, aut insidiantem aut ignotum in prælio, aut in uxore, vel matre, vel sorore, vel filiâ, vel concubinâ, vel eâ, quam in suis liberis, habet deprehensum, cædis ergo nè exulato.

Si quis alium injuste vim inferentem incontinenti necasset, jure cæsus esto.

Si quis homicidam foro, urbis territorio, publicis certaminibus & sacris Amphictyonicis abstinentem occiderit, aut mortis causam prebuerit, perinde ac si Atheniensem civem necasset, capital esto, & Ephetæ jus dicunt. So that by this law a man conscious to himself of homicide might, before he was apprehended, undertake a voluntary exile, and during such an exile was privileged from the penalty of homicide (*k*).

kill a thief, who should be found breaking up in the night, seems to be an express allowance of killing in one's own defence; for the reason of that law is manifestly founded on the principle of self-preservation. *Ne adversus periculum naturalis ratio permittit defendere. Digest. Lib. 9. Tit. 2. l. 4.*

(b) When a man is in danger of loss of life or chastity; because he is in a state of irreparable. See *Selden. de jure natur. Lib. IV.*

cap. 3. *Maimon. More Newchim, Pars III. cap. 40.*

(i) Sometimes the execution was by burning; as in the case of a priest's daughter, who had played the whore. *Levit. xxi. 9.* Sometimes by decollation, which was the usual way for murder. *Selden: de Synedrivi, Lib. II. cap. 13. De jure natur. Lib. IV. cap. 1.*

(k) This was the case of *Theoclymenus* in *Homer Odyss. o. v. 224, 270. Æ. v. 117.*

Homicidas

Homicidas morte multanto in patria occisi terra, et abducunt, ut lege cautum est; in eos ne serviunt, neve pecuniam (l) exigunt.

Before judgment the kindred of the party slain that prosecuted the man-slayer might compound the offense, and release the offender, but after judgment once given, neither the judge nor prosecutor could remit it (m).

Cædis ne postulator unquam is qui homicidam exultantem & redeuntem quo non licet, in jus ad magistratum rapuerit aut detulerit.

And eodem libro tit. 5. *si nox furtum faxit, si in aliquis occisit, jure cæsus esto*, according to the *Mosaical* law, and from thence [6] transcribed into the *Attic* laws, and from thence by the *Decemviri* into the *Roman* laws of the twelve tables in *totidem verbis*.

Among the *Romans* the laws concerning homicide differed in some things both from the *Jews* and *Greeks*, as appears *Digest. Lib. XLVIII. tit. 8. Ad legem Corneliam de sicariis & veneficiis*.

Qui hominem occiderit punitor non habita differentia cuius conditionis hominem (n) interemit.

Qui hominis occidendi furtive faciendi causâ cum telo ambulaverit (o) qui hominem non occidit sed vulneravit ut occidat, ut homicida damnandus, nam si gladium strinxerit & cum eo percusserit, indubitate occidendi animo admittit, sed si clavi aut cucuma in rixa, quamvis ferro, percusserit, tamen non occidendi animo lenienda pœna ejus, qui in rixa casu magis, quam voluntate, homicidium admittit (p).

But if it were merely by misfortune, it was not punished (q).

Qui stuprum sibi vel suis per vim inferentem occidit, dimittendus est, (r), sed is, qui uxorem in adulterio deprehensam occidit, humiliores loco positus in exilium perpetuum dandus, in aliqua dignitate positus ad tempus relegandus (s).

(l) The Greek word *ἀντίποινα* here rendered *pecuniam*, properly signifies a ransom. *Hom. Iliad. c. v. 18, 20, 23, 95.* for by the ancient law of Greece the punishment of homicide was redeemable by the payment of a sum of money to the relations of the slain, which recompence was term'd *ἀντίποινα* or *πώλη*. *Homer. Iliad. l. v. 628, c. v. 498.*

(m) That this was the meaning of the foregoing law, see *Petit in leges Atticas, Lib. VII. tit. 3. p. 509.* See also the Oration of *Demosthenes* against *Aristocrates*, wherein most of the *Attic* laws relating to homicide are explained.

(n) l. 1. §. 2.

(o) l. 1. pr. & Cod. cod. tit. Lib. IX, tit. 36. l. 7.

(p) l. 1. §. 3.

(q) l. 1. §. 3. c. g. If a man, who was cutting a tree, should without calling out throw down a great branch of it upon one who was passing by, and kill him, he was to be acquitted, that is to say, he was not to be proceeded against criminally by the *lex Cornelia de sicariis*; for so is the expression in l. 7. *ad hujus legis coercionem non pertinet*; but still he was liable by the *lex Aquilia* to make a pecuniary satisfaction for the damage. *Instit. Lib. IV. tit. 3. §. 5.* And tho' that law mentions only the case of killing a slave, yet there lay an *utilis actio* in the case of killing a freeman. See *Noodt ad Leg. Aquil. cap. 2.*

(r) l. 1. §. 4.

(s) l. 1. §. 5.

Furem nocturnum qui occiderit, impune feret, si parcere ei sine periculo suo non potuit (t); which law, tho' like to that of the Jews and

[7] Greeks, the Roman lawyers have construed (u), that it is lawful to kill *furem nocturnum recedentem & fugientem cum rebus, licet se non defendat telo, sed non diurnum, nisi se defendat telo*.

The punishment of homicide, unless it were merely casual, among the Romans was *deportatio in insulas & omnium bonorum ademptio*, *sed solent hodie capite puniri, nisi honestiore loco positi fuerint, ut pœnam legis sustineant*; *humiliores enim solent bestiiis subijci (x)*; *altiores vero deportantur in insulas (y)*.

Some temperaments they added in other cases of homicide, as banishment for five years (z), deportation, &c. but regularly the punishment of homicide, unless in case of simple misfortune (a), or defense of life (b), was death *viz. bestiiis subijciantur*.

Among the Saxons (c) the punishment of homicide was not always, nor for the most part capital; for it might be redeemed by a recompense which went under the name of *Wera* and *Weregild (d)*, which

(t) l. 9.

(u) This was not a meer construction of the Roman lawyers, but is expressly provided by the law of the twelve tables, as appears from *Digest. Lib. IX. tit. 6. ad leg. Aquil. l. 4. §. 1. Cic. pro Milone, cap. 3. A. Gell. Lib. 18. cap. Macrob. Saturnal. Lib. I. cap. 4.* The reason of this distinction between a night-thief and a day-thief, see in *Grot. de jur. bel. ac. pac. Lib. II. cap. 1. §. 12.*

(x) *Dig. Lib. XLVIII. tit. 19. de pœnis. l. 28. §. 15.*

(y) *Dig. ad leg. Cornel. de sicariis l. 16.*

(z) l. 4. §. 1.

(a) *Cod. eod. tit. l. 1.*

(b) *Cod. eod. tit. l. 2. & 3.*

(c) It seems to have been the general practice of most of the northern nations to commute the punishment of the most heinous crimes for a pecuniary mulct. *Lindenbergii Codex Leg. Antiq. Lib. IV. cap. 36. Tacitus* speaking of the ancient Germans says, it was customary among them to punish homicide with a certain number of sheep and oxen, out of which the relations of him that was slain received satisfaction. *Tac. de mor. Germ. cap. 21.* From hence probably our Saxon ancestors brought the custom into Britain.

(d) This *Weregild* or *capitis æstimatio*, according to the laws of *Ethelbert*, was usually 100s. *Leg. Ethelbert. l. 21.* tho' in some particular cases it was more, l. 5. 6. 22. If the slayer escaped, the relations

were to pay half the ordinary *Weregild*, l. 23.

By the laws of *Ina* the *Weregild* was different according to the rank and degree of the person killed, of a man worth 200s. was 30s. of a man worth 600s. was 80s. of a man worth 1200s. was 120s. *Leg. Ina. l. 70.* This rule admitted of some exceptions, l. 34. l. 74.

By the laws of *Alfred*, the bare attempt on the king's life was punished with death, unless the offender redeemed it by the payment of the king's *weregild*: the same law was in case a slave attempted the life of his lord, unless he redeemed it by paying his lord's *weregild*. *Leg. Alfred. l. 4.* the *weregilds* were of the same value, as under *Ina*. *Leg. Alfred. l. 9. l. 26.*

By the league between *Alfred* and *Guthrun*, l. 2. the value of a common person was 200s. the same by the league between *Edward* and *Guthrun* in fine.

By the laws of *Athelstan*, whoever should attempt his lord's life, was to be put to death, and there is no mention made of any ransom. *Leg. Athelstan. l. 4.* but at the end of his laws, and of the *Judicia Civitatis Londoniæ*, there is a particular account of the *weregilds* of all orders and degrees, from the king to the peasant, for which see *Wilkin's Leg. Anglo-Sax. p. 64. p. 71.*

By the laws of *Ethelred*, l. 5. the *weregild* of a common person was increased to 25 pounds. By l. 8. *Gul. Conq. apud Wilkin's, p. 221.* it was twenty pounds.

By

which was a rate set down upon the head of persons of several ranks; and if any of them were killed, the offender was to make good that rate, or *Weregild* or *capitis aestimatio*, to the kindred of the party slain; or, as some think, part to the king, part to the lord of the fee and part to the relations of the party slain; which if he could not do, he was to suffer death (e). *Vide Spelm. in Gloss. ad verba Wera & Weregild.*

This custom continued long, even to the time of *Hen. I.* here in *England*, as appears by his laws in *libro rubro*, *sect. 11.* (f) but shortly after grew obsolete, as being too much contradictory to the divine law (g). *Vide Covarr. Tomo 2 Lib. 11. cap. 9. sect. 2.*

But although the custom of *Weregild* is abrogated here in *England*, and by the laws of this kingdom the punishment of homicide is regularly death (h), as shall hereafter be shewn; yet [9] since there are in *England* two kinds of proceedings in punishing of homicide, the one at the suit of the heir or wife by appeal, the other at the suit of the king by indictment, the capital punishment of the offender may be discharged by all parties interested, namely by the appellant by release, and by the king by his pardon.

By the laws of *Cnut*, whoever should lie in wait for the life of the king, or of his lord, was to suffer death, and forfeit all he had. *Leges Cnuti*, l. 54. Whoever committed a public notorious murder, was likewise to suffer death, without redemption: for in l. 61. *Codes publica & domini proditio* are reckoned amongst the *sceleria inexcusabilia*; but it should seem that common homicide was redeemable; for in l. 6. it is said, *Homicidae inclinent, vel emendent, vel scienter in peccatis moriantur.*

(e) The *weregild* was usually divided into three parts: the first, which was called *Frith bote*, was paid to the king for the loss of his subject; the lord had another for the loss of his man, which was called *Man-bote* and the kin of the slain for their loss had the third part, which was called *Mag-bote*. See *Spelm. life of Alfred*, Book II. §. 11. In the case of killing the king, besides the *weregild*, which was to be paid to the king's relations, there was also another payment called *cynebot* or *cyngild*, to be made to the public for the loss of their king.

(f) And §. 12. see *Wilkin's leges Anglo Sax.* p. 244. But it appears from the same laws, l. 71. *ibid.* p. 267. that a malicious murder, by poison or the like, was *factum mortisgrum nullo modo redimendum*: The genuineness of these laws is justly questioned, for that they not only are in the nature of commentaries rather than laws; but also in l. 5. *Gregory's decretals* are cited, which

were not compiled till fifteen years after the death of *Henry I.* however, they are allowed to be very antient, and to contain the usages of the *Anglo-Saxons*. See *Hickesii Dissert. Epist.* p. 96.

(g) It cannot but seem strange to us at this time of day, that the wilful murder of any one, much more of the king, should be punished only with a pecuniary mulct; to solve this difficulty. Mr. *Rapin* supposes that this commutation was allow'd only in the case of simple homicide; or at most what is now known by the name of manslaughter, but not in the case of a premeditated murder: See *Rapin's Histoire d'Angleterre*, Vol. I. p. 520. This notion is in itself reasonable, and seems to be favoured by l. 4. of *Aethelstan*, and l. 54. of *Cnut*, which makes it capital barely *insidiari regi vel domino*, much more to take away the life of the king or his lord; but on the other hand it seems somewhat hard to suppose, that among so many laws against homicide, they should all be levell'd against casual or sudden killing only, and scarce any against wilful murder.

(h) The offender is to be hanged by the neck till he be dead; and in case he was convicted on an appeal, the antient usage was, that all the relations of the slain should drag him with a long rope to the place of execution. 3 *q. Inst.* 131. *Flouard.* 306. b. 11 *Hen.* 4. 122.

And thus far touching the punishment of homicide.

Now I shall consider somewhat also of the punishment of *theft*, and the various laws and usages concerning the same in several kingdoms and states, and at different times in the same state or kingdom.

