



Introduction

David J. Appleby and Andrew Hopper

‘Warr’, Edward Calver declared in 1644, ‘hath never seemed sweet to any but to the unexperienced, who, blinded with its florish and its glory, observe not the Tragicall events that doe attend it.’¹ Given that he was writing in the midst of the most extensive and sustained internecine fighting the British archipelago had ever seen, it was understandable that Calver should consider civil war to be the worst of all worlds. He had already observed at first-hand how political and religious tensions had caused friends, neighbours and relatives to take up arms against each other, with the result that ‘all the obligations of friendship, and Nature lie cancel’d in one another’s blood’.² The fighting became increasingly vicious in the years that followed. In 1646, after a series of reversals, Charles I surrendered to a Scottish Covenanter army gathered around Southwell in Nottinghamshire, and ordered all his followers to lay down their arms. He was eventually handed over to the English Parliament, but, although a prisoner, was able to divide his enemies and provoke a new civil war in 1648. In January 1649 a military junta within the parliamentary alliance put Charles on trial for war crimes and high treason against the people of England. For a monarch to be thus condemned and publicly executed by his subjects was unprecedented; the regicide sent shockwaves throughout Europe. Far from ending the bloodshed it hardened existing enmities, and created fresh ones. Between 1649 and 1652 the death toll continued to mount, in Ireland, Scotland, England and finally in the Caribbean. A greater proportion of the British and Irish population perished in these conflicts than in both World Wars combined.³

The chapters which follow will show that royalist, parliamentary and Covenanter leaders found it necessary to pay close attention to the lateral damage incurred during their military campaigns – not simply out of a sense of moral obligation, but in order to maintain public support for their

respective war efforts. After the cessation of armed hostilities maimed soldiers, war widows and orphans continued to feature in the respective agendas of the Commonwealth, the Protectorate and ultimately the restored Stuart monarchy, as each regime in turn tried to restore peace and harmony to a divided realm. For some time now, historians of the British Civil Wars have also been interested in these issues; indeed, several have come to view the developments that took place in military medicine and pension provision as significant episodes in the welfare history of Europe. *Battle-scarred* examines the human cost of the conflict, and the ways in which it left physical and mental scars on individuals and communities, and more broadly on the political culture of the British Isles.

This volume lies at the confluence of several rivers of historiography. It is a measure of the civil wars' pivotal significance to the national identities and political cultures of the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland that efforts to determine the causes and courses of the various conflicts, and the extent to which these were intertwined, have sparked such a variety of historiographical debates. These heated disputes began soon after the wars themselves, in the writings of rival participants.⁴ There is still no consensus as to a collective name for these conflicts, or even whether a collective name is appropriate.⁵ The term most familiar to the general public, 'the English Civil War', did not come into fashion until the late nineteenth century. It is still favoured today by some historians, and publishers nervous of confusing the book-buying public. Other scholars have fallen back on another established label, 'the English Revolution', for although that term carries the baggage of old Whig and Marxist metanarratives, the radicalism that countenanced the abolition of the monarchy was distinctively English. In recent decades terms such as the 'British Civil Wars' and the 'Wars in the Three Kingdoms' have been used by those who argue that Charles's failure to manage three disparate kingdoms was a prime cause of the conflict, and that events in each kingdom directly affected events in the others. The wars have now been placed in a wider Atlantic perspective, and the recent emergence of an ethnic history of the conflict has elicited a suggestion that it should be called 'the War of Five Peoples'.⁶ We have chosen to use the term 'British Civil Wars' for this volume, despite the fact that most of the chapters are Anglocentric. The conference at which most of the contributors presented their initial findings included two excellent papers on Ireland, but both were already earmarked for publication elsewhere. Nevertheless, the interconnectedness of the different theatres of war is evident in several of the chapters that follow, not only in terms of military operations, but also with regard to the effects on politics, society and culture.

Until the mid-twentieth century most of the writing on the civil wars consisted of military and constitutional accounts, led by S. R. Gardiner's magisterial *History of the Great Civil War* (1886–93).⁷ Alongside these national narratives antiquarian studies chronicled the conflict in the provinces.⁸ In the

1960s these local histories metamorphosed into something more ambitious when Alan Everitt and others sought to explain the causes and conduct of the conflict in terms of gentry-led county communities and their relationship with the centre.⁹ Clive Holmes and Ann Hughes, who famously provided a corrective to the county community model, were no less concerned with this relationship, although their studies stressed the primacy of national politics.¹⁰ The chapters in this volume reflect these and other developments, which have served to enhance our understanding of the period.¹¹ Given that these were wars, however, it is important to consider how this volume stands in relation to wider historiographical trends in military history and the medical humanities.

Conflict has been an ever-present factor in human affairs, so it would seem to follow that war should be an important field of historical study. Why then do some surveys of the historian's craft fail even to mention war, much less military history?¹² And why should military historians – particularly those in the United States – so often complain of being belittled and shunned by academic colleagues?¹³ It is not simply because war is hideous, for military historians would readily agree that it is; indeed, in the preface to his most famous work, *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the Western World*, the Victorian military historian Sir Edward Creasy intimated that those who revelled in war were either weak-minded or depraved.¹⁴ The answer can be found in the cultural trauma of two World Wars, coupled with the democratisation of academe in the latter half of the twentieth century. Post-war governments in Britain, North America and several other countries sought to provide better educational opportunities for their respective populations after 1945. The establishment of new universities led to an expansion in the numbers of students, and these came from an increasingly diverse range of backgrounds. Many of these individuals eventually secured academic positions, which enabled them to promote the historical study of hitherto neglected social and ethnic groups.¹⁵ Such aspirations, which fitted well with emerging post-modernist theory, led them to distrust traditional modes of history writing, which they saw as predicated on the activities and concerns of the political elite. Military scholars steeped in the Creasy paradigm of decisive battles, high politics and great leaders found themselves increasingly marginalised as more and more history departments were colonised by social and cultural historians. Of course, there was not simply an issue with the mode of military history, but also its subject matter. The situation became acute in the late 1960s when a strong anti-war movement emerged within Western academia, and students protested against American military involvement in Vietnam. Since the millennium, the superpowers' military interventions around the world and the attendant humanitarian disasters have revived such sentiments: academic military historians have been accused of lending respectability to industrial military complexes, and nurturing the public's morbid fascination with organised violence.¹⁶ However, Ludmilla Jordanova has cautioned

against neglecting this or any other historical specialism simply because the 'object of study or the manner in which it is pursued raises difficult issues or mobilises prejudices'.¹⁷ Military history is a large tent, and academics have had to come to terms with the fact that it includes the purposely desensitised 'operational' history of the military academies on the one hand, and on the other a popular market which ranges from well-written analytical studies to near-pornographic narratives of violence.¹⁸ Academic military history has undergone several transformations as a result of these pressures.

