Langen, Ulrik. "Public order and the experiment of implementing privacy in eighteenth-century Copenhagen." *Private/Public in 18th-Century Scandinavia*. Ed. Sari Nauman. Ed. Helle Vogt. London,: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 189–200. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350224926.ch-9>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 05:23 UTC.

Copyright © Sari Nauman and Helle Vogt 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Public order and the experiment of implementing privacy in eighteenth-century Copenhagen

Ulrik Langen

On the night of 17 January 1772 Cabinet Minister Johann Friedrich Struensee (1737–1772) was arrested after attending a masquerade at the royal castle in Copenhagen. Over the past two years Struensee had – in the capacity of royal physician – gradually gained nearly absolute power in the kingdom of Denmark-Norway by way of his personal influence on the mentally ill king Christian VII and through his love affair with Queen Caroline Matilda (1751–75, r. 1766–72). The Struensee reign lasted sixteen months during which a considerable number of reforms were launched.

The Struensee reign had a profound influence on the city of Copenhagen and its population. Everything from taxation to funeral practices were turned upside down by public reorganization and administrative reform. While the freedom of the press introduced in September 1770 literally created a new public sphere, a string of initiatives, on the other hand, dealt with the boundaries between the private and the public.

The first taste of a new policy regarding public/private matters was a cabinet order of 31 December 1770 in which the king prohibited any domiciliary visits when the customs authorities searched for contraband goods. But the major turning point came when the municipal council was dismissed in the beginning of April 1771 and a new lord mayor of Copenhagen was appointed. On 3 April 1771, the new lord mayor count Ulrich Adolph Holstein (1731–89) – one of Struensee's carefully chosen administrators – dispatched a bill proclaiming the composition of a new city council. Furthermore, the bill presented five articles by which the terms of reference for the new council were presented. Two articles concerned the elections of the citizens' representatives, while the following three dealt with more basic conditions of the social life of the city.

One article had specific importance regarding privacy concerns. In article 2 it was stated that 'anyone has the right to enjoy absolute liberty in one's own house without being prevented – neither day nor night – by the police from doing private business (*particulaires Forretninger*)'.¹ This was a significant break from the police's license – which had been codified in 1684 – to examine private houses if any activity going against good moral conduct was suspected.²

The meaning of the phrase 'private business' in article 2 of the Bill of 3 April was open to extensive interpretation, but it seems apparent that one purpose of the article was to establish more firm boundaries between private and public by introducing limitations on the public control and interference with what were considered belonging to the private sphere.³ In the same way as Struensee had created a new public sphere by introducing freedom of the press, one could argue that he wanted to outline a private sphere, which was to be fundamentally inaccessible to the public, as long no illegal activities were taking place.

After the fall of Struensee in January 1772 this policy was heavily criticized by prominent civil servants and public intellectuals – especially article 2 which was intensely proclaimed to be the root of the trouble. In this article, I will demonstrate how the critics – the chief of police, the Danish Chancellery and public intellectual Peter Frederik Suhm (1728–98) – managed to evoke a narrative of social disorder and create an argument, that made the extended privacy introduced during the Struensee reign proportionate to the (in their eyes) increasing depravity among Copenhageners, and ultimately, how the policy of privacy was staged as a reflection of the immoral conduct at court represented by Struensee and Queen Caroline Matilda.

The Bill of 3 April 1771

The regulation of urban public space was of great concern to the Danish government as well as to the municipal authorities, and since mid-eighteenth century the idea of 'good police' had dominated the ongoing discussions on the maintenance of security and order in the urban environment.⁴ The emergence of *Polizeiwissenschaft* was a major contribution to this debate on civic order and urban development, but public order and urban stability were not solely matters of law and regulation. Throughout Western Europe, negotiations between city authorities and town dwellers played a prominent role in the attempt to regulate urban public space.⁵

It is not clear where the inspiration to article 2 of the Bill of 3 April came from. After the fall of Struensee, Holstein specifically maintained, regarding the passage about the police visitations, that it was delivered to him by Struensee as a verbal order.⁶ In more general terms, he explained that the main goal was to provide the Copenhageners with as much personal freedom and as many commercial opportunities as possible.⁷ This ambition becomes even more clear when studying an aide-memoire written by U. A. Holstein in April 1771 to follow up on the Bill, in which the concept of 'private business' (*particulaires Forretninger*) came closer to a definition. It is not clear from the aide-memoire who the specifically intended receiver was; the contained instructions were directed to the chief of police, but he was mentioned in third person throughout the document. I will carefully go through the relevant parts of the document in order to determine the key ideas behind article 2.

