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<td>PCA. &quot;A dead rebel soldier, bare footed, killed by a shell,...&quot;</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB. &quot;This view was taken in the trenches of the rebel fort Mahone,...&quot;</td>
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<td>PCD. &quot;A dead rebel soldier, as he lay in the trenches...&quot;</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
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<td>PCE. &quot;This picture is a good view of the covered ways...&quot;</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCF. Title unknown, but probably identical to previous</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA. &quot;A Rebel soldier killed in the trenches...&quot;</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDB. Original title almost identical to that of previous but unknown</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDC. &quot;Rebel artillery soldiers, killed in the trenches...&quot;</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDD. &quot;A dead rebel soldier, inside the Union picket lines,...&quot;</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE. &quot;A dead rebel soldier, inside the Union picket lines,...&quot;</td>
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<td>------------</td>
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<td>BPCA. &quot;Confederate Prisoners in the Punch Bowl.&quot;</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCA. Diagram of Section Breakdown</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCA. Section 1</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCA. Section 2</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCA. Section 3</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCA. Section 4</td>
<td>649</td>
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<tr>
<td>BPCA. Section 5</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCA. Section 6</td>
<td>651</td>
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<tr>
<td>WHLAA. &quot;View of Rebel Prisoners at White House Landing.&quot;</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFAA. Confederate Prisoners Captured at Five Forks</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
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The intent of this study is to reevaluate the nature of the material culture of Confederate enlisted men in the Army of Northern Virginia. It was undertaken, because the traditional, historic portrayal, reflecting these men as suffering severe privation in terms of uniforms and equipment, is incorrect. Southern enlisted men were, in fact, well appointed throughout the war with proper uniforms and requisite equipage. To prove this, photographs in association with extant specimens of clothing and equipment were employed as the primary source materials.

Supporting the thesis first involved an examination of all available Confederate uniform items in conjunction with a study of civilian and Union Army clothing to determine what, exactly, constituted a Southern uniform. This allowed items in the photographs to be properly identified. To organize the data from these garments for efficient use and meaningful presentation, a typology was created. Furthermore, conclusions supporting the thesis were drawn from this source in itself. In association, a study was made of equipment to determine what was essential. These undertakings allowed a hypothesis to be formed of a well appointed Confederate soldier to be tested in the photographs.

Because of the premise of the paper, it was also necessary to review the primary written sources upon which the prevailing beliefs are based. This resulted in reanalysis and conclusions which also support the thesis.

The photographs were then examined in accordance with a methodology for how such should be used to determine material culture. All examples of two photographic genres, casualty and prisoner-of-war, were studied, because as a whole, they are representative of the reality of the situation during the last two-thirds of the war. If problems existed, they should be apparent in them. In these images, what is worn and carried was identified and analyzed, and conclusions sustaining the study's premise were drawn.

In closing, the conclusions derived from the different sources were compared and shown to support each other and the thesis. A new interpretation of the nature of Confederate enlisted men's clothing and equipment was established.
THE CONFEDERATE ENLISTED MAN IN THE
ARMY OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA:
A REEVALUATION OF HIS MATERIAL CULTURE
INTRODUCTION

Students of the American Civil War are consistently presented with the same general description of the common Confederate soldier when the subject of clothing and equipment is discussed. This view, conveyed in the secondary historical literature, has become traditional and is accepted as an "every good schoolboy knows" fact. Portrayed are soldiers universally clad in a variety of garments ranging from part military and part civilian to completely civilian. In turn, such dress is almost inevitably referred to as patched and frayed. "Ragged" is an all too frequent adjective. With regularity, statements are encountered about the considerable number of ever-present barefoot troops and the general lack of equipment. It is maintained that the need for clothes, shoes, and equipment was so great that Confederate soldiers commonly remedied their plight by appropriation from Union dead and prisoners. The general impression is one of total want and desperation due to supply shortages, and it is maintained that as the war progressed, the situation grew increasingly worse. Readers of Civil War literature acquire a conception of a soldier that looked like anything but a soldier. From the standpoint of appearance, the descriptive terms tramp and ragamuffin are impressed upon the readers' minds. Yet, when one closely examines the casualty and prisoner-of-war photographs
taken in the field of members of the Army of Northern Virginia, an extremely contrary image is apparent, and the traditional historical view does not stand the test. With very few exceptions, the soldiers pictured are well appointed in Confederate uniforms and well shod. From those photographs in which accoutrements can be discerned, it is evident they are also well equipped. This indicates that the army's supply of materiels generally met demands, and the men did not suffer from the shortages and subsequent privations so many would have us believe. These photographs must serve as the basis for our understanding and knowledge, and because of them, the situation must be reassessed. In association, a study of extant Confederate uniform items leads to the same conclusions. The common Confederate soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia was well dressed in Southern military uniforms, well shod, and well accoutred with the requisite equipment throughout the war. He was not the ragged, barefoot, poorly equipped individual in nondescript mix-and-match clothing so many have come to see him as.