By the *Jewish* law, Exod. xxii. 1, 4. *If a man steal an ox or a sheep, and sell or kill it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep: If the theft be found in his hands alive, whether ox, ass, or sheep, he shall restore double; and the like for other goods (i); so that there was no capital punishment in case of theft, though it were accompanied with burglary, as breaking a house, (but men-stealers were punished with death (k); but it seems by the civil constitutions of that state the punishment thereof was sometimes enhanced, at least in some circumstances, sometimes to a seven-fold restitution, Prov. vi. 31, and also to death, 2 Sam. xii. 5. (l)*

Now as to the *Attic* laws: *Samuel Petit de Legibus Atticis, Lib. VII. tit. 5.* gives us an account of their laws concerning theft, in some things differing, in some things agreeing with the *Jewish* laws, *furem*

[10] *cujuscunque modi furti supplicio capitis punito.* This was *Dracon's* law: but it was thought too severe, and therefore *Solon* corrected it (m) *Si furtum factum sit, & quod furto perierat receperit dominus, duplione luito furtum qui fecit & quorum ope consilioque fecit; decuplione vindicator, ni dominus rem furtivam receperit, in nervo quoque habetor dies ipsos quinque totidemque noctes, si heliastæ pronunciārint; pronuncianto autem, cum de pœna illius agitur.*

Si lucri furtum cujus æstimatio sit supra 50 drachmas faxit, ad undecim viros rapitor; si nox furtum faxit, si im aliquis occisit, jure cæsus esto:—Manifestum hujusmodi furtum qui faxit, etiamsi vades dederit, non noxæ factæ sarcitione, sed morte luito. Si quis item ex aliquo gymnasio vestis aut lecythi aut alicujus vel mynimæ rei, aut supellestilis è gymnasio, aut ex balineo, aut è portubus, quod excedat 10 drachmarum æstimationem, furtum faxit, morte luito.

Manifesti faccularii (n) morte luunto.

(i) Exod. xxii. 7, 9. The reason why the restitution of an ox was more than of a sheep is supposed by *Maimonides more Nevochim Par. III. cap. 41.* to be because sheep are more easily guarded against thieves than oxen, who feed at a greater distance one from another.

(k) Exod. xxii. 16.

(l) This passage from the book of *Samuel* does by no means prove what it is brought for, viz. that theft was punishable with death by the *Jewish* law; for the case

there put of taking away a poor man's lamb, was attended with violence and other aggravating circumstances, which provoked king *David* to say, *The man that hath done this shall surely die; and some render the words, Does deserve to die; but at most it only proves the vehemence of David's anger at the man, and not what was the law of the Israelites.*

(m) See *A. Gellium, Lib. XI. cap. 18.* & *Plutarch. in Vita Solonis.*

(n) Βαδαντιορῳαυ, A cut-purse.

Veſticularii (o) manifeſti morte luunto.

Plagiarii (p) manifeſti morte luunto.

In hortos irrupere ſiſcoſque deligere capital eſto (q): So that the quantity of the thing ſtolen, the place, the ſeaſon, the manner and other circumſtances heightened theft into a capital puniſhment, that otherwiſe by *Solon's* laws was only pecuniary and imprisonment (r).

Now as to the *Roman* laws: For a theft that was not *furtum manifeſtum*, there is given *actio in duplum*; but if it were *[11]* *furtum manifeſtum*, *actio in quadruplum* (ſ); *furtum autem manifeſtum eſt, cum fur deprehenditur in furto* (t).

But now as to puniſhments among the *Romans*, there were theſe degrees or orders: I. Capital puniſhments, (*viz ultimum ſupplicium*) (u) which were 1. *Damnatio ad ſuream*. 2. *Vivi crematio*. 3. *Capitis amputatio*. 4. *Damnatio ad feras*. II. Others, that were in the next degree, were 1. *Coercitio ad metalla*. 2. *Deportatio ad inſulas*. III. Others again of a lower allay were, 1. *Relegatio ad tempus vel in perpetuum*. 2. *Datio in publicum opus*. 3. *Fuſtigatio* (x).

I find not among the *Romans* any greater puniſhment of theft, than four-fold reſtitution (y) unleſs in theſe caſes:

1. *Si quis ex metallo principis vel ex monetâ ſacrâ furatus eſt, pœna metalli & exilii punitor* (z).

(o) Ταχυκρητων, A houſe-breaker.

(p) Ἀνδοποδοιοποιος, Sive Plagiarius, iſ eſt, qui ſine vi, dolo malo ſciens abducit homines liberos & ingenuos, vendique pro ſervis, aut ſuppreſſit: vel iſ eſt, qui alienos ſervos abducit ſine vi, & plerumque ſine furto, & fugam perſuadet, aut fugitivos celat. Petit. Comment. ad Lib. VII. tit. 5. de furſis.

(q) But this was a temporary law, made in a time of dearth, when it was thought neceſſary to prohibit the exportation of figs. However, prosecutions of offenders againſt this law ſoon grew odious: from hence all malicious informers were called *Sycophants*. Vide *Athenæi Deipnoſophiſt*. Lib. III. & *Scholiaſt. in Ariſtophanis Plutum* ad v. 31. & 874.

(r) Among the *Lacedæmonians* all manner of theft was permitted, as a practice which tended to inſtruct their youth in the ſtratagems of war. A. Gcl. Lib. XI. cap. 18. It was alſo unpuniſhed among the ancient *Egyptians*. A. Gcl. ubi ſupra. But we learn from *Diodor. Sic.* Lib. I. that it was allow'd only on certain conditions, for it was provided by a law, that whoever was minded to follow the trade of knieving, ſhould firſt enter his name with the captain of the gang, and ſhould bring in all his booty to him, that ſo the right owner might know where to apply for the recovery of his goods, which were re-

ſtored to him on paying the quarter of the value.

(ſ) Inſt. Lib. IV. tit. 6. §. 5. *Digeſt. Lib. XLVII. tit. 2. de furſis*, l. 46. §. 2. Herein the *Roman* law greatly reſembled the *Jewiſh*, with this difference that by the *Jewiſh* law the puniſhment of four-fold was to be inſtead of reſtitution; whereas by the *Roman* law the thing ſtolen was recoverable over and above the *pœna quadrupli*. *Dig. cod. tit. l. 54. §. 3.*

(t) *Dig. cod. tit. l. 2. l. 3. pr.* By this was meant not only if he was taken in the fact, but alſo if he was apprehended with the goods upon him before he had carried them to the place, where they were to remain that night, and answers to the expreſſion in our law, of being taken in the mainour.

(u) *Dig. Lib. XLVIII. tit. 19. de pœnis*, l. 21.

(x) *Dig. cod. tit. l. 28. pr. §. 1. l. 11. §. 3.*

(y) So far were the *Romans* from inſlicting capital puniſhments for theft, that on the contrary it was expreſſly forbidden by *Juſtinian*, that any perſon ſhould be put to death, or ſuffer the loſs of member for theft. *Novel. CXXXIV. cap. ult.*

(z) *Dig. Lib. XLVIII. tit. 13. ad leg. Jul. peculatus*, l. 6. §. 2. *Lib. XLVIII. tit. 19. de pœnis* l. 38.

2. *Grassatores qui cum ferro aggredi & spoliare instituunt, capite puniuntur (a).*

3. *Famosi latrones ad bestias vel furcas damnantur. Digest. de pænis (b).*

If we come to the laws and customs of our own kingdom, we shall find the punishment of theft in several ages to vary according as the offence grew and prevailed more or less (c).

[12] Among the laws of king *Athelstan*, mentioned by *Brampton*, p. 849, 852, 854. *Non parcatur alicui latroni supra 12 annos & supra 12d. quin occidatur (d).* *Edmund* his successor *, *præcepit ne infra 15 annos, vel pro latrocinio infra 12d. occidatur, nisi fugerit, vel se defenderit: Malmfbury* tells us, that in the time of *William I.* theft was punished with castration, and loss of eyes (e); but in the time of *Henry I.* the ancient law, which continues to this day, was *ut si quis in furto vel latrocinio deprehensus fuerit suspenderetur (f).*

(a) *Dig. eod. tit. l. 28. §. 10.*

(b) *Dig. eod. tit. l. 28. §. 15.*

(c) By the laws of *Ethelbert*, if one man stole any thing from another, he was to restore three-fold, besides a fine to the king, l. 9. If he stole any thing from the king, he was to restore nine-fold, l. 4.

By the laws of *Ina* a thief was punished with death, unless he redeemed his life *capitis estimatione l. 12.* which was 60s. l. 7. but if a villain, who had been often accused, should be taken in a theft, he was to have a hand or foot cut off, l. 18.

By the laws of *Alfred* whoever stole a mare with the foal, or a cow with the calf, was to pay 40s. besides the price of the mare or cow, l. 16. Whoever stole any thing out of a church, was to pay the value, and a fine according to the value; and also was to have that hand cut off, which committed the fact, l. 6. If any person committed a theft *die Dominico*, or any other great festival, he was to pay double l. 5.

(d) By the first law of *Athelstan* it was but 8d. *Wilkins leges Anglo-Sax. p. 56.* but afterwards by the laws of the same king, enacted at *London*, and thence called *judicia civitatis Lundonie*, no one was to be put to death for a theft under 12d. *Ibid. p. 65.* But in case the thief fled, or made resistance, then he might be put to death, tho' it were under that value, *Ibid. p. 70.* By the law of *Cnut* theft was punished with death, *Ibid. p. 134. l. 4. and p. 143. l. 61.*

(*) This is a mistake, for no such law is found among the laws of that king, but it is among the later laws of king *Athelstan*,

Vide Judicia Civ. Lond. Wilk. leg. Anglo-Sax. p. 70.

(e) By the laws of *William I.* it was expressly prohibited, that any should be hanged or put to death for any offence, but that his eyes should be pull'd out, his testicles, hands or feet cut off, according to the degree of his crime, l. 67. *apud Wilkins Leg. Anglo-Sax. p. 229. p. 218.*

(f) In former times, tho' the punishment of death was capital, yet the criminal was permitted to redeem his life by a pecuniary ransom; but in the 9th year of *Hen. I.* it was enacted, that whoever was convicted of theft (or any other felony, 3 Co. *Instit.* 53.) should be hanged, and the liberty of redemption was entirely taken away. *Wilk. leg. Anglo-Sax. p. 304.* This law still remains at this day; but considering the alteration in the value of money, the severity of it is much greater now than then, for 12d. would then purchase as much as 40s. will now; and yet a theft above the value of 12d. is still liable to the same punishment; upon which *Sir Hen. Spelman* justly observes, that while all things else have rose in their value and grown dearer, the life of man is become much cheaper. *Spelm. in verbo iuricinium;* from hence that learned author takes occasion to wish, that the ancient tenderness of life were again restored *Iustum certe est, ut colapsa legis æquitas reslaureretur, & ut divine imaginis vebiculum, quod superiores pridem ætates ob gravissima crimina nequaquam tollerent, levioribus hodie ex delictis non perderetur.*

And altho many of the schoolmen and cannonists are of opinion that death ought not to be inflicted for theft (g), yet the necessity of the peace and well ordering of the kingdom hath in all [13] ages, and almost all countries prevailed against that opinion, and annexed death as the punishment of theft, when the offense hath grown very common and accompanied with enormous circumstances, tho in some places more is left herein to the *Arbitrium Judicis* to give the same or a more gentle sentence according to the quality of the offense and offender, than is used in *England*, where the laws are more determinate, and leave as little as may be to the *Arbitrium Judicis*. See the case disputed learnedly by *Covarruvias Tomo 2. Lib. II. cap. 9. §. 7.*

This I have therefore mentioned, that it may appear, that capital punishments are variously appointed for several offenses in all kingdoms and states: and there is a necessity it should be so; for regularly the true, or at least, the principal end of punishments is to deter men from the breach of laws, so that they may not offend, and so not suffer at all; and the inflicting of punishments in most cases is more for example and to prevent evils, than to punish. When offenses grow enormous, frequent and dangerous to a kingdom or state, destructive or highly pernicious to civil societies, and to the great insecurity and danger of the kingdom and its inhabitants, severe punishments, even death itself, is necessary to be annexed to laws in many cases by the prudence of law-givers, tho possibly beyond the single demerit of the offence itself simply consider'd.

Penalties therefore regularly seem to be *juris positivi, & non naturalis*, as to their degrees and applications, and therefore in different ages and states have been set higher or lower according to the exigence of the state and wisdom of the law-giver. Only in the case of murder there seems to be a justice of retaliation, if not *ex lege naturali*, yet at least by a general divine law given to all mankind, *Gen. ix. 6.* [14]

And altho I do not deny but the supreme king of the world may remit the severity of the punishment, as he did to *Cain*, yea and his substitutes

(g) *Scotus Sentent. 4. distinct. 154. quest. 3. Sylveſter in Verbo furtum 3.* Not only the schoolmen and cannonists were of this opinion, but by what has been above said, it appears likewise to have been the sense both of the *Jewish* and *Roman* laws, and the *Arabian*. Our author says, the principal end of punishment is to deter men from offending, yet it will not follow from thence, that it is lawful to deter them at

any rate, and by any means; for even obedience to just laws may be enforced by unlawful methods. *Cic. Epist. 15. Ad Brutum. Est pœnæ modus, sicut reum reliquorum;* and again, *Lib. I de officiis. Est enim ulciscendi & puniendi modus.* Besides, experience might teach us, that capital punishments do not always best answer that end. See *Grot. de jur. bel. & c. Lib. II. cap. 20. §. 12. n. 3;*

sovereign princes may also defer or remit that punishment, or make a commutation of it upon great and weighty circumstances, yet such instances ought to be very rare, and upon great occasions.

In other cases the *lex talionis* in point of punishments seems to be purely *juris positivi*; and altho among the *Jewish* laws we find it instituted *Exod. xxi. 24, 25* *Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe*; yet in as much as the party injur'd is living and capable of another satisfaction of his damage, (which he is not in case of murder) I have heard men greatly read in the *Jewish* lawyers and laws affirm, that these *taliones* among the *Jews* were converted into pecuniary rates and estimates to the party injured, so that in penal proceedings the rate or estimate of the loss of an eye, tooth, hand or foot was allowed to the person injur'd, *viz.* the price of an eye for an eye, and the price of an hand for an hand, &c. (*h*).