In the aide-memoire the new lord mayor particularly forbade the chief of police to initiate any investigation into activities taking place within 'the houses'. The aide-memoire was written in German, and Holstein used the phrase 'was in den Häusern geschieht oder nicht geschieht' (what happens and what does not happen in the houses).

It is not clear if the term 'den Häusern' refers to the buildings in which people live as well as the confinement of private homes – and in this regard, did the phrase 'one's own house' (as stated in article 2) apply to tenants as well as house owners? It is also worth noting the ambiguity of the phrase 'what happens or does not happen'. This hazy wording probably referred to concurrent views on activities, which were considered being inconsistent with moral and social norms or judgements on the one hand as well as what was considered proper and expected homely conduct within the household on the other. But the bottom line was that houses (or homes) would from now on be protected against random police investigation, and it was – once more and verbatim to article 2 – clearly highlighted in the aide-memoire that 'anyone has the right to enjoy full liberty' in one's own house. The question is *whose* privacy this measure was aimed at. Did it really concern anyone without considering, for instance, gender or social class? What did 'absolute liberty' mean?

Holstein indicated in more detail that the chief of police was not to worry about any trade taking place in the private houses, nor was he – and this was more controversial – to be concerned if 'a woman lived independently or not'. This was a clear break with common attitudes towards Lutheran household regulations, and moreover, it ran contrary to the prevailing idea that a woman living on her own was to be regarded as a vagrant (*løsgænger*) – if not a prostitute – if she was not tied to either her father, a householder or a husband.⁸ This part of the aide-memoire specifically aimed at protecting independent and self-supporting women against social stigmatization and unwarranted interference from public authorities.

Furthermore, directions in the aide-memoire specified that it was to be of no concern to the police what went on in the houses on Sundays and holidays; consequently, the observance of the third commandment was openly disregarded. This decision was clearly at odds with the laws on sacrilege. Finally, it was declared that it was to be of no concern to the police if drinking and gambling took place in public houses during night time.⁹ In this way, the lord mayor indicated that no distinction should be made between night and day, which was a break from the traditional distinction between night and day in early modern cities and the social code that belonged to this distinction. The difference between day and night marked not only a transition between work and leisure, but also between the orderly practices of everyday life and the more disordered nocturnal life outside the searchlight of the authorities and the social control of the surroundings. Therefore, during the second half of the seventeenth century, a strong demand arose among the inhabitants in the cities for – as mentioned before – *god politi* (good police), i.e. law, order and decent behaviour. The hiring of police officers in the market towns originated from this demand for supervision of *nattesæde* (illegal night-time serving of costumers), which was considered to be sacrilegious, especially if it happened on Sundays and public holidays. For the same reason, the first local police officers hired in the towns were paid from the funds of the church. The church bell's evening ring marked the transition to the night – 'police night' (*politinat*), as it was sometimes called – with strict rules for orderly behaviour. However, it was rarely a particularly easy task for the officers to get citizens to abide by the rules.¹⁰

To sum up, the house or the home was inviolable according to the Holstein aide-memoire. Gambling, drinking, retail business, (suspension of) Sunday observance and

nattesæde were to be regarded as private matters as long as they took place within the confines of private houses or – as in the case of drinking, gambling and *nattesæde* – in the liminal zones of the public houses (alehouses, taverns, etc.).

Two questions remain unanswered from reading the Holstein aide-memoire: Did house mean home – and did home mean private? There is general agreement that such distinctions easily become anachronistic if applied too rigorously to eighteenth-century urban life.¹¹ In the aide-memoire Holstein focused on a set of practices rather than a spatial definition of house and home. The activities taking place within the private houses were not necessarily private as opposed to public – or rather; home did not necessarily mean private as the home was frequently used for commercial purposes. To many craftsmen, home and workshop were not spatially separated, as well as trading or serving alcohol would take place within what we in modern terms would understand as ‘homes’. The spatial division between private and public, between home and commercial premises was more likely to be established by mental line-drawing than by precise physical boundaries.

