Regency masculinity?

Napoleonic War veterans and explaining change in the history of masculinities

Karen Downing

Australian National University, Australia

Abstract Historians of British masculinities find it difficult to explain change over time. While their use of the labels 'Georgian' and 'Victorian' masculinity elide the contemporaneous multiplicities and diachronically enduring characteristics of manliness, they do express observable differences in discussion and debates about, and representations of, masculinity between the late eighteenth century and the mid-nineteenth century. 'Regency' is often used to describe the period of change between the two eras, but there is little comparable use of the term 'Regency masculinity'. This chapter offers naval veterans of the Napoleonic wars as examples of 'Regency masculinity', figures of transitional masculinities, that elucidate how changes in ideas of manly behaviour, representations, and expectations, occur in response to conjunctures of historical circumstance, material necessity, and personal aspiration.

How do notions, expectations, and behaviours of masculinity change over time? This perplexing issue for historians was recently tackled by Ben Griffin in a sophisticated and challenging re-examination of R.W. Connell's work on 'hegemonic masculinity'. Griffin identifies the key problems of Connell's model as articulated by historians over the past two decades: questioning its functionalism, its treatment of femininity, its oversimplification that creates an unwarranted stability, its lack of detail on questions of scale, its problematic ontology, and, what Griffin terms, its situational identity problem – its inability to recognise that individual men move between masculinities in the course of their lives, or even their days. Rather than abandon Connell's model, Griffin offers some provocative modifications that might equip historians of masculinity to make 'meaningful generalisations about change over time' and produce more 'incisive periodisation'. Griffin's analytical framework and its argument successfully deploys Simon Szreter's notion of 'communication communities', the social groups in which ideals are formed and behaviours are learned. In Szreter's formulation identities are

constructed by and embodied in the shared practices and values of these communities, principally the family, neighbourhood, school, church and work. A person's identity is formed as they move between these communities during their lifetimes. The communities may be adjacent, culturally similar and reinforcing, but they may also overlap, with the potential for conflicting loyalties and values. Communities may be physically co-located, such as the family and the neighbourhood, but mass culture and technology allows people to participate in communities whose other members they may never meet. The concept of communication communities explains how middling and elite classes can be identified by a common set of values and practices inculcated through their participation in educational institutions and their shared reading practices while the values and practices of the working class differs from region to region. It also provides an explanation of why changes in society are so uneven. Some communities a person will choose, some they will be forced to participate in. In terms of gender identities, communication communities are where boys learn to be men.[1]

The British Royal Navy, at the end of the eighteenth century, was a large and influential communication community. The demands of the Napoleonic Wars meant the mobilisation of more men than ever before, and the end of the wars in 1815 sent unprecedented numbers of men back into civilian life. Their numbers, and their pervasiveness in visual and literary culture, invites interrogation of naval men as figures of transitional masculinities that explain how changes in representations, expectations and ideals of manly behaviour occur in the conjunctures of historical circumstance, material necessity, and personal aspiration. Naval men's role in democratising concepts of manliness, helps to explain the observed rise in dominance of masculine attributes that suited the needs of an urbanised, market-led, industrialising society, at a time when men were more likely to have shared a common experience in military service than in changes resulting from the industrial revolution.[2]

Choosing naval veterans to explain change

The problem, as John Tosh so succinctly put it, is that '[a]t the level of popular stereotype no greater contrast could be imagined than that between the uninhibited "Georgian" libertine and his sober frock-coated "Victorian" grandson.'[3] Tosh's own more nuanced historical studies identify vying notions of manliness of the Georgian era, rather than simply libertinism, including the conspicuous consumerism of the city aristocracy, the benevolent patriarchy of the country gentlemen, the virtuousness of the evangelising middling sort, the aggressive mercantilism of merchants, and the frank fearlessness of the lower orders. He does, however, still identify a shift to more commonly shared ideals of patriotism, independence, discipline, restraint on physical aggression, and dedication to family pursuits, which were embodied in the middle-class Victorian patriarch of home, business and politics.[4]

The way in which historians describe masculinities, and the continuities and changes that they observe, is an inevitable result of their sources and methodological approach. A gender analysis of

patriarchal relations between men and women or a social historical analysis of masculinity's interaction with class will focus on the relations of power. A psychological analysis will foreground subjective experience that a cultural historical analysis, with its emphasis on codes and representations, will not consider. Tosh contends that the transformation between Georgian and Victorian society was evidenced in a sharper distinction between 'manliness' and 'gentlemanliness' – where 'gentleman' continued to invoke refinement and sociability, and 'manliness' was more about rugged individualism, a style of masculinity, says Tosh, that gained in social and political weight during the nineteenth century. 'Rugged individualism' would seem to sit uneasily with the emphasis on attention to domestic arrangements that Louise Carter finds in debates surrounding the 'Queen Caroline Affair' during which the Prince Regent publicly accused his wife of adultery and attempted to prevent her from being crowned Queen in 1820. Carter says that condemnation of the Prince Regent adds weight to the argument that a new model of domestic masculinity was in ascendancy, even for men in positions of public prominence. Joanne Begiato, however, has shown that such a model was not new in the 1820s, that 'the man of sensibility' was, in part, assessed by his domestic and familial relationships from at least the 1760s.[5]

Other historians argue that there was no change, or that it was limited. Tosh himself has identified household authority as an example of 'enduring masculinity', and concluded that notions of self-discipline and a certain 'roughness' (often peculiarly English) were not superseded during the eighteenth-century rise of politeness. Peter Clark reveals the pre-industrial origins of homosocial clubs, societies and associations, and Allen J. Frantzen, Mark Girouard and Tim Fulford explain the persistence of the notion of chivalry.[6] William Stafford's investigation of the *Gentleman's Magazine* leads him to conclude that there was no disappearance of the man of sensibility, with a concurrent onset of reserve and taciturnity, or a shift from a 'social' to an 'individualistic self'. Kevin Waite, who focuses on the role of sport and the ideology of education in Napoleonic-era public schools, finds more continuity than change: many of the qualities celebrated in late Victorian schoolboys – such as self-reliance, courage, fortitude, and loyalty – were also valued during the Georgian era. And Karen Harvey has suggested that the military contexts in which some men's masculinity was forged suggest limits to the hegemony of politeness during this period.[7]

'Georgian' and 'Victorian' are descriptors used to describe masculinities during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries respectively, but 'Regency', an established label in historical works, is less often used to describe gender. It tends to refer to the period from around 1795 to Queen Victoria's inauguration in 1837 (although the formal Regency lasted from 1811 when George III was deemed unfit to rule until his death in 1820 when the Prince Regent became George IV), and it is used extensively to describe particular trends in British architecture, literature, fashions, politics and culture. Most distinctive about the period, however, is change. Much of the historiography of the early decades of the nineteenth century depicts the Regency as a period of transition between an old England of predominantly rural attitudes, and a new England of accelerating industrialisation; or as a

pre-modern plateau of aesthetic style and taste and tolerant sexuality before the onset of the moral and social seriousness of the Victorian period; or as GM Young colourfully described it in the 1940s, as moving out of the age of humbug into the age of humdrum. Words like 'disorder', 'discontent' and 'uncertainty' are used in works that describe an age of 'reform', of 'revolution' or 'improvement' or of the 'forging of the modern state'. In these works the eighteenth century might last until 1815, but the nineteenth often does not begin until 1830,[8] and the 1815 Corn Law could be described as 'eighteenth-century Britain coming into conflict with nineteenth-century Britain'.[9] This sense of overlap, disruption and transition is also evident in descriptions of men alive during the Regency period. R.J. White finds in the panoply of characters involved in political agitation between Waterloo and Peterloo, a 'strange juxtaposition of the old world and the new, within the lifetime of these men'.[10] Biographers of men of the period struggle to articulate this juxtaposition, so that John George Lambton, born in 1792, is described as 'essentially' an eighteenth-century figure who died without having adjusted to the Victorian world.[11] The events, and the men, of the period we label the Regency are categorised as belonging to one century or the other, or to neither.