[1 See 4 Blackf. Com. ch. i. Of the nature of crimes and punishments.]

(*h*) Maimonides *More Nevochim*, Part III. cap. 41.

CHAP II.

Concerning the several incapacities of persons, and their exemptions from penalties by reason thereof.

MAN is naturally endowed with these two great faculties, understanding and liberty of will, and therefore is a subject properly capable of a law properly so called, and consequently obnoxious to guilt and punishment for the violation of that law, which in respect of these two great faculties he hath a capacity to obey: The consent of

[15] the will is that, which renders human actions either commendable or culpable; as where there is no law, there is no transgression, so regularly where there is no will to commit an offense, there can be no transgression, or just reason to incur the penalty or sanction of that law instituted for the punishment of crimes or offenses. And because the liberty or choice of the will presupposeth an act of the understanding to know the thing or action chosen by the will, it follows that, where there is a total defect of the understanding, there is no free act of the will in the choice of things or actions. But general notions or rules are too extravagant and undeterminate, and cannot

cannot be safely in their latitude applied to all civil actions; and therefore it hath been always the wisdom of states and law-givers to prescribe limits and bounds to these general notions, and to define what persons and actions are exempt from the severity of the general punishments of penal laws in respect of their incapacity or defect of will.

Those incapacities or defects, that the laws, especially the laws of *England*, take notice of to this purpose, are of three kinds:

- I. Natural.
- II. Accidental.
- III. Civil incapacities or defects.

The natural is that of *Infancy*.

The accidental defects are,

- 1. *Dementia*.
- 2. *Casualty*, or *Chance*.
- 3. *Ignorance*.

The civil defects are.

- 1. *Civil Subjection*.
- 2. *Compulsion*.
- 3. *Necessity*.
- 4. *Fear*.

Ordinarily none of these do excuse those persons, that are under them, from civil actions to have a pecuniary recompense for injuries done, as *trespasses*, *batteries*, *woundings*; because such a recompense is not by way of penalty, but a satisfaction for damage done to the party: but in cases of crimes and misdemeanors, where the proceedings against them is *ad pœnam*, the law in some cases, and under certain temperaments takes notice of these defects, and in respect of them relaxeth or abateth the severity of their punishments. [16]

[See 4. Blackf. Com. ch. ii.]

CHAP. III.

Touching the defect of infancy and nonage.

THE laws of *England* have no dependence upon the civil law, nor are governed by it, but are binding by their own authority; yet must it be confessed, the civil laws are very wise and well composed laws, and such as have been found out and settled by wise princes and law-givers, and obtain much in many other kingdoms so far as they are not altered, abrogated, or corrected by the special laws or customs of those kingdoms, and therefore may be of great use to be known, tho they are not to be made the rules of our *English* laws; and therefore tho I shall in some places of this book, and here particularly mention them, yet neither I, nor any else may lay any weigh or stress upon them, either for discovery or exposition of the laws of *England*, farther than by the customs of *England* or Acts of Parliament they are here admitted.

As to this business touching infancy, and how far they are capable of the guilt or punishment for crimes, I will consider, 1. What the civil laws tell us concerning the same. 2. What the common laws of *England* have ordained touching it, and wherein these agree, and wherein they differ touching this matter.

[17] The Civil law distinguishes the ages into several periods as to several purposes.

First, The complete full age as to matters of contract is according to their law twenty-five years (a), but according to the law of *England* twenty-one years (b).

Secondly, But yet before that age, viz. at seventeen years, a man is said to be of full age, to be a procurator (c), or an executor (d); and with that also our law agrees. 5 Co. Rep. Pigot's case (e).

Thirdly. As to matrimonial contracts, the full age of consent in males is fourteen years, and of females twelve (f); till that age

(a) *Institut. Lib. I. tit. 23. De Curatoribus. Dig. Lib. IV. tit. 4. de Minoribus, l. 1. &c.*

(b) *Lit. §. 104. Co. Lit. §. 103.*

(c) *Institut. Lib. I. tit. 6. Quibus ex causis manumittere non licet, §. 5. §. 7. Dig. Lib. III. tit. 1. De Postulando, b. i. §. 3.* At this age it was the custom among the Romans to lay aside the habits of children, and put on the garments of men. Val

Max. Lib. V. cap. 4. §. 4. Sueton. August. cap. 8.

(d) See Savinb. of Wills, par. V. §. 1. n. 6.

(e) It is quoted in Prince's case, 5 Co. Rep. 29. b. Office of Executors, p. 307.

(f) *Instit. Lib. 1. tit. 10. de nuptiis pr. Dig. Lib. XXIII. tit. 2. de ritu nuptiarum, l. 4.*

they are said to be *impuberes* (*g*), and are not bound by matrimonial contracts; and with this also our law agrees (*h*).

Fourthly. As to matter of crimes and criminal punishments, especially that of death, they distinguish the ages into these four ranks.

1. *Ætas pubertatis plena.*
2. *Ætas pubertatis.*
3. *Ætas pubertati proxima.*
4. *Infantia.*

1. *Pubertas plena* is eighteen years (*i*).

2 *Pubertas* generally, in relation to crimes and punishments, [18] is the age of fourteen years and not before (*k*); and it seems as to this purpose there is no difference between the male and female sex; at this age they are supposed to be *solicapaces*, and therefore for crimes altho' capital, committed after this age they shall suffer as persons of full age (*l*); only by the constitutions of some kingdoms, in favour of their age, the ordinary punishments were not inflicted upon such young offenders; as in *Spain*, not unless he were of the age of seventeen years. *Vide Covar. de Matrimonio, cap. 5. §. 8. (m).* In *Relezione ad Clement. cap. Si Furiosus (n).* •By the antient law among the *Jews*, he that was but a day above thirteen years, was, as to criminals adjudged in *virili statu*, but not if under that age (*+*).

3. *Ætas pubertati proxima*, herein there is great difference among the *Roman* lawyers; and tho they make a disparity herein between males and females, yet I think as to point of crimes the measure is the same for both: Some assign this *Ætas pubertati proxima* to ten

(*g*) *Institut. Lib. I. tit. 22. Quibus modis tutela finitur, pr. Dig. Lib. XXVIII. tit. 6. de vulg. & pupil. substitut. l. 2. Macrob. Saturn. Lib. VII. cap. 7.*

(*b*) *Co. Lit. §. 104.* At the same age they were permitted by the civil law to make a Testament. *Digest. Lib. XXVIII. tit. 1. Qui testamenta facere possunt, l. 5. Institut. Lib. II. tit. 12. Quibus non est permittum facere testamentum, §. 1. Cod. Lib. VI. tit. 22. Qui testamenta facere possint, vel. nol. l. 4.* The common law seems not to have determined precisely at what age one may make a testament of a personal estate, it is generally allowed that it may be made at the age of eighteen. *Office of Executors, p. 305. Co. Lit. 89. b.* and some say under, for the common law will not

prohibit the spiritual court in such cases. *Sir Thos. Jones, Rep. 210. 1 Vern. 255. 2 Vern. 469.*

(*i*) *Dig. Lib. I. tit. 7. de adoption. l. 40. §. 1. Institut. cod. tit. §. 4. Dig. Lib. XLII. tit. 1. de re judicat. l. 57. Lib. XXXIV. tit. 1. De alimentis, l. 14. §. 1.*

(*k*) *Dig. Lib. XXIX. tit. 5. de Senatus-consulto Silianiano, &c. l. 1. §. 32.*

(*l*) *Dig. Lib. IV. tit. 4. de minoribus, l. 37. §. 1. Lib. XLVIII. tit. 5. ad leg. Jul. de adult. l. 36. Cod. Lib. 2. tit. 35. Si adversus delictum, l. 1.*

(*m*) *Tom. 1. p. 157.*

(*n*) *Par. III. §. 5. Tom. 1. p. 558.*

(*+*) *Seld. de Synedr. Lib. II. cap. 13. §. 132.*

years and an half; others to eleven years (o): If they be under the age which they call *Ætas pubertati proxima*, they are presumed *incapaces doli* (p), and therefore regularly not liable to a capital punishment for a capital offense: but this holds not always true; for according to the opinion of very learned civilians, before ten years and a half they may be *doli capaces*, and therefore it must be left *ad arbitrium judicis* upon the circumstances of the case; yet with this caution, *Judex, qui ante illam ætatem arbitrari debet puerum esse proximum pubertati, maximis adducendus est conjecturis, & cautissime id aget, ac tandem raro.* Covarr. ubi supra (q). And with this agrees our law, as shall

[19] be shewed. But if the offender be in *ætate pubertati proximâ*, viz. according to some ten years and an half according to others eleven years old, he is more easily presumed to be *doli capax*, and therefore may suffer as another man, unless by great circumstances it appear, that he is *incapax doli*. But this hath also its temperaments, 1. By express provision of the constitution in *Codice de falsâ Monetâ*: “*Impuberes, si consensu fuerint, nullum sustineant detrimentum, quia*” “*ætates eorum, quid videat ignorat;*” but a penalty is laid upon the tutor (r).

2. Tho’ *ætates pubertati proxima* is regularly presumed *Capax doli*, and so may be guilty of a capital offense.—*Digest. De regulis juris* (s). *Pupillum, qui proximus est pubertati, capacem esse furandi*, yet as it is *in arbitrio judicis* to judge an infant within ten years and an half *capax doli*, as before; so it is *in arbitrio judicis* upon consideration of circumstance to judge one above ten years and a half, nay of twelve, thirteen years, or but a day within fourteen years, to be *incapax doli*, and so privileged from punishment, as appearing upon the circumstances of the fact not yet *constitutus in ætate proximâ pubertati*, or at least not *doli capax*; and with this our law doth in a great measure agree.

3. That if he be above ten years and a half, and appears *doli capax*, yet if under fourteen years, he is not to be punished *pœnâ ordinariâ*, but it may have some relaxation *ex arbitrio judicis* (t). But

(o) The prevailing opinion is, that the males are *pubertati proximi* at ten and an half, and the females at nine and an half, because when they had passed the middle distance between infancy and puberty, they might then be properly said to be *ætatis pubertati proximæ*.

(p) Dig. Lib. XLVII. tit. 12. de sepulchro violato, l. 3. §. 1.

(q) Tom. 1. p. 157.

(r) Lib. IX. tit. 24. l. 4.

(s) Lib. L. tit. 17. l. 111, Lib. XXIX. tit. 5. de Senatusconsulto Siliano, l. 14. Lib. XLIV. tit. 4. de doli mali exceptione, l. 4. §. 26. Instit. Lib. IV. tit. 1. de obligat. quæ ex delicto, §. 18. Dig. Lib. XLVIII. tit. 2. de furtis, l. 23.

(t) Dig. Lib. IV. tit. 4. de minoribus, l. 37. §. In delictis.

altho our law indulges a power to the judge to reprove before or after judgment an infant convict of a capital offense in order to the King's pardon, yet it allows no arbitrary power to the judge to change the punishment that the law inflicts; and thus far for the third age or period, *Ætas pubertati proxima*.

4. The fourth age or period is *infantia*, which lasts till seven years; within this age there can be no guilt of a capital offense; the infant may be chastised by his parents or tutors, but cannot be capitally punished, because he cannot be guilty (*u*); and if indicted for such an offense as is in its nature capital, he must be acquitted; and therefore the severity of the gloss upon the decretal *De delictis puerorum*, cap. 1. (*x*) is justly rejected in this case (*y*); and with this agrees the law of England. [20]

But now let us consider the laws of England more particularly touching the privilege of infancy in relation to crimes and their punishments, and that in relation to two kinds of crimes, 1. Such as are not capital. 2. Such as are capital.

First, As to misdemeanors and offenses that are not capital: in some cases an infant is privileged by his non-age, and herein the privilege is all one, whether he be above the age of fourteen years or under, if he be under one and twenty years; but yet with these differences:

If an infant under the age of twenty-one years be indicted of any misdemeanor, as a riot or battery, he shall not be privileged barely by reason that he is under twenty-one years, but if he be convicted thereof by due trial, he shall be fined and imprisoned; and the reason is, because upon his trial the court *ex officio* ought to consider and examine the circumstances of the fact, whether he was *doli capax*, and had discretion to do the act wherewith he is charged; and the same law is of a *femme covert*. 2. But if the offense charged by the indictment be a mere non-feasance, (unless it be of such a thing as he is bound to by reason of tenure, or the like as to repair a bridge, &c.) (*z*) there in some cases he shall be privileged by his nonage, if under twenty-one, tho above fourteen years, because *Laches* in such a case shall not be imputed to him (*a*).

(u) Dig. Lib. XLVII. tit. 2. de furtis, l. 23.
Lib. XLVIII. tit. 8. ad leg. Cornel. de sicariis l. 12.

(x) Decretal. Lib. V. tit. 23.

(y) Tom. 1. p. 157.

(z) 2 Co. Inst. 703.

(a) B. Saver default, 50. Cro. Jac. 465, 466. Pl. Com. 364. a Co. Lit. 246. b.

36 E. 3. *Affs.* 443. 4 H. 7. 11. *b.* If an infant in *Affise* vouch a record, and fail at the day. he shall not be imprisoned (*b*) nor it seems a *feme covert*. 13 *Affs.* 1. (*c*) and yet the statute of *Westmst.* 2. cap. 25. that gives imprisonment in such a case, is general.

