



University
of Glasgow

Pollard, T. (2009) The battle of Culloden: more than a difference of opinion.
In: Pollard, T. (ed.) Culloden: The History and Archaeology of the Last
Clan Battle. Pen and Sword Military, Barnsley, UK. ISBN 9781848840201

Copyright © 2009 Pen and Sword Military

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or
study, without prior permission or charge

The content must not be changed in any way or reproduced in any format
or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder(s)

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details must be given

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/80469/>

Deposited on: 13 September 2013

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

INTRODUCTION

The Battle of Culloden: More than a Difference of Opinion

Tony Pollard

Well over two and a half centuries after the event, the battle of Culloden, fought on 16 April 1746, still means many things to many people. To expatriates it is an emotional touchstone to their Scottish identity and commonly regarded as the opening act of the epic tragedy of the Highland Clearances; to those with nationalist inclinations it is held up as an example of England's terrible maltreatment of its northern neighbour; to Unionists it is seen as the final gasp of a divisive movement hell-bent on returning Britain to an outmoded form of monarchical despotism; to romantics it marks the end of one of those great lost causes, pitching the Highland underdog against the might of the Hanoverian war machine.

What should be obvious to all but the most casual observer is that discussions of Culloden can be passionate and heated, even among academics. This volume does not attempt to reconcile these various viewpoints, some of which obviously sit in direct opposition to one another, nor does it ignore them. Indeed, acknowledgement of these contrasting perceptions and preconceptions is vital in any attempt to provide a meaningful reassessment of a battle which has already spawned an extensive literature. And so it is that some of the writers contained within these covers may appear to be partisan, their stance detectable perhaps through a turn of phrase or the choice of one term over another. It will not be lost on the reader, for instance, that while Duffy has Jacobite sympathies these are counterbalanced by Reid's more sympathetic portrayal of the opposing side. Any attempt to remove these idiosyncrasies by the editor would be sailing uncomfortably close to censorship.

When all is said and done though, it is difficult to find neutral, middle ground in the language used; do we refer to the '45 as an 'Uprising' or a 'Rebellion' Was it the 'government army', 'Hanoverian army' or 'British Army'? Was the son of the exiled James VII, 'James VIII', or the 'Old Pretender', was his son, Charles Edward Stuart 'Bonnie Prince Charlie' or the 'Young Pretender'? As far as the army is concerned the editor, in his own contribution, has adopted 'government' through nothing more than force of habit after working for so long with the National Trust for Scotland – that is the term it uses.¹ However, as Stuart Reid rightly points out it was the British Army which faced the Jacobites on Culloden Moor², and certainly not a Hanoverian army. George II may have been Hanoverian but his army was not; Germanic elements were present in the form of six thousand Hessians on hire from Prince Friedrich of Hesse, but these troops were elsewhere when the battle was fought.³ The issue of national identity with specific reference to the term 'British' is discussed more fully below.

Before proceeding, however, a little background to this volume would not go amiss. A vital impetus has been the archaeological investigation of the battlefield, which has been carried out on a sporadic basis since 2000. This is the first time that the results of this archaeological work have been published in a readily accessible form and because of this the editor makes no apologies for the archaeological chapter being slightly longer than the others. This however is not to belittle the more historically based

chapters, which in themselves make an important new contribution to our understanding of an event which has not wanted for scholarly attention. Most of the contributors served on one or more of the academic panels and discussion groups which accompanied the long process of bringing together the content for the new National Trust for Scotland visitor centre (more on this below). Research into various aspects of the battle by these leading experts was carried out under the auspices of what became known as the Culloden Battlefield Memorial Project, but not all of this could be reflected in the on-site displays and exhibitions, and on this basis it seemed only right to give them an outlet in published form. The present volume is the end result; it may not be the last word on Culloden but it is certainly the latest.