Cultural historians and literary scholars often call the period the 'Romantic Age', signifying, as the editors of the *Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age* explain, a period of 'self-conscious and diverse cultural revolution that takes its names from the canonical group of writers who crystallized many of its key changes and who became ideologically ascendant in the process.'[12] 'Romantic' could certainly be a descriptor of masculinity during this period if we understand 'romantic', as Neil Ramsey defines it, as 'the sentimental and aesthetic preservation of traditions within the modern nation that could limit or ameliorate the enervation suffered by modern, commercial society',[13] or if 'romantic' describes manly behaviour that exercises judgement, restraint and balance as the contemporary work of Maria Edgeworth and Walter Scott did.[14] 'Romantic' can, however, be interpreted more broadly: it does not have the temporal and geographic exactitude that gives it equivalence to 'Georgian' or 'Victorian'.

Thinking in terms of John Tosh's popular stereotypes, the dandy, as epitomised by George Bryan 'Beau' Brummel, is perhaps the most recognisable male figure of the Regency period. While Brummel is an example of the potential for social mobility in the period and has a place in the history of dandyism and male fashion – sitting aesthetically between the luxurious fabrics and highly decorative fashions of earlier aristocrats and the restrained suiting of elite and middle-class men during the nineteenth century – his value in explaining broader changes in masculinities is limited. As Ellen Moers pointed out, the dandy had no coat of arms, no ancestral portraits, no obligations, no attachments, no wife, no child, no occupation and no obvious means of support.[15] The dandy's membership of any particular communication community was limited and his influence, especially on future generations, was negligible. Another fashionable Regency figure was the pugilist, or boxer.[16] Prizefighting was enormously popular and boxing heroes, for a short time, exemplified a manly ideal that accommodated traditional views of manliness with newer sentiments of sensibility in an identity

that was patriotically British. After the first prizefight in America in 1816, however, boxing's repute as uniquely British declined.[17]

The glamourous naval officer, however, is as familiar as the dandy or the boxer, and he was a member of an influential, unambiguously British, institution that bestowed prestige and potential influence, particularly during and after the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. The French wars were not 'total' in sense of twentieth-century wars but, Clive Emsley agues, they were 'qualitatively and quantitatively different from their immediate predecessors' in terms of the demands they made of Britain's people and finances, and their deployment of nationalism as a motivating force. 'Indeed', writes Emsley, 'if there was a common experience shared by all Britons in the last decade of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth centuries, it is to be found less in the changes resulting from the industrial revolution and more in the demands of war.'[18] Military service was a conscious and explicit 'avenue to manhood' and young men's motivation for enlistment was as much the decisive break with parental authority and dependence as the patriotic desire to serve the nation, as Catriona Kennedy finds in letters, diaries and personal testimonies of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. Both the army and, perhaps to an even greater extent, the navy, writes Kennedy, 'had at their disposal a complex assemblage of rituals, symbols and rules designed to mould and reconfigure their members' identities – from the intensely physical drilling and disciplining of the other ranks to the more subtle, coercive pressures of the regimental peer group.'[19]

Much of the following discussion, therefore, would apply to soldiers and the army as much as sailors and the navy but it is arguably naval figures that dominated in visual and material culture. It was with maritime narratives that the British organised – economically, politically and culturally – their seaborne empire,[20] and in this expanding empire, being 'at sea' was for many men, in the words of a popular song, 'where I should ever be'.[21] A career in the army was seen by many as a more part-time career. Recruits tended to be based closer to home and it was, therefore, considered more suitable for elder sons of the aristocracy and gentry who also needed to cultivate interests and pursue activities suitable for an heir. In being relatively safer than the navy, elder sons in the army were more likely to live to inherit property and title. Even the royal family followed this practice: although George III's eldest son and heir, George, Prince of Wales, did not serve, his second son, Frederick, duke of York, commenced a military career and his third, William, joined the navy.[22] With its higher level of risk the navy's potential for glory and money – and, therefore, for social mobility – was also higher. Naval men, therefore, are more explanatory figures in an account of change.

The familiarity of the naval officer, and our popular understanding of the Navy's role in Regency Britain, is due in large part to the enduring reception of the novels of Jane Austen (1775–1817) whose own younger brothers, Francis and Charles, had lifelong careers in the navy. Publishing between 1811 and 1817, Austen's use of naval men as figures of social change, and issues of social mobility, domesticity and politeness has been much-discussed by historians.[23] In her novels, as Tim Fulford writes, Austen 'not only made it admirable to be – or to marry – a naval officer' but gave both

men and women roles in which duty was paramount. In the Royal Navy gentility was redefined in terms of professional activity and discipline, and the gentry, Austen suggests, was renewed by the careers that its less wealthy sons have taken up, and revitalized by opportunities that empire gave for character-building employment.[24] Furthermore, argues, Joseph A. Kestner, Austen's juxtaposition of self-indulgent, enervated men with daring and dutiful Navy men clearly conveys the 'transitional nature of the redefinition and reconstruction of masculinity following the revolutionary and Napoleonic eras'.[25]

Representations of all sailors, not just officers, were pervasive in British visual and material culture and historians have comprehensively covered the association of the sailor figure with masculinity and also with national identity. Joanne Begiato, Isaac Land and Mary Conley, for example, explore how the figure of the sailor was employed to embody nation and empire. Although focusing on different periods and debating the finer points of periodisation, these works provide a persuasive account of the ubiquity of representations of the sailor in everyday life, 'in word, song, picture, object, and spectacle', wherein 'Jack Tar' was both malleable enough to portray changing, even competing, ideals of masculinity as well as being an effective vehicle to perpetuate newly desired ideals. They describe the 'constitutive power' of this figure and its role in democratising elite concepts of manliness.[26] This chapter explains how men moulded by institutional imperatives of active service in the Royal Navy during the Napoleonic Wars played a significant role in this democratising process in post-war British society.

The Royal Navy as a communication community

Communication communities are more than networks for exchange of ideas and culture, consisting as they do of people with a common stake in the goals of the group. They are similar to Barbara Rosenwein's 'emotional communities'[27] that also share goals, interests, values and norms of emotional expression but Szreter's formulation of 'communication community' more adequately captures the complexity of an institution such as the Royal Navy, whose members came from diverse other communication communities of class and geographical region, attracted to naval service for varying reasons, and bringing with them distinctive concepts of manly behaviours and expectations. Their behaviours were rewarded or reprimanded, and their expectations were reshaped, by an institution attempting to meet the challenges of technological innovation, administrative change, and active warfare. Importantly for this discussion, the Navy was a communication community in which conceptions of honour and gentlemanliness were reconfigured: where honour could be earned through deeds rather than heredity, and a gentlemen could be identified by his behaviour rather than his birth.

