

Introduction

Michael Brown and Joanne Begiato

On 18 June 1915, as the Anglo-French offensive in the Artois sector petered out amidst accusations of British ‘inaction’ from the French commander Joseph Joffre (1852–1931), British newspapers contemplated a time when Anglo-French relations had been even less cordial.¹ That day marked the centenary of the Battle of Waterloo, and many newspapers commemorated the event by reflecting on the connections between these two historical moments. According to the *Huddersfield Daily Examiner*,

There is a similarity between 1815 and 1915 which goes deeper than accidental or superficial differences. Once more, as a hundred years ago, our country and the best of Europe are ranged against a cruel and autocratic despotism which threatens the liberties of the world. Once more we are fighting a tyrant whose success means the ruin of all fair hopes of liberty, and a crushing defeat to civilization. And it is this feature, above all, which makes us look back to Waterloo Day with a strong and inspiring consciousness that as we fought with and conquered the Corsican despot, so we will fight with and conquer Teutonic militarism and the hateful rule of Kaiserdom.

Allies and antagonists had been transposed since 1815, making it difficult to speak in anything other than generalities, and perhaps necessitating an emphasis on Napoleon’s Corsican heritage rather than his title as Emperor of France. Yet if friends and foe had changed, the peril facing Britain, and the moral imperative to confront it, seemingly had not. Nor, according to the paper, had Britain’s essential character:

The odds were against us before; perhaps they are against us still. But there is no lack in Great Britain of that stern and steadfast resolve which,

Martial masculinities

undeterred by perils and fearless in the face of danger, accepts each difficulty as it comes as a fresh incentive to manliness and bravery. On Waterloo Day, at all events, we are proud to take up our burden and face what fortune may have in store for us. Under its auspicious star our flag will triumph, as it did in the days of yore.²

For those looking back across the expanse of the nineteenth century, from one momentous conflict to another, the stalwart qualities of British military masculinity served as a linking thread, shaping a mythology of British national identity. In that intervening period, Britain had come to global prominence as an imperial power and had fought numerous wars, ranging from small-scale colonial affairs to larger conflicts such as the Crimean War (1853–56), Indian Rebellion (1857–58) and Second Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902). Even so, the reality was rather more complex than the rhetoric implied. British military masculinity had never been without its anxieties and discontents. Far from it; towards the end of the century in particular, all manner of commentators expressed profound concerns about the state of British manhood and its capacity to ensure national and imperial security in an increasingly competitive and complex geopolitical environment.³ And yet, it could be argued, it was precisely because of these underlying anxieties that the narrative of British masculine prowess was so frequently deployed and rehearsed.

Martial Masculinities: Experiencing and Imagining the Military in the Long Nineteenth Century has its origins in an equivalent moment of historical reflection, some 100 years later still; this was a conference held at the University of Hull in May 2015 to mark the bicentenary of Waterloo.⁴ Though certainly more considered in its analysis than the *Huddersfield Daily Examiner* of 1915, this conference also took place against the backdrop of conflict, notably the end of a more-than-a-decade-long intervention by British troops in Afghanistan, and at a time which saw the resurgence of an equally politically charged valorisation of British military masculinities, epitomised by the growth of such organisations as Help for Heroes and by increasingly fraught debates over the meanings of Remembrance Day.⁵ However, if this conference was timed to coincide with a major anniversary, and facilitated reflection on the social and cultural continuities of nineteenth-century British militarism, then it also provided a most opportune moment to take stock of a growing body of interdisciplinary scholarship which has developed over the preceding decade and a half, and which explores the issue of military masculinities – their realities, representations and ramifications.

Introduction

Although the study of military masculinities has shaped the scholarship on various chronological periods, nations and cultural contexts, the British long nineteenth century (defined here as 1789–1914) has yielded particularly rich intellectual pickings. To be sure, the lion's share of scholarly attention has been directed at either end of this period, namely the French wars (1793–1815) and the First World War (1914–18). Even so, there is a substantial body of material exploring the place of masculinity in relation to Britain's 'small wars' of empire and, as we shall see, a marked degree of recent interest, particularly among literary scholars, in the Crimean War. This volume seeks to explore the richness of the long nineteenth century as a site for the interdisciplinary study of martial masculinities. Of course, any chronological framing is, to an extent, arbitrary, but to do justice to the particularities of the nineteenth century, this volume sets its endpoint at the opening of the First World War. This is not to say that certain chapters do not anticipate or consider the First World War, nor does it suggest that the editors and contributors are blind to the continuities between masculinity and militarism in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; as this introduction hopefully suggests, we are not. Nonetheless, we believe that the conflictual watersheds of the French wars and First World War serve as important cultural markers, the former being arguably the first war of the modern world and the latter the first major war of technological modernity.⁶ By setting our limits thus, we can consider the development of military masculinities in a vital transitional period; one before the advent of mass military participation (in Britain at least), but one that nevertheless saw the rise of mass society, culture and consumption, as well as a transformation in the relations between the military, the state and the public at large.

