

# Eighteenth Century Boxing by: Randy Roberts Louisiana State University

“If I go to him, with my armed fist  
I’ll pash him o’er the face.”

Troilus and Cressida,  
Act II, Scene III.

There is an axiom which holds that nothing draws a crowd as quickly as a fight. This appears to be true. No sport is as old as pugilism; its roots are deeply entrenched in the history of civilization. Down through the centuries boxing has proved to be a medium for all types of artistic expression. “Writers from Homer to Ernest Hemingway, from Plato to William Hazlitt have been concerned with what might be called the most basic form of competition. . .”<sup>1</sup> Yet, for some inexplicable reason, the history of boxing has eluded the grasp of serious and conscientious historians. The task of writing boxing’s history has instead fallen by default into the hands of hack historians and sensationalistic journalists. The result has been disastrous; the true history of pugilism has remained cloaked in a shroud of popular fantasies, traditional myths, and ridiculous falsehoods. The following paper is an attempt to pull back the shroud and to view the history of eighteenth century boxing as a facet of an expanding society rather than as a part of a circumscribed legend.

## I

Like the Pheonix which rises from its own ashes to regain the freshness of youth, pugilism was destined to blossom in the eighteenth century with the same splendor it had enjoyed during the Golden Age of Greece. Its rise was partially aided by the despicable character of the other sports of the day. By the beginning of the eighteenth century the sports of bear-baiting and bull-baiting were coming under increasing attack. Although these sports were not officially outlawed until 1835, the more fashionable set had stopped its patronage of these slaughters by the second quarter of the eighteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

Pugilism offered a more civilized sport for the wealthy to patronize ; it helped to bridge the crevasse between the inhumane, bloody sports and the modern team sports.

Pugilism also had a tranquilizing effect on eighteenth century English society. Before the rise of boxing as an artful form of self-defense, the only recourse to the settlement of an affair of honor was the pistol or the sword. If, as Sir Walter Besant cogently observed, the threat of duelling “demanded and cultivated carefulness of speech, courtesy of manner, and imposed some checks on conduct”; it also encouraged the bullies and adventurers to force their way into high society by sheer terrorism.<sup>3</sup> By offering another, less deadly field of honor, pugilism helped the duel to die out.<sup>4</sup> This therapeutic effect that pugilism had on English society is most accurately conveyed by the following passage written by Pierce Egan, the most famous boxing chronicler of the eighteenth century:

Where, *then*, is the relative, however high in pride and pomp, on viewing the father, husband, or brother, killed in a duel—but what would rather than they should have had recourse of the manly defense of BOXING, than the deadly weapons of sword and ball; from which a bloody nose, or black eye, might have been the only consequence to themselves, and their families, and neither in their feelings or their circumstances been injured; reconciliation with their antagonist—faults mutually acknowledged—and, perhaps became inseparable friends ever afterwards.<sup>5</sup>

At the onset of the eighteenth century, pugilism was as amorphous as the molder’s unused clay. The first puzzle to be solved was which sex would dominate in the battle for the popularity the ring had to offer. Indeed, this question which seems amusing in retrospect, was a serious issue during pugilism’s infancy. For example, in June of 1722 the *London Journal* printed the following challenge :

I, Elizabeth Wilkinson, of Clarkenwell, having had some words with Hannah Highfield and requiring satisfaction, do invite her to meet me on the stage and box with me for three quineas, each woman holding half-a-crown in each hand, and the first woman that drops her money to lose the battle.<sup>6</sup>

Mrs. Highfield signified her acceptance of this challenge when she replied,

I, Hannah Highfield, of Newgate Market hearing of the resolutness of Elizabeth Wilkinson, will not fail,

God willing, to give her more blows than words, desiring home blows, and of her no favour. She may expect a good thrumping.<sup>7</sup>

The *London Journal* later reported that “they maintained the battle for a long time, to the no small satisfaction of the spectators.”<sup>8</sup> This is but one example of an event that was by no means unique; female pugilism was so popular that the women crowned their first championess, Mrs. Elizabeth Stokes, at approximately the same time as the males proclaimed their first champion.<sup>9</sup>

The question of rules and the proper fighting style was the second enigma that faced early pugilism. Until 1743 pugilism remained without any official set of rules. And if this lack of formality regarding rules seems crude, the fighting styles were cruder still. “The human fist—however suitable for saluting, making a threat, or knocking on a door—was not constructed to strike repeated blows against hard objects without some kind of protection.”<sup>10</sup> Hence boxing methods had to adapt to this frailty of the human anatomy. One method of adaptation was to strike an opponent with the bottom part of the fist, the way one would strike a table.<sup>11</sup> Still other, less dignifying, forms of adaptation involved gouging, hair pulling, ear twisting, wrestling throws, and kicking.<sup>12</sup> Thus although pugilism was a more progressive sport than bull-baiting, it was still a highly brutal and savage game; the winner of a bout was more often determined by endurance and the ability to withstand punishment than by skill or punching power.

