AMONG collections deposited in the John Rylands Library in recent years are the military papers of Colonel Samuel Bagshawe. They illustrate many aspects of military and life administration in war and peace, in the middle years of the eighteenth century. The man who preserved them was not an important military officer, and he has only been rescued from the obscurity of the early army lists by his habit of keeping the letters and papers of his correspondents. His social rank, although it commanded respect, was not exalted. In that he was an officer typical of his age and profession, a brief sketch of his career will convey some idea of the type of officer frequently encountered in the army of the early Hanoverians.

Samuel Bagshawe was nephew and heir to William Bagshawe of Ford Hall in Derbyshire, a country gentleman of uncertain temper to whose properties he succeeded in 1756. Left fatherless before his birth, Samuel was brought up in his uncle's house, a specially favoured child, since William Bagshawe had no direct heirs. However, an ebullient and capricious temperament brought him into serious conflict with his uncle whilst still in his teens and threatened to demolish his excellent prospects. His behaviour became the object of much censure. Unable to bear any further restraint, and very probably in a fit of temper, he enlisted as a private soldier in General Anstruther's regiment of foot in 1731, at the age of eighteen. This was a decisive step and one on which he had ample time to reflect, and to repent of his incredible folly, during seven years' service.

1 These form part of the Bagshawe Muniments deposited by Major F. E. G. Bagshawe of Ford Hall, Derbyshire. Some of this material was used by W. H. G. Bagshawe in The Bagshaws of Ford (1886) which also contains extracts from other documents destroyed by the author when he sorted the family papers. The brief account of Colonel Samuel Bagshawe which follows is taken from the long account in this book.
in the garrison of Gibraltar, where Anstruther’s regiment were stationed at this time. He had relinquished a comfortable life and had wilfully thrown away the prospect of succeeding to his uncle’s estates, or so it seemed. Only after a long time, and with considerable difficulty, did his friends at home procure his discharge from the army and secure a reconciliation with his uncle. There was, however, a credit side to this long travail. Bagshawe returned to England a sadder but a wiser man, his character having lost some of the capriciousness and instability that had marred the course of his early life. A clear conception of the superior cast of Bagshawe’s character can be formed from the scribbled drafts that he preserved of many of his letters and from the correspondence of his friends and brother officers which forms the greatest part of this collection.

His military career is an interesting one, and occurs at a stirring time, embracing as it does two major European wars. On his return from Gibraltar he spent two quiet years at home before being given an ensigncy by his uncle’s neighbour, the duke of Devonshire, the largest land-owner in Derbyshire and then lord-lieutenant of Ireland. This was in 1740. Three years later he was a captain, and in 1749 he became lieutenant-colonel of his regiment, the 39th Foot. These steps were due almost entirely to his patron, the third duke of Devonshire, and his son, Lord Hartington, later the fourth duke. Meanwhile he had seen active service. In 1746 he accompanied an expedition to the French coast in the capacity of a major of brigade, that is, as his brigadier’s assistant for staff duties. Here he was so unfortunate as to lose one of his legs, but much to his relief he was permitted to serve on in the army.

With the peace of 1748 the 39th were sent back to Ireland, where they continued to serve until a few years later they made history as the first British regiment to serve in India. Bagshawe was allowed to accompany the regiment despite his disability and acted as second-in-command to his colonel, John Adlcrcron, who had been appointed commander-in-chief of all the British forces in the country. Unfortunately his service in India was nothing but a trial and a disappointment. The French thought it prudent to cease hostilities with the arrival of the troops from
England; his superior, himself involved in tiresome disputes with the Company's officials, denied him an opportunity of field service when war again broke out; and, above all, his health made a rapid deterioration, until he was at last forced to return to England, having already lost one eye and being in grave danger of losing the other.

At home once more, Bagshawe's main preoccupation was with promotion. He was now a senior lieutenant-colonel, to whom the colonelcy of a regiment could not long be deferred, or so he thought. Yet even his powerful friends could make little headway in the face of the king's seeming ingratitude. When Lord Ligonier, the commander-in-chief, presented Bagshawe's memorial to George the Second, that monarch replied ungraciously, but to the point, "How can he serve, wanting a leg and an eye?", unmindful of the fact that poor Bagshawe had lost both in his service.

At last, despairing of ever obtaining a colonelcy by the usual means, he took the drastic step of offering to raise a regiment for the Government at his own expense with the help of his Irish relations by marriage, the Caldwells of Castle Caldwell. This was a desperate remedy indeed, for Bagshawe was not a wealthy man, and his decision amazed his relatives who considered, not without reason, that he had by no means been treated with the consideration to which his merit and services entitled him.

The offer was accepted, and the new regiment was numbered the 93rd. It had a short and sorry history, for it was disbanded with many other new regiments at the cessation of hostilities in 1763, and during its short life it had the misfortune to be treated as ill as its colonel. Despite the efforts of its field officers, three fine men of much service and experience who fashioned it into an efficient unit, it was destined never to proceed on active service but to remain in Ireland and suffer its best men to be drafted out of it, time after time, to replenish regiments abroad whose ranks had been thinned by service and disease.

Bagshawe himself was not to see its end, for he died in July 1762, at the early age of forty-nine. His passing was lamented by a large body of friends, old and new, not least among them his lieutenant-colonel and major in the 93rd who had grown to
like and respect him for his sterling qualities of heart and mind.

The military papers which he left serve as a memorial to himself, his regiments and his brother-officers. Their extent is considerable, and they form, in all probability, the largest collection of its kind in the country.\(^1\) They amount in all to some 2,500 individual items, of which over 400 relate to the history of the unfortunate 93rd Regiment, and nearly 600 to the activities of Bagshawe and the 39th in India, 1754-7, whilst there are over 800 items of correspondence from brother officers, mostly of the 39th Regiment, on the backs of which Bagshawe had scribbled, in many instances, the drafts for his replies.\(^2\) Besides these important groups there are over 500 items relating to military accounts and receipts, and the remainder contains, besides miscellaneous fragments, valuable regimental and company returns and muster rolls.

To indicate the directions in which this collection augments knowledge of the British army in the mid-eighteenth century would be to presuppose the existence of a body of published authoritative works upon the subject. But apart from several articles in the *Journal for Army Historical Research* and the

---

\(^1\) Particularly because of their wide range of topics and correspondents, and their concentration with the affairs of one generation, 1740-63. Smaller collections of some interest are the Irwin Papers in the Central Library, Leeds, part of which contains the military papers of Rich, fifth viscount Irwin (1668-1721), colonel of the 16th Regiment 1714-17 and of the King's Dragoon Guards 1717-21, and the papers of the Mackenzies of Suddie in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 39187-39211 *passim*, which include two interesting volumes dealing with the military life of Lieutenant-Colonel John Mackenzie. The Carr-Ellison MSS. in the Central Library, Gateshead-on-Tyne, contain many letters from two military members of the family, Cuthbert Ellison, who died a senior general officer in 1785 and Robert Ellison, his younger brother, who died in North America, when colonel of the 44th Regiment, in 1756. The letters of Lieutenant-Colonel William Burrard, B.M. Add. MSS. 34, 207, are another contribution to knowledge of military life in the 1740s. Several of the printed volumes of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (H.M.C.) contain material relating to military history 1714-63, notably the *Frankland-Russell-Astley* (Chequers Court) MSS., volume I of the *Stopford-Sackville* MSS., the Irwin and Molesworth MSS. in *Various Collections VIII*, and the *Townshend* MSS., but none of these has the breadth and scope of the Bagshawe Collection.

\(^2\) Respectively 2/1/1-403, 2/5/1-2/6/294, and 2/2/1-824. A detailed handlist has been printed.
occasional one in the established historical journals, the only comprehensive full-scale work on the army in the early Hanoverian period is from the pen of Sir John Fortescue, the historian of the British army, and this is more a chronological study of campaigns than of the troops, their officers and their administration.¹ Fortescue’s general verdicts have been accepted by political historians, but those relating to matters other than the course of war are not altogether satisfactory. Private collections such as the Bagshawe papers shed a more kindly light upon the officers and officials of the period, and upon their activities, than some of the official correspondence used by Fortescue. Since the latter worked upon the eighteenth century army in the early years of this century many new sources of information have been made available and valuable work has been done, mainly in articles; but there has been no collation of information on a greater scale. The difficulty appears to be not so much a lack of material as a want of qualified historians with an interest in this period of military history and sufficient time at their disposal to use the material and make it available.