Seamen (merchant and as well as Royal Navy) were at this time a large sector of the British labour force, and naval operations employed even more than those serving at sea: naval dockyards were Britain's biggest industrial complexes in the eighteenth century and the largest single employer

of civilian labour. Shipbuilding demanded from the British government more than a third of its total expenditure. The 168,000 pounds of hemp, 33,750 pounds of copper, 4,800 pounds of nails, and 100,000 cubic feet of timber that went into each of the 74-gun ships which were the mainstay of the navy were part of a trade that in the Baltic alone engaged 4500 merchant seamen. The financing of naval expansion came largely from excise duties on imports and indirect taxes on a huge variety of goods and luxuries, from windows to hair powder, playing cards, non-working horses, carriages and servants. The bulk of the tax burden, therefore, fell most heavily on the commercial and middling classes as consumers, yet they expressed no discontent as they benefited directly from the navy's control and expansion of the shipping trade. As the navy expanded, Britain's commerce by sea increased by seven per cent year after year.[28]

The Royal Navy was growing faster than any other European power, and its rapid expansion after 1789 meant that thousands more men participated in the navy: In 1792 there were just over 17,361 men registered on naval ships, but in 1810, during the Napoleonic Wars, there were 146,312.[29] To appreciate the scale of that mobilisation, says Isaac Land, we need to know that in this same time period a town of just 10,000 people was considered substantial. London was the exception at just over one million, but only a few other cities in the British Isles had more than 50,000 inhabitants. As Land concludes, 'It is hard not to see how such a vast mobilization of maritime workers would not "impinge" on society, or would appear in any way "remote" from the daily life of a nation in which the largest cities were, almost without exception, ports.'[30] Reinforcing the lack of distinction between naval and civilian life was 'the deployment of a highly-charged patriotic rhetoric that proclaimed the war effort the concern of every man and woman, rich and poor across the four nations of the British isles'.[31]

Accompanying the expansion of the Royal Navy were technological and administrative changes which, in the words of Ben Wilson, turned the Navy into 'a highly efficient, highly motivated war-winning machine.' New ships that incorporated the advantages of British rigging with the design of faster and more seaworthy French vessels were introduced to the fleet in 1755. That same year the Admiralty took control of the marines, and transformed it into a highly-trained force capable of advanced amphibious warfare. Tighter administration, through the centralisation of provisioning instead of reliance on contractors, diminished fraud, improved the quantity and quality of food, and enabled ships once able to be at sea for a fortnight to spend three months away from shore. Promotion procedures were overhauled and more control was taken by the Admiralty so that admirals were not necessarily appointed from captain's lists and the promotion of senior officers was not simply based on long service rather than merit. Unsuitable captains were moved sideways into a new rank of commodore in a new and ship-less squadron allowing better qualified officers to be promoted.[32]

Changes extended to discipline and order aboard ships, the relationship between sailors and officers, and the expectations of officers. Order and motivation aboard ship was maintained through unchanging routine and endless drills. Corporal punishment was still prevalent but it was increasingly

regulated and less casually employed. The routine of daily cleaning kept sailors preoccupied and physically active. The endless drilling produced fighting teams that could work in harmony, and often in silence, even in battle. Ship-board relations remained rigidly hierarchical, from captain down to cabin boy, but 'clusters of hierarchy' – every mast and gun had a 'captain', each division had a midshipmen at its head and a chain of command – provided opportunities for competition within the ship as well as between ships, further sharpening the crew's fighting capacity.[33] Routines, drills, and hierarchical relations instilled self-discipline and duty, essential qualities for success in battle, but also for successful manliness.

The emerging processes of professionalisation rewarded, circumscribed and prescribed particular behaviours in crews.[34] For aspiring officers on the quarter deck, regardless of their social status by birth, courage and ship-board skills were no longer sufficient: more formal education and manners were also required.[35] A man such as Andrew Barclay who 'was never at a school' and learnt all that he knew 'after going to sea' at the age of sixteen might get no further than the rank of gunner. To really shine, wrote Lieutenant Edward Thompson, a man must be 'a man of letters, and languages, a mathematician, and an accomplished gentleman'. Not just 'any blockhead' could become an officer. He recommended studies in French, Spanish, Italian and mathematics to help with navigation, as well as drawing, fortification and surveying of coasts and harbours. By the end of the century aspiring officers were advised to also learn history, geography, politics, and dancing to be competitive for promotions. Conversely midshipmen of elite birth were treated as ratings, given menial tasks and sent aloft to work with the topmen (no exception was made for George III's son). In '[t]he last war,' said Thompson, 'a chaw of tobacco, a rattan, and a rope of oaths, were sufficient *qualifications* to constitute a lieutenant, but now education and good manners are the study of all: and far from effeminacy.'[36] 'Effeminacy' referred to suspicions that education and good manners had undermined the fighting fitness of aristocratic leaders. Such concerns had been bought to the fore following the executions of Lieutenant Phillips in 1745, for surrendering his ship to the French, and of Admiral Byng in 1757, for failing to fight sufficiently vigorously.[37] New merit-based promotions for senior officers meant that elite men could no longer rely on the privileges of birth, and that in addition to their education and manners they needed to demonstrate courage and disciplined leadership. In the Navy men found opportunities to escape the assumptions of their birth status. 'Gentlemanliness' defined by acquired skills and observable behaviours blurred class distinctions.

The Navy was not the only forum in which honour and claims to gentlemanly status were contested and re-shaped, but it was an institution in which very large numbers of men were affected by these changes. It simply was not feasible that the leaders of such huge forces would all come from elite classes as they had done, and S.A. Cavell has shown in a very detailed social survey from data collected on nearly 4000 quarterdeck boys and junior officers that there was indeed wide social diversity among them and faster progress through the ranks for them.[38] Around 50 per cent of officer

entry between 1793 and 1815 came from professional families – medicine, law, civil service – and around nine per cent were from clerical families.[39]

Other newly-valued traits in men were incorporated into naval life. The attention to the domestic sphere that Louise Carter identifies was an aspect of leadership if we think of the 'domestic sphere' as including all-male households on ships. Ships' captains had long assumed the role of 'sea-father' to their young officers, who could join the crew as a captain's servant at just eleven years of age, but by the beginning of the nineteenth century more paternalistic care was extended to all crew-members. Excessive punishment was increasingly condemned and, following the naval mutinies of 1797, the revised regulations and instructions of 1806 included detailed stipulations about education, hygiene and medical care.[40]

Able seamen benefited from such stipulations, and from improvements in the quantity and quality of food, but changes in promotions meant little to seamen who were attached to a ship rather than the navy itself and had no fixed career path. The routine drills necessary to train men to fight, were just as necessary to keep disgruntled men busy: there was no shortage of impressed men who had reason for complaint. The navy relied on impressment – violent and involuntary conscription – to man its warships. By law, any man with experience at sea – fishermen, coastal traders, merchant seamen – could be forced to serve. Impressed men made up about half of its complement during wartime. Edward Spain was content with the adventures and rewards of a merchant seamen but found himself 'press'd' into the Royal Navy on two occasions. Whether voluntary or impressed, a sailor might hail from anywhere in England, or the world. Tens of thousands came from Ireland, perhaps up to 30 per cent of crews. Lascars, sailors from the Indian subcontinent, southeast Asia and the Arab world continued to be found on naval ships, as they had from the sixteenth century, and Americans continued to be pressed without impunity even after independence. Seamen were 'men of the world' and their sense of collective endeavour, and role in the global exchange of goods and as influencers of fashion and taste, in shaping their masculine identities is beginning to be explored.[41]

These regional and ethnic identities did not disappear on board, and conflicts contributed to disciplinary issues. Initiation and hazing rituals were rough, and few of these men would have been used to the isolation of long periods at sea, the complex organisational structures, 24-hour work cycles, constant surveillance, and corporal punishment. Desertion rates were high, averaging 25 percent annually, and mutinies, usually over working conditions, were common. In 1797 around 35,000 seamen participated in the largest, most sustained working-class offensive of the century. They asked their officers to leave the ships, and issued demands: for guaranteed shore leave and freedom from press gangs, increased wages, fairer distribution of prize money, the right to oust tyrannical commanders, and to be tried by a jury of their peers, not by a court martial made up only of officers.[42]