This is a material culture study, the aim of which is to arrive at a solid assessment of what the material culture of the common soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia actually consisted of. It is felt that, given the fact this paper seriously challenges historical and anthropological doctrine, it should only attempt to correct long held misconceptions by reassessing and establishing the reality of the situation, rather than progress further to determine why the situation, as presented, existed. In essence, a ground work is necessary and is being laid that will serve as a foundation for additional research.
It is admitted that while the study resolves various issues, it does provoke more questions. Still, the basic answers, to why the situation with uniforms and equipment to be discussed existed, are quite simple. Members of a military organization are being described - men who belonged to a distinct subculture with very rigid ways and means of doing things. What was worn and carried was determined and issued by a military hierarchy. In turn, the decisions made by superiors as to what would be, especially with regards to equipment, can be viewed as being founded in a very pure sense of functionalism. That which existed, existed due to considerations of practicality in association with an object serving a definite, necessary purpose for keeping body and soul together while on active campaign. Everything existed for a reason. That the prescribed articles are actually present and in good condition in the photographs indicates that the procurement of materials, manufacture, and supply were, at least, sufficient to meet requirements.

To establish the reality of the Confederate soldier's material culture and to support the thesis, historic photographs will be presented, and the data gleaned from them will be discussed in light of related information acquired from an examination of extant Southern uniforms and equipment. The material collected about uniforms and equipment allowed for the establishment of a hypothesis of what the secessionist enlisted man's material culture should be against which what was discerned in the photographs could be compared. As the images reflect the reality of the situation, a correct assessment could then be arrived at. Also, the study of uniforms resulted in the creation of a typology of Southern military garments and their attributes. This is
presented comparatively with data on civilian and Federal clothing so that articles seen in the photographs can be properly identified for what they are. For the pictures, a methodology was established and is presented on how such can be employed as a source for determining material culture.

These portions of the paper are juxtaposed against two additional sections. First, a backdrop is offered of the traditional views which serves to set the stage and support that such beliefs are actually maintained. Secondly, there is a chapter reexamining the primary written sources upon which the current doctrine is based. In concluding, the information acquired will be tabulated and compared, and a proper assessment of the Confederate enlisted man's material culture will be formulated.
CHAPTER I

THE TRADITIONAL HISTORICAL VIEW AS PRESENTED IN SECONDARY SOURCES

The reader of Civil War history need not delve far into the secondary sources before being impressed with the fact that both popular and scholarly studies all present the same opinion when the topic of Confederate uniforms and equipment arises. In one popular volume, it is stated that as early as 1862, Confederate troops were wearing "ragged clothing", and in reference to the winter of 1864-65 at Petersburg, Virginia, the same work says, "Snow and sleet caught many men without shoes, as usual, and few wore clothes worthy of the name." A major popular historian maintained this same view. While writing of the winter of 1862-1863 at Fredericksburg, Virginia, he asserts that there was a want of shoes, socks, underwear, blankets, and overcoats. In another of his studies, he comments that although Confederate soldiers had sufficient arms and ammunition, much of the rest of their kit was not always available, and he continues with, "Almost from the beginning the Confederate uniform was a nondescript, improvised affair...". Another author offers the line, "...Southern soldiers presented an increasingly ragged and nondescript appearance as the conflict progressed." A fifth study maintains, "The average Confederate sol-
dier was lucky to have garments of any sort - regardless of color - to cover his nakedness; he was doubly fortunate if he possessed a good pair of shoes to keep his feet off the ground."5 Juvenile histories convey this impression as well. One such states, "They wore whatever they could get their hands on. Sometimes they received clothing in packages from home; sometimes they scavenged among the Union dead."6

Popular histories of military dress uphold the same belief. One author says, "Towards the end of the war, as a result of the shortage of supplies in the South, the sight of an even approximately correctly-uniformed infantryman was very unusual."7 In reference to Confederate cavalry, another states that due to poverty and shortage, by the end of the war uniforms were a "collection of civilian rags".8 A third writer of this sort of study relates, such was the situation that it is doubtful whether the correct regulation uniform was ever worn in large numbers (if at all), but by the middle of the war the troops of the Confederacy were dressed in a mixture of what few regulation uniforms were available, much captured Federal costume, purely civilian dress, and home-dyed uniforms, which, the supply of grey dye having run out, were of a light brown, buff or yellowish tone known as "butternut"... With this costume was worn large quantities of civilian clothes until soldiers lost all resemblance to members of a military unit;...

