Chapter 6

1632 – CRUSO'S *ANNUS MIRABILIS*

So, we reach 1632, John Cruso's *annus mirabilis*. By now, Cruso was approaching his fortieth birthday.[1] He had moved up a social notch to the parish of St Peter Mancroft and his eldest son, John, matriculated at Cambridge. His experience as a militia captain in Norwich allowed him to adopt a new authorial voice, that of the military author, and in that signal year he published his statement of socio-cultural self-fashioning *par excellence*, *Militarie Instructions for the Cavallrie*.[2] Although this is, above all, an instruction manual on horsemanship, its form and content allow us to explore several themes of current interest in scholarship, such as cultural production, cultural transfer, patronage, gift-giving, and the author–publisher relationship. The chapter begins by placing Cruso's book in the broader context of military publishing in late Tudor and early Stuart England. Important conversation partners here are the military historians Barbara Donagan, David Lawrence, and Ismini Pells. It then analyzes the manifold sources that Cruso uses in his book. In the Letter to the Reader alone, there are eighteen quotations in the main text and margin, many in the original Latin. Cruso's frequent appeal to classical and post-classical authors forms part of his programme of positioning himself as a *miles doctus*, a man skilled in war and words. Cruso dedicated the work to Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel. The chapter analyzes why Arundel was such a judicious choice as dedicatee and what this choice tells us about patronage in Cruso's work. It also analyzes Cruso's relationship with the printer, Roger Daniel, and the engraver, Cornelis van Dalen. After a detailed analysis of the Letter to the Reader, the chapter analyzes aspects of the main text of *Militarie Instructions*, including its structure, content, and language. The

[1] In the first half of the seventeenth century, men and women who reached the age of thirty could expect to live another twenty-nine or thirty years. Edward A. Wrigley *et al.*, *The Population History of England, 1541–1871: A Reconstruction* (London, 1981), p. 250.

[2] ESTC S121933 (STC 6099) and ESTC S126413.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chapter concludes by analyzing the reception of *Militarie Instructions*. A mark of its success is that a second edition was published in 1644. This is analyzed in Chapter 9.

❧

Before going any further, one question to address is whether *Militarie Instructions* was the first military work that Cruso published. Until recently, it was thought that this was the case. However, an entry in the Norwich Chamberlains' accounts for 1626–7 brings this into question. Under the heading 'Paymentes in generall', a clerk has written 'Item to Mr Cruso for A military Booke ij s'.[3] This payment of two shillings may simply refer to a book that Cruso had obtained on the corporation's behalf, for which he was being reimbursed, or to a copy of a book that he had written. Unfortunately, no further information is available and to date no such book has come to light. Until and if it does, we can state that Cruso published five works on various military themes in the period 1632–44, two of which, including *Militarie Instructions*, had second editions.

These five works are all treatises on aspects of military training and action. On the one hand they can simply be seen as didactic literature, but on the other as examples of a popular genre aimed at creating the 'complete soldier' in Jacobean and Caroline England.[4] Such works were often written by 'soldier-authors', men who had seen action.[5] For example, Henry Hexham (c. 1585–1650) was an English military writer who had been in the Low Countries during the Eighty Years' War. He marched with the Prince of Orange's armies, chronicling military actions, such as sieges, in which British troops played an important role, and served as a quartermaster. Amongst the publications which drew on his Low Countries experience was *Principles of the Art Militarie: practised in the warres of the United Netherlands* (1637).[6] Robert Ward was another veteran of the Eighty Years' War. He developed a military literature, which, according to Mark

[3] NRO, NCR 18a/13 fol. 45v. I thank Matthew Woodcock for this reference.

[4] Amy Charles, *The Shorter Poems of Ralph Knevet: A Critical Edition* (Columbus, OH, 1966). p. 22.

[5] David R. Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier: Military Books and Military Culture in Early Stuart England* (Leiden, 2009), pp. 196, 280.

[6] The title page indicates that this book was printed in London, although the ESTC records that despite this it was in fact printed in Delft. See also Paul Hoftijzer, 'Henry Hexham (c. 1585–1650), English Soldier, Author, Translator, Lexicographer, and Cultural Mediator in the Low Countries', in S. K. Barker and B. M. Hosington (eds), *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads: Translation, Print and Culture in Britain, 1473–1640* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 209–25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fissel, combined idiosyncratically English elements with the best elements of continental military writing.[7] His best-known work is *Anima'dversions of warre*, published in folio in 1639.[8] John Roberts drew on his own experience as an artillery expert in the Low Countries in his study of gunnery, *Compleat Cannoniere: or, The gunners guide*.[9]

It will be instructive to frame this analysis with the theory of polysystems developed by Itamar Even-Zohar. He defines a polysystem as 'a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent'.[10] If we take English literature *in toto* as one such polysystem, we can identify various systems or sub-systems within it such as historical literature, political literature, and indeed military literature, no doubt with some overlap. The systems within the polysystem are dynamic.[11] While some move over time to the periphery of the polysystem and more or less disappear, other systems move to the centre as they gain in importance or popularity. An example of the latter within the English literary polysystem is early modern military literature, all the more so as the likelihood of civil war increased.

Taking the military literary system on its own, we can break this down into various sub-systems, one of which is cavalry literature. Cavalry is one of the three components of the army, alongside infantry and artillery.[12] Yet it is striking how few books in English there were on cavalry. Indeed, Cruso's book, which aimed to improve the cavalry in England, filled what David Lawrence calls 'a gaping lacuna in the library of English military books', it being the only one of ninety-four military books and manuals printed before the English Civil War devoted solely to cavalry practice.[13] In fact, this may be one reason why Cruso, the merchant with an eye on the market, chose to write on this subject. Given the dearth of cavalry books, they were on the periphery of English military literature. This in some sense reflects the fact that until the beginning of the seventeenth century, England was primarily a country of infantrymen. However, with the outbreak of the

7 Mark Fissel, *English Warfare, 1511–1642* (London, 2001), pp. 272–3.

8 Robert Ward, *Anima'dversions of warre* (London, 1639).

9 John Roberts, *The Compleat Cannoniere: or, The gunners guide* (London, 1637). Barbara Donagan, *War in England 1642–1649* (Oxford, 2008), p. 35. For 1637, see the ESTC.

10 Itamar Even-Zohar, 'Polysystem Studies'. *Poetics Today*, 11 (1) (1990), 1–268, p. 11.

11 Even-Zohar refers to the theory of dynamic systems. Even-Zohar, 'Polysystem Studies', p. 10.

12 Ismini Pells, *Philip Skippon and the British Civil Wars: The 'Christian Centurion'* (London, 2020), p. 117.

13 Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, pp. 261, 291.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

English Civil War, the cavalry would play a more significant role in English warfare.[14] As Ismini Pells observes, while reading such books was no substitute for experience, it did at least make readers familiar with the theory and shortened training time.[15]

John Cruso had by now been a member of Norwich Stranger militias for over fifteen years. This provided him with valuable experience on which to draw as a military author. It instilled in him a respect for drill practice and an understanding of how to bear and use arms. It is unlikely, however, that horses played a significant role in his militia activities. Indeed, the restricted use of horses in militias in general may have been one of Cruso's motivations for writing the book.[16] It is an interesting question as to whether in the 'missing years', from c. 1608 to 1613 or 1615, he might have been a soldier on the Continent, perhaps in the cavalry, but currently we have no evidence for this. Nevertheless, he was able to draw on a panoply of sources in a range of languages. Cruso probably compiled the work in the second half of the 1620s, with some of his sources only having been published in the mid-1620s.[17]

The subtitle, *Rules and Directions for the Service of the Horse […] rectified and supplied according to the present practise of the Low-Countrey Warres*, suggests that the book draws heavily on sources from the Low Countries, where the Eighty Years' War had necessitated and driven the development of military science. In the Letter to the Reader, Cruso re-iterates this by stating that he has employed 'some idle houres in the diligent reading, and conferring of … such … books and informations as I could obtain out of the Low-countreys and other places…' On p. 33, Cruso writes 'The Low-countreys are (without all controversie) worthily stiled the Academie of warre, where the art militarie (if any where) truly flourisheth.' Similarly, the Dutch

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

[15] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 76.

