
Introduction

'Chaos. Utter chaos. Deserted by some of its senior officers, leaderless, and without structure, support or orders, the British army had ceased to exist' (Childs, 1987, p. 4). This probably describes best the state of the British army in mid December 1688. By this time, a little more than one month after the Dutch invasion, James II's army in England was effectively reduced to a mere 4,000 men.¹ Moreover, James II was about to leave England for France, and William III of Orange, the Dutch stadtholder and James' son-in-law, was ready to become King William III.² However, instead of finding a country, and an army, ready to participate in the conflict against France, William found an army that needed to be reorganised. With a major conflict being fought in Flanders, a rebellion in Scotland and a hostile Ireland, he did not have the luxury to perform a thorough reform. Through improvisation and compromises a system was created that worked. One important factor that saved the English army from falling apart completely, was the professionalism of many of its officers. Many of these officers had seen foreign service, prior to being enrolled in James II's regiments, and for them the involvement of England in a major conflict was a good opportunity for advancement and profit (Childs, 1987, p. 14). So, though the British army had virtually ceased to exist by December 1688, existing regiments were assembled, re-organised if needed, and sent where they were required in the first month of 1689. A corps of 10,000 troops had been dispatched to the Low Countries by the end of May, and another corps had landed in Ireland in August. Newly levied troops constituted large part of this latter force. Also, the rebellion in the Highlands was effectively stopped by the end of 1689. Despite the initial confusions and setbacks, the army had risen from its ashes and England had become an active player in a major conflict against France. England's participation in the Nine Years' War was further given stature by the declaration of war on France on 17 May 1689, who returned the courtesy on 25 June, and entry to the Grand Alliance on 19 December 1689.

A 'British Army' in the modern understanding did not exist during the seventeenth century. Instead, each of the three kingdoms possessed its own, national, military establishment. Though owing allegiance to the same monarch as their supreme commander, and who issued commissions, these establishments were officially legally, and financially, independent. In practice the English Establishment was more important and dominant than the other two. Regiments raised in Ireland or Scotland were found to serve on the English Establishment already in the reign of Charles II. Furthermore, if regiments from Ireland or Scotland were to serve overseas, they could only do so by being placed on the English Establishment first. Another practice, also started by Charles II, was to place, experienced, troops on the establishment of Ireland away from the watchful eye of the English parliament. Prior to the accession of James II as king of England, Scotland and Ireland in 1685, the English Establishment numbered approximately 9,000 men in a handful of marching regiments and independent garrison companies. The Scots and Irish Establishment accounted for about 3,500 and 8,500 men, respectively. Most of the regiments raised by James II in response to the rebellion of the Duke

¹The total army in England numbered about 40,000 men in November 1688. About 10,000 were kept in garrisons, and the remaining 30,000 formed James II's field army to engage the Dutch.

²William III was stadtholder of five of the seven provinces forming the Republic of the Seven United Provinces, colloquially denoted as the Dutch Republic. Though William III occupied an important and powerful position as stadtholder, not least because it was combined with that of captain-general and captain-admiral, he was certainly not sovereign in the Dutch Republic. Sovereignty remained with the states that formed the republic.

TABLE 1: The size of the British Army 1689 - 1698.

	<i>English troops</i>	<i>Foreign troops</i>	<i>Irish & Scots Establish- ments</i>	<i>Low Countries</i>	<i>Totals</i>	<i>Dutch Army</i>
1689	24,515	14,788	39,596	10,972	78,877	84,568
1690	31,770	20,398	44,513	5,360	96,681	74,280
1691	29,118	20,404	31,709	11,144	81,231	73,613
1692	37,796	20,574	17,673	19,276	76,043	75,737
1693	43,046	20,398	19,030	19,211	82,474	75,395
1694	41,981	20,398	17,316	29,100	79,695	102,161
1695	60,269	26,283	13,447	40,000	99,999	102,875
1696	63,054	26,283	13,447	43,156	102,784	102,581
1697	63,054	26,283	13,447	34,146	102,784	91,465
1698	11,903	3,974	18,321	-	34,198	47,773

Source: Primarily based on Stapleton (2003, pp. 128-31), the numbers for the Low Countries come from Childs (1991, pp. 72-3) and Chandler (1983). The latter are exclusive of foreign troops, which are included in Stapleton (2003, p. 233). The English and foreign troops both add up to the numbers maintained on the English Establishment. The number given for the Low Countries is thus part of the number for the English troops. Troops serving in the West Indies and America are accounted for in the English Establishment. The size of the Dutch Army is given for comparison, and is based on Stapleton (2003, p. 114).

