



Section 5: British Battalion Guns

by Garry David Wills (Caseshot Publishing)

This series of articles is intended to build on Francis Duncan's account¹⁵⁴ of the Royal Artillery in the Duke of York's campaign, which is particularly focussed on the early history of the expedition in 1793 and early 1794. This particular article reproduces returns relating to the artillery and draws on the Muster Rolls of both the Royal Regiment of Artillery and the Royal Regiment of Artillery in Ireland. This article will focus particularly on the use of the Royal Regiment of Artillery and the Royal Regiment of Artillery in Ireland in the provision of the battalion guns for the infantry regiments.

SOJ-6(17)

British Battalion guns in the Netherlands in 1794

by Garry David Wills (Caseshot Publishing)

The Muster Rolls in the National Archives, Kew, contain a huge amount of information on a monthly basis. The broad sweep of the Muster Roll data is covered by Laws monumental work¹⁵⁵, however this section is designed to give more detail and in particular the names of the officers and their employment. As a sample of this information I have reproduced in the Appendix, the data for the month of September 1794 for the companies serving with the Duke of York. These Muster Rolls provide the state of the artillery on the eve of the renewed French offensive to complete their conquest of the Netherlands.

Summary of the Muster Rolls for the Royal Regiment of Artillery with the Duke of York

For the Regiment as a whole the Muster Rolls for September 1794, give a total of 28 officers, 30 serjeants, 23 corporals, 36 bombardiers, 16 drummers, 504 gunners and 89 gunner-drivers (see Appendix B for the detail). This gives a grand total of 726 men of all ranks. Of these a total of 7 officers, 6 serjeants, 6 corporals, 9 bombardiers, 157 gunners and 33 gunner-drivers are marked "on command". A further 121 men are absent for other reasons.¹⁵⁶

Comparing these numbers to Duncan's statement of the maximum force of the Royal Artillery with the Duke of York (in February 1794), there is a large difference in the number of gunner-drivers. While the fact that the muster rolls of Shuttleworth's company doesn't mention any gunner-drivers, may not necessarily mean there weren't any with the unit, there is still a big disparity. The other five companies which do report the numbers and names of their gunner-drivers, report only 60% of the minimum numbers that might be expected based on Duncan's stated allocation.¹⁵⁷ The shortages of drivers were made up, at least in part, using men attached to the artillery from the infantry regiments.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁴ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1879, vol. 2, p.54-66

¹⁵⁵ M.E.S. Laws, *Battery Records of the Royal Artillery, 1716-1859*, 1952, p.82-89

¹⁵⁶ Duncan gives the maximum force of the Royal Artillery with the Duke of York (in February 1794) as; 24 Officers, 61 NCO's, 478 Gunners and 224 Gunner-Drivers, a grand total of 787 men of all ranks. (vol. 2, p.58)

¹⁵⁷ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1879, vol. 2, p.55; assuming most of the artillery supports the battalion guns.

¹⁵⁸ Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entry dated 25th August 1793: "the detachments which are sent to the Park to act as drivers are to return to their different regiments tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock"

Summary of the Muster Rolls for the Royal Regiment of Artillery in Ireland with the Duke of York

The September 1794 Muster Rolls for the then separate Royal Regiment of Artillery in Ireland, with the Duke of York, show a total of 15 officers, 6 serjeants, 12 corporals, 12 bombardiers, 6 drummers and 247 gunners or 298 men all ranks, of whom 20 are absent for various reasons (see Appendix C for the detail). The three companies assigned 8 officers, 1 serjeant, 7 corporals and 101 gunners to the battalion guns of the infantry regiments. Of the 15 officers named in these muster rolls only Robert Thornhill appears in Kane, with 10 of them featuring in the list of officers who retired on full pay when the Royal Artillery in Ireland was absorbed into the Royal Artillery.¹⁵⁹

The Army List for 1795 gives higher ranks for 12 of the 15 officers shown in the Muster Rolls; Swayne, Shortall, Blake, Armstrong & Legge are all shown to have been Captains in September 1794; Francis, Kettlewell, Crawford, Thornhill, Westropp, Benson & Fleming are all shown to have been Captain-Lieutenants in September 1794.¹⁶⁰

	Captains	Capt. Lieutenants	1 st Lieutenants	2 nd Lieutenants	Serjeants	Corporals	Bombardiers	Drummers	Gunners	Drivers	On Command/ Batt ⁿ Guns	Sick, etc	Absent	Prisoners of War	Total available for duty
Artillery	9	7	19	8	36	35	48	22	751	89	358	57	89	52	826

Table 11: Summary of the Muster Rolls of Royal Artillery and the Royal Artillery in Ireland for September 1794

Five of the six Royal Artillery companies, as distinct from the Irish companies and George Wilson's company, do not positively identify individuals attached to the battalion gun detachments. However it is clear that these individuals are included in those men that are marked "on command", since those officers that we know were attached to such detachments, Captain-Lieutenant Robertson, Lieutenant Hawker and Lieutenant Fraser, are all marked in this way(q.v.).

Unlike for the Royal Artillery companies, the Muster Rolls of the Irish Artillery companies make no mention of Gunner-Drivers. This is consistent with Fortescue who states that Lord Moira, who brought with him Shuttleworth's (Royal Artillery) and Buchanan's (Royal Artillery in Ireland) companies, arrived without any artillery drivers.¹⁶¹

A comparison between this table (43 officers, 58 serjeants and drummers, 814 other ranks and 89 drivers, or 1004 men of all ranks) and the Duke of York's September return (see Appendix A) suggests that the returns include both the Royal Regiment of Artillery and the Royal Regiment of Artillery in Ireland, but excludes the gunner-drivers. Furthermore, while the overall shape is similar there are discrepancies between the two. Such discrepancies are inevitable as the Muster Rolls of the companies present with the Duke of York, cannot be considered a definitive statement of the officers present. Other individuals from companies stationed in the United Kingdom and elsewhere were detached for service with the Duke of York. Examples of this include Henry Shrapnel (3rd Battⁿ & later 1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) who served with the Duke of York in late 1793¹⁶², Robert Lawson, Charles Wade Thornton and Henry Geary (all 1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ *Army List*, 1803, p.286; J. Kane, *List of the Officers of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1815, p.21

¹⁶⁰ Stuart Reid, *King George's Army(1)*, 1995, p.8-9; this difference does not appear to be related to the dating of a Captain's seniority from the date of their promotion to Captain-Lieutenant.

¹⁶¹ J.W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 2004, vol. 4, Pt 1, p. 299; *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*, vol. 16(1889), p.23; J.J. Crooks, *History of the Royal Irish Regiment of Artillery*, 1914, p.274; Moira did however bring two companies of Waggoners, see *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 76(1998), p.161

¹⁶² National Archives, Kew, WO10/250; Captain John Barnes' Company based at the Tower, August (marked "command") and September (marked "continent"). Shrapnel was later promoted to Captain-Lieutenant and transferred to Captain James Smith's company in the 4th Battalion(WO10/255).

¹⁶³ National Archives, Kew, WO10/249 & 255; Captain William Cuppage's company based near Brighton – Lawson is shown in

A final comparison between this table and the numbers given by Duncan for February 1794, reproduced above, shows 1004 men of all ranks in September 1794 versus 787 men of all ranks in February 1794. This comparison needs to be viewed in the context of the number of infantry battalions with the army; there were 7 in March 1794 but this would reach 27 in September 1794 before peaking at 32 in November 1794.¹⁶⁴ This expansion of the infantry without concomitant expansion of the Royal Artillery with the Duke of York had implications for the way the battalion guns were resourced.

If we, for the purposes of this discussion, assume that all of the Royal Artillery men that were marked as “on command” (but excluding the detachment at Dort) were with the battalion guns, the total number of men of all ranks, available for the battalion gun detachments, from the Royal Artillery and the Royal Artillery in Ireland, was 327. At Duncan’s stated allocation of 1 officer, 2 non commissioned officers, 8 gunners and 3 drivers per battalion gun detachment of 2 guns¹⁶⁵, the 327 men are sufficient for 23 pairs of battalion guns (c.f. the 27 battalions present), however this average hides a more complex picture. Using the same assumption suggests that a maximum of 14 officers were allocated from the Royal Artillery and the Royal Artillery in Ireland combined, thus there were officers for only 14 pairs of battalion guns at the full complement of 1 officer per pair. Similarly there were non commissioned officers (27) for 13 pairs of guns and finally there were drivers (33) for only 11 pairs of battalion guns. The 253 gunners are more than enough for 27 pairs of battalion guns, which at Duncan’s establishment needs only 216 gunners, this suggests that at least some of the gunners and therefore some of the officers and non-commissioned officers marked “on command” were, as would be expected, allocated to other tasks.

Although Wright’s letters, from March 1793 to May 1794, suggest more permanent postings to the battalion gun detachments, it is thus likely that some officers were attached to the battalion gun detachments on a more ad hoc basis than shown in the muster rolls.¹⁶⁶ The muster rolls of the Royal Artillery in Ireland, which are more explicit regarding battalion guns, seem to support this hypothesis, as the men attached to battalion guns (i.e. 8 officers; 8 NCO’s and 101 gunners) are in a ratio of 1:1:13, which when compared to Duncan’s battalion guns detachment ratio of 1:2:8, suggests that fewer officers were so allocated than required.

Duncan states that, in 1795, the infantry battalions in Ireland were required to train battalion gun detachments comprising 1 subaltern, 2 serjeants and at least 30 rank and file.¹⁶⁷ As shown in Appendix A, in the Duke of York’s 1st September Monthly return, of the 27 battalions listed, 11 recorded their own men as “with artillery”, an average of 21 men per pair of battalion guns for the twelve pairs of battalion guns concerned, assuming the Guards regiments were also serving a pair of guns for the combined grenadier battalion.¹⁶⁸ However I have so far, found no evidence of infantry officers being allocated to the battalion guns in this campaign. Indeed on the contrary, for example, while the 3rd Foot Guards recorded 25 of their own men as being “with artillery”, their detachment was commanded by First Lieutenant Augustus Fraser, Royal Artillery. Similarly, the 12th Foot recorded 19 of their own men as being “with artillery” and their detachment was commanded by First Lieutenant James Hawker, Royal Artillery(q.v).

