Introduction

Maxime Poulain

Ghent University, Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 35, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

The idea behind writing this book started in Ninove, Belgium.[1] During trial trenching in 2017 ahead of future development of a site in this town, we encountered some small, superficial hearths. As the original focus of our work was the presence of a Roman site and some bronze age burial mounds, the discovery of these hearths was unexpected. It soon became clear, however that these hearths represent a major component of this site, as the small number of those first uncovered rose into a dozen, then into several dozens, and kept adding up.

Thanks to pre-existing informal networks among the editors of this volume, conflict archaeologists and historians from all over Europe, it rapidly became clear that we had uncovered multiple military encampments, dating back to an era spanning the late seventeenth to the mid eighteenth century. The structures and finds offer unprecedented insights into the life of the French and Dutch armies fighting over the historical region of Flanders, an important crossroad in early modern Europe. Although the site is exceptional in Belgium, it is not an isolated case in a European context. This should not come as a surprise, given the fact that conflicts run as a leitmotiv through the history of the continent.

The archaeology of conflicts is now flourishing. The discipline encompasses a broad range of topics, methodologies and periods, from the excavation of Roman castella[2] to non-invasive research on First World War landscapes,[3] from an architectural analysis of bastioned fortresses[4] to a study of ways of internment during the Second World War.[5] Conflict archaeology, however, has not always been as thriving. A detailed historiography of the discipline has been published elsewhere,[6] so I will refrain from providing a literature review of past and recent work here. However, I do want to highlight a transition in the discipline at the onset of the millennium, due to its particular importance to the present volume. With castles, urban fortifications and weaponry being the main focus in the 1990s,[7] research has shifted to an emphasis on less tangible events. The organization of the 'Fields of Conflict' conference and associated publication on the topic of battlefield archaeology in 2000 are examples,[8] in addition to a contemporaneous effort on the other side of the Atlantic on American Civil War battlefields.[9] In the wake of these events, a growing body of scholarship has targeted Roman[10] and medieval battlefields, although the latter remain underrepresented for various reasons.[11]

[1] The publication of this book would not have been possible without the constructive remarks of three reviewers and the many people involved in proofreading parts of the manuscript. Our gratitude goes to them and to Jacqueline Senior and Tansy Branscombe at BAR Publishing for helping our vague idea for a book turn into reality.

[2] For example, see recent work on the castellum of Oudenburg (Belgium), as part of the North Sea Channel defence: Sofie Vanhoutte, *Change and continuity at the Roman coastal fort at Oudenburg from the late 2nd until the early 5th century AD. Volume I: The site and its significance within the wider context of the Roman North Sea and Channel frontier zone*, Relicata Monografieën 19 (Leiden: Sidestone Press, 2022); Wouter Dhaeze, *The Roman North Sea and Channel Coastal Defence: Germanic Seaborne Raids and the Roman Response* (Wetteren: Universa Press, 2019).

[3] Birger Stichelbaut, ed., *Traces of war: The archaeology of the First World War* (Bruges: Hannibal, 2018).

[4] For example, the Belgrade fortress in Serbia: Marko Popović, *The fortress of Belgrade* (Belgrade: Beogradska Tvrđava, 2006).

[5] Adrian Myers and Gabriel Moshenska, eds, *Archaeologies of internment* (New York: Springer, 2011); Harold Mytum and Gilly Carr, eds, *Prisoners of war: Archaeology, memory, and heritage of 19th- and 20th-century mass internment* (New York: Springer, 2012).

[6] Natasha N. Ferguson and Douglas Scott, "Where the battle rages: War and conflict in Post-Medieval Archaeology," *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 50, no. 1 (2016): 134–147; Iain Banks, "Conflict archaeology," in *The Routledge Handbook of Global Historical Archaeology*, ed. Charles E. Orser, Jr. et al. (London/New York: Routledge, 2020), 192–214.

[7] Guy De Boe and Frans Verhaeghe, eds, *Military Studies in Medieval Europe. Papers of the 'Medieval Europe Brugge 1997' Conference*, I.A.P. Rapporten 11 (Zellik: Instituut voor het Archeologisch Patrimonium, 1997).