[21] 8 E. 2. *Corone* 395. If *A.* kills *B.* and *C.* & *D.* are present, and do not attach (*d*) the offender, they shall be fined or imprisoned; yet if *C.* were within the age of twenty-one years, he shall not be fined nor imprisoned.

3. Where the corporal punishment is but collateral, and not the direct intention of the proceedings against the infant for his misdemeanor, there, in many cases, the infant under the age of twenty-one shall be spared, tho possibly the punishment be enacted by parliament. 14 *Aff.* 17. (*e*) If an infant of the age of eighteen be convict of a disseisin with force, y^t he shall not be imprisoned. *Vide* 26 *Aff.* 9. 43 E. 3. *Imprisonment* 16. 40 E. 3. 44. *a.* (*f.*) and yet a *feme covert* shall be imprisoned in such case. 16 *Aff.* 7.

If an infant be convict in an action of trespass *vi & armis*, the entry must be *nihil de fine, sed pardonatur, quia infans*; for if a *capiatur* be entred against him, it is error, for it appears judicially to the court, that he was within age when he appears by guardian. *P.* 8. *Jac. B. R. Holbrooke v. Dogley, Croke, n 3.* (*g*); the like law is that he shall not be *in misericordia pro falso clamore* (*h*).

B. Coverture 68. General statutes that give corporal punishment are not to extend to infants, and therefore *Pl. Com.* 364, *a per Walsh*, if an infant be convict in ravishment of ward, he shall not be imprisoned, tho the statute of *Merton cap.* 6. be general in that case (*i*): but this must be understood where it is, as before said, a punishment as it were collateral to the offense, as in the cases before-mentioned: but where a fact is made felony or treason, it extends as well to in-

(b) 2 Co. *Instit.* 414.

(c) *B. Coverture* 35. *Rescit* 87.

(d) The words of the book are *ne leve le main d'attach.*

(e) *F. Imprisonment* 8.

(f) "Et le cause est, pur ceo que la ley entend', que un enfant ne poit my co-
"mistr' bien & mal' ne le quel soit ad-
"vantage pour luy, ou nemy; ne nul folly
"ferre adjudge en un enfant." *Mes.* 12. *H.*
4. 22. *b. Blank* dit. que enfant d'age de 18
ans poit estre disseisor ovc-force & estre
emprison per ceila.

(g) *Cro. Jac.* 274.

(b) *Co. Lit.* 127. *a.* yet this was not a settled point, for 2 E. 3. 5. the court doubted of it; and in 17 E. 3. 75. *b.* and 41 *Affs.* 14. the plaintiffs, tho' infants were amerced *pro falso clamore*; but tho they were amerced, yet it appears from the same cases that they were entitled on account of their infancy to a pardon of course. *Sec 1 R. A.* 214.

(i) Another like case is there put, if an infant be a receiver and account before auditors, and be found in arrears, the auditors cannot commit him to prison notwithstanding the general words of the statute of *W.* 2. cap. 11.

fants, if above fourteen years (*k*), as to others, as shall be said. And this appears by several acts of parliament, and particularly by 1 *Jac. cap. 11. of felony for marrying two wives*, &c. where there is a special exception of marriages within the age of consent, which in females is twelve, in males fourteen years; so that if the marriage were above the age of consent, tho' within the age of twenty-one years, it is not exempted from the penalty.

So by the statute of 21 *H. 8. cap. 7. concerning felony by servants that imbezil their masters goods delivered to them*, there is a special proviso, that it shall not extend to servants under the age of eighteen years, who certainly had been within the penalty, if above the age of discretion, *viz.* fourteen years, tho' under eighteen years, unless a special provision had been to exclude them (*l*).

I come therefore to consider the privilege of infancy in cases of capital offenses and punishments according to the laws of *England*, wherein I shall examine, 1 How the antient law stood. 2 How it stands at this day in relation to infants.

I. As to the antient law :

1. By what has been before said it appears that the Civil law was very uncertain in defining what was that *ætas pubertati proxima*, and consequently such as might subject the offender to capital guilt or punishment; some taking it to be ten years and an half, some eleven years, others more, others less. The laws of *England* therefore, that always affect certainty, determined antiently the *ætas pubertati proxima* to be twelve years for both sexes; under that age none could be regularly guilty of a capital offense, and above that age and under fourteen years, he might or might not be guilty according to the circumstances of the fact that might induce the court and jury to judge him *culpa capax, vel incapax* (*m*).

This appears by the laws of king *Athelstan* mentioned in the first chapter, “ *Non pareatur alicui latroni super 12 annos & supra 12 d. quin occidatur.*” And altho' his successor *Edmund* (*n*) reduced

(*k*) *Co. Lit. 247. b.*

(*l*) The like exception there is in the 12 *Ann. cap. 7.* where apprentices under the age of fifteen years, who shall rob their masters, are excepted out of the act.

(*m*) By the laws of *Ino. l. 9.* an infant of ten years of age might be guilty of being accessory to a theft, and was punished accordingly with servitude. *Wilk. Leg. Anglo-Sax. p. 16.*

(*n*) This is a mistake, for it was not *Edmund* but king *Athelstan* himself, who thinking it a pitiable case that a youth but twelve years old should be put to death, as was permitted by the former law, changed the time from twelve years to fifteen, and ordered that none who was but fifteen years of age should be put to death, unless he resisted or fled; if he surrendered himself, he was only to be imprisoned until some of his relations or friends would

(n) reduced it to fifteen years, unless he fled, yet it will appear that the standard of twelve years obtained in after ages (o).

2. It appears that an infant of twelve years was compellible to take the oath of allegiance in the leet, and under that age none were to take the oath, or to do suit to the leet. *Bract. Lib. III. (p). cap. 1. (q) Britton, cap. 29. in fine, Calvin's case, 7 Co. Rep. 6. b.* So that at that age, and not before, he was taken notice of by the law to be under the obligation of an oath, and consequently capable of discretion.

3. The ordinary process against capital offenders was and is by *Capias* and *Exigent*, and *Utlary* thereupon; but against an infant under twelve, process of utlary in cases of indictment was not awardable, and if awarded, it was error; but if above that age, that process was awardable; and *Bract. Lib. III. (r) cap. 11. sect. 4 & 5.* gives the reason, "*Minor vero, qui infra ætatem 12 annorum fuerit uilegari non debet, quia ante talem ætatem non est sub lege aliquid nec in decenna;*" and *ibidem cap. 10 sect. 1.* he mentions an old law of king Edward (s), "*Omnis, qui ætatis 12 annorum fuerit, facere debet sacra-*

[24] "*mentum in visu franciplegii, quod nec latro vult esse, nec latroni consentire;*" and *Stamf. Lib. I. cap. 19.* cites out of a book of *Bracton, De Visu Franci plegii, "Quod quilibet duodecim annorum potest feloniam iudicium sustinere,"* which implies also that within that age, regularly at least, he could not be a felon.

4. Again, *T. 32. E. 1. Rot. 32. Eboracum, coram rege. Adam filius Adæ de Arnhalæ captus noctanter in domo Johannis Somere coram rege ductus cognovit, quod furtive cepit, &c. 9s. per preceptum & missionem Richardi Short:*" Richard Short had his clergy, "*Et*

would become security for him *juxta plenam capitis æstimationem, ut semper ab omni malo abstineat*: if he could not get any such security, then he was to take an oath to the same purpose in such manner as the bishop should direct him, and was to remain in servitude pro capitis sui æstimatione; but if after this he should be again guilty then he was to be put to death without any regard to his age. See *Wilk. leges Anglo-Sax. p. 70.*

(o) In the time of king Henry I. the old law of king Athelstan took place, viz. twelve years of age, and 3d. value. *Ibid. p. 259.*

(p) De Corona.

(q) This seems to be a mistake, for cap. 11. sect. 4. for the oath mentioned in cap. 1. was to be taken by knights and others of the age of fifteen years and upwards.

(r) De Corona.

(s) There is no such law extant among those of king Edward, but the law here quoted is a law of *Cnutus, Leg. Cnuti, l. 19.* which is in these words, *Volumus ut quilibet homo 12 annos natus iussurandum præstet se nolle furem esse neque furi consentaneum,* which oath is to the same purpose with that mentioned by *Bracton, Lib. iii. de corona, cap. 1.* to be taken at the age of fifteen; and tho' there be a difference as to the age, yet probably it is the same oath, for it is very easy and natural to mistake xii for xv. See the statute of *Marlbridge, cap. 10 & 25.* and lord Coke's comment thereon, 2 *Inst. 147.* where he takes notice that the old books are misprinted. See also 2 *Instit. 72. Mirror, cap. 1. & 3. Britton, cap. 12.*

"*prædictus Adam commissus fuit custodia mariscalli custodiendi, quia*
infra ætatem; postea habito respectu ad imprisonmentum, quod præ-
dictus Adam habuit, & etiam ad teneram ætatem ejusdem Adæ, eo
quod non est nisi ætatis 12 annorum, qui talis ætatis judicium ferre
non potest, ideo de gratia regis deliberetur, &c." Upon this record
 these things are observable, viz. 1. The court recorded his confes-
 sion; but regularly that ought not to be, for if an infant under the
 age of twenty-one shall confess an indictment, the court in justice
 ought not to record the confession, but put him to plead *not guilty*, or
 at least ought also to have enquired by an inquest of office of the
 truth and circumstances of the fact. 2. That here he was twelve
 years old, and yet judgment spared, and the reason given, *Qui talis*
ætatis judicium ferre non potest. Yet 3. There is somewhat still of
gratia regis interposed, as it seems, in respect he was past the old
 standard of twelve years.

II. But now let us come to the Common law as it stood in after-
 times; for in process of time, especially in and after the reign of king
Edward III. the Common law received a greater perfection, not by
 the change of the Common law, as some have thought, for that could
 not be but by act of parliament; but men grew to greater learning,
 judgment and experience, and rectified the mistakes of former
 ages and judgments, and the law in relation to infants and [25]
 their punishments for capital offenses was and to this day is as
 followeth.

1. It is clear that an infant above fourteen and under twenty-one
 is equally subject to capital punishments, as well as others of full
 age; for it is *præsumptio juris*, that after fourteen years they are
doli capaces, and can discern between good and evil; and if the law
 should not animadvert upon such offenders by reason of their nonage,
 the kingdom would come to confusion. Experience makes us know
 that every day murders, bloodsheds, burglaries, larcenies, burning of
 houses, rapes, clipping and counterfeiting of money, are committed
 by youths above fourteen and under twenty-one; and if they should
 have impunity by the privilege of such their minority, no man's life
 or estate could be safe (1). In my remembrance at *Thetford* a young

(1) Our author's argument concludes very strongly against their escaping with impunity, but loses much of its force when urged in behalf of capital punishments, for there is no necessity that if they be not capitally punished they must therefore go unpunished; so that whatever severity may

be needful in cases of murders and acts of violence, yet in the common instances of larceny and stealing, some other punishment might be found, which might leave room for the reformation of young offenders.

had of sixteen years old was convict for successive wilful burning of three dwelling houses, and in the last of them burning a child to death, and yet had carried the matter so subtilly, that by a false accusation of another person for burning the first house an innocent person was brought in danger, if it had not been strangely discovered: he had judgment to die, and was accordingly executed (u).

Fourteen years of age therefore is the common standard, at which age both males and females are by the law obnoxious to capital punishments for offenses committed by them at any time after that age; and with this agrees *Fitz. N. B.* 202. b. (x) *Co. Litt.* §. 405 (y). *Vide Mr. Dalton's Justice of Peace*, cap. 93. and 104 (z).

[26] 2. An infant under the age of fourteen years and above the age of twelve years is *prima facie* presumed to be *doli capax*, and therefore regularly for a capital offense committed under fourteen years he is not to be convicted or have judgment as a felon, but may be found not guilty.

But tho *prima facie* and in common presumption this be true, yet if it appear to the court and jury that he was *doli capax*, and could discern between good and evil at the time of the offense committed, he may be convicted and undergo judgment and execution of death, tho he hath not attained *annum pubertatis*, viz. fourteen years; tho according to the nature of the offense and circumstances of the case the judge may or may not in discretion reprieve him before or after judgment, in order to the obtaining the king's pardon. 12 *Aff.* 30. *Corone* 118 & 170. *Alice de Waldborough* of the age of thirteen years was burnt by judgment for killing her mistress; and it is there said, that by the antient law none shall be hanged within age which is intended the age of discretion, viz. fourteen years; but before *Spigurnel* an infant within age (a) that had kild his companion, and hid himself (*se mucha*) was presently hanged; for it appeared by his *muching* he could discern between good and evil, and *malitia supplet ætatem*.

25 *E.* 3. 85. *Corone* 129. One within age was found guilty of larceny, and by reason of his nonage judgment was respited, but

(u) At *Abingdon* assizes, Feb. 23, 1629, before *Whitlock* justice, one *John Dean*, an infant between eight and nine years, was indicted, arraigned, and found guilty of burning two barns in the town of *Winifer*; and it appearing upon examination that he had malice, revenge, craft, and cunning,

he had judgment to be hanged, and was hanged accordingly. *MS. Report.*

(x) *N. Edit.* p. 450.

(y) p. 247. b.

(z) The first edition, but in the last edition, cap. 147 and 157.

(a) Ten years old, according to *Fitz. Herbert's Report Corone* 118.

afterwards he was brought to the bar and had his judgment; tho' this book be generally *one within age*, it must be intended within the age of discretion, *viz.* fourteen years, for it was never made a doubt, whether if above that age he might not have judgment.