Officers known to be associated with specific battalion gun detachments during the 1793-1795 campaign in the Netherlands are;¹⁶⁹

October, November and December 1793, marked as “F Command” or “Foreign Command”, whilst Geary appears in December 1793 to June 1794 also marked “Foreign Command”. For Thornton, see Major Thomas Blomefield’s company for July to October 1793 (WO10/255) when he is marked “Holland” or “Foreign Command”.

¹⁶⁴ The number of battalions have been assembled from a number of sources including the Historical records of the regiments; von Sichert, *Geschichte der königlich-hannoverschen Armee*, vol. 4, 1780-1803, 1871, p.501-505; Fortescue, op.cit., p.314-389; Robert Brown, *An Impartial Journal of a Detachment from the Brigade of Foot Guards commencing 25th February 1793 and ending 9th May 1795*, 2006, p.181; H. Davidson, *History & Services of the 78th Highlanders*, vol.1, p.17

¹⁶⁵ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1879, vol. 2, p. 55; Anon, *A Journal kept in the British Army, from the landing of the troops under the command of Earl Moira, at Ostend, in June 1794, to their return to England the following year*, 1796, p.11; this, a more contemporary source, states the battalion gun detachments as “two light brass 6-pdrs, to each of which belong twelve artillerymen, and three horses with their drivers, besides an ammunition waggon and tumbrel”

¹⁶⁶ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2

¹⁶⁷ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1879, vol.2, p.76

¹⁶⁸ Robert Brown, *An Impartial Journal of a Detachment from the Brigade of Foot Guards commencing 25th February 1793 and ending 9th May 1795*, 2006, p.145

¹⁶⁹ The battalion designations are relevant to the date given and are taken from the Muster Rolls at the National Archives, Kew, WO10/246, 249, 250, 258, 271

1st Foot Guards;

Lieutenant Charles De Ginkle (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was in command of the 1st Guards detachment in May 1793, at Linselles¹⁷⁰ on 18th August 1793 and until October 1793, when he fell ill and later died at the age of 21.¹⁷¹ *First Lieutenant Henry Geary* (Royal Artillery) succeeded De Ginkle in October 1793.¹⁷²

Coldstream Guards;

On 8th May 1793, at St. Amand, *First Lieutenant Alexander Watson* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) led the battalion guns of the Coldstream Guards.¹⁷³ *Second Lieutenant John Birch* (Royal Artillery) replaced Watson for a few weeks in November 1793, while the latter was sick.¹⁷⁴

3rd Foot Guards;

First Lieutenant James De Peyster (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was killed while leading the battalion guns of the 3rd Foot Guards at Linselles, 18th August 1793.¹⁷⁵ *Second Lieutenant Philip Hughes* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) initially replaced De Peyster¹⁷⁶, but at Lannoy on the 28th October 1793, *First Lieutenant Robert Lawson* (Royal Artillery) commanded this detachment.¹⁷⁷ *First Lieutenant Augustus Fraser* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) commanded the detachment from January 1794 to May 1795.¹⁷⁸

Foot Guards Flank battalion;

On 8th May 1793 at St. Amand, *First Lieutenant Thomas Fenwick* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).^{179,180} *First Lieutenant Charles Wade Thornton* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) took over from Fenwick shortly after St. Amand but was wounded and lost his arm at Lannoy on 28th October 1793.¹⁸¹ *First Lieutenant Thomas Downman* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was subsequently attached to the Flank Battalion of the Guards, but was captured on the 18th May 1794, when the detachment was charged by French Hussars at Roubaix, during the battle of Turcoing.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁰ This is the correct spelling of the place name, the Duke of York seems to be responsible for the English spelling of "Lincelles", see A. Burne, *the Noble Duke of York*, 1949, p.67

¹⁷¹ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p. 7, 19, 24 & 25 Letters 7, 18, 25 & 26; *The Army List*, 1793, p.215; W. Courthope, 1838, *De Brett's Complete Peerage of the UK & Ireland*, p.533; National Archives, Kew, WO10/246 – Wright's company May; The Wright Letters & the Army Lists use the spelling "de Ginkle" while Debrett's gives the family name as "de Ginkell"

¹⁷² F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.28, Letter 31

¹⁷³ Francis Duncan, *op.cit.*, vol.2, p.59; Sir Harry Verney, *Journals & Correspondence of Sir Harry Calvert, Comprising the campaigns in Flanders and Holland in 1793-4*, 1853, p.72-73; Daniel MacKinnon, *Origins & Services of the Coldstream Guards*, 1833, vol.2, p.38: Duncan quotes Murray as saying that the battalion guns of the Guards were the only guns in action. McKinnon, again quoting Murray, is clear that the Coldstream's guns were engaged; F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.7-8,19 Letters 7, 8 & 18; Comparison of Wright's Letters 7, 8 & 18 identifies De Ginkle with the 1st Foot Guards, Fenwick therefore with the Guards Flank Battalion and Watson with the Coldstream Guards.

¹⁷⁴ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.29 Letter 32 ; Kane, *op. cit.*, p.21; Birch quickly left to join the Royal Engineers in January 1794.

¹⁷⁵ Anon., "*an Officer of the Guards*" *op.cit.*, vol. 1, p.72; J. Kane, *List of the Officers of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1815, p.17

¹⁷⁶ National Archives, Kew, WO10-249, George Wilson's Company for September 1793; Kane, *op.cit.*, p.21; F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.19 & 23, Letters 18 & 24; this officer joined the Royal Engineers in October 1793 & does not feature in the earlier or later muster rolls or the Army List for the years 1793-5. The Muster roll does not give Lt. Hughes' Christian name.

¹⁷⁷ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.29 Letters 32; *The Army List*, 1793, p.215; *A collection of State Papers, relative to the war against France: now carrying on by Great Britain and the several other European powers*, vol. 1, 1802, p.470; Kane, *op. cit.*, p.20; 3rd Foot Guards and Guards Flank battalion identified as the two battalions involved and Thornton was attached to the Flank Battalion. This Robert Lawson is number 731 in the 1900 edition of Kane, who died in 1802, not the General and horse gunner.

¹⁷⁸ E. Sabine, *Letters of Colonel Sir Augustus Simon Frazer K.C.B.*, 1859, p.vi

¹⁷⁹ Francis Duncan, *op.cit.*, vol. 2, p.59; Sir Harry Verney, *Journals & Correspondence of Sir Harry Calvert, Comprising the campaigns in Flanders and Holland in 1793-4*, 1853, p.72-73; F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.7-8, Letters 7, 8 & 18; Duncan quotes Murray as saying that the battalion guns of the Guards were the only guns in action.

¹⁸⁰ J.H. Leslie, *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, vol.8, no.31, p.2-32, 1929; identifies Fenwick as Thomas Howard Fenwick, who was appointed Quartermaster to the artillery with the Army after St. Amand.(see p.24-25)

¹⁸¹ Robert Brown, *op.cit.*, p.83; Hart's *Annual Army List*, 1847, p.24; Anon., "*an Officer of the Guards*" *op.cit.*, vol.1, p.113; *A collection of State Papers, op.cit.*, vol.1, 1802, p.468-471 F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.9 & 29, Letters 9 & 32; - Murray describes the 2 battalions, the Guards Flank battalion and the 3rd Foot Guards, as being accompanied by "two 12-pdrs and two howitzers", while Brown says 4 field pieces and 2 howitzers. "An Officer of the Guards" describes Thornton as commanding a 12-pdr gun, although Brown and Wright clearly describe Thornton as being attached to the battalion guns of the Guards Flank Battalion. Wright additionally says that, in this action, Lt Colonel Huddleston commanded the heavy guns comprising 3 12-pdrs and 3 howitzers, perhaps suggesting that the "Officer of the Guards" was mistaken; National Archives, Kew, WO10-249, George Wilson's Company for October 1793

¹⁸² J.Philippart, *Royal Military Calendar*, vol.4, 1820, p.437- 438; Anon., "*an Officer of the Guards*" *op.cit.*, vol.2, p.49; *A collection of State Papers, relative to the war against France: now carrying on by Great Britain and the several other Europ. powers ... many of which have never before been publ. in England*, vol.2, 1795, p.38-44; F. Duncan, *op.cit.*, vol.2, p.63; National Archives, Kew, WO10/255, George

12th Foot;

In September 1794, *First Lieutenant James Hawker* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).¹⁸³

14th Foot;

In November 1793, *Captain Lieutenant Henry Shrapnel* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).¹⁸⁴ Subsequently in May 1794, *First Lieutenant Henry Phillott* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).¹⁸⁵

27th Foot;

From September 1793, *First Lieutenant Robert Fead* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).¹⁸⁶

37th Foot;

In November 1793, *First Lieutenant Andrew Schlach* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).¹⁸⁷ At the Battle of Willems, 10th May 1794, *First Lieutenant Robert Lawson* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery).¹⁸⁸

42nd Foot;

From July 1794, *Captain-Lieutenant Robert Crawford* (Royal Artillery in Ireland).¹⁸⁹

53rd Foot;

Until October 1793, *First Lieutenant Wiltshire Wilson* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was attached to the 53rd Foot.¹⁹⁰ In particular, Wilson was attached to the Flank Battalion of the Line, formed from the flank companies of the 14th, 37th and 53rd Foot, on 24th August 1793 near Dunkerque where he was wounded in the thigh.¹⁹¹ After Wilson returned to England, and by November 1793 *First Lieutenant John Bentham* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) briefly commanded this detachment, before he joined the horse artillery in December 1793.¹⁹² In April 1794 *First Lieutenant Turtliff Boger* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) took over from the sick *First Lieutenant Bridges Hooke* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery), as commander of the battalion guns of the 53rd Foot but was wounded on the 18th May 1794 during the battle of Turcoing.¹⁹³ In September 1794, Wilson was a prisoner of war having been captured when Nieuport surrendered in July 1794.

