Chapter 9

CRUSO AND THE ENGLISH CIVIL WARS

1642 saw the initial exchanges in what became known as the First English Civil War, and so it was a good time to publish books on military matters. John Cruso published two new military works for soldiers on campaign as well as a second edition of *The Art of Warre*. Although he probably made some money from these enterprises, his primary motivation was, it seems likely, the desire to do his fellow soldiers a service by furnishing them with the latest knowledge on specific military matters. In 1644 he published a second edition of *Militarie Instructions*. A handwritten copy of this suggests that Cruso's words did not merely sit on soldiers' bookshelves but were taken on campaign.

First, however, we should catch up with Cruso in Norwich. He continued to work as a church elder and, more importantly for this chapter, as a militia captain. Norwich did not see direct action in the English Civil Wars, although it did experience a huge gunpowder explosion, the 'Great Blow' of 1648, the result of a confrontation between rioters and New Model Army troops.[1] The city corporation, along with many other cities in England, took the side of Parliament. One question that arises is which side John Cruso took in the Civil War. Here, it will be instructive to examine the allegiances of the men to whom he dedicated his military works and those who wrote dedicatory verses for these works, as well as to look for any clues in the texts themselves. In short, this chapter explores John Cruso's life and work in the 1640s, a decade dominated by the English Civil Wars, in which England's patchwork of towns, villages, and fields became a vast chessboard.

The 1640s were a period of continuity, but also of change for John Cruso. He continued to live in the parish of St Peter Mancroft. His journey to the

[1] Andrew Hopper, '"The Great Blow" and the Politics of Popular Royalism in Civil War Norwich', *The English Historical Review*, 133, Issue 560 (2018), 32–64.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dutch church was a little longer than it had been when he lived in the parish of St Andrew. It would take him past the market cross and the fifteenth-century Guildhall. Beneath its magnificent exterior, it housed a gaol. The Kett brothers, Robert and William, who had led the rebellion in 1549 which had led indirectly to the arrival of the Strangers, had been detained there. Robert would eventually be hanged from the walls of Norwich Castle *pour encourager les autres*. Eighteen years earlier, Thomas Bilney (1495–1531), sometimes described as an early Protestant martyr, had been held there before being burnt at Lollards' Pit across Bishop's Bridge. A little further on, Cruso would perhaps have seen remnants of the church of St Crowche or St Cross, which had become redundant at the time of the Reformation and was demolished in 1551. Norwich had provided Cruso's parents and thousands of other migrants from the Low Countries with a safe haven, but these stone monuments were reminders of Norwich's own recent troubled past. Turning right, Cruso possibly caught sight of the Duke of Norfolk's Palace by the Wensum, as he made his way to the former Dominican friary, which now served as the wool hall, city library, and home to the Dutch church congregation. Cruso continued to work as an elder for the Dutch congregation until at least 1647, serving under Theophilus Elison, the son of his long-time friend and colleague, Johannes.[2] If, as I have suggested, the Dutch militia practised its drills in the area between the former friary and the parish church of St Andrew, Cruso would have had yet another reason to make this journey on a regular basis.

He continued to fulfil his duties as the captain of the joint Dutch and Walloon Stranger militia. As opposition to the king grew, questions were being asked in high places about the allegiance of the Stranger militias in Norwich, London, and elsewhere. At the highest levels of the state apparatus, concerns were being expressed about the number of weapons being amassed by these Stranger militias. In 1640, Sydrack Jorey wrote to Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland (1602–68) as follows,

> Strangers in this kingdom have so provided themselves with arms, both here in London and other places, especially, Ipswich, Yarmouth, and Norwich, where the French, Walloons, and Dutch are as many if not more than the natives, and exercise military discipline once a fortnight if occasion happen, they may easily become a greater incumbrance to us, or at least aid any invader. This mischief may be easily prevented if his Majesty grant a commission to certain persons, with power to seize their arms to his use and the Oath of Allegiance be administered to them; and in case they refuse to take it

[2] Johannes H. Hessels (ed.), *Ecclesiae Londino–Batavae archivum* (4 vols, Cambridge, 1887–97), vol. III, ii, pp. 2,061–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> they may be commanded to depart the land by a day limited, or receive such punishment by fine or otherwise as the King shall think fit.[3]

This letter may also tell us how frequently the Norwich militia met for drill practice, although it overstates the number of Strangers in the towns mentioned, perhaps to exaggerate the threat that Jorey felt they posed. On 6 April 1641, Cruso was admitted as a member of the Artillery Company based in London. He signed the vellum book of the Company, but paid no quarterage, so one possibility is that he was simply made an honorary member, who did not train with the Company.[4] His brother Timothy had been a member of the Company for many years, its practice ground at the Artillery Garden being conveniently close to his home in Bishopsgate. Timothy's association with the Company may have brought John into contact with its members before he was admitted. By now, John's friend Philip Skippon was Captain-Leader, so he or Timothy may have helped John to gain membership.[5] John's membership of the Company may have played a role in the production of at least one of his new military works, a point I return to below.

On 28 November 1642 John was requested to write to London for an assortment of weapons.[6] From the evidence available, it is not clear whether these were to be used by the Stranger militiamen, but the possibility is there. King Charles had by now raised the royal standard at Nottingham, and early skirmishes had given way to pitched battle, with Royalists and Parliamentarians engaging at Edgehill on 23 October 1642.[7] An entry in the Norwich Mayor's Court Book dated 30 August 1643 tells us that by this

3 *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the Reign of Charles I, 1640–41*, ed. William D. Hamilton (London, 1882), vol. CCCCLXX, para. 92.

4 By 1643 Cruso was 25 shillings in arrears from non-payment of quarterage. I thank David Lawrence for this information.

5 Kirsty Bennett (ed.), *The Cardew–Rendle Roll: A Biographical Directory of Members of the Honourable Artillery Company c. 1537–1908* (2 vols, London, 2013), vol I, p. 597. I thank Ismini Pells for this information.

6 On the 28 November 1642, Mr. Thomas Barrett requested 'Mr. Crusoe' the Captain of the Dutch and French company of militia to write to London for forty 'muskette compleate', ten 'corselette compleate' and thirty pikes, besides making up the shortfall of corslets in the magazine. This may be the Thomas Barrett, who appears in several Norwich records. He was alderman from 1650 to 1655 and was also a collector and receiver of rents. William J. C. Moens, *The Walloons and their Church at Norwich: Their History and Registers 1565–1832* (2 vols, Lymington, 1888–9), vol I, p. 83. NRO, NCR 16a/20, fol. 369v. The arms arrived by boat from London on 21 December. I thank David Lawrence for this manuscript reference and additional information.

7 Ismini Pells, *Philip Skippon and the British Civil Wars: The 'Christian Centurion'* (London, 2020), p. 106.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

time Cruso and his deputy, Francis Dackett, had been discharged of their duties, with Cruso being described as 'the late captaine of the Dutch and Ffrench company'. Grell reiterates this point in his *ODNB* entry for Cruso.[8] However, an entry in the House of Commons Journal on 20 January 1646/7 seems to indicate that Cruso's time as Captain of the Stranger militia was not yet up.[9] This tells us that during the Excise Riots in December 1646, which were an important prelude to the Great Blow sixteen months later, the mayor, Henry Watts, commanded 'Captain John Crusoe, Captain of the Dutch and French Congregation, [to suppress] the Mutinies and Tumults at Norwich'.[10] Was Cruso discharged of his duties as captain of the Stranger militia subsequently re-assuming them or was he in fact not discharged at all in 1643? Currently, we do not know, but this report seems to indicate that his career as a militiaman lasted longer than previously thought. It had begun more than thirty years earlier. He had progressed from being an ordinary member of the Dutch militia to the rank of Captain of the Dutch militia, and then Captain of the joint Dutch and Walloon militia. It is unlikely that he saw active service, but his involvement in the militia played a role in fuelling his interest in military matters, which in turn led to his work as an author of military books. His long involvement in the militia as well as his work as a church elder would certainly have created symbolic capital for him, to use a phrase associated with Pierre Bourdieu.[11] Although he would probably have gained most of this within the Dutch Stranger community, his position as a militia captain afforded him the opportunity to build relationships with leading figures in the Norfolk military establishment, while his position as a church elder brought him into contact with leaders in the Anglican Church.

8 NRO, NCR 16a/20, fol. 398r. I thank David Lawrence for this reference. See also Moens, *The Walloons*, vol. I, p. 83, and Ole Peter Grell, 'Cruso, John', *ODNB*, vol. XIV, pp. 539–40, at p. 539.

9 https://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol5/pp58-59#h3-0014. *Die Mercurii*, 20 Januarii, 1646 (i.e., 1647) [accessed 4 Feburary 2021]. I thank Andrew Hopper for bringing this reference to my attention.