[16] Horses are rarely mentioned in muster returns in England. One exception is that 400 horses were listed on the muster rolls of the trained bands in Norfolk in the late 1620s. However, this gives no sense of whether horses were used during practice and may simply be an indication that the horses were alive. Furthermore, a letter addressed to the Earl of Arundel in 1627 details concerns about the shortcomings of the militia, such as militiamen borrowing horses for muster, rather than having them available for regular practice. Walter Rye (ed.), *State Papers Relating to Musters, Beacons, Ship-money, &c. In Norfolk, From 1626 Chiefly to the Beginning of the Civil War* (Norwich, 1907), pp. 110–13. I thank David Lawrence this information.

[17] For example, Antoine de Pluvinel's *Maneige Royal* (Paris, 1624). John Cruso, *Militarie Instructions for the Cavall'rie (being a facsimile of the edition of 1632) […] with Explanatory Notes and a Commentary*, ed. and intro. Peter Young (Kineton, 1972), p. vi.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

army was known as 'the School of War'.[18] Furthermore, the armies of the States-General were well known for their discipline, although they were by no means unique in this regard.[19] Alongside the soldier-author, John Bingham (*fl.* 1616), Cruso was responsible for introducing Dutch methods of drilling mounted troops at musters into England.[20] Bingham was a veteran of wars on the Continent, who, after his return to England, was appointed leader of the Artillery Company in London.[21]

Nevertheless, Cruso makes explicit reference to only a handful of books which are clearly devoted to the Eighty Years' War. One of these is a history of the Dutch Revolt entitled *Commentarien ofte memorien van-den Nederlandtschen staet, handel, oorloghen ende gheschiedenissen van onsen tyden etc.*[22] This was written in Dutch by Emanuel van Meteren and first published in 1608.[23] Another author writing in Dutch whom Cruso cites is Simon Stevin (1548–1620), who worked as a military engineer for Maurits, Prince of Orange during the Dutch Revolt. He published a work on the laying out of military camps, *Castrametatio of Legermeting* in Rotterdam in 1617.[24] Cruso would later return to Stevin's book, translating several chapters in his own work *Castrametation*, published in 1642. One other source to mention is the *Crychs-recht*, the codification of Dutch military law formalized by the States-General in 1590. The wars in the Low Countries in general form an important backdrop to this work. Indeed, of seven orders of battle presented by Cruso, only one does not concern the army of the States-General.[25]

18 Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 53.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 50.

20 Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, p. 301.

21 Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 75.

22 Christopher Joby, *The Dutch Language in Britain (1550–1702): A Social History of the Use of Dutch in Early Modern Britain* (Leiden, 2015), pp. 325–6. The place of publication is given as 'Schotlandt buyten Danswijck', i.e., 'Scotland outside Danzig'. This may refer to Amsterdam or it could be somewhere else.

23 On p. 96 of *Militarie Instructions*, Cruso recounts a speech given by Maurits, Prince of Orange before the Battle of Nieuwpoort in 1600, citing book twelve of Van Meteren's work. On p. 48 he references Maurits's failed attack on Brugge (Bruges); on p. 59 the Dutch States army attack on Crapoel in Limburg; on p. 69 the States army attack on Den Bosch in 1585, and on p. 80 the attack on Zutphen in 1585, quoting Van Meteren as his source in each case.

24 Cruso references Stevin's work in a marginal note in Part III, Ch. 2 of *Militarie Instructions*, 'On distributing the quarters' (p. 67).

25 Cruso, *Militarie Instructions*, ed. and intro. Young, pp. xvii–xviii. In some cases, Cruso provides details of the Dutch Revolt without giving a source. For example, on p. 8 he notes that whereas the Quartermaster General on the Spanish side had two assistants, on the Dutch side, the same duties were discharged by various quartermasters.

Beyond the Low Countries, Cruso refers to the German military author, Johann Jacobi von Wallhausen (1580–1627) (pp. 26, 29, 43). In the Letter to the Reader, Cruso notes that Von Wallhausen did not, unlike Cruso himself, begin with 'the first rudiments' of the subject, such as the handling of arms. Furthermore, Von Wallhausen's work did not deal with the cavalry and had not been translated into English. This is part of Cruso's adroit positioning of his own book, of which more below. Cruso drew on several Italian authors. Two of these, Giorgio Basta (1550–1607) 'Count of the holy Empire' and Lodovico Melzo 'knight of Malta', served in the Spanish army in the Low Countries. Cruso observes that although their books 'afford good directions' they were written in such a way that only those 'alreadie skilfull in the art militarie' could read them. Cruso benefitted from the fact that the London bookseller, Edward Blount, had died before being able to publish translations of military treatises by Basta and Melzo, having entered them in the Stationers' Register in 1631.[26] The translation of Basta's work was entitled *The government of the light horse*, and the translation of Melzo's work, *Millitary Rules*. No details are provided of the translators.[27] Cruso also drew on the renowned Italian military author Girolamo di Cattaneo (1540–84) (pp. 14, 59, 64), and the Milanese soldier-author, Flaminio della Croce. French military authors include François de la Noue (p. 4), Antoine de Pluvinel, and the Lord of Praissac (pp. 2, 45), one of whose works Cruso would subsequently translate. The Flemish Neo-Latin author Justus Lipsius (*De Militia Romana* and *Politica*) and Cruso's English contemporary John Bingham mentioned above (p. 98) add to the range of early modern sources to which *Militarie Instructions* refers.[28] Cruso describes Bingham's work, *The Tacticks of Aelian* (1616), as 'his Low-countrie exercise' (p. 30), again underlining the contribution of developments in the Eighty Years' War to advances in military science in England.[29]

In early modern military literature, it was common for authors to appropriate 'the wisdom of the ancients', whose authority 'derived from the sensible and universal military truths they dispensed'.[30] Cruso was no different to his

[26] David McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, *Vol. I, Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge 1534–1698* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 182. Blount died in October 1632. Ronald B. McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland 1485–1640* (London, 1949), p. 39.

[27] Edward Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554–1640 A.D.* (5 vols, London, 1875–94), vol. IV, p. 233.

[28] For a detailed list of Cruso's continental sources, see Cruso, *Militarie Instructions*, ed. and intro. Young, pp. xxii–xxiii.

[29] Henry Bingham, *The Tacticks of Aelian or art of embattailing an army after ye Grecian manner* (London, 1616).

[30] Donagan, *War in England*, p. 34.

contemporaries in this regard. In his extensive marginalia, which in some sense serve the same purpose as the modern academic footnote, Cruso indicates to the reader that he is a learned author who knows the canon of classical literature and is therefore to be taken seriously.[31] Furthermore, he often quotes directly in Latin and even Greek to add authority to the vernacular text.[32] In the margin, he quotes from the Greek authors Plutarch (*Lives*, *Philopoemen*, p. 3 and *Sertorius*, p. 5) and Polybius (both in Latin); and the Roman authors Aelian, Cicero, Julius Caesar (*Bellum Gallicum*), Frontinus, Livy, Lucan (*De Catone*), Seneca, Suetonius, Tacitus, Varro, Vegetius (*De re militari*), and Virgil (*Aeneid*). He concludes the Letter to the Reader with a two-line quotation from Horace (*Epistles* I.6.67–8). One post-classical Latin work that he cites is *Tactica*, by the Byzantine Emperor, Leo the Wise (tenth century AD). We have no details about Cruso's library, and so cannot currently answer questions such as whether he owned works by these authors or borrowed them from learned friends such as Johannes Elison. Nevertheless, as they often concern military matters, it is reasonable to assume that he owned many, if not all, of these titles and that his collection of books was therefore significant.