Wilson's Coy, 8th April (marked "battⁿ guns") and 31st May (marked "prisoner"); *The New Army List*, 1848, p.175; F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.32 Letter 35 & p. 57

¹⁸³ National Archives, Kew, WO71/168, Proceedings of Captain Kean's Court Martial; Robertson is an alternative commander for this detachment as he is mentioned in this court martial and was also associated with the 12th Foot in July 1794, but it seems more likely that he was present in another capacity(q.v.).

¹⁸⁴ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.36 Letter 38; Richard Cannon, *Historical Record of the Fourteenth or the Buckinghamshire Regiment of Foot.... to 1845*, 1845, p.43; National Army Museum, London, Accession n^o. 1976-07-45, *The Diary of Lt. Thomas Powell, 14th Foot, 1793-5*; Shrapnel arrived at the end of August 1793 and in November, according to Wright, was either with the 14th or 53rd Foot, based on the 7 infantry battalions then present with the army. I have chosen the 14th based on the fact that he was wounded in September (Kane, 1900, p.233) during the siege of Dunkerque. Shrapnel is not mentioned amongst the wounded for the actions of the 5th & 6th September which suggests that he suffered his wound on the 8th, when the official dispatches do not name the casualties, but Powell mentions that the battalion guns of the 14th Foot were engaged, with the regiment losing 8 men killed and 12 wounded. Meanwhile the 53rd Foot were at Furnes on the 8th September (see J.S. Jordan, *The Political State of Europe for the year MDCCXCIII*, vol. 4, p. 548). The manuscript order book RA26, op. cit., shows Shrapnel in the Park but without a role, on September 16th, following his wounding. Wright also considered Shrapnel his deputy.

¹⁸⁵ Richard Cannon, *Historical Record of the Fourteenth or the Buckinghamshire Regiment of Foot.... to 1845*, 1845, p.46; National Archives, Kew, WO10/258, Captain Trotter's Company - April & May Muster Rolls.

¹⁸⁶ Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entry dated September 16th 1793; National Archives, Kew, WO10/249 – Captain Wilson's company

¹⁸⁷ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, Letter 34; National Archives, Kew, WO10/255 – Captain Scott's Company

¹⁸⁸ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.53 Letter 58; C.T. Atkinson, *Regimental History of the Royal Hampshire Regiment*, 1950, vol.1, p.138-9; Atkinson makes it clear that it was Fox's line brigade that advanced in support of the cavalry and since we know that Phillott (14th Foot) and Boger (53rd Foot) were the other battalion gun commanders in the brigade, it leaves Lawson as the commander of the guns attached to the 37th Foot.

¹⁸⁹ J. Philippart, *Royal Military Calendar*, vol.5, 1820, p.391

¹⁹⁰ *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1900, vol.62; available at [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Wilson,_Wiltshire_\(DNB00\)](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Wilson,_Wiltshire_(DNB00)) (accessed 6th August 2012); F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.20 Letter 19; See also; National Archives, Kew; WO10/249 – Capt. George Wilson's Coy, October 1793; Wilson joined Grant's company in England in November 1793.

¹⁹¹ Richard Cannon, *Historical Record of the Fifty Third or the Shropshire Regiment of Foot.. to 1848*, 1849, p. 6; "an Officer of the Guards" *op.cit.*, vol.1, p.84

¹⁹² F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.36 & 42 Letters 38 & 44; Kane, *op. cit.*, p.19; National Archives, Kew; WO10/250 – Capt. Trotter's Coy; I have allocated Bentham to the 53rd based on Letter 38 & placing Shrapnel with the 14th. (Note also Wrights comments in Letter 22 - "Mr B_____m is another complete hound and good for nothing")

¹⁹³ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.47, Letter 49; *A collection of State Papers, relative to the war against France: now carrying on by Great Britain and the several other Europ. powers ... many of which have never before been publ. in England*, vol.2, 1795, p.42; National Archives, Kew; WO10/249 – Capt. Borthwick's Coy, July – December 1793 ("on command" October to December).

54th Foot;

In 1794, *Lieutenant Robert Thornhill* (Royal Artillery in Ireland).¹⁹⁴

59th Foot;

First Lieutenant Richard Legge (Royal Artillery in Ireland, who commanded two light 6-pdrs¹⁹⁵) was most likely attached to the battalion guns of the 59th Foot, on 10th January 1795. At the same time, *First Lieutenant Frederick Walker* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was probably attached to either the 79th or, more likely, the 40th Foot, assuming only 1 officer per detachment.¹⁹⁶

Unidentified Gun Detachments

In May 1793, *Second Lieutenant Thomas J'Ans* (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was commander of the battalion gun detachment of either the 37th, 53rd or 14th Foot.¹⁹⁷ J'Ans was replaced by *Second Lieutenant Charles Lefebure* in July 1793.¹⁹⁸ *First Lieutenant Henry Phillott* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was also serving with an unidentified battalion in September 1793.¹⁹⁹ Also attached to the battalion guns of unidentified regiments, were the following members of the Royal Artillery in Ireland in the September 1794 Muster Rolls; *First Lieutenants Alexander Armstrong & Poole Westrope* and *Second Lieutenants Robert Francis & Peter Kettlewell*.

Ordnance of the Infantry Battalions

The majority of the battalion guns used in this campaign were light 6-pdr cannon, the original 7 battalions despatched to the Austrian Netherlands in 1793 were so armed.²⁰⁰ There is however evidence of howitzers being used in this role also, as there were insufficient light 6-pdr cannon to equip all of the battalions, in the second half of 1794. In October 1794 there were only 40 light 6-pdrs for the 27 battalions then with the army.²⁰¹ The cannon taken from the 37th Foot at Druten in October 1794 were said by the French to be 6-pdrs.²⁰² However, Major General David Dundas reported that Arthur Wesley (later the Duke of Wellington) and the 33rd Regiment of Foot were supported by 2 howitzers at Geldermalsen on 4th January 1795, where some curriole (3 pdr) guns were also present, attached to the 11th Light Dragoons of Laurie's 4th (or Light) Cavalry Brigade.²⁰³ Finally as mentioned above, "an officer of the guards" suggests that a twelve pounder cannon was, on one occasion, used in this role, although the weight of the cannon would seem to make this unlikely.²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁴ J. Philippart, *Royal Military Calendar*, vol.4, 1820, p.376

¹⁹⁵ J.Philippart, *Royal Military Calendar*, vol. 4, 1820, p.292

¹⁹⁶ LT Jones, *An Historical Journal of the British Campaign- in the Year 1794, with the Retreat Through Holland- in the Year 1795*, 1797, p.167-9; J.A. Browne, *England's Artillerymen*, 1865, p.99; *Royal Military Calendar*, 1815, vol.3, p.354-5; J.W. Fortescue, *op. cit.*, vol.4, pt.1, p.319; L. Maclean, *Indomitable Colonel*, 1988, p.130; Anon, *A journal kept in the British Army, from the landing of the troops under the command of Earl Moira, at Ostend, in June 1794, to their return to England in the following year*, 1796, p.151-157; Both Legge and Walker arrived as part of Lord Moira's force in June 1794. Browne identifies Legge and Walker as wounded on 10th January 1795, when Fortescue identifies elements of Coates' Brigade, comprising the 40th, 50th and 79th Foot, as the only units "severely engaged". However, the 50th did not serve in Flanders & Jones identifies the third regiment as the 59th Foot, which was the one most heavily engaged. Of these regiments the 40th & 59th were originally part of Moira's force while the 79th arrived only in August 1794. Legge is most likely associated with the 59th as he is known to have served at Alost in July 1794, when the 59th Foot was the only regiment of the Coates' brigade (40th, 59th & 79th Foot) present that day. (This is based on an assumption of long term assignment of Legge to this detachment, as we have seen with other officers). Walker was wounded three times (see *The New Army List*, 1848, p.175).

¹⁹⁷ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.6 Letter 6; Kane, *op. cit.*, p.20 – he left the Duke of York's army in June and joined the Engineers in Oct. 1793.

¹⁹⁸ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.17 Letter 16; Kane, *op. cit.*, p.21

¹⁹⁹ Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entry dated September 16th 1793; J.W. Fortescue, *British Campaigns in Flanders 1690-1794*, 1918, p.248, 257, 295; D. Stewart, *Sketches of the Character, Manners, and Present State of the Highlanders of Scotland: With Details of the Military Service of the Highland Regiments*, vol.1, 1822, p.407; The Wright letters suggest that the battalion concerned was one of those at Ostend - 19th, 28th, 42nd, 54th, 57th or 59th Foot. Of these, the most likely candidate is the 42nd Foot which went to Nieuport with the light companies of the 19th, 27th, 28th & 57th Foot.

²⁰⁰ A. Aspinall (ed), *The Later Correspondence of George III*, vol.6, 1962, p.86-87

²⁰¹ G.D. Wills, *Smooth Bore Ordnance Journal*, 4(16), p.75 & National Archives, Kew, WO1/170 p.869

²⁰² Victor-Donatien Musset-Pathay(ed), *Relations des principaux sièges faits ou soutenus en Europe par les armées françaises depuis 1792*, vol. 1, 1806, p.518

²⁰³ R.N.W. Thomas, in *The International History Review*, vol. 11, no.1 February 1989, p.21-22; History of the 78th Foot available at http://www.qohldrs.co.uk/html/seaforth_highlanders_full_hist.htm (accessed 7th August 2012); National Archives, Kew, WO1/175 p.645 reproduced in G.D. Wills, *Smooth Bore Ordnance Journal*, 4(14), 2012, p.72-3; Richard Cannon, *Historical record of the Fifteenth, or the Kings Regiment of Light Dragoons, 1759-1841*, 1841, p.64; P. Groves, *History of the 42nd or Royal Highlanders, or "Black Watch"*, 1893, p.10; Archibald Forbes, *The Black Watch*, 1896, p.135; Brown, *op. cit.*, p.175; guns (presumably the same curriole guns) attached to the heavy cavalry in July 1794. Dundas may have been referring to additional Park or Reserve howitzers, but this seems unlikely given the forces involved, furthermore it is likely that Moira's force of 10 infantry battalions, which included the 33rd Foot, was accompanied by only 16 light six pounders, when it arrived in June 1794.

