

Regimental Records in the Late Eighteenth Century and the Social History of the British Soldier

by G.A. STEPLER

Bounced along in carts, shifting on the backs of pack animals, and sitting in the creaking holds of wooden ships, the books and papers of Britain's regiments travelled the world over. Under the care of a succession of regimental adjutants, serjeants major, and soldiers acting as regimental clerks, they were worked on in the alehouse billets and damp fortresses of the British Isles, in the humid stations of the West Indies, under canvas in the dusty plains of India, and in the remote outposts of the North American interior. The "regimental books" went where their regiments were sent and like their regiments suffered the hardships and losses of active service. Some were taken away by officers when they left the service, despite admonishments that the books were "never to be removed from Head Quarters."¹

Today it is hardly surprising that the survivors are scattered across the globe wherever British soldiers served or their families or descendants settled. They are to be found in a great variety of repositories and collections and no doubt others remain as private family property. The regiments of today's army have very few in their possession. The most extensive collections of eighteenth century records still with their regiment are found with the senior regiments of the Brigade of Guards, who alone in the eighteenth century enjoyed something like a permanent depot in the great metropolis of London. For the historian the wide dispersal of the surviving regimental records creates many difficulties, yet those still extant must be considered as vital for any study of the eighteenth century army's "other ranks."

Throughout the eighteenth century the regiments of the army maintained a high degree of autonomy in virtually every aspect of their internal management, guided largely by the custom and the practice of the British service. Secretaries at War were reluctant to interfere with the prerogatives of regimental colonels and though the perquisites of company officers were subjected to much tighter controls by the later eighteenth century, the regiments still enjoyed great freedom in those details of "interior oeconomy" which most affected the lives of common soldiers.² Only after 1792 did this begin to change. In the absence of general regulations applicable to the whole army, the details of internal arrangement in the regiments were left to the taste and ability of each commanding officer. By custom these details were usually decided by the field officer (a lieutenant-colonel or a major) who commanded the regiment in its quarters, though he was of course

subject to specific orders he might receive from the regiment's colonel. While some corps were taken strongly in hand and turned into "pattern" regiments deemed worthy of emulation, at the other extreme there were those who suffered from inattention, or what was perhaps worse, the whim and caprice of commanding officers who made it "extremely difficult, to adhere to any certain System"³ Uniformity in the keeping of regimental books and records, which were themselves an integral part of a regiment's management, was not to be expected.

The "regimental books, which may be called the records of the regiment," wrote John Williamson, "are those which contain the general orders, regulations, &c. the returns of the regiment, of men inlisted and discharged, proceedings of regimental courts martial, returns of arms, ammunition, clothing &c. and all that relates to the operation and oeconomy of the regiment."⁴ The number, shape, and size of these regimental books, the manner in which they were kept and the information they contained was liable to no regulation. Nevertheless, the records usually fell into four categories: (1) orders and general correspondence; (2) strength returns; (3) records of the receipt and issue of clothing, arms, accoutrements and provisions; and (4) records on the men themselves, including courts martial and individual accounts, the latter usually kept at company level only.

Each regiment followed its own course. In 1750, a single volume of large size seems to have been the usual means of keeping all records, but by the 1760s this was changing. While in some "one large book is appointed to answer for the entry of every particular, which in consequence of its unwieldy size, and the jumble of occurrences, is with difficulty perused," others had adopted the practice of using several different volumes of a smaller, more convenient size. Captain Bennett Cuthbertson, whose *System for the Compleat Interior Management and Oeconomy of a Battalion of Infantry* was purchased by over nine hundred officers on its first appearance in 1768, was a proponent of the latter scheme, which he believed to be "much more methodical" and more accessible for inspection than the use of one large book. He apportioned the information necessary for the daily management of a regiment among four smaller books, the first of which was to contain "all Orders issued from his Majesty, his Viceroy, Secretary at War, Commander in Chief, and General Officers ... likewise all standing orders, from any of the Regimental Field-officers" A second book was to contain copies of the annual reviews, the monthly and weekly returns, and "also every other Return, for which the Adjutant is accountable." The third tome was set aside for various records on the officers and men of the regiment. It included "the succession of (1) Officers, (2) Serjeants and Corporals, and the description of the (3) Drummers, Fifers, and private Men, in alphabetical order, with a registry of all casualties, either by (4) Deaths, (5) Discharges, or (6) Desertion" The final book was to have "Copies of all March Routes, and Returns of Arms, Accoutrements, Ammunition, Cloathing, Camp-equipage, and Forage, received by, and delivered to the Regiment."⁵

