

The army, clearly, had taken Wynendaele to heart. But despite the endless attention devoted by the dispersed troops and companies to the arms exercises, Bland would have been hard put to find more than a handful of battalions of 'well-disciplin'd Foot' outside of London and Dublin. It was all very well for the Foot Guards' battalions, constantly in concentration in and about London and Westminster, to go through the whole of the complicated platoon-firings—'Hyde Park discipline', as many appropriately and derisively styled it. Companies might know their arms exercises; but since platoon fire was delivered according to a prearranged and intricate sequence by platoons and 'firings' told off here and there down the full battalion (as in Figs 1-4, pp. 318-20 below), expertise by individual companies at the simple manual and platoon did nothing to guarantee the successful performance of the platoon-fire system—let alone major manoeuvres—by the full battalion when at last it might be assembled. This was made abundantly clear by the performance of the army in the wars of 1739-48.

1748-1764

The generally poor performance of the army during the campaigns of 1739-48 (especially before 1746), made it clear that the old system of drill laid out in the *1728 Regulations* was in need of considerable revision. This was to be carried out piecemeal during the years 1748-64, a fifteen-year period which—in sharp contrast to the three decades preceeding it—was to see the appearance of a number of regulations issued by authority and of a score of private publications some of which were excellent, and many of which illustrate a new spirit of professionalism loose in the army.

Although the Duke of Cumberland had considerable forces under his command in the Low Countries in 1748, negotiations for the peace were proceeding in earnest from the spring; there were consequently both sufficient forces available in concentration and plenty of opportunities to introduce and establish new drill procedures. Always deeply concerned with all matters concerning drill and regularity, the Duke now set in train the revision of the British drill with the preparation and dissemination, that summer, of the *1748 Regulations*, which all regiments

of foot in the Low Countries were to 'Conform to & practice'.⁷⁷ These new regulations concerned themselves only with the firings, with forming the square and wheeling the battalion line upon its centre, and with fine points such as the disposition of officers and drums; and it was in the firings that the changes made were most significant, since the telling off of the fire divisions and the ordering of the sequence according to which divisions were to give fire was now standardized on a method more easily practised than those laid down in the *1728 Regulations* and in Bland.⁷⁸ With the introduction of these changes, all the British foot except those units in Ireland was, by 1749, practising the manual and platoon exercises, the evolutions, and the majority of its manoeuvres after the old 1728 drill; while the firings and several of its manoeuvres were being carried on according to the new *1748 Regulations*.

The spread of the *1748 Regulations* illustrates once again the powers and limitations of authority. The Duke as Captain-General commanded the forces on the Continent and all the forces elsewhere except those in Ireland. With him in the Low Countries in 1748 were three battalions of Foot Guards and nineteen battalions of marching Foot; and by 1749 four of these battalions (the 8th, 19th, 32nd, and 36th) were at Gibraltar, four were in Minorca (the 12th, 31st, 33rd, and 37th), three Guards battalions and four marching battalions (the 13th, 20th, 21st, and 23rd) were in Britain, six battalions were in Ireland (the 1/1st, 25th, 28th, 42nd, 44th, and 48th), while the last, Loudoun's 64th, had been disbanded. Thus, by mid-1749,

⁷⁷ These regulations were issued in manuscript to the majors of brigade, whose business it was 'to give An Exact Copy of the Same' to the adjutants of each of the regiments in their brigades. There are copies in the Cumb. Pprs, Pt 4, II, fos. 61-2, and in the Kent RO Amherst MSS 05/6. Another copy (although easily overlooked, since it is untitled and undated) appeared in Anon., *Camp Discipline & Kane* (1757), 29-32. In the Kent RO Amherst MSS 05/5, the practice of these revisions (together with the rest of the drill current at the end of the war) is beautifully illustrated in the 'Review of the 2^d Battⁿ of the 1st Regim^t of Foot Guards by H.R.H. the Duke ye 26th of Sept. 1748 N.S. at Eyndhoven'.

