

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

History Presentations

Department of History

10-17-2005

Engendering War: Military Masculinities and the Making of Britain's Eighteenth Century American Empire

Peter Way
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/historypres>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Way, Peter. (2005). Engendering War: Military Masculinities and the Making of Britain's Eighteenth Century American Empire.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/historypres/2>

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of History at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Presentations by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.



Monday, October 17th, 2005
1:30 p.m.

Sky Bank Room (201A)

Bowen-Thompson Student Union

Peter Way

Engendering War: Military Masculinities and the Making of Britain's Eighteenth Century American Empire

Why, until very recently, has soldiering been an almost exclusively male profession, despite the great differences in historical time and place?

How did the gender conventions of eighteenth century civil society affect the military world?

In what ways did soldiers absorb and contest the dominant gender models supplied by popular culture and formalized by their commanding officers?

Military history unconsciously accepts the gendered logic of warfare; that is, violent contestation is natural, unavoidable, foundational for national character, and laudable when performed by men. As a result, there has been little exploration of the ways in which notions of gender have impacted on warfare itself and molded camp life. Yet, the rhetoric of masculinity and femininity has always been used to encourage men to military involvement and to draw them into harm's way; it also excludes women from warfare as other than victims, leading to a vital neglect of the role of women in the military. Gender conventions met resistance in the real life world of the Seven Years' War, where soldiers and camp followers contested their prescribed roles, bringing proletarian values of sexuality, domesticity and male autonomy to bear in ways that re-defined the gendered space of the military sphere and directly challenged military discipline.

Peter Way, Associate Professor in the History Department at Bowling Green State University, is a social historian, whose research and teaching interests lie in the history of working people in North America and within the Atlantic World from the late colonial period into the 20th century. His book, *Common Labor: Workers and the Digging of North American Canals, 1780-1860* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), won the 1994 Frederick Jackson Turner Prize awarded by the Organization of American Historians. Currently a fellow at ICS, Way is writing a monograph titled *Artisans of War: Common Soldiers and the Making of Britain's American Empire in the Seven Years' War*, which seeks to place the war in the context of merchant capital and the imperial state.

Special Thanks to the Office of the Provost for Research and to the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences for their support of this work.

All events are free and open to the public. For more information, call (419) 372-0585

James Calhoun, a soldier of the 44th Regiment, lived with his wife May at Fort Oswego on Lake Ontario. In the spring of 1760, he became embroiled in a dispute with a sergeant named Cameron who knocked some rum from Calhoun's hand, deeming it "would be prejudicial" to the soldier. Calhoun argued with Cameron, while his wife came to his defense, prompting Mrs. Cameron to join the fray. Both couples were confined to the guardhouse. The commanding officer, Lieutenant Colonel Eyre, informed Cameron that "he must part with his Wife." Why Eyre took this measure is unclear, the only justification he offered being the poor quality of Mrs. Cameron's labor as his laundress, she being the "worst he has ever Employed". Eyre admitted to being "no Bishop or Pope, therefore could not take upon him to divorce the wife from the Husband, but he Swore She never Should come where he had anything of a Command."¹ Pope or not, Eyre's powers as commanding officer were extensive. The Calhouns had managed to initiate the *de facto* divorce of their company sergeant from his washerwoman wife. Four years later, they would again become involved in a marital dispute that would involve senior officers in the regiment. This time, as will be recounted, James would be sundered from his washerwoman wife May by his commanding officer.

In the experiences of the Calhouns and Camerons we catch a glimpse of the charged sexual atmosphere of army life built upon patriarchal assumptions about social order. First, it operated within entrenched lines of gender expectations, with soldiering deemed a male occupation by nature and warfare an elevated test of manhood. Second, the army's command structure imitated models of family governance. Officers constituted the patriarchs, soldiers the dependent children of the domestic unit subjugated thoroughly to the will of their paternal commanders. To achieve the military's ultimate goal of being a successful fighting force, the army appropriated patriarchal norms to facilitate the separation of men from mainstream heterosocial society in order to create a "gender" of soldiers; and to subject male warriors to a command structure, naturalized by the

age and rank hierarchies imbedded in patriarchy.

Despite the prescriptive and oppressive qualities of military patriarchalism, soldiers and camp followers in the Seven Years' War contested the gender roles established for them, bringing proletarian values of sexuality, domesticity and male autonomy to bear in ways that not only re-defined the gendered space of the martial sphere. Still, the military an unusual institution skewed toward aggression and violence, presumed masculine characteristics, that were yoked to the interest of the state. When soldier sexuality conflicted with the masculine command structure it mobilized to re-establish patriarchal control within the camps.

Military Masculinity

Military history has subconsciously accepted the gendered logic that warfare is natural, unavoidable, defining of national character, and laudable when performed by men. As a result, there has been little exploration of the ways in which notions of gender have impacted on warfare. This neglect is surprising given the fact that, despite the marked variability of both gender conventions and forms of warfare over time and between cultures, a universal gendering of war is apparent: almost without exception men have done the fighting in wars, while women have been relegated to spectators, victims, or military support roles.ⁱⁱ The designation of warfare as a masculine pursuit is the constitutive aspect of war's engendering. Why this has been the case across the millennia—whether biologically determined, culturally constructed, or both—concerns us not so much here, as does specifics of war's engendering in the eighteenth century.

Sexuality was recast in the early modern period as the needs of patriarchy altered. In Britain during the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, women were seen as sexual creatures with the potential to unman the male through their insatiable desire. This stereotype began to be replaced after 1660, with new notions of gender relations emphasizing sexual difference: men were

associated with reason and culture, and women with nature and “sensibility,” a heightened nervous and emotional responsiveness.ⁱⁱⁱ

Within the military both models of femininity can be seen at work; the misogynous variant viewed women as threatening to the male war effort, while the cult of sensibility cast women as by nature unsuited to warlike endeavor due to their emotionality and physical inferiority. Gender differentiation served fundamental military needs, mapping out “mutually informing binary oppositions such as war/peace, death/life, strong/weak, military/civilian, defenders/defended, [and] friend/enemy,” with the masculine embodying the first half of the dyads (the warlike) and the feminine the second (the pacific). The military’s unique nature as an apparatus of state-sponsored killing leads to its separation from civilian society. This process of physical and normative severance is informed and validated by gender discourse. In this way, the violence essential to warfare is naturalized and enabled.^{iv} The military thus invests not in gender distinctions primarily to privilege men over women, but appropriates such privileging to facilitate the large-scale violence deemed so crucial to national interests. In the Seven Years’ War, specifically, Britain marshaled gender differentiation to the cause of vanquishing the French and establishing a grander territorial empire.