In some ways, Holstein’s aide-memoire seems to represent an initial example of the early-nineteenth-century idea – originating from the so-called *Rechtsstaat* ideology – that the state should refrain from intervening in the private sphere of its citizens, while the traditional jurisdictional powers of the police were to be limited and transferred to common criminal code and regular courts.¹² The legal reform introduced by Struensee in June 1771 – when a new court (*Hof- og Stadsretten*) was established to replace the entanglement of several local courts in Copenhagen – points in the same direction.

Reactions

Before the fall of Struensee in January 1772, the ‘privacy article’ was left more or less uncommented in public. But as soon as the cabinet minister was imprisoned, the critics surfaced. In the eyes of the critics, the initiatives of the Struensee-appointed Holstein had created unwanted dislocations in the social geography of the city. The initiatives were furthermore perceived as promoting a morally unacceptable license regarding sexual conduct, as well as encouraging popular insubordination and unruliness which challenged the social order of the city.

This interpretation was heavily influenced by the dismay caused by the violent riot, which took place in Copenhagen during the night of 17 January 1772, following the imprisonment of Struensee. The popular celebration of Struensee’s downfall in the streets of Copenhagen had turned into a riot during which more than 70 ‘disreputable houses’ (suspected brothels) around the city were attacked by the crowd and property was demolished. Doors and windows were smashed, followed by the destruction of furniture and equipment thrown into the streets. Tapestries were torn down from walls, fixed panels were broken down, floors were forced up, stoves were wrecked, and household effects were stolen and sold on the black market. Even more serious were the physical abuses experienced by the women who the attackers regarded as prostitutes. The incidence can be added to a line of eighteenth-century European ‘pulling down’ of brothels, for example in Brussels 1718 and London 1749.¹³

A significant feature of the numerous broadsides, penny-prints and pamphlets, which were published shortly after the incidence, was the number of detailed narratives (often in the form of ballads) unfolding the determined vandalism and the destruction of the contents of the houses. The violent event became known as 'The Great Clean-Up Party' by the sympathizers of the mayhem – implying that the Copenhageners were cleaning up after the immoral regime of Struensee. Despite the few critical voices, the wrecking and the plundering seem to have been regarded as acceptable to most pamphleteers.¹⁴ One author stated that it was alright for the plunderers to sell the stolen furniture because it was 'unlawful goods' – meaning that the brothel keepers had purchased the goods with money unlawfully earned in a time of high prices and financial decline. Furthermore, the pamphlets made a considerable effort to justify the trespassing and vandalism of the rioters by describing (and assigning) the house as belonging to a liminal zone between public and private.¹⁵

Just a few days after the coup, the first criticism of the Bill of 3 April 1771 was put forward. On 20 January the government demanded – with reference to 'The Great Clean-Up Party' – an explanation from the chief of police for the reasons why the police were unable to 'maintain public order' in the city. Four days later the chief of police, Vilhelm Bornemann (1731–1801), sent his report to the government.¹⁶

There was no doubt in Bornemann's mind that article 2 of the Bill of 3 April 1771 was the sole reason for the disorder, and he was convinced that public stability would instantly be re-established the moment the article was revoked. The article had deprived the police 'the authority to keep an eye on the morals and manners of the common man in the houses and regarding his household, which previously had procured the Police the confidence and respect with the crowd, which in case of disturbance had an unfailing effect. Because of this, the city has been filled with prostitutes, lewd people and vagrants'.¹⁷ According to Bornemann, the Copenhageners did whatever they wanted to do in the houses without restraint, but still worse, they 'forage a supply of impudence, obstinacy, and contempt for every kind of order, and brutish manners and habits of taking the law into their own hands which inevitably will lead to severe violence, when they discover that they are the strongest'.¹⁸ Indeed, it was a grave scenario, which the chief of police evoked in his report.