Despite their regular disaffection seamen chose to make themselves identifiable as sailors. Uniform regulations for commissioned officers were introduced in 1748, uniforms for midshipmen, warrant officers and mates were introduced in 1778, for surgeons in 1805, and for masters and pursers

in 1807. Despite criticism of uniforms – for being too civilian or not 'war-like' enough – over time they helped create recognition of, and identification with, a 'brotherhood' of officers. Seamen had to wait for uniforms until 1857, but until then still chose to make themselves a visible cohort with uniformity in their dress, favouring short blue jackets, coloured waistcoats, check shirts, neckcloth, striped or white trousers and round hats or Monmouth caps. Trousers were themselves a marker of masculine acculturation. Worn exclusively by labourers at the beginning of the eighteenth century, they were the favoured choice of naval officers, colonists and fashionable elites, such as the dandy, by 1800. Initially adopted by officers from their sailors because of their practicality, their growing acceptance among broader society revealed the rising authority of military masculinity. Clothes, along with a sea-legged gait and distinctive language – whether to define membership of the group, impress outsiders, or taunt press gangs – visibly defined seamen ashore.[43]

It may be that seamen sought to visibly identify themselves as naval men in order to share in the glow of public admiration that accompanied the Royal Navy's war time victories: they could claim their place in the great patriotic enterprise even when their officers generally received the credit for victories at sea. But prize money was just as strong a bond to the institution. All the crew shared in prize money, and the cash value of captured ships and the arithmetic of this money was as regulated as shares of pirate plunder. Even an inequitable distribution gave ordinary seamen significant windfalls. Andrew Barclay, for example, volunteered for the Royal Navy when war with America broke out in 1775 rather than be 'pressed into service'. He joined the *Elizabeth* as midshipmen under Captain Frederick Maitland, and his share of prize money from that voyage was £60.[44]

The Royal Navy was a communication community that recognised and rewarded, curbed and sanctioned, existing male behaviours in the pursuit of institutional goals. But the Navy was also an intensely physical experience where sheer survival depended on very skilled men working as a team; where 'the skills of the young topmen aloft were as vital as those of the officer on the quarterdeck.'[45] Men 'bound together in skill, purpose, courage and community',[46] found dignity and self-respect in their roles and, as complaints to authorities and mutinies revealed, seamen expected acknowledgement from officers of their worth.[47] The result was that successful sailors, regardless of their position in the ship's hierarchy, exhibited some shared traits – or were at least expected to have them. They needed to combine physical prowess and courage with resourcefulness, self-discipline, respectful manners, and emotional responsiveness (or 'sensibility').[48] As John Bechervaise wrote in 1839, 'To sum up the true character of the British seamen, he should be a man, who, if placed in difficulty, will have the presence of mind to overcome it; if placed in danger, will possess the necessary courage to meet it; or if presented with an object of beauty, will regard it with all the enthusiasm of genuine admiration.'[49] Heroic masculinity and honour, as portrayed in autobiographies and biographies, construed these manly characteristics as something more than high-risk deeds or the pursuit of status: 'cultivation of the inner man' was also required.[50] The navy was a setting in which both self-disciplined physicality and inner character were needed for heroism. It was a setting in

which men earned the status of gentlemen regardless of their birth and expected to be recognised as such.

Naval service also tied patriotism, duty, and cooperative endeavour to financial incentive and remuneration as a masculine ideal. While mercantile men had long pursued profit, they had been haunted by a class-based distrust of men whose fortunes were based on fungible liquid assets and, especially, on financial credit, rather than on the tangible asset of land. The inherent fragility of this type of wealth meant that business reversals could see a merchant 'wholly unmanned'.[51] Patriotism expressed through courage in battle reconciled the paradox of honour and fiscal interests: profits did not undermine honour when pursued in the national interest.[52]

What should not be underestimated is the appeal of very real physical dangers to which the Navy exposed men. Regardless of moves in society to politeness and manners, demonstrations of physical hardiness and courage were still markers of successful manhood; and the more hazardous and difficult the demonstration, the more credit was reflected on the man undertaking it.[53] For aristocratic men whose everyday lives were somatically comfortable, the navy was an opportunity to prove their physical mettle. For working-class men accustomed to everyday brutality, the navy was an opportunity to be rewarded for the restrained deployment of that behaviour.

Naval veterans at home

Naval experience during wartime materially altered men's lives, creating opportunities for social mobility, financial security, and new aspirations. But these opportunities were severely curtailed when the Napoleonic wars ended in 1815. The sheer number of men serving during the Napoleonic wars made veterans a significant presence in home society. They were discharged in 1815 and 1816 to a collapsing economy: war-ravaged Europe was not spending money on British goods; national debt had increased exponentially; and economic depression lasted until 1821. Returning sailors increased the pressure on an already pressured labour market and added pensions and half-pay provisions to the state's financial burdens.[54] Some sailors found employment in the mercantile marine or the fishing fleet, but many more did not. They swelled the number of beggars on the streets. They were the cause of the reversal on a legal decision to prosecute the customers of gin shops: many of those customers were returned service men, and magistrates felt that their previous gallantry deserved better.[55] Fewer than 12 per cent of all the newly-promoted lieutenants were ever promoted and most did not return to active service: promotions in 1815 alone, produced almost a thousand new lieutenants.[56] Sailors – officers as well as their rank and file subordinates – suffered when the greater part of the fleet was laid up for almost a generation.[57]

Naval training, however, fitted men for new roles in the communication communities of an expanding nation-state. As the government extended its regulative powers they had no difficulty finding men used to bureaucratic procedure and the exercise of authority. The Colonial Office, for

example, filled important administrative positions in the outposts of empire with senior service officers, men who had experience of life abroad and whose pensions could be set off against their salaries. The small corps of emigration officers built up in the 1830s was drawn from naval lieutenants: they were men who knew their way around ships, were not overawed by merchant ships' captains and, being on half-pay, were economical to employ.[58] Donald Moodie was one of those newly-promoted lieutenants who were immediately retired on half-pay in 1816 and moved into a career as a colonial official in the Cape Colony in southern Africa.[59] Naval men were similarly useful in the administration and management of the early railroads where their time-keeping expertise and skill in holding workers to a tight schedule were valued.[60] The self-discipline, sense of duty, and unquestioning obedience that was valued in the navy continued to be rewarded in government bureaucracy and in the instruments of industrial progress.

The Navy and naval men were also instrumental in the expansion of the empire through providing security for shipping, opening up trade routes and conducting scientific expeditions. The Navy did not get much chance to fight between 1815 and 1914. Many of the fleets smaller vessels were converted into survey ships and demobbed officers, who were unemployed on half-pay, put their naval expertise, and education, into use. By 1850 all of the coastline of the Indian Ocean had been charted. Along with creating maps these expeditions collected information on geology, botany, fauna and archaeology. The *Beagle* expedition of 1831, for example, was one of the best-prepared and most ambitious survey voyages sponsored by the Admiralty Board. The Beagles' official naturalist was surgeon-geologist Robert McCormick, Lieutenant Wickham has expertise in botany Second Lieutenant Sullivan in geology and Captain Robert FitzRoy also in geology; even the fourteen-year-old midshipman Philip Gidley King had learnt some zoology and botany from his surveyor-botanist father. Charles Darwin's inclusion as a supernumerary naturalist and gentleman companion to Captain FitzRoy ensured the *Beagle* expedition's place in the history of science.[61]

Naval service provided some independence for its veterans. In the navy a lieutenant's commission itself was considered 'an independency': as one officer remonstrated with his mother, who was anxious for him to leave the service, 'My profession alone renders me independent'.[62] The financial rewards of service during the Napoleonic Wars also provided some men with the means to maintain themselves as gentleman in civilian life, even to aspire to a coat of arms. During the Napoleonic wars men moved up the ranks more quickly as officers fell in battle, and captured enemy prizes became the capital with which to purchase land and the independence that came with property.[63] The £25,000 prize money awarded to the fictional Captain Wentworth for capturing enemy vessels was a very real phenomenon.[64] Some naval veterans did return home to life among the gentry: Hugh Palliser, son of an army captain from an obscure Yorkshire family, was promoted on merit to Commander in Chief and Controller of the Navy and eventually received a baronetcy; Samuel and Alexander Hood, sons of a Somerset vicar, became viscounts; John Jervis, son of an Admiralty lawyer, received an earldom; Charles Middleton, son of a customs collector, was elevated to the

peerage as Lord Barham; and, most well-known, Horatio Nelson, son of a country parson, became Viscount Nelson and later received a foreign dukedom.[65]