Militaristic misogyny was a necessary complement to martial endeavor.^v Officers of the eighteenth-century British army sought to eliminate women by strictly limiting the number who could officially attach themselves to the regiments. Such actions suppressed the female presence but never came close to creating the ideal homosocial universe of masculine warlike endeavor. Simply, women have always fulfilled a valuable function in the reproduction of warfare, serving in a variety of support roles, and contributing to a domestic sphere for soldiers.^{vi} However, the masculine military power structure with its misogynistic tendencies outweighed such female agency. The army exerted more immediate and punishing control than the state did in either

Britain or the American colonies in the eighteenth century, and this discipline was applied to matters of gender relations as well as simple military infractions.

The Patriarchal Army

Understandings of masculinity have also reinforced the internal operation of the army. Officers appeal to ideals of manliness to enlist men to the military, making soldiers the manliest of men. Conferring hyper-masculinity on soldiers achieves the military objective of preparing them to kill and be killed. More directly, hierarchical models of masculine authority inform military discipline, the male-on-male power structure so central to army life.

Much of the literature on patriarchy is constructed in terms of male oppression of females, based on a binary opposition of male power and female oppression, Alexandra Shepard argues.^{vii} In early modern England patriarchy was not the same thing as manhood, and in fact was designed to subordinate men as well as women. Nor were male experiences singular, varying markedly by age, marital status, and social and economic position. As such, patriarchy constituted “rule by fathers” rather than rule by men.^{viii} In the colonies, patriarchal discourse was adapted to strengthen the powers of masters over servants and slaves.^{ix}

The army provides an appropriate institutional analogy to such subordination, soldiers being treated as other than civil beings, denied certain rights and subject to a different legal code. The military can be seen as an exaggerated manifestation of patriarchy.^x Gender notions not only provided, in the relationship of father to son, a prescriptive language of natural subordination. The patriarchal army treated soldiers as perennially young males who had not achieved their majority to legitimate their subordination.

Common soldiers, however, were not irredeemably inferior in the way that women were; as men they had the potential for action. Officers celebrated soldiers as brave and victorious as a

means of inviting or rewarding their best effort, as for example, in the song “Hot Stuff,” written in North America before the campaign of 1759 by the Lieutenant Colonel of the 47th Regiment.

Up the river St. Lawrence, our troops shall advance,
To the Grenadiers march we will teach them to dance;
Cape Breton we’ve taken, and next we will try,
At their capital to give them another black eye.^{xi}

This song is hortatory, an officer inciting his men to risk life and limb by invoking values of manliness, courage and racial superiority that the troops could embrace as Britons. Nonetheless, soldiers no doubt embraced this model of masculinity, offering as it did an essentially affirmative image of themselves. Military manliness was the psychological wage granted soldiers who in reality were largely denied most other things that defined a man in this period—a certain freedom of sexual expression, family life, economic activity, and spatial mobility.

At the same time, Shepard reminds us, it is wrong to assume that there was only one standard. Manhood does not equate to patriarchy, and could be asserted in ways that fell outside of and even conflicted with patriarchal norms.^{xii} In the case of the military, soldiers posited alternative definitions of manhood to those mandated by officer-patriarchs. They purloined aspects of heroic masculinity—toughness, courage, violence—from the interests of the state (warfare) and appropriated them to their own soldier society, where physicality among fellow troops became defining features of proletarian manhood that implicitly challenged patriarchal order. However, such resistive acts remained cordoned by the whip wielded by military justice.

Rank and File Gender Conventions

Recapturing the ordinary soldier's attitude on such gender matters is more difficult. Expressions of popular culture such as ballads and poems offer one means.^{xiii} Military ballads tended to assume the meaning of masculinity,^{xiv} but two elements were reiterated: bravery and the fraternity of drink culture. William Catton, a soldier at the capture of Martinique, penned a poem on the battle that spoke to the former: "Light *Infantry*, their Bold attempts attain'd,/ For matchless Courage, reputation gain'd;/ Our *Grenadiers* drove them from Place to Place,/ Which shews the're not *Bull* breed but *Mongrel* Race."^{xv} "A Soldier's Song" gives a more intimate glimpse into male camp life, with its appeal to the camaraderie of drink in the face of battle:

How stands the glass around,
For shame ye take no care, my boys,
Let mirth and wine abound;
The trumpets sound
Damn fear, drink on, be jolly, boys,
'Tis he, you or I!---
Cold, hot, wet or dry,
We're always bound to follow, boys,
And scorn to fly."^{xvi}

Such balladry provided soldiers with essentially positive images of themselves as men within a fraternity of arms performing extraordinary feats.

The depiction of women within military ballads revealed more conflicting messages, fluctuating between the hoary misogyny of woman as parasite, scold and flirt, and contemporary sentimentality of woman as romantic ideal. "The Camp Medley" sums up the older stereotype.

For women are whimsical; changeable things,
Their sweets, like the bees, they are mingled with stings,
They're not to be got without toil, care and cost,
They're hard to get and are easily lost. . . .
He that is single can never wear horns,
He that is single is happy,
He that is married lays upon thorns,
And always is ragged and shabby. . . .^{xvii}

The play, *The Recruiting Officer*, maintained the solution to the emasculating marriage bed was to sever such responsibilities: "We shall lead more happy lives,/By getting rid of brats and wives;/That scold and brawl both night and day,/Over the hills and far away."^{xviii} Here lies core conceits of military misogyny: that women scheme to get men and their resources, but, once got, by nature cannot remain sexually faithful. Thus, the ideal society would be an all-male one of martial endeavor and bacchanalian recreation, with military life offering its nearest equivalent.

This negative construction of female identity was counterbalanced in other contemporary songs that dwelt on the ideal of love and companionship. One expression of this was the woman who promised to wait for her man. Thus in "The Soldier's Farewell,"

Rous'd by the drum, the signal to away,
Ready to march, see Soldier Will obey;
Close to his side his much-lov'd Moll appears,
Her hair dishevel'd, red her eyes with tears:

Her belly prominent, too plainly shews,
Not vain her grief, not vain alas! Her woes. . .
Ne'er fear my dearest Molly . . .
To England soon I shall return,
With honor and with spoil;
Then banish sorrow from thy heart,
That foe to all thy charms,
For safely I shall come again
Unto thy faithful arms.^{xix}

Here traditional manly valor and the role of economic provider fuse with a newer romantic ideal of partnership (albeit enabled through female chastity). Another incarnation of the perfect woman was she who chose to follow her man to war. In “Bonny Lass in a Barrack,” a soldier’s query “Oh bonny lass will you lay in a barrack? . . . And marry a soldier, and carry his wallet?” is answered in the positive. “Oh yes I will go, and I’ll think no more on it, I’ll marry a soldier and carry his wallet”. But a woman must also commit to a soldier’s life as well as to the soldier.

He. But oh bonny lass! can you go a campaigning,
And bear the fatigue of a battle and famine?
When weary and fainting, oh! would you be near me?
If sick, or if wounded thy preference would cheer
She. Oh! yes I can bear all the hardships you mention,
And twenty times more of you had but invention.
If weary and fainting I’d ever be near thee;

In pain or in sickness my presence should cheer thee.^{xx}

Romantic love in such ballads offered a more positive female image, woman's love is selfless, unquestioning and subordinate to man's self-actualization through warfare.^{xxi}

The extent to which the misogynist and romantic ideals were made real in the army derived less from gender conventions than of the material and demographic realities of military life.