Culloden was the first battlefield in Scotland to be subject to any form of archaeological investigation, and is still one of relatively few in Britain. The first project featured in the BBC television series *Two Men in a Trench*,² which for the first time brought battlefield archaeology to a wide audience and of which the editor was a co-presenter.⁴ The results of that preliminary work, which took place in 2000, and included topographic, geophysical and metal detector survey as well as some excavation, established that archaeological techniques could be used to shed new light on the battle and its landscape context. This knowledge further encouraged an embryonic initiative by the National Trust for Scotland, which as Masson and Harden's contribution will discuss, has for many years had in its care a significant portion of the site, to enhance the presentation and interpretation to the battlefield for the visiting public. The fruits of these labours were officially unveiled on 16 April 2008 when a new, state-of-the-art visitor centre was opened alongside the reinterpreted battlefield.

The results of several seasons of archaeological research have fed directly into the visitor centre, with the display of recovered artefacts providing a direct link to the fighting, killing and dying which created the hallowed ground outside the building. Perhaps more importantly, the surveys have provided a fuller understanding of the battlefield itself and Culloden represents one *of* the first examples of the full integration of archaeological research with historic accounts in the presentation of a battle site to the public.

During the initial fieldwork it became obvious that there were some inaccuracies in the on-site interpretations, as reflected through display boards showing unit locations and flags marking the position of the Jacobite and government lines. Taking these findings into consideration the National Trust for Scotland have provided revised on-site interpretation, re-adjusting where required and providing footpaths more appropriate to a fuller understanding of the site as visitors walk around it. The simple act of removing field fences which isolated some parts of the site has done much to give a truer sense of scale and return the site to something more akin to the relatively open landscape of the mid eighteenth century. Although it is impossible to recreate the battlefield entirely, an important contribution of the archaeological survey to this process was in identifying surviving elements of the 1746 landscape.

As reference to Woosnam-Savage's chapter on the contemporary maps will highlight, the battle was fought within a landscape occupied by a number of distinct features. Perhaps the most obvious of these are the high stone walls of the enclosures, the one to the north known as Culloden Parks and the one to the south as the Culwiniach

Formatted: Font: Italic

enclosure. These disappeared during the 19th–nineteenth century as agricultural improvements took place. Also present were a number of settlements, most of which have either disappeared or been subsumed within modern farms. A possible exception to this is the Leanach farmstead, which according to most of the maps consisted of three buildings and was located somewhere close to the left of the government line. Although two of the buildings no longer exist it has traditionally been thought that the Leanach cottage, which has for a long time been integrated within the NTS presentation of the battlefield, is one of these buildings (though see the archaeology chapter for a fuller discussion).

Establishing where these enclosures and buildings stood was an important component of the investigation as they provided important anchor points for the troops on both sides, with the Jacobite front line strung out between the enclosure walls and the government left standing close to the farmstead. Other features also played a role in the battle; notable here being the road which is shown on several of the maps cutting across the battlefield between the two armies, passing beneath the Jacobite centre and running just to the north of the farmstead, close to the government left. This feature has been almost entirely overlooked by historians but as the archaeological survey progressed, it became apparent that the road, which although marked as the ‘main road to Inverness’ on Sandby’s map, was unlikely to be more than a dirt track, played a vital part in the battle. Given that the road travels along a spine of high ground which may have afforded Jacobite troops charging to the south of it some cover from government fire and roughly corresponds to the main thrust of the Jacobite charge from the centre and right, which converged on the government left, it seems reasonable to suggest that at least some Jacobites charged along it.

This close reading of the landscape gives us a better understanding of why much of the Jacobite centre and right collided with the left of the government line, on Barrell’s and Munro’s positions. Additionally, the very open nature of the ground across which the Jacobite right had to advance, along with its wetter character and the longer distance between the two lines at this point, explains why this part of the charge came no where near making contact with the government right. Culloden is primarily remembered as an infantry action but, as discussed in David Blackmore’s contribution, the cavalry also played a decisive role: the movement of government dragoons to a position to the rear right of the Jacobite line was to do much to secure government victory.

