



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Courage, Honour, and Phlegm: A Study of Eighteenth-Century Military Writers' Descriptions of Soldiers' Combat Emotions and Motivation*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/199101/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Dodson, S (2023) *Courage, Honour, and Phlegm: A Study of Eighteenth-Century Military Writers' Descriptions of Soldiers' Combat Emotions and Motivation*. *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 46 (2). pp. 279-295. ISSN 1754-0194

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12879>

---

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Dodson, S (2023) *Courage, Honour, and Phlegm: A Study of Eighteenth-Century Military Writers' Descriptions of Soldiers' Combat Emotions and Motivation*. *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 46 (2). pp. 279-295. ISSN 1754-0194, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12879>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions. This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

The motivation of soldiers, especially their emotions in battle, has recently become a topic of increased study by historians interested in eighteenth century warfare.<sup>1</sup> This article seeks to add to this discussion by providing a discussion of what eighteenth century military writers believed were the normative ideals for a soldier's motivation as well as the emotions they would feel in battle, thereby adding to the history of emotions when studying the history of the military. This article will address what writers believed encapsulated the terms courage, bravery and honour, why and how a soldier should avoid the loss of honour, coping strategies for encountering the fear of death on the battlefield, and finally a medical and national character overview relating how authors thought these aspects influenced soldiers emotions on the battlefield.

Recent studies upon the topics of soldier's motivation, particularly that of Ilya Berkovich, have provided an excellent reassessment of the motivations of eighteenth century soldiers, highlighting a far more positive outlook than the previous military histories which have followed a far more restrictive Foucauldian approach, believing soldiers were highly drilled automatons, with the threat of punishment keeping them in the ranks.<sup>2</sup> Berkovich has highlighted the culture of honour and the networks of loyalty and acceptance which motivated soldiers to fight, which have clearly refuted the past negative approaches to eighteenth century armies. This article will deviate from Berkovich's study only in the type of source material utilised, addressing the vast amount of military treatises published during the course of the eighteenth century rather than the potentially more valuable letters and ego documents that form the basis of Berkovich and Möbius' works.<sup>3</sup> The reason I have chosen to address these documents was born from a sentence utilised by Berkovich in that the opinions of authors on motivations of soldiers in the eighteenth century were only 'passing remarks.'<sup>4</sup> While this author agrees that no military writer of the period went into great detail on the motivation and emotions of soldiers in battle, especially those of enlisted men, the great quantity of these 'passing remarks' indicated that authors grappled with these factors more than previously thought, and when added together indicated a significant web which supports many of the themes written in these valuable revisionist historiographies. While it is certainly true that the focus on letters and ego documents provide a more accurate depiction of the individual soldiers motivations and emotions in

battle, the study of this literature allows for an analysis of the ruminative opinions of military writers on these topics, identifying what they believed were the normative ideals for soldier's motivations in these armies of the eighteenth century. These sources would then have influenced the young officers who would have read them, providing ideals of the emotional regime for them to learn. However, this focus on the normative character in turn indicates the sources limitations, as they were presented as the 'ideal' for soldiers in the eighteenth century, but rarely reflected the actuality or individuality of soldier's emotions, and so the degree to which any lessons can be derived from them can be debated. Yet, to use these limitations as a reason to not study the literature would remove one piece of analysis from the whole picture.

The literature chosen were military treatises published in English during the course of the eighteenth century, but most particularly those of the mid-eighteenth century, surrounding the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War, which tied into my own research on politics and warfare during the Seven Years War. These treatises mainly dealt with the art of war during the eighteenth century, and as such mostly focused on tactics, military discipline, organisation, drill, marches and camps, which have been covered excellently by authors such as Storrington, Pichichero, Duffy, Starkey, Houlding and Speelman.<sup>5</sup> Eleven texts were British military treatises, while a further seven books were by French authors, but later translated into English and published in Britain. This article seeks not to distil a commentary on British or French military culture by this selection, but simply to assess what European authors wrote about on motivational and emotional topics, thereby helping to add to the recent positive reassessment of eighteenth century armies. The treatises by French authors provided the largest element of comments on these psychological topics, possibly indicating a greater analysis in French military circles than those of the British. This is certainly a focus of Christy Pichichero's own research into the vast array of unpublished or obscure French military treatises surrounding the French enlightenment army, addressing the military psychology and social egalitarianism discussed in those less well known works.<sup>6</sup> Where my work deviates from hers, and similar works by Bien and Bell, is that it is less focused upon a national analysis of French military culture, the literature's role as a process of reform in organisation and efficacy, and the search

for more egalitarian and humanitarian principles, aiming rather to look in European literature for the definitions of phrases such as courage and honour, and the descriptions surrounding these words that motivated soldiers to fight during the eighteenth century.<sup>7</sup> A large part of these military treatises were written by authors who had either been or still were officers or generals in their respective armies, and so likely had first-hand knowledge of the psychological conditions of their troops. Most of these works were published by well-known military publishers, such as the Millan's, with several books, such as Humphrey Bland's *A Military Treatise* (1727) and Maurice de Saxe's *Reveries, or Memoirs Upon the Art of War* (1757), running into multiple editions. However, the larger portion of works were more obscure, being only printed in their respective years, such as Robert Heath's *Gentleman and Ladies Military Palladium* (1759). While most dealt with military topics either under the names of 'art of war' or 'military treatise', others spanned topics such as religious devotion, histories of military figures/countries and dictionaries.

## COURAGE, BRAVERY AND HONOUR

Courage, bravery and honour, all terms that were desired features in a soldier during the period. We have seen through recent scholarly research how these factors were important to the men and women in the armies of the eighteenth century, and how they shaped their communities. Yet, how did military writers define these qualities? A quick perusal of the dictionaries of the period indicate that these definitions were interchangeable, with no clear and concise definition. For example, Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755), one of the most comprehensive and wide reaching dictionaries of the period, utilises courage as a definition of bravery, and bravery for courage.<sup>8</sup> This was similar for the other major dictionaries of the period, who largely copied from each other, highlighting that these definitions, though ambiguous, were the accepted usage.<sup>9</sup> A clearer interpretation was provided by the French military writer Turpin de Crissé, whose insights on the art of war were translated into English during the Seven Years War.<sup>10</sup> His definition, while alluding to previous writer's ambiguity, split these terms upon social-hierarchical lines:

These two virtues, which are often confounded in the same subject, merit a particular distinction... Courage seems fittest for a general, and all those who command; bravery more necessary for a soldier, and all who receive orders; bravery is in the blood, courage in the soul; the first is a kind of instinct, the second a virtue; the one is an impulse almost mechanical, the other a noble and sublime conception.<sup>11</sup>