Cuthbertson put forward his plan in 1768 but its immediate impact on the record-keeping habits of his colleagues may perhaps be doubted. His less original contemporary, the prolific compiler Captain Thomas Simes, whose military books and treatises began appearing in the late 1760s, took until 1777 to include any scheme for the keeping of records. Simes' excuse for being remiss is revealing of what was probably an all-too-common attitude. "Upon my review of my publications," he wrote, "I perceived that a main point for the government and conduct of a battalion (namely, regularity in keeping regimental books, with the advantage attending it) had escaped my memory"⁶ To

remedy this he offered a plan which envisaged seven separate books of records, covering much the same ground as Cuthbertson's original four. Simes proposed a "Government's Book" for the general orders and instructions, a "General Book" to hold copies of all routes and marches, reviews, returns, and courts martial (in tabular form), and a "Quartermaster's Book" for the returns of clothing, arms, and accoutrements. There was also to be a "Pay-Master's Book" for "Forms of Abstracts and other matters for which he is accountable" and a "Surgeon's Book" which was to contain "the Regulations and Treatment of the Sick of a regimental Infirmary, and Form of Return." A "Companies Book" was to record the regiment's standing orders, together with various rolls and returns, that is, morning strength reports, clothing lists, provision and barrack returns, and furlough records. His seventh volume was an "Adjutant's Book," the contents of which were very similar to those of the "Companies Book."⁷

Those books actually kept by the 24th and 70th Regiments of Foot in the 1780s followed neither Cuthbertson nor Simes exactly. According to the standing orders of the 24th Regiment, eight books were to be maintained, six of them by the adjutant and two by the quartermaster. The adjutant's books included one for general orders, another for "all official letters," a third for duplicates of the monthly and fortnightly returns, a fourth for all "returns, states, &c. &c. asked for, or sent to headquarters, the Adjutant Generals Office, War Office, &c. &c. &c." a fifth was an orderly book containing "the daily occurrences, orders and memorandums" and the sixth was a "description book" of the whole regiment "specifying the age, country, size, length of service, of every man in it, with the casualties that may happen." The quartermaster was to keep one book "containing an exact account of all Cloathing received and issued, duplicates of invoices sent by Clothiers, and copies of powder warrants." His other book was to record receipts for all the clothing he issued, together with "every other memorandum that can assist to an explanation in his department."⁸ In the 70th Regiment there was a copy book for all general orders and public letters, a muster book, a book for the monthly returns, a description book, an orderly book, and a quartermaster book.⁹

Custody of the regimental books, except of those which pertained to the quartermaster, usually fell to the adjutant, whose business it was to assist the officer commanding the regiment by managing every detail of its daily administration, duty and general discipline. As the principal staff officer of the regiment, the adjutant was responsible for making out all the various strength returns, the transmission and recording of the daily orders from the officer commanding the regiment, and for such things as the officers' duty roster. He also bore a responsibility for the conduct of regimental courts martial and the execution of their sentences. He worked under the inspection of the major, who in the 24th Regiment of Foot was to view the adjutant's books only four times a year.¹⁰ To assist him, the adjutant relied on the most senior serjeant, the serjeant major (not yet an officially authorized rank), and a soldier who acted as regimental clerk. The adjutant was charged with the responsibility for the correctness of both of these assistants.¹¹

Despite admonishments that they be maintained "in the neatest and most correct manner,"¹² the regimental books were not necessarily well kept. Captain Cuthbertson emphasized strongly the importance of clear, careful and punctual record-keeping, but the practice could too easily fall short of the ideal. Officers in general did not expect to lead a life in which the usual commitments and pleasures of a gentleman were completely superseded by military responsibilities, and many were only too happy to leave the tedium of much company business, including the paperwork, to their non-commissioned

officers. Serjeants commonly assumed a principal role in the management of their captain's company, and similarly the serjeant major could become a figure of the greatest importance in the government of the whole regiment. This often occurred when a very young and inexperienced officer was given the adjutancy, a common situation.¹³