When viewed in this light it is somewhat ironic that the road, which in the twentieth century was to become the B9006, was moved some 200m further to north in the 1980s in an attempt to return the battlefield to something more akin to its original appearance. Prior to realignment, the road ran directly through the clan cemetery, which since the battle has become a place of pilgrimage for visitors, many of whom feel some affinity with the more than a thousand clansmen buried beneath the mounds which sat at either side of the road. However, at least since the middle of the nineteenth century, there were calls for the road to be re-aligned as its passage through the cemetery was regarded as disrespectful. In 1982 those calls were heard and after a plea to the Roads Department by the National Trust for Scotland the move took place. The redundant stretch of road was simply covered with earth and encouraged to blend in with the moorland. The moorland itself is also however a product of the modern era, as much of the battlefield was planted with coniferous

woodland in the nineteenth century. As part of the same scheme which saw the re-alignment of the ~~road-road~~, the trees were also removed, and tree stumps can still be seen among the heather, gorse and birch which has coloniszed the area since deforestation.

When studying a specific battle, especially through the medium of archaeology, there is always a danger of focussing on the microscopic and the particular to the cost of an understanding of the broader picture. Accordingly, an essay on the wider European background to the '45 has been provided by Daniel Szechie while the history of the campaign preceding the battle is covered by Christopher Duffy.

Looking back to the origins of the Jacobite movement it could be argued that Culloden only occurred in the first place because almost sixty years earlier another, much bigger engagement did not. This great 'battle that never was' may have decided the future of the Stuart dynasty at a stroke and one way or another staved off the uncertainty of an unsettled life in exile for its male members. In November 1688 some 20,000 troops under James II advanced toward an invading army of 15,000 under William of Orange somewhere near Salisbury Plain. Although popular history would have us believe that William stood at the head of a Dutch force flying Orange flags it was in fact multi-national and included large numbers of English and Scottish troops, indeed the leading division was commanded by Major-General Hugh MacKay, a Highlander from Sutherland.⁵

Had it not been for defections among key elements of his army, including influential officers like Marlborough, then James and his superior numbers may have been able to push the invaders back into the sea. Abandoned and then fleeing into exile,⁶ James was reaping the whirlwind he had sown with his refusal to recognise that the world had changed with the beheading of his father, Charles I, in 1649. Of course, if James had acted in such a way as to inspire loyalty among his armed services then the invasion would never have taken place, at least not with the collusion of his subjects (his attempts to purge the army of Protestants certainly did not help). But history is full of 'what ifs' (the most popular in the case of the '45 undoubtedly being what if Charles and the Jacobites had not turned back at Derby?).

It was the partly pre-planned dissolution of the Royal army while in the field in November 1688 which prevented bloodshed and gave what was effectively a *coup d'état* the misnomer of the 'Glorious Revolution'. It was however only a temporary respite, and between 1689 and 1746 much blood was to be shed across Ireland, Scotland and England (the latter getting off lightly with only two small engagements, Preston 1715 and Clifton Moor 1745, and with minimal impact on the civilian population).

It has already been noted that Culloden is not a history readily consigned to books and the safe environment of the library. It is a live issue which has refused to be pacified over the passing years and this fact was driven home to the editor recently when he was informed that an official complaint had been made to the BBC about statements he had made during a radio documentary about the battle. The cause of the disquiet was a remark about the clan graves, which, the author proposed, were not exclusively given over to particular clans as suggested by the inscribed grave stones erected by Duncan Forbes of Culloden in 1881. It seems more likely, it was suggested, that for

the most part the grave pits contained anonymous bodies of uncertain affiliation, as it would be impossible to distinguish, with perhaps a few exceptions, which dead Jacobite belonged to which clan. There are several reasons for believing this: the bodies were not buried until several days after the battle; for the most part they were not buried by people who knew them; there are accounts of bodies being stripped naked; even if clothing, in the form of tartan plaids etc, did remain then it would provide little clue as to identity as tartan designs particular to a specific clan did not come into being until the nineteenth century. It was this last statement which caused the greatest objection, from at least one listener, a tartan wearing descendent of a MacDonald who fought on the day.

In order to settle the issue, the editor invited the disgruntled individual to lunch, during which a fascinating, and believe it or not friendly, conversation ranged across not only issues related to the details of the battle but also how it was regarded by Highland people today (many of whom, it was insisted, held the opinions of most historians of the subject in pretty low esteem).