⁷⁸ The Duke was busy reviewing British and allied regiments in the Low Countries' camps throughout the spring and summer of 1748 (see Kent RO Amherst MSS 05/1-8; and J. O. Robson, 'Military Memoirs of Lt-Gen the Hon. Charles Colville', *JSAHR* 28 (1950), 77-80). The new system of telling off the fire divisions seems likely to have been taken from the drill used in the Hanoverian foot: see Amherst MSS 05/1, 'Review of the First Line of Hanover Infantry . . . at the Camp of Nestelroy the Second of July 1748 N.S.'; and note especially the telling off of the 1st bn., Hanoverian Foot Guards, and of the battalion of Druchtleben.

the full Minorca and Gibraltar garrisons were using the new system, and the Duke had made it general practice in Britain.⁷⁹ In Ireland meanwhile, the six battalions come home from the Low Countries continued to practise the new 1748 *Regulations*;⁸⁰ and a seventh Irish corps (Hopson's 29th) was following these regulations too, since its lieutenant-colonel (a crony of the Duke, and of the Adjutant-General in London) claimed that he 'had received Verbal Orders from such high rank as was sufficient to him, to make Hopson's . . . Stick Close to these fireings and Evolutions.'⁸¹ Otherwise, it was not until 1756 that the new system now printed, modified, and issued generally 'By His Majesty's Special Command', was adopted by the rest of the Irish foot.⁸²

The drill of the cavalry was considered at this time too. On 5 May 1749 a board composed of colonels of Dragoon Guards and Dragoons met at the King's command in the Privy Garden, to consider and report on 'a Paper containing several Articles' relative to the organization, interior economy, and drill of their regiments. Their report was read at a meeting of 9 May and then laid before the King.⁸³ On the question whether they felt that there was 'any thing deficient or Superfluous in the present Discipline of the Dragoons', their reply was in the negative, and they had 'no Alterations to propose on that Head'.⁸⁴ That they should thus have replied is interesting, since the expertise of this board—with general officers of the experience of Honywood, Bland, Hawley, and Cope for members—was great; and six of the seven regiments that they represented had only recently been on active service against the French in the Low Countries. The Dragoon Guards and

⁷⁹ Cumb. Pprs, Box 43, no. 294.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, Box 44, no. 99, pp. 10-18.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

⁸² Proposals dated 15 Dec. 1750, in the Duke's papers, indicate that it was planned at the time to attempt to introduce the new system in Ireland. The plan was abandoned, presumably because the Duke's writ did not run across the Irish Sea. Cumb. Pprs, Box 44, no. 140, fo. 3.

⁸³ WO 71/9, pp. 65-74. Gen. Sir Philip Honywood (1st Dragoon Guards) acted as president of this Board, the members of which were Lts.-Gen. Henry Hawley (1st Dragoons), the Earl of Crawford (2nd Dragoons), Humphrey Bland (3rd Dragoons), Sir Robert Rich (4th Dragoons), Sir John Cope (7th Dragoons), and the Hon. Sir Charles Howard (3rd Dragoon Guards). These were seven of the eleven line cavalry corps then in Britain.

⁸⁴ WO 71/9, pp. 72-3.

Dragoons on the British establishment, therefore, continued to perform their drill according to the *1728 Regulations*; and indeed this is not surprising: changes in the manoeuvres and tactics of the mounted arm were few after Marlborough's campaigns, since before the appearance of true light horse the tactical role of the cavalry was well defined, its manoeuvres few, settled, and understood.⁸⁵

Beginning in 1755, a series of regulations and orders appeared which continued the revision of the drill begun in 1748. The first of these—issued by the Adjutant-General in May 1755 to all regiments on the British establishment, by order of the Duke of Cumberland—was a collection of extracts from the general orders given out in the army in the Low Countries between 1745 and 1748.⁸⁶ Dealing for the most part with the myriad daily routine duties in the corps on campaign, in the cantonments, and upon the march, it was only in passing that training and drill were touched upon; nevertheless these orders, which were to be 'looked upon as Standing Orders, and as such to be transcribed in the Regimental Book of each Regiment', helped considerably in systematizing routine throughout the army, as had Bland's text. In 1755 there was also drawn up at the Duke's bidding a set of 'Standing Orders to be Observed by the Whole Corps of Dragoons'.⁸⁷ Although the horses, tack, and kit, and the routine duty of quarters, camps, and marches was included, much space in these dragoon orders was devoted to the mounted evolutions and manoeuvres, and to the dismounted evolutions and firings (after the *1748 Regulations*, now introduced officially among the dragoons).