Independence, a perennial touchstone for masculine success, was for the Victorians 'the key attribute of manliness', but it meant more than freedom from patronage, its principal association in the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century it was defined in contrast to feminine 'dependency' and suggested self-mastery, financial autonomy, and the political participation of citizenship.[66] For ordinary seamen from the labouring classes independence might mean some autonomy in earning a living. Those that received a post-war pension were liberated from some of the pressure of the quest for work – the one shilling a day pension could double the wages of an agricultural labourer in southern England. Such men often chose casual employment rather than steady labour – which irked employers who saw it as a conditioning effect of a sailor's wandering life – but men took employment as needed or available, not so much to maximise earnings as to maintain independence. The majority of discharged men, however, received no pension. Those that could returned to working on the land, but many others started handloom weaving: it was employment that needed little capital or skill and provided some independence. Their autonomy however, left handloom weavers unorganised, easily exploited by middlemen, and extremely vulnerable in economic depression. Weavers were prominent in the political agitation leading up to the first Reform Act in 1832.[67]

Calls for political participation were claims to independence and veterans were present in protests but the government response to protests highlighted another facet of independence. The reforms in the 1750s that had required all fit adult men to serve had effectively equated citizenship with all men rather than only those who possessed land and rank. During the decades of the French and Napoleonic wars, authorities were aware of the risks of asking men from all classes, political backgrounds, regions, and religious denominations to defend the country, and of the consequences of 'common' men learning, afloat or ashore, to act collectively and politically.[68] They knew that demands for political rights were likely to follow, and although the Reform Act of 1832 gave limited extension to the franchise, it paved the way for universal male suffrage in 1884.[69] Much of the political agitation preceding the first Reform Act, including the mass meeting on St Peter's Field in Manchester which became known as the 'Peterloo Massacre', bore the marks of military discipline: they were well-organised, down to the rehearsed drilling of protestors.[70] The military force that was used to quell the disturbances – regular militia, troops and even ships – highlighted the difficulties that local authorities faced in keeping law and order in post-war Britain and added weight to calls for a centralised police force.[71] Such a move had had long resisted by the gentry who associated the prospect with tyranny and curtailment of 'manly' independence – and parliamentary committees in 1816, 1818 and 1822 rejected a centralised force as 'incompatible with British liberty'.[72]

Radical agitation was one aspect of a perceived increase in crime which increased the calls for a professional force and returned service men were also implicated in this increase. Whether it was about naval life making men restless, improvident, and dissolute and thus prone to crime, or whether

it was about the sheer numbers of demobbed men increasing the numbers of poor in many parishes, much of the evidence given to the House of Commons in reports on corn laws, poor laws, the state of the police, and so forth, mentioned the problem of returned sailors (and soldiers).[73] It is an open question whether there was an actual increase in crime, but there was certainly a growing legal intolerance of interpersonal violence which was implicated in an eight-fold increase in the prosecution of men between 1805 and 1842.[74]

Peel was finally successful with his Metropolitan Police Bill in April 1829. The Act was passed without opposition and scarcely any debate despite three-quarters of a century of suspicion and hostility towards the whole idea of professional police. The Metropolitan Police was a force of 3300, as compared to the 450 full-time officers in London two years earlier. Recruiting policy targeted returned service men and Peel's Metropolitan Police could scarcely have come into existence without them.[75] The criteria for recruits emphasised the importance of public service, of gaining the public's trust, for which self-control was seen as essential. The *Instructions* and *Police Orders* of 1829–1830 contained explicit directions for the conduct of a constable: 'He must remember that there is no quality more indispensable to a police officer than a perfect command of temper, never suffering himself to be moved ... by any language or threats ... do his duty in a quiet and determined manner ...' The character and conduct of the police was vigilantly supervised and of the 8000 men enrolled between 1829 and 1831, over 3000 were discharged for unfitness, incompetence, or drunkenness.[76]

The replacement of the citizen-soldier with a paid soldiery for maintaining internal law and the increasing professionalisation of military men in a reduced defence force were two signs of a slowing of the mobility of men's occupations. The technologies of industrialisation required more specialised skills and less transient workforces.[77] Coterminously, middle-class wives were excluded from family businesses and the wives of better-paid working-class men were similarly confined to domestic duties. These moves were reflected in, and reinforced by, the state's census, which in 1801 roughly categorized families as either agricultural or in 'trade manufacture' but in 1831 the category of families was abandoned and adult males were divided into nine major occupational groups. Although this change was done with uneasiness, by 1851 the census had confirmed the sexual division of labour and contributed to the equation of masculine identity with an occupation.[78]

A strong investment in work was a feature of Victorian masculinity. This sense of manhood affirmed in skill, in bread-winning and in fraternal solidarity, Tosh tells us, arose from specific material conditions and was central to the process of class formation. Although this definition of independence, as Matthew McCormack points out, 'excluded many men, it was presented as one to which all men could aspire.' In this context, 'manliness' in the nineteenth century became a term describing those qualities which were respected by men without regard to class – 'by men as men.'[79] A world in which, as Robbie Burns had called for in 1795, 'a man's a man, for a' that'.[80] This democratising of masculine ideals was more apparent in rhetorical claims than lived experience; it was a slow process and arguably did not extend to the working classes until the early years of the

twenty-first century. The Victorians were very conscious of class distinctions and, because of its oversupply of officers at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the Navy was no longer a vehicle for social mobility.[81] Yet, men's service in the Navy during the Napoleonic wars, whatever their social status, did endow some common aspirations that shaped their post-war lives. Most significant was the expectation that skills and the fulfilment of duty be acknowledged and rewarded.

Military masculinity and families

That men had less opportunity for military service did not reduce the appeal of military manliness. The presence of Napoleonic veterans at home only helped the endurance of its appeal and apparent relevance at all levels of society. In politics, Nelson did not live to take part but men such as Wellington and Liverpool prolonged the state's concern with a warlike foreign policy long past its actual usefulness.[82] In communities, veterans were 'characters' who turned up in published local histories, their service records re-told in newspaper obituaries. Seamen's autobiographies – hugely popular in the 1830s and 1840s – whether reminiscing nostalgically or using their patriotic service to call for social and political change, kept naval experience fresh in people's minds.[83] And naval romances such as Frederick Marryat's transparently autobiographical novels, published from 1829 to 1848, gave readers vivid access to how it felt to be an officer or crewman during battles that they knew had actually occurred.[84]

It is, however, in the formative communication community of the family that boys first encountered military manliness as an ideal to strive for, or resist. 'Let it not be forgotten,' wrote Charles Brenton in 1855,

> that from my birth upwards all my associations and impressions were in favour not only of the lawfulness but of the glory of war. All the scenes of my childhood were crowded with memorials of the past, or tokens of the present connection of my family with the profession of arms. I was, so to speak, born and cradled in the midst of them. Epaulettes and cocked hats, the grapeshot that pierced my father's hipbone, the sword voted to him out of the Patriotic Fund…rich with blue steel and unwrought gold, my mother fainting at the news of my father's wounds – these are among the earliest visions of my infancy. The very playthings of our nursery were blocks, marlinespikes, or models of brigs and frigates with jacks and ensigns and appropriate rigging. War seemed the most normal condition of man, and peace a rare and vapid exception.[85]