Martial Families

The family in the early modern period constituted the basis for political and social order. The household comprised the basis of economic activity. "To act like a man in the context of marriage meant to support a wife and children."^{xxii} Army life, however, made impractical traditional households, and thus robbed soldiers of a key element of patriarchal status. The British army in theory constituted an all-male institution with marriage and families discouraged. In practice, women and children were almost always present.^{xxiii} The army usurped the role of paterfamilias, by providing food and often shelter, and by intervening in family and sexual life as a matter of discipline. The prevailing norms of familial relations, encouraged in pamphlets and from pulpits, thus did not apply to camp life. Soldiers occupied a status akin to children under the authority of their officers that prevented the full assertion of patriarchal manhood as husband and father.

Women also usually depended on the army either in the form of their partner's wages or as a result of their employment in ways associated with their gender—cleaning, cooking and caring—as nurses, laundresses and cooks.^{xxiv} Although necessary to family subsistence, female economic activity potentially further eroded their partners' claims to manly self-sufficiency. Still, such shared economic activity could produce a sense of independence for soldiers and their women.^{xxv}

Moreover, female labor provided generally unacknowledged but essential support services to the army. Military rhetoric and gender logic obscured this fact, naturalizing their contributions and mystifying the nature of their exploitation even more comprehensively than that of soldiers.

These observations do not mean that families were not an important part of military life, only that they were conceived of and constructed differently than in civil society. In reality, the need to survive meant that many laboring men and women had to function as co-providers.^{xxvi} A particular martial variant of the household developed based upon the peculiarities of military life: more flexible, open and equal at the same time as it was more instable and liminal economically.

While there was scope for family life in the army, it is safe to say that marked demographic inequality between the genders, high transience, and insecurity for the domestic unit characterized the military environment.^{xxvii} However, the resulting instability of marriage and family life should be put in the context of eighteenth century British plebeian culture, within which the family was more flexible and relationships adaptable over time than among the middle and upper classes.^{xxviii} Working people tended to exert more control over partner choice and were more likely to have premarital sex, many did not marry in church or even legally, and the couple could marry merely by declaring their intent to one another, while desertion and mutual separation were accepted forms of terminating marriage. An unhappy marriage could also be terminated with wife sale, an auction of a female spouse often held in the market, in which the wife could be led in with a halter around her neck (a reference to cattle) and sold to the highest bidder.^{xxix}

We glimpse the fluidity in relationships within plebeian society and among soldiers in the case of William and Elizabeth Scarborough. Elizabeth had lived with William, a soldier in the 27th Regiment, in Trenton, New Jersey, “and passed there, as his Wife”. When William was stationed to Fort George in New York, his wife was left to follow on, but Elizabeth brought with

her Jeremiah Crawley of the New York Provincial troops. Claiming her as his wife, William quarreled with Crawley. Jeremiah proposed they let Elizabeth choose between them; they should “place her, in the middle of the Floor, and that each of them should go to a different door, and whichever she chose to go to, should have her.” In the end, however, William’s decision to give up his “wife” for a fee superceded this proposal of free choice for Elizabeth. The bill of sale read: “These are to certify, that I William Scarborough, doth resign up his right, and title of his Wife to Jeremiah Crawley, never to have anything to say to her, only she may pass by, as another woman . . . in paying Three Pounds four shillings, of New York Currency.” But all was not as final as this agreement suggested. When Crawley left with Elizabeth in a wagon for Albany, however, William followed on foot. The two putative husbands scuffled, then, Crawley claimed, William departed. However, his dead body later surfaced in a river. Jeremiah, tried for murder, was found not guilty, the evidence being deemed insufficient.^{xxx} This account suggests the tenuous nature of marriage and sexual relations within a military environment, pointing both to the relative powerlessness of the male to exert patriarchal control over his female partner, and to the consensual negotiation of sexual activity largely unmediated by the military power structure.

Sex and Discipline

Matters of discipline concerned the army more than its soldiers’ domestic lives, but here issues of sexuality figured as well. Officers believed woman’s Venus-like allure could unman the soldier and lead him astray, with disobedience, dereliction of duty, desertion, and violence followed in woman’s wake. Officers were not too far off the mark in this belief. For an army of men, already weighed down by martial subordination, excited by the grotesquely unbalanced sex ratios, and thwarted in most economic ambitions they may have possessed, acquiring and maintaining a female partner became a means of asserting one’s manliness.

Desertion constituted the army's main concern when it came to the impact of sexuality. Soldiers often attributed their flight to the fires of passion.^{xxxii} Thomas Hunter of the 44th Regiment may be the most extreme case of a man claiming to be led astray by a woman. In November 1762, with the War all but over, he deserted from Montreal with his equipment, blaming drink and "the repeated Sollicitations of a Woman with whom he was intimate", the same reason he had deserted once before. He was sentenced to death, but at the execution an "Accident" occurred, which led his commanding officer to pardon him, hoping it would make Hunter "a good Subject of his King hereafter". Hunter did not profit from his reprieve, for in January, abused by a sergeant and mocked by other soldiers, presumably for his dependence on this woman, he deserted yet again. When discovered, he remarked "I dont care if you take that Pistol, and shoot me thro' the Head." Found guilty by a general court martial yet again, he was executed the same day.^{xxxiii}

Masculinity and Violence

Violence permeated British society in this era. Susan Amussen has argued that violence, not the sexual activities of men, comprised the key to their manhood in the early modern period. Physical force was linked to independence, and was thus a means of demonstrating one's manliness, in particular for those not wholly independent like servants, apprentices, and, I would argue, soldiers.^{xxxiii} Dependent males resorted to violence to determine their status competitively, simultaneously establishing values of manhood based upon strength and toughness that conflicted with patriarchal norms.^{xxxiv}

Male cultural proclivity towards violence must have been exaggerated amongst soldiers, already in an occupation that prized violence.^{xxxv} Sexual contestation was often at the root of conflict. On October 4, 1760, for example, there was "A mighty Discord amongst the Regulars

this Night Disputing who had the best Right to a woman & who Should have the first Go at her even till it came to Bloos, & their Hubbub Raised all most the whole Camp.”^{xxxvi}

As often women were the victims of force. Violence against women constituted a central feature of this masculine culture of physical force, with wife-beating and rape key aspects of British manliness. Still, the sexual aspect of assault was not key to male identity as much as the exercise of physical dominance.^{xxxvii} Amussen observed that rapes in civil society usually were crimes of opportunity: females in dependent positions, such as servants, being preyed on by their superiors, or those caught alone in isolated circumstances where help was not at hand.^{xxxviii} Camp women were the most common victims of rape by soldiers. A brutal case occurred at Crown Point in 1760. Robert Gore and John Christie, two provincial soldiers, came to the door of Mrs. Moy, a drummer boy’s wife, one night, asking to be allowed in to warm themselves. She admitted them, but they then “stop’d her mouth & threw her on the bed that Christie then took her by the leggs & Kept them Extended while gore [sic] ravished her, threatening at the same time to Cut her throat if she made aney noise”. Christie threatened to use a knife on her, then “beat her in a most Cruel manner [and] treated her in So inhuman a manner as made her unable to resist while he Christie ravish^d. her.” The regimental court martial thought the crime so “heinous [sic]” that it merited a greater punishment than it could order, and the case was referred to a general court martial.^{xxxix}

Soldiers were caught in an ideological bind. Infused with a hyper manliness, they were nonetheless in a condition of abject dependence sharply limiting their ability to act as men. For some, violence constituted their only means of establishing their manhood, of denying their emasculation.