[8] Philip W. M. Freeman and Anthony Pollard, eds, *Fields of Conflict: Progress and Prospect in Battlefield Archaeology. Proceedings of a conference held in the Department of Archaeology, University of Glasgow, April 2000*, BAR IS958 (Oxford: BAR Publishing, 2001).

[9] Clarence Raymond Geier and Stephen R. Potter, eds, *Archaeological Perspectives on the American Civil War* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2000).

[10] Well-known cases are the battle of the Teutoborg Forest, at modern Kalkriese (Germany), and the siege at Alésia (France): see for example Susanne Wilbers-Rost, Birgit Großkopf, and Achim Rost, "The ancient battlefield at Kalkriese," *RCC Perspectives* 3 (2012): 91–111 and Michel Réddé, *Alésia. L'archéologie face à l'imaginaire*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Éd. Errance, 2012).

Studies of Roman conflict are increasingly characterised by a holistic perspective, encompassing topics such as the role of women and families in military environments and cultural diversity in the Roman army: Vincent Van der Veen, "Women in Roman Military Bases: Gendered Brooches from the Augustan Military Base and Flavio-Trajanic Fortress at Nijmegen, the Netherlands," *Britannia* 52 (2021): 343–363; Tatiana Ivleva, "British families in the Roman army: living on the fringes of the Roman world," in *Roman Frontier Studies 2009. Proceedings of the XXI International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies (Limes Congress) held at Newcastle upon Tyne in August 2009*, BAR Publishing Roman Archaeology 25, ed. Nick Hodgson, Paul Bidwell, and Judith Schachtmann (Summertown: BAR Publishing, 2017), 26–33; Marenne Zandstra, *Miles away from home. Material culture as a guide to the composition and deployment of the Roman army in the Lower Rhine area during the 1st century AD*, PhD thesis (Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit, 2019).

[11] We can cite the excavation of a mass grave from the Battle of Towton (1461) and the identification of the location of the Battle of Bosworth (1485), both in the United Kingdom: Veronica Fiorato, Anthea Boylston, and Christopher Knüsel, eds, *Blood Red Roses: The Archaeology of a Mass Grave from the Battle of Towton AD 1461*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxbow

In that same trend, we can also document a remarkable increase in the study of conflict sites dating to the (early) modern period.[12]

The rise and focus change of early modern conflict archaeology did not happen in a vacuum. Indeed, it coincides with a remarkable renewal in military history.[13] In the twenty-first century, the latter discipline has increasingly moved away from its traditional emphasis on decisive battles, major diplomatic events and great historical figures, such as generals John Churchill (1650–1722), Duke of Marlborough, or Prince Eugène de Savoie-Carignan (1663–1736).[14] Instead of individuals, research is now examining networks of political and military decision makers, in which there is room for "hesitations and doubt, for luck and opportunism", and for failed projects and unsuccessful negotiations.[15] For example, a recent work has portrayed the military success of Louis XIV as a collaborative effort, rather than an outcome of the genius of a single ruler.[16] War cabinets did not only comprise of the Sun King and his generals, but indeed formed a complex web in which various other agents had roles to play.[17] Others have focused on the dark side of Louis XIV's reign, during which successive defeats went hand in hand with profound transformations in warfare, military administration and its problematic relation to civil society.[18] Indeed, civilians have often been the prime victims of war. Authors have explored, for example, the burden of freebooters in the late-sixteenth-century Flemish countryside,[19] as well as the impact of growing armies on the urban tissue in the eighteenth century.[20]

Many of the works cited above deal with the logistics of warfare and the material organization of armies and their encampments. Archaeology can help to visualize how the normative frameworks from historical sources were realized in the field and to what extent they determined the everyday life of the soldier. Unfortunately, within the growing field of early modern conflict archaeology, the research domain of military encampments remains underdeveloped.[21] On a methodological level, it remains difficult to detect these large-scale but low-impact military features in the small windows offered by trial trenching. Many of these sites go unrecognized, as a result of their ephemeral nature and lack of comparative framework, and therefore subsequently destroyed. The evolving discipline furthermore lacks a consistent terminology and adequate typology for describing and interpreting the large variety of structures (e.g., military kitchens and those of sutlers, shelters for heating, officer's lodging, etc.) and the finds they contain. Also, the relation between the detected archaeological features and written and iconographical sources is problematic at best. Inconsistencies between the various types of sources is the rule, rather than the exception.