Out of the amorphous character of the early ring one man emerged to give the sport some semblance of order and internal stability. In 1719 James Figg, a powerful six-footer from Thame, Oxfordshire, traveled to London and quickly established himself as the premier master of all forms of self-defense.<sup>13</sup> Although he was described by Egan as “more of a *slaughterer*, than a neat, finished pugilist,” Figg proved extremely successful within the ring. In a career which spanned eleven years, he never lost a bout.” He also proved successful in business; his amphitheatre attracted the patronage of the upper classes and gave pugilism the respectability it needed. Figg had many friends and admirers among the fashionable and the literary set—Prime Minister Sir Robert Walpole; Jonathan Swift, the essayist; Alexander Pope, the noted poet; and William Hogarth, the foremost artist in England.<sup>15</sup> Thus under Figg’s tutorage

pugilism began a meteoric rise which would continue, for the most part, the rest of the century.

This meteoric rise of pugilism, however, was not experienced in other countries. Indeed, the English regarded a good, clean knockout blow—preferably a noisy roundhouse right—as a peculiarly Anglo-Saxon characteristic. And the English jealously guarded their sport; to them a foreign challenger was not to be tolerated. An illustration of this pugilistic nationalism can be seen in the bout between Bob Whitaker, a student of Figg's, and Alberto di Carni, a gigantic Venetian. Captain John Godfrey, one of the first to write about pugilism, described the 1733 battle as follows:

The battle was fought at Figg's amphitheatre before a splendid company, the politest house of that kind I ever saw. . . . The Gondolier pitched himself forward with his right leg and his arm full extended and as Whitaker approached gave him a blow on the side of the head which knocked him quite off the stage, which was remarkable for its height. . . . There was a general foreign huzza on the side of the Venetian pronouncing our countryman's downfall; but Whitaker took no more time than was required to get up again when he. . . . with a little stoop, ran boldly in beyond the heavy mallet, and with one English peg in the stomach, quite a new thing to the foreigners, brought him to the breach. The blow carried too much of the English rudeness for him to bear, and finding himself so unmannerly used, he scorned to any more doings with his slovenly fist.<sup>16</sup>

After the bout the Venetian left England. He also left the sport of pugilism to the English.

If pugilism exhibited nationalistic characteristics early in the eighteenth century, it also showed a growing interest in science. Pugilists regarded a knowledge of the human anatomy as essential to their trade. Through trial and error, they discovered certain anatomical principles. They found, for example, that a blow placed lightly under the ear, on the jugular vein, caused the blood proceeding from the heart to the head to be violently forced either to the heart or the head, leaving their opponent prostrate, bleeding from his eyes, ears, and mouth.<sup>17</sup> They discovered that a punch delivered between the eye-brows contributed greatly to a victory because it caused "a violent echymosis, or extravasation of blood, which falls immediately into the eye-lids;" the swelling which resulted from such a rap left one's adversary "artfully hood-winked."<sup>18</sup> The list of

other such cause and effect relationships is long enough to convince even the most ardent skeptic that science did play an important role in eighteenth century pugilism.

The first obstacle to the progression of pugilism came with Figg's retirement. At thirty-five he fought his two-hundred and seventy-first battle in October 1730, and then bowed gracefully out of pugilism.<sup>19</sup> A handful of adequate pugilists followed him, but none could capture the public's fancy like Figg had. The championship was shuffled from Tom Pipes to Greeting and then from Greeting back to Pipes, but the public could have cared less.<sup>20</sup> George Taylor and Tom Boswell distinguished themselves as first-rate pugilists, but both lacked courage. Captain Godfrey, when speaking about Boswell, said:

Praise be to his power of fighting, his excellent choice of *time* and *measure*, his superior judgement, dispatching forth his executing arm! Farewell to him, with this fair acknowledgment, that, if he had a true *English* bottom, (the best fighting epithet for a man of spirit) he would carry all before him. . .<sup>21</sup>

Thus at this crucial period in the ring's history no one could attract the public's imagination, and the much needed royal support was withdrawn. But again one man would emerge to revive pugilism and bring back the royal patronage.