Achilles and Patrocles

Given the sexual demographic within the army, not to mention a long tradition of manly love within military institutions, one expects that homosexuality was a fact of life in the camps. At the same time, same sex relations transgressed the dominant masculine ideals associated with soldiers. Randolph Trumbach has argued that the role of the sodomite, like the prostitute, became key to policing gender conventions in the eighteenth century. Premodern sexuality allowed men to be bisexual, to have both women and adolescent males, without calling their manhood into question. From the early 1700s, however, moral attacks began on effeminate sodomites amongst London's poor. Some had taken on female identity and were mostly involved in prostitution, but did not wholly give up masculine identity, becoming a "third gender" combining aspects of both. Increasingly they were assumed to desire only men, and were characterized as sodomites, or "mollies" in street terms. To be seen as male, one had to be sexually dominant and only interested in women. From the 1720s, then, accepted bisexuality persisted only in environments that were populated by males alone, like ships, colleges and prisons.^{xi}

The army fell between single sex institutions and heterosexual civil society, yet, soldiering had a long tradition of premodern homosexuality. Few instances of same sex relations have found themselves into the records, which was less likely a reflection of their incidence than of how they were dealt with: if voluntary and clandestine, they may have been tacitly accepted; if flagrant or an unsolicited advance, then they were sodomitical in nature, a threat to the manhood of the object of affection, and thus met with direct action or a court martial.^{xli}

The case of Charles McHoennan of the 44th regiment, court martialed at Montreal in July 1763, for attempting to commit sodomy, gives us a glimpse of how ordinary soldiers responded to homosexuality. McHoennan asked fellow soldier James Smith whether he could sleep in his tent as no one else would let him in. Smith agreed and they bedded down on opposite sides of the tent. An hour later, McHoennan moved to Smith's bed, which he was sharing with another

soldier. Smith soon found McHoennan “with his Breeches loose, with his Yard in his Hand attempting to Enter him”, prompting Smith to start beating his attacker and rousing the sergeant with the charge that McHoennan “wanted to Bugger him”. John Hughes, Smith’s tent mate, had opposed letting McHoennan into the tent because “he had heard a general character of [him] . . . that he had been guilty of such attempts on other Men, and that this was publicly talked of”. McHoennan denied the allegation, but, he had been charged about two years earlier by a soldier with the same offence, and a court martial had been held, although McHoennan had been acquitted. This time, McHoennan was found guilty and sentenced to 1,000 lashes and to be drummed out of the service, although the commanding officer reduced his lashes to 500.^{xliii}

Homosexual activity threatened the confused gender boundaries erected in the army. Soldiers, while denied unhindered sexual activity, could not contemplate manly love without facing the consequences of full emasculation.

Military Affairs

The War was over in the late winter of 1764, but at Fort Ticonderoga in New York a new conflict raged, with May and James Calhoun again at its center. Having moved on from Oswego with her husband and the 44th regiment, May Calhoun worked as a washerwoman for Captain Charles Osborne, the fort commandant. A sentimentalist about family life, Osborne used several rooms “to make the married people live as comfortable as was in my power”, one of which went to the Calhouns. But Osborne claimed that Mrs. Calhoun was “receiving such Usage from [her husband], that’s not possible to describe.” She sought the captain’s protection, and he banished James to the barracks, allowing his wife to remain in their apartment, from which he was restricted, “as the woman was by his threats, put she said, in fear of her Life”.^{xliiii}

Initially, this seems a simple case of wife beating. Yet, in contemporary civil society the

husband was allowed to chastise his wife physically, with the authorities only intruding in the most extreme situations. Thus, Osborne's interference with the Calhouns, amounting in modern terms to a restraining order to preserve the wife's safety, highlights the extent of power that could be exercised by military commanders in the personal sphere. Osborne's burnished front was tarnished, however, when James Calhoun's story was told.

Rather than abiding by his commander's orders, James fled to Crown Point where he complained to Lieutenant Colonel John Beckwith, "that he had caught his Captain in Bed with his Wife," and, when confronting Osborne with this, he had been confined for 10 days for disturbing the garrison.^{xliv} Beckwith informed Osborne that Calhoun had complained "you keep his Wife from him and that he has reason to imagine you are very Intimate with her". Beckwith believed Mrs. Calhoun to be "a very bad Woman" and yet for 17 years "the Lawful Wife" of James, who was "very unhappy at the thoughts of his Wife behaving so ill". He demanded that Osborne send her from the fort, "as Countenancing so bad a Woman must Sooner or later Infallably bring a disgrace upon those who are Imprudent enough to Protect her against her husband."^{xlv} Beckwith, apparently orthodox on familial matters, believed in a man's right to act as patriarch to his wife.

Osborne, outraged that Beckwith seemed "determined to believe the Word of a Soldier in preference to that of an Officer," dismissed the allegation of a sexual liaison, disparaging Beckwith's presumption that his "fondness for the sex" might make him commit such an imprudent action. He also blackened the character of James Calhoun, "absolutely the worst man that Lives," whom he often had to order from the married soldiers quarters to protect his wife, but afterward allowed him to return at her "repeated entreaties". Once James broke down the door to his wife's chamber, and not long after got "Egregiously drunk", broke down the same door, and, if Osborne had not intervened, would have "murdered his Wife". It was after this outbreak that James was incarcerated to await a court martial. Osborne believed that the man's

only justification was that “she is his Wife, and consequently he may brake her arms and Legs if its any diversion to him”.^{xlvi} Osborne refused to send Mrs. Calhoun away, couching his defense in terms of her “undoubted right, to get her livelihood by working for whom, and where she thought proper, while she [w]as a follower of the Army”.^{xlvi} Beckwith retorted that “Calhoun has a right not only to demand his Wife, but to take her where ever he can find her to live with him if he Chooses it and no one has a right to keep her from him without his Consent or Approbation.”^{xlvi} When Osborne planned to court martial Calhoun, Beckwith feared that James was “not only like to have his Wife kept from him but in a fair Way to get a good flogging”.^{xlvi}

The dispute between Osborne and Beckwith seemed to lose sight of the Calhouns, and to descend into a contest over who exercised authority, Osborne as the garrison commander, or Beckwith as the regimental colonel.ⁱ This struggle for patriarchal control over army dependents had everything and nothing to do with whether Osborne was sleeping with Mrs. Calhoun.ⁱⁱ Osborne had access and exhibited an unusual concern for a washerwoman, but we only have Calhoun’s evidence that they were involved. The Captain’s word thus had to be accepted as a gentleman. Beckwith, however, remained suspicious, believing Mrs. Calhoun shared a dinner table with Osborne, unusual practice for officer and washerwoman.ⁱⁱⁱ Beckwith’s assertion of higher authority unmanned Osborne in front of his martial family, while Osborne’s obstinate refusal to defer control over this matter likewise emasculated his colonel. Male honor dictated that neither Beckwith nor Osborne could stand down.