A copy of Morier's famous painting which shows the Jacobite attack on the left flank of the government line, on Barrel's position, was used to demonstrate how tartans known today were present on the field in 1746. On the face of it this seemed convincing until it was pointed out by someone else that the tartan pattern makers of the nineteenth century may have used Morier's painting as a source when it came to making up patterns, or setts as they are known, in the nineteenth century. This fits well with the view, held by a number of scholars of the period, that tartans could be identified to localities in the early eighteenth century - due to the appearance of local patterns and the availability of certain dye stuffs - but not to specific clans or families. This latter development, it is believed, did not come until the nineteenth century when tartan and the kilt (the short version rather than the full plaid) became fashionable, and indeed legal, again once the Jacobite threat was safely in the past - the wearing of it was famously banned after Culloden.

Is it the case though that we have events such as the visit of George IV to Edinburgh in 1822, organized by Sir Walter Scott, to thank for the multitude of clan tartans we see today? Certainly at the time the great and the good were falling over themselves to be seen draped in the chequered fabric and pattern books from the period show an increasing multitude of designs. There are, however, surviving examples of tartan from the eighteenth century, along with a number of painted portraits from the period, and indeed earlier, which show tartan being worn (Morier's highly detailed painting could be regarded as a group portrait). Despite claims to the contrary, however, there does not seem to be a straightforward and reliable way of establishing whether or not these represent familial clan tartans or regional forms which were later to provide inspiration for those which identified the wearer as the member of a specific clan. The present author would not be the first to point out that Morier's painting and various others show individual Highlanders wearing several patterns of tartan as part of the same costume, with many of them differing from those current today. This mix and match approach would certainly not suggest adherence to recognized clan setts. There is additionally an account from Culloden of tartan-clad soldiers from both sides being indistinguishable without the presence of the white or black cockade in the bonnet, but as this comes from James Ray,⁷ an Englishman, we should perhaps

consider him unable to ‘read’ tartan – to him one pattern would look pretty much **like** the next.

As for the dead being stripped of their clothing; there is a very colourful account in *The Lyon in Mourning* in which Robert Forbes recorded the testimony of Alexander MacIntosh of Essech, “...who received above twenty wounds on the field of Culloden, was stript naked as he was born, all to the short hose, and reckoned amongst the Dead. However, he came to himself again, and got off the field in the Dead of Night, as his limbs were sound and untouched.”⁸ And further: ‘He told me likewise, that, after stripping of the dead and Wounded, a party of Dragoons came riding over the Field, with their bayonets fixed...’ The dragoons then proceeded to pierce one of MacIntosh’s buttocks, he was lying on his front, but he made no sound or movement and so was left for dead.

Formatted: Font: Italic

This account notwithstanding, there is at least one problem with the theory relating to the anonymous nature of the burials. The first edition Ordnance Survey map of the area, which was surveyed in 1868, shows all of the grave mounds and some of them are marked with clan names – MacGillivray, MacIntosh and Fraser (graves of the Campbells are also marked in the vicinity of the Leanach enclosure). The graves of the Stuarts and the Camerons, which appear on later editions of the map, are not however marked on this first edition. Despite the incomplete nature of the annotation specific associations are clearly in place prior to Forbes of Culloden’s intervention in 1881. Whether the inscribed head stones were preceded by wooden markers is uncertain, there is certainly no mention of such in early to mid-~~nineteenth~~-19th century accounts of the site, including the Ordnance Survey day book. The associations may be based on local oral tradition, and we should not underestimate public interest in the battlefield prior to the late nineteenth century. In one tourist’s account from 1836, which again makes no mention of graves associated with specific clans, a local guide digs a turf from one of the mounds in a quest for bones, and tells his clients that visitors often go away from the place with bones as souvenirs.⁹

The image of men of the same clan sharing a grave, brother lying alongside brother, father alongside son, appeals to the imagination; it gives a neat ending to an event which was anything but. Named graves give descendents, however distant, **provide** somewhere to lay their wreaths or sprigs of heather or in some cases even a last resting places for their own scattered ashes.¹⁰ But when the circumstances surrounding the burials are weighed together it seems likely that the reality is less palatable. Naked, decaying bodies were dragged from the wagons in which they had been collected and dumped into pits with the minimum of fuss, a task probably carried out by frightened locals under the uncaring eyes of victorious government troops. Only later, when calm returned and it was once again safe to walk the moor, did these ‘**mounds of verdant green**’ become associated with particular clans and provide a physical and metaphorical platform for the telling of their brave deeds – associations to be set in stone nearly a century and a half later. As the later discussion of the archaeology makes plain, no such immortality was to be accorded the graves of the fifty or so government soldiers who died on the field, which to this day lie unmarked and untended somewhere in the Field of the English.