Corpse-robbing, a repellent but extremely common habit, led to a large proportion of the Confederate army wearing Federal light blue trousers and captured boots; so popular did this practice become that soon Confederate regiments were wearing Union head-dress and jackets as well! ... Official disapproval (except in cases of absolute necessity) of robbing the dead often restricted Confederate "appropriations" to trousers, boots, and miscellaneous equipment.

A number of additional comments, reiterating these views, are made later in the same text.10

Scholarly studies of the war or particular battles generate the same impression. One volume mentions the lack of shoes and clothing
during the Maryland campaign of September, 1862. Again, referring to the invasion of Maryland, a different book relates that thousands were shoeless, and the southern force is described as "...the most ragged of armies. Uniforms were in rags and tatters, described as "multiforms." The same volume tells of how Union dead were searched for shoes and equipment after the Battle of Second Manassas, August, 1862. An additional work says that prior to the Chancellorsville campaign of early May, 1863, when clothing was available, there was not enough to go around, and it was of poor quality.

Scholarly writings that deal specifically with the topics of uniforms and equipment are also unanimous in maintaining and promoting the poor image of the Confederate soldier. One study comments, "Any form of equipment was in short supply...", and "...the lack of necessities was acute, and in the case of boots, painful as well." This same author later refers to "the deficiency in his [Confederate soldier's] wardrobe". Another writer states, "...the 'uniform of the day' was almost anything that would cover nakedness and warm the body.", and that they were "makeshift affairs". The same goes on to say that Confederates frequently relied on captured Union coats and shoes. A different work relates that the clothing situation worsened as the war went on, Union uniforms and shoes were frequently worn, and Confederate uniforms "...often deteriorated to the point of being little more than a conglomerate of rags and threads." A fourth Civil War militaria study states, "Shoes, shirts, underwear, hats, and even complete uniforms were stripped from Federal dead or prisoners...", and "Confederates wore anything they could get - homespun clothing, captured
Federal items, and just clothing." Another work refers to Southern soldiers commonly relying on captured Union "uniforms, arms, and equipment". Finally, in yet a sixth volume of this ilk, there is the comment.

As the war progressed and military niceties became less and less important, the battle dress of both sides became more and more nondescript. Confederate uniforms, especially, became, as often as not, no uniforms at all - simply what could be scrounged or captured. Supply trains of Federal armies and the bodies of dead Yankees furnished a good portion of Confederate soldier clothing. And the butternut color of Confederate homespun, produced by a dye made of copperas and walnut hulls, gradually replaced the gray of manufactured goods.

The classic study of Confederate soldier life offers the same impression. It refers to the frequency of appropriating Federal clothes and shoes. In addition, there is the line, "...as a general rule, ruggedness increased as the war progressed." The extent to which this image of the Confederate soldier prevails is evident upon witnessing a living history demonstration at Antietam National Battlefield Park. One of the participants wears what is believed to be and presented as typical late war Confederate dress. The outfit consists of a brown civilian frock coat, lighter brown civilian pants, and a shirt. These are extremely patched and frayed. The demonstrator also wears a battered felt hat, and a rope suffices for a belt. The only real military item he possesses is his rifle. The preceding quotes make it apparent that the image of the poorly clad and equipped Confederate soldier has become a universal, historical doctrine that is bordering on dogma. In light of the contrary photographic data to be presented, however, one must wonder about the foundations for such beliefs, especially when the scholarly status of
some whose work has been mentioned is considered. Of course, they are based on the primary written sources. Yet, whereas words are open to interpretation and can be deceptive, photographs do not lie. Because of the data they present, one must question how the documents have been used and/or the nature of the documents themselves. Primary written sources will be discussed later in this study, for reanalysis they obviously need.
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CHAPTER II

A METHODOLOGY FOR PHOTOGRAPH ANALYSIS

Because photographs are being employed as the primary sources to support the thesis, it is necessary to establish a systematic methodology for photograph analysis. This must be done in order to insure that the maximum amount of data is extracted from the images, and, in turn, that this information is properly interpreted. The first step in the process involves the choice of the photographs themselves. There are key factors to keep in mind during the selection phase. For the sake of cohesive, comparative study, photographs of the same genre should be employed, and all known examples of a particular type of view should be examined if a correct interpretation is to be arrived at. In turn, certain genres are likely to offer more meaningful and reliable data than others. Also, one must be sure that an image is of what it is said to be if the data it offers is to have any value.

Photographs of common Confederate soldiers can essentially be grouped into four genres: portrait, camp, casualty, and prisoner-of-war. While valuable for other research goals, the first two classifications were not deemed suitable for the purpose of this study.