Bornemann was convinced that the 'privacy-article' had to be revoked and the domiciliary searches 'in bad and suspicious houses' once again allowed. Furthermore, many of the previous regulations – generated by many years of experience, as Bornemann solemnly emphasized – against 'hobos, prostitutes, *Nattesæde*, amok-running, crowding in the streets' and everything running contrary to decency and good moral ought to be put back in force.¹⁹ It was impossible to maintain public order as long as article 2 was in force.

Moreover, the chief of police suggested that all the alehouse keepers and publicans in the city were to be counted and registered in order for the municipal authorities to have complete overview of the situation and – not least – reduce their number. There were too many of them and they had become 'a sort of privileged vagrants' who made the common man accustomed to 'very harmful idleness and lewdness'. This comment pointed directly to the pervasive practice – made possible by the 'privacy article' and Holsteins orders – of using the private houses for serving alcohol to customers after closing time.

The report was processed in the Danish Chancellery (*Danske Kancelli*) in order to present the case as well as a possible solution to the king. The members of the Chancellery were all in agreement about the benefits of revoking the privacy article. On the question of reducing the number of pubs and alehouses, the opinions were divided. Some of the members argued that no obstacles should be made to trade and industry, while one member highlighted that the considerable number of public houses had disadvantageous effects on trade as well as morals. The alehouse keepers were 'living on top of each other' in Copenhagen and the large number resulted in very little income for most of them, 'which make them urge not only grown-ups but also boys, even women, to drunkenness, night-crowding and other disorderliness'.²⁰ This particular member of the Chancellery knew of several cases of young boys being led astray by beguiling alehouse keepers. Furthermore, he was generally worried about the public houses being a seedbed for pimping and prostitution. Another member argued that it could be dangerous in the present situation to reduce the number of alehouses because it would cause disturbance and bustle 'because it is exactly this mean class of citizens who are instigators of most conspiracies'.²¹ In the heated days after the fall of Struensee, any measure that potentially could cause any disturbance of public order was to be avoided – and in the opinion of this particular civil servant, introducing restrictions on alehouses had the potential of generating severe popular dissatisfaction.

Following the debate in the Chancellery, article 2 of the Bill of 3 April 1771 was revoked on the 6 February 1772 by a royal resolution, which staged the article as nothing less than 'the source to all the disorder which rules the city'.²² The article had deprived the police of its authority and its means to monitor the common people's 'lifestyle and manners in the houses', leading them to 'commit all kinds of lewdness and depravity with impunity'.²³ In this way, the resolution paraphrased the report from the chief of police. The suggestion on reducing the number of public houses was passed over in silence in the royal resolution.

On 27 January 1772, it was communicated in the newspapers that the prohibition against *nattesæde* was restored and that a decree dating back from 1701 was reintroduced. This decree stated that no one was allowed to be present in alehouses after 10 pm and that the chief of police was to make sure that no indecent behaviour was going on. In a police bill (*politiplakat*), Bornemann communicated the royal decision on revoking article 2. Seemingly, to prevent any misreading of the royal decision, i.e. to avoid any popular discontent with this new imposition of restrictions on urban social life, he added an explanation on how to interpret of the revocation of article 2. The chief of police emphasized that 'the appropriate freedom which everyone always had enjoyed when conducting lawful and honest business' would in no way expire or be reduced.²⁴ The purpose of the re-introduction of the police's license to conduct house searches was to observe the maintenance of order, good practice, modesty, decency and good moral character. In the future, the house searches would be carried out to make sure that no sacrilege was committed (for instance, serving alcohol or engaging in unnecessary work or commercial activities during service time) or that no illegal gambling or *nattesæde* was taking place in the alehouses. Furthermore, the police would examine the houses to see if the number of servant girls employed was

disproportionate to the size of the household; this explanation was evidently directed at houses suspected of procuring. Last, but not least, the police would use the house searches to make sure that no 'loose and unattached persons' were living independently but were going into service unless they could prove that they were making an honest living.²⁵

The re-introduction of the house searches was conveyed as a means to fight illegal nightly conduct, gambling and prostitution. The message was that anyone who lived according to moral standards and traditional Lutheran household practice had nothing to fear ('the appropriate freedom which everyone always had enjoyed when conduction lawful and honest business', as mentioned above), while any inclination towards the idea of privacy inherent in article 2 of the Bill of 3 April was considered morally unacceptable and a danger to public order.