Crissé continued by writing that the bravery exhibited by the men was only brought on by the ‘force of example’ displayed by the officers, whereas the officers were imbued with courage at all times, as this was a natural part of their own psyche.<sup>12</sup> This splitting of courage and bravery upon social-hierarchical lines shows that Crissé believed there was a separation of values between officers and men, beliefs that would not be uncommon in 1781 when the French army demanded officers to have a pedigree of noble ancestry extending to four generations.’<sup>13</sup> While this was a significant argument of John Lynn’s recent article, in which he wrote that officers believed soldiers lacked the codes of honour, Pichichero’s arguments in *Le Soldat Sensible*, highlight that French military writers did not always agree with Crissé’s writing, with some French enlightenment writers advocating for a ‘Republican’ army that was built upon inclusive principles, and highlighting that both men and officers had similar value systems, while also stating that Godard d’Aucour in his *L’Académie Militaire, ou les Herós Subalternes*, 1745, asserted that the courage of the individual soldier was greater than the officer, as he fought completely selflessly, whereas the officer fought for ‘personal gain.’<sup>14</sup>

Honour was another important aspect of the world of the soldier in the eighteenth century, and has been identified as governing both the world of the officer and the enlisted man.<sup>15</sup> A quick cursory glance at the British dictionaries suggests that honour entailed respect, reputation, esteem, dignity, glory or a subject of praise.<sup>16</sup> Jean-Baptiste Joseph de Sahuguet d’Amarzit d’Espagnac, brigadier in the French army during the War of the Austrian Succession considered the military profession an honourable trade. His comments attesting this were published in Samuel Bevers’ compendium of military maxims, *The Cadet* (1756): ‘Glory being attach’d to every Circumstance that is excellent and attended with Difficulty, is the Reason why the Profession of Arms is called the

*Profession of Honour*.<sup>17</sup> This emphasises the undertaking of difficult and dangerous tasks, such as in battle, which made the profession of the soldier an honourable one. The notion of glory, (with d'Espagnac stating glory as the 'Eclat of Honour') or gaining a reputation as underpinning the world of an honourable man, closely mirrors Storrington's recent research into the European enlightened culture of the *Grand Homme*, or great man; with young officers advised to read about the exploits of past great generals and military glory being seen as 'prime criterion for greatness.'<sup>18</sup> While British military writers generally agreed with this opinion, there was also a slight deviation in their writing, with a culture of forbearance included in their notions of honour. John Gittins, a captain of the Blue militia regiment in London, one of the City Militias, stated in his work *A Compleat System of Military Discipline* (1735) that:

For the two chief Parts of a Soldier are Valour, and Sufferance; and there is as great Honour gained by suffering Wants patiently, as by fighting valiantly; and as great Achievements effected by the one, as by the other.<sup>19</sup>

The seeking of glory was one of the complaints Humphrey Bland wrote about with reference to young British officers, in his book *A Military Treatise* (1727), which was widely read throughout the eighteenth century by British officers.<sup>20</sup> Bland had accumulated extensive military experience as an officer during the war of the Spanish Succession, and his work attempted to distil the lessons from that. He complained of young officer's rashness in attempting to gain fame and glory on the battlefield by exceeding their orders, as they were 'hurried on, by the Heat and Impetuosity of their Temper, to do something that is Great and Noble.'<sup>21</sup> This shows Bland was attempting to dissuade young officers from emulating past examples of glorious actions, rather focusing on accomplishing their duty and following their orders from the 'cool Reason of Men of Experience', most likely in his attempt to emphasise the importance of order and discipline that was a part of his military treatise.<sup>22</sup>

While writers indicated that honour was tied to the notions of glory, respect and actions of a difficult nature, they also emphasised that there was a chivalrous nature to the honour held by soldiers. An honourable soldier was one who protected the innocent and never sought harm from an

enemy who could not cause harm, such as the injured or prisoners. D’Espagnac wrote a succinct passage that clearly separated the honourable world of the soldier from one of mindless violence:

The Duty of a Soldier is honourable and honest where properly performed; Honour, which should be their guide; abhors the Criminal and Mean; the Army despises those brave Indiscreets, who make their Valour consist in doing Actions of Violence and Brutality. None are distinguished, none honoured, none recompenced but the Man of Worth, who regulates his Duty by *Religion, Humanity, and Justice*.<sup>23</sup>

Meanwhile, his emphasis that a soldier’s aggression should be tempered by ‘religion, humanity and justice’ identified a humanitarian code that intellectuals believed soldiers should live by, something which Storrington and Pichichero have touched on.<sup>24</sup> Overaggressive actions were something to be avoided, and shows d’Espagnac clearly believed these men should be shunned. This focus on a chivalric nature is similar to what René Le Bossu wrote on the *Aeneid* in his widely influential work *Traité du Poème Épique* (1675), whereby he espoused the virtues of Aeneas, who exhibited both martial and civic attributes, over his arch-enemy Turnus, who was instead the rash, aggressive warrior.<sup>25</sup> D’Espagnac’s connection of religion to the soldier was an important aspect of the soldier’s psyche in the eighteenth century, especially as the nature of the business was closely related to death and the afterlife; his statement that ‘every Distress we heap on our Enemy is an Aggravation of our Crimes’, reiterated the religious importance to a soldier’s humanitarian values, by identifying that extremes of violence and brutality would cause damage to your own soul, and potentially bar you from heaven, a factor that would weigh heavily on the minds of the soldiers. D’Espagnac added that the values of a Christian: ‘Fidelity, Moderation, Vigilance, Aptness in Learning, good Order, and Greatness of Soul’ were equally valuable to the soldier, thus insinuating that even though a soldier’s profession involved killing, their worlds should be governed by similar value systems.<sup>26</sup>

Another development in the distribution of literature could have also affected the officer’s value systems. The numerous translations of classical texts may have had an effect on the soldier’s values of courage and honour. Stoic texts such as Marcus Aurelius’ *Commentaries* and Seneca’s