of Monmouth were retained. This brought the English Establishment to 20,000 men in December 1685. The army was further increased in the later part of 1688, in anticipation of the expected Dutch invasion. This gave the English Establishment a theoretical strength of a little over 34,000 men. Reinforcements from Scotland and Ireland brought that number to 40,000 in November 1688. In December 1688, the Earl of Feversham, commander-in-chief of the army, ordered the army to be disbanded. As indicated above, the effective force numbered by that time only 4,000 men, scattered in and around Uxbridge. The remainder had deserted, to William or from their regiment, or remained unmoved by the events in their garrisons around the country. On 1 April 1689, a new list of the English army was prepared listing 30,866 men. This number was divided almost equally between troops sent to the Low Countries, to Ireland, and those kept in England. The majority of regiments were old regiments from before 1689, most of which had been heavily re-organised, to which had been added a few newly raised ones. The large expansion of the army had yet to begin.

England's (Britain's) contribution to the Grand Alliance in the Low Countries commenced in the spring of 1689, when 10,000 men were sent there. However, half of the troops were recalled back to England in 1690, and it was not before 1692 that the number of troops contributed by England increased dramatically. The conflict in Ireland was not ended before September 1691, when the Treaty of Limerick was signed. This played obviously a significant role in keeping regiments away from the war in the Low Countries. Troops serving in Scotland were sent to the Low Countries as well when the peace was restored in the Highlands. Of the dozen battalions shipped hurriedly to the Low Countries in 1689, only six were present in 1690. At the time of the battle of Steenkerke in August 1692, this number had increased to twenty-four British battalions, and twelve Danish and Dutch battalions in English pay. The peak of Britain's involvement in the Low Countries was, however, not reached before 1695 (see also table 1). Besides the troops committed to the Low Countries, a large number was retained in England. They were kept at home as there was always the danger of a French (and Jacobite) invasion. Furthermore, a large force of one regiment of horse, two of dragoons and

fifteen of foot was retained in Ireland after 1691. However, at least nine regiments were transferred to England, and Flanders, in the years following, without being replaced by a similar number. Scotland was likewise garrisoned by a few thousands men organised in a handful of regiments and independent companies. Altogether, the peak of Britain's war effort was reached in 1696, when the British army numbered 102,000 men organised in 140 regiments (see Stapleton, 2003, pp. 128-9).

As for this last figure from 1696, about 26,000 of that number were troops hired from other European states. These troops, called subsidy troops, were taken into English service under treaties signed between England and the state that supplied the men. The first subsidy troops taken onto the English Establishment in early 1689 were 14,000 Dutch troops from William of Orange's invasion force of November 1688. Later in 1689, a contingent of 6,000 men from Denmark was hired. As the war progressed, more regiments were taken into pay from various German states.

As soon as the Treaty of Rijswijk was signed, steps were taken to reduce the number of men under arms to levels deemed more appropriate for by parliament.³ Regarding the forces to be kept in England, Parliament resolved on 11 December 1697 'that all the land-forces of this Kingdom, that have been raised since 29 September 1680, shall be paid and disbanded'.⁴ Reductions regarding the English Establishment commenced already in December 1697. By early 1698 two regiments of horse, two regiments of dragoons, and eight regiments of foot were disbanded with the officers placed on half-pay. Ten regiments on the Irish Establishment, nine of foot and one of horse, were disbanded by a Royal Warrant of 8 February 1698. The reductions of the Scots Establishment were carried out with similar speed. The common theme of these reductions was that most of the regiments detailed for home service were disbanded in favour of the, experienced, regiments that returned from Flanders.