In an effort to keep the records of the 37th Regiment of Foot in good order, Lieutenant Colonel Lord Pennington wished "no Person whatever to write or make Entry's in any of the Regiment's books — but the Clerk of the Regiment — who is to keep them (excepting those relating to the Quarter Masters department) very regular" and as a further check he wanted the clerk to bring them to the commanding officer every month for inspection. Lord Pennington was well aware that literacy and legibility, even among those chosen to keep the records, could not simply be assumed. Major Townshend observed that in the 19th Regiment of Foot, "several of the Non commission.^d Off.^{rs} of the Regiment write very Ill, some of them scardeligible [sic]." On another occasion, having examined "the Specimens" given in by the non-commissioned officers, he was "sorry to find so many deficient in the essential Qualifications of writing & Spelling."¹⁴ Men who were both literate and able to carry a command were not easily found, and although some ability at writing was needed in a serjeant, men promoted to the rank did not necessarily possess that skill. Presumably they were to learn what they needed later. The results may be seen in the extremely poor handwriting, bizarre phonetic spelling, omissions and ungrammatical constructions which characterise many order books. A principal reason for the creation of regimental schools was to teach reading and writing to non-commissioned officers and to likely candidates. A legible hand and a good grounding in grammar were advantages from which a man could reasonably expect some promotion or at least better employment in his regiment.

Among the records kept were copies of orders which are one of the most fruitful sources of information to be found on the daily life of the soldier. Depending on their immediate source and applicability, orders were either general, garrison, brigade, regimental or sometimes battalion. It is the regimental which usually contain the most rewarding material concerning the soldier. These orders were usually given out daily and "such as are necessary to be attended to at all times" were considered as standing orders. Copies of the daily regimental orders, or at least those to be treated as standing orders in the regiment, were usually kept by the adjutant, and it was also common practice for the companies themselves to keep their own order (or "orderly") books in which all orders were to be entered. Each day the regimental adjutant would have the orderly drummer "beat for orders," upon which signal the orderly serjeant and corporal of each company, together with the serjeant major and the fife major, would assemble at their adjutant's orderly room. There the regimental adjutant, or often the serjeant major, would dictate the orders issued that day, and the orderly serjeants would take them down, first in "ruff," later making a fair copy in their pocket-sized order books. The orderly serjeants then went to their respective company officers and showed them the orders. The orders of immediate concern to the officers and men of the serjeant's company would refer to the duties, fatigues, and detachments required the following day and it was also the orderly serjeant's responsibility to warn those men of his company who were "for duty" the next day. Orderly hour was variable, but usually around midday. If necessary, there might be additional calls for orders: "morning orders" were those given out before the usual time, and "after orders" following the usual time, those given out sometime in the evening.



William Cobbett, the indispensable serjeant-major, custodian of the “regimental books.” Plate 4 of a series satirizing his military career. Enlisting as a private soldier in 1784, he rose to the position of serjeant-major and, suspecting some of his officers of corruption, he began collecting evidence from the regimental records for a future court martial. His military service was passed largely in New Brunswick. References to Cobbett’s later radical political interests appear on the upper wall. Courtesy of National Army Museum.

Regimental orders touched every aspect of the soldier’s life and the management of his regiment. Apart from routine information such as the parole and countersign for the daily guards, the names of those officers next for duty and the number of duty men required each day, there were instructions on various, and often quite unrelated, topics covering anything from the messing arrangements within the companies to the fines payable for concealing venereal disease. According to Major Coote, the order books of the 47th Regiment of Foot immediately following the end of the American Revolution were “filled with nothing but repeated animadversions” on the behaviour of the soldiers, and noted “only so many records of their disgrace.”¹⁵ By implication from the repeated admonishments if not always through direct statements, a picture of much of the soldier’s behaviour and outlook does emerge, albeit through the eyes of disapproving officers. It was moreover “in order to prevent the frequent Repetition of Orders, and their appearance in the Serjeants’ Orderly Books” that the idea of standing orders was fixed upon, and this development in itself held significance for the soldier. In recognition of the fact that it was “absolutely Necessary that every Individual in the Corps, should ascertain every Particular of his own and the Regiment’s duty,” the field officers of the

70th Regiment of Foot issued a new set of printed standing orders in 1788. They saw this as a step which would "more clearly establish the Discipline of the Corps upon a proper foundation" for they recognized that "To hunt in a Common Orderly Book is a tiresome and unsatisfactory Pursuit."¹⁶ At the time that their slender volume of orders appeared, regimental standing orders in printed form were becoming more popular. Their emergence however had been far from uniform.