Charles' father was Jahleel Brenton (1770–1844) who combined courageous, possibly reckless, wartime service as a naval officer with, later in life, religious and philanthropic pursuits. Jahleel's brother, Edward Pelham Brenton (1774–1839) was also a naval officer, naval historian, and collaborator in philanthropic activities. Their father, Charles' grandfather, Jahleel Brenton (1729–1802) was a rear-admiral. Charles himself was an Oxford-educated nonconformist minister who truly

admired his father but was acutely aware of the tensions inherent in the co-existence of evangelicalism and militarism.[86]

Further work on the place of naval service in family stories, on the intergenerational transmission of values and ideals would expand our understanding of the changing meanings of 'manliness'. Family biographies of seamen whose sons and grandsons were colonial administrators, public servants, and captains of and labour for industry, have yet to be adequately incorporated into the history of masculinities during the nineteenth century. We understand how memoirs, and biographies, of naval men transmitted particular manly ideals as romantic adventures.[87] We know that works such as Frederick Marryat's popular novel *The Naval Officer* (1829), which was highly autobiographical and inspired by the success of military memoirs, were forerunners of the heroic adventure stories of authors such as Robert Louis Stevenson and Henry Rider Haggard later in the nineteenth century. How this adventure fiction transmitted the association of successful manliness with physical prowess, mastery over oneself and others, and adventure far from domesticity, to a generation of men who had little opportunity for proving themselves in war has been well articulated.[88] And recent work by Michael Brown and Joanne Begiato explains how aged veterans, as actual progenitors of future generations of service men and as intergenerational transmitters of military, masculine and moral values, were deployed in visual culture throughout the nineteenth century.[89] Family biographies would, however, provide contextual depth to the creation of masculine identities. They would also reveal the most glaring omission in this account of change – the role of women. Women were always there, as mothers, wives and sweethearts, barmaids, sex workers, and landladies in port towns and further afield, they were even among the crews.[90] A man's naval career was often, among the gentry, a family enterprise. Women such as Elizabeth (Betsey) Fremantle accompanied their husbands to sea, and when left ashore – as Betsey was for most of the years between 1800 and 1814 – were responsible for managing the children, the family's estates, their social standing, and for furthering her husband's career.[91] There are many such stories still to be told and this work is being done.

Women's role in the formation of masculine identities, however, is under-studied. Charles Benton died childless, but his step-sister Harriet Mary (b.1824) wrote a collection of naval stories for children, *Evenings with Grandpapa* (1860), based on those she had heard from her father. In a second and enlarged edition, Harriet writes to her '*grown-up gentleman*' son 'Bennie' that:

> 'this book ought, by rights, to have been dedicated to our future sailor-boy, Reggie; but even in the more peaceful walk of life you are destined to fill, you can yet carry out the sublime virtues and elevated courage and resolution of the warrior whose blood runs in your veins, mingling with much that is heroic and noble on the paternal side.'[92]

Bennie (Jahleel Brenton Carey, 1847–1883) went on to join the army and, in the well-established tradition, younger son Reggie (Reginald Orme Brenton Carey, 1848–1921) did go into the Royal

Navy. Their father, Harriet's husband Adolphus Frederick Carey (1824–1900), was a clergyman.[93] The 'warrior blood' in their veins came from their mother.

Conclusion

Periodisation in history is contentious. The disciplinary default template of ancient, medieval, early modern, modern and, perhaps, postmodern – to which we might now add 'deep' and 'Anthropocene' – attract repeated criticisms and challenges. The boundaries of the eras are endlessly debated, their distinctive characters warmly argued. They are, probably, only applicable to western societies, as other category labels – the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution – almost certainly are. Despite the articulate and not unwarranted criticisms, no new narrative has emerged to convincingly challenge these divisions. Such categories do work, argues P.J. Corfield, to provide an account of long-term historical change. They also give historians a focus for reinterpretation: 'as new research brings the medieval period out of its darkness, the sunny view of modernity retreats into more nuanced shadows.'[94]

Periodisation in histories of gender have been particularly contentious. Many of the period labels that historians use are 'symbolic markers' of the weight given to particular fields of human activity, they privilege particular vantage points, and feminist historians have resisted the use of familiar periodising categories, finding it inappropriate, even misleading, to use labels derived from the activities of men in the history of women.[95] Historians of masculinity have been similarly hesitant about periodisation: Joanne Begiato, for example, considers the somatic experiences of men, of embodied manliness, to deliberately span 'conventionally discrete periods'.[96] This approach emphasises the multiplicity and contingency of male identities rather than a singular category to be traced chronologically. It is a significant and necessary emphasis but it has left historians of gender – whether considering men or women – unable to show how gender might be integral to wider processes of transition.[97] We run the risk, argues Dror Wahrman, of simply chronicling 'enduring synchronic diversity' or 'hurling examples and counter-examples back and forth': we struggle to explain *how* the meanings and expressions of gender change over time.[98]

The Regency period is, after all, officially only a decade long and around forty years in its most generous interpretation. It is doubtful that the men living through it would have picked out those particular years as a distinctive period of their lives except to say it was their childhood or coming of age, their adulthood, or their old age. The biographers who struggle with the men who lived through this time, trying to fit them into either the eighteenth century or the nineteenth century, and finding in their subjects a similar struggle, are revealing the incoherence of subjectivity over a lifetime. Any semblance of 'new' formations of manliness are never wholly assimilated by individual men. Rather, they are in constant negotiation between material circumstances and social and cultural scripts that reflect life stage as much as other factors of class, ethnicity, race or religion. Considering men in the

communication communities in which they operate – family, school, work, and institutions such as the navy – allows us to see the processes by which practices are recognised, rewarded, punished, and reshaped, and ideals are redefined; to see how change takes effect. Perhaps the value in considering 'Regency' masculinity is not in the historical value of the label but in the requirement that we focus on the fine-grain detail that can surface during such a short time period. As Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard have suggested, '[t]he close analysis of individual experience may well provide the clearest evidence of the subtleties of change'.[99]

Notes

[1] Simon Szreter, *Fertility, Class, and Gender in Britain, 1860–1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 546–58; Ben Griffin, "Hegemonic Masculinity as a Historical Problem," *Gender & History* 30, no. 2 (2018): 385–87.

[2] Joanne Begiato, "Tears and the Manly Sailor in England, 1760–1860," *Journal for Maritime Research* 17, no. 2 (2015): 117–33; Mary Conley, *From Jack Tar to Union Jack: Representing Naval Manhood in the British Empire, 1870–1918* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009); John Tosh, 'Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800–1914', *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 331; Clive Emsley, *British Society and the French Wars, 1793–1815* (London: Macmillan, 1979), 2–4.

[3] John Tosh, "The Old Adam and the New Man: Emerging Themes in the History of English Masculinities, 1750–1850," in *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2005), 62.

[4] John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (London: Yale University Press, 1999), 7; John Tosh, 'Domesticity and Manliness in the Victorian Middle Class: The Family of Edward White Benson', in *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800,* eds Michael Roper and John Tosh (London: Routledge, 1991), 46; Tosh, "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society," 331.

[5] Tosh, *A Man's Place*, 86; Louise Carter, "British Masculinities on Trial in the Queen Caroline Affair of 1820," *Gender & History* 20, no. 2 (2008): 266; Joanne Bailey (Begiato), *Parenting in England, 1760–1830: Emotion, Identity, and Generation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 9.

[6] Peter Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580–1800: The Origins of an Associational World* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000); Allen J. Frantzen, *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice, and the Great War* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1989); Mark Girouard, *The Return to Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1981); Tim Fulford, *Romanticism and Masculinity: Gender, Politics and Poetics in the Writings of Burke, Coleridge, Cobbett, Wordsworth, De Quincy and Hazlitt* (Palgrave, New York, 1999).