A new establishment for England was given on 1 August 1698. There were four troops of horse guards, and one of horse grenadiers on this establishments. Furthermore eight regiments of horse, of which two with nine troops and six with six troops, and three regiments of dragoons, each with eight troops. This was followed by three regiments of foot guards, with twenty-eight, fourteen, and twenty-six companies respectively. And there were seven regiments of foot, one of which was in the West Indies and one in Jersey and Guernsey. Of these regiments, the Royal Regiment of Foot numbered twenty-six companies, and the other regiments thirteen. Finally there were six independent companies in the Americas. One troop of guards, regiment of horse and regiment of foot guards were Dutch (see Appendix E).⁵ Further reductions were deemed necessary, and all personnel were to be natural-born Englishmen. This led to an establishment of 7,000 men to be kept in England, officers and enlisted men. This new establishment took effect from 26 March 1699 and was announced by a proclamation of 23 February 1699. Regarding the horse there were three troops of horse guards, one troop of grenadier guards, and seven regiments of horse of which two with nine and five with six troops. Furthermore three regiments of dragoons with six troops, two regiments of foot guards, of twenty-eight and fourteen companies, and three regiments of foot of ten companies. The forces abroad numbered two regiments of thirteen companies, and six independent companies. The three Dutch corps were reduced from the establishment, and returned to the Dutch Republic.⁶ An new establishment of the forces to be kept on the English Establishment commenced on 25 April 1700. In England there were still 7,000 men, the difference with 1699 being two regiments of horse and one of dragoons less, which were removed to the Irish

³For a narrative of the standing army controversy, and disbandment, see Childs (1987, Ch.. VIII). As Childs points out, the debate was not related to the existence of a standing army itself, but about the number of men to be kept on the establishment. On the disbandment, see in particular also Davies (1950).

⁴JHC Vol. 12 (1803, 11 December 1697).

⁵JHC Vol. 12 (1803, 16 December 1698)

⁶CSPD 1699-1700 (1937, pp. 39-77, February 23) and *Europische Mercurius* (1699, pp. 211-5).

TABLE 2: Army establishments 1698 – 1701.

	1698	1699	1700	1701
<i>English Establishment</i>				
Horse	3,681	2,739	2,061	2,061
Dragoons	1,179	849	588	588
Foot	9,345	3,412	4,351	4,351
<i>Total</i>	14,205	7,000	7,000	7,000
Forces abroad	1,887	1,625	1,058	1,083
<i>Scots Establishment</i>				
Horse	141	126	-	126
Dragoons	704	534	-	478
Foot	3,061	2,722	-	1,952
<i>Total</i>	3,906	3,763	-	2,556
<i>Irish Establishment</i>				
Horse	1,059	522	1,044	1,044
Dragoons	1,572	1,086	1,088	1,178
Foot	12,857	10,247	9,697	6,692
<i>Total</i>	15,488	11,855	11,829	8,914

Note: Unfortunately, information on the Scots Establishment for 1700 could not be located. See the narrative for information on sources used.

Establishment. To compensate the establishment of foot was enlarged. The forces abroad numbered one regiment of foot of ten companies, and six independent companies.⁷ The establishment for 1701 saw some changes in the forces serving abroad only.

The forces to be kept on the Scots Establishment were subject to several re-alignments between 1698 and 1701. A first establishment is given on 21 October 1698. In this establishment there was room for one troop of guards, two regiments of dragoons, one of eight and one of six troops, one regiment of foot guards of sixteen companies. Furthermore, there were four regiments of foot, of which three with twelve and one with ten companies.⁸ On 1 May 1699 the establishment saw some significant change regarding the number of foot regiments. There were four regiments of ten companies, one regiment of eight companies, and one regiment of twelve companies. The two additional regiments were ones returned from the Dutch Republic; other troops were as before.⁹ Some changes were ordered by a Royal Warrant of 26 November 1700. Important was the reduction of two regiments of foot, which were actually transferred to Dutch service by March 1701.¹⁰ One

⁷ BL Add. Ms. 61,317 p. 4.

⁸ CSPD 1698 (1933, pp. 397-410, October 21).

⁹ CSPD 1699-1700 (1937, pp. 152-211, May 1).

¹⁰ CSPD 1700-2 (1937, pp. 139-55, November 26) for the Royal Warrant, and CSPD 1700-2 (1937, pp. 215-37, February 18) for the order to send the regiments to Holland.

regiment of dragoons was reduced from eight to six troops, and the remaining four regiments of foot lost two companies. It is, however, unclear how these changes are related to a new establishment given on 24 June 1701. This establishment shows the same strength for the horse, dragoons and foot guards as in previous years. As for the foot regiments, there were two regiments each of nine companies with an additional company for the preservation of the peace in the Highlands, and one regiment contained twelve companies.¹¹ The regiment difference with 1700 was transferred to Dutch service in March 1701. Not included in the above, and in the figures in table 2, are approximately three hundred men in garrisons, a number that remained relatively constant between 1698 and 1701.