Portraits are not reliable sources for determining what was actually worn and carried in the field. This type of image was posed for in
a studio, and the majority were taken early in the war when a soldier first enlisted. Consequently, the men are frequently shown at their best in their new and immaculate first uniforms and issues of equipment prior to field modifications and the effects of rigorous campaigning. Apart from being new, many of the uniforms shown are of flashy styles that soon disappeared in favor of more practical garb. In at least some instances, it is possible that the equipment is not representative of what was actually issued as it is known that photographers sometimes supplied props for these views. Also, because so many of these originated early in the conflict, they represent a limited time frame indicative only of that period. Finally, there are simply too many such views extant in scattered existence to attempt a thorough analysis. Because of these factors, portraits can not be employed to illustrate the reality of the later clothing and equipment situation during active campaigning.

Problems also exist with using camp photographs. As with portraits, the majority of these were taken fairly early in the war. Consequently, they, too, represent a limited time period and are not indicative of the later state of affairs with regards to uniforms and equipment. These views, as well, are posed with some effort probably made on the part of the subjects to improve their appearance for the cameraman. While the risk of encountering props is certainly not a serious consideration, another problem exists with equipment. Keeping in mind that these images were recorded in long term, well established camps, some of the gear in evidence is likely to represent only life in such a stationary situation, but not of existence on the march. Anoth-
er problem is that the photographer was absolutely free to choose his subject matter. Because of this, a sense of representative sampling is lost. The subject matter can not be assessed as typical of the entire army. Also, while these views generally show groups of men, those portrayed are usually only representative of a single command. Consequently, while data is available for comparative study between the men of a given company or regiment, again, they can not be relied upon as reflective of the army as a whole. This problem is compounded when one takes into account the limited number of camp views that exist.

For the purpose of this study, only photographs taken in the field and confirmed as showing casualties and prisoners-of-war of The Army of Northern Virginia were deemed suitable for use. The major reason for this is the truly representative portrayal of reality they offer. They are representative, because the figures shown were basically arbitrarily chosen for their fate, and consequently, for the photographer's subject. The cameraman's views were preestablished, and he plied his craft as he came upon his subject matter. The casualty images are not posed photographs, and apart from an occasional firearm and perhaps, in one instance, some equipment, there are no props. With the prisoners-of-war, while many of the figures were obviously aware of the photographer's activities and struck a pose, their situation would not allow them to enhance their appearance or use props. These are images of reality. In both genres, the individuals are wearing and carrying what they actually did while on campaign - a time when they should look their worst, and if any problems with their kit exist, they should be noticeable.
In conjunction, another important reason for utilizing these genres is that the photographs were taken after nine different battles - Cedar Mountain, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Aldee, Gettysburg, the Wilderness/Spotsylvania, Five Forks, and the final assault at Petersburg - and as such, cover a period from August, 1862, to April, 1865. As a result, there is a good sampling through time which avoids the early part of the conflict. Because the soldiers shown represent a considerable number of different regiments from most, if not all, of the Southern states, a good degree of sampling in terms of space is achieved. In essence, the casualty and prisoner-of-war photographs are reflective of the army as a whole for the last two and a half years of the war. This allows for comparative study with the result that a larger, more all-encompassing picture can be attained.

As mentioned, another issue in the selection process is being certain that the photographs are actually of that which they are purported to be. In other words, an image must be firmly provenanced and, thus, authenticated. If it is not, the acquired data will be meaningless, if not totally incorrect, and lead to misinterpretation. For an image to be properly provenanced, the three important questions of where, when, and of whom it was recorded must be answerable. This brings up another problem inherent with the use of portraits for this study. In many instances, there is no information about the image, and all we really have is another photograph of another soldier which is valueless beyond any particularistic details that can be gleaned from it. In the case of the images discussed in this study, all but a couple have been firmly provenanced through the brilliant work of William A. Frassanito. Because of this and the fact that it is not this study's purpose to
rehash and reestablish that which has already been done, his conclu-
sions will be accepted, and the issue of establishing a provenance for
each view will not be discussed. For such information, the reader is
referred to Mr. Frassanito's works: Antietam: The Photographic Legacy
of America's Bloodiest Day, Gettysburg: A Journey in Time, and Grant
and Lee: The Virginia Campaigns 1864-1865. Still, in the course of
researching this thesis, the exact locations of the views from Antie-
tam, Fredericksburg, and Gettysburg were visited, examined, and con-
firmed.

It is necessary to point out some of the problems encountered with
Civil War photography and explain how provenance and authenticity can
be established. A number of Civil War casualty photographs were faked
or not actually taken at the location indicated. For instance, works
by Brady's cameramen supposedly showing casualties at First Manassas
and Gettysburg are proven forgeries. Living men were posed in feigned
death. Many of the Gettysburg images recorded by Alexander Gardner and
his crew, while of real casualties, are now known to show areas of the
battlefield far distant from locations stated by the cameramen and
traditionally accepted.