John Keegan's *The Face of Battle* (1976) has often been hailed as the catalyst for this process of refashioning. Although much of his book features fairly standard military narrative, Keegan certainly stimulated historians' interest in the impact of combat on individuals. He was not the first to venture into this area, for Bell Wiley had already written about the experiences of American Civil War soldiers in the 1940s.¹⁹ That conflict also provided fertile ground for scholars to examine relationships between war and society: the so-called 'new military history', which emerged in the United States during the late 1970s. Shaffer's account of the struggles of African-American veterans and war widows to obtain equitable pensions from the Federal authorities is a recent example of this approach.²⁰ Nevertheless, the 'new military history' has attracted considerable criticism over the years. Stephen Morillo, while conceding that it helped rehabilitate war studies in university departments, hints that its original disciples presented themselves as social historians primarily to enhance their employability. His suspicion that they had sought to ingratiate themselves with academic colleagues by adopting a condemnatory tone in their publications echoes an earlier comment made by John A. Lynn, who described their terminology as 'apologetic'.²¹ Practitioners of the 'new military history' have been accused of being uninterested in war, and some detractors have criticised them for focusing on veteran pensioners and prisoners-of-war, on the grounds that such individuals should be considered tangential to military studies. It was because these people could be viewed as victims, Lynn suggested, that the new military historians found it 'somehow more admirable to study them'.²² Clearly, orthodox military historians had been stung by the dismissive and often sanctimonious attitudes they were then encountering within academe. At the same time they were genuinely concerned that military history was being diluted and adulterated. John Keegan had already expressed such anxieties in *The Face of Battle*, when he inferred from a review by Sir Michael Howard (that doyen of British military historians) that in the final analysis military history must be about combat.²³ It is instructive, therefore, to remember what Howard himself wrote in his introduction to *War in European History* (1976):

But to abstract war from the environment in which it is fought and study its technique as one would those of a game is to ignore a dimension essential to the understanding, not simply of the wars themselves but of the societies which

fought them. The historian who studies war, not to develop norms for action but to enlarge his understanding of the past, cannot be simply a 'military historian', for there is literally no branch of human activity which is not to a greater or lesser extent relevant to his subject. He has to study war not only, as Hans Delbrück put it, in the framework of political history, but in the framework of economic, social and cultural history as well.²⁴

In other words, combat cannot be properly understood without a context – and a multivalent context at that. Most medievalists and early modernists accepted this long ago, although they can be forgiven for wondering why colleagues working on modern wars sometimes seem to forget that life existed before the French Revolution. There is, for example, this astonishing statement in Keegan's *The Face of Battle*:

It is really only in the English-speaking countries, whose land campaigns, with the exception of those of the American Civil War, have all been waged outside the national territory, that military history has been able to acquire the status of a humane study with a wide general readership among informed minds.²⁵

It is remarkable that a statement which seeks to make a case for Anglophone particularity should overlook the myriad civil wars in Britain during medieval and early modern times, to say nothing of the numerous historical conflicts between the nations of the British archipelago. One of the aspects of early modern military historiography which does seem to have made an impression on historians of modern warfare is the debate concerning the early modern military revolution in technology, tactics and fortifications, and its role in state formation.²⁶ It should not be too much of a leap, therefore, to appreciate why contributors to this present volume consider that issues such as war-related mortality, medical care, desertion, pensions and welfare are highly relevant to the military revolution debate, because all had a significant impact on the state's capacity to wage war.

European historians have been less agitated by the 'new military history' than their American colleagues. One reason for this was that they found little in it that was actually new, another was that they viewed war-and-society studies as an expansion of traditional military history rather than its replacement.²⁷ M. S. Anderson has traced the beginnings of a European 'war-and-society' movement back to the 1960s, arguing that this was when scholars first began to question the efficacy of traditional military history:

Although [military historians] had paid much attention to what armed forces did to one another in war, they normally showed little interest in how those armed forces related to the societies from which they were drawn and in what war itself – the experience of it while it was going on, the perhaps huge net effect of it once it was over – did to the societies which engaged in it.²⁸

In fact, at least one historian had begun to consider these issues over half a century earlier. Sir Charles Harding Firth is best known as the author of

Cromwell's Army (1902), a comprehensive examination of the physical and mental world of parliamentary soldiers. His research into the treatment of sick and wounded servicemen, and state provision for their demobilised comrades, was unprecedented. As one reviewer acknowledged at the time, these were subjects which historians had hitherto scorned to touch.²⁹ Firth's Victorian contemporaries tended to see even their own soldiery as a faceless mass, to be deployed (and written about) with no more sensitivity than moving pins on a map. He had perhaps first begun to think of common soldiers as individuals in the 1890s when editing the Clarke Papers. Reading the minutes of the Putney Debates between the rank-and-file and their commanders in 1647 (which had been recorded by William Clarke in his capacity as Secretary to the Council of the Army) Firth became intrigued by the 'agitators' who had been elected to represent their comrades in the debates. Such men required a very different scholarly approach from that used to study the political and social elite.³⁰ Firth's next publication, in 1901, was an article on the sick and wounded soldiers of the civil wars.³¹ He returned to this theme in the following year, in *Cromwell's Army*. Later, looking back on his career, Firth expressed regret that he had not found the time to examine the impact of the civil wars upon civilian society. He had nonetheless produced a body of work that was ahead of its time, four decades before Trevelyan's *English Social History*, and sixty years before E. P. Thompson set out to rescue the working classes from the condescension of posterity.³²