Moreover, because of the many detailed historical and iconographical sources available, the added value of conflict archaeology is often questioned.[22] In a context of contract archaeology, in which choices have to be made and early modern archaeology is still too often seen as an obstruction to older layers, it is time to put things plainly and formulate pertinent research questions. For this reason, in June 2019, the intercommunal service SOLVA involved

Books, 2007); Glenn Foard and Anne E. Curry, *Bosworth 1485: A Battle Rediscovered* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2013).

The study of medieval battlefields, however, faces numerous challenges. The absence of historical sources to accurately locate the sites, the collection and re-use of weapons after a battle, and the poor conservation of iron at the surface (in contrast to lead, used for bullets from the sixteenth century onwards) explain the limited number of sites known for the Middle Ages: Tony Pollard and Iain Banks, "Now the Wars are Over: The Past, Present and Future of Scottish Battlefields," *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 14 (2010): 437.

[12] For a review of early modern conflict archaeology on the European continent: Séverine Hurard, Yann Lorin and Arnaud Tixador. "Une archéologie de la guerre de siège moderne (XVII^{e}-XVIII^{e} siècles) à l'échelle européenne," *Les nouvelles de l'archéologie* 137 (2014): 19–24; Maxime Poulain, "Post-medieval archaeology in temperate Europe," in *Encyclopedia of Archaeology*, 2nd ed., ed. Thilo Rehren and Efthymia Nikita (Oxford: Elsevier, forthcoming).

[13] While the renewal of military history is mainly dated from the late 1990s onwards, some pioneers have paved the way in preceding decades. Geoffrey Parker, for example, has explained the failure of the Spanish army in suppressing the Dutch Revolt through a focus on the logistics of warfare, whereas John Keegan has altered battlefield studies by highlighting the experience of individual soldiers: Geoffrey Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road: The Logistics of Spanish Victory and Defeat in the Low Countries Wars, 1567–1659* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972); John Keegan, *The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo, and the Somme* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1976).

[14] Clément Oury, *La Guerre de Succession d'Espagne. La fin tragique du Grand Siècle* (Paris: Tallandier, 2020), 13.

[15] Oury, *La Guerre de Succession d'Espagne*, 14.

[16] Olivier Chaline, *Les armées du Roi: Le grand chantier, XVII^{e}-XVIII^{e} siècle* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2016).

[17] For example, the military advisor Jules-Louis Bolé de Chamlay (1650–1719), who determined the location of encampments and drafted marching orders for the road to follow, or François Michel Le Tellier, marquis de Louvois (1641–91), one of Louis XIV's most important war ministers: Jean-Philippe Cénat, *Chamlay. Le stratège secret de Louis XIV* (Paris: Belin, 2011); Jean-Philippe Cénat, *Louvois. Le double de Louis XIV* (Paris: Tallandier, 2015). On military entrepreneurs, see Jeff Fynn-Paul, ed., *War, Entrepreneurs, and the State in Europe and the Mediterranean, 1300–1800*, History of Warfare 97 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014).

[18] Hervé Drévillon, Bertrand Fonck, and Jean-Philippe Cénat, eds, *Les dernières geurres de Louis XIV* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2017); Etienne Rooms, *Lodewijk XIV en de Lage Landen* (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 2007).

[19] Tim Piceu, *Over vrybuters en quaetdoenders. Terreur op het Vlaamse platteland (eind 16de eeuw)* (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 2008).

[20] Alix Badot, *L'impact des activités militaires sur l'organisation d'une ville Approches environnementales de la résilience dont ont fait preuve Warneton et Namur suite à la guerre de Succession d'Autriche* (Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur, 2021).

[21] Nonetheless, an increasing amount of research is finding its way to publication, for example: Nico Roymans, Bart Beex, and Jan Roymans, "Some Napoleonic-style army camps from the period of the Dutch-Belgian separation (1830–1839) in the Southern Netherlands," *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* 12, no. 2 (2017): 75–93; Audrey Habasque-Sudour, Priscille Dhesse, and Aurélie Guidez, "Un camp militaire temporaire de l'armée française à Eschau (Bas-Rhin) en 1754," *Cahiers Alsaciens d'Archéologie, d'Art et d'Histoire* 64 (2021): 97–118.