In the period covered by Samuel Bagshawe’s military career the army consisted of a congeries of self-contained units, the regiments, which were organized in two separate establishments, the English and the Irish,² and commanded by the king in person who exercised in practice the fullest use of his nominal control over the army. It was not merely a historical accident which made George the Second the last English sovereign to command his troops in action. The royal directives were issued to the army by the secretary at war, in effect the king’s private secretary for military affairs, who was far from being the independent figure depicted by Fortescue. Both George the Second and his father were keenly interested in their army and resented parliamentary interference with it and political influence in it, although they could hardly stop either vice under the social and political conditions prevailing at the time.

² There had been a Scots, which was merged with the English at the union of 1707.
The War Office, with its handful of clerks, was a tiny organization; mainly because there was little for it to do but send out the king's directives, handle routine orders and returns and soothe disputes. The army administered itself. In accordance with routine instructions and under the supervision of the secretary at war and the board of general officers, the proprietary colonels of regiments, directly or indirectly, fed, paid, clothed and equipped their units from the sums issued to them for the purpose by the paymaster-general. The central office and its head, the secretary at war, was concerned only with the abuses and shortcomings of the system. Arms, ammunition and powder, and camp-equipment, when required, were supplied by the board of ordnance under a certificate from the secretary's office.

As remarked, the burden of these duties fell not on the war office staff, but on the colonels and captains of the regiments of the army, and, more particularly, upon the regimental agents whose lives could have been anything but carefree. On behalf of their colonels, who had empowered them by letter of attorney to negotiate in their name with the respective departments of Government, they had to keep the regimental finances running smoothly, usually with the help of a regimental paymaster, and eventually account for them with the Treasury. Bad accounts meant a delay in the payment of essential money that was usually already in arrears. This meant great difficulty in administering the regiment. It was no wonder that agents occasionally defaulted, and sometimes went so far as to commit suicide.

The captains' share in this weary travail is not generally realized. They too shouldered a heavy burden of responsibility. They paid their men, recruited them, maintained their dress, arms and accoutrements in good order, not to mention caring for them when sick and burying them when dead, on a slender allowance that was often upset by the thoughtless deserter who absconded with his uniform and weapons. Quite frequently the captains were out of pocket in the faithful performance of their duties. A capable and honest sergeant was a necessity for them.

The regiments, whether of horse, dragoons or foot, were, as already mentioned, self-contained units commanded by a
proprietary colonel who, not infrequently, had bought his regiment. Since he was usually a general officer of declining age he was seldom with his regiment. The chief executive officer was the lieutenant-colonel, with a major as second in command. Both were usually officers of long service and great experience. The companies in a regiment of foot and the troops in regiments of horse or dragoons were commanded by captains, all save three, which were commanded by the field officers of the regiment, that is, by the colonel, lieutenant-colonel and major. Since the colonel was not often with the regiment, his troop or company was looked after by a special officer, called the captain-lieutenant. There were three officers to each company or troop. Generally speaking, regiments of foot in England mustered around 600 men, and regiments of horse and dragoons around 400. These figures were less in “Irish” regiments, and considerably more on active service.

The two establishments were entirely separate administrative entities, paid by and accountable to the respective treasuries of the two countries. The army itself came under the orders of the monarch wherever it happened to be, but his secretary at war, who issued orders to troops in England, Scotland and the colonial garrisons, had no direct authority in Ireland. There the orders came from the secretary to the lord-lieutenant or the lords justices of the kingdom, who were the king’s representatives in Ireland. The Irish military establishment had been imposed on Ireland by act of the English parliament, and its usual size within this period was limited to 12,000 men. Since Ireland was quiet there was no need to keep regiments at full strength, which enabled many more regiments to be kept in the country than would otherwise have been the case, albeit they were much below operational strength. They provided a useful reserve in time of emergency. When the English parliament could be persuaded that an expansion of the army was essential, regiments were taken from Ireland, recruited to full strength and could then be used for service anywhere, though as an English charge, since away from Ireland they ceased to be a legitimate charge on that country’s exchequer. On the cessation of hostilities the former “Irish” regiments, pruned to their
Numbers on the English charge, which included troops in the colonies as well as those at home, were approximately 23,000 men before the war with Spain broke out in 1739, rising to some 76,000 by 1748, the last year of that war; whilst the close of the Seven Years' War saw around 100,000 men on the accounts, which gives some indication of the demands of global war in the mid-eighteenth century.

Abroad the army was the weary custodian of the nation's overseas possessions, and at home, where the majority of regiments were, the unpopular hand-maid of the law in default of a properly organized security force. Quartered in small detachments throughout the country, it carried out most of the duties now associated with the police force. Its presence was not appreciated. A hundred years made little difference to popular feeling on the subject, for "a surly democrat" of the post-Waterloo period observed to a young officer who was his enforced guest that "soldiers in time of peace are chimneys in summer", which was a sentiment shared by most Englishmen.

The Bagshawe collection is valuable for the light it casts upon some of the darker corners of this setting. Perhaps its most important contribution lies in the fact that by virtue of the large numbers of letters from Bagshawe's brother officers, both junior and senior, which it includes, it is possible to gain an intimate and realistic picture of the regimental officer of the day. This is something which it is difficult to acquire from anything but a collection of this size, which allows daily thoughts and feelings over private and regimental matters, great and small, to be described by different pens. This insight into the personal side

---

1 For the annual estimates see the relevant volumes of the journals of the House of Commons printed in 1803.
2 Notes and Queries, clxxiii (1937), 133.
3 The most useful books for the general background, on which the previous paragraphs are based, are Fortescue's History; C. M. Clode, The Military Forces of the Crown (2 vols. 1869); E. E. Curtis, The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution (1926); A Forbes, A History of the Army Ordnance Services (3 vols., 1929), vol. i relevant; and the Report on the State of His Majesty's Land Forces and Marines, June 1746, printed in Reports from Committees of the House of Commons (1803), ii. 75-211.
of regimental soldiering enables an estimate to be formed of the
degree of feeling which these men had for their calling and of the
spirit in which they approached their duties and bore their
hardships.

An obvious merit is the wealth of material it provides for
the regimental historian. There is a great deal relating to the
39th Regiment, in which Bagshawe served for seventeen years,
during two of the highlights of its early history, its participation
in Hawke's famous sea-fight off Ushant in 1747 while doing duty
as marines on board his fleet, and its epic tour of duty in India
1754-8.1 It is unfortunate that Bagshawe's 93rd Regiment is
not represented by a direct descendant since it was disbanded at
the close of the war which brought it into being, but the papers
relating to it during Bagshawe's tenure of the colonelcy provide
an excellent, detailed picture of the officers who moulded it into
an effective body and also a continuous history of its activities for
all but the last period of its short existence.

The machinery of military administration at this time is
familiar in outline. But its detail and efficiency at regimental
level are not so generally known. Here it is possible to follow
the daily course of administration over a considerable period,
to establish the procedure of the time in all its intricacies over a
wide range of subjects from promotion by purchase to the correct
method of obtaining more ammunition from the tight-fisted
board of ordnance, and to gauge the efficiency of the methods
employed.

The work of regimental agents, who were closely involved
in this war of paperasserie and procedure, has never been studied
in detail, although their place in the military administration of
the period was a most important one. There are in the collection
nearly 200 items from the different agents of the 39th

1 It is unfortunate that an excellent history of the Dorset Regiment, whose
first battalion was formerly the 39th Regiment, was published (1947) before
the Bagshawe muniments became available. It was written by C. T. Atkinson.
The list of casualties in the companies of the 39th present at Ushant is in 2/4/103,
and a complete set of monthly returns for October 1754-September 1756
inclusive, during which time the regiment was in India, is to be found in 2/4/143-
165 and 2/5/188, 253. There is a general return of the 39th for May 1752 in
2/4/140-141, and one for the 93rd for 1761 in 2/1/227-228.
Regiment, which illustrate the scope and the amount of the work which descended on these gentlemen.¹

By no means least, if last, the papers shed light, from a level below that of Government itself, upon some of the workings of the Irish military establishment. The 39th moved from the Irish to the English establishment in 1743 and returned to it in 1748. They left it for their brief Indian tour, but returned to Ireland after their voyage home. The 93rd Regiment was raised in Ireland and remained on the Irish establishment until it was disbanded. Three of these principal contributions to knowledge will be examined in a little detail: the Irish establishment, the regimental agents, and the regimental officers.