## II

"Advance, brave Broughton! Thee I pronounce Captain of the *Boxers*. As far as I can look back, I think I ought to open the characters with him. I know none so fit, so able, to lead up the van."<sup>22</sup> As Captain Godfrey surmised, John Broughton must rank among the greatest fighters of all time for various reasons; his reputation as the father of British boxing is well deserved.<sup>23</sup> Under Broughton's guiding fist, boxing took a sharp turn upward. Public interest was aroused to a feverish pitch and the patronage of the nobility was again secured. Like Figg, Broughton was a heavy-set, power man (196 pounds and 5 feet 11 inches). However, unlike Figg, Broughton was a well educated, intelligent, and courteous gentleman. Although Figg was the ring's first champion, it was Broughton who revolutionized the sport of boxing.

Under Broughton's guidance boxing became a recognized profession. Before his time a boxer had to be a master of the quarterstaff, sword, and foil, as well as the fist. After Brough-

ton a fighter only had to be able to use his fists.<sup>24</sup> This was a revolutionary change in the sport. It allowed the boxer to become more proficient at his single trade, and it made boxing more enjoyable and interesting for the public. This increased specialization in boxing is somewhat analogous to the conversion to the platoon system in football. The importance of this transition should not be underestimated.

The introduction of refined hitting techniques and defensive tactics was the second fundamental change in boxing for which Broughton was responsible. Before Broughton boxing resembled a give-and-take brawl. After Broughton scientific hitting and defensive techniques dominated the sport. In his evaluation of Broughton, John Durant stated:

New to the game were his defensive tactics—his parrying of blows, his blocking, and his ability to catch a fist aimed at his head with his open hand. He could hit, too, and he punched straight from the shoulder, unlike most fighters of his day who used the “round blow,” or swing. Broughton’s favorite punch was called the “Projectile” by the Fancy (ring fans). It was a hard right hand punch to the pit of the stomach and when it landed, the fight was generally over.<sup>25</sup>

On 11 August 1743, Broughton made his most important contribution to the internal stability of boxing when he introduced the first set of written rules.<sup>26</sup> His rules barred gouging and striking a fallen opponent, but wide latitude was left for wrestling and the particularly aggressive style of fighting. One deficiency in his rules was the way a bout could end. A round lasted until knock-down, at which time the fighters had thirty seconds to recoup and get back to the scratch. The referee could not stop a fight; a bout could end only when a fighter failed to come to the scratch in time. Thus:

Under Broughton’s Rules a dying fighter could be brought to the scratch by his seconds and flung at his opponent in the hopes that a miracle or police intervention might somehow save his backer’s money before the referee pronounced life extinct and their man beaten.<sup>27</sup>

Broughton’s rules lasted until 1838 and for all their deficiencies did give boxing a more humane character.

As can be seen Broughton strengthened the internal stability of boxing when he introduced rules and new fighting methods to the sport. But just as important were Broughton’s contributions to the fortification of boxing’s external stability. His

external contributions were twofold: first, he softened boxing so that the upper classes could participate in the sport without fear; second, by his association with the upper classes he brought wealth and nobility into the sport. The result was that boxing gained a high degree of respectability and financial security.

In order to make boxing less abrasive to the upper classes, Broughton opened an establishment in the Haymarket to teach boxing to the noble men, young and old, of his day. So that their patronage would not be jeopardized by rough treatment he invented boxing gloves, or “muffers.”<sup>28</sup> Broughton’s hopes of drawing the wealthy to boxing can be seen by the gentle nature of the following advertisement which appeared in the *Advertiser* of February 1747:

Mr. Broughton proposes with proper assistance to open an academy at his house in the Haymarket for the instruction of those who are willing to be initiated in the mystery of boxing, where the whole theory and practice of that truly British art, with all the various blows, stops, cross buttocks, etc., incidental to combatants will be fully taught and explained; and that persons of quality and distinction may not be debarred from entering into a course of these lectures, they will be given with the utmost tenderness and regard to the delicacy of the frame and constitution of the pupil, for which reasons muffers will be provided what will effectually secure them from the inconveniency of black eyes, broken jaws, and bloody noses.<sup>29</sup>

Needless to say, Broughton’s muffers did not bring an end to the above “inconveniencies,” but his motive for the advertisement was accomplished; the wealthy flocked to the Haymarket to learn the “truly British art.”