²⁰⁴ "an Officer of the Guards" *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p.113; the heavy or "Royal" 5½ inch howitzer was previously used in this role but this



SOJ-6(18)

British Battalion Guns in Action with the Duke of York, 1793-1795

by Garry David Wills (Caseshot Publishing)

In his history, Duncan included a discussion of the disadvantages of the battalion gun system based on Lieutenant-Colonel Hime's comments.²⁰⁵ Fortescue also remarks on the faulty organisation of the contemporary artillery.²⁰⁶ Essentially Duncan makes 5 key points;

- a) Weight of shot restricted by the need to avoid impeding the mobility of the infantry, to the point where the fire is "all but useless".
- b) Seriously encumbered the movement of the infantry, especially if no horses are provided, and sometimes the terrain enforced the abandonment of the guns.
- c) The movements of the infantry did not allow the artillery detachments sufficient time to position, load or lay their guns carefully.
- d) The infantry came to look upon the guns as essential to their own safety.
- e) Since the battalion guns were "practically useless", their employment represented a waste of the ordnance resources that could be better used retained in the artillery park.

Looking at Lt Colonel Hime's later writings it seems that these points may be, with regard to the 1790's campaigns, overstating the case, as he is referring to battalion gun detachments without limbers and horses, and those armed with the lighter 3 pounder guns and even leather guns.²⁰⁷ In his works, Hime quotes from the writings of the famous Royal Horse Artillery commanders, Sir Robert Gardiner and Sir Augustus Frazer. In particular, Gardiner comments scathingly on the difficulty of moving the guns with horses, but without limbers. As we have seen, unlike Gardiner, Frazer had experience of commanding a battalion gun detachment in 1794, and his comments, written in 1818, relate to the poor quality of the equipment, the use of infantry to help crew the guns and the lack of flexibility in deployment. In summary, Frazer describes the battalion guns as "frequently of great encumbrance and rarely of any use".²⁰⁸

In support of the "practically useless" point of view expressed by Frazer, Gardiner, Hime and Duncan, the numbers of British battalion guns captured by the French has been pointed to.²⁰⁹ A number of such losses can be identified during the campaign in the Austrian Netherlands and the United Provinces, e.g.

- a) The Foot Guards Flank battalion lost theirs on 18th May 1794 at Turcoing, as described above.²¹⁰
- b) General Fox's Brigade (the 14th, 37th and 53rd Regiments of Foot²¹¹) lost 5 of their 6 battalion guns, while struggling to escape from envelopment by the French, also at Turcoing on 18th May 1794, First Lieutenant Henry Phillott saved the remaining gun, one of those attached to the 14th Regiment of Foot.²¹²
- c) 12th Regiment of Foot lost one of their guns at St. Michaelsgestel, 15th September 1794, when one of the limber horses was disabled by enemy fire.²¹³
- d) The 37th Foot lost their battalion guns again, on 19th October 1794 at Druten, when they mistook the French 9th Hussars for their supporting Émigré unit, the Rohan Hussars.²¹⁴

was significantly lighter than the medium 12-pdrs; see *The Parliamentary Register, op. cit.*, p.217; A.L. Dawson, P.L. Dawson, S. Summerfield, *Napoleonic Artillery*, 2007, p.102

²⁰⁵ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1879, vol.2, p.55-56

²⁰⁶ J.W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 2004, vol.4, pt.1, p.93

²⁰⁷ H.W.L. Hime, *Stray Military Papers*, 1897, p.108-111; *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*; vol.7(1871), p.130-2

²⁰⁸ *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*, vol.8(1874), p.215-216; R.W. Gardiner, *Observations on the prospective benefits derivable from the incorporation of the artillery with the cavalry and infantry of the army.*, 1856, p.9; A. Frazer, *op. cit.*, p.50-54; With regard to the use of infantry used to man the battalion guns, it is worth remarking that Frazer's battalion, the 3rd Foot Guards, allocated 25 men to this role but were one of only 11 of 27 battalions that did this in September 1794.

²⁰⁹ *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*, vol.8(1874), p.215

²¹⁰ Robert Brown, *An Impartial Journal of a Detachment from the Brigade of Foot Guards commencing 25th February 1793 and ending 9th May 1795*, 2006, p.145

²¹¹ J.W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 2004, vol.4, pt.1, p.296 (Order of Battle for July 1794)

²¹² J.W. Fortescue, *op. cit.*, vol. 4, pt. 1, p.265; Anon, *Historical Record of the Fourteenth or the Buckinghamshire Regiment of Foot... to 1845*, 1845, p.44-46

²¹³ National Archives, Kew, WO71/168; Proceedings of Captain Kean's Court Martial

Thus, approximately 20% of the battalion guns were lost in action during 1794, however 7 of the 10 losses occurred on the same day, when the Duke of York's column was overwhelmed and effectively surrounded. It is also worth noting that the column lost a total of 19 guns on this day, the majority of which were from the Park or reserve guns.²¹⁵ Furthermore at Druten, the 37th Foot was effectively destroyed by the French Hussars, with only 60 men surviving the attack.²¹⁶ On the other hand, the accounts of the campaign contain several examples in which the battalion gun detachments are commended for their performance;

St. Amand, 8th May 1793;

*"I have the utmost satisfaction in informing your Grace that the zeal and ability of Major Wright and of Lieutenants Watson and Fenwick have done them the highest credit. The guns commanded by these officers were the only ones brought into action. I was myself a witness of the promptitude with which Mr. Watson's were served, and know that they had great effect."*²¹⁷

Linselles, 18th August 1793;

*"His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief returns his warmest thanks to Major Wright, and the artillery under his command, for the gallantry and intrepidity they so frequently showed in the attack of the French redoubts, etc, at the village of Linselles, yesterday evening."*²¹⁸

Dunkerque, 24th August 1793;

*"The two guns attached to the flank battalion did infinite execution among the French infantry as they retreated; having got command of a certain spot over which the enemy must pass, they cut them down by platoons at a time; but they suffered severely for their bravery; two pieces of cannon which the French had brought to bear upon them, played with unremitting activity, and before night there were but two artillerymen of both guns that were not either killed or wounded."*²¹⁹

Willems, 10th May 1794;

*"There were a few of our guns in the action of the 10th inst. One of the battalion guns with Lieutenant Lawson fired with great effect at some squadrons of French cavalry, and made them retire; and at the same time saved our cavalry very much. They told me so today, and I hope this will be known, for Lawson charged with them and brought his guns up. If our horse artillery had been in this action, what credit they would have got."*²²⁰

Walheim Bridge, 16th July 1794;

*"This day the French again made an attempt to pass the river Nethe, at the bridge of Walheim, but a British brigade stationed there, (the 12th, 38th and 44th regiments,) with six field pieces and some howitzers, very bravely and successfully opposed their passage. A very heavy cannonade, took place across the river, by which we lost some artillerymen, and made great havoc amongst the French, by the well directed fire that was kept on them from our field pieces."*²²¹

²¹⁴ Pierre David, *A History of the Campaigns of General Pichegru: containing the operations of the armies of the north, and of the Sambre and the Meuse, from March 1794 to March 1795*, 1796, p.125; R.W. Phipps, *The Armies of the First French Republic*, 1926(2011 rep.), vol.1, p.326; R.W. Gould, *Mercenaries of the Napoleonic Wars*, 1995, p.87; National Archives, Kew, WO1/170 p.869 reproduced in G.D. Wills, *Smooth Bore Ordnance Journal*, 4(16), 2012, p.75

²¹⁵ J.W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 2004, vol.4, pt.1, p.289 & 299; National Archives, Kew, WO1/175 p.645; Fortescue mentions that the heavier guns were replaced by Moira, who in June brought 8x 24 pdrs, 4x med^m 12-pdrs, 6x heavy 6-pdrs, 1x 8 inch howitzer, 16x light 6-pdrs, 6x 5½ inch howitzers, 2x currcle 3 pdrs, 3x 8 inch mortars, 6x 5½ inch mortars and 10x French 4 pdrs. However these were not strict replacements as they were already embarked at Portsmouth on 17th May 1794, the day before the losses occurred.

²¹⁶ C.T. Atkinson, *Regimental History of the Royal Hampshire Regiment*, 1950, vol.1, p.144-145

²¹⁷ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*; 1879, vol.2, p.59; James Murray writing to the Master General of Ordnance, 10th May 1793

²¹⁸ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*; 1879, vol.2, p.60; F.W. Hamilton, *Origin & History of the Grenadier Guards*, 1874, vol.2, p.286

²¹⁹ Brown, *op. cit.*, p.71-2; F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.20, Letter 19; It is not clear whether Brown refers to the Flank battalion of the Guards brigade or that of the line brigade, which were both engaged. On this day the Royal Artillery's casualties were 3 rank & file, killed and 1 lieutenant (Wiltshire Wilson, attached to Line Flank Battalion), 7 rank & file, wounded (London Gazette, 3rd Sept 1793). Wright commented "*that both he (Thornton) and Lt. Wilson behaved very well*".