3. But yet farther, if an infant be above seven years old, and under twelve years, (which according to the ancient law was *Ætas pubertati proxima*) and commit a felony, in this case *prima facie* he is to be judged not guilty, and to be found so, because he is supposed not of discretion to judge between good and evil (*b*); yet even in that case if it appear by strong and pregnant evidence and circumstances, that he had discretion to judge between good and evil, judgment of death may be given against him. 3 H. 7. 1. b. & 12. b. An infant of the age of nine years kild an infant of the like age; he confessed the felony, and upon examination it was found he hid the blood and the body; the justices held he ought to be hanged (*c*).

But in cases of this nature, 1. It is necessary that very strong and pregnant evidence ought to be to convict one of that age, and to make it appear he understood what he did; for if the law require such an evidence where the offender is above twelve, and under fourteen, much more if he were under twelve at the time of the fact committed. 2. The circumstances must be inquired of by the jury, and the infant is not to be convicted upon his confession. 3. It is prudence in such a case even after conviction to respite judgment, or at least execution (*d*); but yet I do not see how the judge can discharge him if he be convicted, but only reprieve him from judgment, and leave him in custody till the king's pleasure be known.

And therefore the book of 35 H. 6. 11. & 12. per Moyle & Billing, "That tho' a jury should find such an infant guilty, the court *ex officio* must discharge him," must be understood either *first* only of a reprieve before judgment, or *secondly* at least, that the jury find the fact, and that he was either within the age of infancy, *viz.* seven years old, or that he did the fact, but was under fourteen, and not of discretion to judge between good and evil; in which case the court *ex officio* ought to discharge him, because it is not felony.

(b) B. Corone 153.

(c) But however they respited the execution that he might get a pardon. F. Corone 57. B. Corone 133. Dalton says that

an infant of eight years of age may commit homicide, and shall be hanged for it. See Dalton's Justice, cap. 147.

(d) Dalt. Justice, p. 505.

4. And lastly, If an infant within age be *infra ætatem infantie*, viz. seven years old, he cannot be guilty of felony (e), whatever circumstances proving discretion may appear; for *ex presumptione juris* he cannot have discretion (f), and no averment shall be received against that presumption: and altho the laws of England, as well as the Civil and Canon law, assign a difference between males and females as to their age of consent to marriage, viz. fourteen to the male, twelve to the female; yet it seems to me, that as to matters of crimes, especially in relation to capital punishments, the females have the same privilege of nonage as the males; and therefore the regular *Ætas pubertatis* in reference to capital crimes and punishments of both is fourteen years, with those various temperaments and exceptions above assigned.

And it is to be observed, that in all cases of infancy, insanity, &c. if a person incapable to commit a felony be indicted by the grand inquest, and thereupon arraigned, the petit jury may either find him generally *not guilty*, or they may find the matter specially, that he committed the fact, but that he was *non compos*, or that he was under the age of fourteen, *scilicet ætatis 13 annorum*, and had not discretion to discern between good and evil, & *non per feloniam*; and thereupon the court gives judgment of acquittal. 21 H. 7. 31. (g). But if a man be arraigned in such a case upon an indictment of murder or manslaughter by the coroner's inquest, there if the party committed the fact, regularly the matter ought to be specially found, because if the jury find the party not guilty, they must inquire how he came by his death, viz. "*Et juratores prædicti quesiti per curiam, quomodo is ad mortem suam devenit, dicunt super sacramentum suum, quod prædictus A. B. die—anno—apud D. dum non fuit compos mentis, or dum fuit infra ætatem discretionis, scilicet 9 annorum, nec scivit discernere inter bonum & malum, prædictum J. S. cum gladio, &c. percussit & ipsum ad tunc & ibidem occidit, sed non ex malitia precogitata, neque per feloniam, vel felleo animo; & sic idem J. S. ad mortem suam devenit.*" But if he be first arraigned,

[29] and acquitted upon the indictment by the grand inquest, and found not guilty, he may plead that acquittal upon his arraignment upon the coroner's inquest, and that will discharge

(e) And yet there is a precedent in the register, fol. 309. b. of a pardon granted to an infant within the age of seven years, who was indicted for homicide: in this

case the Jury found, that he did the fact before he was seven years old.

(f) *Plowd. 19. a.*

(g) *B. Corone 61.*

him; and the petit jury shall inquire farther how the party came by his death.

[4. Blakf. Com. ch. ii. page 22.]

CHAP IV.

- Concerning the defect of ideocy, madness and lunacy, in reference to criminal offenses and punishments.

AND thus far touching that natural defect of *infancy*. Now concerning another sort of defect or incapacity, namely *ideocy*, *madness* and *lunacy*: For tho by the law of *England* no man shall avoid his own act by reason of these defects (*a*), tho his heir or executor may, yet as to capital offenses these have in some cases the advantage of this defect or incapacity (*b*); and this defect comes under the general name of *Dementia*, which is thus distinguished.

I. *Ideocy*, or *fatuity à nativitate vel dementia naturalis*; such a one is described by *Fitzherbert*, who knows not to tell 20s. nor knows who is his father or mother, nor knows his own age; but if he knows letters, or can read by the instruction of another, then he is no ideot. *F. N. B.* 233. *b*. These, tho they may be evidences, yet they are too narrow, and conclude not always; for *ideocy* or not is a question of fact triable by jury, and sometimes by inspection.

II. *Dementia accidentalis, vel adventitia*, which proceeds from several causes; sometimes from the distemper of the humours of the body, as deep melancholy or adust choler; sometimes from the violence of a disease, as a fever or palsy; sometimes from a concussion or hurt of the brain, or its membranes or organs; and as it comes from several causes, so it is of several kinds or degrees; which as to the purpose in hand may be thus distributed: 1. There is a partial insanity of mind; and 2. a total insanity.

The former is either in respect to things *quoad hoc vel illud insanire*; some persons, that have a competent use of reason in respect of some subjects, are yet under a particular *dementia* in respect of some particular discourses, subjects or applications; or else it is partial in

(*a*) For it is said to be a maxim in law, that no man of full age shall be permitted to stultify himself. 4 Co. Rep. 123. *b*. *Beverly's case*, Co Lit. 247. *a*. The reason hereof is, because a man cannot know or

remember what acts he did when he was of non sane memory. 35 Affis. pl. 10. See contra *F. N. B.* p. 449. *Shew. Ca. Parl.* 153. 2 Salk. 576.

(*b*) Co. Lit. 247. *b*. *Plowd.* 19. *a*.

respect of degrees; and this is the condition of very many, especially melancholy persons, who for the most part discover their defect in excessive fears and griefs, and yet are not wholly destitute of the use of reason; and ~~the~~ partial insanity seems not to excuse them in the committing of any offense for its matter capital; for doubtless most persons that are felons of themselves, and others are under a degree of partial insanity, when they commit these offenses: it is very difficult to define the indivisible line that divides perfect and partial insanity; but it must rest upon circumstances duly to be weighed and considered both by the judge and jury, lest on the one side there be a kind of inhumanity towards the defects of human nature, or on the other side too great an indulgence given to great crimes: the best measure that I can think of is this; such a person as labouring under melancholy distempers hath yet ordinarily as great understanding, as ordinarily a child of fourteen years hath, is such a person as may be guilty of treason or felony.

Again, a total alienation of the mind, or perfect madness; this excuseth from the guilt of felony and treason (*d*); *de quibus infra*. This is that, which in my lord Coke's *Pleas of the Crown*, p. 6. is call'd by him absolute madness, and total deprivation of memory.

[31] Again, this accidental *dementia*, whether total or partial, is distinguished into that which is permanent or fixed, and that which is interpolated, and by certain periods and vicissitudes: the former is *phrenesis* or madness; the latter is that, which is usually call'd *lunacy*, for the moon hath a great influence in all diseases of the brain, especially in this kind of *dementia*; such persons commonly in the full and change of the moon, especially about the Equinoxes and summer solstice, are usually in the height of their distemper; and therefore crimes committed by them in such their distempers are under the same judgment as those whereof we have before spoken, namely, according to the measure or degree of their distemper; the person that is absolutely mad for a day, killing a man in that distemper, is equally not guilty, as if he were mad without intermission. But such persons as have their lucid intervals, (which ordinarily happens between the full and change of the moon) in such intervals have ~~usually~~ at least a competent use of reason, and crimes committed by them in these intervals are of the same nature, and subject to the same punishment, as if they had no such deficiency (*e*); nay, the

(*d*) 21 H. 7. 31. 2.

(*e*) F. Corone 324.

alienations and contracts made by them in such intervals are obliging to their heirs and executors (*f*).

Again, this accidental *dementia*, whether temporary or permanent, is either the more dangerous and pernicious, commonly call'd *furor*, *rabies*, *mania*, which commonly ariseth from acute choler, or the violent inflammation of the blood and spirits, which doth not only take away the use of reason, but also superadds to the unhappy state of the patient rage, fury, and tempestuous violence; or else it is such as only takes away the use and exercise of reason, leaving the person otherwise rarely noxious, such as is a deep *delirium*, *stupor*, memory quite lost, the phantasy quite broken, or extremely disordered. And as to criminals these *dementes* are both in the same rank; if they are totally depriv'd of the use of reason, they cannot be guilty ordinarily of capital offenses, for they have not the use of understanding, and act not as reasonable creatures, but their actions are in effect in the condition of brutes (*g*). [32]

III. The third sort of *dementia* is that, which is *dementia affectata*, namely *drunkenness*. This vice doth deprive men of the use of reason, and puts many men into a perfect, but temporary phrenzy; and therefore, according to some Civilians (*h*), such a person committing *homicide* shall not be punished simply for the crime of homicide, but shall suffer for his drunkenness answerable to the nature of the crime occasioned thereby; so that yet the formal cause of his punishment is rather the drunkenness, than the crime committed in it: but by the laws of *England* such a person (*i*) shall have no privilege by this voluntary contracted madness, but shall have the same judgment as if he were in his right senses. *Plowd.* 19. *a. Crompt. Just.* 29. *a.*

But yet there seems to be two allays to be allow'd in this case.

1. That if a person by the unskilfulness of his physician, or by the contrivance of his enemies, eat or drink such a thing as causeth such a temporary or permanent phrenzy, as *aconitum* or *nux vomica*, this puts him into the same condition, in reference to crimes, as any other phrenzy, and equally excuseth him.

2. That altho the *simplex* phrenzy occasion'd immediately by drunkenness excuse not in criminals, yet if by one or more such practices, an *habitual* or fixed phrenzy be caus'd, tho this madness was

(*f*) 4 Co. 125. *a.*

(*g*) *BraB.* 420. *b. F. Coronæ* 193, 351.

(*h*) *Barbolinus* and others. See *Ce-*

varruvius, Tom. 1. p. 557. in *relat.* ad *Clem. Si furiosus. Par.* iii. §. 3. & 4.

(*i*) 4 Co. 125. *a.*

contracted by the vice and will of the party, yet this habitual and fixed phrenzy thereby caus'd puts the man into the same condition in relation to crimes, as if the same were contracted involuntarily at first.

Now touching the trial of this incapacity, and who shall be adjudged in such a degree thereof to excuse from the guilt of capital offenses, this is a matter of great difficulty, partly from the easiness of counterfeiting this disability, when it is to excuse a nocent, and partly from the variety of the degrees of this infirmity, whereof some are sufficient, and some are insufficient to excuse persons in capital offenses.

[33]

Yet the law of *England* hath afforded the best method of trial, that is possible, of this and all other matters of fact, namely by a jury of twelve men all concurring in the same judgment, by the testimony of witnesses *viva voce* in the presence of the judge and jury, and by the inspection and direction of the judge.

There are two sorts of trials of ideocy, madness, or lunacy; the first, in order to the commitment or custody of the person and his estate, which belongs to the king, either to his own use and benefit, as in case of *ideocy*; or to the use of the party, in case of accidental madness or *lunacy*; and in order hereunto there issues a writ (*k*) or commission to the sheriff or escheator, or particular commissioners, both by their own inspection and by inquisition to inquire, and return their inquisition into the Chancery; and thereupon a grant or commitment of the party and his estate ensues; and in case the party or his friends find themselves injured by the finding him a lunatick or ideot, a special writ may issue to bring the party before the chancellor, or before the king to be inspected. *Vide Fitz. N. B. 233 (l).*

But this concerns not the purpose in hand; for whether the party that is supposed to commit a capital offense be thus found an ideot, madman or lunatick, or not, yet if really he be such, he shall have the privilege of his ideocy, lunacy, or madness, to excuse him in capitals.

Secondly therefore, the trial of the incapacity of a party indicted or appealed of a capital offense is, upon his plea of *not guilty*, by the jury upon his arraignment, who are to inquire thereupon touching such incapacity of the prisoner, and whether it be to such a degree, as may excuse him from the guilt of a capital offense (*m*).

(*k*) See *Stamf. Prerog.* 33. *b.* (*l*) *N. Edit.* 517. (*m*) *Savil.* 50. 1. *And.* 107.

In presumption of law every person of the age of discretion is presumed of *sane memory*, unless the contrary be proved; and this holds as well in cases civil as criminal.

Again, if a man be a lunatick, and hath his *vidua intervallo* and this be sufficiently proved, yet the *lunatick* [34] the acts or offenses of such a person to be committed in those intervals, wherein he hath the use of reason, unless by circumstances or evidence it appears they were committed in the time of his distemper; and this also holds in civils as well as in criminals.