The Irish military establishment is shrouded in some mystery and many of its inner workings are unfamiliar to historians. This is so largely because of the destruction of the Irish records forty years ago and the comparatively few records relating to Ireland in the early eighteenth century in the Public Record Office. Writing on the subject in 1949 in the first number of The Irish Sword, the Journal of the Military History Society of Ireland, S. H. F. Johnston drew the attention of Irish historians to the many gaps in our knowledge and sought to enlist their aid. Among the points on which he wished to have more information was the matter of the lord-lieutenant’s right to grant commissions, and the relations which subsisted between the latter and the military commander in Ireland.²

The lord-lieutenant undoubtedly possessed the power of direct appointment, and of recommendation, to military posts on the Irish establishment and among the regiments there. This delegation of the royal prerogative was occasioned by political considerations. The lord-lieutenant, and in his absence the lords-justices, passed essential measures through the Irish parliament by means of the judicious disposal of patronage, of which military preferment was but a part. This much is, of

¹ In 2/2 from Desbrisay, Ladeveze, Levett, and Calcraft, and in 2/1 from Montgomery, the agent of the 93rd Regiment. Four of Calcraft’s letter-books are in B.M. Add. MSS. 17,493-17,496, and about seventy letters of Richard Worthington, agent to Rich, fifth viscount Irwin when he was colonel of the 16th Regiment, 1714-17, are among the Irwin Papers at Leeds.

² The Irish Sword, i. 34.
course, generally known. It is the extent of the lord-lieutenant’s power which requires elucidation.

Samuel Bagshawe owed his first three commissions up to and including the rank of captain entirely to his patron, William, third duke of Devonshire, when he was lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and they did not cost the recipient a penny although they represented £1,500 worth of preferment, since they were given without purchase. The lord-lieutenant seems to have been able to appoint junior officers to regiments upon the Irish establishment without a great deal of regard to the wishes of their colonels. This Bagshawe found out when, in due course, he decided to raise a regiment for Government at his own expense. The operation of the same power that had been so convenient for him when he was a junior officer, ambitious for promotion and secure in the esteem of his powerful patron, was to become displeasing to him when he became a colonel himself. He seems to have had little choice in the selection of officers for the 93rd, most of whom were appointed by the lord-lieutenant in response to his own or other people’s wishes. Among these officers was one who was destined to give him a good deal of trouble. This was Francis Flood, the nephew of Warden Flood, who in 1760 became Lord Chief Justice of Ireland.¹ His commission as lieutenant in the 93rd Regiment was procured for him by his uncle from the lord-lieutenant, John, fourth duke of Bedford, without reference to Samuel Bagshawe.² These instances illustrate the exercise of the lord-lieutenant’s power of direct appointment.

¹ See 2/1/368 and 371 in particular.
² 2/1/49. Writing in 1761 Lieutenant-General Cuthbert Ellison of Hebburn stated that the lord-lieutenant could, without reference elsewhere, appoint to vacant ensigncies and cornetcies, and recommend, usually with success, to the higher vacancies, Gateshead, Central Public Library, Carr-Ellison MSS., A 21 letter of 31 January 1761; but this seems to assess the lord-lieutenant’s powers at their lowest. The duke of Bedford when lord-lieutenant gave a company in the 90th Regiment to a young Welshman, the son of a Caernarvonshire baronet in 1760. (P.R.O., W.O. I/609, 61) fol. There is an interesting quid pro quo arrangement between Calcraft and the duke when one of the former’s friends was assisted in his promotion in the Irish establishment in B.M. Add. MS. 17,495 fol. 237. See also H.M.C., Stopford-Sackville MSS., i (1904), 169, where Lord Chesterfield details the military preferment he secured for his pages. The secretary at war had nothing to do with Irish appointments, but he was notified after they had been made in order that he might get the commissions signed in
His great influence in recommending to all vacancies upon the Irish establishment certainly extended to the highest military ranks. He had a distinct say in the appointment of officers to be colonels of regiments, although his recommendations were not always accepted, since colonelcies were lucrative posts keenly contested in political circles, and sometimes the king had to appoint men whose backers it was expedient to assuage. The lord-lieutenant was, therefore, not always served, but his wishes counted for a great deal. When old General Ffolliott, colonel of the 18th Regiment, died in 1762 the duke of Devonshire wrote to the lord-lieutenant to recommend Bagshawe for the vacant regiment, saying that he should feel much obliged if it were done. An officer who stood high in the lord-lieutenant's esteem could look forward to being assisted in his career. Robert Sandford, a young lieutenant-colonel of thirty-one who was a protege of John, fourth duke of Bedford, was quarter-master-general in Ireland when his patron procured the colonelcy of the 66th for him in the summer of 1758. A few months later a vacancy occurred in an older regiment unlikely to be disbanded at the peace, and Bedford promptly secured it for Sandford, besides "fixing a scheme" for him to remain quarter-master-general despite his promotion to a colonelcy.

The lord-lieutenant certainly recommended to vacancies among the number of general officers allowed upon the establishment. In 1759 Major-General John Adlercron, the 39th's colonel, heard that there was to be an addition to their number and sent a memorial to the lord-lieutenant urging his claims for the office of the one of the secretaries of state. See P.R.O., W.O. 1/602, fols. 53, 255, 279.  

2 2/2/455. It was customary for the Q.M.G. not to have a regiment in addition to his employment, which was worth £365 a year. The lord-lieutenant's influence in the disposal of regiments was considerable. In 1752 Sir John Whitefoord, a Scottish baronet and colonel of a dragoon regiment in Ireland, was anxious to assist his younger brother Charles to a colonelcy on that establishment, but he was rather doubtful of Charles's success, since he "had heard a bird whistle, that the Recommendation of the last two who got Regiments, was only meant to serve a third Person, who was recommended at the same time. Now as this Person is still in your way", he continued, "I don't know what to think. Besides, as the Ld Lieut has got two Regiments lately, won't the King name to the first vacancy himself?" (W. Hewins (ed.), Whiteford Papers (1898), pp. 113-14).
due consideration. Whereupon, he related to Bagshawe, the latter "was pleased to give me for an answer, that such an employment required Young & Active people".1

Respecting the relative position of the lord-lieutenant and lords-justices with the military commander in Ireland, there is little doubt that the latter possessed no effective say in anything save routine administration and measures for the defence of the kingdom. In many matters he was purely an adviser, and like all advisers his influence varied from person to person. The lord-lieutenant's full title indicated his plenary powers. He

1 2/2/42. The appointment of general officers to the Irish staff was, however, wholly at the king's pleasure, and the letters notifying their appointment always ran, "whereas His Majesty is pleased to place", etc. This is in contrast to other appointments in which the lord-lieutenant's advice and consent is part of the preamble. See W.O. 8 3/ fols. 38-41, 61-63, 69, 74 for appointments in the 'thirties and 'forties.

On the whole question of the lord-lieutenant's military patronage the Dropmore Papers (H.M.C.) provide an insight into the situation of affairs thirty years later, during the second term of office of George Grenville, first marquis of Buckingham, lord-lieutenant 1787-9. He complained bitterly that his careful government of Ireland was being jeopardised by his inability to secure what he wanted in the line of the military patronage that he conceived was his due, and he charged the king with trying to take from him "every degree of army patronage" (Vol. i. p. 456 See also pp. 175-6, 309-10, 357-8, etc.). Buckingham undoubtedly looked upon the lord-lieutenant's military patronage as an inalienable right (pp. 344, 358). It was something of a shock to him to find that it was founded on nothing more than general practice. On examination, the instructions to the lord-lieutenant contained no hint of a right to military patronage. His brother stated that "both in the commission and in the instructions to the Lord-Lieutenant, all military promotions are expressly reserved to the King and . . . they do not fall in the line either of those offices which the Lord-Lieutenant himself disposes of, or of those on which the King declares his intention of waiting for the Lord-Lieutenant's recommendation". Pitt, the prime-minister, wrote to the same effect, "I cannot, however, find that the general rule is founded in anything but practice, or that there is any such promise as you suppose [to await the Lord-Lieutenant's recommendation] in the instructions. . . . There is a clause containing a promise of this nature, but it refers only to ecclesiastical and civil offices". There was, however, this general convention which had always applied, of which "the practice and the understanding certainly is, and it is so recognised in Lord Sydney's letter, that the Lord-Lieutenant should recommend to all commissions below the rank of colonel" (Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of George III (4 vols., 1853-5), i. 404-5). The Memoirs contain some of the replies to Buckingham's letters printed by the H.M.C. The dispute that occasioned this correspondence indicates that the considerable military patronage exercised by the lords-lieutenant of Ireland was founded on usage rather than prescription.
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was "lord-lieutenant-general and general governor", whilst the military officer was specifically stated in his letter of appointment to be lieutenant-general and commander-in-chief "under the government there".¹