[7] William Stafford, "Gentlemanly Masculinities as Represented by the Late Georgian *Gentleman's Magazine*," *History* 93, no. 309 (2008): 68; Kevin Waite, "Beating Napoleon at Eton: Violence, Sport and Manliness in England's Public Schools, 1783–1815," *Cultural and Social History* 11, no. 3 (2014): 419–20; Karen Harvey, "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650–1800," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 308.

[8] Iain McCalman, "Regency", in *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age: British Culture 1776–1832,* ed. Iain McCalman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 672; G.M. Young, *Victorian England: Portrait of an Age* (London: Oxford University Press, 1949), 48; David Eastwood, "The Age of Uncertainty: Britain in the Early-Nineteenth Century," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 8 (1998): 91–115 ; R.J. White, *Waterloo to Peterloo* (Harmondsworth, Mx: Penguin, 1968), xiii; 343; Deidre Shauna Lynch, "Introduction," in Jane Austen, *Persuasion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 (1818)), x.

[9] The law prohibited the import of foreign corn while British corn was less than 18 shillings a quarter; it caused 'discontent' for the next thirty years. Emsley, *British Society and the French Wars*, 166.

[10] White, *Waterloo to Peterloo*, 88.

[11] Ged Martin, "Lambton, John George , first earl of Durham (1792–1840)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.virtual.anu.edu.au/view/article/15947, accessed 15 September 2009.

[12] Iain McCalman, ed., *An Oxford Companion to the Romantic Age: British Culture 1776–1832* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 4.

[13] Neil Ramsey, "To Die as a Soldier': The Vital Romance of the Military Novel: To Die as a Soldier," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41, no. 4 (2018): 581.

[14] Irene A. Beesemyer, "Romantic Masculinity in Edgeworth's *Ennui* and Scott's *Marmion*: In Itself a Border Story", *Papers on Language and Literature* 35, no. 1 (1999): 96

[15] Ellen Moers, *The Dandy: Brummel to Beerbohm* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1960), 17–18; T.A.J. Burnett, *The Rise and Fall of a Regency Dandy: The Life and Times of Scrope Berdmore Davies* (London: John Murray, 1981), 51.

[16] John Ford, *Prizefighting: The Age of Regency Boximania* (Devon: David & Charles Limited, 1971); Peter Radford, *The Celebrated Captain Barclay: Sport, Gambling and Adventure in Regency Times* (London: Review [Headline Book

Publishing], 2002); J.C. Reid, *Bucks and Bruisers: Pierce Egan and Regency England* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971).

17 Karen Downing, "The Gentleman Boxer: Boxing, Manners, and Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century England," *Men and Masculinities* 12, no. 3 (2010): 328–52, 348.

18 Emsley, *British Society and the French Wars*, 2–4.

19 Catriona Kennedy, *Narratives of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars: Military and Civilian Experience in Britain and Ireland* (Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 34.

20 John R. Gillis, "Island Sojourns," *Geographical Review* 97, no. 2 (2007): 281.

21 The Sea! the Sea! the open Sea! / The blue, the fresh, the ever free; / Without a mark, without a bound, / It runneth the earth's wide regions round. / It plays with the clouds, – it mocks the skies, / Or like a cradled creature lies. / I'm on the Sea! – I'm on the Sea! / I am where I should ever be. *Five Popular Songs…,* c1840s (undated), British Library General Reference Collection C.116.h.2.(6.).

22 Ellen Gill, "'Children of the service': Paternalism, Patronage and Friendship in the Georgian Navy," *Journal for Maritime Research* 15, no. 2 (2013): 44–45.

23 Michèle Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750–1830," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 328; Karen Downing, *Restless Men: Masculinity and Robinson Crusoe, 1788–1840* (Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 111, 116.

24 Tim Fulford, "Romanticizing the Empire: The Naval Heroes of Southey, Coleridge, Austen, and Marryat," *Modern Language Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (1996): 188–90.

25 Joseph A. Kestner, "Jane Austen: Revolutionizing Masculinities," *Persuasions: Journal of the Jane Austen Society of North America* 16 (1994): 154–55.

26 Begiato (Bailey), "Tears and the Manly Sailor," 118; Conley, *From Jack Tar to Union Jack*; Isaac Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor, 1750–1850* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

27 Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007).

28 Margarette Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy: British Sea Power, 1750–1815* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2002), 2–5; Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 629; Adam Nicolson, *Men of Honour: Trafalgar and the Making of the English Hero* (London: Harper Perennial 2006), 41–42.

29 Kennedy, *Narratives of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars*, 35.

30 Stefan Dudink and Karen Hagemann, "Masculinities in Politics and War in the Age of Democratic Revolutions, 1750–1850," in *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, ed. Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 14; Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 1.

31 Kennedy, *Narratives of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars*, 2.

32 Ben Wilson, *Empire of The Deep: The Rise and Fall of the British Navy* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2013), 313, 319–24.

33 Wilson, *Empire of The Deep*, 389–390; Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 121–122.

34 Conley, *From Jack Tar to Union Jack*, discusses how these processes continued in the second half of the nineteenth century.

35 Wilson, *Empire of The Deep*, 397; Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy*, 23.

36 Thomas Scott, "Life of Captain Andrew Barclay of Cambock…," Mitchell Library, B 193, 5.

37 Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy*, 2–3; Harvey, "History of Masculinity," 308.

38 Downing, *Restless Men*, 75–76; S.A. Cavell, *Midshipmen and Quarterdeck Boys in the British Navy, 1771–1831* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 2012), 76–78, 85, 130–34.

39 Kennedy, *Narratives of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars*, 37; N.A.M. Rodger, *The Command of the Ocean: 1649–1815. A Naval History of Britain, Vol. 2* (London: Allen Lane. 2004), 513.

40 Gill, "Children of the Service," 149–165; Gareth Atkins, "Christian Heroes, Providence, and Patriotism in Wartime Britain, 1793–1815," *The Historical Journal* 58, no. 2 (2015): 405–406: Rodger, *Command of the Ocean*, 403.

41 Marcus Rediker, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), vii; Beverly Lemire, "'Men of the World': British Mariners, Consumer Practice, and Material Culture in an Era of Global Trade, c. 1660–1800," *Journal of British Studies* 54, no. 2 (2015).

42 Edward Spain, "Reminiscences, 1774–1802," Mitchell Library, C266, CY 1403; Niklas Frykman, "Seamen on Late Eighteenth-Century European Warships," *International Review of Social History* 54, no. 1 (2009): 73, 79, 88; Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 30, 34–35.

43 Wilson, *Empire of The Deep*, 320–32, 388–389; Frykman, "Seamen on Late Eighteenth-Century European Warships," 76; Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 40–45; Beverly Lemire, "A Question of Trousers: Seafarers, Masculinity and Empire in the Shaping of British Male Dress, 1600–1800," *Cultural and Social History* 13, no. 1 (2016): 1–22; Kennedy, *Narratives of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars*, 49.

44 Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 6, 55; Greg Dening, *Mr Bligh's Bad Language: Passion, Power and Theatre on the Bounty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 149; Rodger, *Command of the Ocean*, 522; Scott, "Life of Captain Andrew," 1–3.

45 Rodger, *Command of the Ocean*, 392.

46 Rediker, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea*, 154.

47 Rodger, *Command of the Ocean*, 489; Lemire, "A Question of Trousers," 4.

48 G.J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 115–23.

[49] John Bechervaise, *Thirty-Six Years of a Seafaring Life* (Portsea, England: W. Woodward and sold by Longman, 1839) quoted in Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 120.

[50] Atkins, "Christian Heroes, Providence, and Patriotism in Wartime Britain," 406.

[51] Toby L. Ditz, "Shipwrecked; or, Masculinity Imperiled: Mercantile Representations of Failure and the Gendered Self in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *Journal of American History* 81, no. 1 (1994): 51, 57.

[52] Nicolson, *Men of Honour*, 118.