²²⁰ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.53, Letter 58; see also J.W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 2004, vol.4, pt.1, p.249-250 & C.T. Atkinson, *Regimental History of the Royal Hampshire Regiment*, 1950, vol.1, p.138-9; none of the sources state how far Lawson took his guns away from the battalion he was supporting!

²²¹ Anon, *A Journal kept in the British Army, from the landing of the troops under the command of Earl Moira, at Ostend, in June 1794, to their*

Boxtel, 15th September 1794;

“Sir Ralph Abercromby was pleased personally to thank Capt. C. [Captain-Lieutenant Robert Crawford, Royal Artillery in Ireland] for three times dispersing the enemy’s bussars, and bringing up the rear of the reserve, by the rapid and well-directed fire of the guns under his command” (i.e. the battalion guns of the 42nd Foot, the Black Watch).²²²

Geldermalsen, 8th January 1795;

Corporal James Field (William Wright’s Company, Royal Artillery in Ireland) has left the following account of service with the battalion guns of the 28th Foot. On this day, Major General Lord Cathcart led the 14th, 27th and 28th Regiments of Foot, plus the Uhlans Britannique, in an attack on the French garrison of Geldermalsen, when *“the British and French repulsed each other 4 times during the day”*. The 14th Foot and 27th Foot had led the attack with the 28th Foot coming up in support later.²²³ Unsurprisingly, therefore, Corporal Field’s account is laced with a degree of hyperbole;

*“We dashed over, and took our station. The battle had been raging for hours some miles in front. The day was clear, without a cloud. We had not been long in line, before our regiment, the 28th, and a few others, were ordered out. When we came to Buren, Lord Cathcart met us, and cried out, “My brave boys advance quickly we have great need of you.” We put our horses to the gallop for about two miles. When we came to the edge of the river, such a sight! – the English retreating, broken in mass, on the ice; the French pouring in their fire on them, and they falling in numbers. We unlimbered and loaded, but could not fire, nor could one fresh line form, till the broken line had passed. We then slapped at them, and fired several rounds from each gun, before the regiments could form or commence firing. This the enemy did not expect. They halted, and brought two guns to face ours; but they did not stand long. From the time we entered, the battle did not last an hour. The French gave way and fled out of the town. O! what a sight did the ice and field of battle present! Not a spot to step on without treading on the dead or dying.”*²²⁴

Lord Cathcart’s report makes no mention of any disorder amongst the British infantry but reports some 140 killed, wounded and missing. He did however commend the action of the battalion guns of the 28th Foot;

*“The 28th could not be placed so as to cover this passage effectually, without being exposed to a heavy fire, which they returned in the most soldier like manner. Their fire, and that of their guns, again cleared the village.”*²²⁵

In the light of Gardiner’s comments regarding the movement of the battalion guns, this account clearly shows the battalion guns being moved into action using their limbers rather than by hand. Another example of a limber being used under fire is given in Captain Kean’s court martial.²²⁶

Lent, January 10th 1795;

An officer serving in Coates’ brigade has left us another stirring account of a battalion gun in action under heavy pressure from the Fench, at Lent near Nijmegen;

*“We lost a number of our brave men in this retreat, which was continued an hour before the piquet joined the brigade, it being formed on the road near the village of Elst, where about twelve o’clock the engagement became general. The heavy fire of grape shot which was kept up by our field pieces, made great havock amongst the enemy, who concealed themselves as much as possible in the woods and behind the dykes, from whence they kept up a very heavy and incessant fire, and as their numbers were everywhere increasing as ours diminished, they very resolutely determined to take our field pieces which so annoyed them, and accordingly advanced upon that which was the nearest them, with such spirit as to come within 30 yards of the gun, but a lucky discharge of grape, dropped upwards of 20 of them at that distance, and the gun was brought off, though two artillery officers (Lieuts. Walker and Legg,) with the Captain of Grenadiers (Vaughan) were wounded at the gun, together with many of the 59th Grenadier company who had charge of it.”*²²⁷

return to England the following year, 1796, p.33; the howitzers are likely to have been from the Park or Reserve artillery, but based on other evidence are likely to have been only 2 or at most 4 in number.(q.v.)

²²² J. Philippart, *Royal Military Calendar*, vol.5, 1820, p.391

²²³ W. Copeland Trimble, *The Historical Record of the 27th Inniskilling Regiment*, 1876, p.45; Anon, *The Historical Record of the Fourteenth or Buckinghamshire Regiment of Foot*, 1845, p.51-2; R.W. Gould, *Mercenaries of the Napoleonic Wars*, 1995, p.27

²²⁴ R. Huston & J. Field, *The life of faith in the Son of God illustrated in the Memoirs of Mr. James Field*, 1851, p.12

²²⁵ *The Universal Magazine*, 1795, vol.96, p.72-73; JSAHR, vol.29 (1951), p.151

²²⁶ The National Archives, Kew, WO71/168; Kean’s court martial re action at St. Michaelsgestel, 15th September 1794; “in the act of limbering up, one of the horses received a wound in the thigh by a 12lb shot and was disabled”

²²⁷ Anon, *A journal kept in the British Army, from the landing of the troops under the command of Earl Moira, at Ostend, in June 1794, to their return to England in the following year, 1796*, p.154



SOJ-6(19) Major Jesse Wright and the Brigading of the Duke of York's Battalion Guns

Garry David Wills (Caseshot Publishing)

The brigading of several battalion gun detachments is acknowledged as an established practise by Adye in 1802.²²⁸ The benefits of using guns in brigades rather than dispersed amongst the infantry battalions was discussed in Parliament in 1779, following experience gained in the American War of Independence. In particular it was asserted that;

*“The forming artillery into brigades, in preference to detaching two guns to each battalion, has been constantly practised in most services during last war, under the ablest men, and it is productive of many advantages, as the brigades, by that means, either singly or united, fall under the command of a proportionable number of officers. The service is carried on with greater regularity, and the effect of the fire becomes much more formidable than when scattered along the front of the line.”*²²⁹

Despite this, in his “Remarks”, Augustus Frazer states that that no brigading of the battalion guns was attempted during the 1793-5 campaigns nor before 1803.²³⁰

Major Jesse Wright (1st Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) features regularly in the accounts of the artillery in the 1793/4 campaigns. He was the original commander of the Duke of York's artillery before Congreve arrived.²³¹ Major Wright's role throughout 1793 and until his death, on the 17th May 1794, was to command the battalion guns, initially of the Guards Brigade, the guns attached to which he regularly referred to as “his brigade”, and subsequently of the army as a whole, thereby including those of the line regiments with the Duke of York, the 14th, 37th and 53rd Regiments of Foot.²³² Wright's letters make it clear that he commanded the battalion gun detachments both on the battlefield and with respect to the personnel appointed to these detachments. However this organisational brigading does not necessarily mean that the guns of his brigade served together on the battlefield. Duncan gives an example of implied tactical battlefield co-ordination based largely on the presence of Major Wright with the battalion gun detachments. The example is at St. Amand in May 1793. In this case, Duncan suggests Major Wright commanded four guns of the Guards brigade as a single battery, used for counter-battery fire.²³³ Murray also states that Major Jesse Wright was in attendance with 4 of the 8 battalion guns of the Guards Brigade, but while he saw Watson in action, he implies that the other 2 guns were elsewhere.²³⁴ Wright's letters endorse this somewhat, suggesting that, in this example at least, the guns remained with their respective battalions, which were actually on different missions.²³⁵ Finally in this example, if brigading the guns tactically was the objective we might have expected that Wright would have also employed the guns of the 3rd Foot Guards, which were available.

²²⁸ S. Ayde, *The Bombardier and Pocket Gunner*, 1802, p.24

²²⁹ J. Stockdale(ed), *The Parliamentary Register: or, History of the proceedings and ...*, vol.12(1802), p.134; Part of General Burgoyne's evidence following the defeat at Saratoga. He cites the artillery commander, Major General William Phillips, as the source of this recommendation.

²³⁰ *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*, vol.8(1874), p.215; A. Frazer, Remarks on the organisation of the Corps of Artillery in the British Service, 1818, p.50-54

²³¹ A. Burne, *The Noble Duke of York*, 1949, p.47; Kane, *op. cit.*, p.6

²³² F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.5, 11, 12, 25, 32, 36, 37, 45

²³³ F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1879, vol.2, p.59; see also Anon., *An Accurate & Impartial Narrative of the War by an Officer of the Guards ... & Poetical Sketches of the Campaigns of 1793 & .. 1794 & .. 1795*, 1796, vol.1, p.29; Burne, *op. cit.*, p.49 - talks of Wright leading 4 guns.