[22] This is narrowly intertwined with the status of the archaeology of the early modern period in general, see Davy Herremans and Wim De Clercq, "The current state of post-medieval archaeology in Flanders," *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 47, no. 1 (2013): 83–105; Maxime Poulain and Wim De Clercq, "Exploring an Archaeology of the Dutch War of Independence in Flanders, Belgium," *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 19, no. 3 (2015): 623–646; Eric Tourigny et al., "Global post-medieval/historical archaeology: What's happening around the world?" *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 53, no. 3 (2019): 419–429.

in the Ninove excavations, together with the Flanders Heritage Agency and Ghent University, organised a symposium on the topic of military encampments during the long seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was an international meeting as the myriad nationalities involved in early modern warfare require that the archaeology of conflict be an inherently international discipline. Currently, there is too little contact and collaboration between researchers of individual countries, which has resulted in an inconsistent terminology and a wide range of interpretations for similar structures as noted above.

In an effort to boost this collaboration and comparison, speakers presented the state of archaeological research in their respective countries, discussed the layout and organization at particular sites and explored the potential of material culture in the reconstruction of the soldiers' daily lives and the social relations amongst them. This stimulating exchange and the urgency to develop a fully-fledged discipline in today's commercial context of archaeology motivated the publication of this symposium and other topical research.

The 14 contributions in this volume provide an overview of the documents, features and finds that are linked to military encampments and the methodologies that can be applied for their study and interpretation. The geographical focus lies in Northwestern Europe (Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands), the heartland of conflict and military innovations on the Continent in early modern times.[23] While regionally limited, this volume has a broader, international impact, given the territorial ambitions of French rulers, the multi-national character of major conflicts, and the presence of French and Dutch colonial powers across the globe. The chronological range spans the "unusually belligerent" period between the late sixteenth and early nineteenth century.[24] For the later Middle Ages, armies mainly requisitioned standing buildings; as very few references to tents can be found in historical sources (although exceptions do exist: see the discussion in this volume by Authom, Danese and Denis of the features that can possibly be linked to the 1488 siege of Namur).[25] This practice continues into the early 1500s.[26] However, in the sixteenth century, we also notice an increasing importance of handheld firearms, the use of earthworks, and the gradually diminishing role of cavalry and artillery in favour of ever-growing groups of infantry, who can no longer be quartered within city walls on every occasion. Large-scale encampments developed and were altered throughout the centuries, but they nonetheless continued to show a certain uniformity in terms of material culture. Armies namely held on to traditional lead ammunition until the early 1800s. Pointed or conical bullets were only invented later in that century, ultimately, generating a new style of warfare.[27]

Within these geographical and periodical boundaries, this volume provides a first of its kind framework for historians and archaeologists of early modern conflict and demonstrates the importance of the discipline to both researchers and policy-makers. Hopefully, the identification of military encampments will no longer depend on informal encounters and personal interests, with this volume serving as a reference. As such, this volume may generate a much-needed increase in data and knowledge, and offer first steps towards a common terminology and typology to, ultimately, result in a better understanding of a soldier's daily life in early modern times.

This volume is organised in three parts, the first of which deals with the historical sources and theoretical treatises that can be used for the study of encampments. The first chapter by Bertrand Fonck and Olivier Accarie-Pierson offers an overview of the archives kept at the *Service historique de la Défense*. It is a crucial point of departure for anyone studying French military camps. Although the potential of these collections remains largely unexploited, they can greatly supplement the study of the 'subsoil archive'. The sources allow us to study military practices in all its diversity (e.g., military engineering and cartographic collections, but also diaries and memoirs of officers or soldiers). They also shed light on the relations between the military and civil society, which are of great significance to studying the impact of encampments on local communities.

In the second chapter, Erik Wauters and Arne Verbrugge invert the perspective: rather than starting from an archive, they take an archaeological site as a point of departure. Of particular interest for a wider readership, the authors list the databases of written and cartographical sources – many of which are freely accessible online – that can be used for detecting potential camp sites before excavation and for identifying the different nationalities and components from which these encampments were constructed. This methodology was successfully applied in the site in Ninove, where multiple encampments were found (see below). This exemplary collaboration between a historian

[23] For a central European perspective on the archaeology of early modern battlefields and encampments, see Arne Homann, "Battlefield Archaeology of Central Europe – With a Focus on Early Modern Battlefields," in *Historical Archaeology in Central Europe*, ed. Natascha Mehler, Special Publication 10 (Rockville: Society for Historical Archaeology, 2013), 203–230.