*Morals by Way of Abstract* or Epictetus' *Enchiridion* could have influenced these concepts, as numerous editions would be published throughout the period and may have had a wide readership.<sup>27</sup> Meanwhile soldiers could have found example in the writings about heroes such as Achilles, Hector and Odysseus in Homer's *Iliad* and *The Odyssey*, especially Alexander Pope's translation, or gain examples from history through purely military texts such as Caesar's *Commentaries* or Tacitus' *Histories*.<sup>28</sup> Cairns has indicated that in Homer's *Iliad* there is a community of honour, and that this community held each other to a standard of bravery; not performing well or showing signs of cowardice were 'consistently described in terms which condemn them as unseemly and subject to popular disapproval.'<sup>29</sup> Through this, classical men were concerned for their self-appearance, not wishing to display attributes of cowardice. There is evidence that the lessons from these classical works made their way into the military world. For example, John and Paul Knapton, publishers in London, who had been the ones to disseminate Humphrey Bland's *A Military Treatise*, were also the publishers of Alexander Pope's translations of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, it was also the Knaptons who published one of the translations of Caesar's commentaries, undertaken by none other than a military officer, Colonel Martin Bladen, indicating soldier's interest in classical military works.<sup>31</sup> This would suggest that officers who bought Knapton's military books may also have bought classical works too. Alexander Pope, who translated the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in 1715 and 1725 respectively, believed that his writings should be read as a guide to manliness.<sup>32</sup> The wide circulation of Pope's translations would have filtered these masculine views into the military, as such shaping the world of military honour within eighteenth century armies. There is evidence that Homer's opinions were analysed by military writers, as his writings were discussed in their books. For example, in Crissé's *An Essay on the Art of War* (1761) he makes reference to the *Iliad*, idolizing these ancient Greek heroes by stating they were 'esteemed as Gods, because they, by their genius and valour, supplying the want of art, were regarded as being superior to humanity, as mortals born for its destruction.'<sup>33</sup> This glorification of ancient Greek heroes would have provided an example to young men and officers who would have read Crissé and Homer. Readers of this journal will be aware of Jonathan Taylor's recent study on the comparison of eighteenth-century military men to heroes such as Achilles and Aeneas. Taylor has identified numerous passages in literature, especially those of



poems on war, espousing the warlike attributes of Greek heroes and how they manifested in eighteenth-century soldiers, thus indicating how classical martial virtues were venerated in the period.<sup>34</sup>

While authors could not agree upon the definitions of the substance of honour, and the other requisite terms of courage and bravery, they all unanimously agreed that the loss of this so called honour was to be avoided at all costs: ‘a Soldier, who once gets the least Blemish in his Reputation, forfeits all his Honour.’<sup>35</sup> The surest route for a soldier to blemish his reputation and thereby lose his honour, was in the neglect of his duty. The Chevalier de la Valiere in his *The Art of War*, translated into English in 1707, wrote that once a man becomes a soldier, ‘as soon as he has a Sword by his Side, every Body will laugh at him if he does not his Duty’; once the soldier entered the world of the military man, he must overcome the fear’s connected with this profession, especially that of death, in order to complete his duty.<sup>36</sup> Despite their earlier deviations on the concepts of honour, Gittins and Bland both agreed upon the avoidance of the loss of honour by ensuring the undertaking of one’s duty. Gittins wrote that ‘A Soldier must always esteem Honour, and the Publick Good, above his own Safety; and ought to fear nothing but God, and Dishonour,’ emphasising the protection of honour over personal safety.<sup>37</sup> If his reputation was tarnished in the eyes of his fellow soldiers, as he had not overcome his fears, it was considered a fate worse than death. Bland wrote of the accountability that a soldier’s fellow comrades would hold him to, and the scorn he would receive if he did not live up to it, when he wrote about the nature of a siege, and the resulting circumstances that would ensue if the commander did not sufficiently display enough bravery in the place’s defence:

Should he surrender before he is reduced to a Necessity of yielding, they [the enemy] will look upon him as a Man void of Courage and Conduct, and despise him as one whose Fear had betray’d him into an unworthy Action; and if an Officer is despis’d by the Enemy for his ill Conduct, as he certainly will, he surely deserves the highest Punishment from his Friends for it.<sup>38</sup>

Not fulfilling one’s duty, or displaying weakness or cowardice in front of the enemy, not only brought derision from the enemy, but also from one’s fellow officers who would believe he had not

displayed the necessary bravery that was needed in a soldier. This was a necessary component of the soldier's world in the eighteenth century which has been highlighted by Berkovich's findings.<sup>39</sup> It is important to state that fear in itself was not something to be ashamed of, rather the inability to overcome that fear in order to perform your duty that elicited the connotation of shame; with this in mind, Valiere added that an officer who had first compromised his honour through a lack of bravery, may regain his standing in the army if he subsequently overcame his fear and continued to do his duty though he lacked an inherent brave nature: 'I find when they have once committed the first Fault, they may be honour'd, and reckoned as Brave as any.'<sup>40</sup> This is to be found in the research undertaken by Berkovich and Möbius, with numerous letters and events highlighting how soldiers were welcomed back into the social groups of the soldiers once they had re-established their honour by overcoming their fears.<sup>41</sup>

Since undertaking a military profession could run the risk of leaving a blemish on their reputation, gentlemen were advised to consult their natural inclinations to warfare before becoming a soldier. Crissé stated that 'a man who proposes war for his profession, should never engage it without having consulted his natural bent, or without knowing the particular turn and power of his mind.'<sup>42</sup> Therefore Crissé was suggesting a degree of personal reflection, identifying that the military profession was not for everyone. Crissé added that if a man became a soldier without a natural liking for the business, he would not become successful at his trade and would run this risk of failing in his duty, a statement Valiere concisely advised his readers in: 'it were better never to undertake a thing, than not to perform it as we ought.'<sup>43</sup> This theme was continued by Bland, who reiterated his previous comment on the derision a soldier would receive if he continued in his profession without the requisite bravery needed:

To blame a Man for want of Courage when Nature has not bestow'd it on him, is not only hard, but unjust; but a Man that continues in the Service when he knows himself defective in that Point, betrays both his King and Country, and therefore merits the severest punishment.<sup>44</sup>

Sarah Goldsmith wrote that upper class men of the period were 'driven by a militarized concept of honour' and that 'eighteenth-century elite men were expected to confront, overcome and

endure danger.<sup>45</sup> In so doing, they were supposed to put themselves into situations that would test their mettle in these scenarios. Clearly the last few passages have shown that military writers did not expect all men to be able to undergo the harsh psychological traumas of warfare, and that they cautioned their readers to carefully consider their personality, identifying whether they were willing to undergo danger in these scenarios; as if not there was sufficient honour in other professions, such as a churchman or lawyer, but once a man had decided to become a soldier, they would have to do their duty or suffer the significant loss of honour.<sup>46</sup>

Ultimately, writers emphasised that the honour of the soldier was connected to several factors: bravery and courage in the face of danger, the attainment of glory through difficult and heroic deeds, and most importantly overcoming the fear of death in order to accomplish one's duty. This bravery was tempered by justice and religion, as it was not just an uncontrollable rage, enlightened values that were important to the honourable world of the eighteenth century soldier. The anonymous *Political Instructions for the Use of Gentlemen* (1708) succinctly highlighted these points by relating all the necessary virtues for a gentleman:

Valour, which raises him above the fear of death, and furnishes him with a firm resolution, to surmount all the hazards his person is expos'd to, upon glorious enterprises; and lastly, justice, to give all men their due, and by that sacred tie, maintain a firm union in the society. A gentleman should keep in sight the example of a great man, who liv'd and dy'd without scandal, or the least blot upon his name: Vir quadratus, sine vituperio, a compleat man, in all respect.<sup>47</sup>