²³⁴ Anon, *The European Magazine*, 1793, vol.23, Jan. to June 1793, p.394-5; Francis Duncan, *op.cit.*, vol.2, p.59

²³⁵ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.7-8, Letter 8; “I was with them [Fenwick & Watson] both occasionally” other parts of the same letter could be interpreted that the guns were together “we fired roundshot from these four guns for about 2 hours”, but we know that the Guards Flank Battalion & the Coldstream Guards were on separate missions; Brown, *op. cit.*, p.16; see also Fenwick's letters in J.H. Leslie, *JSAHR*, vol.8, no.31, p.25, 1929

A second potential example occurred before Valenciennes on the 25th June 1793, although Brown is rather vague in his reference to Wright commanding a “some new batteries”.²³⁶

Wright’s letters also give other examples of him supporting/overseeing the deployment of single detachments of battalion guns, for example with the 1st Foot Guards at Linselles and near Dunkerque in August 1793.²³⁷ Linselles is a particularly good example as the three Foot Guards battalions attacked two redoubts in a single line with the 1st Foot Guards on the right, the 3rd Foot Guards in the centre and the Coldstream Guards on the left, across a frontage of approximately 900 yards. Wright’s letters make it clear that he stationed himself with De Ginkle and the guns supporting the First Guards on the right.²³⁸

Wright was mortally wounded, losing his leg, on the 17th May 1794, at Turcoing.²³⁹ Wright’s death begs the question of what became of his role as Brigade commander of the Guards Brigade battalion guns and those of the army. A surviving manuscript order book shows that the battalion guns were organisationally grouped under supervising captains and that there was more than one captain in this role.²⁴⁰ The sources contain tantalising glimpses of the possible identities of these battalion gun brigade commanders as the army expanded to ultimately seven brigades of infantry, for example;

- a) *Captain-Lieutenant William Borthwick* was associated with the 27th Foot²⁴¹ in September 1793 and with the 53rd Foot of Stewart’s Brigade in October 1793 at Nieuport.²⁴²
- b) *Captain Thomas Trotter* was associated with the 53rd Foot of Fox’s Brigade of the Line in May 1794.²⁴³
- c) *Captain-Lieutenant Archibald Robertson* (4th Battⁿ, Royal Artillery) was named as commander of the guns of Stewart’s Brigade (12th, 38th & 55th Foot) at Walheim Bridge, in July 1794.²⁴⁴ He was later associated with the 12th Foot of Balfour’s 3rd Brigade in September 1794.²⁴⁵
- d) *Captain George Wilson* was associated with the battalion guns of the 3rd Foot of Stewart’s 1st Brigade, at Druten, October 1794.²⁴⁶

By October 1794, based on Wright’s letters we would expect six brigade captains for the battalions guns of the army, one per infantry brigade (1 guard and 5 line).²⁴⁷ Thus, although Frazer appears to assert the contrary, it is clear that the battalion guns of the Duke of York’s army were brigaded at least from an organisational point of view. This suggests that Frazer’s remarks apply strictly to the tactical use of the guns. While Wright’s letters and these sources demonstrate that the battalion gun brigade captains were tactically active, at least in these instances, there are no convincing recorded instances of the battalion guns being brigaded tactically (i.e. fighting in a groups of 4-6 guns) in this campaign.

²³⁶ Robert Brown, *op. cit.*, p.40; Army Lists 1794 and 1795; this probably refers to the allocation of battalion guns to the redoubts, which formed part of the siege works - an example of an order to this effect during the subsequent siege of Dunkerque can be found in Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entry dated 27th August 1793.

²³⁷ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.19, Letters 18 & 19

²³⁸ F. Maurice, *The History of the Scots Guards from the creation of the regiment to the eve of the great war*, 1934, vol.2, p.206-7

²³⁹ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.7-8, Letter 8; National Army Museum, London, *Manuscript journal of Capt J C Atherley, Coldstream Guards, Flanders, Apr to Dec 1794*,

²⁴⁰ Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entry dated 5th August 1793; “Captains commanding brigades of battalion guns will give the necessary orders for them to join their respective regiments” – at this time there were 6 British infantry battalions in two brigades, so presumably there were two captains commanding brigades of battalion guns – Wright and probably Capt. Lt. William Borthwick –see entry dated 16th September 1793

²⁴¹ Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entry dated 16th September 1793 - “Lt. Fead with 2 non-commissioned officers and 14 men to join the 27th Regiment with two light 6-pdrs and will march tomorrow morning at nine o’clock from the Park. Lt. Fead’s guns to be under the command of Captain Borthwick.”

²⁴² Richard Cannon, *Historical Record of the 53rd or the Shropshire Regiment of Foot*, 1849, p.6

²⁴³ Robert Brown, *op.cit.*, p.156; Captain Trotter was most senior RA officer present after Congreve, Stewart and Huddleston, he was a Major in the Army from 1/3/74 and was also Brigade Major of the artillery in Duke of York’s army; see *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*, vol.15 (1888), p.521

²⁴⁴ John Adams, *A view of universal history, from the creation to the present time ...*, vol.3, p.362; Robertson was Capt-Lt in July 1794.

²⁴⁵ National Archives, Kew, WO71/168; Proceedings of Captain Kean’s Court Martial; Robertson is incorrectly but perhaps understandably named “Robertson” in this document. Lt. Hawker seems to have been the detachment commander. On 15th September 1794, Hawker and Robertson were each responsible for a single gun supporting the 12th Foot.

²⁴⁶ Richard Cannon, *Historical record of the Third Regiment of Foot or the Buffs*, 1837, p.207; George Wilson was the most junior of the Royal Artillery captains serving with the Duke of York. In Apr 1794 George was part of the Park, commanding a Brigade of 4 12-pdrs – see proceedings of his court martial (National Archives, Kew, WO71/167)

²⁴⁷ J.W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 2004, vol.4, pt.1, p.304



SOJ-6(20)

British Battalion Guns in the Netherlands in 1793-5; Concluding Remarks, Appendices and Bibliography.

Garry David Wills (Caseshot Publishing)

The study of the muster rolls & returns has proved useful in elucidating the role of the Royal Artillery in supporting the infantry battalions and has helped to highlight some detail regarding the operation of the system of battalion guns.

Duncan's dismissal of the usefulness of the battalion guns, while directionally correct in the overall history of the Royal Artillery, overstates the case with respect to the Duke of York's campaigns in 1793 and 1794. In this campaign, the battalion guns were heavier than had been the case earlier in the century and were supplied with horses, limbers and sometimes even drivers, rather than relying on the infantry and gunners to move them by hand. While Frazer's opinions cannot be ignored, he was writing from the perspective of twenty years experience in the elite Royal Horse Artillery, the prime beneficiaries of the extensive experimentation throughout the second half of the 18th Century.

During this campaign the shortage of drivers demonstrated by the muster rolls, will have had the effect of the role being fulfilled, in perhaps a majority of cases, by the infantry and artillerymen attached to the guns. This presumably meant that the limbers were more likely to be kept close to the guns, as in the examples mentioned above.

Compared to the later Napoleonic period, cannon were relatively numerous in the Duke of York's British contingent of the Combined Army in 1793-1795, amounting to approximately 2-3 guns per thousand troops throughout 1794. In April 1794, the battalion guns amounted to only half of the available guns.²⁴⁸ In October 1794, when the army was much larger, the proportion of guns attached to the infantry battalions rose to 70% of the total guns available.²⁴⁹ Consequently, the reserve or position artillery, i.e. those field guns excluding those attached to the infantry battalions, was relatively small, (12 guns & 4 howitzers in September 1793²⁵⁰; 12 guns & 2 howitzers in April 1794; 20 guns & 4 howitzers in October 1794) and was often itself only deployed in small groups of 2 or 4 guns.²⁵¹ By comparison, throughout the Peninsular War Wellington had an average of just over one gun per thousand troops, half the level he enjoyed at Waterloo. Thus in the Peninsular, Wellington fought his battles with a total artillery that was only 15-20% greater than the Duke of York's reserve or position artillery, on a like for like basis, and all of Wellington's guns were used in direct support of the infantry and cavalry.²⁵²

To understand why battalion guns were used in the campaigns of the 1790's (and given a post of honour), it is perhaps worth noting that at least one contemporary commentator viewed them as an "admirable improvement" on the artillery of the beginning of the 18th Century.²⁵³ Even Frazer acknowledges that the period of 1790's, was a period of experimentation with improvements in the system, citing specifically the

²⁴⁸ *The British Military Library or Journal*, vol.1, 1799, p.301;

²⁴⁹ National Archives, Kew, WO1/170 p.869 reproduced in G.D. Wills, *Smooth Bore Ordnance Journal*, 4(16), 2012, p.75; At this time there were 26 British battalions with the army.

²⁵⁰ Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entry dated September 16th 1793

²⁵¹ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.49, Letter 51; Brown, op. cit., p.175 & 186; Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA26 – Manuscript Order Book, France & Flanders 1793; entries dated 5th, 9th & 17th August 1793

²⁵² *British Military Library*, vol.1, 1799, p.301; National Archives, Kew, WO1/170 p.869; National Archives, Kew, WO1/170 p.555; L. von Sichert et al, *Geschichte der königlich-hannoverschen Armee*, 1871, vol.4, p.349; Digby Smith, *Napoleonic Wars Databook*, 1998, p.267,327,346,358,362,380,426,500,518,540; M. Calvert & P. Young, *Dictionary of Battles 1715-1815*, 1979, p.288; B.P. Hughes, *Firepower*, 1974, p.103; H.W.L. Hime, in *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*, vol.5(1867), p.272

²⁵³ *British Military Library or Journal*, vol.1, 1799, p.194; George Hewett, *Instructions relative to the Baggage and Marches of the Army*, 1797, p.19 - "The battalion guns will always march at the head of the regiment"

militarization of the drivers, the use of limbers to carry the gunners, improved gun carriages, double rather than single draft and the new ammunition “cars”.²⁵⁴

Given the pre-existing evidence of the benefits of brigading battalion guns tactically, and the existence of such brigades organisationally with named brigade captains, the lack of evidence for the tactical deployment of the battalion guns by brigade, suggests that the Duke of York’s artillery commanders still believed that “the artillery was of much more use in close support at short range than as artillery of position”.²⁵⁵ Alternatively the more senior infantry battalion commanders may have refused to allow the battalion gun brigade captains to concentrate their guns, but we currently have no direct evidence in support of this option.

While the French equipped their new demi-brigades with battalion guns as they were formed in 1793-1795, the road to the nineteenth century had been demonstrated by the extensive use of the French horse artillery, or artillery *légère*, in close support of their numerous *tirailleurs* and battalion columns, albeit often in sections of 3 or 4 guns, during the conquest of the Austrian Netherlands and the United Provinces in 1793-1795.²⁵⁶ Consequently, the opportunity missed by the British horse artillery in Flanders was commented on by officers with the Duke of York, who could also observe the horse artillery of their allies, the Hanoverians.²⁵⁷

Discussion of the use of artillery can be divided between the alternatives of providing close support to the infantry and cavalry and of massing at the point of decision.²⁵⁸ The ability of battalion guns to provide close support to the infantry may have been improved but this did not address the key issue of the loss of guns from the reserve artillery, thus precluding the massing of guns at the point of decision.