The immoral court

U. H. Holstein was dismissed 18 January 1772, the day after the fall of Struensee. It has been argued that the reason for his removal was directly connected to the disturbances of the 17 January. To calm down the Copenhageners, the government considered it to be necessary to remove the person who was generally regarded as the author of the prohibition against police interference with whatever activities taking place in the houses.²⁶ There are some indications that Holstein's innovative and wide-ranging urban reforms were overshadowed by the banning of the domiciliary visits and that he – quite unfairly – came to be viewed as the incarnation of all trouble and public disorder in Copenhagen during the nine months he was active as lord mayor.

In his diary, historian and public intellectual Peter Frederik Suhm was quite explicit when characterizing U. H. Holstein. Back in April 1771, when Holstein had been appointed lord mayor of Copenhagen, Suhm wrote that Holstein 'was unfit for office, and furthermore lecherous'; he was rumoured to be running about warehouses and 'gathering thoughts and ideas on ordinances and new arrangements from prostitutes and pimps'. Specifically regarding article 2, Suhm wrote in his diary how the police no longer was allowed to do domiciliary visit. According to Suhm, the sole purpose of this measure was to protect the prostitutes.²⁷

After the fall of Struensee and the dismissal of Holstein, Gothard Albert Braem (1710–88) was appointed new lord mayor of Copenhagen. He was an ardent enemy of the Struensee regime, a sentiment that was quite explicitly communicated in a longer account on the state of Copenhagen he sent to the king in June 1772. After painting a very dark picture of the fatal economic and commercial conditions in the Capital, he mentions the Bill of 3 April 1770. In his opinion, article 2 had made the number of 'lecherous houses and loose women' increase dramatically and the number of people infected with venereal diseases was so large that the hospitals were heavily burdened.²⁸ In this narrative, the 'privacy article' was solely tied to moral decay and lechery. This view was common in many of the pamphlets published after the downfall of Struensee; the main purpose of the 'privacy article' was said to have been to protect brothels from inquisition and prostitutes from indictment. This went hand in hand with the idea of

the depraved policy of the fallen cabinet minister; the rationale being that because Struensee was an immoral man, he wanted to care for the safety of prostitutes, and article 2 was the instrument to accomplish this protection. To the new regime, this was a convenient interpretation because it moved the attention away from the political aspects of Struensee's measures by insisting on a moral and religious judgement of the Struensee reign.²⁹

The before-mentioned Suhm expanded this view in an anonymous pamphlet entitled 'To my countrymen and fellow citizens: Danes, Norwegians and Holsteiners' ('Til mine Landsmænd og Medborgere: De Danske, Norske og Holstenere') in which he examined the state of affairs during the Struensee reign. Among a long line of offences, he highlighted article 2 of the Bill of 3 April 1771 and elaborated a theory of political deviousness and moral decay at court.³⁰ He claimed that the purpose of article 2 was to pacify the Copenhageners. The Struensee government had reasoned that man loves freedom and wilfulness and is by nature inclined to pleasure, which makes him immoral and indulgent towards petty crimes. By introducing article 2, the government hoped to obtain support of the crowd and thereby remove popular attention from the government's undertakings in general. The government aimed at lulling the crowd to sleep by providing entertainment, freedom of the press, distribution of free wine and bread, spectacles, etc. According to this interpretation, article 2 was regarded as a part of a political strategy of concealment.

Furthermore, Struensee and his associates – including Queen Caroline Matilda – provided this 'illegal freedom' in order to justify and legalize their own deeds. If we are to believe Suhm, everyone shivered when thinking of the conduct at court during the Struensee reign; the realm was disgraced, the people were despised and virtue was ridiculed. Suhm's argument gained a strong gender dimension, as he highlighted how 'shameless women' in this period were preferred to other ladies at court. Thus, the privacy aspect of the article 2 was elevated to be a reflection of the immoral behaviour at court.