These collections of standing orders were only preliminary, for in April 1756 there was issued 'By His Majesty's Special

⁸⁵ The manoeuvres practised by the Dragoon Guards and Dragoons, c.1750, will be found in BL King's MS 239. This is a finely bound, 54-folio MS book of well-executed plans of the mounted evolutions and manoeuvres; and in the finely drawn plan of the 'Review of the British Cavalry By His Royal Highness the Duke ye 9th of July 1748. Camp of Nestelroy, New Stile' (Kent RO Amherst MSS 05/4). There is nothing among these that differs from earlier practice.

⁸⁶ Reprinted by P. Sumner as 'Standing Orders for the Army—1755', in *JSAHR* 5 (1926), 191–9, and 6 (1927), 8–10 (cited hereafter as *1755 Standing Orders*). These were reprinted in Anon., *Camp Discipline & Kane* (1757), 57–70.

⁸⁷ Reprinted with notes by P. Sumner as 'Standing Orders For The Dragoons, circa 1755', in *JSAHR* 23 (1945), 98–106 (cited hereafter as *1755 Dragoon Orders*). It is clear from their style and content that Hawley had a hand in their preparation.

Command' an entirely new platoon exercise, to be observed henceforth (without 'the least Alteration in or Deviation from it') by all the regiments in Britain, Ireland, and the overseas stations and garrisons.⁸⁸ With notes on the posting of officers, NCOs, and drums in the battalion line, and retaining both the firings and the system of telling off the fire-units as laid down in the 1748 *Regulations*, this new regulation represented the most significant official revision of the army's platoon exercise since the appearance of the 1708 arms drill. These 1756 *Regulations* cut the platoon exercise to a mere twenty-four motions; they were much more easily learned than the sixty-three of the old 1728 *Regulations* (still officially in use until now, but doubtless modified of late years according to the whims of the colonels and field officers of individual corps), and when mastered would have added noticeably to the rate of fire that the battalions could keep up—by an additional round every two minutes, at least, a factor to be of no small importance on the open battlefields of the Seven Years War. The new platoon exercise was practised by the sergeants and corporals of the 1st Foot Guards before being printed and issued to the whole of the King's forces, on 18 April 1756; and indeed the new drill was already being performed publicly by the NCOs of the 1st Guards on the 24th of April.⁸⁹

The 1756 platoon was reprinted several times during the ensuing few years, but each time as part of a larger drillbook—the 1757 *Regulations*—which now embraced all five elements of the drill. Prepared by the Duke of Cumberland, his Adjutant-General Robert Napier, and Lt.-Col. Alexander Dury of the 1st Foot Guards (of which corps Cumberland was colonel), this new drill, like the 1756 platoon before it, was being prac-

⁸⁸ This was *A New Exercise, To be observed by His Majesty's Troops on the Establishment of Great-Britain and Ireland* (1756).

⁸⁹ This was reported in the *London Evening-Post* of 27 Apr.; and that paper's report was copied by the *Gentleman's Magazine* (Apr. 1756). The reporter described the performance, which he watched in St. James's Park, as 'the Manual Exercise of the Prussians'; and (what with the easy availability of that magazine) historians have assumed ever since not only that he was correct, but (quite mistakenly) that he was referring to the full Prussian drill and not to just one element of it. It is quite possible that the Prussian platoon exercise (first privately published in English in 1754) was the inspiration of the 1756 English platoon; they resemble one another closely, although the English platoon exercise resembles that composed by Blakeney in 1740 quite as much as it does the Prussian platoon exercise.

tised in the months before its army-wide issue by the NCOs of the 1st Guards.⁹⁰ Once satisfied, the Adjutant-General on 25 June 1757 issued through his office this new full regulation drill which not only laid down the 1756 platoon exercise, together with the firings and the system of telling off the fire-units as first described in the *1748 Regulations*, but made regulation a new manual exercise, a new series of evolutions,⁹¹ and added a few manoeuvres now to be practised as the regulation drill in all of the regiments.⁹² Slightly shortened versions (i.e. without the new manoeuvres) of these *1757 Regulations* were issued thereafter;⁹³ and from 1758 marginal notations were included for the instruction of the dragoons, when performing the drill on foot.⁹⁴ These regulations, and the series of editions that

⁹⁰ Cumb. Pprs, Box 50, nos. 17, 211; and Box 52, no. 64.

⁹¹ Of the greatest importance in the development of manoeuvre technique, the *1756 Regulations* significantly reduced the rank- and file-intervals (always learned as part of the simple evolutions), which had been used unchanged in the army since the days of King William, making possible for the first time true close-order drill at speed, on all occasions.