In the introduction to their edited collection on soldiering in the age of revolution, Catriona Kennedy and Matthew McCormack acknowledge the persistent perception of military history as a conservative, even reactionary, field of study, 'a bastion of Rankean empiricism, grand narrative and Whiggish teleology', concerned, for the most part, with 'technical details, generals and battles' as well as 'operational effectiveness and the factors which determine victory or defeat'.⁷ Certainly, academic military historians have often been wary of, if not downright hostile to, the theoretical and methodological approaches of cultural and gender history. Nonetheless, even before the explosion of research into the cultural history of war that has taken place since the millennium, there were historians who eschewed the conventional

focus on strategy and organisation to consider the social and cultural dimensions of conflict. One of the most remarkable early examples of this tendency was Olive Anderson, whose work on the economic, social and religious dimensions of the Crimean War, and of mid-Victorian militarism more generally, was notable for its analytical inclusivity and imagination.⁸ Though somewhat outside our period, Arthur Marwick's contemporaneous work on the First World War, *The Deluge* (1965), was similarly striking for the ways in which it considered the social and cultural effects of war. By the 1970s, even some avowedly military historians were demonstrating the interesting new directions that the discipline might take. Thus, John Keegan's *The Face of Battle* (1976) was critical of traditionally instrumentalist conceptions of military history and sought to apply a more historicist sensibility to the study of battle, including a sensitivity to the experience of the rank-and-file soldier. Equally, by the 1980s, historians from other disciplines, such as Joan Hichberger, a historian of art, were beginning to consider the ways in which war was represented and its values communicated to, and disseminated throughout, Victorian society.⁹

However, it was really in the late 1980s and 1990s, with the advent of the 'cultural turn', that the history of war was brought increasingly into line with the concerns of mainstream academic history. Works such as Daniel Pick's *War Machine* (1993) sought to understand war not as a universal phenomenon with its own higher logic, but rather as a cultural product, shaped, in the case of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, by medical, scientific and philosophical currents. Likewise, in his *British Military Spectacle* (1996), Scott Hughes Myerly opened up the study of army uniforms, conventionally the esoteric concern of militaria specialists, allowing historians to appreciate how they shaped the cultures, identities and popular perceptions of the army in early nineteenth-century Britain.

One of the most important strands of scholarship to emerge from the social and cultural history of war since the 1980s has been that focused on gender and masculinity. Alongside scholars like Peter Stearns, whose pioneering *Be a Man!* (1979) did much to encourage the emergent historical study of masculinities, imperial historians J. A. Mangan and John M. Mackenzie used masculinity as a prism through which to understand how such activities as sport and hunting shaped notions of national character and identity, as well as how those activities served as potent metaphors for war and its supposed virtues.¹⁰ The notion that war and empire might function both as arenas for the shaping and testing of

Introduction

masculine identities, as well as fantastical spaces wherein such identities might be imaginatively constructed and/or projected, was brought to the fore by Graham Dawson's *Soldier Heroes* (1994). Dawson's specifically Kleinian psychoanalytic approach may not have spawned many imitators (although Pick's near contemporary use of psychoanalysis in *War Machine* suggests a trend in the early to mid-1990s), but his sensitivity to the psychology of war was more influential. Indeed, the voluminous literature on 'shell shock' in the First World War has demonstrated the importance of ideas about masculinity and appropriately masculine behaviours in shaping clinical categories and diagnoses, while Michael Roper's *The Secret Battle* (2009) highlights the wider implications of psychology and emotion for men's 'survival'.¹¹ In his highly influential account of 'modern war culture', Yuval Noah Harari has likewise drawn attention to the psychological impact of war and the notion of war as a form of personal revelation that emerged in the early nineteenth century.¹² However, perhaps because of the huge toll it took on men's minds and bodies, and because, in Britain at least, it marked the first time that the experience of war became more generally diffused among the nation's population, especially its men, it is the First World War that has generated a particularly rich cultural historiography in this regard. Indeed, the First World War is often represented as the culmination of nineteenth-century trends. Especially notable for its focus on embodiment and masculinity is Joanna Bourke's seminal *Dismembering the Male* (1996). Nevertheless, studies on martial embodiment in an earlier period now exist, such as Philip Shaw's work on wounded soldiers and Matthew McCormack's *Embodying the Militia in Georgian England* (2015).¹³