Conclusion

When Holstein wrote his aide-memoire in an attempt to elaborate on the use of article 2 of the Bill of 3 April 1771, he presented a string of restrictions regarding the monitoring of the urban population. In short, Holstein demanded restraint from the police officers and referred to 'the houses' as places fundamentally off-limits unless any citizen required the presence of the police. Holstein did not say much about the desired effects of these new rules for police conduct. But article 2 and the aide-memoire can – in a favourable light – be viewed among other things as an attempt to stimulate private business and economic activity by relieving small businesses (like serving on the premises) from any non-mercantile restrictions, i.e. religious rules and moral claims. It can also be seen as a progressive initiative to encourage independent and self-supporting women, as well as a quite radical introduction of privacy as a certain domain free from random police interference.

This did not necessarily mean that the private domain was synonymous with private life and homely confinement. The private domain was just as much a place for

commercial leisurely activities, such as drinking and gambling. In this way there was some kind of performative quality attributed to the private domain of the city houses – privacy could be acted out. According to the chief of police and the members of the Chancellery, the performance of this privacy resulted in popular insubordination and moral decay – ultimately in a threatening public disorder. The ‘mean class of citizens’ – as a member of the Chancellery put it – could not be trusted the right to privacy, i.e. the right to avoid random house searches. P. F. Suhm took the argument to the next level by integrating the privacy indicated by article 2 in a line of initiatives with which the Struensee government attempted to cover up their activities by giving the people a false feeling of freedom along with *panem et circenses*. To Suhm, the privacy stipulated by article 2 was nothing but a phantom invented to anesthetize the people.

From a perspective of public order, the opponents of article 2 were focused on the morality and mores of the inhabitants, which was why they persistently opposed what they considered to be attempts to destabilize religious practices, whereas Holstein seems to have been much more attentive to stimulating trade and manufacturing – which would have a positive impact on public revenues – by limiting police interference. While Holstein regarded privacy as a means to further economic growth and the welfare of the urban population (even if it encouraged morally dubious activities as gambling and *nattesæde* – and even prostitution), his opponents were convinced that privacy, in the form represented in article 2, was undermining public order and ‘good police’.

Notes

- 1 ‘Skal enhver i sit Huus nyde fuldkommen Frihed uden at blive forhindrede af Politiet Dag eller Nat i deres particulaires Forretninger’.
- 2 *Schous forordninger*, 29 April 1684, 409, specified by an instruction of 24 March 1741 and an ordinance of 19 April 1743, see Kolderup Rosenvinge 1828, 21 and Koch 1982, 46.
- 3 On the Bill of 3 April 1771, see also Stevnsborg 1998, 247–56.
- 4 On ‘good police’, see Munck 2007. Jørgen Mührmann-Lund has convincingly argued that even in absolutist Denmark, ‘good police’ was not ‘social disciplining’ meaning an authoritarian policy to change society, but rather a conservative policy demanded by the subjects. The unintended effects of the absolutist reforms of police enforcement on traditional social order were also minimal and due to resistance adapted to the changing demands of the subjects during the eighteenth century, which meant a greater emphasis on criminal investigation, which had not been a police task in the beginning of the century. Mührmann-Lund 2011, 359–60 (English summary) and Mührmann-Lund 2016.
- 5 On the relationship between negotiating and regulating the urban public space, see, for example, Rau 2007 and Sennefeldt 2008.
- 6 ‘daß was den Passum betrifft, daß, um allen Anstoß zu vermeiden, die Polizey-Bediente nicht wie gewöhnlich in den Häusern visitiren dürfen, auf mündlichen Befehl des Grafen Struensee mit eingerückt ist’, Hansen 1916–23, 586.
- 7 Trier 1916, 135. It is very likely that Holstein was inspired by German *Polizeiwissenschaft*, which seems to have been a concern in his administrative