James Calhoun, denied the full exercise of male honor as a soldier, was unmanned in a much more visceral way: a husband denied his wife, locked from his household, facing *de facto* divorce, and threatened with a whip. He chose to stand up for his private domestic rights (whether they involved merely the desire to be the sole benefactor of his wife’s affections, or more darkly, the right to physically cow his partner), and fled to the regimental colonel to state

his case, which emphasizes the degree to which soldiers fought the gender conventions of the patriarchal army. Meanwhile, as all too often is the case, May Calhoun is left silent, a void to be filled by the masculine military record. Whether she was an object of violence or illicit desire, or both is impossible to conclude, and there remains no direct evidence to explain how she felt about the invasion of her domestic affairs, other than her presumed voluntary sequestration in the quarters of captain Osborne.

This episode, arising from a seemingly mundane domestic dispute, stripped off the redcoat that typically obscured military sexuality, and revealed much about the gendered world of warfare: the puissant authority of commanding officers in matters sexual; the social relations constructed by ordinary soldiers and their women; the sexual tensions that inevitably emerged in this inordinately masculine world; and the danger entailed in when such tensions crossed the divide between soldier and officer.

Conclusion

No doubt existed as to the nature of the true military man, the ideal of the brave male warrior being a staple of all cultures. Eighteenth-century British soldiers, on the strength of ballads, poems and general orders, could rest assured that they were manly men. Paradoxically, the rhetoric of masculinity was also deployed to insure the dependence of soldiers upon their superior male figures. In the process, soldiers were stripped of many male prerequisites—social, economic and sexual independence. The army thus exploited gender in a number of ways, and not primarily to advantage men with respect to women. More importantly, the military marshaled gender, and specifically the notions of the valorous man and dependent boy, to facilitate the subordination of common men to the needs of the war machine in an imperial struggle that would ultimately serve the interests of nobles and gentry, merchants and manufacturers. The fact

that the gender dynamics of this machine did not always function without friction is abundantly clear. Soldiers, at once endowed with a hyper-masculinity in the ideal and infantilized in the real workings of military discipline, nonetheless captured a no man's land within which they could engage in sex and families could dwell. However, it was a space upon a larger battlefield over which they did not exercise command and upon which they were exposed to visceral terror and bodily harm. Warfare, elemental human conduct, and sexuality, a fundamental code of human differentiation, have from the beginning of history fused together in service of the state. Rank and file troops and female camp followers have ever been transfixed by this cruel amalgamation.

ⁱWO71/46/97-102.

ⁱⁱThis seemingly ahistorical "puzzle" forms the basis of Joshua Goldstein's multi-disciplinary review of the literature on warfare and gender, Gender and War: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), esp. chap. 1. By comparison, Marcia Kovitz argues against "a universal gender division of labor in war," although hers is a much narrower study while her definition of what constitutes warfare is broader than the combat definition embraced by Goldstein. In the end, she would agree with the latter that fighting has almost universally been a masculine role in the military. See Kovitz, "The Roots of Military Masculinity," in Paul R. Higate, ed. Military Masculinities: Identity and the State (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 3-5.

ⁱⁱⁱAnthony Fletcher, Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 5-6, 283-84, 290-92, 296; Robert B. Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres? (Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman, 1998), 8-9, 19-20. See also Barker-Benfield, Culture of Sensibility, xvii-xviii, 26-27, 36.

^{iv} Kovitz, "Roots of Military Masculinity," 6.

^vThis orientation has meant women's role in the military has been under-scrutinized. Yet, as Barton Hacker argued, "women were a normal part of European armies at least from the fourteenth century until well into the nineteenth century." Military historians largely ignored this fact, he believed, because women did not normally function in combat roles, the central concern of these historians. Also, at the time that military history was taking shape, in the late nineteenth century, women had been largely excised from the military sphere by the professionalization of army

support services and thus not as evident a reality to students of the subject. Barton C. Hacker, "Women and Military Institutions in Early Modern Europe: A Reconnaissance, Signs, vol. 6 (1981), 643-45. For exceptions to this rule, see: Walter Hart Blumental, Women Camp Followers of the American Revolution (1952; rpt. ed., Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer Company, 1988); Paul Kopperman, "The British High Command and Soldiers' Wives in America, 1755-1783," Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research, vol. 60 (1982), 22-23; John Rees, "'The Multitude of Women': An Examination of the Numbers of Female Camp Followers with the Continental Army," Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military, vol. 14, no. 2 (Summer 1996), 1-47; Holly A. Mayer, Belonging to the Army: Camp Followers and Community during the American Revolution (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996). These studies are more concerned with filling the lacunae of female military life, however, than they are of interrogating military history with the concept of gender.

^{vi} Hacker, "Women and Military Institutions in Early Modern Europe," 643-71.

^{vii}Historians of gender in Britain have identified a great anxiety about the patriarchal order in the late sixteenth through eighteenth centuries, which manifested itself in prescriptive literature on household management and female conduct, and the policing of plebeian female transgressions by witchcraft persecutions, charivaris, and the use of ducking stools. Fletcher, Gender, Sex and Subordination; Barker-Benfield, Culture of Sensibility; Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus, eds., Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities (London: Longman, 1997); D. E. Underdown, "The Taming of the Scold: the Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England," in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson, eds., Order and Disorder in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 116-36. Of the vast literature on the subject of patriarchy, see for example: Sheila Rowbotham, "The Trouble with Patriarchy," in Raphael Samuel, ed., People's History and Socialist Theory (London, 1981); Barbara Taylor, "In Defence of 'Patriarchy'," in Samuel, ed., People's History and Socialist Theory; Sylvia Walby, Theorizing Patriarchy (Oxford, 1990); Michael McKeon, "Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660-1760," Eighteenth-Century Studies, 28:3 (1995): 295-322.