For the Irish Establishment, the figures for 1698 refer to the establishment that was to commence on 1 October 1698. Regarding regiments, this establishment consisted of three regiments of horse, two with six troops and one with nine troops, four regiments of dragoons, each consisting of eight troops, and twenty-one regiment of foot of thirteen companies each. This establishment included five Huguenot regiments.¹² The establishment that fixed the Irish Establishment at '12,000', and saw the removal of the Huguenot regiments, was to start on 1 May 1699. This new establishment accounted for two regiments of horse, each of six troops, three regiments of dragoons, eight troops each, the Royal Regiment of Foot with twenty-two companies, and nineteen other regiments with each eleven companies.¹³ A new establishment took effect on 1 June 1700. There were to be four regiments of horse of six troops each. Furthermore four regiments of dragoons, of which one with eight, two with six and one with four troops. The Royal Regiment of Foot was established at nineteen companies, and the nineteen other regiments at ten companies. The overall figure of 12,000 did, however, not change.¹⁴ When the War of the Spanish Succession was about to commence, twelve battalions were taken from the Irish Establishment in June 1701, and dispatched to Holland. Furthermore, three battalions were shipped to the West Indies that same year as well, with the important difference that these regiments remained on the Irish Establishment. A new establishment for Ireland took effect on 1 August 1701 and gave room for four regiments of horse as before, and four regiments of dragoons, of which three with six and one with eight troops. As for the foot, there were thirteen regiments of which four were newly raised. Each regiment had an establishment of ten companies, though those of the regiments sent to the West Indies were somewhat larger.¹⁵

The result of the reductions detailed above meant that a large number of officers became redundant to the several establishments. These officers were placed on half-pay as a retainer for future service. Officers thus placed on the half-pay list were, in theory, the first to be taken into active service in case of vacant commissions. The concept of half-pay originated from 1641, and was initially an act of royal favour. This was continued under the reign of Charles II, when half-pay was granted occasionally after the reductions of 1667, 1674 and 1679.¹⁶ In 1698 half-pay for disbanded officers was mainly introduced to give the parliament sufficient financial slack to raise funds to fully pay off the disbanded officers. The House of Commons took more control over the half-pay officer in 1699, and attempted to lay down rules for eligibility and requested that half-pay officers were appointed for vacant positions. Half-pay would also be stopped when an officer became provided for otherwise.¹⁷ However, from forty-nine vacancies between February 1698 and March 1700 only eighteen were filled by officers from the half-pay list. A further thirty-five places were to be filled in the next

¹¹ CSPD 1700-2 (1937, pp. 348-93, June 24).

¹² CTB, Vol. 14 (1934, Warrants etc: October 1698, pp. 1-15).

¹³ Tudor and Stuart Proclamations Vol. II (1910, p. 171) and CTB, Vol. 15 (1933, Warrants etc: August 1699, pp. 26-31).

¹⁴ CTB, Vol. 15 (1933, Warrants etc: June 1700, pp. 1-15).

¹⁵ CTB, Vol. 16 (1938, Warrants etc: August 1701, pp. 1-10).

¹⁶ Related to the reduction of regiments raised for the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-67), Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-74) and English participation on the side of the Dutch Republic in the Franco-Dutch War (1672-78), respectively.

¹⁷ JHC Vol. 12 (1803, January 18, 1698) and JHC Vol. 12 (1803, April 27 and 29, 1699).

year, of which fifteen were given to half-pay officers.¹⁸ For William III, this was not totally unacceptable as it kept inexperienced, unwanted and incapable officers away from positions in standing regiments, and allowed fresh blood to enter the ranks. So, though half-pay was not a permanent reward or pension, there were many exceptions to that rule.¹⁹ While on half-pay, officers were ordered to do duty with standing regiments, that became doubly officered this way, and wait for vacancies. Furthermore, a *Royal Company* of half-pay officers was formed on 3 September 1698, composed of forty captains, thirty lieutenants and thirty ensigns. This company was attached to the First Regiment of Foot Guards.²⁰ Keeping officers on half-pay provided also a reserve force, in the form of regimental cadres, next to providing a pool of, potentially, experienced officers. The regiments that remained on the establishment were reduced much in terms of the number of soldiers. The number of officers and non-commissioned officers was reduced only slightly. This also emphasises that the reductions were not carried out bluntly. Instead, much effort was put on retaining the experienced regiments, see also above, and to reduce those that remained as cadres to build up again if needed. As the Treaty of Rijswijk was in reality nothing but a cessation of hostilities, in anticipation of the expected conflict over the Spanish inheritance, the resourceful way in which the reductions were implemented meant that the army was able to mobilise quickly again in 1701 and 1702. The issue of half-pay itself was not completely settled in 1701, and the mobilisations for the War of the Spanish Succession postponed this question for another thirteen years.