## CONTROLLING FEAR: PSYCHOLOGY ON THE BATTLEFIELD

The fear of death or significant injury was something that was on the minds of the soldiers, evinced by the many letters written by soldiers after battles during the period. Fear was engendered by the soldiers contemplating the coming battle and the danger of imminent death.<sup>48</sup> In fact Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Viscount Turenne, advised commanders to attack quickly on the battlefield, as 'a

slow motion allows too much time for reflection' and would allow fear to begin to control the soldier.<sup>49</sup>

However, military writers understood that sometimes fear was unavoidable, as certain situations engendered these feelings, and so the men could not be blamed for letting it control them. Within battle, armies or portions of their forces would sometimes be gripped by panic, which was an 'uncontrollable reaction' that would sweep through the men, overcoming their 'training, discipline, and courage', and subsequently causing the soldiers to flee.<sup>50</sup> This panic was an 'emotionally charged fear response' that evoked a 'fight, flight, or freeze pattern.'<sup>51</sup> Panic could rapidly spread through an army, and may have been helped by the nature of the composition of eighteenth-century armies. Armies would be formed up in lines, which would usually engage each other in an attritional struggle. If one line gave way, this would psychologically affect the second line, who would perceive their men fleeing the field, and would think to save themselves as well. Bland labelled this as 'an imaginary danger' as he perceived that the men did not use logic or reason in understanding the flight of their allies, but developed in their minds a belief that the enemy was unconquerable: 'they are apt to form to themselves vast Ideas of the Enemy, which, by working strongly on the Imagination, become so terrible, that, by the Time they approach near, they frequently betake themselves to a shameful Flight, or make but a weak Resistance.'<sup>52</sup> Bland's comment suggests he believed that the men were rather uneducated in military tactics which influenced their panicked actions. This ties to what Pichichero has discovered in her research, that in order to combat these fears, M. de Fauville advocated for the instruction of soldiers in basic tactics in order to instil confidence in the men during panic infused manoeuvres of the battlefield.<sup>53</sup> The nature of a panicked flight was something written about by Carl Daniel Küster, a Prussian army chaplain, who described the 'shudder of the fear of death in battle' affecting all the men at one point, some at the beginning, some in the middle and some at the end.<sup>54</sup> It was only when this fear swept over all the men at the same time that this turned into a 'panic scare', as 'a general flight will only develop when this emasculating fear gets hold of the majority of the army and the weak sweep the strong away.'<sup>55</sup>

The changeable nature of fear in the men, controlling their reasoning and emotions, was also a feature of Saxe's writings. In a passage of his *Reveries or Memoirs upon the Art of War* (1757), he disagreed with an opinion by the Chevalier Folard, whose writings on columnar warfare were an important part of French military doctrine up to the French revolutionary wars; while Folard believed men were always brave, especially within the supporting confines of the column, Saxe believed that bravery was 'a variable and uncertain quality of the mind' and that the general should enable the bravery in his men by not exposing them to scenarios which would cause them to panic.<sup>56</sup> Katrin and Sascha Möbius suggest that these beliefs on the nature of panic absolved the men from accusations of cowardice, as men who were known to be brave in previous situations were caught up in these panic scares, which indicated that panic was believed to be something more than just fear in the men. This belief was corroborated by Saxe when he described the flight of the French infantry at the Battle of Friedlingen, 1702. Since the French infantry had already demonstrated their bravery by vanquishing a significant portion of the enemy Imperialist troops earlier in the battle, their flight at the end of the battle had been due to a panic scare, rather than the soldier's inability to overcome their fear.<sup>57</sup> Saxe also wrote that fear was an aspect beyond human control, as it could be 'only ascribed to the weakness and imperfections incident to human nature', suggesting he believed men must overcome their own biology in order to be brave.<sup>58</sup> This analysis has been covered by Pichichero, who stated that the understudied influence of the 'human heart' had been the reason why Saxe had written his memoir.<sup>59</sup>

Previous scholarship has focused on the harsh discipline enacted on the men, which was the main factor in which officers maintained 'direct control' over the soldiers, ensuring they fought during a battle.<sup>60</sup> However, the recent revisionist histories have indicated this was not always the case in old regime armies, with the men exhibiting the will to fight similar to their French revolutionary counterparts. This was mirrored in the literature, where there were numerous factors discussed that allowed a soldier to minimise his fear. One of the most important of these factors was the religious faith of the soldier. In eighteenth-century European warfare, wars were rarely fought with religious principles in mind, a factor that had belonged to the wars of the previous centuries, especially those of the seventeenth century, yet religion was still seen as a major part of the motivation of men during

warfare in the eighteenth century. For example, Prussian soldiers were seen to hate enemy Catholic Austrian soldiers, with Sergeant G.S. Liebler describing the Austrians as ‘the enemies of the Gospel.’<sup>61</sup> European soldiers still believed in the Christian faith in its various denominations, and utilised these values as coping mechanisms for their fear on the battlefield.<sup>62</sup> One book, Charles Drelincourt’s *The Christian’s Defence against the fears of Death* (1651), was translated into English from the original French, and ran into twenty-two editions throughout the eighteenth century, showing the popularity of the book. Drelincourt talked of man’s fear of death and tried to assuage his readers from those fears. He labelled death as an end to the sufferings of life, stating ‘death is so far from being so dreadful and painful as we commonly imagine, that, on the contrary, it is that very thing that puts an end to all our pains and miseries.’<sup>63</sup> Drelincourt wrote that the injuries and diseases that we encounter in life are what generate great suffering in our bodies, while death relieved us ‘from all pains, aches, and distempers.’<sup>64</sup> Drelincourt’s use of religion to describe how death released our soul from earthly torment, and raised it up ‘to the highest glory and happiness’ in heaven was a belief that was held by the soldiers of the period. A perusal of the numerous letters in Katrin and Sascha Möbius’ analysis of the Prussian army, indicates this religious belief held by the soldiers. The Musketeer Johann Christian Riemann talked of his brother’s death, believing that he had escaped the horrors of war and entered heaven due to the fulfilment of his duty:

Let us comfort ourselves with our brother’s honour, he has left his glory in this world, that as a faithful soldier he shed his blood courageously and bravely and lost his life for his right, for his king’s honour, for his fatherland and its allies and for the good of us all. May our gracious God give him eternal bliss for this, he has escaped all hardships and has gone to a place, where all war and war cries have an end.<sup>65</sup>