The civil authorities dealt with all applications, recommendations and memorials relating to officers, which seem to have gone straight to them and not via the commander-in-chief. Colonel Adlercron spoke to the chief secretary, or to Mr. Waite, secretary to the lords-justices, on such matters.² It was entirely up to the chief secretary whether memorials were sent over to England or not. Lord George Sackville, when chief secretary to his father, the duke of Dorset, refused to forward a request that major Matthews Sewell of the 39th be allowed to sell his commission; and he was extremely displeased when captain-lieutenant Wray of the same regiment sent an additional memorial towards his promotion privately to England on the genuine assumption that the official recommendations had already gone from Dublin Castle, which they had not. Lord George, reported a regimental correspondent, "took greater offence at Wray's proceeding than can well be expressed" and continued "inexorable". He ordered all the purchase money to be withdrawn from the hands of the agent, and thus occasioned "a Dead Stop of Promotion" in the regiment.³

The day to day orders for the troops came from the secretary to the lord-lieutenant or the lords-justices, paralleling the English system where the orders came from the king's secretary for military affairs, the secretary at war. The commander-in-chief's duties appear to have been purely military, and to have been restricted to matters connected with recruiting men, reviewing troops, ordering military exercises, and to a general concern with military administration.⁴ He sent reports to England of the state of the Irish regiments, carrying on a general liaison, and he was probably responsible for the defence of the kingdom. He was concerned with military patronage and preferment only

¹ See P.R.O. W.O. 8/3/ fol. 75.
² 2/2/4-5, 11, 15. For the organisation of "the military department" in the lord-lieutenant's office in 1777, see H.M.C., Stopford-Sackville MSS., i. 245.
³ 2/2/4 and 2/2/280.
⁴ E.g. 2/2/25, 33, 296, 294.
in an advisory capacity, and had no authority on such matters himself. His influence would depend in great measure upon his personal relations with the lord-lieutenant.

The Irish establishment was in no way under the thumb of the secretary at war nor yet under the direct orders of the English commander-in-chief when one was appointed. An interesting demonstration of the complete separation of powers, and an object lesson in the inferior position of the Irish commander-in-chief, who is not mentioned in the skirmish detailed below, is afforded by the Bagshawe papers.

At the end of 1748 the 39th Regiment was at Bristol, awaiting a fair wind to take them to Ireland. When part of the regiment embarked upon the transports Lieutenant Robert Supple "took it into his head to behave very indecently & imprudently" to Lieutenant-Colonel Matthews Sewell, the commanding officer. Sewell immediately placed him in arrest, and wrote to the secretary at war and to the colonel of the regiment desiring a court-martial on Supple.

The regiment meanwhile crossed to Ireland where, of course, it came upon that establishment and ceased to belong to the English one. There Supple's friends, greatly aided by the speaker of the Irish House of Commons, urged Sewell to lay aside the prosecution and be content with an apology; but he was not to be mollified. Captain Grant reported what was supposed to have passed between Sewell and the speaker. Sewell said:

that as he had reported him to the Duke,¹ the Secretary at War, Lord Harrington ² & the Lords Justices it was out of his power to forgive it, to which he was answered that neither the Duke nor the Secretary at War had any business with it, [that] the Regiment was on this Establishment and he had no business to Report it anywhere else; he [Sewell] said as the Duke was General of the Army it was his Duty to Report it to him, & upon his mentioning the Duke on several occasions, in that affair, the Speaker gave him to understand that he had better drop that, that the Duke had no command here, and that the Lords Justices were quite independent of him.³

What is most illuminating about this is that it occurred when Cumberland was captain-general and at the height of his prestige and power, at a time when the central control of the army was

¹ William, duke of Cumberland, captain-general of the army, 1746-57.
² Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 1746-50.
³ 2/2/238 and 249.
more unified and firmer in touch than at any other time in the first half of the eighteenth century.

Among the other points on which Mr. Johnston sought information were the precise nature of garrison duty in Ireland and the obscure question of recruiting in Ireland. On the first head he desired "a more detailed and more convincing picture" of the activities of regiments there. This is certainly provided by the collection. Military routine in time of peace is illustrated in the letters of a number of regimental correspondents between 1749 and 1752, and at the more frenzied pace of war-time activity in the large bundle of papers relating to the 93rd from its raising up to the time of Bagshawe's death two and a half years later.¹

There is a great deal of useful information in the various letters on the question of recruiting which was, after all, of the greatest importance. As regularly as clockwork a large body of officers departed from each regiment the moment the annual review, the highlight of the regimental year, was over in mid-summer, and spent the ensuing six months endeavouring to recruit sufficient men to balance the yearly wastage caused by discharge, death and desertion.

Regiments in Ireland only recruited Irishmen in time of emergency. It was otherwise forbidden by general regulation and officers recruited either in their native areas or where directed by their colonel or by government.² This much has long been generally known and is exemplified by the Bagshawe correspondence, which shows officers of the 39th Regiment proceeding to all parts of the compass in England, Scotland and Wales to recruit their men. Since the officers were always of mixed nationality the regiments would always contain a number of men from each kingdom in the Union.

¹ Particularly in the letters of Adlercron and Sewell in 2 2 ; 2 1 for the 93rd.
² Lieutenant-Colonel Windus of the 93rd had views on the choice of a recruiting station. " I am really of Opinion when officers go home on the Recruiting Service, they are not quite so Diligent as when at a strange place, & never tire of living with their Friends, Consequently don't take all the pains they should do to forward the Business they are sent on, & I believe in that, I am Not Singular in my Opinion, I don't mean that all Officers do so, but very young Gent⁴ are apt to be a little Giddy & to mind their Country Diversions more than Recruiting, whereas in Other places where they live at their own Expense, they must Mind their Business more, or run in Debt, w⁴ in indeed is with Difficulty avoided " (2 1 46).
There were very few Irishmen in the 39th Regiment during Bagshawe's time in it. A list of Irish soldiers was compiled in 1751 which shows that there were thirty-one of them in the regiment in 1749 and only sixteen two years later, and nearly all of these had actually been born in different regiments of the army, their fathers having also been soldiers. The number had risen to forty by May 1752. This small number is not surprising, since even Protestant Irish were permitted to be recruited only in time of emergency or under special regulation. Among the War Office out-letters to Ireland in the Public Record Office are two orders from the lord-lieutenant in 1745 and 1747 permitting Protestant Irishmen to be recruited in the provinces of Ulster, but only under extreme caution, since it was expressly stated that recruits must "take and subscribe the Oaths and Declarations appointed by Law".

Even under the recruiting exigencies of the Seven Years' War which saw the greatest army of the century in being, the wild expansion of 1793-4 not excepted, Government was chary of recruiting the Catholic Irish who were, oddly enough, permitted to be recruited into the marines. Marines, "as they take of all Religions", remarked Edward Windus, the experienced lieutenant-colonel of the 93rd Regiment, had the easiest recruiting problems. Recruiting was much more difficult for line regiments. Government was extremely particular about Irish recruits where they had to be accepted, although the new Irish regiments must have been full of them, there being no fewer than 411 of them in the 93rd in June 1761.

Two officers of the 93rd incurred their lieutenant-colonel's grave displeasure when they recruited men who were known to be Roman Catholics. Writing to Bagshawe the latter observed that they had "Acted in Open Opposition to the First & most Material Article of your Recruiting Instructions, by enlisting Papists, knowing them (I may say), to be such ...". He continued:

This is so flagrant a piece of Disobedience in the Above named Officers, & so contrary to the Ld. Lts. Intentions, as well as Lord Rothes's & yours, That I

1 2/4/148. 2 2/4/141. 3 P.R.O., W.O. 8/3/98 and 113. 4 2/1/51. 5 2/1/228.
have not only rejected them, but have sent them with the Corporal (who conducted them here) to you, that you may learn from them (as I did) all the particulars, & to take what notice you think proper of the behaviour of the two officers.¹

The incident must have reached the ears of the lord-lieutenant, for a few weeks later his secretary wrote to enquire whether the "reported Papists" were still with the regiment.²

From these instances it seems that there were no known Catholics and few Protestant Irish in the army in the war of 1739-48 and no known Catholics in the army, save in the marines, in the Seven Years' War, Government's regulations being so definite in this matter and so strongly enforced.