It was a short step from taking a lesson at Broughton’s academy to actively patronizing a fighter. The Duke of Cumberland, glory of the Hanoverians, was just one of many who took the step. Cumberland is best remembered only because he was Broughton’s leading patron.<sup>30</sup> Yet, although this wealthy patronage put boxing on sound financial ground, it also led to a rise in large betting which in turn resulted in the increased brutality involved in major bouts. An illustration of the increased brutality caused by betting can be found in *The Memories of Jacques Casanova*. Casanova, who was always being shocked in London, related that on one of his tours through London he saw a large crowd staring at something. His companion supposedly went up to the crowd and returned

saying: "That's a curious sight for you; you can enter it amidst your remarks on English manners." Casanova asked what it was and his companion replied that it was "a man on the point of death from a blow he had received in boxing with another fellow." Casanova asked if anything could be done and his companion said: "There is a surgeon there who would bleed him, if he were allowed." After Casanova asked who would prevent the surgeon from bleeding the fighter his companion remarked,

That's the curious part of it. Two men have betted on his death or recovery. One says, "I'll bet twenty guineas he dies," and the other says, "Done!" Number One will not allow the surgeon to bleed him, for if the man recovered, his twenty guineas would be gone.<sup>31</sup>

It would be folly to suppose that all betting was as abominable as the above, but betting did play an important role in the rise and fall of boxing's popularity during the years Broughton was champion.

On 10 April 1750 Broughton fought Jack Slack, the Norwich butcher, for the championship. Broughton showed all the adverse effects of prosperity—fatness and lack of condition—and lost the fight in under fourteen minutes. However, the real loser was boxing; it lost the security for which Broughton had been responsible.

After the fight Cumberland, who had bet £10,000 sterling (\$50,000) on Broughton, withdrew his patronage and had Parliament pass legislation against boxing.<sup>32</sup> Once outlawed in London boxing entered into a period of decay. Between 1750 and 1789 "champions of little worth succeeded each other with the rapidity of the emperors who followed Nero, leaving the public scarce time to learn their names."<sup>33</sup> The decline of the boxers' ability, the increased amount of fixed bouts, and the withdrawal of the royal patronage all signified the depth to which boxing had sunk. Indeed, boxing's Dark Ages had arrived.

### III

The year 1789 marked the end of boxing's Dark Ages and the beginning of its Renaissance. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly what events ushered in this new interest in boxing. But, it is certain that boxing, or for that matter any sport, thrives on personalities. Like the vampire who needs new,



fresh blood to stay young, boxing requires a continual flow of neoteric blood to maintain its virile appeal. During the years from 1789 to 1812, boxing was never in need of fresh fighters. These twenty-three years are rightfully classified as the Golden Age of British boxing. As John Boynton Priestley has surmised, boxing was the passion of the period.<sup>34</sup>

Daniel Mendoza, "the light of Israel," was the fighter most directly responsible for pulling boxing out of its doldrums. This Jew from London's East End proved to be the spark which reignited the public's interest in boxing. Although small in stature and light in weight, Mendoza revolutionized the sport when he introduced new fighting techniques.<sup>35</sup> During the period between Broughton and Mendoza fighters had returned to the older, cruder style of boxing; brute strength and endurance were the traits which won battles. Mendoza changed this by reintroducing science and finesse into fighting. He relied on his superior agility and speed to defeat boxers who used the traditional English bulldog style of boxing.