[53] Christopher Claxton, *The Naval Monitor; Containing Many Useful Hints...* (London: A. J. Valpy, 1833), 147; Downing, *Restless Men,* 75.

[54] N. Gash, "After Waterloo: British Society and the Legacy of the Napoleonic Wars," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 48 (1978): 145–152.

[55] Ben Wilson, *The Making of Victorian Values: Decency and Dissent in Britain, 1789–1837* (New York: Penguin Press, 2007), 219, 255.

[56] N.A.M. Rodger, "Commissioned Officers' Careers in the Royal Navy, 1690–1815," *Journal for Maritime Research* 3, no. 1 (2001): 98.

[57] E.L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform, 1815–1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946 (1938)), 261–62.

[58] Gash, "After Waterloo," 149. Christine Wright has made a comprehensive study of this pheonomenon among army veterans: *Wellington's Men in Australia: Peninsula War Veterans and the Making of Empire, 1820–40* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

[59] Christopher Saunders, "Moodie, Donald (1794–1861)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, https://doi-org./10.1093/ref:odnb/19081, accessed 20 March 2019.

[60] Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 137.

[61] Ian McCalman, *Darwin's Armada: How Four Voyagers to Australasia Won the Battle for Evolution and Changed the World* (Camberwell, Victoria: Penguin Group Australia, 2009), 24–40; Wilson, *Empire of the Deep,* xxiv

[62] George Ridout Bingham, Burgos, to his mother, 3 October 1812, National Army Museum, 6807-163-2, quoted in Kennedy, *Narratives of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars*, 41

[63] Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy*, 3, 4, 36; Cavell, *Midshipmen and Quarterdeck Boys in the British Navy*, discusses in length the limits of this social mobility.

[64] Jane Austen, *Persuasion*, 223.

[65] Cavell, *Midshipmen and Quarterdeck Boys in the British Navy*, 79–80.

[66] Tosh, *A Man's Place*, 111; Matthew McCormack, *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2005), 2.

[67] Gash, "After Waterloo," 145–52.

[68] Rodger, *Command of the Ocean*, 490.

[69] Matthew McCormack, "The New Militia: War, Politics and Gender in 1750s Britain," *Gender & History* 19, no. 3 (2007): 497; McCormack, *The Independent Man*, 187–200; Dudink and Hagemann, "Masculinities in Politics and War," 14; Also Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (London: Yale University Press, 1992), 323.

[70] Gash, "After Waterloo," 150–51; White, *Waterloo to Peterloo*, 190.

[71] Frank Ongley Darvall, *Popular Disturbances and Public Order in Regency England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934); Gash, "After Waterloo," 151; White, *Waterloo to Peterloo*, 107–108; Donald Read, *Peterloo. The 'Massacre' and its Background* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958), 81; Emsley, *British Society and the French Wars*, 176.

[72] Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility*, 80; T.A. Critchley, *A History of Police in England and Wales* (New Jersey: Patterson Smith, Montclair, 1972), 46.

[73] For example: Reports respecting grain, and the Corn Laws, 25 July 1814; Report from the Committee on the State of the Police of the Metropolis, 1816; Report from the Select Committee on the Poor Laws, 1817; Minutes of evidence taken before the committee appointed to consider of the several petitions relating to ribbon weavers, 1818; House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, http://parlipapers.chadwyck.co.uk; 320.

[74] Martin J. Wiener, "The Victorian Criminilization of Men," in *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America*, ed. Peter Spierenburg (Ohio: Ohio State University, 1998), 202–203, 209.

[75] Critchley, *A History of Police in England and Wales*, 49–50; Gash, "After Waterloo," 150.

[76] J. T. Lyman, "The Metropolitan Police Act of 1829: An Analysis of Certain Events Influencing the Passage and Character of the Metropolitan Police Act in England," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* 55, no. 1 (1964): 153.

[77] Even in the Navy: Conley, *From Jack Tar to Union Jack*, 32–35.

[78] Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850* (London: Routledge, 2002), 229–271; Tosh, 'Masculinities in an Industrializing Society', 332; McCormack, *The Independent Man*, 208.

[79] Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities*, 76, 84, 95.

[80] Full lyrics at *Burn's Country*, http://robertburns.org/works/496.shtml , accessed December 2018.

[81] Conley, *From Jack Tar to Union Jack*, 99–122.

[82] Benjamin Robert Haydon reflected in 1830, 'The military vigour, the despotic feeling engendered by twenty-five years of furious war, rendered them unfit, perhaps, to guide the domestic policy of the country', quoted in White, *Waterloo to Peterloo*, 105–106.

[83] Cookson, 'Early Nineteenth-Century Scottish Military Pensioners as Homecoming Soldiers', *The Historical Journal* 52, no. 2 (2009): 337; Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 105–130.

[84] Fulford, "Romanticizing the Empire," 191–93

[85] L.C.L. Brenton, ed., *Memoir of Vice Admiral Sir Jahleel Brenton* (new edn, London, 1855), lvii; Atkins, "Christian Heroes, Providence, and Patriotism in Wartime Britain," 412.

[86] Atkins, "Christian Heroes, Providence, and Patriotism in Wartime Britain," 412–13; P.K. Crimmin, "Brenton, Sir Jahleel, first baronet (1770–1844)," *ODNB,* https://doi-org /10.1093/ref:odnb/3326, accessed 18 March 2019; J. K. Laughton, revised by Andrew Lambert, "Brenton, Edward Pelham (1774–1839)," *ODNB,* https://doi-org /10.1093/ref:odnb/3325, accessed 18 March 2019.

[87] Neil Ramsey, *The Military Memoir and Romantic Literary Culture, 1780–1835* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), 51.

[88] Ramsey, *The Military Memoir and Romantic Literary Culture*, 197; Tosh, *A Man's Place*, 174–77; Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities*, ch 3.

[89] Michael Brown and Joanne Begiato, "Visualising the Aged Veteran in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Memory, Masculinity and Nation," in *Martial Masculinities: Experiencing and Imagining the Military in the Long Nineteenth Century,* ed. Michael Brown, Anna Maria Barry and Joanne Begiato (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019).

[90] Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, 16, 44–45, 57–76; Rodger, *The Command of the Ocean*, 407.

[91] Elaine Chalus, "'My dearest Tussy': Coping with Separation during the Napoleonic Wars, 1800–14," *A New Naval History*, ed. Quinton Colville and James Davey (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), ch 2.

[92] Harriet Mary Carey, *Evenings with Grandpapa, or, The Admiral On Shore, From the Fireside Stories of Sir Jahleel Brenton* (London, 1860); Crimmin, "Brenton, Sir Jahleel."

[93] Geni.com, https://www.geni.com/people/Harriet-Mary-CAREY/6000000006052983672, accessed 20/3/19. Harriet had nine children. Gill, 'Children of the Service', 155.

[94] P.J. Corfield, 'POST-Medievalism/Modernity/Postmodernity?', *Rethinking History* 14, no. 3 (2010): 382.

[95] Alexandra Shephard and Garthine Walker, eds, *Gender and Change: Agency, Chronology and Periodisation* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009) 1–7; Ludmilla Jordanova, *History in Practice* (London: Arnold, 2000), 127, 132.

[96] Joanne Begiato, "Between Poise and Power: Embodied Manliness in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-century British Culture," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 26 (2016): 130.

[97] Shephard and Walker, *Gender and Change,* 5; Laura Lee Downs, *Writing Gender History* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010), 83.

[98] Dror Wahrman, "Change and the Corporeal in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-century Gender History: Or, Can Cultural History Be Rigorous?," in *Gender and Change,* ed. Shephard and Walker, 174; Karen Harvey, "The Substance of Sexual Difference: Change and Persistence in Representations of the Body in Eighteenth-Century England," *Gender & History* 14, no. 2 (2002): 219.

[99] Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500–1950," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 280.