Despite Firth's innovative scholarship, publishers were slow to wean their readers off narratives which focused almost exclusively on generalship and strategy. Traditional military historians such as J. F. C. Fuller continued to dominate publishing catalogues until the end of the Second World War.³³ Nevertheless, Firth's legacy became increasingly evident when discussions of military medicine and welfare began to appear in academic works by the likes of Elizabethan scholar C. G. Cruickshank, and later still in popular histories of the civil wars written by Brigadier Peter Young and Wilfred Emberton.³⁴

In recent years military historians have witnessed the emergence of a so-called 'third school', whose practitioners utilise a range of interdisciplinary approaches in order to examine armed conflict as a cultural phenomenon. Some might argue that culture has always been an important consideration for military historians: Hans Delbrück posited links between national cultures and ways of waging war well over a century ago, and numerous historians were still emphasising the importance of culture in shaping military practice in the 1970s and 1980s.³⁵ It fell to John Shy to lay the foundations of a theoretical framework for a cultural approach to the history of war in 1993.³⁶ Even the US military colleges have come to embrace the cultural turn, seeing in it an opportunity to enhance their 'operational' histories, and thereby gain a deeper understanding of the strategic cultures of friend and foe.³⁷

Many critics of the war-and-society approach have proved receptive to this cultural turn. Even as he excoriated the 'new military history' in 1997,

Lynn declared culture and gender to be more profitable ways of analysing the military activity of the past.³⁸ Notwithstanding an instinctive suspicion of theory, his cultural approach consists of three strands: societal, military and strategic.³⁹ Ironically, the first strand in particular raises questions as to where 'society' ends and 'culture' begins; as discussions of plunder and rape in Lynn's own highly acclaimed *Women, Armies and Warfare in Early Modern Europe* (2007) illustrate.⁴⁰ The chapters in this present volume seek to explore those boundaries while investigating how cultural attitudes towards war (particularly civil war) were constructed, negotiated and maintained in seventeenth-century England and Scotland.

The collected essays in *Battle-scarred* investigate the capacity of the British peoples to cope with the traumatic events of the mid-seventeenth century, and with the physical, mental and cultural scars left in their wake. The dividing line between civilian and military communities was always blurred: apart from the fact that civilians and soldiers were invariably in close proximity to one another, most soldiers were not career professionals but, rather, civilians who had been induced to fight. Nevertheless, from the moment such individuals enlisted they were viewed in a different light. This volume is divided into three sections: Part I focuses on mortality and memorialisation; Part II offers several different perspectives on military medicine during the civil wars; Part III surveys the hidden human costs of war, including military-related disorder, psychological trauma and the complex issues associated with war relief.

In Part I Ian Atherton and Stuart Jennings consider how soldiers died, and what happened to their bodies. Whereas Atherton's chapter concentrates on battlefield fatalities, Jennings uses the royalist garrison of Newark as a prism through which to view the effects of epidemic disease. One question common to both chapters concerns the location of the physical remains. Huge numbers of dead must have been interred in individual graves or in mass burial pits after battles such as Marston Moor (where as many as 6,000 soldiers are thought to have died), and during numerous garrison epidemics.⁴¹ That only a tiny fraction of these inhumations have so far been identified contrasts markedly with numerous discoveries associated with the Wars of the Roses. Osteoarchaeologists and forensic scientists know far more about medieval soldiers than those of the mid-seventeenth century (although the recent archaeological discovery of a mass grave containing soldiers killed at the battle of Lützen in 1632 may eventually help to redress this balance).⁴² Both chapters contain intriguing suggestions as to why the bodies of civil-war soldiers remain largely unaccounted for. The practice in modern conflicts has been to construct and maintain battlefield cemeteries as sites of social memory and public commemoration. Atherton argues that this culture of memorialisation has encouraged archaeologists to rely heavily on later oral traditions when searching for civil-war battlefields and bodies. He proposes that they should pay more attention to seventeenth-century records and culture. By analysing contemporary records regarding the handling of

the slain, he contributes to ongoing debates regarding the nature and preservation of civil-war battlefields, and collective memories of the conflict. In contrast to the care lavished on the bodies of the elite, and despite recent historiography which argues that parish registers were strikingly inclusive when recording mortality within civilian communities, Atherton concludes that common soldiers were regarded as social outcasts even in death, and that little effort was made to mark the site of their final resting place.

Atherton's findings dovetail neatly with Jennings' chapter on Newark. Most soldiers spent their time occupying towns, patrolling and exploiting the surrounding area, rather than fighting in large set-piece battles. Violent death could come during a siege, or when conducting small-scale raids on adjacent enemy territory, but even when they were besieged garrison troops were far more likely to die of disease than anything else. Plague and other epidemics regularly afflicted large towns in peacetime, particularly those such as Newark, which lay astride important trade routes. In time of war the presence of large numbers of troops made epidemics even more likely. The risk was significantly higher when the soldiers came from outside the area, as in October 1645 when Prince Rupert arrived at Newark with troopers from plague-ridden Bristol. Relations between civic authorities and garrison commanders were often complicated by arguments over resources and housing, but outbreaks of dysentery, typhus or plague generally encouraged cooperation. Jennings has analysed Newark's well-preserved civic archives and what survives of the garrison's military records in order to reconstruct the aetiology of disease in the town between 1642 and 1646. He finds that Newark's civilian leaders were sensible of the military's need to maintain discipline and combat effectiveness, while the royalist commanders acknowledged their moral obligation to protect civilian residents. Jennings explains how responsibility for the measures to limit the spread of infection was shared, how and where infected soldiers and civilians were treated, and who met the cost of medical care and burial. He finds that while soldiers and civilians seem to have been treated equitably for the duration of their illness, they were segregated after death. Consequently, whereas the burials of the town's civilians were carefully recorded, the whereabouts of the military's burial pits remain a matter of conjecture. Even in a staunchly royalist town such as Newark, garrisoned largely by royalist troops recruited from the surrounding area, soldiers remained a race apart.