⁹² There is no known extant copy of the *1757 Regulations*, as issued under the Adjutant-General's signature on 25 June 1757. There are however a great many contemporary references to them: e.g. in William Windham's *Norfolk Militia* (1760), 15 n. 2 (on which work, see p. 207; repeatedly by James Wolfe, as in his letter of 7 Feb. 1758 to Lord George Sackville (quoted in R. Wright, *op. cit.* 418-19); and in the Inspection Returns (WO 27) for the later 1750s. The 1758-60 editions of the *1757 Regulations*, if approached *without* awareness of the existence of the *1757 Regulations*, are difficult to interpret; and this has caused much confusion in the historical literature, often leading to the erroneous assumption—reinforced by the appearance at this time of translations of the Prussian regulations and by the unfortunate remark picked up from the press by the *Gentleman's Magazine*, noted above—of their derivation from the Prussian regulations. The full contents (save for some of the manoeuvres) can be deduced from the later editions.

⁹³ The 1756 edition was reprinted under the same title in New York in 1757, for the corps there; and in the same year it was reprinted in that catch-all, the anonymous *Camp Discipline & Kane* (1757), 71-8. Early in 1758 the first of the subsequent editions of the *1757 Regulations* (containing manual, platoon, evolutions, firings, and notes) appeared as *Manual Exercise As Ordered By His Majesty, For The Year 1758* (1758); later in the year another edition (with marginal notes for the dragoons' training) appeared as *New Manual Exercise, As Performed by His Majesty's Dragoons, Foot-Guards, Foot, Artillery, Marines, And by the Militia . . . Second Edition* (1758), thus including explicitly the other arms which had already been practising the drill since 1756. Copies were printed in Dublin and Limerick in 1758 with the Lord-Lieutenant's orders of 18 Mar. 1758 appended, ordering that these regulations be observed by all the foot and dragoons on that establishment. The latest copy I have seen was *The New Manual Exercise as Performed by His Majesty's Dragoons, Foot-Guards, Foot, Light Infantry, Artillery . . . Third Edition . . .* (Dublin, 1760), in which the new light infantry companies were included.

⁹⁴ On 7 June 1757 Ligonier wrote to Cumberland from London, where he was soon 'to see the adjut^s Serg^{ts} & Corp^{ls} of the dragoons . . . go through the new Exercise in

followed, up to 1760, were the culmination of Cumberland's programme of drill reform.

The same new spirit of energy manifest in the work of the central authorities during these years infused the world of private military writers. Several important treatises appeared at this time, and the period is a notable one for the translation of foreign drillbooks.

Of the private works that now appeared, three especially—although devoted to quite different subjects—stand out because of the breadth of vision and the occasional brilliance they displayed. Foremost among these was the *Art of War* by the comte Turpin de Crissé, first published in Paris, 1754, and in London in translation, 1761.⁹⁵ Turpin's lengthy essay, which was a detailed study of the practical carrying on of operations by an army in the field, was without doubt the best work available on that subject during the eighteenth century. Though he described war as he found it and was not inventive, Turpin's style was spirited and intelligent, commanding respect; never formal or dogmatic, his descriptions of tactical dispositions and the conduct of operations were bound only by general rules admitting considerable flexibility. These qualities were the fruit of profound study; and the sophistication of his analysis of active operations, his firm appreciation of the importance of retaining the initiative, and his grasp of the importance of intelligence, security, and terrain not only in grand and petty tactics but on overall strategic planning, derived from that study. The exceedingly clear format, the realism, and the vigour of the *Art of War* made it an immensely profitable work for both field and general officers.⁹⁶

which Gen^l Napier [the Adjutant-General] tells Me they are very Perfect'. Cumb. Pprs, Box 52, no. 116. R. Whitworth, op. cit. 218, makes the common error of assuming that some new Prussian drill is being referred to in this letter.

⁹⁵ Lancelot, Count Turpin de Crissé, *An Essay on the Art of War. Translated from the French . . . by Captain Joseph Otway*, 2 Vols (1761), was published in German translation at Potsdam in 1756, which speaks well for it. Turpin (who was a colonel of French hussars from 1747 until 1761, and a lieutenant-general by 1792) was a prolific author on military subjects, including translation and commentary on the works of several captains both ancient and modern.