Following the methods set forth by Frassanito, the provenance and
authenticity of an image can be confirmed or established in the follow-
ing manner. In the case of the casualty views, one must ask: Do the
details indicate that the men really are casualties? Is the position
of the body unnatural and consistent with a violent death? Are there
signs of stiffness indicative of rigor mortis? Has the body bloated?
This can be ascertained from such features as overly tight clothing or
unfastened buttons. The search for such grotesque details, while not
pleasant, is necessary.

Once the photograph is authenticated as showing real casualties, then it must be established if they are shown where they are said to be shown and if they are Confederate. The location can be confirmed by picking out landmarks - a building, hill, large tree, or boulder - in the view that might still be extant. A survey of the area in question is then required to locate the feature. If found, the location is authenticated. In turn, if documents and maps show that this area was solidly occupied only by Confederate troops, then it is safe to say that the casualties are Southerners. If it is a locale in which both sides were engaged and could thus portray a mixture of the opposing forces, then the documents must again be resorted to. In the case of the Gettysburg images, it is known that Gardner and his crew did not commence their work until July 5, two days after the fighting ceased. By this time, the Federal burial details were nearly done, if not completely finished, with the interment of their own comrades, leaving the Confederate dead for secondary consideration. Consequently, by establishing the date the photograph was recorded and where it was recorded, combined with a knowledge of the historical situation, it is safe to assert that the figures are, in fact, Confederates. Also, those very details of uniforms and equipment that are sought can, in turn, be employed to further confirm the image's authenticity. The end result is that the questions of where, when, and of whom, are answered. With additional documentary research, it is even possible to establish a probable regimental or brigade identity for the men. For instance, a solid provenance combined with the historical facts that only a certain command was engaged there indicates who the men are.
Having selected the photographs and established a provenance for each, only then can the analyst proceed to the interpretive phase. At this point, the provenance is essential for a correct and meaningful assessment. Basically, each photograph is unique and, in effect, has its own story to tell. Each potentially reflects a different set of circumstances, and a sound provenance is needed to deduce the situation as captured by the camera. For instance, with the casualty views, one might show a figure heavily equipped while another is of a man with no gear at all. Without a provenance, it would be easy to say that the second was representative of a poorly supplied Confederate soldier when in reality he is not. The dates of the photos - the when - now come into play. These tell us that the first view was made a day earlier than the second. This in conjunction with a knowledge of basic activities following a battle easily explains the absence of accoutrements. In the interim, the policing details had done their work and removed the equipment.

After completing the above procedures, the researcher can begin to analyze the photographs individually. This involves a simple three step progression of examination which basically conforms to the methods taught students for analyzing a painting in Introduction to Art 101. Different things are, however, looked for for different reasons. First, each image needs to be assessed in a very general manner to determine potential usefulness. Is the view suitable for the type of research one is attempting to conduct? This is actually a continuation of the selection process, and logically, it should have been performed at that point. As an example of what is meant, in the case of this
study, a number of prisoner of war photographs were taken at such a
great distance that the viewer could not hope to derive any information
from them, and they could be eliminated. This stage in analysis is
comparable to that in viewing a painting when the decision is made
about whether or not it is liked, and the question is asked if closer
examination is warranted to determine why. Once the images with true
potential are collected, one moves to the next step involving more
in-depth study. During this phase, the researcher begins to ask more
specific questions pertinent to a specific photograph and determine and
note the more general features. In the case of this paper, general
clothing types were defined at this point. Here, an art student, in an
effort to determine what the artist had done, would examine the general
use of color, space, shapes, etc. Upon conclusion of this stage, the
final one, entailing very detailed study in a search for specifics, can
commence. With this paper, this was the point where the particular
attributes of a given garment were identified. For instance, how many
buttons does this shell jacket have, and what do they appear to be made
of? The art student might analyze the exact nature of the brush
strokes or identify certain color mixes to ascertain how the artist
achieved what he or she did. Quite simply, the analysis process moves
from the general to the specific. In anthropological terms, these
three steps are defined by John and Malcolm Collier in their book,
Visual Anthropology: Photography as a Research Method, 1986, as
open-ended or simply, open viewing, structured research, and micro-
analysis. Once the data is collected, further work basically involves
proceeding in the same manner as if written sources or artifacts had
been used. The facts are organized, tabulated, compared, and conclusions are drawn.

When interpreting the views, the state of the period's photographic arts need be considered. These pictures were recorded in black and white. Consequently, there is only shading to work with which ranges from white through various degrees of gray to black. Needless to say, it is impossible to determine colors except in those rare instances in which the cameraman bothered to record them, or if the item viewed is of such standard and well documented nature that we know its color already. Also, it is important to remember how different colors will reproduce in black and white. Black, navy blue, and dark gray will appear similar, as will light gray and light blue. In addition, frequently, certain colors will not show up in contrast. Greens, reds, and even yellows can appear black and will not be noticeable against another dark object. For instance, what in reality is a dark blue coat with red trim may appear to have no trim at all.