10 Hopper, '"The Great Blow"', pp. 36–7.

11 For Bourdieu, 'Symbolic capital, that is to say, capital – in whatever form – insofar as it is represented, i.e., apprehended symbolically, in a relationship of knowledge or, more precisely, of misrecognition and recognition, presupposes the intervention of the habitus, as a socially constituted cognitive capacity'. https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/bourdieu-forms-capital.htm [accessed 4 February 2021].

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CASTRAMETATION AND *THE ORDER OF MILITARY WATCHES*

By 1642, Cruso was almost fifty years of age, but he was still leading the active life advocated by Machiavelli, publishing two new military works and re-publishing another in that year. While the paratexts tell us about Cruso's social and literary network, the texts add to our knowledge about Cruso as a military author and translator. Let us begin with the two new military works, *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches*.[12]

The intention was probably to sell these works together for the register and pagination are continuous. However, they do have separate title pages, and so could be sold separately.[13] Both works were handbooks for army officers. *Castrametation* was published in quarto and could be used during military campaigns. Maurice Cockle observes that it was part of a shift in English military literature from books dealing with the whole range of the subject, to ones that focused on one, or at most two, branches of the subject. This also applies to *The Order of Military Watches*. Cruso was the first author to write a treatise in English exclusively on castrametation.[14] Indeed, in his dedicatory epistle, Cruso remarks that he published the work 'because our nation is not beholden to any (to my knowledge) that hath laboured therein'. Nevertheless, he was not the first author to write in English on the subject. The soldier–author Henry Hexham analyzes encamping in detail in the second part of his *Principles of the Art Militarie* (1638).[15] He draws on several of the classical and Renaissance military sources to which Cruso refers.

The longer title is *Castrametation, or the Measuring out of the Quarters for the Encamping of an Army*.[16] Below the printer's device on the title page is Cruso's *onymat cryptique* '(By) J.C.' which, as we have learnt, was a

[12] Donald Wing lists 'Castrametation' on its own as number 7432, i.e., without reference to 'The Order of Military Watches'. This is probably because the pagination and register are continuous. ESTC R879.

[13] In his dedication to Philip Skippon in *The Order of Military Watches*, Cruso writes 'Sir After Encamping, which […] I have now treated of; I conceive it not improper (in prosecution of my designe) to proceed to the Order of Military Watches'. One volume at the British Library (shelfmark 1398.b.7) has both works bound together. Two other volumes (shelfmarks 103.g.13 and 103.g.11), comprise only one work each, *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches*, respectively.

[14] Maurice Cockle, *A Bibliography of Military Books up to 1642*, 2nd edn (London, 1957), pp. 122–3.

[15] Henry Hexham, *Principles of the Art Militarie: practised in the warres of the United Netherlands* (London [i.e., Delft], Part 1, 1637; Part 2, 1638).

[16] The *OED* dates the word 'castrametation' to the late seventeenth century, so Cruso may have been one of the first English authors to use it, if not the first.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

common way for Cruso to indicate his authorship. The printer's imprint reads, 'London, Printed by R.C. for Andrew Crook, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Greene Dragon in Saint Pauls Church-yard. 1642'. We can work out the identity of R.C. from the printer's device. This is a half eagle and key with the motto *Post tenebras lux* [After darkness, light], the arms of the city of Geneva. This was first used as a printer's device in London by Rowland Hill who had worked in Geneva from 1559 to 1560. It was passed to Thomas Cotes in 1627 having previously been in the possession of William Jaggard. Cotes worked with Crook (also Crooke) (c.1605–74), who may not simply have been the seller of Cruso's book, but also the publisher, as did his brother Richard, whose initials 'R.C.' are in the imprint.[17]

The notion that Richard Cotes was the printer of *Castrametation* gains weight when we look at the title page of *The Order of Military Watches*. The imprint simply reads 'Printed for Andrew Crooke 1642'. However, the printer's mark is a framed device of a rose, a gillyflower ,and another flower surrounded by the Welsh motto *Heb Ddieu, Heb Ddim* [Without God, Without Anything]. This emblem appears on the title pages of Shakespeare's plays in quarto dated 1608.[18] In or before 1618 it passed to William Jaggard. On his death in 1623 it passed to his son Isaac, and in 1627 to Thomas and Richard Cotes. In 1641, the year before *The Order of Military Watches* was published, the device passed to Richard Cotes alone.[19] This was not the only joint project undertaken by Cotes and Crooke. In 1650 Cotes printed John Lightfoot's *The harmony of the foure evangelists*, again for Crooke. One other connection between Crooke and Norwich is that having printed unauthorized versions of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*, Crooke printed the first authorized version in 1643.[20]

Castrametation and *The Order of Military Watches* are the only two books in Cruso's English military oeuvre not printed by Roger Daniel, so the question arises as to why Daniel did not print these books. One possibility is that he was busy for much of the year printing communications

17 Ronald B. McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland 1485–1640* (London, 1949), p. 49.

18 Geraint Evans, 'Heb Ddieu Heb Ddim: the Welsh Printer's Device on Shakespeare Quarto Title-Pages', *Studia Celtica*, 44(1) (2010), 155–64.

19 McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices*, p. 110.

20 Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (Oxford, 1968), p. 56. In this regard, Claire Preston, *Thomas Browne and the Writing of Early Modern Science* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 11, describes Crooke as 'the opportunistic pirating publisher of the earlier versions'. Plomer (p. 56) is, however, kinder to Crooke, describing him as 'one of the leading publishers of his day'. For more on Sir Thomas Browne's association with Crooke, see Reid Barbour, *Sir Thomas Browne: A Life* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 276–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from King Charles who had removed to York.[21] However, according to the British Library catalogue he did print other books at Cambridge in this year, including the second edition of Cruso's *The Art of Warre*. One other possibility is that Cruso was in London in relation to his membership of the Artillery Company, a point I return to below.

❧

Castrametation is dedicated 'TO THE WORSHIPFULL, My much honoured Friend, WILLIAM DENNY, Esq., Sergeant Major of a Regiment of FOOTE'. Sir William Denny was born in Norwich, the son of a Suffolk yeoman. He was educated, like Aquila Cruso, by Mr Stonham, Rector of St Stephen's. In 1620 he matriculated as a pensioner at Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge.[22] In 1631, Denny wrote a dedicatory poem to Ralph Knevet's 'pastorall', *Rhodon and Iris*.[23] Denny was probably the author of *Pelecanicidium, or the Christian adviser against self-murder* (London, 1653), and the pastoral poem, *The Shepheard's Holiday*.[24] He would write a dedicatory poem to the second edition of Cruso's *The Art of Warre*.[25] In 1642, Denny, who eventually declared his Royalist allegiance, was created a baronet. He died in London in 1676.

Cruso's dedicatory epistle to Denny in *Castrametation* points to a long friendship between the two men. Cruso writes that he sought Denny's patronage 'both in respect of my many obligations; as also for that I know you are able to correct what is amisse, and courteous to pardon it'. In Chapter 5, I suggested that Denny may have been a member of a poetic community in Norwich along with Knevet and Cruso. One possibility is that Cruso is referring to earlier comments made by Denny on Cruso's English verse.

21 David McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, *Vol. I, Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge 1534–1698* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 297.

22 John Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to 1900*, *Part I: From the Earliest Times to 1751* (4 vols, Cambridge, 1922–7), vol. II, p. 33.

23 Amy Charles, *The Shorter Poems of Ralph Knevet: A Critical Edition* (Columbus, OH, 1966), p. 175.

24 Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, vol. II, p. 33. For the published text of *The Shepheard's Holiday*, see William Hazlitt (ed.), *Inedited Poetical Miscellanies, 1584–1700* (s.l., 1870), pp. 59–116.

25 Denny had initially let it be supposed that his sympathies lay with Parliament, although he subsequently declared his Royalist allegiance. Robert Ketton-Cremer, *Norfolk in the Civil War: A Portrait of a Society in Conflict* (Norwich, 1985), pp. 151, 177.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As in other dedicatory epistles, Cruso cannot resist positioning himself as a *miles doctus* by throwing in a quotation from or reference to the ancients. He begins his epistle to Denny by inserting a Latinized quotation that he attributes to Aristotle:

> Sir. It pleased a Noble friend to say of the Lord du Praissac's Discourses (by mee lately Englished) as Aristotle said of his owne writings, Se scripsisse & non scripsisse.