⁹⁶ E.g. John Forbes, James Wolfe, and Henri Bouquet all studied and recommended the work even before its translation. Forbes conducted his Fort Duquesne operations

Broader in vision, if less expert in detail, was Thomas More Molyneux's *Conjunct Expeditions*, published in 1759 in the wake of the 1757 and 1758 raids on Rochefort, Saint-Malo, and Cherbourg.⁹⁷ Presenting his work in two parts, Molyneux first wrote the history of the main amphibious operations from antiquity to the present, and having done so he drew lessons and analysed the evident implications. The general failure of most such expeditions, he concluded, resulted from several factors, the chief of which was that there had never been any attempt to learn from past mistakes; consequently no body of tactical doctrine had been developed, no proper equipment, and no special training procedures, so that nothing but continued ill success could be expected to attend future amphibious expeditions. Having concluded this, Molyneux set out in the second part of his treatise to correct this situation by laying down overall operational procedures and plans, by describing special equipment which experience had shown to be needed, and by suggesting what training and tactics were appropriate for such a form of warfare. He argued that amphibious warfare, properly conducted, could achieve important results; and that Britain—with her huge navy, small army, and geographical position—should by her nature pursue this form of warfare. Molyneux's was by far the most thoughtful of those works that took this strategic line, and his analytical approach made his argument convincing; likewise his lengthy technical treatment of the special *matériel* necessary for such operations and his suggestions on the technical handling of assault landings (though often ill-found) added to the solid impression the book created. It was in fact to be of the greatest use to the army and marines, so often called upon in the Seven Years War and in the American

in 1758 according to the tactical system known as the 'protected advance', as laid down by Turpin—who had it from Montecucculi. In his 1763-4 campaigns in the Ohio country, Bouquet practised a version of this too. George Washington (who became acquainted with the work while serving under Forbes) obtained a copy of the 1761 English translation, and recommended its study to fellow American officers at the time of the War for Independence. Beckles Willson, *op. cit.* 295; O. L. Spaulding, 'The Military Studies of George Washington', *AHR* 29 (1924), 677-8; and K. L. Parker, *op. cit.* 254-69, and 292-342, *passim*.

⁹⁷ Thomas More Molyneux, *Conjunct Expeditions: Or Expeditions that have been carried on jointly By the Fleet and Army, with a Commentary on a Littoral War* (1759). Molyneux, as an officer of the regular army, had been on Mordaunt's Rochefort raid of 1757, which had been ill conceived and badly carried out.

War of 1775–83 to take part in coastal raids and landing operations.⁹⁸

The third of these most impressive works was Lt.-Col. Campbell Dalrymple's *Military Essay*, a long and detailed treatise, the overall aim of which was to 'new-model' the army.⁹⁹ Like Saxe, Dalrymple knew his Greek and Roman history; and he felt that any full-scale remodelling would have to be based on a system of recruiting that, like those of antiquity, turned not to mercenaries and pressed men but rather drew in 'citizens' educated from youth to valour, discipline, and self-sacrifice.¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless, although impracticable in this respect, the work was otherwise invariably realistic; and the great bulk of the work, which consisted of a detailed discussion of weapons, of clothing and accoutrements, and of basic and advanced training and drill, was always admirable and generally applicable in the British Army. Dealing equally with the horse and foot, he was most concerned that recruits in their training should be brought along with consideration; and he described in much detail the steps according to which basic training should be laid on. His ideas on advanced drill, similarly, were well-founded. The *Military Essay* was a mine of useful information for regimental officers, experienced or otherwise; it was always interesting and often brilliant, a challenge to officers, and without doubt one of the half-dozen best treatises written in English during the eighteenth century.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Two other works, Lt. John MacIntire's *A Military Treatise on the Discipline of the Marine Forces, When at Sea: Together with Short Instructions for Detachments Sent to attack on Shore* (1763), and Joseph Robson's *The British Mars. Containing Several Schemes and Inventions . . . shewing more plainly, The great Advantage Britain has over other Nations, by being Masters at Sea* (1763), appeared at this time: they dealt with other aspects of amphibious operations and with marine service. MacIntire's book was a sound, practical text on the training of Marines (and of regular foot shipped as marines) in the drill peculiar to action afloat. Robson's book, on the other hand, was filled with a fascinating collection of crackpot inventions designed for use in assault landings and the siege operations that might follow.