Cruso, the man of God, as well as war, frames *Militarie Instructions* with quotations from the Bible. On the title page, he inserts a judicious quotation from Proverbs (21. 31), 'The horse is prepared for battell: but victorie is from the Lord', while the Letter to the Reader begins with a quotation from Ecclesiastes (12. 12). In the final chapter, he quotes several verses from the Psalms, a speech made by Hezekiah, King of Judah, in which he asserted that God was on his side against the King of Assyria (II Chr. 32. 7–8), and words of comfort from Alphonsus King of Aragon and Sicily to his son Ferdinand replete with references to God. He concludes a short epilogue with a dose of *humilitas affectata* in the form of a quotation from the Apocrypha: II Maccabees 15. 38: 'If I have done well, and as the matter required, it is that which I desired: but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto'. Some in the Reformed tradition eschewed the Apocrypha seeing it as extra-Biblical. We do not know Cruso's view on this, but perhaps he simply saw this text as a piece of literature that suited his purpose well.

[31] These notes would appear to be original notes (*notes originales*) to borrow from Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 324–5. These are notes added by the author in contrast to those added later by someone else such as an editor or commentator.

[32] Tom Deneire, 'Neo-Latin and Vernacular Poetics of Self-Fashioning in Dutch Occasional Poetry (1635–1640)', in Tom Deneire (ed.), *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Language of Poetics, Translation and Transfer* (Leiden, 2014), pp. 33–58, at p. 51.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Attention should be drawn to the relationship between Cruso's own texts and his sources. One way of understanding this relationship is to think in terms of 'transmission patterns'.[33] One such pattern, manifested in *Militarie Instructions*, involves the collating of many source texts in one target text. Another approach is to translate one source text into a target text almost word for word. Examples of this occur in Cruso's *The Art of Warre* and *Castrametation*. Other texts, above all poetic ones, are based on identifiable source texts, which Cruso re-configures in one of a range of rhetorical transformations. His re-working of his poetic sources allows him to present himself as a *doctus imitator*.

Cruso's multilingualism enabled him to draw on non-English texts, and so we can cast him a 'cultural go-between'.[34] To put it another way, Cruso was an agent of cultural transfer, taking knowledge produced in one culture and re-working to introduce it into another culture, i.e., the English military culture. Taking this one step further, we might frame the Stranger community in Norwich, and Norwich *in toto*, as a site of cultural production. While the Stranger weavers produced the 'new draperies', and taught new skills to local people, Cruso used his linguistic and military skills to mediate knowledge on the cavalry, which would in time inform military practice before and during the English Civil Wars. To borrow from the language of commerce, Cruso's work and indeed that of the master weavers illustrate how Stranger communities could act as entrepôts for the transmission of ideas and practices from the Continent.

❧

The front matter of *Militarie Instructions* consists of the title page, a dedication, and a letter to the reader. Each of these contributes to Cruso's carefully crafted socio-cultural self-fashioning. Barbara Donagan describes the book, consisting of 108 pages in folio, as 'large, elegant, sophisticated, and demanding'.[35] The style is quite matter of fact, a function of the subject matter, occasionally prolix, but shorn of 'over-elaborate' flourishes. The full title is:

> *Militarie Instructions for the Cavallrie: or Rules and Directions for the Service of Horse, Collected out of Divers Forreigne Authors Ancient and*

[33] A. E. B. Coldiron, *Printers without Borders: Translation and Textuality in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2015), p. 29.

[34] Cf. Andreas Hofele and Werner von Koppenfels, *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Go-Betweens in Early Modern Europe* (Berlin, 2005).

[35] Donagan, *War in England*, p. 34.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Modern, and Rectified and Supplied, according to the present practise of the Low-Countrey Warres.

This is written in upper case with the main title in a larger font than the subtitle. However, the word 'Cavallrie' is the largest word in the main title and in bold, for it was this word above all that, Cruso hoped, would catch the eye of the potential reader. Beneath the title is the quotation from Proverbs, a floral symbol, and the printer's mark: 'Printed by the Printers to the Universitie of Cambridge MDCXXXII'. Reference to the University of Cambridge no doubt helped Cruso to position himself as a learned author.

Cruso needed to print his book in Cambridge as there was no printer in Norwich. Chapter 1 provided details of the printing activities of the Brabander Anthonie de Solempne. However, these ceased in 1570 and printing presses did not return to Norwich until the early 1700s. Therefore, Norwich authors such as Cruso and Sir Thomas Browne had to use the services of printers in London and the university towns of Cambridge and Oxford to publish their books. 'The Printers to the Universitie of Cambridge' were in effect one man, Roger Daniel. It was not unusual for authors to work with the same printer repeatedly. Daniel published Cruso's military works over a twelve-year period. Anne Coldiron observes that early modern printers were no mere drudges, churning out one copy after another of the same book. Rather, she writes, they were entrepreneurs, experimenters, and innovators somewhat akin to early twentieth-century film producers.[36] This was probably true of Daniel. David McKitterick describes him as 'a London craftsman' with a background in the engraving trade. In the 1630s and 1640s, he worked intermittently with the Cambridge graduate Thomas Buck doing much to revive the Cambridge University Press. However, by the end of 1632 Daniel was the sole active university printer, with Thomas Buck and his brother, John, more interested in the general affairs of the university, and in making money.[37]

McKitterick provides an extensive account of the books that Daniel printed.[38] The British Library catalogue has some 100 entries for Daniel, and as 'Printer to the University of Cambridge', he was both productive and successful. Most of the books that Daniel printed in his printing house, not far from Great St Mary's Church in Cambridge, were on students' reading lists.[39] However, there were exceptions, such as the first edition of George Herbert's *The Temple* (1633), a speech preached by Ralph Cudworth

[36] Coldiron, *Printers without Borders*, p. 3.
[37] McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, pp. 169, 173, 300–1.
[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 175–93.
[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 228–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

before the House of Commons (1647), and books by Cruso.[40] Apart from *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches*, Daniel printed all Cruso's English prose works, including the two editions of *Militarie Instructions*. Given that they co-operated intermittently for more than a decade, Cruso and Daniel clearly had a good and productive working relationship.

Before moving onto the dedication, we need to take a step back, for in some gatherings there is an additional title page, placed before the one described above. This has an elaborate full-page engraving, which depicts cavalrymen in a range of postures and two opposing cavalry formations making a charge. In the bottom left-hand corner are the words 'C.V. Dalen sculpsit', a reference to the Dutch-born artist and engraver Cornelis van Dalen (1602–65).[41] This engraving includes a short version of Cruso's title. A cartouche at the foot of the title page indicates once more that the book was 'Printed by the Printers to the University of Cambridge', but additionally that it was to be sold by the London stationer Nicolas Alsope 'at the Angell in Popes Head Alley'.[42] Alsope was most probably the seller for Cruso's translation, *The Complete Captain*, also printed by Daniel. This illustrates the close relationship between printers and booksellers.[43] Surviving gatherings have engravings, which are unsigned in the main body of the text, of which more below. Finally, differences between extant copies indicate that there was more than one print run.[44]

❧

[40] For Cudworth, see *A sermon preached before the House of commons, March 31, 1647: reproduced from the original edition* (New York, 1930).