Although the focus of this volume is on soldiers, with only two chapters exploring the cultural power of naval masculinities, it is essential to recognise the enormous power of the navy in contributing to and disseminating constructions of military masculinities. Far more men were employed in the navy during this period, and Britain's role as a sea power meant that naval officers and ratings were significant types of military manliness, held up for celebration and, occasionally, criticism. Scholarly trends in naval history have followed a similar trajectory to those of the army, though with something of a time lag. Accounts of British naval might published in the 1990s and 2000s focus on control of the seas and navies as projections of power.¹⁴ Like early military histories, they analyse national policy and finance, military strategy and logistics. Alongside these sweeping grand narratives are social histories of life below decks.¹⁵ As the 2005 bicentenary of the Battle of

Trafalgar hove into view, however, a number of publications emerged which marked a cultural turn in naval studies. Margarette Lincoln's *Representing the Royal Navy: British Sea Power, 1750–1815* (2002), for instance, used visual and some material culture to investigate the impact of the navy on British society. The cult of Nelson was also mined for its insights into the cultural significance of naval officers, battles and heroism.¹⁶ For instance, the collection edited by David Cannadine, *Admiral Lord Nelson: Context and Legacy* (2005), surveys Nelson's appeal in his own time and long after, exploring Nelson as a historical subject and enduring professional inspiration, but also as an alluring symbol of patriotic military manliness, reaching mythical status.

More recently, the ordinary seaman in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has come under closer investigation. Isaac Land's *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor, 1750–1850* (2009) is a cultural history of the many intersections between masculinity and nationalism which exposes the ambiguous national, political, occupational and gender identities of those serving in the navy in an age of revolution. Mary Conley explores depictions of 'Jack Tar' in the age of empire, during which time the image of the navy in society shifted. The navy's function was to protect imperial trade routes, and thus 'naval manhood came to be aligned with imperial manliness' by the First World War.¹⁷ By the end of the nineteenth century, uniformed sailors were 'a central part of national and imperial pageantry, of state funerals and other occasions, suitably drilled and disciplined for their ceremonial roles'.¹⁸ In the last decade, studies of the figure of the Tar have revealed his ambiguities: at any one time depicted as comical, bawdy, sentimental, heroic, pathetic and virile.¹⁹ These studies, and others like them, expose the multivalent and complex nature of military masculinities.

Collectively, what much of this work on martial masculinities suggests is that military and naval identities were not shaped solely by the act of fighting. Indeed, active combat was a relatively infrequent part of the soldier or sailor's daily life, even on the Western Front of the First World War, let alone on campaign or at sea in the nineteenth century. Bourke's work has demonstrated the importance of homosociality in allowing men to cope with both the strains of battle and the tedium of trench life. Other work, meanwhile, has shown how these affective relationships were often shaped by domestic models and how familial relations structured military life, both directly (in terms of continued contact with home) and indirectly (in terms of substitute families formed in service). Recent work on life on board ships of the Royal Navy shows

Introduction

the ways in which the spaces were configured to create a domestic environment for the men.²⁰ Meanwhile, Roper's work and Holly Furneaux's *Military Men of Feeling* (2016) have shown how 'family feeling' was integral to unit cohesion in the First World War and Crimea, respectively. Furthermore, Furneaux and Sue Pritchard have drawn attention to the ways in which soldiers, during extended periods of inaction, would often indulge in craft activities such as quilting, now generally associated with feminine domesticity.²¹ Likewise, Jeannine Hurl-Eamon's *Marriage and the British Army in the Long Eighteenth Century* (2014) has demonstrated how such domestic ties bound men to home, even when far away from it. Indeed, popular depictions of the soldier's and sailor's 'Farewell' and 'Return' shaped sensible and sentimental modes of patriotic military masculinities throughout the long nineteenth century.