⁹⁹ Campbell Dalrymple, *A Military Essay. Containing Reflections on the Raising, Arming, Cloathing, and Discipline of the British Infantry and Cavalry . . .* (1761). Dalrymple was lieutenant-colonel of the 3rd Dragoons in 1761.

¹⁰⁰ Dalrymple's suggestions—on the establishments of the foot, e.g., pp. 25–8—were sometimes taken from Saxe's *Reveries*, which appeared in English at this time (see p. 205; and the book was clearly inspired by Saxe's example.

¹⁰¹ Dalrymple was to be quoted with regularity by most British writers, henceforth; and as early as May 1762 he was acknowledging 'the gracious manner' in which no less

Several other works appearing at this time added significantly to the store of drillbooks available. The sudden prominence of the Prussians after Mollwitz was reflected, during the 1750s, in the publication of the first of many subsequent English translations of their regulations.¹⁰² Unlike the several regulations issued to the British Army, these official Prussian works dealt not only with the five elements of the drill but also with the complete interior management and discipline of the regiments, and with all of the routine duties of the officers. The most striking characteristic of these regulations—one no doubt already half expected by British readers, aware of the machine-like discipline prevailing in the Hohenzollern service—was their sheer thoroughness; concise, pithy, clear, and well organized, these regulations read like statute books. Several other works dealing in depth with various aspects of the Prussian service also became available at this time.¹⁰³

The French, too, were well represented in English translations at this time; and the best of their works, Saxe's *Reveries*, owed its appearance in English to the on-going labours of Sir William Fawcett. The *Reveries*, of course, is one of the classics of military literature; and it can hardly be done justice in a few lines of summary. Infused throughout with an extraordinary spirit of innovation and reform—'nothing is so disgraceful as that slavish adherence to custom, which prevails at present', an expert than the Duke of Cumberland had been 'pleased to receive my Book'. Cumb. Pprs, Box 57, no. 216.

¹⁰² The first translation to appear was the *Regulations for the Prussian Infantry* (1754), reprinted as *Regulations for the Prussian Infantry . . . to which is added The Prussian Tactick* (1759); while in the meantime the *Regulations for the Prussian Cavalry* had come out (1757). These three translations were the work of Sir William Fawcett who, as in his 1757 translation of Saxe's *Reveries*, undertook the work only to 'be of assistance' to his 'Brother Officers'. Henceforth during the eighteenth century up-to-date translations of Prussian regulations were always available, as all the advertisements of the book-sellers illustrate.

¹⁰³ The best of these was the Anon., *New Regulations for the Prussian Infantry: Containing an exact Detail of the Present Field-Service . . . and recent Parts of the Foot-Exercise* (1757). With several excellent plates, and devoted entirely to the study of battalion drill and tactics in the field, this work was of the greatest utility to British officers in the advanced training of their corps. Internal evidence indicates that this was not Fawcett's work.

In 1762 Frederick II's instructions to his generals, written by the King in 1747, were translated into English and published as Anon., *Military Instructions by the King of Prussia* (1762); printed in limited numbers at Berlin in 1753 and captured by the Austrians in 1760, this book had already been printed by the Austrians and the French in 1761. From 1764 through 1785, the London staff kept yearly summaries of the annual Prussian manoeuvres. WO 30/45, MS book.

wrote Saxe¹⁰⁴—it ranged widely from the raising, training, and petty tactics of his specially designed ‘legions’, to the major operations of the full army in the field; and at every stage bold new ideas, many of them brilliant and several of them practicable (as Saxe was to demonstrate with success in his campaigns and battles), marked his text, pointing the genius of their author. Free from the conventions of the age and deploring the clumsiness of the unitary army (and especially the static fire-fights of which so many battles largely consisted), he described a flexible new tactics based on retaining the initiative, on engaging in detail, and (above everything else) on the morale of his soldiers and the speed and handiness of their manoeuvring. Where his ideas were practicable in the armies of the *ancien régime*, the British included, three especially stand out: first, his advocacy of small-redoubts before and within the battle-line to break up the attacks of the enemy and to discourage him from launching major assaults upon your main position, while at the same time permitting you ‘to introduce the method of engaging *en détail*, and of attacking in brigades’, thus enabling you to fix your enemy’s attention at points ‘to which you can always send fresh troops’;¹⁰⁵ secondly, his stress on the manoeuvrability of the infantry, to be attained by training the troops to march and manoeuvre in close order, to a cadenced step;¹⁰⁶ and thirdly his insistence that officers inspire their men, since morale is by far the most important element in war, where the fate of armies has often been determined by the sudden panic or the sudden bravery of a handful of men.