[24] Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution. Military Innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500–1800*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

[25] Franck Viltart, "Itinéraires, transport et logement des armées dans les projets de croisade de Philippe le Bon (1454–1464)," in *Partir en croisade à la fin du Moyen Âge : Financement et logistique*, ed. Daniel Baloup and Manuel Sánchez Martínez (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Midi, 2015), § 24, accessed May 20, 2022, https://books.openedition.org/pumi/16674.

[26] For example, although not strictly a military camp, the Field of Cloth of Gold (1520) can be mentioned. For this meeting between Henry VIII of England and Francis I of France, members of the French court were not only housed in richly decorated tents. At least part of the French entourage was in lodged in town houses and an abbey: Glenn Richardson, *The Field of Cloth of Gold* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2020).

[27] Homann, "Battlefield Archaeology," 203, 207.

and an archaeologist permitted the identification of the armies that were present and the duration of their stay (from five days to over a month).

The next set of chapters further explores the potential of these historical sources, military tracts in particular. They lay the theoretical groundwork for further discussion in this volume. Klára Andresová analyses *Castrametatio*, the 1617 treatise of the Flemish engineer and mathematician Simon Stevin (1548–1620). In his book, which builds on the works of various ancient authors, Stevin presents his view on the ideal layout and construction of military camps. Andresová compares Stevin's work with those of his contemporaries, and notes that, while the former was occupied with setting up an army camp, the latter rather wrote military handbooks on how to select the ideal location for a camp site. The importance of water and supply routes and the possibility of waste disposal are recurring themes in those handbooks.

Castrametation continued to be influenced by Roman military theory in the following centuries. However, increasing firepower stimulated the transition in the late 1700s from a deep to a thin tactical order, in which soldiers were no longer grouped in compact encampments, but spread out across a line. Frédéric Lemaire observes a contemporaneous shift from tents to barracks. Rules for encampments with tents and barracks are stipulated in exceptional detail in documents dating to the turn of the nineteenth century. The choice for tents or barracks is initially determined by the battle order (*ordre profond* or *ordre mince*), as indicated by both historical and archaeological sources. However, the use of barracks ultimately gained the upper hand as – according to a personal testimony by Napoleon Bonaparte himself – it offered important advantages.

Nevertheless, the question remains: how much did this theory have in common with practice? In order to respond to this question, the second part of this volume aims to provide both broad overviews and in-depth studies of military encampments. Marc Brion takes us to Flanders (Belgium) and discusses how the huts, tents and kitchens described by Stevin may have looked like, by linking archaeological finds to iconographical sources. It is the first effort at establishing a typology of military installations and their archaeological footprint. During trial trenching, Brion observes that hearth structures prove to be key markers of the presence of a military encampment. However, due to the low density of such features on a site and the presence of large zones without any apparent features (tents hardly leave an imprint in the subsoil), he notes that it is best to detect military encampments before trial trenching. But this leaves us with the question, how to do so? Geophysical research has thus far proven unsuccessful in detecting military encampments in Flanders. Based on a review of excavations in this region, Brion proposes a methodology in which historical and iconographical sources are first thoroughly analysed. Once a military site is detected, archaeologists should also screen the plough layer, in collaboration with experienced metal detectorists, as many features and finds are situated close to the surface and might otherwise be peeled off by the excavator. For low-density sites, the trial trenches can be as wide as 4 m instead of the usual 2 m. Finally, some recommendations are given for the excavation of the many pits we find on camp sites, in order to avoid missing any information on internal arrangements, benches, niches, hearths and post holes.