Such concerns with domesticity are symptomatic of an ever-widening analytical frame for scholars interested in martial masculinities across the nineteenth century. While the navy may have been the largest single employer in industrial Britain, with the most powerful fleet in the world, the army was, up until the First World War at least, comparatively tiny, positively dwarfed by its rivals' standing armies. As such, relatively few men in Britain had direct experience of army service, with far more having served at sea. Even so, as the scholarship has demonstrated, the importance of martial masculinities extended far beyond the confines of personal experience. In this respect, the work of scholars such as Dawson and Michael Paris has been particularly influential in fostering the concept of a 'pleasure-culture of war' in which the values of militarism and military masculinities were elaborated, communicated and disseminated through literature, poetry, art and song, as well as through play, education and socialisation at home, in school or in organisations such as the Boys' Brigade.²² This interest in the wider cultures of martial masculinity has been taken forward by scholars such as Catriona Kennedy and Neil Ramsey, who consider the broader resonances and reception of war narratives in early nineteenth-century Britain, as well as by historians of naval masculinities like Land, Joanne Begiato and James Davey, who consider the ways in which the profusion of naval-themed song, balladry, imagery and material culture during the nineteenth century shaped ideas not simply about naval masculinities but also about national identity more broadly.²³ Meanwhile, Michael Brown has shown how civilians might draw on a metaphoric language of war, empire and martial masculinity to buttress their own claims to public recognition and professional respectability.²⁴

This volume is intended to reflect this outward turn in the scholarship from personal experience to the cultural imaginary and its impact on individual subjectivities and national identities. But as well as this, it is also intended to reflect the methodological and disciplinary breadth of recent work in the field. In particular, the study of war, and of military masculinities, is no longer the sole preserve of historians, but has also been embraced by literary scholars. Romanticists such as Shaw led the way with their interdisciplinary studies of war and its cultural power, and Victorianists have followed suit. Indeed, according to one recent account, ‘Victorianists have rediscovered war’.²⁵ The Crimean conflict, in particular, has been subject to a great deal of literary analysis, including Stephanie Markovits’ *The Crimean War in the British Imagination* (2009), Furneaux’s *Military Men of Feeling* and a 2015 issue of *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* on ‘Charting the Crimean War: Contexts, Nationhood, Afterlives’. What all of this research has shown is the extent to which militarism, military values and martial masculinities permeated British culture, thought and social practice, not simply in the heady years of New Imperialism, but across the century as a whole.

This volume constitutes an interdisciplinary intervention into the study of martial masculinities. It draws on a variety of disciplines; historical, art historical, literary, material and musical. The contributions are divided into two parts, one on ‘experiencing’, the other on ‘imagining’ martial masculinities. We recognise that experience and imagination are not distinct categories of analysis, that they are intimately intertwined and mutually constitutive. We do not seek to establish an artificial distinction between the kinds of sources studied. After all, it is evident that soldiers’ letters are as much textual forms as H. Rider Haggard’s novels, while Lord Uxbridge’s body was as ‘representational’ as any poem. Neither do we wish to separate out historical and literary methodologies, or to align experience with the former and imagination with the latter. While the historians in this volume can indeed be found in the former part, the use of historicist approaches by literary scholars and textually sensitive readings by historians render such disciplinary distinctions largely moot. Rather, what we do hope to achieve through this structure is to emphasise the ways in which martial masculinities travelled through culture and through time, working their way into diverse aspects of thought, practice and representation. The first half is thus rooted in military men’s experience of battle, and their life after service, but draws outwards from the individual and the intimate

Introduction

to the representational and the public. It begins with Julia Banister's exploration of Lord Uxbridge's amputated leg, and the contested reception of the hero's (dismembered) body. It then moves through Louise Carter and Helen Metcalfe's discussion of military service and of the kinds of emotional relationships that soldiers formed with each other, and with those back home. Next, Anna Maria Barry concerns herself with the case of Charles Incedon, a man who used his experience as a sailor to shape his public identity as singer of patriotic and sentimental songs. Michael Brown and Joanne Begiato conclude the first half with their study of the representation of the aged veteran, and of the ways in which lived experiences might be transmuted into varied cultural forms to serve a shifting range of social, cultural and political agendas.