Writers believed that a soldier’s survival on the battlefield was completely down to the providence of God, a factor Robert Heath was keen to highlight to his readers: ‘a good Soldier, on his Duty, is as ready to meet Death, as to encounter the Enemy, since nothing but Providence can protect him.’<sup>66</sup> This predestined belief in a soldier’s survival is a motif that is seen throughout soldiers letters, for example, Henry Pleynall Dawnay, 3rd Viscount Downe wrote of the Battle of Minden, 1759, that

‘It pleased God to remind me of his protection amidst the fury of the cannonade & fire of that day by suffering only a musket ball to take off a part of my sleeve & bruise my arm.’<sup>67</sup>

Another motivational factor was what John Lynn ascribed to as *esprit de corps*, such as the Prussian reliance on developing a bond between the men and their regiments.<sup>68</sup> Pichichero has written extensively on the development of *esprit de corps* within French military literature, including Saxe’s suggestions on numbered regiments, copper plates bearing the regimental number, tattoos on men identifying them with a regiment, and providing a unique regimental flag as a symbol for the men in the regiment to perform well under.<sup>69</sup> Saxe wrote on how a regiment with a name and a history, would fight all the harder as ‘the exploits of a corps which has any fixed title, are not so soon forgotten, as those of one which bears the name of its colonel only.’<sup>70</sup> This previous history of the regiment would spur the men on to perform well in battle, as none would wish to stain the name of the regiment, which suggested a hybrid collective honour that was connected to the specific unit of the regiment. If the regiment did gain a bad name this would thereby damage the honour of the men in the regiment, such as that of the Prussian Alt-Anhalt regiment at the siege of Dresden, 1760. Making sure the rest of the army knew of the dishonour of the regiment would encourage the men to perform better in their next engagement in order to restore the honour of the men, which the Alt-Anhalt regiment did at the battle of Liegnitz, 1760. Saxe added that French regiments which bore the name of a particular province performed better than those with the name of a Colonel, as: ‘it becomes much easier, to inspire a corps, which is distinguished by a title peculiar to itself, with a spirit of emulation, than another which is called after its colonel, who very probably may be disliked.’<sup>71</sup> Building upon what Pichichero talked about Saxe’s comments on regimental standards, a particular quote by Saxe emphasised the psychological benefits a standard would have on developing an *esprit de corps* in the troops:

The men must be taught to think it a matter of conscience, and an indispensable obligation, never to forsake them: they are to be looked upon as things sacred, and regarded with a respect inviolable... after troops are once brought to such a degree of attachment to them, they can hardly ever fail of success in any enterprise; resolution and courage will be the

natural consequences of it; and if, in desperate affairs, some determined fellow seizes but a standard, he will render the whole century as intrepid as himself, and be followed by it wheresoever he leads the way.<sup>72</sup>

While many current historians believed harsh discipline was the only method that kept soldiers in the ranks during a battle, military literature does not always support this belief. Rather, literature suggests that officers should provide a good example to their soldiers in order to foster an environment in which the men would be willing to follow them into danger. While Pichichero wrote how one French military memoir lamented how French officers had become negligent and indifferent to the health and lives of their soldiers, being ‘without application and emulation’, British military literature, specifically that of Bland, described how officers were advised to take on a ‘serene and cheerful air’ while in combat in order to dissipate the men’s fears and ‘fortify their courage’, something identified in the soldier’s letters assessed by Berkovich, and tied into Bland’s earlier comments on the culture of forbearance being an important part of a soldier’s honour.<sup>73</sup> Bland wrote that the soldiers were keenly aware of the abilities of their officers, and would not be willing to support one if he did not show the requisite abilities and courage that was to be expected from the honourable profession of the soldier. He added that soldiers were ‘strict observers’ of the officers capabilities, and described how an officer must first show his bravery in front of the men before he could gain their trust.<sup>74</sup> Once they had developed a favourable opinion of their officer’s capacity, the men would be more willing to fight and would elicit a spirit of superiority over the enemy within them that would ‘seldom or ever fail of success.’<sup>75</sup>

Setting an example was also an important attribute of classical military theory written down in *The Commentaries of Caesar* (1753), another book which was published widely in the run up to the Seven Years War.<sup>76</sup> Officers and Generals were advised to combat the fear of death that their soldiers would feel upon the impending battle by shoring up their men’s courage through exhortation. Caesar states that ancient commanders would harangue their men with numerous reasons to remember during the fighting, such as the love for your country, the remembrance of past victories over the enemy which would engender a feeling of superiority (similar to Bland’s writings above), and the ‘injustice



of a violent and cruel enemy' who would subsequently take advantage of the innocent people in the camp if the army was defeated.<sup>77</sup> Reminding the soldiers of why they were fighting, especially against an enemy who you believed 'barbarian', was a tool that could fortify the men's courage. This was seen even during the Seven Years War, such as Frederick the Great's famous Parchwitz address before the battle of Leuthen, 1757, and whenever the Prussian army fought against the Austrians or Russians, with soldier's letters indicating that the men sometimes fought all the harder against these enemies as they viewed them as having committed atrocities against them.<sup>78</sup>

## HUMOURS AND HEAT

Medical science of the eighteenth century also added to several of the concepts we see on the battlefield. One term utilised in the eighteenth century to describe the emotions of men in battle was that of 'heat'. Heat could have been utilised to describe the adrenaline rush brought on by the stress of the fear of death, which caused the soldier or army as a whole to eagerly come to blows with the enemy. Zedler's *Grosses Vollständiges Universal-Lexicon* (1732) applied a scientific description to this phenomenon: 'Burning is a mightily excited warmth in the human body, caused by too powerful a movement of the animal spirits or particles of sulphur in the human blood.'<sup>79</sup> This description of heat is similar to the definitions of ardour in English dictionaries of the time, where it was detailed as vehemence or fervency, but also given a scientific explanation as 'a very great heat raised in a human body.'<sup>80</sup> The Prussian army chaplain Carl Daniel Küster believed that victories were gained by the soldiers who could maintain their 'heat' in battle longer than the enemy, intimating that heat was a resource to be carefully managed. This heat would provide them with the psychological motivation to continue fighting while the enemy would run out of their heat, thereby giving in to their fear.