[41] For an example of a gathering with the Van Dalen engraving, see CUL, shelfmark Cam.b.632.1. See also Margery Corbett and Michael Norton, *Engraving in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A descriptive catalogue with introductions. Part III The Reign of Charles I with 466 Illustrations Compiled from the notes of the late A. M. Hind* (Cambridge, 1964), pp. 256–7.

[42] McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, p. 182. In some surviving copies the cartouche is blank. One example is the presentation copy given by Cruso to Jonas Proost: CUL shelfmark M.8.24. This has an *ex libris*, Jo: Horden and a bookplate with the date 1715.

[43] McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press,* p. 182. According to the British Library catalogue, Jeremias Drexel's *The school of patience, in three books* was also printed in 1640 by Daniel and sold by Alsope at the Angel.

[44] For example, in one issue of the first edition (ESTC S126413) line 10 of the title begins 'forreigne'. In another issue (ESTC S121933), it begins 'forrain'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It was still customary to dedicate books to a rich and powerful protector.[45] Cruso chose Thomas Howard, Fourteenth Earl of Arundel, and Fourth Earl of Surrey (1585–1646). Arundel, a renowned art collector and prominent courtier, was 'Earle Marshall of England', a role which gave him responsibility for the militias nationally.[46] Furthermore, he was 'Lord Lieutenant of his Majesties forces in Norfolk and Norwich', and so responsible on the monarch's behalf for organizing local militias. In his dedication, Cruso acknowledges this when he refers to 'that charge wherewith I stand entrusted within your Lord-ships Lieutenancie'. It would, therefore, be difficult to think of a more appropriate person to whom Cruso could dedicate this book.[47] Not only would his militia associations have recommended the book to the potential reader, but perhaps also his reputation as a man of impeccable taste and discernment in cultural matters.

However, we must exercise caution in drawing conclusions about the precise nature of Cruso's relationship to the Earl. In the dedicatory epistle, Cruso rhetorically asserts that it had not originally been his intention to publish the work, but 'oh dear!', it fell into the hands of two 'noble' men who deemed it worthy of being published:

> Having lately finished this discourse of Cavallrie, intending it onely for my private use and information, it had the fortune to light into the hands of two noble and most judicious perusers.

The trope of not intending to publish a work but being obliged to do so was a common one, which goes back at least as far as Horace (*Epistles* I.20). Cruso goes on to write that he was publishing the book at the behest of some of the Earl's 'deputie Lieutenants', possibly pointing to a larger network to which he had access and asks the Earl to give his 'honourable patronage and protection' to the book. Given the Earl's responsibility for organizing militias, Captain Cruso may well already have been known to him, if, for example, the Earl attended the annual musters in Norwich. If so, the dedication may have been a means of gaining favour with the Earl: *captatio benevolentiae* to borrow from Latin rhetoric.[48] However, Arundel may have functioned rather as an idealized patron, one who was far beyond Cruso's social circle, but whose name would help promote and position the

[45] Genette, *Paratexts*, p. 118.

[46] He is sometimes styled the Second Earl of Arundel, as some view the earldom obtained by his father as a new creation. Furthermore, he is sometimes styled the Second Earl of Surrey.

[47] In Norwich, the Justices of the Peace supervised the English militia company.

[48] Genette, *Paratexts*, p. 198.

book.[49] Whatever the case, Arundel was not a Maecenas for Cruso. Cruso made his money as a hosier and cloth merchant and there is no evidence of a Maecenas bankrolling his literary activity. Cruso dedicated his book to Arundel to build social rather than financial capital. As well as introducing or possibly re-introducing himself to Arundel *cum suis* with his book, employing Arundel's name in this manner will have made an impression on the reader or potential reader.

In the epistle, Cruso draws from his extensive repertoire of rhetorical devices. He describes himself as Arundel's 'dutifully devoted servant' and employs *humilitas affectata* as he seeks 'in all humilitie' patronage for his work, which he describes as 'weak essaies' and 'poore labours'.[50] Despite these rhetorical protestations, Cruso is of course nevertheless confident enough to dedicate his work to an aristocratic courtier.[51] In this and other dedicatory letters we perhaps get closest to Cruso's 'performative sense of identity' of which Matthew Woodcock talks with reference to Thomas Churchyard.[52] He concludes the epistle with his *onymat cryptique*, I.C.

❧

The Letter to the Reader is another element in Cruso's programme of carefully positioning himself and his book. It is rich in intertextuality, concluding with a judiciously chosen couplet from Horace, an author with whom Cruso seems to have had a strong affinity. Both men were born outside the social elite: Horace the son of a freedman and Cruso the son of Flemish immigrants. Furthermore, both were military men. Horace had seen action at Philippi, while Cruso had risen through the ranks of the Norwich Stranger militia.

The letter begins with an appeal to the twin sources of Judaeo-Christian and pagan antiquity. As noted above, Cruso quotes from Ecclesiastes, 'Of making many books there is no end' (KJV), to argue that although many classical and post-classical authors have written on the infantry, few have written on the cavalry. Aelian did so, whereas Vegetius deemed it unnecessary to devote much attention to the subject, as it was praxis and the quality

[49] David Bergeron, *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570–1640* (London, 2018), pp. 9, 207.

[50] For more on the trope of humility in early modern England, see Jennifer Clement, *Reading Humility in Early Modern England* (London, 2016).

[51] For a collection of essays on the self-fashioning of Constantijn Huygens, see Lise Gosseye, Ad Leerintveld, and Frans Blom (eds), *Return to Sender: Constantijn Huygens as a Man of Letters* (Ghent, 2013).

[52] Matthew Woodcock, *Thomas Churchyard: Pen, Sword, and Ego* (Oxford, 2016), p. 5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the horse rather than lengthy manuals that would drive the cavalry forward. Cruso quotes Vegetius:

> De equitatu sunt multa præcepta … ex libris nihil arbitror colligendum, cum praesens doctrina sufficiat.
>
> [There are many rules for the cavalry … I judge that nothing should be gathered from books, since the present knowledge suffices.]
>
> (*De re militari* II:1)

Cruso of course begs to differ. Apart from Aelian and Vegetius, Cruso cites Julius Caesar, Livy, and Polybius, as he attempts to position himself as a *miles doctus*. He justifies such extensive plundering of these ancient authors by asking rhetorically 'for what is there in these modern warres, which is not borrowed from antiquity?' However, to avoid accusations of excessive plundering, he tells his readers that 'if my annotations be displeasing to any, they may use them like Countrey stiles and step over them'. He concludes the letter with yet more *humilitas affectata*, framing it with a quotation from Horace's *Epistles* (I.6.67–8):

> If these essaies may be a means to incite someone or other, better able, to put pen to paper, I shall think my pains abundantly rewarded. In the meantime, I desire they may be received with the right hand, as they are offered, and conclude in the words of the Poet,
>
> *–si quid novisti rectius istis,*
> *Candidus imperti; si non, his utere mecum.*
>
> [–if you know [any rules] that are more correct than these,
> tell me honestly; if not, use these ones as I do].[53]

Epistle I.6 is addressed to Numicius and explores what it takes to be happy. With *istis*, Horace is referring to the *praecepta* for happiness that he presents to Numicius.[54] For Cruso, *istis* could refer to his 'essaies' or, more likely, to the *praecepta* for the cavalry, which he adumbrates at length in the main text of the book, and to which he refers in the alternative title for *Militarie Instructions, Rules and Directions for the Service of Horse*. While rules for happiness and cavalry are of a quite different order, Cruso has no qualms about appropriating Horace's words to tell the reader, 'unless you know

[53] In the margin, Cruso gives the reference, 'Horat. Epist. 6 lib 1'. Horace begins the first of these lines with 'vive, vale' [live long, farewell], omitted by Cruso.