Comment [j1]: citation?

The expression of strong feelings is by no means limited to the passionate ancestor; Scottish historian Alan MacInnes has compared the aftermath of the battle, which saw

a brutal repression extend across the Highlands, as 'ethnic cleansing'.¹¹ Brutal acts of violence were visited on wounded Jacobite soldiers on the field, to civilians caught up in the immediate aftermath, and then on the wider population of the Highlands in the months that followed. Closely identified with these acts is the Duke of Cumberland, otherwise known as 'the Butcher' because of his perceived role in them. His greatest crime was probably to engender in his men a real contempt and hatred for the Jacobite, and the Highlander in particular. This lack of humanity was perhaps a useful quality in those about to face a daunting enemy in battle, but when elements of that same army are let off the leash with less than specific orders once the fighting is over then the result is surely predictable. It was also Cumberland who recommended that the entire population of the Highlands be transported to the colonies. James Wolfe, the later hero of Quebec and ADC-aide-de-camp to Hawley at Culloden, saw a more practical application for these belligerent people, and in reference to the benefits of the Highlander to the British Army observed that they 'make little mischief when they fall.' Cruel as these acts were, there can be no denying that MacInnes's language is emotive and highly charged and some have suggested that, however unpleasant and unjustifiable, they should not be described in the same terms as the extermination of the Armenians by the Turks, of the Jews by the Nazis or the various atrocities committed in the Balkans at the tail end of the twentieth century.¹²

Certainly, as we consider Culloden and its aftermath from the comfort of a stable and secure west in the early part of the 21st-twenty-first century, we would do well to remember that they occurred in a very different time and indeed place; where a child could be hung for minor theft and the barbarous ritual of hanging, drawing and quartering was still reserved for crimes against the state (the last such execution in Scotland took place on Glasgow Green as late as 1820). Warfare in the mid-eighteenth-18th-century was a brutal business and the Geneva Convention was still over a century away, though in what sense it has become a civilised pursuit would be difficult to define. The first convention of 1864 covered the treatment of wounded soldiers, while prisoners of war had to wait until the third convention of 1929 and concern for civilians in time of war was not incorporated until the fourth convention of 1949. That said though, rules of war did exist in 1746 and the Scots and Irish soldiers in regular French service who surrendered after the battle were the only captives treated as *bona fide* prisoners of war, Britain being at war with France at the time, the rest were regarded as rebels and treated as such, many of them dying in the horrendous conditions of their captivity.

The Highland Clearances are another greatly emotive issue and have come to be regarded by many as a direct circumstance of Jacobite defeat at Culloden, perhaps even as a continuation of the suppression which came in its wake. Under the guise of agricultural 'improvements' they took place over a century from the 1760s onwards and undoubtedly included tragic incidents and acts of cruelty by landowners and their factors, but it is an oversimplification to regard them as a direct result of the '45 and Culloden. Movements of populations at the behest of powerful landowners wishing to maximise the income from their holdings were not confined to the Highlands, or indeed to Scotland, and economic migration in the face of increasing urbanisation outweighed forced removal (Scottish cities saw dramatic growth and expansion during this period). But neither can they be uncoupled entirely; the battle and its aftermath helped to lay the groundwork, quite literally in some cases, by facilitating the confiscation of estates and creating a conflicted social milieu within which the

introduction of agricultural improvements was to be a much more tumultuous process than elsewhere.¹³ They were not however an expression of Cumberland's ill-conceived and ill-tempered proposed response to the 'Highland problem'. When all is said and done, ~~then~~ it seems highly unlikely that recent attempts to rehabilitate Cumberland's reputation¹⁴ will cut much ice north of the Highland line, where memories are long, nor in many other parts of Scotland where the image of 'the Butcher' sits comfortably within a popular perception of Scottish history.