Ultimately, Hime’s thesis that the increasing mobility of the guns rather than increasing firepower was the key to the development of the effectiveness of the Royal Artillery²⁵⁹, set up a dynamic between the two models of offering close support to the infantry, in which the battalion guns could not compete with the Royal Horse Artillery. However, while acknowledging the obvious advantages of the latter, the discussion in the latter half of the 19th Century and thereafter has done a considerable disservice to the men who led and manned the battalion guns of the Duke of York’s army.

In summary, whatever the short comings of the battalion gun system, the evidence tends to suggest that the system was under continual development throughout the 1790’s and that it was not as “practically useless” as later commentators asserted. The system certainly should not, in itself, be considered a significant cause of the failure of the Allied armies to defeat Republican France in 1793-5.

In closing I would like to acknowledge the help provided by Paul Evans and the Staff of the Archives at the Firepower Museum in Woolwich Arsenal, the Staffs of the Templar Study Centre, National Army Museum in Chelsea, the British Library in London, Grantham Library and the National Archives in Kew. I would also like to acknowledge the help of Paul Demet who has reviewed the final draft and provided the reference for Thomas Fenwick’s letters.

²⁵⁴ A. Frazer, *Remarks on the organisation of the Corps of Artillery in the British Service*, 1818, p.52-57

²⁵⁵ B.P. Hughes, *Firepower*, 1974, p.85; Hughes uses these words to summarise the attitudes at the time of Dettingen in 1743.

²⁵⁶ J.A. Lynn, *The Bayonets of the Republic*, 1984, p.213 ; P. Griffith, *The Art of War in Revolutionary France 1789-1802*, 1998, p.236-7

²⁵⁷ F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2, p.53, Letters 51, 58; Firepower Museum Archives, Woolwich Arsenal, London; RA 20/217; Letter from Col. St. Leger to Congreve dated 10th December 1793, regarding the success of the deployment of “two long 6-pdrs drawn by 6 horses carrying 52 rounds of ammunition in their limber box and six men riding 3 upon the limber boxes and 3 upon the gun carriage of each piece” relative to the Hanoverian “flying artillery” near Orchies.

²⁵⁸ J.B.A. Bailey, *Field Artillery and Firepower*, 2004, p.178

²⁵⁹ H.W.L. Hime, in *Proceedings of the Royal Artillery Institution*, vol.8(1871), p.358



SOJ6(21)

Appendices; British Artillery in the Austrian Netherlands and the United Provinces, 1794; Returns and Muster Rolls.

Garry David Wills (Caseshot Publishing)

Appendix A; Returns

Table 12: Duke of York’s Monthly Return 5th August 1794²⁶⁰

	Officers	Sergeants	Drummers	Rank & File Fit for Duty	Rank & File Sick	Total Rank & File
Artillery	34	19	9	711	51	762

Table 13: Duke of York’s Monthly Return for the Artillery on 1st September 1794.²⁶¹

		Total
Present;		
Officers	3 Lt-Col, 10 Capt, 23 Lts, 9 Staff	45
Sergeants	21	21
Drummers	12	12
Rank & File	398 present for duty, 50 sick, 45 prisoners of war, 322 on command, 30 batmen	845
Since last return	85 joined and 2 dead.	-
GRAND TOTAL		923 men of all ranks

Of the 27 infantry battalions listed in this same return, 11 recorded their own men as “with artillery”, either manning the battalion guns or acting as drivers in the artillery park²⁶²; they were;

1st Foot Guards-33,	Coldstream Guards- 28,	3rd Foot Guards- 25,
8th Foot- 23,	12th Foot – 19,	14th Foot- 32,
37th Foot- 17,	38th Foot- 20,	44th Foot- 5,
53rd Foot- 32,	55th Foot- 20.	

This is a total of 254 men “with artillery.”²⁶³

One feature of the September return is that the artillery has, proportionately, twice as many men absent as “prisoners of war” as the infantry battalions. The artillery accounted for 45 of the total of 470 prisoners of war, with the infantry averaging 16 prisoners for each of the 26 battalions for which data is provided. However, this result is within the natural variation of the data, as the infantry battalions vary from 0 (15 battalions) to 191 (53rd Foot).²⁶⁴

²⁶⁰ National Archives, Kew, WO1/170 p.137

²⁶¹ National Archives, Kew, WO1/170 p.555

²⁶² J. Gurwood, *The Despatches of the Duke of Wellington during his Various Campaigns*, 1844, vol.1, p.21; “To the Adj. Gen. Camp, 10th Sept. 1794. Ten men went this morning from the 33rd regt. to the artillery park to act as drivers. I shall be very much obliged to you if you will inform H.R.H. the Commander in Chief that, until that time, I could not find 10 proper men who would consent to quit their regiment.”

²⁶³ A. Frazer, *Remarks on the organisation of the Corps of Artillery in the British Service*, 1818, p.50; Frazer estimates that half the gunners manning the battalion guns were infantrymen. These men were referred to as “additional gunners” by both Wright and Fenwick - see J.H. Leslie, *JS.AHR*, vol.8, no.31, p.16, 1929

²⁶⁴ 45 is the figure in the return for “other ranks”, the September muster rolls increase this number to 52 for all ranks.

Appendix B: Muster Rolls of the Royal Regiment of Artillery

The musters were held on the 8th or 9th September 1794 at “the camp” or “the camp near Berlicom” or “Berlikom”. Berlicom was the main Headquarters for the Duke of York at this time and is near the fortress city of Bois-le-Duc or s’Hertogenbosch. Where the names of the officers are not given in full in the muster rolls, I have added them, in parenthesis, using the 1794 & 1795 Army Lists.

1st Battalion²⁶⁵

Captain-Lieutenant John Bradbridge’s Company

Captain George Glasgow (in England), Captain-Lieutenant John Bradbridge, First Lieutenants Alexander Watson & Nathaniel Foy (both on Command), Second Lieutenant John Eaves²⁶⁶, 5 Serjeants²⁶⁷, 4 Corporals, 6 Bombardiers, 4 1st Gunners, 85 2nd Gunners, 2 Drummers & 17 Drivers

Of these;

- 1 Officer, 2 Serjeants, 2 Corporals, 1 Bombardier and 5 Gunners are marked as being in England,
- 2 Officers, 2 Serjeants, 2 Corporals, 2 Bombardiers, 58 Gunners and 17 Drivers are on “Command”,
- 1 Bombardier and 5 Gunners are marked “Duty”,
- 2 Gunners are marked “Guard”,
- 1 Gunner and 1 Drummer are “sick”,
- 14 Gunners are “Prisoners of war”.

Captain George Wilson’s Company

Captain George Wilson, Captain-Lieutenant Wiltshire Wilson (Prisoner of War), First Lieutenants Robert Fead & Thomas Downman (Prisoner of War), Second Lieutenant Charles F. Napier (England), 5 Serjeants, 4 Corporals, 6 Bombardiers, 2 1st Gunners, 84 2nd Gunners, 13 Drivers and 3 Drummers.

Of these;

- 1 Corporal & 6 gunners are marked “Battⁿ Guns”,
- 2 Officers and 2 Gunners are Prisoners of War,
- 2 Serjeants, 1 Corporal, 12 Gunners & 3 Drivers are “on Duty”,
- 3 Gunners are on “Command”,
- 1 Officer, 1 Corporal and 4 Gunners in “England”,
- 1 Corporal, 1 Gunner and 1 Driver are “Sick” & 1 Serjeant is dead,
- 8 Gunners are marked “To Tenby”.

Captain William Borthwick’s Company

Captain James Winter (England), Captain-Lieutenant William Borthwick, First Lieutenants Bridges D. Hooke (Leave) & William Robe, 5 Serjeants, 4 Corporals, 6 Bombardiers, 2 1st Gunners, 85 2nd Gunners, 3 Drummers & 14 Drivers.

Of these;

- 1 Officer, 2 Serjeants, 1 Corporal, 7 Gunners and 1 Drummer are in “England”,
- 2 Serjeants, 2 Corporals, 4 Bombardiers, 32 Gunners and 7 Drivers are on “Command”,
- 1 Serjeant, 1 Bombardier, 5 Gunners and 3 Drivers are marked “Duty”,
- 3 Gunners are marked “Guard”; 1 Officer is on “leave”; 13 Gunners and 2 Drivers are “Sick”,
- 1 Gunner is “Dead”
- 10 Gunners & 1 Driver are “Prisoners of War”

²⁶⁵ National Archives, Kew, WO10/266

²⁶⁶ This officer does not appear in the Army Lists of 1794 or 1795 nor in Kane

²⁶⁷ I have chosen to retain the contemporary spelling of serjeant throughout this document, as it appears in the Muster Rolls & Returns.

4th Battalion²⁶⁸

Captain Francis Laye's Company

Captain Francis Laye (England), Captain-Lieutenant Edmund Lemoine, First Lieutenants James Hawker (on command) & Turtliff Boger, Second Lieutenant Hugh Fraser (England), 5 Serjeants, 4 Corporals, 6 Bombardiers, 1 1st Gunner, 73 2nd Gunners, 3 Drummers and 23 Drivers.

Of these;

- 2 Officers, 3 Serjeants, 2 Corporals, 4 Bombardiers, 25 Gunners, 2 Drummers & 1 Driver are “in England”,
- 1 Officer, 1 Bombardier, 20 Gunners & 3 Drivers are “on Command”,
- 1 Corporal, 4 Gunners & 2 Drivers are marked “Duty”,
- 1 Serjeant, 2 Gunners & 3 Drivers are “Sick”,
- 1 Bombardier is marked “Wounded & missing”,
- 3 Drivers are “Prisoners of War”.