[54] Herbert Musurillo, 'A Formula for Happiness: Horace "Epist." 1.6 to Numicius', *The Classical World*, 67.4 (1974), 193–204, at p. 203, writes, 'The final acceptance or rejection of all this advice is left up to Numicius himself in [these] ambiguous lines'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

better, use these rules'. The fact that Cruso's *praecepta* were re-printed in 1644 in the heat of the First English Civil War suggests that few in England did know better.

❧

The quotation from Horace in some sense functions as a transitional text taking the reader from the front matter to the main body of the text. The book describes the duties and responsibilities of the different ranks within the cavalry and explains the arming and exercising of the various types of cavalry. Furthermore, it urges cavalrymen to get their horses used to the smells and sounds of battle.[55] Cruso gives the book a clear and logical structure. One can imagine him marshalling his material somewhat like the men under his command on the drill ground in Norwich, recognizing in each case that organization was a *sine qua non* for success. The book consists of sixty chapters divided into four parts. Part I, by far the largest, has three sections, 'Of levying of men', 'Of souldiers in generall', and 'Of souldiers in particular'. It deals with selecting officers and soldiers, the duties of officers and the arming and training of the cavalry. The contents of Parts II–IIII can be deduced from their titles: Part II, 'Of marching'; Part III, 'Of encamping'; and Part IIII 'Of embatteling'. The book is therefore an example of what David Lawrence terms an 'analytical treatise', i.e., a 'comprehensive stud[y] of the art of war that generally addressed the exercising of the foot soldier, but could also examine cavalry practice, logistics, encamping, fortifications and siegecraft'.[56]

Each part of *Militarie Instructions* is preceded by a brief 'Argument' which sets out the main purpose of that part. Part I consists of thirty-one chapters. The first section, 'Of levying of men', analyzes the tasks that different ranks within the cavalry fulfil and what qualities they require. Among the ranks analyzed are 'the Generall of horse', the captain, the lieutenant, the quartermaster, corporals, and trumpeters. In the first chapter, Cruso argues that officers should be chosen on merit rather than birth, and, drawing on his own experience as a hosier, that just as artisans should serve an apprenticeship before practising a trade, so those who aspire to be officers should first serve as soldiers. In the 1630s, England was not engaged in a series of wars, and so there were limited opportunities for potential officers to follow this

[55] Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, p. 295. Cruso, *Militarie Instructions*, ed. and intro. Young, pp. vii–xvii.

[56] Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, p. 195.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

advice.[57] In the third chapter, Cruso exhorts officers to treat soldiers under their command well, rather 'helping them in their necessities, then [than] rigorous in punishment'. However, taking his lead from the *Crychs-recht*, he argues that those guilty of extortion should be executed. The second section, 'Of souldiers in generall', deals with the corruption of the cavalry, the need to reform it, distributing booty, soldiers' pay, and the appropriate proportion of cavalry to infantry. In the third section, 'Of souldiers in particular', he deals with practical issues including arming cavalrymen, providing them with instructions on how to hold and use their weapons and how to control their horse while doing so. He emphasizes the importance of preparation and practice to success in battle, perhaps with the many years of drill practice in Norwich in mind.

Part II, 'Of marching', advises officers how to keep their troops safe on the march. It is the shortest section, consisting of seven chapters, which give advice on guides, gaining intelligence, the use of scouts, the order in which the different sections of an army should march, and how baggage should be transported securely. Part III, 'Of encamping', has twelve chapters, presented in the order in which a camp is made and broken. Cruso analyzes how the camp is to be secured, how to obtain food and water for the horses, and how spies can gain information about the enemy. Part IIII 'Of embattling' has nine chapters, dealing with how cavalry formations should be positioned prior to battle and how they should engage the enemy during battle. Two general themes demand our close attention: the use of illustrations including engravings, and Cruso's use of language. Let us consider these in turn.

❧

One set of illustrations consists of simple diagrams with brief annotations indicating how cavalry formations should position themselves and manoeuvre on the battlefield (pp. 47–54). Intricate engravings enhance the presentation of the book.[58] However, apart from the second title page, they lack a signature. McKitterick attributes the engravings to Cornelis van Dalen, the engraver of the second title page. He argues that Cruso probably paid for these himself, reasoning that the existence of an early state of the plates without the University Printers' imprint indicates that they were cut before a decision was taken on the choice of printer. He bases

[57] Martyn Bennett, *Cromwell at War: The Lord General and his Military Revolution* (London, 2017), pp. 36–7.

[58] Corbett and Norton, *Engraving in England*, pp. 256–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this assertion on A. M. Hind's account of the engravings.[59] However, this perhaps overstates the case. There is only one plate which lacks the University Printers' imprint, i.e., an early state of the second title page. This has an empty cartouche devoid of Roger Daniel's imprint. This version of the title page appears in the copy in Cambridge University Library which Cruso gave to Jonas Proost. Hind only ascribes five of the other engravings to Van Dalen (figs 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8). It is possible, I would argue, given that the engravings lack a date, that they were cut later, after Cruso had chosen his printer. Another problem relating to Van Dalen is that according to Hind, he was working in England from 1633 to 1638, making portrait engravings of Charles I and several courtiers.[60] Therefore, if he did make these other engravings, as Hind asserts, then Cruso would have needed to work with him at a distance, as he was probably in Norwich and Van Dalen in the Dutch Republic. This in turn raises the question of how Cruso would have contacted Van Dalen, one which we unfortunately currently cannot answer. Alternatively, of course, Van Dalen may have arrived earlier in England than Hind states. One other question that arises is who produced the other engravings in the book, which Hind does not ascribe to Van Dalen. While Van Dalen's involvement cannot currently be ruled out, another possibility is that Roger Daniel, with his background in the London engraving trade, might have been involved in cutting some of the plates.[61] Finally, some engravings were based on those in works by Johann von Wallhausen, mentioned above. Indeed, McKitterick goes as far as to say that Van Dalen 'pillaged' some of Von Wallhausen's illustrations for his engravings.[62] One example is the dragoon on the second title page, which is taken from a plate by Theodore de Bry for Von Wallhausen's *Kriegskunst zu Pferdt* [The Art of War for Cavalry].[63]

The text includes sequential figure numbers which refer to the relevant engravings. In extant copies, there are sixteen figure numbers, although some have fewer than sixteen engravings.[64] This difference is probably a product of the fact that the book was sold 'loose leaf'. The buyer could

[59] McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, p. 283, n. 4. Corbett and Norton, *Engraving in England*, pp. 256–7 for the Hind reference.

[60] Corbett and Norton, *Engraving in England*, p. 253.

[61] McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, p. 169.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[63] Johann von Wallhausen, *Kriegskunst zu Pferdt. Darinnen gelehret werden die* initia *und* fundamenta *der Cavallery* […], 1st edn (Frankfurt, 1616). Cruso, *Militarie Instructions*, ed. and intro. Young, p. vii.