The actual physical quality of the photographs necessitates certain guidelines for viewing if the maximum amount of data and a correct analysis are to be attained. Ideally, it would be best to have access to the original negatives (if they exist) and produce new prints to work with. Barring their availability, published prints have to suffice, and with care, the same results can be achieved. When using such, however, several words of caution are in order. The most important consideration is the quality of the reproduction. Printing methods, type of paper, size, and whether or not the image was created using the original negative can effect the print's clarity and con-
trast. Because of this, it is advisable (if possible) to work with at least three reproductions of the same view. In addition to being of assistance in actual examination, this will also confirm that the entire view has been acquired as many are cropped for publication. While comparison may show little variation, frequently, details not visible in one version may well be discernible in another. The viewer should never rely solely on what is considered the best overall image. For instance, what might appear as only a shadowed crease across a jacket in such, and not even visible in another example, might prove to be a clearly discernible accoutrement strap in the third. On the other hand, when a detail is apparent in one version, an effort should be made to confirm it in the others. Use of several images is a constant process of cross-referencing.

When it comes to picking out the details, several techniques can be employed. Much can be detected with the naked eye, but usually mechanical aids are also required. Although good quality blowups of each photograph would be of assistance, careful use of a powerful magnifying glass and, on occasion, a jeweler's eye will achieve the same results. Also, for those details difficult to define, the viewer can outline them. This simple but effective process involves getting a couple of good quality xerox copies of the photograph and literally outlining the object in question. What may have appeared as a shadow or a blur can suddenly take on the reality of a distinctive form. It must be pointed out that it is extremely doubtful that all the details of a view can be discerned in one sitting. Proper identification involves constant reviewing. Such an approach serves to confirm or disavow that previously
detected, and it will frequently produce new aspects not noticed earlier. There is no doubt that further work with the images in this study would produce even more information than what is related.

The details in a photograph can be categorized into two types: hard and soft. Hard details are actual objects with the physical qualities of definable shape and form. These are discernible via the methods just described, and should be determined first. Additional information can be ascertained by studying the soft details such as shading, shadows, texture, and reflections. Working with such produces data that is important in and of itself and also helps in understanding the hard details.

If carefully examined, shading can be used to establish important facts. In this study, it is especially valuable for determining whether or not troops in an image are uniformly dressed, especially in instances where there is a lack of distinctive hard details. The process to establish such facts requires considerable cross-referencing between figures in the same print and between the various versions of the prints themselves. As an example, a hypothetical group of photographed prisoners-of-war will be discussed. In this view, three figures are standing well in advance of a larger group of men. Those comprising the forward trio are also standing well apart from each other, while those behind are tightly bunched together. The first thing to keep in mind is that the advanced group is receiving a different light than those to the rear who by their closeness are blocking light and casting shadows on each other. Consequently, the shadings between the two groups will appear very different. The three foremost men initially
seem to be identically uniformed in dark jackets and light pants. To ascertain if this is really the case, the viewer needs to pick an isolated angle on all three which is receiving the same light and has a three dimensional quality. For instance, choose the left leg on all three, and then, examine the shading from the front section (that closest to the camera) around the left side to the area that is furthest away. Within these sections, compare all the variations in shade for each man. Do the highlighted areas, (obviously receiving the most light) match? If so, ask if the intermediate shades (reflecting less light and probably indicative of the article's true shade) are the same. Finally, compare darker, shadowed regions created by wrinkles in fabric, a piece of overhanging equipment, or simply receiving indirect light. If all these areas are identical, then one can be fairly certain that all three men are wearing the same trousers. Still, cross-referencing with the other copies of the same image is needed for confirmation. Given the variations in the qualities of the different prints, in most cases, the shading of the pants will appear lighter or darker than in the one initially studied. If, however, within the second and third prints, themselves, there is a consistency, then confirmation is acquired. On the other hand, if there is even the slightest inconsistency in one of the prints, then the trousers can not be accepted as identical. In instances where there are hard details such as pocket styles, etc., which have already been determined to be the same, this process will offer further solid substantiation that the pants are, indeed, identical.

After working with the advanced figures, examine those to the rear
in the same fashion. Having established their shadings, then a comparison between the two groups is in order. Naturally, the tones of the figures in the background are darker than those to the front, and so, on the basis of shading alone, it certainly cannot be said that the trousers in one group are the same as those in the other. Yet, if hard details were previously discerned, and these are either distinctive or abundant and appear with both parties, then, if the contrast in tones is not too great, it is possible to state that the men in both groups wear the same trousers.