While valour was valued, British writers indicated that a cool stoic disposition caused by an increase of phlegm was a more desirable disposition in the soldiers, tying into both Gittin's and Bland's earlier comments about fortitude being an important part of honour. Phlegm was believed to be one of the four humours of the body, and would enable you to control your fear on the battlefield,

by ‘moderating your transports’, thereby controlling your emotions.<sup>81</sup> The greater preponderance of phlegm in a body enabled a soldier to control his fears, as his mind would not be as agitated as a man with less phlegm.<sup>82</sup> The anonymous work *The Antient and Present State of Military Law in Great Britain Consider’d* (1749) also suggests that ardour was something to be avoided as it caused the men to become undisciplined and uncontrollable, a factor that was ascribed to the Highlanders defeat at Culloden, 1746.<sup>83</sup> Meanwhile, the anonymous work, *The British Military Library* (1799) utilised the term ‘phlegmatic’ as a description of the types of valour. Phlegmatic valour was a constitution in the soldiers that allowed them to contemplate ‘danger without emotion’, and enabled them to advance upon the enemy ‘with that sort of masculine tranquillity and heroic pride which is called intrepidity.’<sup>84</sup> The other form of valour was the ‘impetuous courage which maddens and kindles at the sight of danger’, which seems similar to what has been written by John Lynn when he addressed ‘fear-induced panic’, whereby soldiers would often act extremely aggressively due to the fear of death, a sensation Randall Collins described as ‘forward panic.’<sup>85</sup> Interestingly, while phlegm was regularly associated with the cool intrepid form of valour, this aggressive form of valour was never attributed in literature to an increased level of choler or yellow bile in the body, one of the humours that would have inculcated an aggressive or short tempered mentality in the men.

The literature about this scientific aspect also had national and cultural undertones. Much has already been written on the notion of national character, with Christy Pichichero, David A. Bell, Adam Storrington, Alex Inkeles and Christopher Duffy all relating the historical stereotypes of national character.<sup>86</sup> Duffy and Bell especially talk of the eighteenth century opinion that the nature of the climate greatly affected the temperaments of the soldiers, with cold northern climates producing soldiers of a dull disposition, where they entered the dangers of battle ‘heedlessly’, whereas warmer climates produced impatient and ‘hot’ soldiers.<sup>87</sup>

This section hopes to build upon their work by providing specific examples from several military treatises, indicating that many military writers had common beliefs in the characteristics of each nation’s militaries, with usually a more positive, biased outlook upon the soldiers of their own nation. Bland wrote that it was a common notion in the eighteenth century that the Dutch were

inculcated with a preponderance of phlegm, enabling them to tolerate danger better on the battlefield than other nations, encapsulating this idea of phlegmatic valour previously talked about.<sup>88</sup> Phlegm was adjudged to have made soldiers more obedient to their commanders on the battlefield, as an increase in phlegm was believed to elicit a docile temperament.<sup>89</sup> This phlegmatic opinion was also placed by Henry Lloyd upon the soldiers of the German nations, barring Prussia, who Lloyd believed was composed of ‘strangers of different countries, manners, and religion’ who were only kept together by strict discipline, a belief which indicated that these opinions on national character were usually the biased opinions of the authors, with his statement being refuted by the recent arguments of Katrin and Sascha Möbius.<sup>90</sup> Despite the clear bias, many writers agreed that these northern European nations’ temperaments were a sharp contrast to French soldiers, with even Storrington’s recent article talking of French authors of the period writing about French natural impetuosity, while Duffy suggests people believed the French had a ‘Liveliness, a questioning turn of mind, and a persistent tendency towards indiscipline.’<sup>91</sup> Lloyd wrote that the French were ‘gay, light, and lively, governed rather by an immediate and transitory impulse, than by any principal of reason’, informing us that he believed they were impetuous in their early attacks, but if success was not yielded to them, they would quickly lose heart and turn to flight.<sup>92</sup> This negative belief was echoed by Francesco Guicciardini, in his *The History of Italy* (1754), in which he wrote that ‘it was the nature of the French to attack with fury, and spend their spirits at the first charge, but to remit of their ardor, and be dismayed at a vigorous repulse.’<sup>93</sup> This common belief of the French was not only written in literature, but was a theme of soldier’s letters, highlighted most clearly in Prussian army chaplain Carl Daniel Küster’s letter stating that ‘The French attack in heat, but soon get cool again. As soon as their heated fever attack is over, they fall victim to the cold like feeble flies in autumn.’<sup>94</sup> According to Lloyd and Bland, the English were believed to have been placed between the tempers of the Dutch and the French, having a cool mind while under fire, but being closer aligned to the French, as they were considered impatient: ‘the English are naturally active, strong, bold and enterprising; always ready to go on to action; but impatient when delay’d or kept back from it.’<sup>95</sup> This more closely aligns to what Duffy has written on the ‘English’ national character, that of being ‘amazingly proud and haughty’, with their ‘fury and

xenophobia' imbuing their bravery in battle, that was supported by a natural belief in the individual worth of every Englishman.<sup>96</sup> While the national character of specific nation's soldiers can certainly be debated, literature indicates that there were certain overarching themes to each nation's soldiers, or at the very least many authors agreed upon what was written about different nation's soldier's psychologies and emotions in battle.

Ultimately, the previous passages of this article have evidently shown that military writers were clearly aware of the emotions of the soldiers in battle, as well as the psychological and social environments, especially that of a soldier's honour, which motivated a soldier to fight during the eighteenth century. As such, these passages have aimed to show what military writers believed were the normative ideals for a soldier's emotions and motivations in combat. While certainly a thorough analysis or discussion was never conducted by these authors, the fact that numerous writers have written passages on this topic in at least twenty books have shown that they did ruminate on these factors, and were aware of their importance enough to have grappled with them in their military treatises. While soldier's letters and ego documents continue to remain the most valuable source in analysing soldiers battlefield emotions and motivations, this article has argued how military authors opinions are still a valuable source base from which to analyse the history of emotions when connected to warfare. Further study should be undertaken both in determining to what level classical literature added to the military world of honour of the soldier in the eighteenth century, as well as an investigation into what degree soldiers may have gained psychological insight or inspiration from the military literature they had read, especially as we know many officers read copious amounts of military literature during the period. Through highlighting the work by military writers, this article has aimed to continue the investigation into motivation for eighteenth-century soldiers, including their psychological and emotional features while in battle, and hopefully sustained the re-evaluation of soldiers of eighteenth-century armies when compared to those of the later Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Lynn II, *The Bayonets of the Republic* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996); 'The Intersection of Military History and the History of Emotions: Reconsidering Fear and Honour in Ancien Régime Warfare',

---

*British Journal for Military History*, vol.6 no.2 (2020) (23-40); Ilya Berkovich, *Motivation in War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War: the Psychology of Honour* (London: Bloomsbury, 2020); Erika Kuijpers, Kornee van der Haven, *Battlefield Emotions 1500-1800* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); Yuval Noah Harari, *The Ultimate Experience. Battlefield Revelations and the Making of Modern War Culture, 1450-2000* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008) p.164.

<sup>2</sup> John Keegan, *A History of Warfare* (London: Hutchinson, 1993) pp. 343, 352-3; Michael Howard, *War in European History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) pp.79-81; Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (London: Allen Lane, 1979).