Part II considers various aspects of military medicine during the civil wars. The early modern period witnessed profound developments in medical practice and theory. During the sixteenth century, medieval prohibitions on dissection had been lifted, allowing practitioners such as Andreas Vesalius to formulate a more accurate understanding of human anatomy. This offered a corrective to the profession's widespread reliance on the theories of the classical Greek physician Galen. These theories, which were largely based on animal dissection, held that the body contained four 'humours' (blood,

yellow bile, black bile and phlegm), and that illness resulted from an imbalance between these fluids. Galen's notions were further challenged in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries by the Swiss physician Paracelsus, and the Fleming Jan Baptist van Helmont, pioneers in the use of chemical medicines. Although iatrochemistry had not entirely superseded humoral theory by the end of the seventeenth century, it was indicative of a trend towards a more scientific approach based on experimentation and observation. The foremost representative of this trend in England before the civil wars was William Harvey – royal physician to both James I and Charles I – whose work on the function of the heart and blood circulation, *De Motu Cordis*, was published in Frankfurt in 1628. Harvey's findings met with a mixed reception, not least within the Royal College of Physicians, but his research and lectures had a profound effect on medical practice.

The historiography of medicine has undergone a transformation quite as dramatic as that experienced in military studies in recent decades. As Ian Mortimer has noted, medical practice in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can no longer 'be regarded as simply the low foothills before the steeper slopes of modern medical discoveries'.⁴³ Scholars such as Charles Webster and Roy Porter have successfully questioned the traditional view of early modern medical professionals as blundering amateurs, while Margaret Pelling has prompted us to re-evaluate the provision of medical care for those below the elite.⁴⁴ Mortimer himself has argued that there is evidence for a significant increase in medical usage from the mid-seventeenth century onwards, an argument with which Patrick Wallis has concurred.⁴⁵ Webster has provided a model for viewing the seventeenth century as a watershed in medical thinking, placing reforms in science and medicine within the wider movement for social reform fuelled by the apocalyptic and millenarian traditions of the so-called 'Puritan Revolution'.⁴⁶ While Webster's arguments have been questioned by Peter Elmer (who has shown that the drive for medical reform was shared by royalists and Anglicans) the historiography to date suggests that this was a key period in British medicine.⁴⁷

The role the British Civil Wars played in the development of medicine – not least in increasing the demand for, and supply of medical care – remains largely underexplored. Harold Cook has argued that warfare was a primary factor in transforming medicine internationally, but suggests that as far as Britain is concerned the key period was at the end of the seventeenth century. By this interpretation, the restructuring of the British military establishment and attendant medical services after 1689 was undertaken in order to facilitate the large-scale Continental campaigns waged during the reigns of William and Anne. Cook's model implies that this restructuring acted as the catalyst for change, but he does acknowledge that some developments had their roots in earlier decades.⁴⁸ This makes it all the more imperative to encourage further study into how the medical profession reacted and adapted to the demands of the civil wars. Discussions on the subject have

been hampered by the fact that it is only in recent years that the historical study of military medicine has begun to catch up with the rest of the medical humanities. C. H. Firth wrote in 1902 that he found the history of medical provision during the civil wars to be wholly inadequate; however, although he was keen to redress this deficiency he saw no reason to challenge the traditional view that early modern regimental surgeons were ignorant quacks.⁴⁹ Little progress had been made by 2001 when Eric Gruber von Arni sought to publish his work on parliamentary military hospitals and nursing. During his researches Gruber von Arni was forced to contend with medical historians who held that warfare had had little effect on medieval and early modern medicine, and was therefore unworthy of study.⁵⁰ Since the millennium the situation has improved markedly, but there is still more to do as regards the early modern period. There are, nevertheless, reasons to be optimistic: firstly, although this present volume is devoted to the effects of land warfare, there is no doubting the huge strides which have been made in the study of early modern naval medicine by scholars such as Geoffrey L. Hudson.⁵¹ It is also noteworthy that the Centre for Medical History at the University of Exeter saw fit to recruit a military specialist, Ismini Pells, into the team of their Wellcome Trust project, 'The Medical World of Early Modern England, Ireland and Wales 1500–1715', and that the Wolfson Foundation has funded the foundation of the Research Centre for Care, Welfare and Medicine at the National Civil War Centre in Newark.⁵² Finally, it is a sign of progress that the issues discussed in Part II have now begun to seep into the mainstream histories of the civil wars.

Stephen Rutherford's chapter focuses on the practicalities of military surgery, particularly the treatment of gunshot wounds. The rapid increase in the use of firearms in warfare led to profound changes in the balance of wound types by the end of the sixteenth century. Belying their popular image as incompetent butchers, many military surgeons appear to have been highly proficient, developing new techniques and surgical instruments in order to cope with an increasingly industrialised battlefield environment. Rutherford surveys the damage musket balls could inflict on the human body, and, using case studies and treatises authored by surgeons who served during the conflict, assesses how military surgery had developed by the mid-seventeenth century. English surgeons such as the parliamentarian James Cooke and the royalist Richard Wiseman were familiar with the latest European practices, and utilised an evidence-based approach reminiscent of modern practice. Rutherford considers the efficacy of their methods in the light of his detailed knowledge of modern biology, pathology and treatments. He finds that the techniques used by civil-war surgeons, and military surgical procedures, compare favourably with practices from the nineteenth century to the present day. Despite the fact that seventeenth-century medical practitioners knew nothing of microbiology, and little of the biological basis of physiology or wound-healing, Rutherford demonstrates that their procedures were

often highly effective. Notwithstanding the lack of antibiotics, anaesthetics, hygienic environments and high-quality surgical steel, survival rates appear to have been impressively high. Rutherford concludes that in finding effective answers to the problems posed by the advent of gunpowder weapons, early modern practitioners should be seen as competent professionals who laid the foundations of modern surgery.