In truth, I have not been able to identify the source of this quotation from Aristotle. It seems that the point being made here is that while Aristotle was the author and composed some of his own material, he also incorporated the knowledge and wisdom of others in his work.[26] This point does not connect smoothly with what follows, and indeed the letter does not form a coherent whole. Here, one is left with the impression that quoting Aristotle was more important to Cruso than being absolutely *ad rem*. He continues by observing that his unnamed 'noble friend' had argued that the Lord of Praissac's work was so dense that it required detailed commentary to make it comprehensible. It was this that had prompted Cruso to write *Castrametation*, which uses the second chapter of Praissac's *Les Discours Militaires* on the laying out of a camp as one of its sources.[27] He had already 'Englished' this in *The Art of Warre* but expands on it in *Castrametation*. The fact that it was a 'noble friend' who had suggested that Cruso should publish an expansion on Praissac's work allows him to avoid accusations of hubris and is an example of the 'modesty formula'. Cruso had previously taken this from his toolkit of rhetorical devices in *The Art of Warre*, which, he claimed, his friend Philip Skippon had suggested he translate.[28]

Cruso concludes the epistle with the usual dose of *humilitas affectata*, and the by-now familiar appeal to 'idle hours' or 'leisure', but also with a suggestion that if *Castrametation*, 'a small Essay', is well-received, then he would give the rest of Praissac's work similar treatment:

[26] The Latin means literally 'that he himself had written [them] and he had not written [them]'. This statement could be understood as an example of metatranslation, i.e., 'the way translations reflect about themselves as translations'. Theo Hermans, *The Conference of Tongues* (Manchester, 2007), p. 41. In some sense this points to Cruso's work as a hybrid, both translation and original work, drawn from a range of primary sources.

[27] This chapter has different titles in different editions of Praissac's work. These include *Du Loger de l'Armée* [Encamping the army] and *Comment il faut loger* [How one should encamp].

[28] Peter Burke, 'Representations of the Self from Petrarch to Descartes', in Roy Porter (ed.), *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present* (London, 1997), pp. 17–28, at p. 22. Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 131.

> And as this small Essay shall find acceptance I shall direct myself (as leisure and my poor stock of knowledge shall serve) in the undertaking of the whole worke. Meane time, I kiss your hands and rest
>
> Your humble servant,
> Jo. Cruso.

As far as we know, the more thorough treatment of Praissac's work did not materialize, although Cruso did re-publish his 1639 translation, *The Art of Warre*.

Apart from the front matter, the work is divided into twenty-one short chapters. As with Cruso's other military works, they are evidence of the methodical manner in which he ordered his material. The first chapter defines castrametation. The second chapter analyzes where a camp should be set up. Chapters III–IX address the quartering of different sections of the army, such as the infantry, cavalry, and officers, and the positioning of the 'market place', where the sutler sold provisions to soldiers. Chapters X–XVII provide lists of regiments and equipment in an army, while the final chapters analyze the design and measuring out of an encampment.

In the dedication for *The Order of Military Watches*, Cruso refers to *Castrametation* as 'Comment upon the Lord of Praissac's Discourses [on Encamping]'. However, the relationship between the two works is in general quite loose.[29] As a rough guide, whereas Cruso's work consists of fifty-one pages in quarto, Praissac's chapter consists of thirteen pages (pp. 23–35) in octavo. As suggested by the quotation attributed to Aristotle, Cruso adds his own and other material to his work. Furthermore, Cruso does not reproduce Praissac's diagrams. Reference to Praissac may additionally have helped Cruso to position himself and his work.

Cruso begins his treatise in Chapter I by defining his terms. He observes that 'castrametation' is 'a word borrowed from the Romans'. He then defines several types of camp: *Castra Temporanea* as 'a temporarie campe'; *Castra Sustentoria* as 'a flying Armie'; and *Castra Strataria* as 'a Campe to environ and besiege a Towne or Fortresse'. The use of Latin once more positions Cruso *ab initio* as a *miles doctus*. He continues the chapter by describing the situations in which each *castra* should be employed.

Apart from Praissac, another author to whom Cruso owes much in *Castrametation* is the Brugge-born polymath Simon Stevin. He worked

[29] One exception comes in Cruso's Chapter 2 (point 2). Here, Cruso references Chapter 2 of Praissac's work in the margin. Praissac argues that an encampment should be made near a river. Cruso repeats this point and borrows reasons for this from Praissac, such as the need for drinking water, but adds some of his own, e.g., it allows for the disposal of carrion.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for many years as a military engineer for Maurits, Prince of Orange, as he led the Dutch struggle for independence from Spain. In Chapter X of *Castrametation*, Cruso argues that to build the most effective encampment for an army on the march, a quartermaster must have lists of the forces and equipment in the army. He then refers to 'the Lists of the late Prince of Orange his Armie, Anno 1610, quartered before Gulick, for an Example; (for which I am beholden to Master Simon Steven [sic])'. This allows him to provide the detailed lists of officers, regiments, and equipment in chapters XI–XVII, i.e., seven of the twenty-one chapters. They correspond to the lists on pages 18–31 of Stevin's Dutch work on the laying out of military camps, *Castrametatio, dat is legermeting* [Castrametation, that is measuring out of an army camp] (Rotterdam, 1617).[30] This work was published towards the end of Stevin's career (he died in 1620) and was the product of his experience accumulated over many years from working in the field for Prince Maurits. Stevin's account is based, *inter alia*, on the siege of Jülich (Cruso's Gulick) by the troops of the States-General in 1610.[31] In contrast to the loose relationship between Cruso's work and Praissac's *Les Discours Militaires*, here for the most part Cruso directly translates Stevin's lists almost word for word.[32] This is, therefore, another example in Cruso's oeuvre of the importance of translation in the transmission of knowledge.[33] However, one departure from Stevin comes in chapter 12, the list of the regiments

[30] In some gatherings, this is bound with another work by Stevin, *Nieuwe Maniere van Stercktebou door Spilsluysen* [New Ways of Fortification with Spindle-sluices], published in Rotterdam in 1617. Hoftijzer mentions the translation into English of a mathematical text by Simon Stevin, by another mathematician, Edward Wright. This was published in 1599. 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, at p. 212.

[31] He refers to 'het Legher der Hoochmogende Heeren Staten onder anderen voor Gulich des Iaers 1610'.

[32] Fiona Williamson observes that Cruso 'translated several texts from Dutch into English'. This perhaps overstates the case, for as far as I can see, his translation of Stevin's lists is the only example of a translation, in the sense of one source text and one target text, from Dutch in his military works. He did use other Dutch works such as Van Meteren's *Commentarien* as sources, but he did not translate them. On the other hand, he did translate texts from French to English. Fiona Williamson, *Social Relations and Urban Space: Norwich, 1600–1700* (Woodbridge, 2014), p. 94.

[33] Sietske Fransen, 'Anglo-Dutch Translations of Medical and Scientific Texts', *Literature Compass*. 2017;14:e12385. https://doi.org/10.1111/lic3.12385 [accessed 4 February 2021], p. 7. James A. Secord, 'Knowledge in Transit', *Isis*, 95(4) (2004), 654–72 https://doi:10.1086/430657 [accessed 4 February 2021].

of the infantry. Whereas Stevin puts French regiments first, Cruso puts the English one first, no doubt with his intended readership in mind. This appropriation of Stevin's text is Cruso's most explicit and extensive use of a work that emerged from the Eighty Years' War. The fact that Stevin wrote in Dutch meant that Cruso was well placed to translate it for an English audience, acting once more as a 'cultural go-between'. Cruso furnishes his work with twelve diagrams, some of which are based on ones in Stevin's book.[34] They are of varying complexity illustrating how encampments and parts thereof are to be laid out, often with dimensions, and how men and equipment should be distributed across the encampments. They would have made it easier to use the book on campaign.

Cruso's translation from Dutch for *Castrametation* is part of a pattern of translation between Dutch and English which experienced a surge in the 1640s. The overall number of translations between the two languages is difficult to establish precisely, but there is evidence that it ran to several thousand. Cruso's translation of Stevin was therefore but one of many translations between these languages.[35] However, in terms of the 'balance of trade', as a result of the Civil War, there were more translations from English to Dutch than vice versa, so Cruso was in that sense swimming against the tide.[36]

Taking *Castrametation* as a whole, on one level it functions as a practical 'how-to' for building military encampments; but on another level it functions as a statement of learned authorship by a *miles doctus*. In addition to references to Praissac, in Chapter II, Cruso observes that he is following ancient commentators including 'Vegetius, Hyginus Gromaticus, and others'. In the margin, he gives the reference for Vegetius as *De re militari*

[34] For example, Cruso's figures 8 and 9 correspond to the diagrams on pp. 34 and 35 of Stevin's work.

[35] Peter Burke, 'The Circulation of Historical and Political Knowledge between Britain and the Netherlands, 1600-1800: The Place of Translations', in H. J. Cook and S. Dupré (eds), *Translating Knowledge in the Early Modern Low Countries* (Zürich, Münster, 2013), pp. 41–52, at p. 43.