And altho in civil cases, he that goes about to allege an act done in the time of lunacy, must strictly prove it so done, yet in criminal cases (where the court is to be thus far of counsel with the prisoner, as, to assist him in matters of law and the true stating of the fact) if a lunatick be indicted of a capital crime, and this appears to the court, the witnesses to prove the fact may and must also be examined, whether the prisoner were under actual lunacy at the time of the offense committed.

A man that is *furdus & mutus a nativitate*, is in presumption of law an idiot, and the rather, because he hath no possibility to understand what is forbidden by law to be done, or under what penalties (*n*): but if it can appear, that he hath the use of understanding, which many of that condition discover by signs to a very great measure, then he may be tried, and suffer judgment and execution, tho great caution is to be used therein (*o*).

I come now to apply what has been said to the various natures of capital crimes.

If a man in his sound memory commits a capital offense, and before his arraignment he becomes absolutely mad, he ought not by law to be arraigned during such his phrenzy, but be remitted to prison until that incapacity be removed; the reason is, because he cannot advisedly plead to the indictment; and this holds as well in cases of treason, as felony, even tho the delinquent in his sound mind were examined, and confessed the offense before his [35] arraignment: and this appears by the statute of 33 H. 8. cap. 20.

(*n*) Vide Leg. Alfredi, l. 14. B. Coronæ 101 & 217.

(*o*) According to 43 Affs. pl. 30. and 2 H. 4. 2. if a prisoner stands mute, it shall be inquired, whether it be wilful or by the act of God; from whence Crompton asers, that if it be by the act of God he

shall not suffer. Crompt. Just. 20. But if one who is both deaf and dumb, may discover by signs that he hath the use of understanding, much more may one, who is only dumb, and consequently may be guilty of felony, *sed quare*, how he shall be arraigned.

which enacted a trial in case of treason after examination in the absence of the party; but this statute stands repeal'd by the statute of 1 & 2 Phil. & Mar. cap. 10. Co. P. C. p. 6. And if such person after his plea, and before his trial, become of *non sane memory*, he shall not be tried; or, if after his trial he becomes of *non sane memory* he shall not receive judgment; or, if after judgment he becomes of *non sane memory*, his execution shall be spared; for were he of sound memory, he might allege somewhat in stay of judgment or execution. Co. P. C. 4 (p).

But because there may be great fraud in this matter, yet if the crime be notorious, as *treason* or *murder*, the judge before such respite of trial or judgment may do well to impanel a jury to enquire *ex officio* touching such insanity, and whether it be real or counterfeit.

If a person of *non sane memory* commit *homicide* during such his insanity, and continue so till the time of his arraignment, such person shall neither be arraigned nor tried, but remitted to gaol, there to remain in expectation of the King's grace to pardon him. 26 Aff. 27. 3 E. 3. Corone 351.

But it seems in such a case it is prudence to swear an inquest *ex officio*, to enquire touching his madness, whether it was feign'd; and thus it was done in the case of 3 E. 3. and in *Somervil's* case, *Anderson's Rep. par. 1. n. 154.* But in case a man in a phrenzy happens by some oversight, or by means of the gaoler to plead to his indictment, and is put upon his trial, and it appears to the court upon his trial, that he is mad, the judge in discretion may discharge the jury of him, and remit him to gaol to be tried after the recovery of his understanding, especially in case any doubt appear upon the evidence touching the guilt of the fact, and this *in favorem vitæ*; and if there be no colour of evidence to prove him guilty, or if there be a pregnant evidence to prove his insanity at the time of the fact committed, then upon the same favour of life and liberty it is fit it should be proceeded in the trial, in order to his acquittal and enlargement.

[36] If a person during his insanity commit *homicide* or *petit treason*, and recover his understanding, and being indicted and arraigned for the same, pleads *not guilty*, he ought to be acquitted; for by reason of his incapacity he cannot act *felleo animo*. 12 H. 3. Dower 183. Forfeiture 33. 21. H. 7. 31. b. *il alera quite*, that is, shall be found not guilty.

(p) See Sir John Hawkes's Remarks on Bateman's trial. State Trials, Vol. 4. p. 205.

And

And it is all one, whether the phrenzy be fix'd and permanent, or whether it were temporary by force of any disease, if the fact were committed while the party was under that distemper.

In the year 1668, at *Aylesbury*, a married woman of good reputation being deliver'd of a child, and having ~~exceeded~~ ^{fallen} into a temporary phrenzy, and kill'd her infant in the absence of any company; but, company coming in, she told them she had kill'd her infant, and there it lay; she was brought to gaol presently, and after some sleep she recover'd her understanding, but marvelled how or why she came thither; she was indicted for murder, and upon her trial the whole matter appearing, it was left to the jury with this direction, that if it did appear, that she had any use of reason when she did it, they were to find her guilty; but if they found her under a phrenzy, tho' by reason of her late delivery and want of sleep, they should acquit her; that had there been any occasion to move her to this fact, as to hide her shame, which is ordinarily the case with such as are delivered of bastard children and destroy them; or if there had been jealousy in her husband, that the child had been none of his; or if she had hid the infant, or denied the fact, these had been evidences that the phrenzy was counterfeit; but none of these appearing, and the honesty and virtuous deportment of the woman in her health being known to the jury, and many circumstances of insanity appearing the jury found her not guilty, to the satisfaction of all that heard it.

Touching the great crime of *treason* regularly the same is to be said, as in case of *homicide*, such a phrenzy or insanity as excuseth from the guilt of the one, excuseth from the guilt of the other: the reason is the same; he that cannot act *felonice* or *animo felonico* cannot act *proditorie*, for being under a full alienation of mind, he acts not *per electionem* or *intentionem*. This appears by the [37] statute of 33 H. 8. cap. 20. which, tho' it enact, that a *non compos mentis* shall be tried for treason, yet it expressly declareth, "That if any
" commit high treason, while they are in good, whole, and perfect
" memory, and after examination become *non compos mentis*, and that it
" be certified by four of the council, that at the time of the treason
" they were of good, sound, and perfect memory, and then not
" nor lunatic, and afterwards became mad; then they shall proceed
" to trial:" which strongly enforceth, that a treason cannot be committed by a madman, or lunatic, during his lunacy.

And

And with this agrees my lord *Coke*, *P. C.* p. 6. in these words, *He that is non compos mentis, and totally deprived of all compassings and imaginations, cannot commit high treason by compassing or imagining the death of the king; for furiosus solo furore puniter; but it must be an absolute madness, and a total deprivation of memory.*

This, tho it be general, yet the same author tells us, *4 Rep.* 124. *b.* *Beverly's* case, in these words, *Mes in ascun cases non compos mentis poit committe hault treason, come si il tua, ou offr a tuer le roy.* This is a safe exception, and I shall not question it, because it tends so much to the safety of the king's person: but yet the same author, *P. C.* p. 6. tells us, that tho this was anciently thought to be law, yet it is not so now; for such a person as cannot compass the death of the king by reason of his insanity, cannot be guilty of treason within the statute of 25 *E.* 3. And thus far concerning the incapacity of ideocy, madness, and lunacy.

[4. Blackf. Com. ch. ii. p. 25.]

CHAP. V.

Concerning casualty and misfortune, how far it excuseth in criminals.

[38] I COME to the second kind of accidental defects, *viz.* *casualty* and *misfortune*, and to consider how far it excuseth: and first we are to observe in this, and likewise in some other of the defects before and hereafter mentioned, a difference between civil suits, that are terminated in *compensationem damni illati*, and criminal suits or persecutions, that are in *vindictam criminis commissi*.

If a man be shooting in the fields at rovers, and his arrow hurts a person standing near the mark, the party hurt shall have his action of trespass, and recover his damages, tho the hurt were casual (*a*); for the party is damnified by him, and the damages are but his reparation; but if the party had been kill'd, it had been *per infortunium*, and the archer should not suffer death for it, tho yet he goes not

(*a*) *Hob.* 134.)

altogether

not altogether free from all punishment (*b*) 6 E. 4. 7. *per Cateſby* (*c*).

As to criminal proceedings, if the act, that is committed be simply casual, and *per infortunium*, regularly that act, which, were it done *ex animi intentione*, were punishable with death, is not by the laws of England to undergo that punishment; for it is the will and intention, that regularly is required, as well as the act and event, to make the offence capital.

Now, what shall be said thus simply casual, and what the punishment, will be at large consider'd, when we come to [39] homicide *per infortunium*; only something will be necessary to be said thereof here.

If a man do *ex intentione* and voluntarily an unlawful act tending to bodily hurt of any person, as by striking or beating him, tho he did not intend to kill him, but the death of the party struck doth follow thereby within the year and day (*d*); or if he strike at one, and missing him kills another, whom he did not intend, this is felony (*e*) and homicide, and not casualty or *per infortunium*.

So it is if he be doing an unlawful act, tho not intending bodily harm of any person, as throwing a stone at another's horse, if it hit a person and kill him; this is felony and homicide, and not *per infortunium* (*f*); for the act was voluntary, tho the event not intended; and therefore the act itself being unlawful, he is criminally guilty of the consequence, that follows:

But if a man be doing a lawful act without intention of any bodily harm to any person, and the death of any person thereby ensues, as if he be cleaving wood, and the axe flies from the helve, and kills another, this indeed is manslaughter, but *per infortunium*; and the party is not to suffer death, but is to be pardoned of course; for it

(a) Hob. 134.

(b) For he forfeits all his goods and chattels. 2 H. 3. 18. F. Corone. 302. 2 Co. Inst. 14. 3 Co. Inst. 220. By the ancient law he was liable to make the same recompense or *wer-gild*, as in any other case of homicide; e. g. if one shooting at a mark should accidentally wound and kill another, he was nevertheless to pay his *wer-gild*. Leg. H. 2. l. 88. l. 90. *Legis enim est placitum, qui inscienter peccat, scienter emendat*; but by the same law, if one, who was standing on a tree or any other place, where he was at work, should chance to fall on another passing by, he was not to pay any thing, but was deem'd

intirely innocent. See Wilk. Leg. Anglon. Sax. p. 277, 279.

(c) B. Corone 148. Treſpaſs 310. F. Corone 354.

(d) The reason of this is, because the law doth presume, that after the year and day it cannot then be discerned, whether he died of the stroke, or a natural death. 3 Co. Inst. 53.

(e) The like in the case of maihem, if a man strike at one, and missing him maim another, 13 H. 7. 64. a.

(f) 11 H. 7. 23. a. per Fineux Ch. Just. B. Corone 229. Proclamation 13. 22. Affiſs pl. 71.

appears by the statute of *Marlbridge*, cap. 26. that it was not done
 [40] *per felonium* (g): yet the laws of England are so tender of
 the life of man, and to make men very cautious in all their
 actions that the party, tho his life be spared, yet forfeits his goods,
 and must expect the king's grace to restore them.

There happen'd this case at *Peterborough*: Deer broke into the
 corn of A. and spoiled it in the night-time; A. sets his servant to
 watch in the night with a charged gun at the corner of the field,
 commanding him, that, when he heard any thing ~~run~~ into the stand-
 ing corn, he should shoot at that place, for it was the deer: the master
 was in another corner of the field, rushed into the standing corn;
 the servant according to his master's direction shot, and killed his
 master; it was agreed on all hands, this was neither petit treason, nor
 murder, but whether it were simple homicide, or *per infortunium*,^o was
 a great difficulty: First, the shooting was lawful, when the deer came
 into the corn, it being no *purlieu*, nor proclaimed, or chased deer;
 again, the error of the servant was caused by the master's direction,
 and his own act; but if it had been a stranger that had been killed
 it had been homicide, and not misadventure; on the other side, the
 servant was to have taken more care, and not to have shot upon such
 a token as might have befallen a man as well as a deer; and therefore
 for the omission of due diligence, and better inspection, before he ad-
 ventured to shoot, it might amount to manslaughter, and so be capital;
 and this seems to be the truer opinion.

But in the case of Sir *William Hawksworth*, related by *Baker* in
 his chronicle of the time of *Edward IV.* p. 223 (h) he being weary
 of his life, and willing to be rid of it by another's hand, blamed his
 parker for suffering his deer to be destroyed, and commanded him,
 that he should shoot the next man that he met in his park, that would
 not stand or speak; the knight himself came in the night into the
 park, and being met by the keeper refused to stand or speak; the

(g) Here our author rightly says it ap-
 pears by the statute of *Marlbridge*, that it
 was not felony, for that statute only sup-
 poses it not to be felony, but does not
 make that not to be felony which was so
 before, as some have imagined. 2 Co. In-
 st. 148, 315. for it appears by *Magna*
Charta cap. 26. which was before the sta-
 tute of *Marlbridge*, that he who kill'd an-
 other *per infortunium*, was in no danger of
 death. Kel. 123. nor indeed could it be
 felony, it not being done *felice animo*, 4 Co.
 124 b. The design of that statute was quite

of another nature, *viz.* that the country
 should not be amerced where a man was
 kill'd *per infortunium*, for at that time
murdrum peculiarly signified the secret private
 killing of a man; as if he was found
 kill'd, but it was not known by whom;
 and thus it is defined by *Bracton*, Lib. III.
de corona, cap. 1. to be *occulta occisio*; and
 in the laws of *Henry I.* l. 92. *murdrus*
homo dicebatur, cujus interfectio nesciebatur;
 and in *Dialogo de Scaccario*, Lib. I. cap. 10.
murdrum idem est, quod absconditum.

(h) Sub anno 1471.

keeper

keeper shot and killed him, not knowing him to be his master; this seems to be no felony, but excuseable by the statute of *Malefactores in parvis* (i) for the keeper was in no fault, but his master; but, [41] had he known him, it had been murder.