The second half widens the lens further, exploring the ways in which martial masculinities served as meditation and metaphor for writers and readers alike. Barbara Leonardi examines the work of the 'Etrick Shepherd', James Hogg, its representation of the horrors of war and its oblique reflection on Waterloo and Scottish martial masculinity. Susan Walton considers Charlotte Yonge and the ways in which martial values and regimental pride could be passed through generations and across genders. Next, Lorenzo Servitje explores Alfred Tennyson's poem 'Locksley Hall' (1842) and its frustrated protagonist's sublimation of his identity into a collective military masculinity. Karen Turner, meanwhile, considers Charlotte Brontë's obsession with military history and her extensive use of martial metaphors in *Jane Eyre* (1847) to describe acts of love and courtship. And in the final two chapters, Elly McCausland and Helen Goodman explore the realm of late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century children's and adolescents' fiction, using Arthurian tales and H. Rider Haggard's novels, respectively, to point up the varied and complex ways in which both writers and readers imagined the relationship between masculinity, maturity and adventure.

A number of key themes emerge from this collection. First, the interplay between military and civil worlds is striking. The language and metaphors of martial masculinities permeated people's ways of thinking and expressing themselves. Walton's analysis of Yonge's life-writing and fiction shows that military characteristics could be aspired to by both sexes, and by children as well as adults. As Isaac Land indicates in his Epilogue, women have fought in battle on land and sea, and, as we shall see in this volume, many more reproduced martial values in their lives and work. Thus, Charlotte Brontë deployed a military vocabulary

and martial strategy to construct elements of her fiction. Moreover, her construction of the 'metaphorical soldier', as Turner describes Brontë's warrior-priest characters, represents courtship as a battle. Crucially, for our purposes, as in the case of *Jane Eyre*, this was a style of combat from which the woman could emerge victor, because she too knew the rules of engagement. By the end of the century, as McCausland and Goodman show, adventure literature for children and adolescents was saturated with exemplary protagonists, from youths to old men, who embodied inspirational martial qualities. Military masculinity was thus a performance, whether personal, like Charles Inledon, who, as Barry argues, deployed his early career as a sailor to enhance his reputation as a singer, or collective, such as indicated by the photographs, processions and theatrical spectacles of Crimean and Indian Mutiny veterans in their regimental uniforms.

The performance of military masculinities was, however, by no means simple or straightforward, and a second theme that marks out this volume is the multiplicity of martial identities and their inherent ambiguities. There is no doubt that there were certain qualities associated with military manliness, yet these were constantly in tension. Servitje, for example, proposes that Tennyson's 'Locksley Hall' exposes the underlying complexities of military masculinities. The poem conveys the ways in which the individual soldier is sublimated into the whole, manipulated into serving the empire and nation. Similarly, Leonardi shows how military masculinity could be positioned as tainted because it opened the individual to exploitation. Her examination of Hogg's writing argues that he denounced the human loss of the Napoleonic Wars and, in so doing, undermined the myth of the Highland Warrior. For him, the soldier risked being a 'mere machine' because patriotism and military values led him to blindly fight and needlessly die for his 'feudal' overlords. On the one hand, Hogg used medievalism to critique war. McCausland's examination of Arthuriana in late nineteenth-century boys' fiction, on the other hand, shows that medieval chivalry could be co-opted to shore up traditionally ascribed warrior values in the face of modern and de-individualised conflict. Here, the moral rather than physical virtues of the soldier hero were given prominence. Indeed, throughout the long nineteenth century, the very materiality of military masculinity could simultaneously promote and undermine it.

Thirdly, the body was central to military masculinity but also, therefore, a means by which it was vulnerable. As Banister demonstrates, accounts of martial heroism were put under strain when the hero was

Introduction

physically damaged. Lord Uxbridge emerged from battle a hero, but his loss of a limb, even if stoically borne, undermined the ideals of a military masculinity forged through whole, strong male bodies. Cultural restoration work was required to maintain Uxbridge in the role of military hero. Charles Incedon discovered that his own body became a liability in his attempt to transform his martial past into popular fame. A former Jack Tar, he could benefit from the sailor's appealing persona while his body fitted the public stereotype of naval manhood, although he was less well-served by the accompanying stereotypes of the Tar as man of appetite when his own reputation for womanising could not be offset by the risks and glamour of actual naval service. Moreover, once he grew fat, his donning of a uniform simply served to highlight the potential discrepancies between sinewy military and soft, civilian bodies. For veterans, on the one hand, bodies were markers of military valour and prompts for others to respect their service and sacrifice. On the other hand, infirmity exposed aged veterans to poverty, and while it could be used to remind the state of its responsibilities to its soldiers and sailors, it produced, at best, sympathy, and, at worst, neglect.