[36] Burke, 'The Circulation of Historical and Political Knowledge', p. 45. Helmer J. Helmers (*The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639–1660* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 30–1), illustrates that there was a surge in translations from English to Dutch in a range of subjects and media. For example, there was an increase in translations on religious and historical themes and in pamphlet literature. A survey of the Royal Dutch Library pamphlet collection (Knuttel) indicates that in the period 1601–20, translations from English made up 3 percent of all the catalogue's pamphlets published in Dutch; by 1643 one in every two pamphlets had originally been written in English, with the figure dropping back to 4.3 percent for the period 1661–80.

I.21. This chapter of Vegetius's work in some sense frames Cruso's work, for there is a further reference to it in the final chapter, XXI. Christopher Allmand demonstrates the importance of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and observes that *De re militari* remained in print in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[37] Cruso's extensive use of this work here and in *Militarie Instructions* suggests that it continued to be influential deep into the seventeenth century. In the margin next to Hyginus Gromaticus, Cruso writes 'De Castramet.', a reference to the fact that at this time a work on castrametation, *Liber de munitionibus castrorum* [Book about the Fortifications of Military Camps], probably written in about the third century AD, was ascribed to Hyginus Gromaticus. Another work in Latin to which Cruso refers is Aelianus Tacticus's (also Aelian) *De instruendis aciebus* [On Drawing up Battlelines], which probably dates from the second century AD. In the Renaissance, Latin and Greek editions of the work were available. Indeed, Aelianus's work was an important source of inspiration for the military reforms inaugurated by Maurits, Prince of Orange.[38]

A marginal note in Chapter II reads 'Freitag, in his Fortifications lib.3.Cap.2', which is a reference to Adam Freitag's *Architectura militaris nova et aucta, oder Newe vermehrte Fortification, von Regular Vestungen, von Irregular Vestungen und Aussen wercken*, which made a fundamental contribution to the science of fortifications.[39] Prior to 1642, this book, first published in 1631 by the Elzeviers of Leiden, had appeared in four editions, two in German and two in French. Cruso does not tell us which edition he had consulted. In the German edition, Freitag addresses the theme of castrametation in book 3, chapter 2, entitled, *Wie ein Läger soll geschlagen werden und wie die quartier ausszutheilen sein* [How a camp should be set up and how accommodation is to be distributed]. In Chapter II, Cruso also references Leo the Wise's *Tactica*, while in Chapter III, 'for the French manner of Encamping', he cites Antoine de Ville's *Les Fortifications du Chevalier* (Book 2, Part 2, Chap. 25). This was first published in Lyon in 1628 and was also a source for *The Order of Military Watches*. Finally, in Chapter XXI Cruso refers to Vegetius's *De re militari* 1.21, once more to Leo the Wise's *Tactica* (Chap. 11), and to Frontinus's *Strategemata* (IV.1).

[37] Christopher T. Allmand, *The De Re Militari of Vegetius* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 348.

[38] Gabriele Pedullà, 'Machiavelli the Tactician: Math, Graphs, and Knots in the Art of War', in Filippo del Lucchese *et al.* (eds), *The Radical Machiavelli: Politics, Philosophy, and Language* (Leiden, 2015), pp. 81–104, at p. 88.

[39] http://architectura.cesr.univ-tours.fr/traite/Notice/Freitag1631.asp?param=en [accessed 4 February 2021]. Adam Freitag, *Architectura militaris nova et aucta, oder Newe vermehrte Fortification, von Regular Vestungen, von Irregular Vestungen und Aussen wercken* [1st edn] (Leiden, 1631).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Frontinus, Cruso tells us, recorded that Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, was 'the first that environed his Campe with a Rampart'. Cruso's references to De Ville and Freitag provide further evidence that he had ready access to books published on the European mainland.

As for the reception of *Castrametation*, one fellow military author, David Papillon (1581–1649), was not very complimentary, describing it as having 'encreased the ignorance of [the] meane capacities' of its readers.[40] Nevertheless, the fact that surviving copies are held in fourteen libraries in Britain and North America suggests that some contemporaries found the work useful. Cruso's translation of sections of Stevin's work adds to our knowledge of translations between Dutch and English in the early modern period.[41]

❧

The Order of Military Watches By J.C. is a much more limited enterprise. It consists of twenty-three pages, pp. 52–74 of the bound edition. As with *Castrametation*, little had previously been written on military watches in English. After the separate title page, in the dedicatory epistle Cruso observes that it is 'a subject wherein not onely our Authour, but all others have beene exceeding sparing'. However, he asserts that it is one of 'extraordinary use and consequence'. He dedicated the work to Philip Skippon, to whom he had previously dedicated his 1639 work, *A Short Method*. In 1639, Skippon had left Norfolk for London and re-entered active service. On 25 October he had replaced Marmaduke Rawden as Captain-Leader of the Artillery Company.[42] This was a military guild whose members were among London's wealthier citizens. It had a vibrant social calendar with meetings and feasts. Furthermore, it provided officers for the London Trained Bands or militias. As Captain-Leader, Skippon was responsible for training the members of the Artillery Company. In this role, he would encourage the

40 David R. Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier: Military Books and Military Culture in Early Stuart England* (Leiden, 2009), pp. 366–7. Papillon makes this comment in the Letter to the Reader of his own work on fortifications published in London in 1645, *A practicall abstract of the arts, of fortification and assailing.*

41 This subject has been discussed by Peter Burke, 'The Circulation of Historical and Political Knowledge', and Harold Cook, *Matters of Exchange*: *Commerce, Medicine, and Science in the Dutch Golden Age* (New Haven, CT, 2007).

42 David Lawrence, 'The Honourable Artillery Company Quarterage Book, 1628–1643: New Evidence of the Company's Pre-Civil War History', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 97 (Autumn 2019), 229–45, at p. 240; Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 67. The prefix 'Honourable' was a later addition, officially bestowed on the Company by Queen Victoria in 1860. I thank Ismini Pells for this information.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

use of Continental military techniques that he had learnt during his time as a soldier in the Low Countries and the Palatinate.[43]

In a gathering in the British Library, there are in fact two dedications to Skippon.[44] They present the same short dedicatory epistle, but address Skippon differently. In the first dedication, he is addressed as 'The Right Worshipfull My ever honored Friend Philip Skippon Esq. Captaine of the Ancient and Noble Company, Exercising Armes in the Artillery Garden in London'. This refers to his appointment as Captain-Leader of the Artillery Company at the Artillery Garden in 1639. The second dedication is also addressed to 'The Right Worshipfull My ever honored Friend Philip Skippon', but now as 'Sergeant Major Generall, and one of the Committee for the Militia of London, Captaine of that Ancient and Noble Company, Exercising Armes in the Artillery Garden of the said City'. Skippon was appointed to the position of Sergeant Major General of the London Trained Bands in January 1642, the same month as Parliament requisitioned the London Trained Bands for its cause. As the title page has the date 1642, this suggests that it was typeset in the first weeks of the year before Skippon's new appointment (or before Cruso was aware of this), but a later dedication needed to be printed to give his new position. One can only speculate, however, as to why both dedications are in the same gathering.

The dedication to Skippon is very short, shorn of the references to classical authors with which Cruso peppered other dedicatory epistles. After briefly stating his reason for publishing this work, Cruso concludes by flattering Skippon and indicating that his friend had reviewed a draft copy of the work,

> I could not present it to any other but your Worthy Selfe, since you have beene pleased, in the perusall of it, to give it such perfection, as whatsoever is good in it, I account of your owne […]

After Cruso's dedication to Skippon, there is a dedicatory poem by 'Fran. Cock.' The identity of this author is unclear. One possibility is that it was the 'Francis Coocke' listed in the quarterage records of the Artillery Company. These indicate that he was lodging with John Cruso in 1643, the year after the publication of *The Order of Military Watches*. Given that the dedicatee, Philip Skippon, and by now Cruso himself, were both members of the Company, this is certainly a strong possibility.[45] We have few other details about Coocke/Cock. Like Cruso, he may have been a Norwich man. The Cocks were a leading family in early modern Norwich, with two branches

[43] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 75.
[44] London, British Library, shelfmark 1398.b.7.
[45] Bennett, *The Cardew–Rendle Roll*, vol. I, p. 563; Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 76.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of it providing four aldermen and five councillors between 1526 and 1682.[46] He may have been the Francis Cock, whose sons, George and Robert, attended Norwich Free Grammar School and then matriculated at Christ's College, Cambridge in 1628 and 1631 respectively. However, there is no direct evidence linking Cock to this poem.[47] Another possibility is that this is a Norwich freeman. An entry in the list of freemen for 5 September 1640 reads 'Franciscus Cocke, filius Francisci Cocke'.[48] Could it be father or son? Unfortunately, we cannot currently say.