Capt. Samuel Bever’s short, popular guide for young officers, *The Cadet*, was likewise illustrative of the considerable influence

¹⁰⁴ Anon. Trans. [Sir William Fawcett], *Reveries, or Memoirs upon the Art of War, by Field Marshal Count Saxe . . .* (1757), v. This translation was reprinted in London in 1759, and again in 1776.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 135–6, 149–56, and *passim*.

¹⁰⁶ Marching in step, to a musical cadence, was probably the most widely adopted of the reforms suggested by Saxe (*ibid.* 15–18); this device made possible speedy and flexible manoeuvring by ranks at close order, and was one of the most significant developments in the drill of the armies of the eighteenth century. On the cadenced step and the British Army, see here, pp. 277–9. In a famous passage, Saxe wrote that ‘the manual exercise is, without doubt, a branch of military discipline necessary to render a soldier steady and adroit under arms; but it is by no means of sufficient importance in itself to engage all our attention . . . The principal part of all discipline depends upon the legs, not the arms: the personal abilities which are required in the performance of all manoeuvres, and likewise in engagements, are totally confined to them.’ *Ibid.* 14.

which foreign military works were having at this time.¹⁰⁷ Essentially a collection of thoughts and maxims drawn from the writings of such prominent captains and theoreticians as Vauban, Turenne, Folard, Saxe, Santa Cruz, Le Blond, and Puysegur, the aim of *The Cadet* was to distil the best from foreign-language works and, with a short running commentary, to make available this material for young British officers who might otherwise fail to become acquainted with it. Bever's chapters—most of which were devoted to the duties of each of the various ranks in the army—displayed a selection of material the choice of which was both judicious and economic. Though hardly deep, this little collection was a useful introduction of the service to young officers and might also have stimulated them to further reading.

The first two in what was to be a succession of works on various aspects of the 'petite guerre' appeared at this time, and again both were in translation from the French.¹⁰⁸ Both were excellent, dealing in detail with the considerable variety of the service likely to befall detached parties. Thus the speedy construction of small redoubts and breastworks; the preparation of farmsteads, country-houses, churches, and other isolated buildings for defence;¹⁰⁹ the attack and defence of small villages, street by street and house by house;¹¹⁰ the blocking of river fords, and of defiles; and a host of stratagems such as false attacks, the clever use of obstacles like *abatis* and *chevaux de frise*, the storming of entrenchments, and night marches, were dealt with too. Both works were rooted in experience, eschewing

¹⁰⁷ Samuel Bever, *The Cadet. A Military Treatise* (1756), came out in a revised edition under the same title, in 1762. In 1756 Bever became major of the 46th Foot.

¹⁰⁸ These were Capt. J.-L. Le Cointe's *The Science of Military Posts, for the Use of Regimental Officers, who frequently command Detached Parties. In which is shewn the Manner of Attacking and Defending Posts . . . [and] the Construction of Field-Forts* (1761); and John Muller's translation, with additional notes, of the Chevalier L. A. de La Mamie de Clairac's *The Field Engineer* (1760). A 2nd, revised edition of this latter work appeared in 1773, again by John Muller. Clairac (whose book was first published in France in 1749, and again in 1757), was 'an Engineer of high Rank in the French Army', as Muller described him, and had enjoyed 'a long Course of Experience'. Le Cointe (whose work was published in France in 1759), was a captain in the French horse, and had served in Piedmont and Flanders under the prince de Conti.

¹⁰⁹ E.g. Clairac on the defence of churches is full of good advice (pp. 41-5).