What Jacobite defeat at Culloden did bring about was the emasculation of the clan system, an outcome which finds much common ground with the military objectives of British imperial campaigns, such as those in the Sudan and Zululand in the later part of the nineteenth century. The greatest impacts were obviously felt in the Highlands where the clan system, which operated through a complex network of feudal and familial allegiances and obligations, had long controlled the nature of social relations and economy in the region. Despite the presence of Lowland troops in the Jacobite army there can be no denying that it was the Highlands which suffered the major brunt of the backlash – though this was in part due to the settling of old scores originating from the small scale conflicts and feuds which the clan system engendered. In recent years there has been a tendency to express the Jacobite Conflicts as a Scottish civil war pitching Lowlander against Highlander, Presbyterian against Catholic and Episcopalian. There is some truth to this but the warp and weft of allegiance and enmity was far more complicated.

The issue of who was fighting who brings us to one of the most enduring misconceptions about Culloden; that it was an England versus Scotland affair, in the same mould as battles such as Bannockburn and Flodden. Like Bannockburn, which plays host to an annual rally by the Scottish Nationalist Party, Culloden has become something of a focus for nationalist sentiment. The earliest suggestion of this goes back to 1950s when letters in the NTS archive refer to the daubing of nationalist graffiti on the stone traditionally associated with Cumberland's position during the battle. The new visitor centre at Culloden has rightly attempted to present a balanced and nuanced picture of a battle which has in certain quarters been falsely cast as a straightforward fight between Scotsmen in kilts and Englishmen in red coats. As Stuart Reid points out in his contribution, there were at least four Scottish regiments among the sixteen infantry battalions fielded by Cumberland, with many more Scots distributed among the 'English' regiments. There were also small numbers of English Jacobites on the field – there could have been more, but most of these had been left behind to defend Carlisle, and were to suffer badly for doing so.

It is, however, possible to labour this point and we cannot overlook the fact that the contemporary accounts, in the form of letters and journals, leave us in no doubt that at least some Jacobites did refer to the enemy as English; whether the word was used by Highlanders as a pejorative catch-all term which encompassed both Lowland Scots and the English has not really been considered but it seems unlikely (see Stuart Jeffrey's contribution for a revealing overview of the contemporary accounts).

At Culloden, the place name 'Field of English', given to the area where the government dead were buried, is at least as old as the association of the clan graves with clan names. Despite recent attempts to smooth over the ruffles created by the act of Union of 1707 it cannot be written off as a cause of conflict.¹⁵ Even today, the 300

—year—loss of a Scottish parliament is summed up for many Scottish nationalists in the Burns lyric, ‘bought and sold for English gold.’ The arrival of the Union undoubtedly served as a recruiting sergeant for the Jacobite cause, with an attempted French invasion in support of a Jacobite rising following almost immediately on its heels in 1708 – the French fleet turned away from the Scottish coast with the son of James VII, Francis Edward Stuart - the ‘Old Pretender’ - on board and the rising never materialized. It was not for nothing that many of the broadsword blades imported from the continent were inscribed with slogans such as ‘Prosperity to Schotland and No union,’ (the spelling of course indicative of the blade’s Germanic origins). ~~and~~

Perhaps ironically, ~~the~~ the Union arrived while a Stuart, James VII’s daughter, Queen Anne, was on the throne and hopes that her reign would secure the return of the Stuart dynasty were misplaced.¹⁶ The Jacobite leader during the ‘Fifteen’¹⁵, John Erskine, the 22nd Earl of Mar, was a loyal servant of Anne, who appointed him Secretary of State for Scotland, but he was equally willing to serve George I when the Elector of Hanover came to the throne in 1714 – this willingness to switch allegiances earned him the less than flattering nick-name of ‘Bobbing John’. The Hanoverian George did not however trust a Tory who had previously served a Stuart and so he was denied a position. Affronted by this rejection, Mar became a fervent Jacobite and led the rising in 1715, but in no small part to his poor general-ship it was a lost cause, which even the presence in Scotland of James, the Old Pretender, in the winter of 1715 could not revive. It goes almost without saying that personal opportunism and political pragmatism similar to that displayed by Mar, rather than blind loyalty or deeply held beliefs, were to be the prime motivators for many key players on both sides during the Jacobite ~~e~~Conflicts.