The man at the centre of Ismini Pells's chapter, Major-General Philip Skippon, received a near-fatal gunshot wound at the battle of Naseby in June 1645. At the height of the battle, a musket ball punched through his armour and penetrated his stomach, leaving him with an eight-inch wound. The extensive surviving documentation relating to the surgical operations and palliative care the general received allow for an unusually detailed medical case study. Using contemporary medical memoirs and treatises as a backdrop, Pells utilises original correspondence, financial accounts and hitherto unused material from Northampton General Hospital's archives to demonstrate that the episode reflected the best medical standards of the time. As she explains, there was more to this case than meets the eye: the fact that a particular faction within the parliamentary alliance had substantial political capital invested in the general's recovery meant that the physicians and surgeons attending him were required to operate under considerably more pressure than usual.

Eric Gruber von Arni has been a leading light in the struggle to raise the profile of early modern military medicine, not least through his ground-breaking monograph *Justice to the Maimed Soldier*, which surveyed Parliament's military hospital provision and nursing during the civil wars.⁵³ He has gone on to produce further important studies on military medicine in the later seventeenth century.⁵⁴ In *Battle-scarred* Gruber von Arni focuses on royalist medical provision during the First Civil War, most especially military hospitals in the Oxford area. The fact that royalist hospitals are far less well documented than their parliamentary counterparts perhaps explains why they have not previously been studied in any depth. Gruber von Arni begins by surveying the medical care provided for the royalist casualties injured at Edgehill in October 1642. He goes on to consider conditions in the Culham Hill Leaguer outside Oxford in 1643, before providing an assessment of the royalist military hospitals in and around Oxford. His findings leave no doubt as to the problems which faced Charles I and his advisors in the royalists' wartime capital. Supplies were often scarce, and overcrowding in the city created logistical, clinical and environmental problems. The chapter also examines royalist military hospital provision elsewhere in the country. Gruber von Arni concludes that, notwithstanding the imbalance in resources between the two sides, the royalists failed to give casualties the same priority as their parliamentary enemies.

Richard Jones's chapter posits a number of links between the life-cycle of a famous Elizabethan reference work – John Gerard's *Herball, or, Generall*

Historie of Plantes (1597) – and the brutal realities of the civil wars. Gerard was a herbalist of repute in Elizabethan England, influential in the Barber-Surgeons' Company, and closely connected with Lord Burghley, but like so many early modern authors his work relied heavily on the efforts of predecessors. Nevertheless, his voluminous and expensive compendium was soon established as an essential reference work within the medical profession. Its popularity was boosted in 1633 by the publication of a revised and expanded edition, undertaken by the Yorkshire-born apothecary and physician Thomas Johnson. The work remained the most detailed and up-to-date commentary on the subject until Culpeper's *English Physician* appeared in the 1650s. For this reason, Jones is on safe ground in arguing that the 1633 edition informed the work of medical practitioners during the civil wars, and he demonstrates that many of the herbs and plants described therein were directly relevant to military medicine. Thomas Johnson's involvement with Gerard's *Herball* is therefore somewhat ironic: he went on to serve as a royalist field officer during the First Civil War, only to die of a fever in 1644 while recuperating from wounds suffered during a skirmish near Basing House.⁵⁵ Having established the historical context of the 1633 edition, Jones conducts a meticulous examination of a surviving copy, tracing its provenance through several generations of a Nottinghamshire family. The Coopers were noted royalists, and the head of the family, Sir Roger Cooper, was closely involved with the defence of Newark. The family home in Thurgarton hosted a small royalist garrison, and may conceivably have functioned as a military hospital for Newark. With this genealogical and historical information as a backdrop, Jones moves on to analyse the text, and more crucially the written annotations and manicules (pointing hands) in the margins. It is clear that this particular copy was consulted repeatedly for information on treatments of ailments commonly associated with siege warfare. Drawing the various strands of evidence together, Jones argues that the copy may very well have been utilised during the second siege of Newark in 1644.

Part III embraces both the cultural turn and war-and-society studies. The formation of collective memory is an important element in the process of shaping a society's political and military culture. In this, as in so many other things, modernists and early modernists have travelled the same road, mostly in blissful ignorance of each other's presence. There is now a healthy body of work on the complex relationships between war, societal culture, welfare and memorialisation in the modern world, underpinned by series such as Palgrave Macmillan's *War, Culture and Society*, and Manchester University Press's *Cultural History of Modern War*.⁵⁶ It is instructive, for example, to read Drew Gilpin Faust's account of how Confederate and Federal authorities developed protocols to manage the horrendous mortality of the American Civil War, both in terms of logistics and the maintenance of public morale.⁵⁷ Meanwhile, on the other side of the ridge, early modernists have been exploring similar issues in their own period. The recent historiography of the

British Civil Wars is rich in such studies, some predicated on the high politics at the centre, others on the social politics of the parish.⁵⁸ Just as Faust has uncovered a republic of suffering in the *post-bellum* United States, so the chapters here illustrate how the warring sides, and the civilian communities they administered, faced increasingly complex moral dilemmas and practical difficulties as the wars continued. If anything, these problems gained greater urgency after the fighting had ended. Not only had successive Commonwealth, Protectorate and Restoration regimes to deal with a divided society's collective sense of moral dislocation and mass bereavement, they had also to satisfy the expectations of thousands of maimed and impoverished officers and men, and an equally large army of widows and orphans. Furthermore, each regime in turn had to decide how to behave towards former enemies, thousands of whom had also been maimed, impoverished and bereaved – but who, as myriad petitioners emphasised, had been the agents of their own side's suffering.

David Appleby argues in his chapter that although the 'wandering soldier' was a stock figure in early modern literature, the deserters who haunted civilian communities have received little more than a passing mention in the historiography. It is also interesting that although there is now a rich historiography relating to early modern vagrancy, the civil wars are rarely discussed; indeed, the reader could be forgiven for assuming that war-related mortality between 1639 and 1652 reduced the floodtide of vagrants to a manageable trickle. Utilising local archives, state papers, plays, ballads and popular literature, Appleby argues that historians have seriously underestimated the political threat represented by the activities of thousands of deserters, escaped prisoners-of-war and counterfeit soldiers. The chapter shows how parish officials became adept at identifying different categories of unsupervised 'wandering soldiers'; an important skill, given that some could be extremely dangerous. Appleby challenges the received wisdom that demobilised veterans and deserters simply went home, arguing that thousands of conscripts had little incentive to do so. The chapter considers the economic dislocation which could be caused by such population displacement. Finally, Appleby scrutinises the efforts made by the authorities to manage the problem, and why, given the numbers involved, the old moral panics associated with vagabonds did not reoccur.