Mendoza also brought royal patrons back to the ring. When the Prince of Wales, heir apparent to the English throne, gave Mendoza an audience after he defeated Martin, the Bath Butcher, the die was cast.<sup>36</sup> This event signaled that boxing had reached its meridian; the upper classes were socially free to enjoy the highly respectable sport of boxing. It became fashionable to be the patron of a fighter. Indeed, the sentiment, if not the letter, of the following passage seems remarkably close to the attitudes held by the patron of the artist during the Italian Renaissance :

It was the custom of the . . . nobleman to introduce his gladiator to his guests after dinner at Wargrave, where they were allowed to judge the strength of his arm by the whizz of his fist an inch off their noses.<sup>37</sup>

Yet not all of the noblemen and wealthy patrons cared for Mendoza. It must be remembered the Jew in London was virtually ghettoized during the eighteenth century.<sup>38</sup> C. Maritz, an eighteenth century writer, claimed that Jews were more unpopular in England than they were in Germany. Jew-baiting, a sport every bit as popular as bull-baiting in England, bore testimony Maritz's claim.<sup>39</sup> However, Mendoza had the courage to introduce boxing to the Jewish community. After Mendoza's instruction Jews became less subservient and it was "no longer safe to insult a Jew unless he was an old man or alone."<sup>40</sup> This drew the wrath of the gentile chauvinists. "Surely," they must

have thought, “this Jew Mendoza can not be the champion of *all* the English.”

The search for the great gentile hope culminated with the appearance of John “Gentleman” Jackson. Egan, the Thucydides of boxing history, concluded his sketch of Jackson with the following couplet:

Take him for all and all,  
We shall not (*easily*) look upon his like again.<sup>41</sup>

No one received as much attention from Egan as did Jackson. Egan wrote that

In the pugilistic hemisphere, Jackson has long been viewed as a fixed *star*, and the other bodies may be compared to so many satellites revolving round the greater orb, deriving their principal vigor and influence from his dominion.<sup>42</sup>

Jackson was a wonderous physical specimen. On beholding Jackson, the Prince of Wales exclaimed, “My God, there is a man.”<sup>43</sup> A powerful six-footer, Jackson was a superb sprinter and a remarkable athlete.<sup>44</sup> But it does not appear that Jackson was as great as his gentlemen supporters claimed. He fought only three fights and lost one of those.<sup>45</sup> Furthermore, one of his two victories was gained under the most suspicious circumstances.

The Jackson-Mendoza bout must be regarded as an illustration that a large portion of the British Fancy did not enjoy having a Jewish champion. Although Mendoza had skillfully avoided Jackson’s blows in the early rounds, Jackson was not to be denied a victory. Hence, in the sixth round Jackson secured a firm hold on Mendoza’s long, black locks with his right hand and unmercifully pummeled Mendoza’s face with uppercuts with his left hand.<sup>46</sup> “When Mendoza remonstrated to the referee, he was told there was no rule against holding one’s opponent by the hair and it was a darn shame, wasn’t it?”<sup>47</sup> Technically the referee was correct. Broughton’s Rules had not outlawed the tactic. And earlier in the century fighters had shaved their heads to prevent such an attack. But by the 1760’s the hair-pulling technique must have been outlawed by some *de facto* means. After 1760 boxers had allowed their hair to grow fashionably long, and there is no evidence that any fighter took unfair advantage of the long hair styles.<sup>48</sup> Certainly, Jackson had not used the tactic in either of his two previous bouts. Likewise, Mendoza had never encountered that method of

fighting before. Therefore, one can only conclude that Jackson took unfair advantage of Mendoza, and that the referee and spectators permitted the injustice.

The Jackson-Mendoza bout is not the only example of English nationalism in the ring during the Golden Age of bare-knuckle boxing. And, indeed, nationalism was not unique to boxing ; it was a phenomenon which manifested itself in all phases of English life. It must be remembered that the Golden Age of English boxing corresponded exactly with the years of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars ; nationalism understandably ran high. The trait of nationalism dominated the literature and boxing chants written during this period. When a challenge to England's superiority in the ring came in the form of a black American, the Fancy responded in the only way they knew, nationalistically.

On 10 December 1810, at Copthall Common, Essex, the first championship bout between a white man and a black man was held. This bout marked the end of the Golden Age of the English ring. Although Tom Cribb, the white Englishman, emerged from the bout with the victory, both his image and the image of the English ring were greatly tarnished. During the course of the fight Tom Molyneux, the black American, had dealt Cribb tremendous punishment. In the twenty-third round

Cribb landed his best blow, a solid smack directly in Molyneux's left eye, which so enraged the black man that he threw a left hook to Cribb's body, seized him around the waist, lifted him high and flung him to the ground. There the champion of England lay, flat as a mackerel, and after he was dragged to his corner, no amount of pinching, prodding, shaking, dousing, face-slapping and shrieking by his handlers could restore him to consciousness. Three times Gentleman Jackson called "Time!," according to the rules; Cribb was unable to come to scratch.<sup>49</sup>

Under normal circumstances Cribb would have lost. But the bout was not held under normal circumstances; it was the first international bout, a fight the English were determined to win. Thus Cribb was given time to recover by a series of delays. And Molyneux, who did not enjoy the luxury of being unconscious, was left standing, exposed to the cold, damp weather, and weakened both physically and psychologically.<sup>50</sup> When Cribb recovered he easily defeated his maltreated foe.