[64] The ESTC notes that F. S. Ferguson states that seventeen plates were cut for *Militarie Instructions*, although no extant copy has more than sixteen plates.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

purchase the engravings separately, and then have the text pages and engravings bound by a binder. The engravings were unpaginated but did indicate where they were to be inserted.[65]

Several of the engravings are extremely detailed and ornate. Fig. 1 illustrates the parts of the body armour of an armed lancer, while fig. 2 illustrates four stages of a lancer practising a charge. Fig. 3 depicts twenty-four postures of the cavalryman with a firearm. These illustrate how the cavalryman should carry, load, and discharge his firearm.[66] Fig. 4 consists of a detailed diagram of an encampment for a regiment with explanatory notes. Figs 6 and 7 present cavalry formations for defence and attack, with each figure on horseback depicted separately, while fig. 8 illustrates six orders of battle described by Von Wallhausen. Less spectacular, but nevertheless instructive, are diagrams of battle formations of Maurits Prince of Orange before Rees in 1614 (figs 11 and 12), Rees in 1621 (fig. 13), and before Dornick (Tournai) in 1621 (fig. 14). These engravings certainly embellish Cruso's work and contribute to the reader's understanding of how the cavalryman should practise and how cavalry formations should operate on the battlefield.

A LINGUISTIC EXCURSUS

Although this is primarily a literary-historical study, it will be instructive to analyze briefly two features of Cruso's language use to illustrate how this formed an intrinsic part of his programme of socio-cultural self-fashioning. The first of these concerns two distinctive morphological features and the second is switching between English and other languages.

In Early Modern English (EModE), a significant shift took place in the morphology of third-person singular present indicative verb endings. In general terms, at the start of the period of EModE (i.e., c. 1500) the dominant ending was *-th* (e.g., 'he goeth'). By 1700, *-th* had all but been replaced by *-s*, with use of the former ending only continuing to any extent in religious contexts. Of thirty verbs in a sample from the first four chapters of *Militarie Instructions* (c. 2,000 words), twenty-nine end in *-th* and only one in *-s*.[67] Among contemporary authors, practice varied: in a 1644 prose

[65] For example, the engraving of the lancer has 'Fig: 2, Par: 1, Cap. 28'.

[66] Donagan, *War in England*, p. 38.

[67] To ensure that *Militarie Instructions* is not an exception in Cruso's *oeuvre*, I have taken a further sample of 7,500 words from Cruso's five English prose works and analyzed the distribution of verb endings for the third person singular present indicative. In this sample, there are ninety-seven tokens. Of these, eighty end in *-th*, while the other seventeen end in *-s*. Although the frequency across these works is lower

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

work, John Milton invariably uses *-s*, whereas in *Leviathan* (1651), Thomas Hobbes uses *-th* twice as often as *-s*.[68] One reason why authors used *-th* frequently was that it continued to be a prestige form in the seventeenth century. This was at least in part related to its use in religious works such as the King James Bible and *The Book of Common Prayer*.

Sociolinguists have identified four social ranks in early modern England: upper class, social aspirers, middle class, and lower class.[69] Social aspirers tend to be conservative users of language who prefer to use older, prestige forms of language as social markers in contrast to more progressive authors who adopt linguistic innovations such as *-s* more quickly. Sir Thomas Browne was a social aspirer who used the prestige form *-th* extensively.[70] Likewise, John Cruso was a social aspirer, who used this prestige form to contribute to his self-fashioning. Cruso's use of the subjunctive in open condition clauses, 'if he passe' and 'if he finde', points in the same direction. In EModE, the subjunctive mood was used less frequently in these and other clauses than in Middle English and so by Cruso's time it was an older, prestige form of the language.[71] We do have to exercise caution here, for these are printed documents rather than manuscripts and it may be that the printer intervened to some extent in the use of language. Nevertheless, we can tentatively say that as a social aspirer Cruso used older, more prestigious forms of the language as part of his programme of self-fashioning.

Cruso was a polyglot who lived in a multilingual city. He was no doubt accustomed to switching effortlessly between languages in a trice. This linguistic dexterity is echoed in his written work. In *Militarie Instructions*, he frequently switches from English to other vernaculars or Latin. I have already suggested that code switching forms part of Cruso's socio-cultural self-fashioning. It points to his aspiration to be a *miles doctus*, but perhaps it also illustrates that he found language fascinating, and it is this that shines through above all.

Much of the secondary literature on code switching concerns the spoken use of language in a contemporary context. However, the work of James Adams on code switching in antiquity provides a useful framework

than that found in *Militarie Instructions*, it is clear that *-th* is the dominant ending in Cruso's English prose.

68 Charles Barber, *Early Modern English*, 2nd edn (Edinburgh, 1997), pp. 7; 168.

69 Terttu Nevalainen and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg, *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 2003), pp. 144–5.

70 Christopher Joby, 'The -th Ending in Correspondence in Early Modern Norfolk,' *Journal of English Linguistics*, 45(4) (2017), 338–66, at p. 349.

71 *Ibid*., pp. 347–8. Cruso also uses the subjunctive in concessive clauses, e.g. 'unless he consider'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for analyzing switching in written sources in general.[72] One important finding by Adams is that switching by authors such as Cicero was always intentional, and the same could be said of Cruso. Adams categorizes instances of code switching by motivation and it will be instructive to analyze Cruso's code switching in this manner. Among these motivations are switching to give a quotation, a proverb or fixed expression, a specific technical term, or the origin of non-English words, something that appealed strongly to Cruso.

Early in the Letter to the Reader, Cruso switches into Latin to quote from Vegetius's *De re militari*.[73] He concludes the letter by again switching into Latin to quote from Horace's *Epistles*. This framing device enhances the status of a text otherwise largely in the vernacular. In antiquity, Latin epitaphs were often preceded or followed by a Greek formula or tag for a similar purpose.[74] Cruso again quotes from Vegetius's *De re militari* (II:6) in Part I, Ch. 19 (p. 26) '… in the free state the number was farre encreased. Legio plena habet pedites sex millia centum, equites septingentos viginti sex; that is, a full legion hath of foot 6100, and of horse 726'. He could of course simply have written the English in the main text and placed the Latin in the margin. One reason for including the Latin in the text was to indicate to the reader that he knew this language and that he could translate it into English. As well as attempting to present himself as a *miles doctus*, he expected his readers to be *milites docti*, and thus left some Latin quotations untranslated. Towards the end of Part I, Ch. 26, in discussing the current state of the cavalry in England, he switches into Latin to quote from Justus Lipsius (*Commentarius ad Polybium*, Vol. V), 'I feare we may ask (with Lipsius) *haec ridenda, an miseranda sunt*?' [Should these things be laughed at or pitied?]. Cruso is clearly not impressed by the cavalry in England, which of course provided him with the opportunity to publish his book.

Another motivation for switching is to give an apophthegm, or proverb or fixed expression. Educated Romans would often insert Greek proverbs or proverb-like expressions into their texts.[75] Cruso quotes Vegetius (p. 32), interpolating in English and giving his own English translation: 'Nemo facere metuit (saith he) quod se bene didicisse confidit, No man

[72] James Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Oxford, 2003). See also Christopher Joby, *The Multilingualism of Constantijn Huygens* (Amsterdam, 2014), Ch. 6 for an analysis of code switching in the work of Cruso's contemporary, Constantijn Huygens.

[73] Vegetius III:26: 'Vegetius … concludeth in these words, De equitatu sunt multa præcepta …' [There are many rules about the cavalry].

[74] Joby, *The Multilingualism of Constantijn Huygens*, p. 223.