In 1765 Major Townshend recommended to the officers of the 19th Regiment of Foot that each of them acquire their own book for copies of the regimental orders, which at that time were being kept only by the serjeant major, "Fairly Transcribed in A Book for that purpose."¹⁷ Six years later, Lieutenant Colonel Pringle was urging each company and also all of the younger officers of the 51st Regiment of Foot to possess a similar book for copies of all general and regimental orders "as from the Tenor of them must be constantly attended to, and to which the Commanding Officer of the Regiment, will refer from Time to Time, as Occassion may require." They were, however, only to copy those orders "taken from the Large Book of Orders, under the direction of the Adjutant of the Regiment."¹⁸ This system continued in the 51st Regiment throughout the 1770s, but in the 35th Regiment of Foot the officers had already received a set of printed standing orders as early as 1769. When Charles Buckeridge joined the 37th Regiment of Foot in 1774, he received a manuscript copy of that regiment's standing orders, supplied to him, as to every other new officer, by the regimental clerk for a charge of three half crowns.¹⁹ Through the 1780s and 1790s printed volumes of regimental standing orders began appearing more frequently. The 47th Regiment of Foot printed a set in 1785, and two years later Lieutenant Colonel Richard England had a new set of orders printed for the 24th Regiment of Foot, to replace those "lost during the course of Service the Regiment was employed on last War in America."²⁰ Each of the foot guard regiments also set down their own standing orders, but true to their own way of doing things these were much briefer and less comprehensive than those of the marching regiments and seem to have been continued only in written form for some considerable time after 1800.

In 1755 the Duke of Cumberland, as Captain General of the army, had tried to ensure not only that each regiment had a set of standing orders, but also that they were the same in every regiment throughout the army. They were "to be handscribed in the Regimental Book of each Regiment."²¹ Many regiments certainly made the desired entry in their books. In 1757, however, the Duke fell from favour and strict uniformity seems never to have been achieved, or at least did not last very long. His orders were supplanted by others, lost, or simply forgotten. The Duke's direct attempt at a uniform system for all regiments fell by the wayside and was not revived, but by the last decades of the eighteenth century some uniformity seems again to have received encouragement, this time through the spreading custom of printing regimental standing orders. There were similarities and even direct copying between regiments, a process also stimulated by the migration of experienced field officers through various regiments during the course of their careers. The very appearance of regimental standing orders, and their evolution in the second half of the eighteenth century from periodic written entries in the one "Large Book of Orders," to small printed volumes given to each officer was a conscious step towards improving discipline and general efficiency. In the first instance it was intended that this would make officers more aware of their duties and general responsibilities, and this in turn would only improve the welfare of each of their soldiers.

Order books of one type or another are the most common survivals from the regimental records of the later eighteenth century. Being kept at company as well as regimental level, they were simply more numerous than the regimental books proper. It is, however, to the regimental books, and specifically to the various registers, that one must turn for the kind of information necessary for both a broader picture of soldiers through quantitative studies and for detail on the lives of individuals. The registers were drawn up as working documents and, being created as the commanding officer saw fit and as need arose, often included records not mentioned in the suggestions offered by authors such as Cuthbertson or Simes. In the 37th Regiment of Foot, while it was under the command of Lord Pennington, there was to be a Regimental Book of Furlows, a regular list of Marriages, and a History of the 37th, in which the conduct of every soldier was to be regularly entered.²² From 1777, the 51st Regiment of Foot kept a book for recording the names and behaviour of all those given permission to work.²³ A "Surgeon's Book," which recorded admissions to the regimental hospital, was yet another type of record which might be kept, and by 1780 the practice of recording regimental trial proceedings was well established, being "generally done, though there is no regulation or order for it."²⁴ Surviving books from the First Regiment of Foot Guards include a Recruit Posting Book, a separate register of casualties (whether by discharge or death) and another of deserters, two courts martial books (or "confirmation books" of sentences, setting out crime, sentence, and the execution of the punishment), and a large collection of regimental trial proceedings.²⁵ There was also a defaulters' book, which is not among today's survivors.