The veteran was often depicted in the act of returning to domesticity through this period. Yet the military was never a domain that was isolated from the domestic or familial. Thus, our fourth theme explores the interconnectedness of the military and the domestic. Metcalfe uses bachelor soldiers' correspondence to reveal how they recreated domestic, homely spaces while on active service. This was not merely a material practice designed to produce temporary comfort. It was a form of nostalgia that helped manage the medical condition's symptoms. Moreover, their discussions and evocations of these homes in letters exchanged with family members offered emotional comfort and demonstrated the critical links between civilian and military spheres. There is still some degree of debate about how far domestic and military masculinities were antithetical modes. For Servitje, on the one hand, Tennyson's 'Locksley Hall' reveals the opposition of domestic and military forms of masculinity. The poem's narrator is subjected to a military life because he is unsuccessful in marrying and setting up home. Carter, on the other hand, uses soldiers' life-writings to reveal the continuity and similarity between them. While soldiering could undermine family life, since men were required to leave home to serve and often discouraged from combining marriage and family with a profession in arms, military men's masculine identity was still rooted in the domestic. They cultivated links with family members as best they

could, and they constructed surrogate family relationships within their regiments, just as sailors did on board ship. Here, commanding officers were paternal figures, while fellow soldiers were brothers in arms. It is thus unsurprising that when military men returned home and set up families, they cultivated martial values across the generations, characteristics which, as we see from both Charlotte Yonge's family life and the cultural motif of the aged veteran, their wives and daughters, as well as their sons, were encouraged to uphold.

In such ways, this volume highlights the complexities and ambiguities of martial masculinities in nineteenth-century Britain. At a time when the trope of the noble, self-sacrificing and wounded soldier continues to be deployed to serve a variety of interests and agendas, such sensitivity to history, meaning and representation is not simply an intellectual exercise but a social and political responsibility. We hope that what follows will serve to facilitate an ongoing interdisciplinary conversation about these themes and will stimulate further research into what is both a flourishing and timely field of scholarship.

Notes

- 1 Robert A. Doughty, *Pyrrhic Victory: French Strategy and Operations in the Great War* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2005), pp. 161–2.
- 2 *Huddersfield Daily Examiner*, 18 June 1915, p. 2, col. D. Some of this material is credited to the *Daily Telegraph*, although exactly how much is unclear.
- 3 For example, see Michael Brown, 'Cold Steel Weak Flesh: Mechanism, Masculinity and the Anxieties of Late Victorian Empire', *Cultural and Social History* 14:2 (2017), 155–81.
- 4 The conference, 'Military Masculinities in the Long Nineteenth Century', 20–21 May 2015, was organised by Anna Maria Barry and Emma Butcher and was affiliated with Waterloo200, the official body recognised by the UK government to commemorate the bicentenary. For more details on the conference, see <https://militarymasculinities.wordpress.com/> (accessed 23 July 2018).
- 5 The year 2015 also saw the announcement by the British government that women would be able to serve in combat roles in the British army, something which was formally introduced in 2016. Nonetheless, the culture of the military and its representation remains overwhelmingly masculinist.
- 6 David Bell, *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Modern Warfare as We Know It* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2007); Daniel Pick, *War Machine: The Rationalisation of Slaughter in the Modern Age* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