There are altogether some 200 letters from the different agents who served the colonels of the 39th Regiment between 1745 and 1759, the year in which Bagshawe left the regiment after seventeen years' service in it in war and peace, for ten of which he had been its lieutenant-colonel. There are also a few letters from the agent who served his 93rd Regiment in Ireland, but these are surprisingly few in number, amounting to no more than a dozen.

The agents in question were Captain Thomas Levett, English agent to the 39th 1745-8, Captain Theophilus Desbrisay, a Huguenot officer who was Irish agent 1748-52, Lieutenant-Colonel Anthony Ladeveze, Irish agent 1752-4, when the regiment went to India, and John Calcraft. The latter, perhaps the most famous of all eighteenth-century army agents, took over direction of the regiment's affairs whilst it was in India and paid for from the English establishment, but on its return to Ireland in 1758 Captain Desbrisay looked after it once again, since Ladeveze had died in the interval of Indian service. Captain William Montgomery was the agent of the 93rd.

With the exception of Calcraft all the agents who handled the regimental administration were retired military officers. This is hardly surprising. The occupation, though arduous, was congenial to military men, and the intricacies of the task, which involved a thorough knowledge of military administration and routine procedure, were the better performed by men who knew the sort of people with whom they had to deal. An agency was

¹ 2/1/46. Lord Rothes was commander-in-chief in Ireland. ² 2/1 66.
established and extended as much by personal contacts and a shrewd application of personal favours as by the prompt and efficient despatch of business. These agents were no parade ground soldiers, or men who had been soldiers only for a day. Their rank had been earned by service and was not a meaningless embellishment. Levett and Ladeveze were veterans of Marlborough’s campaigns in the Low Countries. The former had retired from the Horse Grenadier Guards in 1729 after twenty-five years service, and Ladaveze had been lieutenant-colonel of the 19th Regiment 1741-4, when he retired after thirty-seven years in the army. Desbrias and Montgomery were men of a similar stamp, thoroughly conversant with the minutiae of the military profession by reason of their own experience.

The regimental agent had been, in origin, the colonel’s clerk for managing the affairs of his regiment, and in the early days of the standing army the agents had been selected from among the private men of the regiment. By the beginning of George the First’s reign the agent had become a man of considerable importance, whose rank in society was little inferior to that of his clients. Although the number of agents in business in 1714 was still large, it did not equal the number of regiments in the army, since several of them had the affairs of a group of regiments in their hands. This accretion of agencies was a process which gathered momentum as the century advanced, and the number of agents in business steadily decreased, despite the growing size of the army. A score of them looked after the affairs of the 150 regiments of the Seven Years’ War. The greatest of these was John Calcraft whose office in Channel Row, Westminster, transacted the business of some sixty regiments. He had built up this great agency partly by his friendship with Henry Fox, the secretary at war, who put him in the way of many favours, partly by his engaging and friendly, if calculating, personality which made him many friends among rising military officers, and partly by buying up other agencies when he could. When

1 The fact that retired or half-pay military officers set up agencies helped to raise the social standing of the agent. Richard Worthington had been a lieutenant of the 16th Regiment and had served with it at Blenheim and elsewhere before he became Lord Irwin’s agent.
Captain Levett had to retire from business on account of age and chronic ill-health Calcraft bought his agency. Levett’s chief clerk, David Roberts, who was one of Samuel Bagshawe’s friends and correspondents, then became head of one of the divisions of the office in Channel Row.¹

An agent was empowered to act on behalf of his colonel on all matters concerning the regiment by the formal grant of a letter of attorney. An agent sometimes paid money for the exercise of the agency. Sometimes he gave security for his handling of the regiment’s affairs, but this depended upon the caution of the colonel immediately concerned. Agents failed, on occasion, and when they did the colonel bore the consequences, unless he had obtained security sufficient to cover the loss. A letter from Lord John Murray relating to this question of security is preserved among the Bagshawe muniments. It was written in 1768 to James Grant, a late captain in the 47th Regiment and town-major of Limerick, who was soliciting Lord John for the agency of his regiment, the 42nd, and it details Murray’s demands.²

Very often a colonel had little to say in the choice of his agent. When, in 1757-8, it seemed that Bagshawe might be given a regiment, Calcraft and Leonard Morse, a war office clerk who was Bagshawe’s friend and frequent correspondent, asked him to bear them in mind for the agency. To Morse he wrote saying that he would like to see the agency in his hands, but, he observed, “I need not acquaint you how Seldom the Colonels have the power to name their Agents”.³ This he explains in a letter to Calcraft:

With Respect to the Request you make for the Agency. Your Merit, Capacity & Connection would make it an honour to me to have such a person to manage the Affairs of the Regt: but I need not mention to you that these Appointments [sic] are now reduced to Method & indeed it is very far from being unreasonable if

¹ 2/2/420 and 448.
² 5/1/415 (undated, but can be placed in 1768, the year in which James Grant left the 47th Regiment on Murray’s instructions). Grant was to have the agency on the same terms as the late agent. "If agreeable to you [I] shall now appoint you Agent, on the same terms he had it, only that you advance me four hundred pounds, for which I shall pay you interest but that the principal be continued in my possession as a deposit for Security, during your being Agent for it, unless I shall choose to repay it.” In 1760 the secretary at war had commanded colonels to take security from their agent, if they had not already done so. ³ 17/2/425.
when a person by the Credit of his Patron & Friend obtains Promotion to accept a person whom his Friends should recommend. The D[uke] of D[evonshire]: is my Patron, Sir Robt Wilmot has long been a disinterested Friend. It will be my desire when I obtain a Reg[nament: that the Agent may be agreeable to them. . . . If you will please to be of the Pains to see Sir Robt Wilmot & prevail with him to mention it to the D: of D: His Grace's and Sir Robert's Aprobation [sic] will absolutely determine mine.¹

In short, the patronage by which so many officers gained their promotion limited the colonel's freedom of choice. When Bagshawe gained colonel's rank by raising his own regiment he was, of course, able to appoint his agent in accordance with his own wishes.

The multifarious duties which fell to a regimental agent are illustrated by the letters included in this collection. They may be considered under two headings, administrative and financial. He arranged all the transactions relating to the regiment's clothing: ² the contracts with the different tradesmen, clothiers, tailors, shoe-makers, hatmakers, the supervision of the packers who sent off the clothing to the regiment, and the payment of insurance to cover its loss on the journey.³ He applied to the Board of Ordnance, on the colonel's order, for extra arms and for powder and ammunition, and he sent in the appropriate returns to the secretary at war's office. In fact, he performed a thousand and one tasks relating to the comfort and efficiency of the regiment, all of which required an expert knowledge of military requirements and routine procedure. The financial side of his business was assuredly his biggest headache. On the one hand he had to deal with regimental officers whose book-keeping varied considerably, being commensurate with their ability and industry, and on the other with Government departments who disliked inexact accounting and used it as an excuse to withhold payments already considerably in arrears yet urgently needed to maintain

¹ 2/2/448. Sir Robert Wilmot was Secretary to the various lords-lieutenant of Ireland from 1736 to 1772.
² Regiments of foot were clothed annually, horse and dragoons every two years and the household troops every third year.
³ This could be quite high. Clothing sent to North America to the 44th Regiment in 1755 cost its colonel £101 (Carr Ellison MSS., A 20, letter of 20 April 1758). See Forbes, op. cit. vol. i, for a detailed account of the clothing of the army.
the regiment and its personnel. The agent's financial business consisted of the dual process of obtaining money and keeping track of its expenditure. He secured a lump sum from the Treasury and disbursed it, at need, to the company commanders for their men. To assist him a regimental paymaster, who was simply a regimental officer who was given the post in addition to his other duties, kept the individual company accounts which had to square annually with the accounts kept by the agent. The latter issued monthly abstracts from his accounts to each of the company commanders, to enable them to see the state of their company finances and help him to prevent the usual muddle from getting completely out of hand. He handled the different regimental funds and disbursed and supervised the recruiting fund which came partly from levy money issued by Government and partly from the regimental funds. He arranged credit for the officers to cash their private and public bills wherever they went, and looked after all their financial affairs which, as may well be imagined, were sometimes desperately involved. He handled their pay, part of which, the subsistence, was always paid up to date and sometimes in advance, although the greater part of it was always in arrears.