<sup>3</sup> For the value of memoirs, letters and ego documents, see: Yuval Noah Harari, 'Military Memoirs: A Historical Overview of the Genre from the Middle Ages to the Late Modern Era', *War in History*, vol.14 no.3 (2007) (289-309); Yuval Noah Harari, *The Ultimate Experience: Battlefield Revelations and the Making of Modern War Culture, 1450-2000* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

<sup>4</sup> Ilya Berkovich, *Motivation in War*, p.19.

<sup>5</sup> Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1987); Adam Storr, 'The Age of Louis XIV': Frederick the Great and French Ways of War', *German History*, vol.38 no.1 (2019) (24-46); Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible : Military Psychology and Social Egalitarianism in the Enlightenment French Army', *French Historical Studies*, vol.31 no.4 (2008) (553-580); Patrick J. Speelman, *Henry Lloyd and the Military Enlightenment of Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 2002); Armstrong Starkey, *War in the Age of Enlightenment, 1700-1789* (Westport CT: Praeger, 2003); J.A. Houlding, *Fit For Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

<sup>6</sup> Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible: Military Psychology and Social Egalitarianism in the Enlightenment French Army', *French Historical Studies*, vol.31 no.4 (2008) (553-580).

<sup>7</sup> Christy Pichichero, *The Military Enlightenment: War and Culture in the French Empire from Louis XIV to Napoleon* (London: Cornell University Press, 2017); David D. Bien, 'The Army in the French Enlightenment: Reform, Reaction and Revolution', *Past & Present*, vol.85 (1979) (68-98); David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

---

<sup>8</sup> Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, vol. 1 (London: W. Strahan, 1755).

<sup>9</sup> Nathan Bailey, *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (London: D. Midwinter, 1740); John Kersey, *A New Classical English Dictionary* (Dublin: S. Powell, 1757); John Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language* (London: Edward and Charles Dilly, 1775); Carey McIntosh, 'Eighteenth-Century English Dictionaries and the Enlightenment', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol.28 (1998) (3-18) p.4.

<sup>10</sup> Turpin de Crissé, *Essai sur l'Art de la Guerre* (Paris : Jombert, 1754)

<sup>11</sup> Turpin de Crissé, *Essay on the Art of War*, trans. Joseph Otway (London, A. Hamilton, 1761) pp.iv-v.

<sup>12</sup> Turpin de Crissé, *Essay on the Art of War*, pp.iv-v.

<sup>13</sup> David D. Bien, 'The Army in the French Enlightenment', p.68; Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', p.560.

<sup>14</sup> John A. Lynn II, 'The Intersection of Military History and the History of Emotions', p.27; Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', pp.560-61; Christy Pichichero, *The Military Enlightenment* pp.158-59.

<sup>15</sup> Ilya Berkovic, *Motivation in War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017) pp.166-94.

<sup>16</sup> Nathan Bailey, *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary*; John Kersey, *A New Classical English Dictionary*; Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*; John Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*.

<sup>17</sup> Samuel Bever, *The Cadet*, p.180.

<sup>18</sup> Samuel Bever, *The Cadet*, pp.178-79; Adam Storrington, 'The Age of Louis XIV', pp.27-32.

<sup>19</sup> John Gittins, *A Compleat System of Military Discipline* (London: T. Humfreys, 1735) p.viii.

<sup>20</sup> Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline* (London: Sam Buckley, 1727)

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid*, p.124.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*, p.124.

<sup>23</sup> Samuel Bever, *The Cadet*, p.182.

<sup>24</sup> Adam Storrington, 'The Age of Louis XIV', p.27; Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', pp.558, 572-73.

---

<sup>25</sup> Jonathan Taylor, “‘Who Bravely Fights, and Like Achilles Bleeds’”: The Ideal of the Front-Line Soldier during the Long Eighteenth Century’, *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol.43 no.1 (2020) (79-100) p.81.

<sup>26</sup> M. Snape, *The Redcoat and Religion: The Forgotten History of the British Soldier from the Age of Marlborough to the Eve of the First World War* (London: Routledge, 2005); Hans Speier, ‘Militarism in the Eighteenth Century’, *Social Research*, vol.3 no.3 (1936) (304-336) p.330; Paul E. Kopperman, ‘Religion and Religious Policy in the British Army, c.1700-1796’, *Journal of Religious History*, vol.14 (1987) (390-405); Kevin Linch, *Britain and Wellington’s Army, Recruitment, Society and Tradition, 1807-1815* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011) pp.144-46.

<sup>27</sup> Marcus Aurelius, *The Emperor Marcus Antoninus his Conversation with Himself*, trans. Jeremy Collier (London: Richard Sare, 1701); Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *Seneca’s Morals by Way of Abstract*, trans. Sir Roger l’Estrange (London: W. Bowyer, 1702); Epictetus, *Epicteti Enchiridion made English*, trans. Ellis Walker (London: Samuel Keble, 1701). All these works had numerous editions, titles and translations throughout the eighteenth century.

<sup>28</sup> Homer, *The Iliad of Homer*, trans. Alexander Pope (London: W. Bowyer, 1715), *The Odyssey of Homer*, trans. Alexander Pope (London: Bernard Lintot, 1725); Julius Caesar, *The Commentaries of Caesar*, trans. William Duncan (London: J. Tonson, 1753); Publius Cornelius Tacitus, *The Annals and History of Cornelius Tacitus*, trans. Anon (London: John Nicholson, 1716). All these works had numerous editions, titles and translators throughout the eighteenth century.

<sup>29</sup> Douglas L. Cairns, *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) pp.70-79. See also: Mark W. Edwards, *Homer: Poet of the Iliad* (London: John Hopkins University Press, 1987) pp.150-52; Hanna Roisman, *Loyalty in Early Greek Epic and Tragedy* (Königstein: Verlag Anton Hain, 1984); Katherine Callen King, *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages* (Oxford, University of California Press, 1987).

<sup>30</sup> Daily Courant, May 13<sup>th</sup> 1735.

<sup>31</sup> London Evening Post, November 5<sup>th</sup> 1754.

<sup>32</sup> Carolyn D. Williams, *Pope, Homer and Manliness* (London: Routledge, 1993) p.1.

<sup>33</sup> Turpin de Crissé, *An Essay on the Art of War*, p.183-84; see also: Maurice de Saxe, *Reveries, or Memoirs Upon the Art of War*, p.141-42; William Biggs, *The Military History of Europe, &c. Since the Commencement*

---

*of War With Spain* (Limerick: Andrew Welsh, 1749) pp.12, 189; Anon, *Essay on the Art of War* (London: A. Millar, 1761) p.120.

<sup>34</sup> Jonathan Taylor, “‘Who Bravely Fights, and Like Achilles Bleeds’: The Ideal of the Front-Line Soldier during the Long Eighteenth Century’, *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol.43 no.1 (2020) (79-100).