There are situations where figures receiving the same light may actually be wearing the same garments, but they do not appear to be due to differences in shading. In essence, the tones of two separate pairs of pants which are, in fact, identical, can vary somewhat because of several possible factors. One pair might simply be reflecting more the effects of dirt, stains, fading, or wear. Each might be representative of a different issue or slightly varying dye lots. Here, again, an abundance of matching hard details or very distinctive ones between the two will allow the viewer to establish that they are alike. It should be noted that many photographs of Federal troops wearing the same standardized uniforms show marked variations in shades.

When analyzing shading, a check or control can be used in the assessment when there is doubt as to whether different tones are the same or not. For this work, the "Zone System" created by Ansel Adams and found in his book, The Negative, was employed. This consists of an established series of shade gradations progressing from white through various grays to black. Comparison of shades in an image with those
on the chart will determine if the tonalities match. This is not unlike using the Munsel when taking soil samples in the field.

Shadows, while frequently obscuring details, can be used to advantage. For instance, in the case of red trim on a dark coat not actually being visible itself, its presence may be determined by a shadow. In essence, a raised cord piping which is not actually discernible might create a slight shadow indicating its presence.

Reflections can also be used to great advantage. They generally indicate a glossy item such as metal or polished leather. For example, while the actual outline is not definable, a glare running across the chest of a figure from the left shoulder indicates a cartridge box sling. In the matter of discerning small items such as metallic buttons from reflections, some caution is advised. A chip in an original glass negative will cause the same effect as a small reflection when reproduced. Consequently, the viewer needs to ascertain if the apparent reflection does actually represent a button. This can generally be determined by its juxtaposition with other details; by establishing that the reflection appears where a button should appear.

Texture is also a valuable soft detail. While not as readily discernible as other features, there are several instances in this study where it has offered additional confirmation that two separate items were the same, and in a few cases, it has allowed for the actual identification of the type of material from which something was made.

It is also possible to determine the exact nature of articles that are only partially visible and determine the presence of something that can not be seen at all. This requires a prior, thorough knowledge of
the material one is attempting to detect, in this case, uniforms and equipment. For instance, familiarity with the different styles of coats and jackets and how they hang when worn can establish such an item's type even though the hem can not be seen. A particular individual in a photograph may have his coat open and held back with his hands on his hips so that the hem is not visible. Knowing the difference between how a frock coat versus a shell jacket would hang in such a situation will indicate which it is. A shell jacket is too short to be held back as such, and consequently, that which is worn can only be the longer frock coat.

The number of buttons on a jacket can be frequently estimated even though all are not visible. Two are enough if it can be ascertained that they are consecutive with none missing in between. If this can not be determined, then three are required to discern that the distance between them is the same and confirm that none are lost. Once the degree of spacing is established, it can be measured out between the collar and the waist to determine how many additional but unseen buttons there are.

Also, although neither a canteen or haversack may actually be visible, the presence of two straps over an individual's right shoulder indicates that both are carried. A single strap confirms the existence of one or the other.

As to the theoretical method employed when viewing photographs, one can use either an inductive or deductive approach. While both can be employed ultimately to achieve the same results, it must be pointed out that the deductive is by far the most efficient and effective. With
the inductive there is too great a risk for an incorrect interpreta-
tion. It involves studying the photograph first and then attempting to
identify that which is detected. The deductive method requires a thor-
ough prior knowledge of the items one is trying to discern before
examining the images. This allows the viewer a solid concept of what
to look for which the inductive does not. For such familiarity, the
viewer can rely on written sources, but a complete examination of
actual extant examples will allow a far better understanding of what is
being seen. From such a study of existing items, the researcher should
do two things. The first is to establish a typology for the different
articles. In the case of this paper, this meant defining the various
styles of Confederate military coats, jackets, vests, trousers, etc.
For each type, a complete list of attributes and their variations is
needed. The creation of a good typology orders the data for effective
use, and allows the viewer to readily identify and categorize the items
discerned in the photographs and define any new types or attributes
that might be encountered. Secondly, this data allows the formulation
of a hypothesis of the situation one expects to find in the images
against which what is actually detected can be compared. In this
instance, prior familiarization let this researcher establish a
hypothetical picture of how an average Confederate soldier should
appear in terms of what he would wear and carry.

The various items that will be discussed were found in the collec-
tions of The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia, the Smith-
sonian Institution, National Museum of American History, Washington,
D.C., the Louisiana Historical Association Confederate Museum, New
Orleans, Louisiana, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park, Fredericksburg, Virginia, Manassas National Battlefield Park, Manassas, Virginia, and Bill Turner, Clinton, Maryland.