Ethnic cleansing or no, the Union certainly brought with it an attempt to suppress any expression of Scottish national identity. This perhaps most obviously manifested itself through the renaming of the country as ‘North Britain’ on maps of the period.¹⁷⁶ Maps were also the business of the surveyor General Roy, who in the aftermath of the ‘45’^{Forty Five} was set the task of creating detailed maps of Scotland. Today, these are an incredibly valuable resource to archaeologists and historians, as they show every farmstead, village, field and road, or at least set out to do so. They were not however created for the benefit of those wishing to travel or learn more about the geography of the nation but in order to provide information on where threats to the state were likely to originate, the routes likely to be taken by an enemy force and even to provide an idea of how many troops any locality could support through its food resources (it wasn’t just his incredible eye for detail which prompted him to show ploughed fields). Roy’s incredible maps are a prime example of how cartography can be used as a tool of suppression and control and to this day this military role is reflected in the term Ordnance Survey. In the same way, Field Marshal Wade had earlier been tasked to build roads throughout the Highlands, not for the benefit of the locals but to ensure that troops could be marched to any trouble spot with the maximum of haste (there is perhaps poetic justice in the fact that one of the first beneficiaries of these military roads were the Jacobites, who used them to great effect during their lightning campaign in the Autumn of 1745).

Before bringing this brief discussion to a close it would be remiss not to make some reference to the collection of spectacular battle photographs which appear in this volume and on its cover. These shots were taken by Danny Carr during the filming of

a battle re-enactment commissioned by the National Trust for Scotland for use in the 'battle immersion room' in the new visitor centre. Anyone who has visited the battlefield since April 2008 will vouch for the powerful impact made by this dramatic display. While standing in the room, the visitor is confronted with the projection of floor to ceiling battle footage, with each wall providing a different viewpoint of the fighting, while the crack of musket and cannon shot and the screams of men are broadcast through the sound system, all of which serves to place the viewer in the thick of the action. The film, which was directed by Craig Collinson and produced by Nobles Gate, an Edinburgh based television production company, utilised around two hundred re-enactors, with a stretch of moorland outside Lauder in the Scottish Borders standing in for Culloden. The author was invited to take part and duly appeared as both a Jacobite, who died, and a government redcoat, who survived (in truth he volunteered to die to be reborn as a trouser wearing redcoat after almost freezing to death for real as a sockless Jacobite). The project involved numerous re-enactment groups from Scotland and England, many of whom specialise in reproducing 18th century military life, including a group who put much time and effort into recreating Pultney's regiment. The production represents the most ambitious attempt to portray the battle on film, or at least video, since Peter Watkins made his ground-breaking docudrama in 1964. Not surprisingly perhaps the majority of Government troops had come from south of the border and although a recreation there could be no doubting a somewhat charged atmosphere as the two armies faced one other and echoes of this brutal conflict rippled down through the centuries.

Formatted: Superscript

To sum up, the battle of Culloden was a bloody mess and hopefully the forgoing has demonstrated that our understanding of it today is none too tidy either. To assist the reader in picking their way through this palimpsest of opinion and viewpoint and to draw their own conclusions this volume has drawn together a series of studies which deal with both specific and general issues, with the main focus throughout being the last pitched battle fought on the British mainland.

Notes

1. The author, an Englishman who has lived in Scotland ~~since from~~ childhood, is certainly not immune to partisanship, a fact not lost on the author of *Feintheart*, a book recounting an Englishman's experiences ~~while travelling through~~ Scotland (by Charles Jennings, Abacus, 2001). The book cited a newspaper article which with reference to the archaeological survey at Culloden quoted the editor commenting that: 'Prince Charles will still have lost, much as we would have liked to reverse the decision'. The book went on to say of this: 'Two and hundred and fifty years on, empires rise and fall, world wars are won and lost, the silicon revolution is upon us, but we still need to know a bit more about the battle of Culloden just in case the English ever feel like trying anything like it again. What is this? This is a peculiarly Celtic way of embracing the future.(183)' The same newspaper article elicited a letter of complaint from a member of the public which finished with 'God Bless the Duke of Cumberland'. In retrospect these were ~~These were~~ rash words indeed and over time the author has come to moderate his opinions and indeed has come to regard the entire affair in much more balanced fashion, despite an almost irrepressible urge to support the underdog, and in a recent article on modern perceptions of Culloden described his sympathies thus:

Formatted: Font: Italic

2. The original Gaelic ‘Cul-oitir’ means ‘the back-lying coast-ridge’. At the time, the moor was also known as Drumossie but the place’s association with Culloden House, home of the Lord President, and its estate were to give it preference when it came to giving the battle a name.

3. Thanks to their role in the American Revolution in the 1770s the Hessians have earned something of a reputation as the ‘boot boys’ of the British state. One only has to look to Washington Irving’s 1820 story ‘The Legend of Sleepy Hollow’ to see how these troops, one of whom was the spectral headless horseman, had become bogey men of American folklore. It is now however little remembered that during the ’45 the commander of the Hessian contingent in Scotland, Prince Freidrich, son and heir of the Freidrich who hired the troops to George II, was himself a Jacobite sympathiser, and was later exposed as a Catholic.

4. Tony Pollard and Neil Oliver, *Two Men in a Trench: Battlefield Archaeology, the Key to Unlocking the Past* (Michael Joseph/Penguin 2002).

5. Mackay was to be in command of the government army which suffered defeat at the hands of the Jacobites under Dundee at the Battle of Killiecrankie in 1689.

6. James’s departure was [used to political gain when it was](#) regarded as an abdication and ~~even~~ the Scottish parliament ruled that in leaving the country he had forfeited his right to the crown.

7. Jeffrey Stephen

8. [Robert Forbes, *The Lyon in Mourning or a collection of speeches, letters, journals etc. relative to the affairs of Prince Charles Edward Stuart by the Rev. Robert Forbes, A.M. Bishop of Ross and Caithness 1746-1775. Edited with a preface by Henry Paton and published by the Edinburgh University press, 1896.*](#)

Formatted: Font: Italic

9. [Reminiscences of a visitor to Culloden published in the Inverness Courier on 22 January 1840 \(reproduced in *Bloody Culloden*, edited by John MacDonald, *The Inverness Courier*, 1995\): ‘As we sat on the greensward of these battle-graves, we observed that in many places the turf had been broken up by digging; and our young guide told us that scarcely a party came there but was desirous to carry away the fragment of a bone as a relic.’](#)[Stealing bones ref](#)

Formatted: Font: Italic

10. In the author’s experience there appears to have been an increase in recent years of the appearance of cremated human bones around the base of the gravestones in the clan cemetery.

11. Allan I Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603-1788* (East Linton, 1996, 211, 215). Also, ‘[The Aftermath of the ’45](#)’ in Robert Woosnam-Savage, *Charles Edward Stuart and the Jacobites* (Glasgow Museums 1995).

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

12. Stuart Reid describes such claims as ‘fashionable but silly’ in the back-cover blurb for the recent re-appraisal of Cumberland in *Sweet William or the Butcher: the Duke of Cumberland and the ’45* by Jonathan Oates (Pen and Sword, Batsley 2008).

13. Ibid, Oates

14. Eric Roberts, *The Highland Clearances: People, Landlords and Rural Turmoil* (Birlinn, Edinburgh 2000).

15. Michael Fry, *The Union: England, Scotland and the Treaty of 1707* (Birlinn, Edinburgh 2006).

~~16. Another fascinating 'what if' revolves around assignment of a pro Catholic ambassador to Paris by Anne in ???~~

167. This denial of identity also impacted on the titles of military units, for instance the Scots Fusiliers, renamed as such in 1685 after being originally raised in 1678 at the Earl of Mar's Regiment of Foot, were renamed as the North British Fusiliers in 1707, the year of Union. But as ever, nothing is cut and dried and the some regiments did demonstrate their roots through their name: both the Royal Scots and the fought as part of the government army at Culloden.