<sup>35</sup> Chevalier de la Valiere, *The Art of War*, trans. anon. (London: J. Morphew, 1707) p.117.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, p.118.

<sup>37</sup> John Gittins, *A Compleat System of Military Discipline*, p.viii.

<sup>38</sup> Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline*, p.235.

<sup>39</sup> Ilya Berkovich, *Motivation in War*, pp.170-74, 184.

<sup>40</sup> Chevalier de la Valiere, *The Art of War*, p.119.

<sup>41</sup> Ilya Berkovich, *Motivation in War*, pp.195, 222-23.

<sup>42</sup> Turpin de Crissé, *Essay on the Art of War*, p.vi.

<sup>43</sup> Turpin de Crissé, *Essay on the Art of War*, p.vi; Chevalier de la Valiere, *The Art of War*, p.116.

<sup>44</sup> Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline*, pp.124-25.

<sup>45</sup> Sarah Goldsmith, *Masculinity and Danger on the Eighteenth-Century Grand Tour* (London: University of London Press, 2020) p.80.

<sup>46</sup> Chevalier de la Valiere, *The Art of War*, p.118.

<sup>47</sup> Anon, *Political Instructions for the Use of Gentlemen* (London: C. Smit, 1708) p.50.

<sup>48</sup> Ilya Berkovich, *Motivation in War*, p.196; Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War: the Psychology of Honour*, pp.102-06.

<sup>49</sup> Henri de la Tour d’Auvergne, *Military Memoirs and Maxims of Marshal Turenne* (Dublin: George Faulkner, 1740) p.38.

<sup>50</sup> Susan M. Heidenreich; Jonathan P. Roth, ‘The Neurophysiology of Panic on the Ancient Battlefield’, in *New Approches to Greek and Roman Warfare* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2020) p.228. This is a must read for



---

anyone wishing to understand the neurophysiological effects on a soldier, especially that of his brain and CNS, which cause him to panic on the battlefield.

<sup>51</sup> Susan M. Heidenreich; Jonathan P. Roth, 'The Neurophysiology of Panic on the Ancient Battlefield', p.231.

<sup>52</sup> Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline*, pp.142-43.

<sup>53</sup> Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', p.564.

<sup>54</sup> Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War*, p.105.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid, p.105.

<sup>56</sup> Maurice de Saxe, *Reveries, or Memoirs on the Art of War*, p.v.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, p.105; Maurice de Saxe, *Reveries, or Memoirs on the Art of War*, p.vi.

<sup>58</sup> Maurice de Saxe, *Reveries or Memoirs on the Art of War*, p.v.

<sup>59</sup> Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', p.559.

<sup>60</sup> Ilya Berkovich, *Motivation in War*, pp.1-2.

<sup>61</sup> Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War: the Psychology of Honour*, p.142.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid, pp.135-37.

<sup>63</sup> Charles Drelincourt, *The Christian's Defence against the fears of Death*, trans. Marius d'Assigny, 1751, 17<sup>th</sup> ed. (London: R. Ware, 1751) p.222.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid, p.223.

<sup>65</sup> Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War*, p.130.

<sup>66</sup> Robert Heath, *Gentleman and Ladies Military Palladium* (London: H. Woodgate, 1759) p.19; see also William Agar, *Military Devotion: or, the Soldier's Duty to God, His Prince and His Country* (London: P. Brindley, 1758) pp.23-24; John Edwards, *The Surest Way of Prospering in our Military Affairs the Ensuing Campaigns, and Thereby of Putting a Speedy Conclusion to the Expensive and Bloody War Which at Present we are Involv'd in* (London: Jonathan Robinson, 1708) p.4.

---

<sup>67</sup> Sheffield City Archives, WWM/R/1/144.

<sup>68</sup> John A. Lynn II, 'The Intersection of Military History and the History of Emotions', p.28; Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War*, p.132.

<sup>69</sup> Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', pp.566-67.

<sup>70</sup> Maurice de Saxe, *Reveries, or Memoirs on the Art of War*, pp.40-41; Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', pp.566-67.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, pp.40-41.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid, pp.75-75; Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', p.567.

<sup>73</sup> Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline*, p.144; Ilya Berkovich, *Motivation in War*, pp.211-14; Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', p.571.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid, p.144.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, p.144.

<sup>76</sup> This article will utilise the following reference for this book, however there were multiple translators and publishers during the period: Julius Caesar, *The Commentaries of Caesar*, trans. William Duncan (London: J. Tonson, 1753).

<sup>77</sup> Ibid, pp. lxxv-lxxvi.

<sup>78</sup> Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War*, pp.141-42.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, pp.141-42; Johann Heinrich Zedler, *Grosses Vollständiges Universal Lexicon* (Halle, Verlegts Johann Heinrich Zedler, 1732)

<sup>80</sup> Nathan Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum* (London: T. Cox, 1730) p.56.

<sup>81</sup> Anon, *Essay on the Art of War* (London: A. Millar, 1761) p.21.

<sup>82</sup> Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline*, p.147.

<sup>83</sup> Anon, *The Antient and Present State of Military Law in Great Britain Consider'd* (London: W. Owen, 1749) p.3.

---

<sup>84</sup> Anon, *The British Military Library* (London: J. Rider, 1799) pp.80-81.

<sup>85</sup> John A. Lynn II, 'The Intersection of Military History and the History of Emotions' pp.26-27.

<sup>86</sup> David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France*, pp.143- ; Christy Pichichero, 'Le Soldat Sensible', p.565; Adam Storrington, 'The Age of Louis XIV', p.38.; Alex Inkeles, *National Character: A Psycho-Social Perspective* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1997); Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1987).

<sup>87</sup> Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason*, pp.19-32; David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France*, pp.143-46.

<sup>88</sup> Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline*, p.147.

<sup>89</sup> Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, vol. 2 (London: W. Strahan, 1755); Anon, *The German Spy* (London: T. Cooper, 1740) pp.139-40.

<sup>90</sup> Henry Lloyd, *the History of the Late War in Germany* (London: R. Horsfield, 1766) Preface; Katrin Möbius, Sascha Möbius, *Prussian Army Soldiers and the Seven Years War*, pp.29-32.

<sup>91</sup> Adam Storrington, 'The Age of Louis XIV', p.39; Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason*, p.19.

<sup>92</sup> Henry Lloyd, *the History of the Late War in Germany* (London: R. Horsfield, 1766) Preface.

<sup>93</sup> Francesco Guicciardini, *The History of Italy* (London: John Towers, 1754) p.319.

<sup>94</sup> Carl Daniel Küster, 'Von den Schlachttagen, als sogenannten heißen Tagen', *Officier-Lesebuch*, vol.2, pp.82-85.

<sup>95</sup> Henry Lloyd, *The History of the Late War in Germany*, Preface; Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline*, p.143.

<sup>96</sup> Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason*, pp.31-32.