Captain Thomas Trotter's Company

Captain Thomas Trotter, Captain-Lieutenant Archibald Robertson (Command), First Lieutenants Henry Phillott (Leave) & Augustus Fraser²⁶⁹ (Command), Second Lieutenant Ralph Milbank (England), 5 Serjeants, 3 Corporals, 6 Bombardiers, 78 2nd Gunners, 2 Drummers & 22 Gunner-Drivers.

Of these;

- 1 Officer, 3 Serjeants, 1 Corporal, 1 Bombardier, 6 Gunners & 2 Drummers were in “England”,
- 2 Officers, 13 Gunners & 6 Drivers were on “Command”,
- 10 Gunners were “Sick”,
- 5 Gunners and 1 Driver were on “Duty”,
- 2 Gunners were “Absent without leave”,
- 1 Officer was on leave,
- 2 Corporals, 13 Gunners & 3 Drivers were “Prisoners of War”.

Captain Ashton Shuttleworth's Company

Captain A(shton) Shuttleworth, Captain-Lieutenant J(ohn) Burton (on command at Dort²⁷⁰), First Lieutenants G(eorge) A(dam) Wood & F(rederick) Walker (on command), 5 Serjeants, 4 Corporals, 6 Bombardiers, 1 1st Gunner, 89 2nd Gunners & 3 Drummers.

Of these;

- 2 Serjeants & 2 Drummers were at “Woolwich”,
- 1 Officer, 1 Serjeant, 2 Bombardiers, & 20 Gunners were “On Command”,
- 1 Officer, 1 Serjeants, 1 Corporal & 5 Gunners were “on Command at Dort”,
- 5 Gunners were “Sick”; 2 Corporals, 1 Bombardier & 10 Gunners were “on Duty”,
- 1 Corporal & 1 Drummer were “Recruiting”.

²⁶⁸ National Archives, Kew, WO10/264

²⁶⁹ In the Muster Roll & the Army List 1794 (p.216), Fraser is spelt with an “s” not a “z” as in later publications, e.g. Sabine, 1859

²⁷⁰ Modern day Dordrecht

Appendix C: Muster Rolls of the Royal Regiment of Artillery in Ireland²⁷¹

The September Muster Rolls for the three companies in the Netherlands with the Duke of York, yield the following information. The musters were held on the 8th or 9th September 1794 at “the camp” or “the camp near Berlikom” or “Berlikom.”

Captain John Arabin’s Company

Captain John Daniel Arabin, Captain-Lieutenant Hugh Swayne (gone to Ireland), First Lieutenants James Shortall & Walter Blake, Second Lieutenant Robert Francis (Bⁿ Guns), 2 Serjeants, 4 Corporals; 4 Bombardiers, 18 1st Gunners, 63 2nd Gunners; 2 Drummers.

Of these,

- 1 officer, 1 serjeant, 4 corporals & 40 gunners are marked as “Bⁿ Guns”,
- 1 corporal and 5 gunners are on “Command”, which presumably refers to different duties from battⁿ guns,
- 2 gunners and 1 drummer are marked “Sick”.

Captain William Wright’s Company

Captain William Wright, First Lieutenants Alexander Armstrong²⁷²(Battⁿ Guns) & Richard Legge²⁷³(Battⁿ Guns), Second Lieutenant Peter Kettlewell(Battⁿ Guns), 2 Serjeants, 4 Corporals, 4 Bombardiers, 18 1st Gunners, 65 2nd Gunners, 2 Drummers.

Of these,

- 3 officers, 2 corporals & 22 gunners are marked as “Battⁿ Guns”,
- 1 serjeant and 6 gunners are “On board ship”,
- 1 serjeant, 6 gunners and 1 drummer are “in the [artillery] Park”,
- 1 corporal and 6 gunners are sick; 1 gunner is “sent to England”,
- 1 drummer has “deserted” and 1 gunner is “Dead”.

Captain William Buchanan’s Company

Captain William Buchanan²⁷⁴ (on leave at Alost), First Lieutenants Robert Crawford (Bⁿ Guns), Robert Thornhill(Bⁿ Guns) & Poole Westrope²⁷⁵ (Bⁿ Guns), Second Lieutenants Stewel Benson²⁷⁶ (Sick) & Thomas Fleming (Bⁿ Guns), 2 Serjeants, 4 Corporals, 4 Bombardiers, 18 1st Gunners, 65 2nd Gunners, 2 Drummers

Of these,

- 4 officers, 1 corporal and 39 gunners are marked as “Bⁿ Guns”,
- 1 corporal and 6 gunners are “on Guard”,
- 2 gunners have “Deserted”,
- 1 officer, 1 drummer and 5 gunners are “Sick”,
- 2 gunners are “on the March”,
- 1 gunner is a “Prisoner” and 1 gunner is “Dead”.

²⁷¹ National Archives, Kew, WO10/269. The name of the Royal Artillery in Ireland is reported in various ways in the literature, I have chosen to use the form shown in the Army Lists, 1793 & 1794 (both p.219), 1795 (p.273) & the last entry in 1801 (p.398)

²⁷² *The Army List for 1795* (p.273-274) includes three Armstrongs in the Royal Artillery in Ireland; Alexander was Captain from 16/12/93, Henry was Captain Lieutenant from 1/7/94 and E. Armstrong was a 1st Lieutenant from 1/8/94.

²⁷³ This is the more junior Richard Legge, he is not in the 1794 Army List but features in that of 1795, where he is shown as a Captain from 16/6/94.

²⁷⁴ In *the Army List of 1794 and 1795*, “Buchanan” is spelt “Buchannan”

²⁷⁵ The Muster Roll uses this incorrect spelling of Lieutenant Westropp’s surname, which is correctly given in the Army Lists of both 1795(p.274) &1798 (p.367). The 1795 List has Westropp as a Captain-Lieutenant from 1/7/94.

²⁷⁶ *The Army List for 1795*, gives this officer’s name as Stowell Benson

Bibliography

- Anon., *A Journal kept in the British Army, from the landing of the troops under the command of Earl Moira, at Ostend, in June 1794, to their return to England the following year*, 1796
- Anon., *An Accurate & Impartial Narrative of the War by an Officer of the Guards ... & Poetical Sketches of the Campaigns of 1793 & .. 1794 & ..1795*, 1796
- Anon., *The Historical Record of the Fourteenth or Buckinghamshire Regiment of Foot*, 1845
- C.T. Atkinson, *Regimental History of the Royal Hampshire Regiment*, 1950
- S. Ayde, *The Bombardier and Pocket Gunner*, 1802
- J.B.A. Bailey, *Field Artillery and Firepower*, 2004
- R. Brown, *An Impartial Journal of a Detachment from the Brigade of Foot Guards commencing 25th February 1793 and ending 9th May 1795*, 2006
- J.A. Browne, *England's Artillerymen*, 1865
- A. Burne, *The Noble Duke of York*, 1949
- M. Calvert & P. Young, *Dictionary of Battles 1715-1815*, 1979
- R. Cannon, *Historical record of the Fifteenth, or the Kings Regiment of Light Dragoons*, 1759-1841, 1841
- R. Cannon, *Historical Record of the Fifty Third or the Shropshire Regiment of Foot.. to 1848*, 1849
- J.J. Crooks, *History of the Royal Irish Regiment of Artillery*, 1914
- W. Courthope(ed), *De Brett's Complete Peerage of the UK & Ireland*, 1838
- P. David, *A History of the Campaigns of General Pichegru: containing the operations of the armies of the North, and of the Sambre and the Meuse, from March 1794 to March 1795*, 1796
- A.L. Dawson, P.L. Dawson, S. Summerfield, *Napoleonic Artillery*, 2007
- F. Duncan, *History of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1879, vol. 2
- A. Forbes, *The Black Watch*, 1896
- J.W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, 2004, vol. 4, pt. 1
- A. Frazer, *Remarks on the organisation of the Corps of Artillery in the British Service*, 1818
- R.W. Gardiner, *Observations on the prospective benefits derivable from the incorporation of the artillery with the cavalry and infantry of the army..*, 1856
- R.W. Gould, *Mercenaries of the Napoleonic Wars*, 1995
- P. Groves, *History of the 42nd or Royal Highlanders, or "Black Watch"*, 1893
- J. Gurwood, *The Despatches of the Duke of Wellington during his Various Campaigns*, 1844
- F.W. Hamilton, *Origin & History of the Grenadier Guards*, 1874, vol. 2
- H.W.L. Hime, *Stray Military Papers*, 1897
- R. Huston & J. Field, *The life of faith in the Son of God illustrated in the Memoirs of Mr. James Field*, 1851
- LT Jones, *An Historical Journal of the British Campaign; In the Year 1794; with the Retreat Through Holland, in the Year 1795*, 1797
- J. Kane, *List of the Officers of the Royal Regiment of Artillery*, 1815 & 1900
- M.E.S. Laws, *Battery Records of the Royal Artillery, 1716-1859*, 1952
- D. MacKinnon, *Origins & Services of the Coldstream Guards*, 1833, vol. 2
- L. Maclean, *Indomitable Colonel*, 1988
- F. Maurice, *The History of the Scots Guards; from the creation of the regiment to the eve of the great war*, 1934, vol. 2
- J. Philippart, *Royal Military Calendar*, 1820
- R.W. Phipps, *The Armies of the First French Republic*, 2011, vol.1
- E. Sabine, *Letters of Colonel Sir Augustus Simon Frazer K.C.B.*, 1859
- L. von Sichart et al, *Geschichte der königlich-bannoverschen Armee*, 1871
- Digby Smith, *Napoleonic Wars Databook*, 1998
- W. Copeland Trimble, *The Historical Record of the 27th Inniskilling Regiment*, 1876
- Sir H. Verney, *Journals & Correspondence of Sir Harry Calvert, Comprising the campaigns in Flanders and Holland in 1793-4*, 1853
- F.A. Whinyates(ed.), *The Wright Letters*, 1901-2