The chapter by Erin Peters investigates the public narration of psychological disability brought on by the lingering effects of combat trauma and memories of fear among soldiers and civilians during and after the civil wars. This is a particularly timely study given that psychologists specialising in modern post-traumatic stress disorder are beginning to explore the advantages of adding a historical dimension to their research.⁵⁹ Peters challenges conventional histories of psychiatry, which assume that medieval and early modern attitudes to mental illness were dominated by demonological concepts, and that the afflicted were treated in a cruel and inhumane manner

as a consequence. A very different picture emerges from popular literature before, during and after the civil wars, with writers able to construct and disseminate remarkably sensitive psychological disability theories and narratives. These publications reflected a growing interest in the conceptualisation of psychological damage that was far removed from crude ideas of 'good' and 'evil'. Peters analyses the ways in which people attempted to understand their experiences of the civil wars, and the curative methods with which they attempted to treat the invisible wounds inflicted by those experiences. She argues that contemporary responses to the disabling nature of psychological trauma demonstrate that people were cognisant of the therapeutic value of attempting to construct publically available narratives. Peters concludes that the civil wars caused a popular understanding of the disabling and disfiguring nature of psychological damage to develop, which contrasted with the central authorities' insistence on viewing disability purely in terms of physical impairment.

Hannah Worthen's chapter reveals that seventeenth-century Kent was a very singular county. It did not experience any serious fighting within its borders during the First Civil War, but unlike most other counties within the so-called parliamentary heartlands of south-east and eastern England it was always deeply divided along political and religious lines. This instability allowed royalists to exploit local grievances against parliamentary rule and stage a full-scale insurrection in 1648. The memory of 1648, and increasing political fragmentation, made the task of restoring peace, order and harmony in Kent much more difficult, at the same time as the county's proximity to London made it imperative. Worthen explores the relationships between rulers and ruled through the administration of military welfare in the county between 1642 and 1680, focusing particularly on the petitions of maimed soldiers and war widows preserved in Quarter Sessions records. In doing so, she re-engages with Alan Everitt's famous (and famously contested) 'county community' model to assess whether local expediency or national policy exerted the greater influence on the administration of war relief.⁶⁰

Criticisms that Everitt's model was too heavily predicated on the county elite have become more strident as civil-war historiography has swung towards the social history of the common people. However, Andrew Hopper's chapter shows that there will always be a need to study the mores of political and social hegemony. Hopper draws on petitions submitted by the widows and orphans of Parliament's military commanders, along with correspondence written by them or on their behalf, to show how they mobilised personal networks to agitate in their favour. Just as their dead menfolk would have done, widows were obliged to adopt strategies to safeguard their families, livelihoods and estates. Hopper investigates what conduct and deportment were expected of elite war widows and how strategic self-fashioning might elicit favourable responses from authority. The chapter questions how elite widows fared in comparison with those of the rank and file, before measur-

ing their experiences against those of royalist officers' widows petitioning for relief after 1660. Hopper concludes by arguing that in several cases their involvement and sacrifice for the cause transformed some widows into significant political figures.

In the final chapter, Chris Langley provides a wider British perspective by investigating the charitable campaign undertaken on behalf of Scottish prisoners-of-war held in England during the 1650s. The New Model Army took large numbers of Scots Covenanters prisoner at the battle of Dunbar in September 1650, most of whom were subsequently transported to Tynemouth Castle and Durham in England. Despite the disruption caused by the ongoing English invasion, Scottish Kirk leaders organised countrywide collections to enable the prisoners to purchase food and other essentials. Letters from Edinburgh arrived in parishes around Scotland, updating communities on the whereabouts and living conditions of their imprisoned servicemen, and requesting donations. There was an enthusiastic response, although only a proportion of the money reached the prisoners. Langley argues that ministers realised that this networking might serve as a way to heal differences within the Kirk and the wider Scottish political nation. As a result, their letters pointedly omitted references to the prisoners' previous political affiliations or the divisive issue of Charles II. Eventually the campaign merged into other movements aimed at unifying (Protestant) Scotland, and constructing a coherent opposition to English occupation. Langley concludes that the Kirk's charitable venture was not only successful in raising money, but made an important contribution to a wider political debate about what it meant to be a good Covenanter.

Battle-scarred, then, presents an integrated and multi-faceted survey of the 'Tragical events' that attended the British Civil Wars, and how they affected English and Scottish people across the social spectrum. The historiography behind the topics covered by this volume is, in most cases, still very much in its infancy; as we are still in the process of framing the questions, this volume is necessarily a reconnaissance. It explores several promising avenues of research, which, it is hoped, will broaden the scope of civil-war studies. In *War in England, 1642–1649* (2008) – an outstanding example of recent scholarship on the mental landscape of the conflict – Barbara Donagan has ventured the rather pessimistic observation that 'the English civil war [*sic*] is of only moderate interest to military historians'.⁶¹ It is true that the conflict did not inspire any great innovations in military technology, strategy or tactics; neither did the limited scale of the campaigns enable commanders such as Prince Rupert or Thomas Fairfax to establish reputations to match those of Gustavus Adolphus and Count Tilly in the Thirty Years' War.⁶² Scholars who see military history solely in terms of combat can indeed safely ignore the civil wars. However, as discussed earlier, the finest military historians have invariably sought to take a more sophisticated approach.⁶³ Those

who subscribe to a more inclusive military history can learn much from the innovations in administration and oversight which emerged during the conflict, particularly as these developments had an influence on British military and political culture – a culture which took on a global significance by the end of the seventeenth century.⁶⁴ Additionally, the conflict stimulated marked improvements in military medicine, and the quality of institutional care bestowed on maimed soldiers and war widows in seventeenth-century England compared favourably with that provided elsewhere in Europe. While few of the contributors to *Battle-scarred* would describe themselves as military historians, all intend that their work should complement and enhance the military and political history of the civil wars, not dilute or replace it. Above all, the editors' aim is to help bring about that 'complete-picture' history, which many military historians have themselves called for.⁶⁵ At the same time, we remain mindful of Barbara Donagan's comment that 'every war is miserable in its own way', and we note John A. Lynn's warning against creating a 'universal soldier' (or a universal surgeon, deserter, prisoner or war widow). Above all, we concur with Jeremy Black's observation that 'culture is dynamic, not static, as both a reality and as an analytical process'.⁶⁶ If the British Civil Wars teach us anything it is that culture – like history – is a malleable product.