[75] *Ibid.*, pp. 232–43.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

feareth to do that which he hath well learned how to do'. Other authors, such as Thomas Aquinas, had previously quoted this passage for its apophthegmatic nature.[76] Cruso often switches to give a specific term, although sometimes another motivation, that of evocation, is also at work. In giving these terms, he provides the reader with details of their origin, although he is not always suitably informed. Nevertheless, this switching adds to the notion that he found language intrinsically interesting. In 'The Argument' of Part I, Cruso writes 'Cavallrie, so called of *Cavallo*, (which in the *Italian* and *Spanish* signifieth a *horse*)'. In the margin, he provides further etymological information for *Cavallo*: 'Derived from the Latine word *Caballus*, and this from the Greek word *καβάλλης*'. So, in this opening sentence of the main text and the accompanying note, he suggests at least a passing knowledge of four other languages. Part I, Ch. 14, 'On souldiers in generall, Of the corruption of the Cavallrie', begins: 'Souldiers take their name from the Dutch word *Soldye*, which signifieth *pay* or *stipend*'. This is probably a false etymology. However, it allows Cruso to discuss the importance to the success of any army of paying soldiers regularly and adequately. Both examples illustrate that Cruso likes to introduce his theme by exploring the origins of key terms.[77]

Other terms for which Cruso provides the origins leading him to code switch are 'exercising', which he associates with the Latin word for 'army' (*exercitus*) (p. 31), and the Spanish *camisado*, which originally referred to a night attack, in which attackers wore (white) shirts as a means of mutual recognition (p. 87). On p. 106 Cruso switches to describe the battle cries given in various languages, writing, 'as the Turks crie, Bre, Bre, Bre; the Irish, Pharro, Pharro; the French, Sa, Sa, Sa; the Dutch, Vall aen, Vall aen, & c.'[78] In the margin, he adds 'this by the Grecians was called ἀλαλαγμός, and by the Latines *Barritus*…' The Greek term is used by Herodotus and Plutarch, among others. Cruso uses these terms to evoke the sounds of the battlefield, as well as to underline his multilingualism.[79]

The Dutch 'Vall aen, Vall aen' [attack, attack] is printed in Gothic typeface, as are several other Dutch terms, including *Soldye* and *Crychs-recht* (p. 19), and *Aenslach* [attack] (p. 56), as well as marginal notes in Dutch (p. 19). Such switching is in some sense double switching, not only in language, but

[76] Thomas Aquinas writes in his *Summa Theologiae* (1a2ae.40,5), 'Unde Vegetius dicit, Nemo facere metuit quod se bene didicisse confidit'.

[77] The *OED* records that the word 'soldier' comes from the Old French 'soud(i)er'. Whether this was known at the time would require further investigation.

[78] Young argues that Sa, Sa, Sa was in fact the battle cry of Imperial army and not the French army. Cruso, *Militarie Instructions*, ed. and intro. Peter Young, p. xxiii.

[79] Joby, *The Multilingualism of Constantijn Huygens*, pp. 243–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also in typeface. The use of Gothic font drew attention to the words and emphasized to the reader that Cruso knew Dutch military terminology. Its use alongside that of Greek and italic fonts indicates that the printer, Roger Daniel, had a range of typefaces at his disposal, and that Cruso worked closely with him to ensure that specific fonts and font sizes were used for given words and phrases.

These examples illustrate that Cruso used language to construct his literary identity. Furthermore, switching into other languages, sometimes translating into English, sometimes not, also tells us something about Cruso's intended readership. Not for him the ordinary soldier, but rather the well-educated mounted officer, who, perhaps like himself, aspired to be a *miles doctus*, and who was *multarum linguarum peritus*.

❧

As for the reception of *Militarie Instructions*, Maurice Cockle described it as the most renowned early English work on the cavalry.[80] It influenced several other military works, so it will be instructive to take a closer look at these. Several copies of this edition survive, including two presentation copies.

Cruso's *Militarie Instructions* can be said above all to have brought about reform to the English cavalry.[81] It influenced later works, such as analytical treatises written in the late 1630s. One such work was Robert Ward's *Anima'dversions of warre*, mentioned above, described by Mark Fissel as an 'exhaustive' account of the art of war. Ward went a social notch higher than Cruso by dedicating his work to King Charles. Although Ward does not mention Cruso explicitly, preferring to draw on the 'ancients' such as Vegetius and Livy, David Lawrence notes that in Section XII 'The Drilling or Exercising of Horse Troopes', Ward made use of Dutch drilling methods described by Cruso.[82] Ward also set out the duties and responsibilities of the officers of the horse troop, as Cruso had done, although his account may draw on several sources.

Another work influenced by *Militarie Instructions* was *The Young Horseman, or, The honest plain-dealing cavalier* written by the Parliamentary

[80] Cockle, *A Bibliography of Military Books up to 1642*, 2nd edn (London, 1957), pp. 96–7. See also Thomas M. Spaulding and Louis C. Karpinski, *Early Military Books in the University of Michigan Libraries* (Ann Arbor, 1941), p. 121.

[81] Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, pp. 301, 311.

[82] *Ibid.*, pp. 300, 301. See also Cockle, *A Bibliography of Military Books*, pp. 117–19 for publishing details and a summary of each section.

cavalry officer, John Vernon.[83] However, whereas Cruso's work was in folio, Vernon's was in quarto and probably intended for use on campaign. It was a much more limited enterprise than Cruso's book, consisting of only forty-four pages, but was nevertheless widely popular.[84] In the introduction, Vernon wrote that 'every ordinary souldier might easily purchase [it] with his money or weare [it] in his pocket'.

In this regard let us briefly return to Even-Zohar's theory of polysystems.[85] If we take European military literature *in toto*, the sub-systems of French, German, and Low Countries military literatures were central, while English military literature was peripheral. However, by drawing on these central literatures, Cruso invigorated English military literature, helping to move it away from the periphery. To borrow from another literary theorist, Pierre Bourdieu, Cruso's work on the cavalry helped to shape a new literary field: English cavalry literature.[86] Another English military author, William Barriffe, felt that Cruso had dealt with his subject so successfully that he omitted reference to the cavalry in the first five editions of his *Military discipline: or, the yong artillery man*.[87] Only in the sixth edition, printed in 1661, did he feel it necessary to add a section on cavalry tactics as these had developed so much during the English Civil Wars.[88]

As to whether the first edition influenced the armies in the opening battles of what became known as the First English Civil War, one must be careful about ascribing formations or tactics to given authors. Martyn Bennett suggests that in attacking the royalist foot regiments at Edgehill in 1642, Cruso's instructions were 'largely followed' by the parliamentary horse regiments. This may be true, although more evidence is required to make the case for direct influence.[89] Nevertheless, as noted above, it was alone in the pre-Civil War literature in being devoted to the cavalry. Furthermore, few English cavalry generals, at least in the Parliamentary forces, had battlefield experience, and so the information in Cruso's book would have been

83 John Vernon, *The Young Horseman, or, The honest plain-dealing cavalier* (London, 1644).

84 Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, pp. 263, 306–10.

85 Even-Zohar, 'Polysystem Studies', p. 17.

86 Jan Bloemendal, 'Introduction: Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Some Thoughts Regarding Its Approach', in Tom Deneire (ed.), *Dynamics of Neo-Latin*, pp. 18–32, at p. 28.

87 William Barriffe, *Military discipline: or, the yong artillery man*, 1st edn (London, 1635).

88 Cruso, *Militarie Instructions*, ed. and intro. Peter Young, p. xxix; Cockle, *A Bibliography of Military Books*, pp. 103–5.