It is obvious that with regiments dispersed in detachments or overseas, with communications as faulty and uncertain as they were, much difficulty would be encountered by the agents in the performance of their duties. However, even more formidable difficulties were imposed by the system on which the army was organized. A regiment could not remain on the books of one agent even though its colonel desired it. The difficulty arose from there being two military establishments, the English and the Irish, each with their own set of agents whose accounts were not transferable. If a regiment went to Ireland it had to have an Irish agent, and if it were ordered back to England its accounts had to be handled by an English one. Ironically enough, these cross-postings were most frequent in war-time when agents already had quite enough business on their minds. On each change of establishment the old agent had to settle accounts with the new. This was frequently a lengthy business. It took the Irish and English agents of the 39th Regiment nearly
three years to settle the regiment's accounts for its short period on the English establishment 1743-8; and when Colonel Ladeveze took over the agency from Captain Desbrisay in 1752 thirteen months elapsed before their accounts were closed.

The chief losers in the first matter were the agent, Captain Levett, and poor Bagshawe who had been regimental paymaster for much of the regiment's time in England. It was accepted by the Irish authorities that arrears due to the regiments that had come back from England after the peace, of which the 39th was one, should be paid only after the accounts had been cleared. This was easier said than done. Many of the officers involved in the accounts had left the regiment, some having died, others being on half-pay and some had gone to other regiments. The crux of the matter lay in the losses and deficiencies that had occurred since the regiment went to England in 1743. Bagshawe blamed "the such irregular service" on which the regiment had been engaged for his inability to keep proper accounts. The regiment had been in the north, it had been on the expedition to the French coast in 1746, it had been guarding prisoners of war in the west-country, and, worst of all, it had been employed in small and large detachments on board the fleet for several years. This last service had played the biggest part in bedevilling the accounts: desertion, with its attendant loss of uniform, accoutrements and arms, had been high, because the sea-service was most unpopular; extraordinary expenses for sea-clothes and other ship-board necessities had been unavoidable; and the general difficulties and uncertainties attendant upon sea-service, together with the sketchiness of communications, had done the rest. It says much for Bagshawe that he did not attempt to evade his responsibility, unfair though much of it was. He saw to it that nobody in the regiment, particularly officers' widows, should be losers except himself. His relations with Levett, the agent, during this trying time were uniformly good. The two were good friends who respected each other's integrity, and their friendship could withstand the onset of difficulties. Ultimately, in April 1751, a warrant for clearing the 39th from the English establishment was sent to Ireland, after three years' wrangling on the

\[1/2/393. \quad 2/2/302. \quad 2/2/386.\]
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subject. Bagshawe and Levett were, as the latter styled it, "great sufferers by the issue".¹

A similar predicament, on a grander scale, occurred after the 39th returned from India in 1758 and again went on the Irish establishment. Major Francis Forde had gone out with the regiment as its paymaster, but, apparently, he had sent home no accounts whatever which delayed Calcraft, the agent, in settling the regiment's affairs and securing more money for its use, and he made matters worse by electing to stay in India in the military service of the East India Company.² "It is impossible to express the Confusion that the Accounts of the Regt are in, Maj'. Forde has sent no manner of Accounts, and Mr. Calcraft says he has drawn for more money than he should, in short we must take the last Gentleman's word for everything", wrote Major David Hepburne in December 1758. He went on to describe the recruiting situation to Bagshawe. "Nor does it appear as yet, that we have the smalest [sic] Certain Fund to begin the recruiting on. I fear greatly, my dear Col, that you will have your Share of plague with regard to our Reg't affairs. . . ."³ In his next he continues, "I know not where to find one peny [sic] to set them agoing. There is certainly no fund on this side [of] the water and unless Mr. Calcraft gives the officers Credit either on Capt. Desbrisay or at their Stations all our labour is in vain."⁴

¹ 2/2/393. See Levett's letters for the details, especially 2/2/371-393. Eighteenth-century soldiers had a dread of the sea-service, due in part to long confinement on board and in part to the privations and shortages they undoubtedly endured. Ensign John Nugent of the 39th reported to Bagshawe in 1747 that everything was on board the allotted ship "except two or three [men] who kept out of the way till we are redy to sail for fear of being confined on bord ", but, he assured the latter, "I have people looking for them and as soon as they are found will take cear of them" (2/2/473). The same trouble was repeated in India when detachments of the 39th served on board Admiral Watson's fleet. Major Lovett reported that the grenadiers were showing "a great Desire of being very troublesome & Mutinous, & y' is much easier Corrected on Shoar than on Board " he opined (2/6/64). For an amusing description of the life of an officer of marines at sea, see Whitefoord Papers, p. 29. Prize money was the only consolation of sea-soldiers.

² Francis Forde (1721-69) made himself a great reputation in India, where he was Robert Clive's right hand man. He displayed military genius of a high order. See the account in the D.N.B. and the memoir by Lionel Forde (1910).

³ 2/2/267.

⁴ 2/2/268.
Forde's negligence delayed Calcraft's settlement of accounts with the Irish agent, and this made the Irish treasury loath to issue money for recruiting. They gave £1,500 for the purpose, but refused Colonel Adlercron's request for more, whereupon recruiting came to a halt for want of money. The officers themselves were hard hit by the general confusion. In 1757 Bagshawe stated that three years' arrears were due to him, and the other officers were in a like condition, but two years later there was still no likelihood of their being paid. The officers themselves were hard hit by the general confusion. In 1757 Bagshawe stated that three years' arrears were due to him, and the other officers were in a like condition, but two years later there was still no likelihood of their being paid.

Practical difficulties of a similar nature faced every agent. These instances of financial confusion indicate that the system of military organization and administration was ill-adapted to circumvent difficulties caused by extra-ordinary service, although they were defeating the ends that system was intended to serve. On the other hand, Bagshawe's arrears show that the officers too had their share of the general woe. They were continually bowed down by the weight of their financial responsibilities. Company commanders were the worst hit. Everywhere they turned they had to deal with financial accounts that were part public, part private, or, they might be termed, public accounts with acute personal concern, since they were the losers should there be any deficiencies of men or material. There were company accounts for pay, clothing, recruiting and the repair of arms and accoutrements to be seen to, as well as the usual administrative returns and routine duties. The letters of regimental officers are often full of financial preoccupations of this dual nature. David Hepburne said he was "wearyed out of his life" by Captain Desbrisay over accounts, and he must have been echoing a general cry. Officers, particularly junior ones with little besides their pay, lived on a razor's edge. Lieutenant Robert Lindsay was arrested and cast into the Fleet prison for debt, although it should be said that he was reputed to be a bad-hat whose departure would be no loss to the regiment. But others

1 2/2/40 and 42.
2 2/2/427 and 471.
3 Major Sewell's in particular. A great part of the subject matter of all the correspondence from regimental officers in 2/2 is concerned with financial matters, whose burden is evident from these letters.
4 2/2/272.
5 2/2/339-342; but he was due three years' arrears of pay (2/2/410).
were as much victims of circumstance as criminals by intent. Lieutenants James Mountford and John Lyons had got into trouble over debt and were to be arrested on their return from a duty cruise with the fleet. The former arrived back first, whereupon a brother subaltern wrote, "Mountford is at last arriv'd and great consultations there are how to demolish him if the money be not soon paid." Most of the junior officers were in and out of debt at one time or another, an unpleasant situation not relieved by pay being so much in arrears. Mountford, by drawing more money than he should, was tried for a breach of his recruiting instructions and was "in a good deal of tribulation." He wrote a pathetic letter to Bagshawe detailing the unjust and severe treatment he had received from Major Sewell, then commanding at regimental headquarters. However guilty these young officers were, their difficult financial circumstances are a partial extenuation of their conduct.

The army of the early Hanoverians was officered in large measure by the upper classes, that is, by the aristocracy and the country gentry, English, Scottish, Welsh and Anglo-Irish, and their sons; but there was also a great number of officers of more obscure origin. The Bagshawe military papers shed light upon the background of this humbler group whose names will not be found in *Burke* or *Debrett*. It was from this group, however, that the majority of officers in the marching regiments of foot were recruited. The 39th Regiment was no exception to the general rule. A hint of the connections and origins of Bagshawe's brother officers is to be found here and there among the correspondence. When Captain Rowland Lewis died in India in 1754 at the age of forty-one after twenty-three years service in the regiment, Bagshawe wrote a letter of condolence to his brother who was an apothecary on Tower Hill. Charles Duclousy, an ensign of 1751, was the son of Martin Duclousy, a

1 2/2/147. 2 2/2/231. 3 2/2/472.