In retrospective, the Glorious Revolution of 1688, resulting in England's entry to a major European conflict, can be regarded as a watershed of the role the army fulfilled. Under the Stuart kings Charles II and James II the army was *de facto* a force of the king, and one for his protection²¹: he paid for the army from his own funds, issued commissions, and employed the armed forces according to his own policies. With a lack of other policing forces, the army had also a role in support of civil power. This latter role was still maintained after 1688, but army moved towards an apolitical position in society. Furthermore, the Nine Years' War saw the continental commitment of the army, a role that it was to play until 1815. The army's subordinate role was formalised during 1689. On 12 April 1689, following the mutiny of the Royal Regiment of Foot (p. 61) and general unrest in the armed forces, the [first] *Mutiny Act* passed the House of Commons. Via this act military offences could be punished via the court-martial; moreover it 'was parliament's way of enforcing the army's loyalty to the new regime' (Childs, 1987, pp. 85-6). The Mutiny Act, which lasted until 10 November 1689, did however not consider the status of a standing army in time of peace. This was regulated in the *Bill of Rights Act*, which passed Parliament on 16 December 1689. In article six it states

That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against law;

Though command of the army would still remain with the monarch, who issued commissions and recruited soldiers, it was an important step towards placing the army under control of parliament, and '1688 brought a profound and lasting alteration in relations between the Crown, parliament, and the army' (Childs, 1994, p. 57).²²

With hindsight, and with the many dangers of 'what-ifs', it might be argued that the British army would have taken a different course in history, and have remained in obscurity and have played a less than secondary role

¹⁸JHC Vol. 13 (1803, 14 March 1700) and JHC Vol. 13 (1803, 27 March 1701).

¹⁹Walton (1894, pp. 494, 606, 688-90) and Childs (1987, pp. 70-3).

²⁰Tudor and Stuart Proclamations Vol. II (1910, p. 169) for officers of reduced Irish regiments to be incorporated in standing regiments; see Walton (1894, p. 820) and Childs (1987, p. 199) for the Royal Company.

²¹Hence the designation *Guards and Garrisons*.

²²See Childs (1987, Ch. 3) and Childs (1994) for further details on this subject.

in the European theatre for many years, had the events following the Dutch invasion of 1688 not dragged it into the Nine Years' War and continental commitment. The way the reductions were carried out between 1697 and 1699 also showed the beginnings of professionalism within the military establishment of Britain. And it can even be said that 'one can trace the origins of what would become the British army, to William III.' (see Stapleton, 2003, p. 136).

Outline and scope

This *Regimental list of reduced officers for 1699* is divided into three parts and a number of appendices. The three parts present the reduced officers for the three establishments in 1699. In general, the regiments that were part of any of the three establishments in 1699, or until their reduction, are given together with the officers reduced from these regiments. The regiments without any reduced officer are given for completeness and are listed under the establishment they were part of in 1699.

The information regarding the reduced officers was derived from various sources. The most complete source regarding reduced officers on the English Establishment is probably JHC Vol. 12 (1803, 11 March 1699). In this entry the various reduced officers are listed per regiment, complete with details on pay. The officers reduced from Scots regiments on the English Establishment (i.e., those regiments that served in Flanders) are given as well. This list of officers should, however, be studied with some care. Though the officers mentioned were reduced, not all officers were entitled to half-pay.²³ In January 1698, the House of Commons voted that all officers, disbanded or to be disbanded, were to receive half-pay. One year later the rules were made more strict, with the most relevant change being that half-pay was to be given to natural-born subjects only. So, only English officers from Scots regiments reduced on the English Establishment received half-pay, but that was not effected before March 1700. CSPD 1698 (1933, pp. 278-334, June 27) gives an establishment for half-pay of field officers of regiments disbanded in Scotland. A note, however, informs us that this establishment was never used. An establishment of half-pay officers for 26 March 1700 is given in CTB, Vol. 15 (1933, Appendix), and JHC Vol. 13 (1803, 31 March 1701) provides the same for 26 March 1701. Finally, CTB, Vol. 17 (1939, Civil List Debt: Army Debt, Half Pay Arrears) shows the half-pay arrears in March 1702. A close comparison of these lists over successive years gives valuable insight in the, admittedly not very fast, dynamics of the half-pay establishment. The removal of officers from the half-pay list, to a full-pay commission or when leaving the service completely for whatever reason, has been indicated.