Unlike the impressionistic and often highly selective reminiscences of those soldiers who have left us their account of military life, the registers offer a glimpse of such problems as desertion and punishments through the daily record kept of such occurrences. What has survived is itself selective, and often fragmentary. The context of surviving records is extremely important and although quantitative studies from registers of casualties, deserters, courts martial, and description books are certainly possible, the results can be limited, hedged in with the difficulties of often very imperfect data. The registers, like order books, can suffer from poor writing and be further compromised by suspected, or very obvious, errors and omissions. The annual inspection of regimental records, done at the yearly review of each regiment, appears usually to have been a most cursory affair and, judging by the surviving records, assuming they are representative (which seems likely), the attention paid to accuracy and punctuality in making entries was frequently lax.

Because they were dependent on a succession of clerks for their upkeep, registers can be incomplete, inconsistent, and of very uneven quality. A promising beginning can dwindle to very occasional entries which seem most unlikely to form a complete record. The completeness of any given record must always be a serious consideration while further difficulty can arise when other information necessary to make the fullest use of a surviving record is not to be found. Without a regiment's effective strength over the period covered by a record, the real frequency of a particular occurrence among the rank and file cannot be known with certainty. The exact system, or perhaps more accurately the rule of thumb, used in the registers is not necessarily comprehensible and the precise purpose of the record may be unclear. This is particularly true of deserter records. Before the 1830s there were no regulations on the reporting of deserters, that is, no officially recognized criteria as to when a man who was absent became a deserter. When, or even if, a man was

to be declared a deserter was decided wholly by his officers. The grounds for entering a man's name into the Register of Deserters kept by the First Regiment of Foot Guards are not clear. The number of deserters listed for any given month does not match the number reported for the same month in the regiment's monthly returns.²⁶

Apart from the company account books, which devoted a page to each man, no records were kept on individual soldiers as such. Only on his certificate of discharge were the details of a soldier's career collected together in one place, and then only in the briefest outline. Apart from the description books, individuals appeared only incidentally in the regimental registers, but where a variety of records survive, as from the First Regiment of Foot Guards, brief career sketches of individuals are possible. Delinquent behaviour was one criteria for appearing in various of the regiment's books and, whereas those soldiers who have left personal memoirs of their service seem often to have been rather different from their comrades, and certainly not usually among the worst behaved men, it is the careers of the regimental rogues, the hardened old offenders, which emerge most fully from the registers. Here one can reconstruct their repeated offences, desertions, and generally injudicious conduct. In the case of the First Regiment of Foot Guards, the survival of many regimental court martial proceedings can often add further details from a source which is itself rich in information on soldiers.²⁷

The records which once existed, even if not maintained on the scale or with the rigour envisaged in military treatises and regimental orders, would certainly, had they all survived, provide historians with a great deal of information on the life of the eighteenth century soldier. What has survived are usually only odd volumes, the existence of any considerable number of regimental books from one period for any one regiment being a rarity. This survival of the army's records as regimental fragments was a direct result of the decentralized nature of eighteenth century military administration, further exacerbated by the peripatetic life of the soldier even within the British Isles. All of this served to emphasize the importance of the regiment and its autonomy in the British service, and this in turn makes it necessary for students of the soldier's social history both to immerse themselves in the working minutiae of regimental management and to establish as full a context as possible for the service of particular regiments during the period referred to in their surviving records.

Obviously it is essential to know the exact purpose for which a record was created, by whom, and under what circumstances. Contemporary treatises, orders and instructions, and the careful study of surviving regimental books themselves explain much. Yet, because the regiments did not adhere to any one scheme or set of instructions for record-keeping (and can occasionally be shown to have ignored or themselves misunderstood instructions), the answers to such questions can be elusive, severely limiting the value of such records to the historian. The postings, recent service, movements, and general reputation, and if possible something of the personalities of its field officers, must all be considered if fragmentary evidence on desertions, discharges, deaths, sickness, or general discipline are to be properly assessed. Without a full appreciation of the particular regiment and its circumstances, erroneous conclusions are easily drawn as may be illustrated from a recent study on the British soldier in the American Revolution. On the basis of returns done on cavalry regiments in Britain and on a handful of infantry regiments in Canada in 1775 and 1782 respectively, the author concluded that the average soldier was a man of about thirty years of age, and that the eighteenth century British army, unlike modern armies, avoided the youthful soldier.²⁸ Cavalry regiments, however, are