Brion's contribution flows into the chapter by Nicolas Authom, Véronique Danese and Marceline Denis, who give an overview of sites in southern Belgium. Military encampments are split up in those used during a siege, for bivouac and those that were erected in the context of battlefields, such as Waterloo (1815). Despite these different contexts, they all consist of small pits and hearths. Larger structures for waste disposal (cf. Andresová) are not reflected in the archaeological record, an observation that compels us to reflect on our archaeological praxis: we stop excavating when the number of features diminishes, while the most informative cesspits might just lie behind the excavation limits. One encampment, related to the battle of Fontenoy (1745), stands out because of six large pits, used for the collective burial of fallen soldiers. Initially, no other features were linked to the camp site. In hindsight, the authors are now able to identify several pits and trenches, originally interpreted as elements of prehistoric or Roman burial practices, as parts of the encampment. It is the perfect illustration of the fact that future generations of archaeologists must be made aware of this type of site and its features.

After these overviews and their methodological considerations, a following set of chapters offers in-depth analyses of individual sites. We start with the large-scale excavations at the Fort Saint-Sebastian, close to Paris, one of the most iconic examples of the interdisciplinary study of encampments. Fort Saint-Sebastian was built in 1669, and was used to prepare 16,000 to 30,000 of Louis XIV's men for siege warfare for two years. 3,500 archaeological structures and almost 2 km of defensive moats offer unprecedented insight into the aforementioned military practices and the relations between local and high society. Indeed, besides being a training camp, a manoeuvre ground and tactical laboratory, this encampment also served as an official military showcase. It might explain why, in contrast to the sites mentioned above, rules of castrametation have been strictly applied in this case. The two phases of encampment are clearly organized by following the outline of the fortification, with companies separated by 10 m-wide streets. Cavalry and infantry regiments can easily be distinguished on the basis of spatial organization, the type of features and associated material culture. For the first time, we are able to grasp the large group of sutlers and other civilians accompanying armies in early modern times. Séverine Hurard, Olivier Bauchet and Xavier Rochart make the important observation that for many soldiers, 'the experience of the military life was probably the first experience of social and cultural diversity'.

Archaeological excavations across the study region show, however, that rules of castrametation have not always been applied as strictly as in the case of the Fort Saint-Sebastian, and that ideas of castrametation changed over time. The excavations in Ninove, discussed by Erik Wauters, Arne Verbrugge, Bart Cherretté, Marc Brion and myself, are illustrative of the fact that ideal spots in the landscape (cf. Stevin's contemporaries) were well-known to military scouts. This generates an archaeological palimpsest, in which features from the three different campaigns (1692, 1693 and 1745) are intermingled. Separating the features belonging to the 1692 camp from those of the 1693 camp will be a hard nut to crack. Several pits from the 1745 campaign can be distinguished on the basis of sparse datable material and particular French imports. However, for those features lacking in finds, historical sources offer interesting insights, as we know that the 1745 encampment was occupied for several months at the end of the campaign season. Large earth-sheltered structures are particularly suited for a longer stay in more severe weather conditions, and are thus likely a part of the eighteenth-century occupation on this site.

Nicolas Authom and Marceline Denis carry this discussion on by describing the installation of several strategically situated encampments located on a plateau in Frameries (Belgium). Not only does the site's location echo that of Ninove, but it was also found to consist of a large diversity of archaeological features of similar typology (e.g., hearths, pits and shelters). However, further comparison with Ninove and sites mentioned elsewhere in this volume nevertheless shows significant differences. Similar features differ within a single encampment and between sites. Authom and Denis attribute those differences to the individuality of soldiers. That individual agency stands in contrast to the theoretical frameworks provided by Andresová and Lemaire. Soldiers seem to have appropriated military instructions and adapted them to the conditions on the terrain.

Michèle Risch and Laurent Brou study the French camps erected for the 1794–95 blockade of the City of Luxembourg. The 'freshness' of features and the number of finds allowed archaeologists to distinguish temporary camps from more long-term installations. Structures resemble those observed in earlier contributions, although this time some remarkable finds were made, such as an Austrian-Hungarian sabre, possibly taken from the enemy. Similar to the site of Ninove, the authors make the connection between the excavated shelters and the particularly harsh winter of 1794–95. The French Revolution did entail changes in the internal organization of the army and in the soldiers' uniform, as is evident in finding buttons that mention the French Republic, instead of the royal insignia. However, the particular construction of shelters had proven its utility and was, thus, free of influence by political turmoil.