Whichever Francis C(o)ock(e) wrote the poem, we can presume he knew Cruso well, for he gives it the title, 'To my judicious Friend, Captaine John Cruso, upon his Treatise of Watches'. The verse itself is certainly competent, though with few poetic fireworks, consisting of eleven rhyming iambic pentameter couplets. It is framed with praise for Cruso, beginning:

> Brave Architect of Warre, I must admire,
> Not imitate, tis so sublime a fire,
> Quickens thy Active Soule, thy labours may
> (Unenvy'd) reach, thy Worth Bellona's Bay
>
> (lines 1–4)

In Roman mythology, Bellona was the goddess of war, the sister of Mars. The god is invoked in the final couplet, in which Cock praises Cruso's 'wit':

> Hadst not thou don't brave Cruso, it is fit
> We yeeld up Mars the Head-peece, thee the Wit.
>
> (lines 21–2)[49]

As for the text, there are no chapter divisions, diagrams, marginal notes, or references to ancient authors in contrast to Cruso's other works, and one gets a sense that Cruso wrote this short work at speed to meet market demand as England moved towards Civil War. New patterns of army movements emerged with encamping and guarding camps playing an important role as armies criss-crossed England. Therefore, new sources of expertise in these disciplines were required such as Cruso's manuals. The principal source for *The Order of Military Watches* was probably Antoine de Ville's *Les Fortifications du Chevalier*, to which Cruso had referred in *Castrametation*. On p. 61, Cruso notes that 'Mounsieur de Ville' asserted that sentinels should be musketeers. This corresponds to the sentence in De Ville's work,

[46] John Pound, *Tudor and Stuart Norwich* (Chichester, 1988), p. 74. This is possibly the 'Mr Francis Cocke' listed as an English militia captain in Norwich in 1613. NRO, NCR 13a/37.

[47] Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, vol. I, pp. 361–2.

[48] NRO, NCR 17c/2, List of Freemen 1548–1713, fol. 7v.

[49] See Appendix 2 for the full text.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Les Sentinelles […] doiuent tousiours etre Mousquetaires' (Livre III, Partie I, Chapitre IV) (p. 368). De Ville devotes several chapters in Livre III, Partie I to military watches. However, Cruso seems to have used these as a source of information and inspiration, rather than translating them word for word. He peppers his own text with French terms such *corps de garde* (he writes *guard*) and *patrouille* found in De Ville's work, but matching passages in Cruso's work to specific source texts is problematic. Therefore, we can view it as essentially Cruso's own work, rather than a translation, but one which again owed much to Continental military literature. Furthermore, the fact that De Ville's work was an important, if not the most important, source for Cruso's work further underlines the value of his knowledge of French in his military writing.

Cruso concludes this work with his customary dose of humility, suggesting that his aims for the book were limited. Here, as elsewhere however, we should be cautious about taking Cruso at his word,

> What hath beene already said, will (I hope) be sufficient for generall directions, in any case which may befall: If it may prove usefull and profitable for our trained Bands (many of which, I feare, are much to seeke in the knowledge and practice of this so important a part of the moderne *Militia*) I have my desire.

As noted above, in January 1642 Parliament had requisitioned the London Trained Bands for its cause and Philip Skippon had been appointed as Sergeant Major General.[50] Given that Cruso had dedicated *The Order of Military Watches* to Skippon, and that Francis Cock may have been a member of the Artillery Company, which had close associations with the bands, it is possible that the reference to 'our trained Bands' in the final paragraph points to the London Trained Bands.[51] Furthermore, Cruso seems to have written the work above all to provide guidance on military watches to the men, who were 'much to seeke in the knowledge and practice' of this discipline; men who were moving from being militia members, practising on the drill ground, to going on military campaign and seeing action in pitched battles. This connection with the London Trained Bands may also explain why Cruso published the combined work in London, rather than in Cambridge, as was the case for his other military works.

Here, a word is in order about printers. David Lawrence observes that there was an awareness of the marketability of military books by London printers, several of whom were members of the Artillery Company. They

[50] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 7, p. 91.

[51] In 1642, John's brother Timothy was in a trained band. Bennett, *The Cardew–Rendle Roll*, vol. I, p. 598.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

published military books and manuals for members of the Artillery Company.[52] A Richard Coates was admitted to the Artillery Company in 1611.[53] This may be the Richard Coates or Cotes who printed *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches*. If so, it would underline Lawrence's point, adding to the list of military manuals that emerged from interaction between Artillery Company members, and would further help to explain why the works were printed in London and not Cambridge.

THE ART OF WARRE (2ND EDITION)

The third work that Cruso published in 1642 was a second edition of *The Art of Warre*, first published in 1639. The most striking difference between these two editions is the front matter. Beneath the title, which remained unchanged, viz. *The Art of Warre, or Militarie discourses*, the 1642 title page lists the contents by chapter heading.[54] Beneath this, the printer's mark tells us that this edition, like its predecessor, was printed by Roger Daniel. However, this edition was to be sold by the London stationer Francis Constable at Westminster Hall (ESTC R204361). He had been active as a bookseller in London and Westminster since about 1614. For many years, he was one of the legions of booksellers operating around St Paul's. Well before 1642 he was renting a stall in Westminster Hall.[55]

The 1639 edition had no dedicatory poems. By contrast, the 1642 edition included three such poems, two in English and one in Latin.[56] They were composed by William Denny, the dedicatee of *Castrametation*, the Cambridge scholar Richard Watson (1611/12–85), and the Norwich-born scholar and Anglican priest, William Sedgewick (1614–75). Denny gave his verse the title 'Upon the accurate translation of the Lord Du Praissac his Militarie discourses, done by his esteemed friend Captain John Cruso'. The verse, comprising eighteen rhyming iambic pentameter couplets, begins by praising Cruso, 'Times have their Genii: yea, and places too'. Later, Denny refers to the author as 'most industrious Cruso'. Perhaps taking his inspiration from Cruso's book, the Cambridge-educated Denny packs his verse with references to classical mythological figures including Astraea, Bellona, Pallas (Athena) and Minerva. Furthermore, Denny has something to say on translation,

52 Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, p. 12.
53 Bennett, *The Cardew–Rendle Roll*, vol. I, p. 548; Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 81.
54 There is a copy in Cambridge University Library, shelfmark: Syn.7.64.172.
55 Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers*, p. 51.
56 For the full texts, see Appendix 2.

He, that hath but the language, boldly may
Seek to translate, yet is but half the way,
Who renders Sence for Sence, and Words of Art
Does properly expound, does act the Part

In other words, translation should not just be literal, but capture the sense of the original. Denny suggests that Cruso has achieved this, concluding that both the original author, Praissac, and the translator should be praised,

Praissac is well_come into England. We
May joy in him: But yeeld our thanks to Thee.

Denny signs his verse 'W. Denny Esq. Serg. Ma.' pointing to his own military credentials. The second dedicatory poem was written by Richard Watson, who signs himself 'Ri. Watson, Col. Gon. & Cai. Soc'. Watson was born in London in 1611/12 and was admitted to Gonville & Caius College in 1628. From 1636 to 1644 he was a fellow [soc[ius]] of the college. He was also a lecturer in Greek and Hebrew and an Anglican clergyman, who, like Denny, would side with the Royalist cause in the English Civil War. Watson corresponded with John Cosin and one possibility is that John Cruso got to know Watson through Cosin.[57] However, a more likely connection is through John's brother, Aquila, who was associated with Gonville & Caius for many years. In Chapter 2, we learnt that Watson, who was some fifteen years younger than Aquila, and no mean scholar himself, praised Aquila's learning very highly. Furthermore, several small pieces of writing by Watson and Aquila were published together in 1665.[58]

Watson's poem, which consists of seventeen rhyming iambic pentameter couplets, is a cleverly devised verse full of poetic invention, with more than a hint of Baroque hyperbole. It is divided into four sections of three, four, five, and five couplets. In the first section, Watson imagines that if he had an army he would attack forces that might criticize Cruso's work: censure and envy, in some sense presented as allegorical figures, and Momus, the ancient personification of satire, leaving Cruso's judgement as master of the field. In the second section, Watson references Cruso's earlier work *Militarie Instructions* and several of the authors that Cruso mentions in his Letter to the Reader, whom, Watson argues, Cruso outshines. He asserts that if that were the only military work by Cruso that he had known, he

[57] Aquila Cruso and Richard Watson, *Aquilæ Cruso, τοῦ μακαρίτου, Εὐδαίμων Aristotelicus; Richardi Watson Ludio Paræneticus; orationes olim habitæ Cantabrigiæ […] Prioris adhuc Antimachus Gigantum; posterioris alia, etc.* (London, 1665). Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, vol. IV, p. 349.