As to matter of high treason, where the life of the king is concern'd, it is not safe too easily to admit an excuse by chance or misfortune; tho such fact cannot be treason, that was purely casual and involuntary, for there must be a *compassing or imagining* to make treason; yet a treasonable intention may be disguis'd under the colour of chance, and the safety of the king's life is of highest concernment.

And therefore when *Walter Tyrrel*, with a glance of an arrow from a tree involuntarily, as *Matthew Paris* (k) tells us, kill'd *William Rufus*, it could not be treason, (l) because there was no purpose of any mischief, and he shot at the deer by the king's command; yet the fact was of such a consequence, that he fled for it, which was a circumstance that might probably infer, that there was some ill-intention, which might make him guilty of treason, and not barely accident. *Co. P. C. p. 6.*

History tells us, that upon a solemn just, or tournament appointed by *Henry II.* king of *France*, upon the marriage of his daughter, the king himself would needs run, and commanded the earl of *Montgomery* to run against him; the earl's lance breaking upon the king's cuirass, a splinter flew into the king's eye, and hit it, whereof he died: this was not treason, because purely accidental.

[See Foster. Discourse the 2d, ch. i. page 258, &c.]

CHAP. VI.

[42]

Concerning ignorance, and how far it prevails, to excuse in capital crimes.

IGNORANCE of the municipal law of the kingdom, or of the penalty thereby inflicted upon offenders, doth not excuse any, that is of the age of discretion and *compas mentis*, from the penalty of the

(i) This statute was made the 21 E. 1. and doth expressly enact, "That if any parker find a trespasser wandering within his liberty, intending to do damage therein, and upon cry made to him to stand he will not yield, but fleeth or defendeth himself with force; if such par-

ker kill such offender in endeavouring to take him, he shall not be arraigned for the same, nor suffer any punishment." *S. P. C. 13. l.*

(k) p. 54.

(l) *Customier de Normand, cap. 14.*

breach of it; because every person of the age of discretion and *compos mentis* is bound to know the law, and presumed so to do: *Ignorantia eorum, quæ quis scire tenetur, non excusat (a).*

But in some cases *ignorantia facti* doth excuse, for such an ignorance many times makes the act itself morally involuntary; and indeed many of the cases of misfortune and casualty mention'd in the former chapter are instances that fall in with this of ignorance: I shall add but one or two more.

It is known in war, that it is the greatest offense for a soldier to kill, or so much as to assault his general: suppose then the inferior officer sets his watch, or sentinels, and the general to try the vigilance or courage of his sentinels comes upon them in the night in the posture of an enemy, (as some commanders have too rashly done) the sentinel strikes, or shoots him, taking him to be an enemy; his ignorance of the person excuseth his offense.

In the case of *Levet* indicted for the death of *Frances Freeman*, the case was, that *William Levet* being in bed and asleep in the night, his servant hired *Frances Freeman* to help her to do her work, and about twelve of the clock in the night the servant going to let out *Frances* thought she heard thieves breaking open the door; she therefore ran up speedily to her master, and informed him, that she thought thieves were breaking open the door; the master rising suddenly, and

[43] taking a rapier, ran down suddenly; *Frances* hid herself in the buttery; lest she should be discovered; *Levet's* wife spying *Frances* in the buttery, cried out to her husband, "*Here they be, that would undo us.*" *Levet* runs into the buttery in the dark, not knowing *Frances*, but thinking her to be a thief, and thrusting with his rapier before him hit *Frances* in the breast mortally, whereof she instantly died. This was resolved to be neither murder, nor manslaughter, nor felony. *Vide* this case cited by justice *Jones*, P. 15 Car. 1. B. R. Cro. Car. 538. *Cook's* case.

[Forster 299.]

CHAP. VII.

Touching incapacities, or excuses by reason of civil subjection.

I COME now to those incapacities, which I have stiled civil, and to consider how far they indemnify and excuse in criminals, and criminal punishments.

And first concerning that, which ariseth by reason of civil subjection.

And this civil subjection is principally of the subject to his prince, the servant to his master, the child to his parent, and the wife to her husband. Somewhat I shall say of each of these.

I. As to the *first* of these subjections, the *subject* to his *prince*; it is regularly true, that the law presumes, the king will do no wrong; neither indeed can do any wrong (*a*); and therefore, if the king command an unlawful act to be done, the offense of the instrument is not thereby indemnified (*b*); for though the king is not under the coercive power of the law, yet in many cases his commands are under the directive power of the law, which consequently makes the act itself invalid, if unlawful, and so renders the instrument of the execution thereof obnoxious to the punishment of the law. [44]
Vide *Stamf. P. C.* 102. *b.* (*c*); yet in the time of peace, if two men combat together at barriers, or for trial of skill, if one kill the other it is homicide; but if it be by the command of the king, it is said (*d*) it is no felony. 11 *H.* 7. 23. *a.*

II. As touching the civil subjection of the *child*, or *servant*; if either of them commit an act, which in itself is treason, or felony, it is neither excused nor extenuated as to the point of punishment by the command of his master, or parent; for the command is void and against law, and doth not protect either the commander or the instrument, that executes it by such command (*e*).

(*a*) *Co. Lit.* 19. *b.* 4.

(*b*) As if one man arrest another merely by the king's commandment, that shall be no excuse to him, but he is nevertheless liable to an action of false imprisonment. 16 *H.* 6. *F. Monstrauns de faits* 182. 1 *H.* 7. *c.* *B. Prærogative* 139.

(*c*) Vide *Bracton Lib.* 111. *De assionibus*, *cap.* 9.

(*d*) Per *Fineux Ch. Just.* but *Broke* in his abridgement of this case, *Corone* 229, says, that other justices in the time of *Henry VIII.* denied this opinion of *Fineux*, and held, that it was felony to kill a man in jussing and the like, notwithstanding the commandment of the king; for that the commandment is against law. 3 *Co. Inst.* 56, 160.

(*e*) *Dalt. Just. Cap.* 157. *N. Edit.*

III. As to the civil subjection of the *wife* to the *husband*: tho in *many* cases the command, or authority of the husband, either express or implied, doth not privilege the wife from capital punishment for capital offenses; yet in *some* cases the indulgence of the law doth privilege her from capital punishment for such offenses, as are in themselves of a capital nature; wherein these ensuing differences are observable.

1. If a *feme covert* alone without her husband, and without the coercion of her husband, commit treason or felony, tho it be but larciny, she shall suffer the like judgment and execution, as if she were *sole*; this is agreed on all hands. *Stamf. P. C. Lib. 1. cap. 19. 15 E. 2. Corone* 383.

[45] 2. But if she commit larciny by the coercion of the husband, she is not guilty. 27 *Aff.* 40. (*f*); and according to some, if it be by the command of her husband. *Ibid.* (*g*) which seems to be law, if her husband be present (*h*); but not if her husband be absent at the time and place of the felony committed.

3. But this command or coercion of the husband doth not excuse in case of treason, nor of murder, in regard of the heinousness of those crimes. *Mr. Dalton's Just. Cr.* 104 (*i*). And hence it was that in the cases of the treasons committed by *Arden* and *Somerville* (*k*) against Queen *Elizabeth*, both their wives were attaind of high treason, tho their execution was spared; and yet they were only assenters to their husband's treasons, and not immediately actors in it, and so were principals in the second degree; and upon the same account the earl of *Somerset* and his wife were both attaind, as accessaries before, in the murder and poisoning of Sir *Thomas Overbury* (*l*).

4. If the husband and wife together commit larciny or burglary, by the opinion of *Bracton*, *Lib. III. cap. 32. §. 10* (*m*). both are guilty; and so it hath been practised by some judges. *Vide Dalt. ubi supra*, cap. 104. and possibly in strictness of law, unless the actual coercion of the husband appear, she may be guilty in such a case; for it may many times fall out, that the husband doth commit larciny by the instigation, tho' he cannot in law do it by the coercion of his

(*f*) *E. Corone*, 199. *Bracton de Corone*. cap. 32. § 9.

(*g*) *Quoniam ipsa superiori suo obedire debet*. *Leg. Inae*, l. 57. *B. Corone* 108.

(*h*) Because the law supposes her to be then under the coercion of her husband. *Kel.* 31.

(*i*) *N. Edit.* cap. 157.

(*k*) 1 *And.* p. 104.

(*l*) *Stat. Trials*, Vol. I. Tr 28 & 29.

(*m*) *And Sect. 9. and Fleta*, Lib. I. cap. 38. § 12, 13, 14. especially, *Si fur- tum invenitur sub Clavibus Uxoris*. *Vide Bracton & Fleta*; *ibid.* and *LL. Cnuti*, l. 74.

wife; but the latter practice hath obtain'd, that if the husband and wife commit burglary and larciny together, the wife shall be acquitted, and the husband only convicted; and with this agrees the old book, 2 E. 3. *Corone* 160. And this being the modern practice and *in favorem vitæ* is fittest to be followed; and the rather, because otherwise for the same felony the husband may be saved by the benefit of his clergy, and the wife hanged, where the case is within clergy (*n*); tho I confess this reason is but of small value, for [46] in manslaughter committed jointly by husband and wife the husband may have his clergy, and yet the wife is not on that account to be privileged by her coverture.

And accordingly in the modern practice, where the husband and wife, by the name of his wife, have been indicted for a larciny, or burglary jointly, and have pleaded to the indictment, and the wife convicted, and the husband acquitted; merciful judges have used to reprieve the wife before judgment, because they have thought, or at least doubted, that the indictment was void against the wife, she appearing by the indictment to be a wife, and yet charged with felony jointly with her husband.

But this is not agreeable to law, for the indictment stands good against the wife, in as much as every indictment is as well several as joint; and as upon such an indictment the wife may be acquitted, and the husband found guilty, so *converso* the wife may be convicted, and the husband acquitted; for the indictment is in law joint, or several, as the fact happens; as so is the book of 15 E. 2. *Corone* 383. and accordingly has been the frequent practice *Vide Dalt. ubi sup. cap.* 104. where there are several instances of the arraignment of husband and wife upon a joint indictment of felony; which, if by law she could not be any way guilty, had been erroneous, for the indictment itself had been insufficient: therefore, tho the former practice be merciful, and cautious, it is not agreeable to law; for, tho ordinarily according to the modern practice the wife cannot be guilty, if the husband be guilty of the same larciny or burglary; yet if the husband upon such an indictment be acquitted, and the wife convict, judgment ought to be given against her upon that indictment;

(*n*) The reason of this is, because a woman cannot by law have the benefit of the clergy. 11 Co. 29. *b.* yet in *Fitz. Corone* 461. it was admitted, that a woman might claim clergy; however, as the law

now stands, she may in all cases have the same benefit by the statute of 3 & 4 W. & M. cap. 9. §. 7. as a man may by his clergy.

for every indictment of that nature is joint or several, as the matter falls out upon the evidence. *Vide* 22 E. 4. 7 (o).

[47] 5. But if the husband and wife together commit a treason, murder, or homicide, tho she only assented to the treason, they shall be both found guilty, and the wife shall not be acquitted upon the presumption, that it was by the coercion of her husband, for the odiousness, and dangerous consequence of the crime; the same law it is, if she be accessary to murder before the fact.

6. If the husband commit a felony or treason, and the wife knowingly receive him, she shall neither be accessary after as to the felony, nor principal as to the treason, for such bare reception of her husband; for she is *sub potestate viri*, and she is bound to receive her husband; but otherwise it is, of the husband's receiving the wife knowingly after an offense of this nature committed by her (p).

"M. 37. E. 3. Rot. 34. Linc. coram Rege. Ricardus Dey & Margeria Uxor ejus indictati, pro receptamento felonum; Margeria dicit, "quod indictmentum predictum super predictam Margeriam factum minus sufficiens est, eo quod prædicta Margeria tempore quo ipsa dictos felones receptasse, seu eis consentire debuisset, fuit cooperta prædicto Ricardo viro suo, & adhuc est, & omnino sub potestate sua, cui ipsa in nullo contradicere potuit; & ex quo non inferitur in indictmentum prædicto, quod ipsa aliquod malum fecit, nec eis consentivit, seu ipsos felones receptavit, ignorante viro suo, petit judicium, si ipsa, vivente viro suo, de aliquo receptamento in præsentia viri sui occasionari possit. —Postea viso & diligenter examinato indictmento prædicto super præfatam Margeriam facto, videtur curiæ, quod indictmentum illud minus sufficiens est ad ipsam inde ponere responsuram: Ideo cesset processus versus eam omnino, &c."

Upon which record these things are observable:

1. That the wife, if alone and without her husband, may be accessary to a felony *post factum*. 2. But she cannot together with her husband be accessary to a felony *post factum*; for it shall be intirely adjudged the act of the husband; and this is partly the reason, why she cannot be accessary in receipt of her husband being a felon, because she is *sub potestate viri*. 3. That in this case she was not put to plead to

[48] the indictment *not guilty*, but took her exception upon the indictment itself; and so note the diversity between an indictment of felony, as principal, and the indictment of her, as accessary

after; for in the former case she shall be put to plead *not guilty* to the indictment, tho it appear in the body thereof, that she is *covert*. 4. That yet the indictment stood good, as to the husband; and upon this consideration, tho it is true the husband and wife may be guilty of a treason, as is before shewn, yet it seems, she shall never be adjudged a traitor barely for receiving her husband, that is a traitor, or for receiving jointly with her husband any other person that is a traitor, unless she were also consenting to the treason, for it shall be intirely adjudged the act of her husband.