As discussed by Lemaire, barracks were used during the French Revolutionary Wars (1792–1802), but only became the norm during the Napoleonic Wars (1803–15). A study by Sjaak J.R. Mooren, Maaike Kalshoven, Michel Hendriksen, Wilfried A.M. Hessing and Ingrid J. Cleijne focusses on a French-Batavian camp near Utrecht (the Netherlands), dated between 1804–08. This camp near Utrecht was part of a series of army camps where troops were gathered for Napoleon's planned – but never executed – invasion of Britain. In line with Lemaire, the archaeologists could observe the replacement of tents by wooden barracks in 1805. The archaeological results show the strict hierarchy, according to which the camp was designed, and further enrich the typology of attested features: tents, barracks, structures for storages and even possible gardens. Although the layout is very regulated in comparison to preceding centuries, inconsistencies with existing maps persist, which prove to be schematic or idealised displays rather than an accurate representation of the camp. Importantly, this research does not only focus on the layout of the camp, but also on the daily life of traders, women and children who accompanied soldiers. Part of the excavations targeted the civilian part of the camp, which resulted in identifying sod houses with an irregular layout to be belonging to those civilians.

Finally, Sławomir Konik also discusses a camp from the Napoleonic Wars, but offers another perspective: that of Napoleon's adversary. His study is focused on the 1809 camp in Wagram (Austria). Similarities between the camps of both sides of the conflict testify to the rapid spread and mutual influence of military theory and praxis on the European continent. Nonetheless, it is possible to add yet another form to the typology of features discussed elsewhere in this volume, namely, the field table. The site at Wagram is not only a camp, but also a battlefield. The skeletal remains of 60 soldiers were found there. Analysis of the finds from the graves establishes that the soldiers belonged to both sides of the conflict. Konik concludes with important methodological remarks, which have striking similarities to the suggestions made in the chapter by Marc Brion (such as the importance of metal detecting in the plough layer and of emptying the fill of a feature, rather than making a cut). Although each site has its own characteristics, the emergence of a pan-European methodology to detect military encampments during trial trenching promises a bright future for the discipline.

The final part of this volume focusses on the daily life in the camp. Indeed, in discussing theoretical treatises and structural features, we sometimes forget the people behind them. In my chapter with Wim De Clercq, we explore a soldier's everyday life through the proxy of material culture. More than allowing archaeologists to identify and date encampments, and to attribute functions to certain archaeological features and zones, we argue that material culture also carries a symbolic value. It is this very social dimension of material culture that soldiers will exploit in order to create and reflect a military group identity. The analysis of the artefacts at two sites dating to the turn of the seventeenth century shows that smoking and drinking played a crucial social role within

an encampment by creating a convivial setting, offering a pastime and giving courage when needed. Bonds between soldiers are strengthened even further through the active use of material culture as a political instrument in the conflict. A preliminary study of the finds in Ninove shows how changes occurred in the eighteenth century, with the professionalization of armies and their supply chains, allowing them to directly import ceramics from France.

Delphine Cense-Bacquet, Tarek Oueslati, Sabrina Save and Alys Vaughan-Williams further compare the official military directives with the archaeological reality on the ground. The analysis of animal and plant remains at a French camp of 1793 provides several interesting insights into the wood used for the construction of tents and shelters and the way by which food was supplied and prepared. The authors observe that, in spite of the efforts of scouting for ideal camping grounds, soldiers had to adapt to the environment and the conditions with which they were confronted, as the necessary supply of goods was not always assured. The reuse of animal bones as combustibles serves as an example of this adaption. It further highlights the importance of agency, noted by Denis and Authom, and the potential of archaeology to reveal the individuality of soldiers in the mass conflicts of early modern times.

In conclusion, the following pages offer a rich variety of international perspectives on military encampments in the early modern period. By comparing the features and finds of encampments in a European framework, this publication aims to build the first foundation of an upcoming discipline. The contributions in this volume make a strong case for the importance of the interdisciplinary – and thus also archaeological – study of this topic. The authors formulate multiple questions on the everyday, material lives of the soldiers and those of their surroundings, on their experience of war, on the organization of camps on the terrain (and not merely in theoretical treatises), on the choice of a particular location for an encampment, and on the significant impact of such a military presence on the local society. All are important questions that may steer the archaeological study of early modern military encampments in the coming years. On behalf of my fellow editors, I would like to thank all contributors for making this volume possible and hope that, as a reader, this book might inspire new pursuits and deepen research in this domain.