89 Bennett, *Cromwell at War*, p. 57.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of value to them.[90] Oliver Cromwell, who commanded the parliamentary cavalry at the second battle of Newbury in 1644, had not seen battlefield action until Spring 1643, and so, although we lack direct evidence, he and his fellow cavalry officers may well have needed to consult Cruso's book.[91]

TWO PRESENTATION COPIES

A measure, albeit a very rough one, of the success of Cruso's work is that eighteen libraries in Britain, the United States, and Australia hold copies of the work. Among these are two presentation copies in Cambridge libraries. Cruso presented one copy to Gonville & Caius College, where John Jr. studied. This is now in the college library.[92] As noted at the start of the prologue, this bears a Latin handwritten inscription and could in some sense be viewed as a 'literary calling card'. Cruso presented the other copy to Jonas Proost, the minister of the Dutch church in Colchester.[93]

For five years, John Jr. (1618–81) attended the school run by Revd. Stonham, the Rector of St Stephen's in Norwich. He was following in the footsteps of his uncle, Aquila, who had also studied at Stonham's school and then Gonville & Caius. John Jr. matriculated in 1632, the year in which *Militarie Instructions* was published. One possibility is that John Sr. picked up copies of his book from Roger Daniel's printshop, and then walked to Gonville & Caius, not 100 yards away, to present a copy, and his son, to the master of the college. John Jr. was admitted as a sizar, but in 1633 became a scholar and, like his uncle, was clearly a clever chap. In 1639 he was awarded an MA and was a Fellow of the college from 1639 to 1644.[94]

The copy that Cruso presented to Jonas Proost is now in Cambridge University Library. On the flyleaf, Cruso wrote a long dedication to Proost, which reflects the respect and affection that he had for his friend and colleague, allowing him to cement their friendship:

> To the reverend and pious, & my most most worthie ffriend Mr. Jonas Proast
>
> Since the spirit of the Lord of hoastes (whoe is allso a Man of Warre) hath stiled you (and also of your function) the Horssemen and Chariots of Israel, lett me not be thought alltogether absurd in presenting you with a discourse of Horsse. The ancient Sages in pourtraying Minerva armed, would hereby

90 *Ibid.*, pp. 36–7.
91 *Ibid.*, pp. 56–7; Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 41.
92 Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College Library, shelfmark L.18.14.
93 McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, p. 434, n. 15.
94 John Venn, *The Biographical History of Gonville & Caius College: 1349–1897* (3 vols, Cambridge, 1897–1901), vol. I, p. 304. John Jr. was admitted as a sizar on 27 March 1632.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> intimate that there is and ought to be some affinitie betweene Mars and the Muses. The worke I acknowledge to be but weakely performed, my more serious imployments permitting me (ut Canis ad Nilum) onely to doe it by snatches. Yett that long experience which I have of your clemencie and candor, affirmeth me that you will curtiusely accept it, from your ever obliged friend, Jan Cruso Norw[i]ch 10 Maij 1632.

Several points are in order here. First, by asserting that the God of the Old Testament, the 'Lord of hoastes', was also a Man of Warre, Cruso was reminding Proost, and perhaps reassuring himself, that Christian faith and waging war were not mutually exclusive, above all if the war is deemed to be the 'Cause of God'.[95] Second, Cruso mixes references to the Bible and pagan classical literature, a mark of the Christian humanist writing of this period. Peter Burke argues that the incompatibility between classical and Christian wisdom presented a fundamental problem for humanists. He writes 'there had always been tension between Christian values and the attempt to revive pagan antiquity'. Whilst there is certainly some truth in this observation, Cruso and other humanist authors nevertheless frequently mixed references from these two traditions, and for Cruso, the church elder, this does not seem to have presented a significant problem.[96]

Third, reference to Mars and the Muses neatly encapsulates the ideal of the *miles doctus*, the learned soldier modelled on figures from antiquity such as Julius Caesar, to which Cruso aspired. Fourth, there are further examples of code-switching. Here, Cruso switches from English to Latin to give a proverb, 'ut Canis ad Nilum'. He uses this to indicate that 'like a dog at the Nile', he could only now and then dip into his work.[97] This evokes the notion of *sprezzatura* or nonchalance that Castiglione describes in *Il Cortegiano* [The Courtier], which I introduced in Chapter 4 in relation to Cruso's Dutch contemporary, Constantijn Huygens. It suggests that

[95] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 41.

[96] Peter Burke, *The European Renaissance: Centres and Peripheries* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 32, 152.

[97] McKitterick reads this as 'ut Caius ad Nilam' but this is incorrect. McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, p. 434, n. 15. A later work has the phrase 'In short, Harding, ut canis ad Nilum, scarce touches the argument with the tip of his lips'. John Prince, *Danmonii Orientales Illustres: Or, The Worthies of Devon* (London, 1810), p. 466. An English version of the phrase appears in the dedication to a book entitled *The Military Discipline wherein is most Martially shone the order of Drilling for the Musket and Pike*, published anonymously in 1623 (London, BL, shelfmark C.27.a.21). In the dedication is written, 'but to imitate the Dogs by the Water of Nilus, who runne lapping their drinke, as daring not to tarry for feare of the Crocadiles, so doe I meane onely to give you a taste of such acutes'. This, of course, explains why dogs only dipped quickly into the Nile.

one should conceal one's art and make it appear that whatever one does or says is effortless. Although this work was aimed at courtiers, its influence spread far beyond court circles. Elsewhere, Cruso appeals to *sprezzatura* by stating that his work is the product of his 'idle hours'. Fifth, inscribing a book in this way is an example of what Burke calls 'the "laws" of friendship' which were part of the humanist approach to friendship. In this regard, an inscription differs from a dedication in that it is a private rather than a public communication.

Sixth, as Genette notes, apology is one of the established topoi of inscriptions. Not for the first or last time, Cruso employs *humilitas affectata*, saying that the task of writing the book was 'weakely performed'.[98] Seventh, as in the age of printing it is the only handwritten part of the book, it makes this copy unique and therefore more valuable both in economic terms and as a sign of friendship. Although Cruso wrote the dedication in English, he signed it with his Dutch name, Jan. This may be because he spoke to Proost in Dutch or to underline their shared Low Countries heritage. Finally, the date, 10 May 1632, gives us a specific *terminus ante quem* for the printing of *Militarie Instructions*.

❧

Given its size and the scholarly precision of its references, *Militarie Instructions* was clearly intended to be read in a domestic setting or on the practice ground, rather than on campaign or the battlefield, by members of the more affluent classes from whom cavalrymen including future officers would be drawn.[99] One purchaser of Cruso's work was a young Edward Harley who would become a parliamentary colonel. His bookseller's bill for March 1642 includes Cruso's *Militarie Instructions* as well as his *The Art of Warre* analyzed in the next chapter.[100]

Militarie Instructions was Cruso's most important contribution to early modern military literature. Several other authors used it as a source; it was itself a widely used text in the early stages of the First English Civil War; and it was republished in 1644.[101] It is, however, also a very deliberate act of self-presentation. The quality of printing was high; it included clear and instructive illustrations, which could be supplemented by ornate, detailed engravings; it was dedicated to no less a figure than the Earl of Arundel, a paragon of power and patronage *sans pareil* in Caroline England; and

98 Genette, *Paratexts*, p. 141.
99 Donagan, *War in England*, p. 36.
100 *Ibid*., p. 39.
101 Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, pp. 300, 309.

it evinced a rich pattern of intertextuality. Indeed, the numerous references to ancient and Renaissance authors form an essential part of Cruso's programme of presenting himself as a *miles doctus*. The weaving of words and phrases from several other languages into his English creates a complex multilingual text, which again points to an author keen to underscore his own erudition, although one is occasionally left to wonder whether he overplays his hand in an attempt to convince the reader and indeed himself that he could pass muster as a learned military author. This notion gains strength when we analyze his use of language. This demonstrates that he is an author keen to enhance his own social position, fully aware of how language could be operationalized to achieve this. Questions remain such as Cruso's precise relationship to Arundel and to Van Dalen. Furthermore, we have no manuscripts or printer's proofs with which to explore how Cruso's work developed. Nevertheless, this chapter has, one hopes, added to the reader's understanding of this complex and talented author. The next chapter contributes another layer to this understanding by exploring Cruso's translation of military works from French to English.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.008 Published online by Cambridge University Press