It is certain a *feme covert* may be guilty of misprision of treason committed by another man than her husband: but whether she can be guilty of misprision of treason, if she knows her husband's treason, and reveal it not, is a case of some difficulty: on the one side the great obligation of duty she owes to the safety of the king and kingdom, the horridness of the offense of treason, and the great danger that may ensue by concealing it, seems to render her guilty of misprision of treason, if she should not detect it; on the other side, it may be said, she is *sub potestate viri*, she cannot by law be a witness against her husband, and therefore cannot accuse him: *Ideo quære*. But, certainly, if she consented to the treason of her husband, tho he were the only actor in it, she is guilty as a principal, and hath no privilege herein by her coverture, as is before shewn.

[Blackf. Com. ch. ii. page 33.—28. 1 Hawk. P. C. 2.]

C H A P VIII.

[49]

Concerning the civil incapacities by compulsion and fear.

I JOIN these two incapacities together, because they are much of the same nature, as to many purposes; and how far these give a privilege, exemption, or mitigation in capital punishments, is now to be considered.

First, There is to be observed a difference between the times of war, or public insurrection, or rebellion, and the times of peace; for in the times of war, and public rebellion, when a person is under so great a power, that he cannot resist or avoid, the law in some cases allows an impunity for parties compell'd, or drawn by fear of death, to do some acts in themselves capital, which admit no excuse in the time of peace.

M. 21 E. 3. coram Rege. Rot. 101. Line. “*Walter de Alyngton, and divers of his confederates at St. Botolph’s Regiam potestatem assumentis, & ut de Guerrā insurgentes quendam Thomam de Okeham sutores in capitaneum, & majorem suum eligerunt,*” seized on two ships, and took away the corn (a); appointed a bell to be rung (b); and commanded, that at the ringing thereof *ipsi & eorum quilibet essent parati, &c.* “*Et plures homines villæ prædictæ, qui ad maleficia sua consentire noluerunt, ceperunt, & eos sibi jurare fecerunt ad imprisas suas manutenendas.*” They were arraigned upon the indictment, and committed: “*Illi, qui coacti fuerunt jurare, dimittuntur per manucap- tionem; & illi, qui receperunt denarios, petunt quod, ex quo patet per indictmentum prædictum, quod ipsi coacti fuerunt recipere denarios contra voluntatem suam, petunt, quod possint quieti recedere; & [50] consideratum est per curiam, quod nihil mali in his reperitur; sed quia curia nondum advisatur, dies datus est per manucap- tionem, ideo venit jurata.*” I find no further proceeding against them.

M. 7 H. 5. coram Rege. Rot. 20. Heref. cited Co. P. C. p. 10. Those, that supplied with victuals Sir John Oldcastle, and his accomplices then in rebellion, as is said, were acquitted by judgment of the court; because it was found to be done *pro timore mortis, & quod recesserunt, quàm cito potuerunt*: note, it was only furnishing of victuals, and *pro timore mortis*, which excused them: for after the battle of Evesham in 49 H. 3. when that prudent act was made for the settling of the kingdom, called *Dictum de Kenilworth*, those, that were drawn to assist the barons against the king, tho they were not put into the rank of those that paid five years value of their lands for their assistance, *viz.* those, that *gratis, & voluntarie, & non coacti miserunt servitia sua contra regem, & ejus filium (c)*; yet, it seems, they were put to a smaller mulct; for by the 12th, 13th, 14th, and 15th articles: “*Coacti, vel metu ducti, qui venerunt ad bella, nec pugnaverunt, nec male fecerunt; impotentes, qui vi vel metu coacti miserunt servitia sua contra regem, vel ejus filium; coacti, vel metu ducti, qui fuerunt deprædatores, & cum principalibus prædonibus prædationes fecerunt,*

(a) One hundred and twenty quarters of corn, value 36*l*.

(b) *Quandam communem campanam ordinaverunt pulsari.*

(c) Nor into the rank of those, who by lies and falshood had drawn off others to the earl of Leicester’s party, and were punished with a mulct of two years value, as

by Artic. 11. “*Leici manifeste, procurantes negotia comitis Leycestriæ & complicitum suorum, attrahendo homines per mendacia & falsitates, instigando parti comitis & suorum, detrahendo parti regis & filii sui, puniantur per quantum valet terra eorum per duos annos.*”

“*& quonda*

“ Et quanda commodè potuerunt, recesserunt, & ad domos redierunt;
 “ [emptores scienter rerum alienarum valorem bonorum, quæ emerunt,
 “ restituant, & in misericordia domini regis sint, quia contra justitiam
 “ fecerunt, quia rex inhibuit, jam dimidio anno elapso;] illi, qui ad
 “ mandatum comitis Leycestriæ ingressi sunt Northampton, nec pugna-
 “ verunt, nec malum fecerunt, sed ad Ecclesiam fugerunt, quando regem
 “ venientem viderunt, & hoc sit attinētum per bonos, solvant, quantum
 “ valet terra eorum per dimidium annum; illi, qui ex feodo comitis tene-
 “ bant, sint solum in misericordia domini regis: impotentes, & alii
 “ homines, qui nihil mali fecerunt, statim rehabeant terras [51]
 “ suas, & damna recuperent in curia domini regis.”

But even in such cases, if the whole circumstances of the case be such, that he can sufficiently resist, or avoid the power of such rebels, he is inexcusable, if upon a pretence of fear, or doubt of compulsion, he assist them.

Now as to times and places of peace.

If a man be menaced with death, unless he will commit an act of treason, murder, or robbery, the fear of death does not excuse him, if he commit the fact; for the law hath provided a sufficient remedy against such fears by applying himself to the courts and officers of justice for a writ or precept *de securitate pacis* (d).

Again, if a man be desperately assaulted, and in peril of death, and cannot otherwise escape, unless to satisfy his assailant's fury he will kill an innocent person then present, the fear and actual force will not acquit him of the crime and punishment of murder, if he commit the fact; for he ought rather to die himself, than kill an innocent: but if he cannot otherwise save his own life, the law permits him in his own defense to kill the assailant; for by the violence of the assault, and the offense committed upon him by the assailant himself, the law of nature, and necessity, hath made him his own *protector cum debito moderamine inculpatæ tutelæ*, as shall be farther shewed, when we come to the chapter of homicide *se defendendo* (*).

But yet farther, it is true in cases of war between sovereign princes the law of nations allows a prince to begin hostility with such a prince that designs a war against him; and if the fear be real, and upon just ground, *non tantum de potentia sed & de animo*.—*Grot de jure belli & pacis*, Lib. II. cap. 22. §. 5. he may prevent the other's actual aggression, and need not expect, till the other actually invade him, when

(d) See this writ in the *Register*, fol. 82. b. F. N. B. Vol. Edit. 79. N. Edit. 177.

(*) *Postea cap.* 53.

possibly it may be too late to make a safe defense; and the reason is, because they are not under any superior, that may by his [52] process or interposition secure the prince against such a just fear; and therefore in such case the law of nations allows a prince to provide for his own safety.

But it is otherwise between subjects of the same prince: If *A.* fears upon just grounds, that *B.* intends to kill him, and is assured, that he provides weapons, and lies in wait so to do; yet without an actual assault by *B.* upon *A.* or upon his house, to commit that fact, *A.* may not kill *B.* by way of prevention; but he must avoid the danger by flight, or other means; for a bare fear, tho upon a just cause, and tho it be upon a fear of life, gives not a man power to take away the life of another, but it must be an actual and inevitable danger of his own life; for the law hath provided a security for him by flight, and recourse to the civil magistrate for protection by a writ or precept *de securitate pacis*. and thus far touching the privilege by reason of compulsion or fear.

[4. Blackf. Com. ch. i. p. 30.]

C H A P. IX.

Concerning the privilege by reason of necessity.

ALTHO all compulsion carry with it somewhat of necessity, and abates somewhat of the voluntariness of the act that is done, yet there are some kinds of necessities, that are not by any external compulsion or force.

Touching the necessity of self-preservation against an injurious assault somewhat hath been said in the last chapter, and more will be said hereafter in its due place: I shall proceed therefore to other instances.

[53] The necessity of the preservation of the peace of the kingdom by the apprehending notorious malefactors excuseth some acts from being felony, which in the matter of them without such necessity were felony.

If a thief resist, and will not suffer himself to be taken upon hue and cry or pursuit, *justiciari se nobilit permitttere*, if he be killed by the pursuants, it is no felony (*a*); *de quo vide latius infra*.

(a) See *Leg. Ine*, l. 25.

By the statutes of 3 & 4 E. 6. cap. 5. and 1 Mar. cap. 12. If there be a riotous assembly to the number of twelve assembled to commit the disorders mentioned in those acts, the justices of peace, the sheriff, mayor, or other officer of any corporation, &c. may raise a power to suppress and apprehend them; and, if they disperse not upon proclamation, if any of the rioters be kill'd, or maimed, or hurt by the justices, &c. or those assembled by them to suppress the riot, it is by this act punishable.

It is true, this act (b) continued only during queen Elizabeth's life, and is now expired (c); but altho, perchance, as to the killing of such persons, as do not presently return upon proclamation to their homes, it needs the aid of an act of parliament to indemnify them; yet, if they attempt any riotous act, and cannot be otherwise suppress'd, the sheriff, or justice of peace may make use of such a force upon them for preservation of the peace, as well by the Common law, as by the statute; *quod vide in Anderson's Rep. part 2. n. 49. p. 67. Burton's case in fine*; and the statute of 13 H. 4. cap. 7. *in principio*, and 2 H. 5. cap. 8. whereby all men are bound, upon warning, to be assistant to the sheriff and justice for the suppressing of riots even by force, if it cannot be otherwise effected; so that the clauses touching this matter in the temporary statutes of 3 & 4 E. 6. and 1 Mar. are but pursuant to the law and former statutes for necessity of preserving the peace.

Some of the casuists, and particularly Covarruvias, *Tom* [54]
I. *De furti & rapinæ restitutione*, §. 3. 4. p. 473. and *Grotius de jure belli ac pacis*, Lib. II. cap. 2 §. 6. (d) tell us, that in case of extreme necessity, either of hunger, or clothing, the civil distributions of property cease, and by a kind of tacit condition the first community doth return, and upon this, those common assertions are grounded; "*Quicquid necessitas cogit, defendit.*" "*Necessitas est lex temporis & loci.*" "*In casu extremæ necessitatis omnia sunt communia:*" and therefore in such case theft is no theft, or at least not punishable, as theft; and some even of our own lawyers (e) have asserted the same; and very bad use hath been made of this concession

(b) viz. 1 Mar. cap. 12. for 3 & 4 Ed. 6. cap. 5. was repeal'd by 1 Mar. cap. 12.

(c) It was at first made to continue only till the end of the next session, but was afterwards by several new acts continued during the life of queen Mary; and by 1 Eliz. cap. 16. was continued during her life also, and has never since been revived; but in

1 Geo. 1. cap. 5. a new act was made to much the same purpose, which is perpetual.

(d) See *Puff. de jure naturæ*, Lib. II. cap. 6. § 6.

(e) *Britton*, cap. 10. *Crompt.* 33. *Plowd.* 18. b. 19. a. *Dalt. Just.* cap. 99.

by some of the Jesuitical casuists in *France*, who have thereupon advised apprentices and servants to rob their masters, when they have judged themselves in want of necessaries, of clothes, or victuals; whereof, they tell them, they themselves are the competent judges; and by this means let loose, as much as they can, by their doctrine of probability, all the ligaments of property and civil society.

I do therefore take it, that, where persons live under the same civil government, as here in *England*, that rule, at least by the laws of *England*, is false; and therefore, if a person, being under necessity for want of victuals, or clothes, shall upon that account clandestinely, and *animo furandi* steal another man's goods, it is felony (*f*) and a crime by the laws of *England* punishable with death; altho the judge, before whom the trial is, in this case (as in other cases of extremity) be by the laws of *England* intrusted with a power to relieve the offender before or after judgment, in order to the obtaining the king's mercy.

For 1. Men's properties would be under a strange insecurity, being laid open to other mens necessities, whereof no man can possibly judge, but the party himself.

2. Because by the laws of this kingdom (*g*) sufficient provision is made for the supply of such necessities by collections for the poor, and

[55] by the power of the civil magistrate; and consonant hereto seems to be the law even among the *Jews*, if we may believe the wisest of kings. *Proverbs* vi. 30, 31, "*Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul, when he is hungry; but if he be found, he shall restore seven-fold, and shall give all the substance of his house.*" It is true, death was not among them the penalty of theft, yet his necessity gave him no exemption from the ordinary punishment inflicted by their law upon that offense (*h*).

Indeed this rule, "*in casu extremæ necessitatis omnia sunt communia*," does hold in some measure in some particular cases, where by the tacit consent of nations, or of some particular countries or societies, it hath obtain'd.

1. Among the *Jews* it was lawful in case of hunger to pull ears of standing corn, and eat, *Matth.* xii. 1. &c. (*i*) and for one, that

(*f*) See *Dalton ubi supra*.

(*g*) 43 *Eliz. cap. 2. &c.*

(*h*) But their ordinary punishment being only pecuniary could affect him only when he was in a condition to answer it; and therefore the same reasons, which would justify that, can by no means be extended

to a corporal, much less to a capital punishment.

(*i*) For the *Pharisees* objected against it only on account of its being done on the sabbath day, *Mark* xi. 23. &c. *Luke* vi. 1, &c.