NOTES

- 1 BL, Thomason E1150(3), E. Calver, *England's Sad Posture* (London, 1644), preface.
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638–1652* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007), p. 436.
- 4 J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, 8 vols (London, 1659); B. Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (London, 1682); E. Ludlow, *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow*, 3 vols (Vevay, Switzerland, 1698–99); E. Hyde, earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*, 3 vols (London, 1702–4). A critical survey of the early histories of the conflict can be found in C. H. Firth, 'The development of the study of seventeenth-century history', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 7 (1913), 25–30.
- 5 J. Morrill (ed.), *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1993), p. vii.
- 6 L. Bowen, 'Rediscovering difference: nations, peoples and politics in the British Civil Wars', *History Compass*, 4:5 (2006), 847. The pioneer in this field was M. Stoye, *Soldiers and Strangers: An Ethnic History of the English Civil War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005).
- 7 S. R. Gardiner, *The History of the Great Civil War*, 4 vols (London: Longmans, 1886–93).
- 8 A. Kingston, *East Anglia and the Great Civil War* (London: Stock, 1897); J. Willis Bund, *The Civil War in Worcestershire, 1642–1646* (Birmingham: Midland Educational Co. Ltd, 1905); E. Broxap, *The Great Civil War in Lancashire, 1642–1651*

- (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1910); A. C. Wood, *Nottinghamshire in the Civil War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937).
- 9 A. Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640–60* (Leicester: University of Leicester Press, 1966); A. Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex, 1600–1660* (London: Longman, 1975); J. Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630–1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974).
 - 10 C. Holmes, ‘The county community in Stuart historiography’, *Journal of British Studies*, 19:2 (1980), 54–73; A. Hughes, ‘The king, the Parliament, and the localities during the English Civil War’, *Journal of British Studies*, 24:2 (1985), 236–65.
 - 11 C. Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1972); C. Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane, 1993); R. Cust, ‘News and politics in early seventeenth-century England’, *Past & Present*, 112 (1986), 60–90; J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641–1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
 - 12 A recent example is P. Claus and J. Marriott (eds), *History: An Introduction to Theory, Method and Practices* (London: Routledge, 2012).
 - 13 D. Showalter, ‘A modest plea for drums and trumpets’, *Military Affairs*, 39:2 (1975), 71; J. Lynn, ‘The embattled future of academic military history’, *The Journal of Military History*, 61:4 (1997), 778, 780–3; R. Citino, ‘Military histories old and new: a reintroduction’, *American Historical Review*, 112:4 (2007), 1070.
 - 14 E. Creasy, *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the Western World* (3rd edn, London: Richard Bentley, 1852), p. vii.
 - 15 S. Morillo, with M. Pakovic, *What Is Military History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006), p. 39.
 - 16 Morillo, *What Is Military History?*, pp. 38–9, 41; J. Chambers II, ‘The new military history: myth and reality’, *The Journal of Military History*, 55:3 (1991), 395.
 - 17 L. Jordanova, *History in Practice* (2nd edn, London: Hodder Arnold, 2006), p. 176.
 - 18 See N. Dixon, *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence*, quoted in R. Holmes, *Acts of War: The Behaviour of Men in Battle* (London: Cassell, 1985), pp. 4–5.
 - 19 B. Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana University State Press, 1943); B. Wiley, *The Life of Billy Yank* (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1952).
 - 20 D. Shaffer, *After the Glory: The Struggles of Black Civil War Veterans* (Lawrence, KA: University Press of Kansas, 2004).
 - 21 Morillo, *What Is Military History?*, pp. 39–40; Lynn, ‘The embattled future of academic military history’, 784.
 - 22 Lynn, ‘The embattled future of academic military history’, 784; Citino, ‘Military histories old and new’, 1070; R. Browning, ‘New views on the Silesian Wars’, *Journal of Military History*, 69:2 (2005), 522–3.
 - 23 J. Keegan, *The Face of Battle* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1976), p. 29.
 - 24 M. Howard, *War in European History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. ix–x.
 - 25 Keegan, *The Face of Battle*, p. 55.
 - 26 C. Rogers (ed.), *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings on the Transformation of*