4 The Invalid regiments seem to have been officered by a very mixed bag. Lieutenant Robert Supple went to the 41st Invalids from the 39th and has this to say of his companions. "Such a core of officers as we got in this Regiment I believe the world can't show for Brutishness and ill temper. I should be very glad to be out of it" (2/1/153). However, he served with them until his death in 1774. 5 2/5/145.
Huguenot refugee who was chief clerk to his fellow exile Captain Desbrisay, the army agent, and Edward Forde who went out with the 39th to India as a volunteer, and then paid £200 for the post of quartermaster when that officer died, was the nephew of Major Francis Forde, himself one of the younger sons of the numerous family of an Anglo-Irish country gentleman. The latter gave Bagshawe some account of his nephew’s history:

My nephew who is here with me understands Merchants Accts in all branches, he Serv’d five years in a Compting house at Liverpool, to a merchant of Great business, but unfortunately married before he was out of his time, for which his Father has banished him to this Country.²

The tradition of military service was strong in some lesser families. An appreciably large number of officers were the sons of regimental officers whose social insignificance and lack of influential friends, unrelieved by genius on their own part, had condemned them to remain in the junior ranks throughout their military career. Ensign John Chilcott, “a very genteel young Man”, gazetted to the 39th in 1758, who had the misfortune to be thrown from his horse and killed barely a year later, was “son to Captain Chilcot, a very worthy person sometime ago belonging to the English Fuzeliers”.³ He was so described by John Adlercron, the 39th’s colonel, who had served alongside his father in the “English Fuzeliers”, that is, the 7th Regiment. The father had been promoted to a commission from quartermaster of the 7th in 1727. Another officer with the same background was William Kellett, surgeon of the 39th Regiment 1752-63, who gained an ensigncy in 1757 and retired thirty years later, after commanding the regiment in its next warlike employment, during the great siege of Gibraltar 1778-83. In 1753 he had made an unsuccessful attempt to secure an ensign’s commission. Major Sewell gave Bagshawe something of his history at that time:

Mr. Kellett desires his best Respects, he is willing to pay such Price for the Colours to Lt. Jas Donnellan, as Col Bagshaw shall be pleased to Direct, as he has given a great price for the Surgency. & served as Ensign in Flanders & during the Rebellion in Scotland, his Father a very old Captain and killed at Falkirk: beg you Would be so good to recommend him to Col Adlercron, as soon as you conveniently can.⁴

His father was Captain Richard Kellett of the 27th Regiment, an ensign of 1710, who was killed in action against the Scots at Falkirk after thirty-six years service. The family tradition of military service was carried on by the younger Kellett’s son, another William, in his turn. On the other hand, some of Bagshawe’s brother officers were of an equal or a higher social standing then himself. Among them was Verney Lovett, major of the 39th during the first part of its Indian tour, who was a nephew of Lord Verney and son of Colonel John Lovett, the builder of the early Eddystone lighthouse, and another was James Cotes, lieutenant-colonel of the regiment 1745-9, who was a nephew of Lord Digby and the elder son of a family which had held Woodcote in Shropshire since the Norman Conquest. Lord Sempill, a Scottish nobleman, served in the regiment for some time. But generally speaking, the officers of the 39th were not distinguished for their connections with society. Their social standing is exemplified by the consternation caused among Lord Molesworth’s family when their niece, a Miss Bolton of Brazee near Dublin, ran away with Lieutenant Archibald Grant of the regiment.¹

The size of the Bagshawe collection enables an intimate impression to be gained of some of the officers of Samuel Bagshawe’s acquaintance. The 39th contained some colourful characters. Regimental “bad-hats” are always interesting in retrospect. The 39th Regiment could lay claim to a real scoundrel, Henry Keene by name, and since it could not get rid of him, its colonel determined that he should never be promoted beyond his rank of captain. When in 1747 Bagshawe catalogued his villainies at the request of Brigadier Richbell, the 39th’s colonel, Keene had been a captain for sixteen years and had served altogether thirty-one years in the regiment. Bagshawe did his task well and seemed glad to do it:

That all who know him believe him to be as bad a Man as ever carried a Commission would be easily proved, but it may be difficult to prove the Detail of his Pranks, the Witnesses so many of them are one way or another out of the Regim; however there is nobody that is acquainted with him that doubts he robbed the Dying Officers in Jamaica,² beside a Variety of other Rogueries in y³

¹ 2/2/231. ² The 39th served in Jamaica in 1731-2.
place, not to mention his giving Sir John Cope a bill of two hundred pounds to forward his getting his Comp'y: on a person in Ireland when there was no such person in being. The 4 Days Act in favour of persons hastily enlisting is supposed to owe its Birth to him from his torturing of Men to make them 'list', and afterwards he tried to rob them, this last and Selling them pewter Buckles for silver were the means of bringing him to a Court Martial in Ireland from which, I believe, you know how he escaped. He lies under a strong belief of hiding himself in France in the first Engagement and I believe it would be proved, he also brought liquors etc to his Comp'y on board. His behaviour at Arklow both to his Comp'y & a particular person in ye Country is not unknown to you as also other tho' not all his Misbehaviour since you got the Reg't: beside he is not at all qualified in point of Discipline for the Employment, and you know at Sir Philip Honeywood's Review he refused to exercise the Reg't and said he was unfit for it on acc't: yt he had been run through the Body.

In his private affairs Keene was equally unscrupulous and just as inept. In 1748 he was paying court to a wealthy lady. Wrote a brother officer:

She has a good deal of Money & had he conducted his Aff' well, might undoubtedly have Succeeded, but in this as in all his other aff's he was a mere marplot, by acting contrary to her directions he discovered the whole aff' & she now won't see him, & he has quarrelled with all the confidents amongst whom was a Lawyer to whom he was to give a £1000 too [sic] in case it was attended with success, & now he threatens to Sue her for a breach of contract, so much for that.

Fortunately there does not appear to have been many of this calibre in the 39th Regiment, although Bagshawe's 93rd had its share of difficult officers. The majority were hard-working, reasonably conscientious men, whose number was enlivened by the presence of some high spirits among the younger of them. Captain David Hepburne, a Scot whom everyone knew as "Davy", was described by Lieutenant Grant at Portsmouth in 1747 as "by much the greatest beau in this garrison", whilst the latter,

1 Colonel of the 39th Regiment 1730-32, and the "Johnnie" Cope of the song, who was defeated by the Highlanders at Prestonpans in 1745.
2 The L'Orient expedition of 1746.
3 2/2/502. This last was quite untrue.
4 2/2/146.
5 Lieutenant John Meredyth was an outstanding case. See in particular 2,1/48 and 252. The commanding officer had his usual troubles, which were not lightened by some officers. Robert Preston wrote in his forthright way on one occasion, "And to add to the rest of my Distresses Schuyler plagues me night and Day to go to Bab: Gray and Davis go [to] Miss Dickson, I wish the Devill had them altogether, I cannot find out what Connection the Service and Mistresses have together." (2/1/307).
6 2,2/190.
another Scot, was described by an earnest superior as "a very giddy young man." This was a reputation justly earned, since he was the officer previously mentioned who ran off with Lord Molesworth’s niece and incurred the family’s grave displeasure in so doing. He was then a penniless subaltern of modest origins, but his Indian service converted him into a nabob. He returned home "a fifteen thousand pounder", as Captain Walsh described him, rather enviously, in a letter to Bagshawe. An Indian prince who had been assisted by Grant’s detachment had contributed eleven thousand pounds to his fortune.

Major Sewell’s name has been mentioned on several occasions. He presents an interesting example of the humourless officer. Major of the 39th Regiment 1747-54, he was a man whose undoubted abilities as a regimental officer were largely vitiated by the defects of his manner and character. When he joined the 39th as its major he had been thirty-eight years an officer, although his first commission seems to have been granted at the tender age of nine. His experience had been varied, since at one time or another he had served in dragoons, foot, and marines. Although not a bad man, Sewell seems to have been an incredibly petty one, and he was amazingly persistent in the pursuit of trifles. Throughout his service in the 39th he set his brother officers continually by the ears until they became thoroughly disgusted with him.