¹¹⁰ Le Cointe's description of the detailed preparation of a village for defence is outstanding, as is his discussion of the tactics to be used in attacking such a place (pp. 137-54, 174-80).

theory and dealing in a very practical vein with their subject-matter; and both—Le Cointe's especially—were designed not for trained engineers or senior officers so much as they were aimed at those junior officers who were most likely to find themselves in command of detached forces.¹¹¹

The reform of the English militia and the new vigour introduced into its affairs after the passage of the Militia Acts of 1757–8 was reflected in the appearance of drillbooks devoted to that service; but the best of these books were of use to the officers of the regular army in the basic training of their men too, since the militia drills (on paper) tended to differ very little from the practice of the regular army.¹¹² Without doubt the most useful and popular such work in the army was William Windham's *Norfolk Militia*, which dealt at length with all five elements of the drill.¹¹³ Addressing itself especially to the procedures by which the men could best be trained, it contained over fifty plates illustrating the manual and manoeuvres; and these were the best plates yet to have appeared in any English drillbook. Another militia officer, Edward Fage, brought out his short but admirable *Regular Form of Discipline* which, like Windham's drillbook, was so clear and well organized in its discussion of basic training that regular officers could hardly but have benefited from it.¹¹⁴

There were too, as we have seen, revised versions of Kane,

¹¹¹ Clairac's was a practical guide but, more than Le Cointe's, it was sophisticated enough to be of use to engineer officers as well as officers from the line regiments. Indeed, Clairac 'considered, that though many have wrote upon the Construction of permanent Fortification, as well as upon the Attac and Defence of Places, yet little had been wrote in regard to the requisite Knowledge of an Engineer in the Field' ('Ed.'). Le Cointe, meanwhile, led off his text with some 35 pages of practical geometry—sufficient for regimental officers otherwise unlettered in engineering, and necessary for a proper basic understanding of the essentials of the 'science' of field-works and defences.

¹¹² See, e.g., the anonymous *New Military Instructions for the Militia . . .* (1760), virtually a word-for-word copy of the 1758 edition of the *1757 Regulations*.

¹¹³ William Windham and George Townshend, *A Plan of Discipline, Composed for the Use of the Militia of the County of Norfolk* (1759), was rushed to the press late in that year, incomplete; the full edition (with title unchanged) came out at London in 1760. In 1768 the full 1760 edition was reprinted as *A Plan of Discipline for the Use of the Norfolk Militia . . .* (1768). Townshend wrote the dedication only.

In the introduction to his facsimile reprint of von Steuben's *Regulations for the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1779 (rpt. 1966)), R. Riling notes that as many as nine imprints of the *Norfolk Militia* were made in the American colonies between 1768 and 1774.

¹¹⁴ Edward Fage, *A Regular Form of Discipline for the Militia, As it is Perform'd by the West-Kent Regiment* (1759).

Bland, and Blakeney being printed at this time; and though of limited practical use as regards drill and tactics, the first two of these were still of some value to raw officers as guides to the routine of the service.¹¹⁵

Finally, the last of the old profusion of privately prepared manual and platoon exercises came out at this time, the work of George Grant.¹¹⁶ Grant's platoon was quite impracticable, despite the fact that its preparation had cost him 'a great deal of Pains and Study'; he slurred together too many of the individual motions of the exercise, finishing up with an exercise which still involved more motions than the one that was to be issued by authority in 1764. Grant's little book contained a number of interesting observations on training and tactics, nevertheless; and despite the fact that his text was hardly literate, still these observations may have been of some value to the few who troubled their heads with his written style.

1764-1778

With the conclusion of the Peace of Paris the central authorities in London began once again the preparation of new drill regulations designed to incorporate the considerable tactical experience and change of the past decade. Two new sets of regulations were envisaged from the start and, although they were issued concurrently, the purposes of the two projects were regarded as distinct. On the one hand a new arms exercise was to be prepared and given out, by the King's command, to be practised through the army generally. On the other hand the Horse Guards had a more immediate, particular concern: it planned to regularize the procedure carried out at the spring and autumn reviews of those regiments under its most immediate inspection and control—that is, the regiments doing duty in the kingdom of England. The first of these projects required the preparation and issue of new manual and platoon

¹¹⁵ Among these, the anonymous *Camp Discipline & Kane* (1757) included much recent material on the encampments of the army, and on such varied topics as pay, honours, clothing, rank, etc., mostly drawn from orders given out by authority over the years c. 1740-57.

¹¹⁶ George Grant, *The New Highland Military Discipline, or a short Manual Exercise Explained . . .* (1757). As its title indicates, Grant thought that his manual would be of most use in the Highland regiments, being new-raised corps destined soon to be sent abroad. Grant's book is in facsimile reprint, with an introduction by J. R. Harper, as *The New Highland Military Discipline of 1757* (Ottawa, 1967).