The sport of bare-knuckle boxing declined in England after the Cribb-Molyneux bout. One reason for the decline was that boxing, by its very simplistic nature, lent itself to corruption and intimidation more than other sports.<sup>51</sup> Secondly, because of improved training techniques and refined hitting methods bare-knuckle fighting became an extraordinarily brutal and bloody affair. It became common for a fight to last three or four hours and to end only after a hundred or more rounds. In these battles the punishment received by both fighters was tremendous. Thus bare-knuckle boxing traveled the same road as bull-baiting and bear-baiting. It became too barbaric for a society which was growing in sophistication. Boxing as a sport was preserved only by the introduction of the Queensberry Rules. But the sport that the fan of the eighteenth century had known was forever lost.

#### IV

Of the symptoms of *effeminacy* none so certain as a change from athletic and hardy sports, or exercises, to those requiring less bodily strength, and exposing the persons engaged in them to less bodily suffering; and when this change takes place, be assured that national cowardice is at no great distance, the general admiration of deeds and hardihood having already been considerably lessened. . . . As sports or exercises approach nearer and nearer to real combats, the greater . . . is our admiration of those who therein excel.<sup>52</sup>

When John Cobbett wrote the above passage in 1805 he touched upon the effect that boxing had upon the eighteenth century. Boxing had been more than a sport; it had been a reflection of a highly complicated age, an age of uncertainty but progressive change. Boxing had changed with society. The effects of science, royalty, and nationalism had all been felt within the ring. Boxing did not exist in a vacuum during the eighteenth century, rather it was as organic as society itself.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>William F. Lewis, "Man to Man: A History of Boxing," *Mankind*, April, 1972, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup>George Rude, *Hanoverian London 1714-1808* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), p. 75.

<sup>3</sup>Sir Walter Besant, *London in the Eighteenth Century* (3rd edition; London: A. and C. Black, Ltd., 1902), pp. 358-359.

<sup>4</sup>George Maccauley Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century, 1782-1901* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1922), p. 170.

<sup>5</sup>Pierce Egan, *Boxiana; or Sketches of Ancient and Modern Pugilism; From the Days of the Renowned Broughton and Slack, To the Heroes of the Present Milling Era* (Leicester, England: Vance Harvey Publishing, 1971 [first published in 1812]), p. 13.

<sup>6</sup>William B. Boulton, *The Amusements of Old London: Being a Survey of the Sports and Pastimes, Tea Gardens and Parks, Playhouses and Other Diversions of the People of London from the 17th to the Beginning of the 19th Century* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1969 [first published in 1901], p. 29; William Connor Sydney, England and the *English in the Eighteenth Century: Chapters in the Social History of the Times*, Volume I (2d. edition; Edinburgh: John Grant [1891]). pp.

<sup>7</sup>Boulton, *The Amusements of Old London*, p. 29.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup>Lawrence Huttan, "Prize-Fighting in the Olden Times," *Harper's Weekly*, August 31, 1895. p. 825.

<sup>10</sup>Rex Lardner, *The Legendary Champions*, (New York: American Heritage Press 1972), p. 2

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 1; Lewis, "Man to Man," p. 37.

<sup>13</sup>By all forma of self-defense I mean the ability to use foil, back-sword cudgel, and quarter-staff, as well as the fist. That Figg was a master of all these forms of self-defense can be seen by his calling card which described him as "Master of ye noble science of defense. . . . teaches gentlemen ye use of ye small sword, backsword, and quarterstaff at home and abroad." Boulton, *Amusements of Old London*, pp. 73-74.

<sup>14</sup>Egan, *Boxiana*, p. 20.

<sup>15</sup>Boulton, *The Amusements of Old London*, p. 4.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 76-77. Egan, *Boxiana.*, pp. 23-25, gives a more nationalistic account of the bout. The description also illustrates something of the general boxing styles of that day.