He was a great letter-writer on every conceivable excuse and his activities in this direction became a regimental joke. Archibald Grant, sometime his adjutant, has left a picture of his daily round with Sewell. To Bagshawe he wrote:

Believe me, Dear Major, I am keep’d so constantly employ’d sometimes about business, but much oftener about nothing by our Commander that I cannot promise myself an hour in the day. Whenever he has a letter to write which you know happens pretty frequently, I must sit by till tis done, then read, give my opinion, and afterwards Copy into a great book. And I have two or three letters from him every morning, generally before nine o’clock.

Sewell evidently took his duties seriously. On the subject of command and authority he was exceedingly touchy.

1 2/2/534.  2 2/2/757.
4 2/2/213. Sewell substantiated his reputation very handsomely. His letters, over two hundred in number, form the largest group of individual correspondence.
On one occasion he became embroiled in a first-class row with the naval authorities over David Hepburne’s service on board the fleet. “We have glorious doings here”, wrote Grant from Plymouth, “Our Commander not only works those under his Command, but the Admiralty, Admiral & Fleet, the Extent of whose Authority he will soon let them know.”¹ On another, some lieutenant-colonels in an Irish garrison disputed his right to be garrison commander. The issue was referred to the commander-in-chief who decided in Sewell’s favour, “immediately on which he removed from his Lodgings & went into the Barracks & Assumed the Command there, where I assure you he does Command”². He was described in many ways by his brother officers, none of them complimentary. Lieutenant William Dawkin, a senior subaltern whom Sewell habitually worked into a nervous fury, called him “one of the most trifling Fellows I have ever saw or ever met w’th”³. Captain Levett, the 39th agent, styled him “your wrong-headed Major”;⁴ whilst Bagshawe himself, generally a forbearing man, said ruefully, “It is a terrible thing to deal with some sort of people”.⁵

Yet Sewell, slow-witted, ponderous, contentious, and ridden with faults, was fundamentally good-natured. Moreover, he took a genuine interest in his profession and in the men he commanded. His several hundred surviving letters to Samuel Bagshawe (1748-53) demonstrate how he encouraged deserving soldiers and generally interested himself in his men’s welfare. He did not advocate flogging as a punishment although he condoned its use as a deterrent, “in terrorem” as he put it.⁶ It was a great pity that his inherent good qualities should have been hindered and even diverted from their proper exercise by his unfortunate temperament.

These papers help to dispel the view, long held, that eighteenth-century officers were merely amateurs who took their tasks very lightly, and whose infrequent performance of them left much to be desired. The majority of the officers whose correspondence is preserved among the Bagshawe muniments seem to have performed their duties honestly, fairly conscientiously and to the

¹ 2/2/245. ² 2/2/211. ³ 2/2/145.
⁴ 2/2/363. ⁵ 2/2/396. ⁶ 2/2/549.
best of their ability. Perhaps the fact that at this period it was still possible for an officer to live on his pay, and that a large number proceeded to do so, helped the association of rank and privilege with duty and responsibility, a unity which fell away in the latter part of the century. A heartening picture of military life in the middle of the century is provided by the trio of field officers at the head of Bagshawe's 93rd Regiment: Bagshawe himself, his lieutenant-colonel Edward Windus, and the major, Robert Preston. The latter were not men of Bagshawe's choice, for he had no say in their appointment, and their merit is correspondingly the more reassuring. The three were officers with whom fate, in the guise of orders from government, was to deal hardly. With great spirit they raised and disciplined their regiment in the short space of six months and then awaited a summons to the field, either to Germany or on an expedition, but such was not their fortune. The regiment remained in Ireland throughout its brief existence and was obliged, time after time, to produce large drafts of men for the regiments on foreign service. On several occasions the fruits of months of hard work were snatched away in the course of an afternoon by the inspecting officer. Windus, describing one such visitation to his colonel, subscribed himself, "Your Affectionate Bro' in Affliction".1

Bagshawe was a good officer and a zealous one. As he said, his inclination went with his profession, even to the extent of raising a regiment at his own expense. In 1757 he was forced to return from India because he had lost the sight of one eye through disease and was in grave danger of losing the other. Content at first to recuperate at Ford Hall, to which he had succeeded while abroad, it was not long before he, a lieutenant-colonel of forty-four, maimed and half-blind, and his own regiment overseas, began to plague the authorities for employment. By the end of a year his eloquence was the result of steady practice. To Lord Barrington, the secretary at war, he wrote:

It will befall me as to a Boy kept from School by the Poverty of his Parents, when he returns he sees the Lower Classes in the Higher Forms and has the further Mortification to find that they are really better Schollars. I am making a great

1 2/1/320. It should be remarked that Preston had no part in the raising of the 93rd. 2 3/548.
Progress in Ignorance: there are many Officers abroad who have learned something from me who now may, or very soon will be able to instruct me. I lament more the Loss of Knowledge than the Loss of Preferment. In a little time I shall be ashamed to serve.¹

Windus was an older officer than Bagshawe. He had been in the army since 1729, and had spent his life in the 2nd Queens, whose major he had been when he left to join the 93rd. His enthusiasm for the service is evident in the many long, detailed letters which he sent to Bagshawe.² They give an exhaustive account of the condition of the 93rd for the greater part of its brief existence and seem to indicate a man who was loyal, painstaking and thorough, who, despite repeated set-backs, managed to retain his enthusiasm and his sense of humour at a time when both were badly needed.

Robert Preston, the major, wrote to Bagshawe when Windus was absent, and his letters supplement the latter's as a detailed record of the regiment.³ His letters give a better insight into his nature than do those of Colonel Windus, who seems to have been more cautious and reserved than his Scottish subordinate, at any rate on paper. He was not the original major. He had come "with Reluctancy" into the 93rd in September 1760, for he had spent twenty-four years in the 26th Regiment and had been confident that he would have someday been its major, whereas the 93rd, being a new regiment, was certain to be disbanded at the peace, an event he greatly feared, for as he said, "I should neither like half pay nor being out of the Army in which I have spent all my life". He regarded the 26th as "a Regiment that I may say without any great Vanity I have had a Considerable hand in the Breeding up", and when he came to Bagshawe's and worked hard in it, only to see it "turned out into the Barrack Yard, and all the Best men picked out of it, I many times wished to God that I had never seen nor heard of it".⁴ After one of these periodic draftings he wrote to Bagshawe:

All my Schemes and all my Pains about your Regiment is gone to the Devil. But God be Thanked I can begin again, after a few oaths that I gave last night I find myself quite easy. When I was an Adjutant I had twice the Modling of the 26th Regt, and why not now as Major have twice the Moddling [sic] of the 93rd.

¹ 2/2/52. ² In 2/1. ³ In 2/1. ⁴ 2/1/268.
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I am both Ready and Willing. It is my superiors Business to Command. It is mine to Obey. Windus comes now in for his Share of the Trouble. He went Great game with me upon his arrival telling me that like an Old Soldier he came in when all the Trouble was over, I am sorry that now he has the Joke against him.¹

Perhaps the finest tribute to the field officers of the 93rd was an indirect one made by Major Preston at the end of the letter quoted above, in which he had reviewed his bitter feelings on being posted to the regiment and his initial unhappy experiences in it. Robert Preston was not much good at hiding his feelings either in speech or in writing and this estimate of his brother officers was an honest one. It says much for the satisfactory condition of the 93rd.

But now Sir, those Impressions are Wore off. And as I have the Good will and Friendship of you and Collonel Windus I think myself very happy. Much more so than going into a Regiment where it may happen at least for Sometime that I should have the Illwill and Dislike of my Collonel, Lieu⁴ Collonel and all the Officers.²

In short, he balanced his present satisfaction against his precarious prospects, which was praise indeed, and is a fitting end to this short account of their association.

The outstanding merit of this collection is its capacity to convey the feel of soldiering in this period and to show what a military life, with its difficulties, trials and disappointments, entailed for all concerned. Largely because of its size, it provides a great deal of information on a wide range of subjects which is not, at present, available elsewhere on anything approaching the same scale, although it is possible that similar collections do exist, unknown, in private hands. This article has attempted to outline the scope and to give an impression of the detail of the correspondence of these eighteenth century officers who were the friends and companions of Samuel Bagshawe.

¹ 2/1/319.
² 2/1/258. He was referring to a possible transfer to a regiment that would not be disbanded at the peace.