- practice as county governor (*amtmand*) in the town of Tønder in the years before he became lord mayor of Copenhagen.
- 8 On vagrancy and households, see Koefoed 2017; Jacobsen 2008; Henningsen and Langen 2010, 61–2.
 - 9 ‘Er [the Chief of Police] hat sich übrigens mit dem jenigen auf keine Weise zu bemängen was in den Häusern geschiehet oder nicht geschiehet, sondern einem jeden hierin alle Freiheit zu lassen, auch nicht nur das Gewerbe dieser oder jenen zu bekümmern, oder ab eine Persohn auf ihre eigene Hand sitzet oder nicht, ob in den Wirtshäusern des Nachts getrunken oder gespielt wird, oder was an Festtagen in den Häusern passiret oder nicht passiret, kundschaft einzuziehen, solange man seine Beystand nicht verlanget’, Copenhagen City Archives: Magistratens almindelige øvrighedsforretninger, Struensees kabinetsordrer m.v. 1770–2, memorandum written by Holstein (undated).
 - 10 Regarding *nattesæde*, see Mührmann-Lund 2015. On the early modern night, see Ekirch 2005 and Koslofsky 2011.
 - 11 See, for instance, Klein 1995 and Shoemaker 2003. For an interesting summary and new perspectives on the debate on gender and early modern public/private distinctions in the historiography of the last decades, see Heuvel 2019.
 - 12 Kotkas 2013, 190.
 - 13 Stevnsborg 1980, 570–99. On physical abuses during the riot, see Horstbøll, Langen and Stjernfelt 2020, 237–58.
 - 14 Langen 2020.
 - 15 As George Rudé and numerous other scholars have pointed out, mob aggression in this period was predominantly directed towards material property rather than turning into physical abuse of fellow city dwellers. Although in this case, many women were brutally victimized by raging intruders. Rudé 1971, 17–34.
 - 16 Bornemann’s report: Danish National Archive (DNA), Danish Chancellery, ‘Koncepter og indlæg til 1. departements missiver 6 Februar 1772’, no. 71.
 - 17 ‘Derved er Politiet sat ud af den Myndighed at have øye med meeninge Mands Sæder og Levemaade i Husene; og af den Forbindelse med hans Huusholdning, der (...) tilforn forskaffede Politiet den Fortroelighed og Ærbødighed hos Pøbelen, som i Tilfælde af Sammenløb havde en ufejlbar Virkning. Derved er paa den anden Side Byen bleven opofylt med Skiøger, liderlige Mennesker og Løsgjængere’, DNA, Danish Chancellery, ‘Koncepter og indlæg til 1. departements missiver 6 Februar 1772’, no. 71: Bornemann to the King, 22 January 1772.
 - 18 ‘samler sig en Forraad af Frækhed, Selvraadighed, Foragt for alle Befalinger, fæiske Sæder, og Vane at tage sig selv til rette, der nødvendigvis maae bryde ud til de største Voldsomheder, naar de seer at de ere de stærkeste’, DNA, Danish Chancellery, ‘Koncepter og indlæg til 1. departements missiver 6 Februar 1772’, no. 71: Bornemann to the King, 22 January 1772.
 - 19 ‘Løgiængere, Skiøger, Nattesæde, Grassategang og Stimen paa Gaderne. Ibid.
 - 20 ‘ey alene Voxne men Drænge, ja Qvindfolk med til Drukkenskab, Nattestiimen og andre uordentligheder’, DNA, Danish Chancellery, ‘Koncepter og indlæg til 1. departements missiver 6 Februar 1772’, no. 71: written deliberations of the chancellery members (undated).
 - 21 ‘thi det er just denne nedrige Classe af Borgere som ere Ophavsmænd til de fleste Sammenrottelser’, *ibid.*
 - 22 ‘Kilden til den Uorden, som nu hersker her i Staden’, DNA, Danish Chancellery, ‘Koncepter og indlæg til 1. departements missiver 6 Februar 1772’, no. 71: royal resolution 6 February 1772.

- 23 'ustraffet kand begaae alle Liderligheder og Laster'. Ibid.
- 24 'den tilbørlige Friehe, som enhver stedse har havt udi sine lovlige og ærlige Forretninger'. Public notice (*Politiplakat*) of 10 February 1772, *Kiøbenhavns Politiske Veyviser* 1773, 84.
- 25 'løse og ledige Personer'. Ibid., 83–4.
- 26 Trier 1916, 163–4.
- 27 Suhm 1918, 56.
- 28 Trier 1905, 12–13. The entire account is printed in Trier 1905, 9–32.
- 29 See, for instance, Anonymous *Sandfærdig Beskrivelse over De betydelige Forandringer og mærkværdige Tildragelser i Kiøbenhavn Fredagen den 17 Jan. 1772*, (no year of publication).
- 30 Suhm 1772, 6–7.