^{viii}Alexandra Shepard, The Meaning of Manhood in Early Modern England (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 1-5. Anne Lombard makes a similar argument for Puritan New England. Puritans did not think of gender as a dichotomy of male and female, but in hierarchical terms with distinctions drawn as much between adult or manly men and male youths, as they were with women. The authority of the father within the household was paramount in

these “patriarchal families,” with both women and male youths situated below male heads of household in the hierarchy. The relationship between father and son constituted the foundational one among males in colonial New England, and it was bound up with issues of labor and property. In New England into the mid eighteenth century where land ownership was pervasive and the labor market stunted, the male head of household’s authority was accentuated as he had an even firmer grip on economic resources than did fathers in England, and male offspring had few alternatives. Age and economic independence, as well as tangled familial issues, acted as dividing lines between men with regard to the exercise of authority. Anne S. Lombard, Making Manhood: Growing Up Male in Colonial New England (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 7, 10-11, chap. 1.

^{ix}Carole Shammas, “Anglo-American Household Government in Comparative Perspective,” William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 52:1 (January 1995), 117-28; xv; Kathleen Brown, Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), especially introduction.

^xKathleen Brown defined patriarchy as: “the historically specific authority of the father over his household, rooted in his control over labor and property, his sexual access to his wife and dependent female laborers, his control over other men’s sexual access to the women of his household, and his right to punish family members and laborers.” Brown, Good Wives, 4-5.

^{xi}Songs Naval and Military (New York: James Rivington, 1779), 81, 83. This is actually a reference to Scottish manliness and “Scottish valour.”

^{xii}Shepard, Meaning of Manhood, 1-6.

^{xiii}The ballad or chapbook was the most popular literary form in this period, their content disseminating to the laboring classes if only in the retelling. In these songs and poems, women often were portrayed as sexually potent and/or shrewish and men often impotent, an inversion of social reality generated by male anxieties. The newer, more positive image of the faithful domestic woman/wife was also apparent. Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 37.

^{xiv}Susan Dwyer Amussen reminds us: “The social construction of manhood is less visible than that of womanhood, because the attributes of men, as of any dominant group, are naturalized, while those of subordinate groups are made deviant: the ‘lenses of gender’ in our society make male experience the norm.” See “‘The part of a Christian man’: the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England,” in Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky,

eds., Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 214.

^{xv}William Catton, "The Siege of Martinico, A Poem," printed sheet found in Monckton Papers, vol. 50, file 7, Northcliffe Collection, MG 18 M (microfilm reel C 367), National Archives of Canada, Ottawa [hereafter NAC].

^{xvi}Songs Naval and Military, 45, 46.

^{xvii}*ibid.*, 41, 42, 43.

^{xviii}*ibid.*, 61.

^{xix}*ibid.*, 88-90.

^{xx}*ibid.*, 60.

^{xxi}There existed also a popular sub-genre of military ballads and stories that recounted the adventures of women who go to war as soldiers rather than purely as spouses. These tales "feature a sturdy heroine, patriotic, adventurous, and something of a trickster." See: Dianne Dugaw, "Balladry's Female Warriors: Women, Warfare, and Disguise in the Eighteenth Century," Eighteenth Century Life, 9:2 (1985), 1; Dugaw, Warrior Women and Popular Balladry, 1650-1850 (1989; paperback ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). For women, no doubt, it offered escapism, a way to imagine life outside the patriarchal household and the possibility of achieving a status akin to men in that most masculine of occupations. For men, the female soldier exerted a certain prurient appeal, with cross-dressing and the ultimate uncovering of the female body central to the narrative. Here, another mythic figure drawn from the classics surely is informative, the Amazon. Eschewing the company of all men, except for the base intercourse of conception, these creatures possessed an attraction to women in their physicality and prowess in the public sphere of warfare. But such masquerading as the male came at a cost, captured in the mutilation of that defining part of womanhood, the breast, the right one of which was lopped off to facilitate the Amazon's use of the bow, phallic symbol of masculine power. Prescriptive writers on sexual mores throughout the early modern period referred to the figure of the Amazon as a warning against female independence, sexual and economic as a rule, rather than military. See: G. J. Barker-Benfield, The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), xxvii, 351-54; Goldstein, War and Gender, 11-19. The female soldier, not unlike the Amazon, comprised a transgressive figure, whose straddling of the defining boundary—warlike masculinity and pacific femininity—proffered psychic release for both men and women circumscribed by gender norms at the same time as it supplied a cautionary tale meant to reinforce the divide.

^{xxii}Shammas, "Household Government," 104, 109; Amussen, An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern Society (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 1-2, 94; Hill, Women, Work, and Sexual Politics, 22-23; Lombard, Making Manhood, 99, 101 [quot.]; Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 87-88.

^{xxiii}Sylvia R. Frey found that single soldiers were the norm for eighteenth-century European armies, and that states increasingly moved to restrict its troops' rights to marriage and having a family. The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 59-61. The British army did allow some men, particularly noncommissioned officers, to take their families with them to new stations. In fact, it was almost forced to by the men's desire for a domestic existence if it wished to secure recruits for a North American theatre of war. See: Officers sent to Europe to recruit for the Royal Americans in 1756 were allowed money for "the passage of a small number of Women and Children," which they would "be indispensably Obligated to take for the Success of the Affair and the acquisition of proper Men." The Regiment's 4th Battalion reported the following June that 60 women accompanied its 683 privates and 100 noncommissioned officers and drummers (a male/female ratio of 13:1). Plan for recruiting in Germany, [Feb. 1756], LO 2576, box 19, Loudoun Papers, North American Series, Huntington Library, San Marino, California [hereafter in form LO 2576, box 19]; James Prevost, Return of 4th Battalion Royal American Regiment, 5 June 1757, LO 3794, box 84. Similarly, a company of the 50th Regiment reported that, alongside 89 men and 18 lieutenants, noncommissioned officers and drummers, 10 women (or 9.3% of the garrison) were drawing rations in the winter of 1756-57. Thomas Jocelyn, Return of Provisions from Dec. 24, 1756 to Jan. 25, 1757, LO 3027, box 58. This record probably largely undercounted the presence of women and children, as only those who were on the official ration list would have been included. By comparison, Walter Hart Blumental found that in May 1777 the British army (including the civil branch) had a male to female ratio of 8:1 and the German troops 30:1; by August 1781, the proportion was 6.5:1 in the army and 15:1 among the Germans. Blumental, Women Camp Followers, 18-19. Once in the New World, the army not only raised its numbers by enlisting in the colonies, but also accrued noncombatants as the new recruits brought dependents with them and single soldiers set about finding female companionship from the colonial population. See: General Monckton's Orderly Book, 6 Oct. 1759, vol. 23, Northcliffe Collection (microfilm reel C 366). When New France was vanquished, the troops also got access to *Canadien* women. "The Canadian Females take greatly with our Soldiery, and are not insensible to their Addresses," wrote Thomas Gage in 1761. "Many of them have followed the Reg^{ts}. that are gone, and I am daily plagued for Wives & Daughters that elope from one

Part of the Country to another, as the Troops shift their Quarters.” Thomas Gage to Jeffery Amherst, 3 July 1761, War Office Papers, Series 34, Paper of General Jeffery Amherst, vol. 5, p. 166, Amherst Papers, Series 34, War Office Papers, Public Record Office [PRO], London [here after in form WO34/5/166].