[58] Venn, *The Biographical History*, vol. I, pp. 209, 286–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would have been certain that Mars and Minerva had committed incest to produce Cruso. While incest is perhaps too suggestive of a close family relationship between Mars and Minerva, Watson's point is that Cruso married the warlike attributes of Mars with the artistic endeavour associated with Minerva. In fact, Minerva was a goddess of warfare as well as a sponsor of the arts, a point to which Cruso alluded in his handwritten dedication of *Militarie Instructions* to Jonas Proost, discussed in Chapter 6.

In the third section, Watson recognizes that Cruso wrote not only on the cavalry but also on the infantry and artillery. He concludes that Mars 'that God of warre' had in fact previously only been an apprentice and that Cruso had made him a master of his trade, so that he was now a freeman. Art, of course, mirrors life here for Cruso the hosier was a freeman to whom Thomas Palgrave had been apprenticed between 1624 and 1632. In the final section, Watson compares the contributions of Cruso and Praissac to *The Art of Warre*. He begins by asserting that if the author of the source text is praised for a translation of his work, then that is much to the credit of the translator. He concludes:

> […] For it will be said,
> 'Twas *writ* by Praissac, but by *Cruso* made.
> Nay, Poets Prophets are. In time to come,
> They'l say, Thou stol'st France's *Palladium*.
> Till then I'le stile thee (and not think I erre)
> The warlike *Hermes*, *Mars's* Interpreter.

A palladium was a cult image of antiquity and so the suggestion is that future generations may say that Cruso 'stole' a cult image of France, i.e., Praissac's *Les Discours Militaires*. For the time being, however, Watson frames Cruso as an authorial Hermes who mediated Mars to the English. Watson certainly packs in classical references to his verse, alluding to 'the Thessalian Art', i.e., magic, alongside Momus *et al.*, in what is an act of self-presentation of his own.[59] The Baroque hyperbole may seem somewhat disingenuous to the modern reader, but was perhaps to be expected in dedicatory verses in the early modern period.

The third dedicatory poem is a Latin verse of eleven elegiac couplets by 'Guil. Sigiswicke soc. Caio-Gon'. This is William Sedgewick. He was born in Norwich, attended Mr Stonham's school in the city, and matriculated at Gonville & Caius in 1631, a year before John Cruso's son, John Jr. He was a fellow of the college from 1640 to 1651, during which time

[59] According to Greek legend, Atrax of Thessaly was the inventor of magic. In antiquity, magic was referred to as *Ars Thessalica* or *Ars Atracia*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he was appointed as a Greek lecturer. In 1650 he was appointed as vicar of Mattishall in mid-Norfolk. He died in 1675.[60]

Harm-Jan van Dam notes that it was unusual for a dedicatory poem to be in a different language from the text.[61] Clearly, though, there was an expectation that Cruso's audience could read Latin. The title of Sedgewick's poem is *Ad dignissimum virum & de re militari optimè meritum Johannem Cruso, hujus operis Interpretem, factâ primum ad Galliam. Apostrophe* [To the most worthy man of great merit in military matters, Johannes Cruso, the interpreter of this work, originally written to France. Address]. As the title suggests, Sedgewick begins by addressing Gaul or France directly:

> Gallia, quid nostras armato milite comples
> Oras, belligeri prodiga terra Dei?
>
> [Gaul, you wasteful land of a Martial God,
> why do you overwhelm our shores with an army?]

In one notable couplet, Sedgewick praises Cruso's work directly:

> Interea non culpo tuos Crusóe labores:
> Id dubito, ars major sit tua sitve fides.
>
> [Meanwhile, I do not censure your works, o Cruso:
> I do not doubt that your skill or your faith is great.]
>
> (lines 9–10)

He concludes by stating that as *The Art of Warre* has now been 'Englished' by Cruso, England may worship its own god of war or martial art:

> sic olim Angliacâ meritos referente triumphos,
> Singula gens proprio Marte vel Arte cadat.
>
> [So, may this singular race, by reporting the deserved triumphs
> In English, fall before its own Mars or Art.]

The dedications to Lord Matravers, Philip Skippon, and 'To the Gentlemen of the Artillerie and Militarie companies […]' in the first edition are reprinted in the second edition. However, unlike the first edition, the 1642 publication includes two short English verses by the author (see Appendix

[60] Venn, *The Biographical History*, vol. I, p. 297; Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, vol. IV, p. 41. See also http://www.british-history.ac.uk/topographical-hist-norfolk/vol10/pp233-239(William Segiswycke) [accessed 4 February 2021].

[61] Harm-Jan van Dam, 'Liminary Poetry in Latin and Dutch: The Case of Pieter Bor's *Nederlantsche Oorloghen*', in Tom Deneire (ed.), *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Language of Poetics, Translation and Transfer* (Leiden, 2014), pp. 59–85, at p. 60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1, C). In the first of these, 'The Author, to his Book', which consists of five rhyming couplets, Cruso directly addresses his work:

> Goe little Book, thine aid afford.
> Unto the Battailes of the Lord.
>
> (lines 1–2)

One possibility here is that Cruso is evoking Catullus or Martial whose opening poems both refer to their little book or books (libellus/libelli). However, it is more likely to be a reference to Ovid's *Tristia*, which begins, 'Parve – nec invideo – sine me, liber, ibis in urbem' [You will go, little book, to the city without me, and I will not grudge it].[62] If so, Cruso may be drawing from Ovid either directly or via an English author such as Chaucer or Spenser.

The second poem consists of four rhyming couplets. It is entitled 'Dedicatorie' and is addressed to the reader, 'You for whom this work was fram'd' (line 1). In the final four lines, Cruso encourages the reader to take the book with him on campaign:

> Bear it to th' Field, and let it bee
> At Rendevous's your Company,
> Where, for your lesson, and your sport,
> You every day may take a Fort.

Given that the English Civil War started in the year of its publication, soldiers may well have followed Cruso's advice and had his book, printed in octavo, tucked in their satchels to read at camp. Cruso concludes the poem by saying farewell to his book with the Latin *Vale*. In his book on Thomas Churchyard, Matthew Woodcock writes that his subject had no 'laureate pretensions'.[63] The same can be said of these English poems by Cruso. They are, rather, playful ditties with a nod to antiquity which send the book on its way and exhort the reader to pack a copy to study as he prepares for battle. As with the 1639 edition, copies of the 1642 edition are bound with *A Short Method*. The title page for this remains unchanged, with the date still given as 1639. Copies of this edition are held in at least six libraries in Britain and North America.[64]

[62] Ovid's verse is in turn modelled on Horace, *Epistles* I.20. Betsy Nagle, *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid* (Brussels, 1980), p. 35, writes '[Ovid] addresses his libellus as master to slave'.

[63] Matthew Woodcock, *Thomas Churchyard: Pen, Sword, and Ego* (Oxford, 2016), p. 3.

[64] The ESTC lists four libraries. To these can be added the British Library and Cambridge University Library.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MILITARIE INSTRUCTIONS (2ND EDITION)

The final military work by Cruso printed in his lifetime was a second edition of *Militarie Instructions* (Wing C7433, ESTC R23795), the work that had announced him to the world, or at least English readers of military works, in 1632. In some sense this most impressive of Cruso's military works and the only one printed in folio framed his career as a military author, with the second edition printed in 1644. As with the second edition of *The Art of Warre*, the principal changes from the first edition are in the front matter, with the text remaining unchanged.[65]

The main alteration in the front matter is the addition of an appendix, which requires our close attention. Cruso opens the appendix by protesting that the second edition was 'coming forth without my knowledge', and so he had been unable to insert amendments in the text:

> Curteous Reader, this second Edition of my book of Cavallrie coming forth without my knowledge, I was disappointed of my purpose of inserting some alterations and additions in their due places.

Such protests are, of course, common in early modern literature and we should be wary about taking Cruso's protests too seriously. He then draws the reader's attention to the alterations that he would have made to the text (if he had but known earlier that it was to be re-published!). One example is a change that Cruso would have brought to Part I, Chapter 2 'Of the Generall of horse'. Here, he states that the cavalryman should have two horses, one a nag or bidet for the march and the other a 'horse of service' for battle. In the appendix he asserts that for several reasons not least the cost, such nags should not be used. To make his case, he writes that nags are now not allowed 'in the Armie of the States of the united Provinces'. This suggests that he still viewed military practice in the Low Countries as a model for armies in England. Part I, Chapter 17 concerns soldiers' pay. As England had 'now fallen into times of Action', he deemed it necessary to add a detailed list of current rates of pay for various ranks of soldier in the appendix but does not give his source. Although his book focuses on the cavalry, he included rates not only for 'the Horse', but also for 'the Foot and Train of Artillerie'. The pay rates range from £10 a day for the 'Lord Generall' to as little as 8d. for a rank-and-file soldier.[66] Such a list is absent

[65] David Lawrence, *The Complete Soldier*, p. 309, esp. n. 124, observes that the engravings of postures in the first edition had been removed, possibly as they were deemed no longer necessary when training cavalry troops. However, if he is referring to fig. 3, these are reproduced in the British Library copy, between pages 18 and 19.