Introduction

- 7 Catriona Kennedy and Matthew McCormack (eds), *Soldiering in Britain and Ireland, 1750–1850: Men of Arms* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 3–4.
- 8 Olive Anderson, *A Liberal State at War: English Politics and Economics during the Crimean War* (London: Macmillan, 1967); Olive Anderson, ‘The Growth of Christian Militarism in mid-Victorian Britain’, *English Historical Review* 86 (1971), 46–72.
- 9 J. W. M. Hichberger, *Images of the Army: The Military in British Art, 1815–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).
- 10 Both have published widely but, for example, see J. A. Mangan, *The Games Ethic and Imperialism: Aspects of the Diffusion of an Ideal* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986); J. A. Mangan, ‘“Muscular, Militaristic and Manly”: The British Middle-Class Hero as Moral Messenger’, *International Journal for the History of Sport* 13:1 (1996), 28–47; J. A. Mangan and Callum McKenzie, *Militarism, Hunting, Imperialism: ‘Blooding’ the Martial Male* (London: Routledge, 2010); John M. Mackenzie, ‘The Imperial Pioneer and Hunter and the British Masculine Stereotype in Late Victorian and Edwardian Times’, in J. A. Mangan and James Walvin (eds), *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800–1940* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), pp. 176–98.
- 11 The literature on ‘shell shock’ and war neuroses in the First World War is vast, but, for a recent account, see Tracey Loughran, *Shell-Shock and Medical Culture in First World War Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017). For a more general account of masculinity in the First World War, see Jessica Meyer, *Men of War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
- 12 Yuval Noah Harari, *The Ultimate Experience: Battlefield Revelations and the Making of Modern War Culture, 1450–2000* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
- 13 Philip Shaw, *Waterloo and the Romantic Imagination* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Philip Shaw, *Suffering and Sentiment in Romantic Military Art* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013).
- 14 Jeremy Black, *Naval Power: A History of Warfare and the Sea from 1500 Onwards* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); N. A. M. Rodgers, *The Safeguard of the Sea: A Naval History of Britain, 660–1649* (London: Penguin, 1997); N. A. M. Rodgers, *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649–1815* (London: Penguin, 2004); Brian Lavery, *Nelson’s Navy: The Ships, Men and Organisation 1793–1815* (London: Conway, 1989).
- 15 N. A. M. Rodgers, *The Wooden World: An Anatomy of the Georgian Navy* (Glasgow: William Collins, 1986).
- 16 Nelson is the subject of a sizeable number of publications.
- 17 Mary Conley, *From Jack Tar to Union Jack: Representing Naval Manhood in the British Empire, 1870–1918* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p. 1.

Martial masculinities

- 18 James MacKenzie, 'Preface', in Mary Conley (ed.), *From Jack Tar to Union Jack: Representing Naval Manhood in the British Empire, 1870–1918* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p. ix.
- 19 A remarkably early example of interest in the cultural representation of the sailor is Charles Napier Robinson's *The British Tar in Fact and Fiction: The Poetry, Pathos, and Humour of the Sailor's Life* (1911), which gathered textual and visual images of the Tar from the sixteenth century onwards. Recent analysis building on Land and Conley includes Joanne Begiato (Bailey), 'Tears and the Manly Sailor in England, c. 1760–1860', *Journal for Maritime Research* 17:2 (2015), 117–33 and Beverly Lemire, 'A Question of Trousers: Seafarers, Masculinity and Empire in the Shaping of British Male Dress, c. 1600–1800', *Cultural and Social History* 13:1 (2016), 1–22.
- 20 Elin Jones, 'Masculinity, Materiality and Space Onboard the Royal Naval Ship, 1756–1815' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Queen Mary University of London, 2016), chapter 2.
- 21 Holly Furneaux and Sue Pritchard, 'Contested Objects: Curating Soldier Art', *Museum and Society* 13:4 (2015), 447–61.
- 22 Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1994); Michael Paris, *Warrior Nation: Images of War in British Popular Culture, 1850–2000* (London: Reaktion, 2000). The literature on masculinity, empire and socialisation is too vast to list here, but, for an early example, see J. A. Mangan (ed.), *Making Imperial Mentalities: Socialisation and British Imperialism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), and for more recent work, see Joseph A. Kestner, *Masculinities in British Adventure Fiction, 1880–1915* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010) and Stephanie Olsen, *Juvenile Nation: Youth, Emotions and the Making of the Modern British Citizen, 1880–1914* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).
- 23 Neil Ramsey, *The Military Memoir and Romantic Literary Culture, 1780–1835* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011); Catriona Kennedy, *Narratives of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars: Military and Civilian Experience in Britain and Ireland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Isaac Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor, 1750–1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Begiato (Bailey), 'Tears and the Manly Sailor'; James Davey, 'Singing for the Nation: Balladry, Naval Recruitment and the Language of Patriotism in Eighteenth-century Britain', *The Mariner's Mirror* 103:1 (2017), 43–66.
- 24 Michael Brown, "'Like a Devoted Army": Medicine, Heroic Masculinity, and the Military Paradigm in Victorian Britain', *Journal of British Studies* 43:9 (2010), 592–622.
- 25 Michelle Tusan, 'War and the Victorians: Response', *Victorian Studies* 58:2 (2016), 324–31.