known to have had a generally much slower turnover of men than the infantry, while those infantry regiments used as evidence had all been in North America for at least six years (and in one instance for fourteen years).²⁹ Being starved of recruits, the infantry in the sample had quite literally grown old. Distant and often lengthy colonial service played a major part in the lives of Britain's foot soldiers, a fact of which contemporaries were well aware. That fact has apparently been completely overlooked in this author's assessment of surviving evidence, not to mention her folly in comparing cavalry regiments in peacetime with infantry regiments in wartime after seven years of conflict. In fact it was not that the youthful soldier was avoided, but rather that the presence of many old soldiers could *not* be avoided. The eighteenth century army was no different from others in recruiting large numbers of very young men, often mere boys. The "age" of a regiment depended entirely on circumstances.

The would-be student of the eighteenth century army must become a student of its individual regiments — which unfortunately is not simply a matter of reading the conventional, published regimental histories. While these do provide an outline of a regiment's service and often much else that is useful, they are too frequently silent on matters which reveal the regiment's inner life. Periods of malaise, when discipline and reputation were at a low ebb, and desertions unusually high because of weak command or a difficult posting, are not mentioned. Equally, and perhaps more surprisingly, the outstanding merit of a particular regiment can also go unnoticed. The only remedy to this situation is a return to the very scattered and often fragmentary primary sources themselves, of which the collection of eighteenth century review returns in War Office 27 at the Public Record Office in Kew is a necessary starting point.

Much emphasis must be put on the study of individual regiments, but this fact itself immediately raises the problem of generalizing about military life on the basis of so many particular examples. In the absence of extensive records on the other ranks of the whole army, or even of a substantial part of it, this must be owned a difficulty, yet it is only through a sharp awareness of each regiment's particular circumstances that generalizations can be attempted at all. Nor perhaps are descriptions of the "average soldier" and his experience necessarily of much meaning. Quite apart from the problems of the surviving evidence which make the study of individual regiments unavoidable is the fact that eighteenth century regiments enjoyed a large measure of independence and saw a great diversity of service, making life in one regiment or even in one particular company quite different from that in another.

In 1768 Captain Cuthbertson had urged the importance of well-kept records on his fellow officers. With accurate records, disputes could be resolved more easily. The adjutant would be aided "in the expedition and correctness with which he will thereby be enabled, to make out his Returns" The quartermaster too would feel "the advantage, on many occasions, of being able to have recourse to such authentick records." But, fearing that the records might not be properly cared for, he had also felt it necessary to remind his colleagues that "the Box containing them, must by some means or other, be carried on a March, at the expence of the Regiment, in order for their being constantly at the Head-quarters of it"³⁰ By the early years of the nineteenth century the importance of record-keeping had gained sufficient notice for regulations on the subject to be included in the *General Regulations and Orders for the Army*. Continuing the trend away from the "one large book," which had been the common practice in 1750, to an increasing number of separate volumes, the general regulations of 1811 listed fifteen different

regimental books for the infantry and sixteen for the cavalry regiments. In addition, regimental quartermasters were to have six and the surgeons nine different books. At the company level there were now general regulations as well which required infantry companies to maintain six separate record volumes and cavalry troops, seven.³¹

By the early nineteenth century printed volumes of regimental standing orders too had become standard. Matters had progressed from the days when all records were simply “a jumble of occurrences” consigned to a single unwieldy tome. In its way, the story of regimental record-keeping marks out very clearly the growing proficiency of the military profession and with it an improvement in the soldier’s well-being. But, to the historian trying to trace these changes, when he surveys the remaining fragments, there can only be some regret that more attention had not been paid earlier to Captain Cuthbertson’s homely observation that without “the greatest exactness” in its records “the affairs of a Regiment must soon be involved in confusion, and no traces appear, by which the least information can be given of past events.”³²