- Early Modern Europe* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995); Citino, 'Military histories old and new', 1077–8.
- 27 D. Dunn (ed.), *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), p. 1.
 - 28 M. Anderson (ed.), *War and Society in Europe of the Old Regime 1618–1789* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998), p. 5.
 - 29 C. H. Firth, *Cromwell's Army: A History of the English Soldier during the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate* (London: Methuen, 1902), chapter 11; F. Harrison, 'Review of *Cromwell's Army*, by C. H. Firth', *English Historical Review*, 18:69 (1903), 170.
 - 30 W. Clarke, *The Clarke Papers*, ed. C. H. Firth, 4 vols (Camden Society, new series, 1891–1901), I, p. 285.
 - 31 C. H. Firth, 'The sick and wounded of the Great Civil War', *Cornhill Magazine*, 3rd series, 10 (1901), 289–99.
 - 32 I. Roots, 'Firth, Sir Charles Harding (1857–1936)', *ODNB*; G. Trevelyan, *English Social History* (London: Longman, 1942); E. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1963), p. 12.
 - 33 J. Fuller, *The Generalship of Ulysses S. Grant* (London: John Murray, 1929); J. Fuller, *Grant & Lee: A Study in Personality and Generalship* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1933); J. Fuller, *The Decisive Battles of the Western World and their Influence upon History*, 3 vols (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1954–56).
 - 34 C. Cruickshank, *Elizabeth's Army* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946), especially chapter 11 'The medical service'; P. Young and W. Emberton, *The Cavalier Army: Its Organization and Everyday Life* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1974).
 - 35 Howard, *War in European History*, p. x; Morillo, *What Is Military History?*, p. 43; A. Marwick (ed.), *The Study of War and Society: Thucydides to the Eighteenth Century* (Bletchley: Open University Press, 1973), pp. 15–17.
 - 36 J. Shy, 'The cultural approach to the history of war', *The Journal of Military History*, 57:5 (1993), 13–26.
 - 37 W. Pruett, 'A history of the organizational development of the Continental Artillery during the American Revolution' (US Army Command and General Staff College, unpublished MA thesis, 2008), pp. 131–41; J. Black, *War and the Cultural Turn* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012), pp. 27, 152.
 - 38 Lynn, 'The embattled future of academic military history', 784–9.
 - 39 J. Lynn, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture* (rev. edn, New York: Basic Books, 2003), pp. xv, xix, xx.
 - 40 J. Lynn, *Women, Armies and Warfare in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 150–9.
 - 41 P. R. Newman and P. R. Roberts, *Marston Moor, 1644: The Battle of the Five Armies* (Pickering: Blackthorn Press, 2003), p. 124.
 - 42 N. Nicklisch, F. Ramsthaler, H. Meller and S. Friederich, 'The face of war: trauma analysis of a mass grave from the Battle of Lützen (1632)', *Plos One*, 12/5 (2017); e0178252. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178252> (accessed 31 August 2017).
 - 43 I. Mortimer, *The Dying and the Doctors: The Medical Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), p. 1.
 - 44 C. Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626–1660*

- (London: Duckworth, 1975); R. Porter, *Disease, Medicine and Society in England 1500–1860* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987); M. Pelling, *The Common Lot: Sickness, Medical Occupations and the Urban Poor in Early Modern England* (Harlow: Longman, 1998).
- 45 Mortimer, *The Dying and the Doctors*, pp. 204–11; P. Wallis and T. Pirohakul, ‘Medical revolutions? The growth of medicine in England, 1660–1800’, *Journal of Social History*, 49:3 (2016), 510–31.
- 46 Webster, *The Great Instauration*.
- 47 P. Elmer, ‘Medicine, religion and the puritan revolution’, in R. French and A. Wear (eds), *The Medical Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 10–45.
- 48 H. J. Cook, ‘Practical medicine and the British armed forces after the “Glorious Revolution”’, *Medical History*, 34 (1990), 26.
- 49 Firth, *Cromwell’s Army*, pp. 251, 254–5.
- 50 E. Gruber von Arni, *Justice to the Maimed Soldier: Nursing, Medical Care and Welfare for Sick and Wounded Soldiers during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum, 1642–1660* (2nd edn, Nottingham: Partizan Press, 2015), p. 2.
- 51 G. L. Hudson (ed.), *British Military and Naval Medicine, 1600–1830* (New York: Rodopi, 2007); G. L. Hudson, ‘The relief of English disabled ex-sailors c. 1590–1680’, in C. A. Fury (ed.), *The Social History of English Seamen, 1485–1680* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), pp. 229–52.
- 52 <http://humanities.exeter.ac.uk/history/research/centres/medicalhistory/projects/earlymodernmedicine> (accessed 18 April 2017).
- 53 E. Gruber von Arni, *Justice to the Maimed Soldier: Nursing, Medical Care and Welfare for Sick and Wounded Soldiers during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum, 1642–1660* (1st edn, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001).
- 54 E. Gruber von Arni, *Hospital Care and the British Standing Army, 1660–1714* (1st edn, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); E. Gruber von Arni, ‘The medical resources of William III’s English Army during the Nine Years’ War’, *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 85:342 (2007), 126–45.
- 55 C. King, ‘Johnson, Thomas (1595x1600–1644)’, ODNB.
- 56 For example, C. Reardon, *Pickett’s Charge in History and Memory* (London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); P. Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); J. Watson, *Fighting Different Wars: Experience, Memory and the First World War in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); E. Rosenberg, *A Day Which Will Live: Pearl Harbor in American Memory* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); J. Anderson, *War, Disability and Rehabilitation in Britain: Soul of a Nation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).
- 57 D. Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Vintage Books, 2009), p. xviii.
- 58 B. Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London: Allen Lane, 2001); J. Mills (ed.), *Cromwell’s Legacy* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012); G. L. Hudson, ‘Negotiating for blood money: war widows and the courts in seventeenth-century England’, in J. Kermode and G. Walker (eds), *Women, Crime and the Courts in Early Modern England* (London, University College, 1994), pp. 146–69; D. J. Appleby, ‘Unnecessary persons?’

Introduction

- Maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex 1642–1662', *Essex Archaeology and History*, 32 (2001), 209–21; M. Stoye, 'Memories of the maimed: the testimony of Charles I's former soldiers, 1660–1730', *History*, 88:290 (2003), 204–26.
- 59 Professor Jamie Hacker Hughes at Anglia Ruskin: www.anglia.ac.uk/news/research-detects-ptsd-3000-years-ago (accessed 20 April 2017).
- 60 Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion*.
- 61 B. Donagan, *War in England, 1642–1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 2.
- 62 *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- 63 Howard, *War in European History*, pp. ix–x.
- 64 Donagan, *War in England*, p. 3.
- 65 Citino, 'Military histories old and new', 1081; Black, *War and the Cultural Turn*, pp. 148–9; Browning, 'New views on the Silesian Wars', 522–3; Howard, *War in European History*, pp. ix–x.
- 66 Donagan, *War in England*, p. 1; Lynn, *Battle*, p. xiii; Black, *War and the Cultural Turn*, pp. 3, 43.