<sup>17</sup>Egan, *Boxiana*, pp. 40-41.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>19</sup>Leslie Stephen and Sid Sidney Lee (eds.), *The Dictionary of National Biography: From Earliest Times to 1900*, Volume VI (London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922), p. 1301.

<sup>20</sup>Lewis, "Man to Man," p. 37.

<sup>21</sup>Egan, *Boxiana*, p. 31.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>23</sup>Boxing historians generally recognize a difference between pugilism and boxing. Pugilism is regarded as being cruder and less scientific than boxing. From Broughton's time onward the term boxing, rather than pugilism, best describes the sport.

<sup>24</sup>Stephen and Lee, *The Dictionary of National Biography*, Volume II, p. 1370.

<sup>25</sup>John Durant, *The Heavyweight Champions* (New York: Hastings House, 1971) p. 4.

<sup>26</sup>Nat Fleischer and Sam Andre, *A Pictorial History of Boxing* (New York: Citadel Press, 1959), p. 12.

<sup>27</sup>Denzil Batchelar, *British Boxing* (London: Clarke and Sherwell Ltd., Northampton, [N.D.]), p. 9.

<sup>28</sup>C. J. B. Marriott, "Boxing," in *The Victorian History of the Country of Middlesex*, Volume II, edited by William Page (2d edition; London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1970 [first published in 1911]), p. 292.

<sup>29</sup>Boulton, *The Amusements of Old London*, p. 89.

<sup>30</sup>Cumberland and Broughton toured the Continent together, and, it would seem, were seldom seen separately in London. Boulton, *Amusements of Old London*, p. 88. Also see George Rude, *Hanoverian London, 1714-1808* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), pp. 74-75.

<sup>31</sup> Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis, *Three Tours Through London in 1748, 1776, 1797* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1914), pp. 62-63.

<sup>32</sup> Lardner, *The Legendary Champions*, p. 6.

<sup>33</sup> Joseph Abbott Liebling, *The Sweet Science* (New York: Viking Press 1958). p. 2.

<sup>34</sup> John Boy&on Priestley, *The Prince of Pleasure and His Regency, 1811-20* (New York: Harper and Row, Pub., One.. 1969), p. 47.

<sup>35</sup> Fliescher and Andre, *A Pictorial History of Boxing*, pp. 18-20. Mendoza was five feet seven inches and 160 pounds.

<sup>36</sup> Harold V. Ribalow, *The Story of Daniel Mendoza: Fighter from Whitechapel* (New York: Farrer, Straus, and Cudahy, Inc., 1962), p. 51.

<sup>37</sup> Boulton, *The Amusements of Old London*, p. 97.

<sup>38</sup> "The Immortal Champion: A Gentleman Who Didn't Fight," *World Boxing*, October, 1972 p. 31.

<sup>39</sup> M. Dorothy George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Capricorn Book, 1965). p. 132

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> Egan, *Boxiana*, p. 296.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 387.

<sup>43</sup> "The Immortal Champion," *World Boxing*, p. 30.

<sup>44</sup> Jackson was reported to have been able to write his name with an eighty-four pound weight attached to his little finger. One boxing historian remarked that "not the least remarkable part of this feat was a champion had not been found who could write his name at all." Danzil Batchelor, *British Boxing* (London, Collins, 1948), pp. 10-11.

<sup>45</sup> He defeated William Futrell on 9 July 1788 and Daniel Mendoza on 15 April 1795. He lost to George "The Brewer" Ingleston on 12 May 1789 when he slipped on the wet ring floor and turned his ankle.

<sup>46</sup> "The Immortal Champion," *World Boxing*, p. 52.

<sup>47</sup> Leonard Shecter, *The Jocks* (New York: Warner Paperbacks Library, 1969), p. 240.

<sup>48</sup> I examined over 250 bouts between 1760 and 1812 and never once encountered a bout that ended in a fashion similar to the Jackson-Mendoza bout.

<sup>49</sup> Lardner, *The Legendary Champions*, p. 25.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>52</sup> John M. Cobbett and James P. Cobbett (editors), *Selections from Cobbett's Political Works: Being a Complete Abridgment of the 100 Volumes which Comprise the Writings of "Porcupine" and the "Weekly Political Register,"* Volume II (London: Ann Cobbett, N.D.), p. 14.