[66] Barbara Donagan, *War in England 1642–1649* (Oxford, 2008), p. 281 gives the same rate of pay, 8d., for the rank-and-file soldier.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from the first edition and its inclusion in the second edition helps us to date a handwritten copy of *Militarie Instructions*, to which we return shortly. The list also gives a useful overview of the range of occupations of army personnel, which include chaplains, surgeons, and blacksmiths.

Cruso then provides *corrigenda* for the other three parts of his work. Here, he records changes in tactics, such as moving from horses wheeling away to charging through enemy ranks (Part IIII). Clearly, military tactics had moved on apace in the 1630s and early 1640s and Cruso had kept abreast of them. For Part III, he draws the reader's attention to his own 1642 publications *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches* for up-to-date information on those subjects.

In contrast to its 1632 predecessor, the 1644 edition includes a dedicatory poem by Colonel Edmund Harvey (c. 1601–73). In January 1642 Harvey was admitted to the Artillery Company, which Cruso had joined in 1641.[67] He was not a Norfolk man, but the son of a London merchant. Ole Grell describes Harvey as a 'radical London mercer'. In contrast to at least two of the authors of the dedicatory verses in the second edition of *The Art of Warre*, Harvey was on the side of Parliament during the English Civil War.[68] The title and coda of the dedicatory poem suggest that Harvey and Cruso were well-acquainted, viz. *To his Much Honoured Friend, Captain John Cruso* and *Your devoted Friend, Edmund Harvy, Colonel.*

They may have got to know each other through their association with the Artillery Company or their shared political and religious convictions, although as Grell observes, even though the connection might seem to place Cruso on the same side as Harvey in the Civil War, he rejected the radical Puritanism of such men. Both men knew Philip Skippon, so he may have been the conduit for their acquaintance.[69] The fact that both men worked in the textile trade and were occasional poets may also have helped them find common ground. However, perhaps what may have drawn the two men together above all is a specific interest in the cavalry. At the outbreak of the civil war, Harvey was commissioned as a colonel of the city horse in London.[70] Harvey's interest in the cavalry may mean that he had read the 1632 edition of Cruso's work. He would later sit as a commissioner for the trial of King Charles I, although he did not sign the king's death warrant.[71]

Harvey's dedicatory poem consists of twenty-four lines of rhyming octosyllabic couplets. It is of no great literary merit, but is fulsome in its praise of Cruso, as illustrated by the opening lines:

67 Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 73. Bennett, *The Cardew–Rendle Roll*, vol. II, p. 826.
68 Grell, 'Cruso, John', p. 539.
69 Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 189. Pells refers to Harvey as an 'old associate' of Skippon.
70 *Ibid*., p. 114.
71 Bennett, *The Cardew–Rendle Roll,* vol. I, pp. 826–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I know the Authours works and name,
Great Mars his scholar, is his fame:
Whose valour, honour, industrie,
Hath taught the use of Cavallry

The printer of this edition, as of the 1632 edition, was Roger Daniel. The imprint informs us that it was 'to be sold by W. Hope at the Unicorn in Cornhill near the Royall Exchange'. William Hope had been active as a bookseller in London from 1636. In that year, Henry Plomer locates him in Cornhill. In 1639–40, he places Hope at 'the Unicorn in Cornhill near the Royall Exchange'. This imprint suggests he worked there after 1640. He later moved to the Blue Anchor by the Royal Exchange.[72]

David McKitterick is in no doubt that this was a major work in Daniel's printing career. The quality of the printing and above all the plates leads him to place it alongside a folio Greek New Testament (1642) and works by Thomas Fuller as an achievement 'of unquestionable magnitude'.[73] As a footnote, it is worth adding that Daniel clearly sided with the king as the Civil War got under way. In 1642, he printed 'His Majesties Declaration to all His loving Subjects of August 12 1642'.[74] As for Cruso, the matter is no means clear. As I discuss shortly, he was on good terms with men on both sides of the Civil War and there is evidence that points towards his support of each side.

First, however, a word is in order about the reception of the 1644 edition of *Militarie Instructions*. At the Society of Antiquaries in London, a hand-written transcript of Cruso's book is preserved. This is in a miniature-size leather pocketbook, which probably belonged to a high-ranking Royalist officer. It is in fact a partial transcript based on the second edition of *Militarie Instructions*. Previously, it had been thought that it was based on the first edition and was dated to around 1640.[75] However, the inclusion of a summary of the text in the appendix, which only appears in the second edition, along with a full list of the rates of pay, just mentioned, make it clear that a *terminus post quem* for this pocket book is 1644.[76] On the inside of the front cover is the bookplate of Sir George Clifton 4th Bt. (1666–1731) of Clifton Hall, Nottinghamshire. This may suggest that it first belonged

72 Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers*, p. 101.
73 McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press*, p. 384.
74 *Ibid*., p. 298.
75 London, Society of Antiquaries, SAL/MS/940/1. A catalogue card at the Society of Antiquaries dates the pocketbook to around 1640.
76 Pamela J. Willetts, *Manuscripts in the Society of Antiquaries of London* (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 436.

to a member of his family, possibly Sir Gervase Clifton (1587–1666), who supplied arms to King Charles and was subsequently fined by Parliament. As Cruso's book was published in folio, this example illustrates that in this case at least an officer deemed it sufficiently useful to transcribe it to take it onto the practice grounds or even on campaign.

Copies of the second edition are preserved in nine libraries in Britain, France, and North America. One well-preserved copy in the British Library demands our attention.[77] On the inside cover is the *ex libris* of Fairfax of Cameron in the form of a large ornate bookplate. This title had been created by Charles I for the diplomat and politician, Sir Thomas Fairfax (1560–1640). His son, Ferdinando (1584–1648), who assumed the title, was a Parliamentary commander in the English Civil War. The best known of the Fairfaxes is probably his son, Thomas (1612–71), who became the Third Lord Fairfax of Cameron. He was the famous Parliamentary commander who took charge of the newly formed New Model Army in 1645 and who led Parliamentary forces to victory at the Battle of Naseby.[78] Unfortunately, we have no information about when this copy of Cruso's work entered the Fairfax of Cameron collection, but it was possibly in the possession of Thomas, Third Lord Fairfax. If so, this illustrates that men on both sides in the English Civil War made use of Cruso's book and that its instructions were taken right into the heart of the war. On a blank page in the front matter, an undated auction catalogue entry has been pasted with the price of £6 6s. 0d. This alerts potential buyers to the fact this this copy includes plates by Van Dalen, as was the case with the 1632 edition. Finally, it is an interesting question as to whether the most prominent leader of Parliament's cavalry forces in the later stages of the First Civil War, Oliver Cromwell, owned a copy of Cruso's book or whether he drew any lessons from it. While it is certainly true that some of Cromwell's actions mirrored those recommended by Cruso, the case for direct influence cannot yet be made.[79]

❧

[77] London, BL, shelfmark RB.23.b.1961.

[78] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 130.

[79] Martyn Bennett, *Cromwell at War: The Lord General and his Military Revolution* (London, 2017), pp. 53–60, analyzes the extent to which the armies in the First Civil War followed or went against Cruso's advice, but he does not seem to ascribe a direct influence on Cromwell by Cruso's work. One possible exception concerns Cruso's firm advice that soldiers should be paid regularly, which Cromwell took seriously (*ibid.*, p. 51), although again this does not confirm a direct influence of Cruso's book on Cromwell.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Before concluding, a word is in order about what the peritextual material of the four works analyzed above tells us about Cruso's network and his political tendencies in the years before and during the English Civil War. First and foremost, it underlines the fact that Cruso had a well-developed social and literary network. We see this most clearly in the 1642 edition of *The Art of Warre*. The poem by the clergyman scholar Richard Watson emphasizes Cruso's connections with Cambridge, despite not having studied there himself. Another clergyman scholar, William Sedgewick, had connections with both Norwich and Cambridge, and more specifically Gonville & Caius College, which had a long association with Norfolk. A third author, William Denny, to whom *Castrametation* was dedicated, was well known to Cruso. Like the other two authors, he had a connection with Gonville & Caius, the college at which John's brother, Aquila, and his son, John Jr., had studied. Furthermore, Denny may have been a member of a poetic community in Norwich to which Cruso also belonged. While Denny declared for the king, other members of Cruso's network such as Philip Skippon and William Harvey declared for Parliament. This brings us to the question of Cruso's own allegiance in the English Civil Wars.