Notes

- 1 National Army Museum, London (hereafter NAM), 6912-14-58b, p.1, Regimental Standing Orders for the 70th or Surry Regiment of Foot. Issued by Lieut. Col. Richard St. George, Island of Jersey, 14 Jan. 1786.
- 2 See Alan J. Guy, *Oeconomy and Discipline: Officership and Administration in the British Army, 1714-63* (Manchester, 1985).
- 3 Bennett Cuthbertson, *A System for the Compleat Interior Management and Oeconomy of a Battalion of Infantry* (Dublin, 1768), p. ix.
- 4 John Williamson, *The Elements of Military Arrangement, and of the Discipline of War; Adapted to the Practice of the British Infantry* (Third edition, London, 1791), I, p. 41.
- 5 Cuthbertson, *A System*, pp. 178-79.
- 6 Thomas Simes, *A Military Course for the Government and Conduct of a Battalion, designed for their regulation in Quarters, Camp or garrison, with ... observations and instructions for their manner of attack and defence* (London, 1777), p. 68.
- 7 *Ibid.*, pp. 68-154.
- 8 *Regimental Standing Orders; to be observed in the Twenty-Fourth Regiment of Foot: issued by Lieut. Col. Richard England, Dublin Barracks, Nov. 20th 1787* (Dublin, 1787), p. 21.
- 9 Regimental Standing Orders for the 70th Regiment of Foot, pp. 1-3.
- 10 Cuthbertson, *A System*, p. 179; *Regimental Standing Orders, Twenty-Fourth Regiment of Foot, 1787*, p. 21. Williamson put the responsibility for the safe keeping of the books on the major, who was to see them “carefully transmitted to his successor,” Williamson, *Elements*, I, p. 41.
- 11 Regimental Standing Orders for the 70th Regiment of Foot, p. 1.
- 12 *Ibid.*
- 13 Guy, *Oeconomy and Discipline*, p. 14.
- 14 NAM, 6807-160, Abstract of standing orders of the 19th Regiment of Foot, 1763-1770: regimental orders (hereafter R.O.), 3 July and 6 October 1765.
- 15 NAM, 6912-14-55, Order book, 47th Regiment, R.O., 5 March 1784.
- 16 *Regimental Standing Orders issued by the Field Officers and to be observed by the 70th (or Surry) Regiment of Foot* (Kilkenny, 1788), p. 3.
- 17 NAM, 6807-160, 19th Regiment of Foot, R.O., 31 May 1765.
- 18 National Archives of Canada (hereafter NA), Henry Pringle Papers, MG28 L8, Regimental orders, 51st Regiment of Foot, 1768-1778: R.O., 31 December 1771.
- 19 NAM, 6912-14-31, Standing orders, 37th Regiment of Foot, 1774.
- 20 *Standing Orders to be Observed in the 47th (or Lancashire) Regiment, by order of Lieutenant Col. Paulus Aemilius Irving* (Limerick, 1785); *Regimental Standing Orders, Twenty-Fourth Regiment of Foot, 1787*, p. v.
- 21 NAM, 7712-48, Standing Orders and Orderly Book of Lieut. Col. the Hon. George Monson, 96th Regiment during the Expedition against Mohammed Issoof, June 1763-February 1764.
- 22 NAM, 6912-14-31, Standing orders, 37th Regiment of Foot.

- 23 NA, Henry Pringle Papers, 51st Regiment of Foot, R.O., 4 September 1777.
- 24 Williamson, *Elements*, II, pp. 145-46.
- 25 Grenadier Guards, London (hereafter GG), Archives, R-163, R-184, R-285, R-558 and 559, and R-534 to R-546.
- 26 GG, R-285 and R-335 to R-338.
- 27 See G.A. Stepler, "British Military Law, Discipline, and the Conduct of Regimental Courts Martial in the Later Eighteenth Century," *English Historical Review* 102, no. 405 (October 1987), pp. 859-86.
- 28 Sylvia R. Frey, *The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period* (Austin, 1981), pp. 23-24.
- 29 J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795* (Oxford, 1981), p. 126.
- 30 Cuthbertson, *A System*, p. 179.
- 31 *General Regulations and Orders for the Army ... 1811* (London, 1816), p. 291.
- 32 Cuthbertson, *A System*, p. 177.