The colonies’ provincial forces were less willing to have women along on a campaign, the New Englanders in particular considering their presence immoral. See: “Captain Elisha Hawley’s Journal,” in James Russell Trumbull, History of Northampton Massachusetts from its Settlement in 1654, vol. 2 (Northampton: Gazette Printing, 1902), 257; The Journals and Papers of Seth Pomeroy Sometime General in the Colonial Service, ed. Louis Effingham de Forrest (New York: The Society of Colonial Wars in the State of New York, 1926), 109; John Burk Diary, 21, 22 Aug. 1755, Peter Force Papers [8D:16, reel 31], LC.; Orderly Book of 3rd Battalion, Pennsylvania Regiment, Provincial Forces of Pennsylvania, [9] Aug. 1758 (“Colonel Bouquet’s Orderly Book”), HM 613, Huntington Library; Orderly Book kept by Lieut. Joseph Bull, 14, 16 June 1759, 1st Battalion, New York Regiment, Provincial Forces of New York, HM 687, Huntington Library. See also, Fred Anderson, A People’s Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 118-19.

^{xxiv}Women’s most important jobs were associated with the army hospitals, in particular nursing. A woman belonging to the 48th Regiment was listed as a nurse and cook in the hospital at New York in 1756. At Halifax the next year, General Loudoun ordered regimental officers to supply enough of their women to wash the clothes of the sick in the hospital, prompting Captain James Abercromby to order six women from his company for the duty. George Douglass, Return of the Men of the following Regiments present in New York, 26 July 1756, LO 1359, box 30; Loudoun, General Orders, 27 July 1757, LO 3576, box 78; Abercromby, Orderly Book, 28 July 1757, LO 3993, box 89. For their nursing work, women sometime only received provisions in payment.^{xxiv} Normally, however, women were paid 6d. sterling per day for nursing (equivalent to a private’s pay) and 1s. for washing. Abercromby Orderly Book, 28 July 1757, LO 3993, box 89. See also: Disney Orderly Book, 7 April 1755, 27 July 1757; 3rd Battalion, Pennsylvania Regiment, Orderly Book, 20 Aug. 1758. The grande dame of the hospital women was Charlotte Brown, matron of the general hospital, who had sailed with Braddock’s expedition but escaped the defeat, having been left behind at Fort Cumberland. “The Journal of Charlotte Brown, Matron of the General Hospital with the English Forces in America, 1754-1756,” in Colonial Captivities, Marches and Journeys, ed. Isabel M. Calder (New York: MacMillan, 1935), 169-98. Women’s activity as military nurses signified that women had not yet been fully excluded from the medical profession, although relegated to support role. In England at this time, women

worked as nurses—wet-nurses, children’s nurses, and as nurses in the hospitals that opened in this period. They were increasingly being driven out of the more “skilled” positions, however, and pushed into “the proletariat of the medical profession.” Nursing was deemed “an untrained and low-status occupation,” hence reserved for women. Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 184. Working for the army subjected women to military discipline. Not only did officers expect camp followers to serve if called upon, when employed, they, like soldiers, must remain on duty until relieved or face punishment. In 1757, nurses in Albany were not to leave the hospital without a discharge from its clerk. The following year in May, it was threatened that any woman who refused to be a nurse there would “be cut off from provisions, & Drumm’d out of the corps or garrison, & never suffer’d to return,” an order that was reiterated when the army moved up to Lake George. Disney Orderly Book, 17, 18 Oct. 1757; “The Monypenny Orderly Book,” in Bulletin of the Fort Ticonderoga Museum, vol. 12, no. 5 (Dec. 1969), 338, and vol. 12, no. 6 (1970), 458.

^{xxv} Shepard, Meaning of Manhood in Early Modern England, 202.

^{xxvi} Amussen, An Ordered Society, 67; Shepard, Meaning of Manhood, 16-17, 186-88, 194-95, 202. See also Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 110-11.

^{xxvii} The wartime footing upon which soldier society usually rested undercut the army’s tenuous commitment to family life. For example, during Braddock’s march on Fort Duquesne it was ordered that no more than two women per company would be allowed to march on; the rest, “wives to Soldiers”, to be sent to Fort Cumberland where the Governor was to “Victule” them. Any uninvited woman caught with the army would be “Severely punished” the first time, and “Suffer Death” the second. Pass given by Gen. Braddock for certain females, 9 June 1755, in Samuel Hazard, ed., Pennsylvania Archives, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Joseph Severns, 1852), 348; Disney Orderly Book, 11 June 1755.

^{xxviii} Lawrence Stone recognized that “the lower classes” practiced different mores than did “the top levels of society.” In developing the abridged edition of his classic The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800 (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), he chose to solve the problem by all but eliminating the former from the text. See pp. 17, 23.

^{xxix} Bridget Hill, Women, Work, and Sexual Politics in Eighteenth-Century England (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 6, 179ff., 205-207, 215-19; Amussen, Ordered Society, 124; E. P. Thompson, ?; Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 97-98. Genteel society began to exert more “moral” control over the sexual and marriage practices of plebeian society at the time of the Seven Years’ War, however. The London Foundling Hospital admitted the first

abandoned babies in 1741, and in the years 1756-1760, its years of most liberal admission, nearly 50% of all first births in London were delivered at the hospital. Lord Hardwick's Marriage Act of 1753, for example, made it more difficult for people to remarry and enhanced the detection of bigamy. Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 99, 109.

^{xxx}War Office Papers, Courts Martial Records, Series 71, vol. 68, pp. 247-55, PRO [hereafter in form WO71/68/247-55].

^{xxxi} As a favored defense it ranked alongside drunkenness, the effect of which was likened to the feminized emotional state of love, and capture by enemy Indians, interestingly another outsider group with an assumed devious nature who were often defined in feminine terms. Perhaps the "otherness" of these experiences provided a tailor-made justification: virtuous man led astray by the monstrous feminine.

^{xxxii}WO71/72/162-64, 167-70.

^{xxxiii}Susan Dwyer Amussen, "'The part of a Christian man': the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England," in Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky, eds., Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 214, 220-27.

^{xxxiv}Shepard, Meaning of Manhood, 16, 128, 130-32, 140, 151. See also Lombard, Making Manhood, 12.

^{xxxv}Proving one's toughness helped establish status among the rank and file in a range of activities that spanned sport to outright murder. Regular soldiers vied with provincials in a six-mile whale boat race at Crown Point in 1760, at once seeking to demonstrate their manliness, their acquisition of military skills, and relative place in the imperial pecking order. The regulars plied six oars and the provincials eight paddles, the latter proving victorious by 42 minutes. Diary of Thomas Moody Campaign of 1760 of the French and Indian War, ed. P. M. Woodwell (South Berwick, Maine: The Chronicle Print Shop, 1976), 20-21. Interpersonal conflict often proved deadly, as it did at St. Theresa in 1760. John Rowe of the 27th regiment was asked by a commissary boy to reclaim a fishing rod from a Montgomery Highlander, who had taken it from him. A dispute resulted, the rod was broken, and the Highlander pulled a dirk on Rowe and chased him. Rowe grabbed up a stick and struck the Scotsman on the temple. He died the next day. Brought up on charges of murder, he was found not guilty as acting in self-defense. WO71/46/125-26.