The fact that Cruso included the poem by Harvey in the edition of *Militarie Instructions* printed in 1644 when the First Civil War was well under way may be the strongest evidence that Cruso sided with Parliament. Furthermore, he was a member of the Artillery Company until at least 1643. By 1640, many of its members were opposed to the king's insistence on conformity to high church rites in the Church of England.[80] Moreover, Cruso seems to have had a close association with the London Trained Bands, which were requisitioned by Parliament in 1642.[81] On the other hand, other close associates such as William Denny were Royalists. The notion that Cruso may have taken the side of Parliament nevertheless gains weight when we read that 'the strangers were as a rule on the rebel side'.[82] Furthermore, the Norwich city corporation declared for Parliament.[83] There were, however, Royalist sympathizers in the city. In this regard, Matthew

[80] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 81. The Artillery Company's adversaries branded its members 'sectaries' and 'puritans', but such accusations were part of the polemical discourse before and during the Civil Wars (pp. 271–2).

[81] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 7.

[82] Moens, *The Walloons*, vol. I, p. 83.

[83] Thomas Browne, *The Prose,* ed. Norman Endicott (London, 1968), p. xx; Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and Their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich, c.1560–1643* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 253–6; Williamson, *Social Relations*, p. 94; Andrew Hopper, 'The Civil Wars', in Carole Rawcliffe and Richard Wilson (eds), *Norwich since 1550* (London, 2004), pp. 89–116, at p. 89.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Reynolds observes that 'anti-Calvinist divines harnessed a measure of lay support within the city, helping to create a grassroots royalist contingent by 1642'.[84] In addition, there is reason to believe that some in the Stranger churches are likely to have sided with the Royalists, wanting to avoid the impression of harbouring Puritan sympathizers. Nevertheless, Cruso's own links with Skippon, the Artillery Company, and Harvey, may tip the balance in favour of Parliament.

However, as Ismini Pells observes, labels such as royalist and parliamentarian describe 'coalitions of difference' 'whose adherents might be drawn from across the various ideological spectrums and encompass many complexities'. Therefore, even if Cruso did take one side or the other, we need to be cautious about any conclusions we draw from this. If, as I have suggested, he sided with Parliament, he would not have been among its more radical supporters. As Cian O'Mahony notes, Cruso seems to have 'detested the more vitriolic expressions of Protestant faith'.[85] Furthermore, while Cruso's inner convictions may have led him to sympathize with one side, his own circumstances may have made it more expedient to ally himself in public with the other side.[86] Further investigation into the conflicting accounts of his final years as a militia captain may help to answer this question. Perhaps what we can say with more certainty is that just as Cruso crossed other boundaries, such as linguistic and confessional ones, that are often drawn in analyses of early modern English history, so too he was willing to cross political boundaries, making public displays of his friendship with Royalists and Parliamentarians alike. It is an interesting question as to whether he did this for pragmatic reasons, to keep his options open and avoid ending up on the wrong side, perhaps putting the status of his fellow Strangers at risk, or out of a deep conviction that one should eschew partisanship and seek a *via media*, not least because he, like many others, had friends and associates on both sides of this divide, and perhaps had some sympathy for both sides. In truth, both are possible, but we currently have no firm answer to this question.

❧

[84] Reynolds, *Godly Reformers*, p. 255. The fault lines apparent in Norwich before and during the Civil War would later manifest themselves in the Whig/Tory divisions that emerged in the city after the Restoration (p. 257).

[85] Cian O'Mahony, 'Souldiers, or Clarkes, or both: Ralph Knevet and the Fashioning of Military Identity through Print and Performance', in Matthew Woodcock and Cian O'Mahony (eds), *Early Modern Military Identities, 1560–1639: Representation and Reality* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 79–99, at p. 80.

[86] Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 79.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This chapter has taken as its principal theme Cruso's role as a military author. It covers only three years, 1642 to 1644, but illustrates the crucial role that he played in the mediation and dissemination of military knowledge in the early years of the First English Civil War. The four works analyzed, two of which were second editions, demonstrate Cruso's versatility and adroitness as a military author. *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches* are essentially 'how-to' manuals addressing specific activities that armies would need to undertake in the Civil War. They were among the earliest works to deal with these subjects in English and are examples of a more general move towards manuals dealing with one or two military subjects. They can perhaps be understood as part of a movement of the sub-system of practical manuals towards the centre of the English military literature system.[87] *Militarie Instructions*, Cruso's only publication in folio, is an exemplar of learned military writing. However, as the example of the handwritten copy owned by the Clifton family illustrates, it was not merely a book that sat gathering dust on officers' bookshelves, but was, one might presume, taken on campaign and possibly into the heat of battle. The notes in the appendix to the second edition illustrate that Cruso had kept abreast of military developments on the Continent. One way of viewing Cruso's work is as the literary analogue to soldiers such as Philip Skippon returning from action in the Low Countries. While Cruso's works introduced techniques for training and battle developed on the Continent in book form, soldiers returning from the Low Countries introduced new techniques on the drill ground or on campaign, based on the latest developments on the Continent, as well as the discipline for which the States army was renowned.[88] The influence of the wars in the Low Countries on the English Civil Wars cannot be underestimated. A further example is that the Lawes and Ordinances of War issued by the Earl of Essex in 1642 and re-issued by Fairfax for the New Model Army were very similar to those in the Dutch Laws and Ordinances issued in 1590, known as the *Crychs-recht*.[89]

This chapter has also illustrated that the intertextual relationship between Cruso's texts and his source texts is marked by its diversity. In *Castrametation*, whereas he translates Simon Stevin's work on the subject almost word for word, he bases other parts of it loosely on the second chapter of Praissac's *Les Discours Militaires*, supplementing his work with other ancient and Renaissance sources. *Militarie Instructions* has no single primary source text

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

88 Pells, *Philip Skippon*, p. 74, p. 107.

89 *Ibid*., p. 154. As noted in Chapter 6, Cruso references the *Crychs-recht* in *Militarie Instructions*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but refers to a plethora of contemporary and ancient sources which Cruso weaves together to form his own, new *textus*. As for *The Order of Military Watches*, De Ville's *Les Fortifications du Chevalier*, seems to be an important, if not the most important, source text, but the relationship between the two texts is a loose one. There is little else to speak of regarding intertextuality in this short work. As for format, while *Militarie Instructions* was published in folio, *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches* were in quarto and *The Art of Warre* in octavo. Therefore, although each of these works falls into the broad category of 'military literature', they are marked by heterogeneity in content, intertextuality, format, and presentation.

The front matter of each of these four works provides further insights into Cruso's social and literary network. This is most clearly the case with *The Art of Warre*. The first edition had no dedicatory poems, while the second edition included three. Two names, Philip Skippon and William Denny, appear twice in the front matter of these works, suggesting a strong link between Cruso and these men, both of whom, like Cruso, were sprung from Norfolk soil. The fact that Skippon took the side of Parliament, while Denny was a Royalist, suggests that Cruso put friendship above partisanship.

Finally, as well as doing a service to his fellow soldiers, Cruso used these books to add to his own self-fashioning, bending his art to the service of his life to advance his career and enhance his reputation.[90] His military works allowed him to present himself as the *miles doctus*. *Militarie Instructions* illustrates his familiarity with classical and Renaissance military texts. Furthermore, it is replete with quotations in Latin. Cruso's knowledge of French and Dutch were the key to *Castrametation* and *The Order of Military Watches* as well as *The Art of Warre*. Indeed, it was Cruso's knowledge of languages, and his ability to move between them, acting as it were as a *pons linguarum*, or linguistic bridge, which allowed him to carve out a distinctive place for himself in English military authorship. By contrast, his poetic voice, or at least the one in which he chose to publish, was predominantly a Dutch one often inflected with Latin tones, and it is to this voice that we return in the next chapter, which analyzes Cruso's 221 Dutch epigrams, his final literary flourish, published in 1655. These epigrams, placed alongside Cruso's *amplificatio* on Psalm 8, his Dutch and English elegies, and his English prose based largely on Continental sources, add to the notion that heteroglossia, to borrow from Mikhail Bakhtin, lay at the heart of Cruso's literary oeuvre.

[90] Stephen Greenblatt, *Sir Walter Ralegh: The Renaissance Man and His Roles* (New Haven, CT, 1973), p. 59.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781800104235.011 Published online by Cambridge University Press