For the Irish Establishment, CTB, Vol. 15 (1933, Warrants etc: August 1699, pp. 26-31) is probably the most relevant and complete primary source. This list is augmented with an additional half-pay establishment from June 1700 in CTB, Vol. 15 (1933, Warrants etc: July 1700, pp. 1-15). The half-pay establishment in August 1701 is given in CTB, Vol. 16 (1938, Appendix). Again, a close comparison of these lists is worthwhile. In May 1701, twelve battalions from Ireland has been brought to a larger footing, prior to being shipped to the Netherlands, by the addition of two companies. These additional companies were largely officered by half-pay officers from the Irish list. With another three battalions proceeding to the West Indies, half-pay officers who refused to go, fifty-nine in total, were removed from the list in October 1701.²⁴

A number of other entries in the *Calendar of Treasury Books*, the *Journal of the House of Commons* and the *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* were used to fill in missing details. Altogether, more than 1,500 officers were reduced and are listed in this publication. The compilation of a regimental list of reduced officers has been the primary scope of this work. As such, biographies of officers, and their careers, have not been included.

²³Therefore this publication has been named a list of *reduced officers*, instead of *half-pay officers*.

²⁴A list is found in CSPD 1702-3 (1916, pp. 528-566, January 29).

For a few officers only, some details have been given as this was considered useful. Biographies of officers can be found in, for example, Charles Dalton's *English Army Lists and Commission Registers, 1661 - 1714* (Dalton, 1904).

A group of about 660 French Huguenot officers that were placed as pensioners on the Civil List of the Irish Establishment are listed in Appendix A. These officers differ from the reduced officers listed in the first three parts. One important difference is that most of these officers had not served in English (or Scots or Irish) regiments, but in distinct Huguenot formations. Another difference is that only part of the officers had served, in regiments, part of the English Establishment directly. A large group of the officers had served initially in Piedmont and Savoy until about 1695, and on the Rhine afterwards. They were nevertheless reduced to the Irish Establishment in 1699.

Appendix B gives a list of reduced officers from a short-lived train of artillery. This train was formed in 1698, during peace-time, and reduced already the next year. A short summary of independent companies on the English Establishment, most of which were serving in the Americas, is given in Appendix C. Appendix D gives an overview of regiments that were in existence between 1688 and 1697, but that were disbanded before the conclusion of the war. The majority of these regiments originate from 1689, and were disbanded within a few years. They are included to give a complete picture of the expansion of the army in early 1689. The few Dutch regiments that were retained on the English Establishment between 1697 and 1699 are detailed in Appendix E. Information regarding the financial side of the reductions, the rates of pay and total cost, is given in Appendix F.

The distribution of the army in 1699, after the reductions were considered complete, is found in Appendix G. This overview complements the data for 1699 found in table 2 above. Tables with regiments have been prepared for a number of select battles, sieges and other occasions. These tables are found throughout the first three parts, and should help to give a better understanding on the activities of the army during the Nine Years' War. Precedence, seniority, of regiments is discussed in Appendix H. Though the concept precedence existed for many years, it was not before 1694 that explicit rules were laid down as detailed in said appendix. The regiments in the first three parts are, however, not exactly listed in order of seniority. Instead, the pattern followed is that as found in sources like JHC Vol. 12 (1803, 11 March 1699).

During the seventeenth century, the regiments of the British army were in most cases designated by the name of the regimental colonels. The main exceptions were the regiments and troops of guards, which were never designated by their colonel's name. A few other regiments bore an additional title, such as those named after a member of the Royal family. These regiments were designated by both their Royal title and the name of the colonel. When the colonelcy of a regiment changed, the regimental name would change accordingly. There was quite some variety in how this was applied in practice, and all this variation can easily lead to confusion. This publication uses the names of names as found in contemporary sources. The succession of colonels given in the regimental narratives should serve as a guide for regimental names at other periods. The list of colonels is primarily based on Leslie (1974) and Dalton (1904). It should be noted that personal titles are 'final' and do not necessarily apply during the time of the colonelcy. Prior titles are given when needed, and the index of regimental colonels provides further guidance. Changes in designation of regiments, when applicable, are noted in the regimental narratives. To conclude this work, an outline of the succession of regimental titles at selected years after 1699 is given in Appendix I.