^{xxxvi}"Journal of Sergeant Holden," in Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 2nd series, vol. 5 (1889-1890), 403. When jealousy was added to the sexual mix, it became potentially more dangerous. Thomas James, a

Ranger, was charged with assaulting and insulting two naval officers at Halifax in 1755. One night James accosted the two officers, calling them names and offering violence. When one drew his sword, James struck him in head with a stick, knocking him down. In his defense James said that his wife lodged at the Swan public house, outside of which the altercation had occurred, and he had heard “there were Men after her the whole day”. Coming home that night he saw men at the door of the Swan with her, and assumed the worst. His sergeant deposed that James was “a very honest Man, but that since he has been married he has been at times distracted with Jealousy . . . that in a fit of Phrenzy he once hung himself up by the neck and must have quickly died had he not been accidentally relieved.” James received 500 lashes for letting his emotions master him. WO71/42/144-46.

^{xxxvii} Amussen, “‘The part of a Christian man’,” 217-20.

^{xxxviii} Amussen, “‘Christian man’,” 217-20.

^{xxxix} Capt. John Wrightson, Proceedings of a Regimental Court Martial, 30 Jan. 1760, Volume 5, American Series, Thomas Gage Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor [hereafter in form GP:5]; William Haviland, 3 Feb. 1760, GP:5. Sexual violence was not restricted to adult women, as child rapes occurred as well.^{xxxix} Probably much the same factors applied: the unbalanced sex ratios and consequent sexual frustration amongst the more numerous men; the hierarchical subordination of children; and their exposure to sexual predators within the camps. Thus, in 1758, a soldier in the 35th Regiment who acted as servant to an ensign, was sent to the dungeon in New York for “Reveshing the Land Lords Daughter of 7 years of age and giveing her the French[?] Disease”. And a regimental court martial in 1760 tried Urban Lewis, a Massachusetts provincial, for “committing Violence on a child”. Loudoun Memorandum Books, vol. 5, 26 Jan. 1758, HM 1717, Huntington Library; John Thomas Orderly Book, 12 Feb. 1760. Unfortunately, in neither case information on the legal outcomes survives.

^{xl} Trumbach, “Sex, Gender, and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment London,” in Forbidden History: The State, Society, and the Regulation of Sexuality in Modern Europe, ed. John C. Fout (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 89-94. See also Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 79-80.

^{xli} Thus in August 1755, a provincial soldier named Bickerstaff on the expedition against Crown Point was “wipt for Profane Swaring & a Sodimittical attempt [sic]”. Another source, however, notes that he was confined for “Sodomy” rather than an attempt. Nonetheless, he was given 100 lashes and drummed out of army with a rope around his neck and ordered sent to a convenient place, there to be kept until the expedition was over. The relatively light

punishment can be explained by the fact that this was a provincial court martial, which always tended to be less severe than those of regular army. Bickerstaff's drumming out of the army is more interesting in that it was a punishment usually reserved for women, and highlights the fear of sodomy as almost a contagion that needed to be removed. Journals and Papers of Seth Pomeroy, 106; Burk Diary, 6 Aug. 1755.

^{xlii}WO71/73/257-62.

^{xliii}Osborne to Gage, 10 Feb. 1764, GP:13. The Calhouns are identified as the Cahoons in the correspondence surrounding this case.

^{xliv}Beckwith to Gage, 13 Feb. 1764, GP:14.

^{xlv}Copy of Beckwith to Osborne, 5 Feb. 1764, enclosed in Beckwith to Gage, 13 Feb. 1764, GP:14.

^{xlvi}Copy of Osborne to Beckwith, n.d. ["Sunday Morn"], and 6 Feb. 1764, enclosed in Beckwith to Gage, 13 Feb. 1764, GP:14.

^{xlvii}Osborne to Gage, 10 Feb. 1764, GP:13. See also, Osborne to Beckwith, 13 Feb. 1764, enclosed in Beckwith to Gage, 13 Feb. 1764, GP:14.

^{xlviii}Beckwith to Osborne, 9 Feb. 1764, enclosed in Beckwith to Gage, 13 Feb. 1764, GP:14.

^{xlix}Beckwith to Gage, 25 Feb. 1764, GP:14. Osborne went ahead with the court martial but no evidence exists for the ruling on James Cahoon. Osborne to Gage, 16 March 1764, GP:15.

ⁱBeckwith to Gage, 13 Feb. 1764, GP:14.

ⁱⁱThis was not the sole example of a soldier charging that an officer was sexually involved with his wife. John Siborn (also spelt Syborn) was a bombardier in the Royal Artillery stationed in Newfoundland who was broken to mattross for a number of offences, including challenging another soldier to fight and being generally troublesome. Siborn responded to the court martial by claiming that his captain was prosecuting him because "Captain Ord being disappointed in his attempt of getting the better of your poor Petitioners Wife telling her that if she did not consent for him to lie with her he would break me". Siborn and his wife were forced to move from the house they lived in, and the mattross latter deserted to Ireland (where his wife appears to have returned) and then England where he presented his case at the headquarters of the Royal Artillery. A court of Enquiry was held on Ord, finding him not guilty despite one hostile witness backing Siborn's story. Siborn was confined to be punished for slandering Ord. John Siborn, Petition to the Duke of Marlborough, 12 Feb. 1757, LO 2826, box 62; Griffeth Williams to Col. Belford, 5 Dec. 1756, LO 2316, box 54; An Examination by Order of His grace the Master General of the Ordnance

on John Syborn, 7 Feb. 1757, LO 2761, box 62; Williams to Richard Edwards, 12 Sept. 1757, LO 4453, box 98; Edwards to Loudoun [John Campbell, 4th Earl of Loudoun], 13 Sept. 1757, LO 4459, box 99; A Court of Enquirrie held to examine a Complaint preferred by Jno. Syborn, LO 5501, box 118; James Ambercromy to Loudoun, 3 Feb. 1758, LO 5531, box 119.

^{lii}Osborne to Gage, 16 March 1764, GP:15; Beckwith to Gage, 18 March 1764, GP:14. Osborne interference in the Calhoun's relationship, whether sexual or not, constituted a claim of domestic authority over a married couple a civil household would not countenance. Common law allowed men to "correct" their wives and to control their movement, a right that had eroded somewhat by 18th century. Women were able to "pray the peace" against violent husbands to get some protection from the courts, much the way Osborne alleged that Mrs. Calhoun did. Still, the husband's right to chastise his way continued to be exercised regularly. J. M. Beattie, "The Criminality of Women in Eighteenth-Century England," Journal of Social History, vol. 8 (Summer 1975), 86.