Also necessary is a prior knowledge of related items. In this case, because the issue of Confederates wearing civilian and captured Federal clothing is in question, an understanding of these garment types is required as well. This permits comparison and lets types and attributes distinctly Southern be defined as such, which in turn, allows these items to be readily identified in the images and properly categorized. One need not be as thorough in examining related articles, but a solid concept of at least the types and their basic, key attributes is important.

When working with photographs, it is just as important to be able to determine what is not in evidence as it is to discern what actually is. Here, the deductive approach with a hypothetical concept of what should be is of major importance. It allows the viewer to detect what is not there and leads to an effort to account for its absence. Based on the preconceived hypothetical image, a checklist should be established that will help ascertain what is present and what is not. With an inductive approach, the viewer runs the risk of only identifying what is actually visible, because without a preconceived concept there is a tendency for a natural lack of awareness. This could lead to an incorrect interpretation of the photograph.

In essence, the deductive method allows the data from the images to be more immediately meaningful. The inductive is far less efficient, because the researcher is basically putting the cart before the horse.
The viewer will have to backtrack in order to identify the items perceived. The deductive also better allows particularistic details to be viewed in a comparative sense as a whole. A much larger and more meaningful picture can be attained.

What value do photographs have for historical archaeology? The point in time of both photographic development and the War Between the States is generally outside the period dealt with by members of this academic profession. In fact, the era is all too frequently ignored with justification for neglect based on such arguments as the period is well documented or too recent, and so, archaeological investigation is not necessary or even worthy of consideration. In reality, archaeological investigation of this age is needed, and for such efforts photographs will offer an indispensable source of information. They will allow the researcher to make assessments of the material culture of various segments of society, which, in turn, can be shaped into hypotheses that can be tested through excavation. Photographs will serve the same function for nineteenth century archaeology that the much relied upon Dutch Genre Paintings do for seventeenth century. Also, photographs have the potential to fulfill a capacity similar to, if not the same as, the frequently used probate inventories. In essence, they offer the ability to determine what was there and what was not.

For the particular purpose for which images were employed for this study, as will be shown, neither the written sources or their current interpretation can be relied upon to determine the true nature of the common Confederate soldier's material culture. The photographic evidence presents a very clear and contrasting view of reality. Thus,
arguments that documentation sufficiently supplies the needed information for the era and archaeology is not necessary, are not valid. Regarding the argument that the period is too recent to warrant archaeological consideration, it must be recalled that at the inception of the field in the 1930's, American Revolution sites then being investigated were only slightly more than one-hundred and fifty years old. Sites from the War Between the States are now one-hundred and twenty-five years old - not a considerable difference. The bottom line is that the era is worthy of archaeological investigation for many reasons. As the photographs will show, we do not know as much about it as we think, and archaeology will be of great value in arriving at a correct interpretation.

In all fairness, after the above criticism directed toward the present position of historical archaeology, some is also due for current practices in the historical community. In light of the material to be presented, it is time for historians to seriously take into account and utilize sources other than the written word. In many instances, documentation is simply not sufficient for the proper evaluation of a subject. This is certainly the case with this study. Yet, many have seemingly become heavily entrenched with the notion that written documents are the only valid source of information. They are not, and quite frequently, a true interpretation can not possibly be formulated until other materials are investigated and incorporated in the research scheme. Photographs constitute such a source material.
CHAPTER III

CIVILIAN DRESS, 1850-1865

As stated, a working knowledge of period garments other than Confederate military types is necessary. This allows the establishment of something against which Confederate clothing can be compared, so, when defining the types and noting their attributes, distinctions can be made and the differences properly noted. In turn, this permits the viewer to better assess and identify the articles in the photographs. Required is a familiarity with styles of civilian coats, waistcoats, and trousers between 1850 and 1865. Excepting items horribly out of fashion, this time frame encompasses the various styles worn during the war years.

Coats

During this period, there were five basic types of civilian coat. The first, the dress coat, was a tailed cutaway categorized as full or half dress. At the beginning of the 1850's, the full or evening dress style possessed a deeply rolled, long, fold-over collar/lapel configuration. The line of demarcation between collar and lapel was defined with an "M" shaped notch. Sleeves had closed cuffs and could be of one
or two piece construction. Whether single or double-breasted, this coat was always worn open. The four or five buttons were inevitably cloth covered unless the coat was blue, in which case they were gilt. Pockets were located at the waist beneath small flaps. Cut as separate pieces, the tails joined the body at the waist and extended to the backs of the knees. These coats were very fitted.¹

By the end of the period, the collar was a bit lower and narrower and was commonly faced with velvet. In addition, the lapels were cut shorter. These coats were then fashioned with a longer waist, the width of the tails was reduced, and the pockets were located in back in the pleats of the tails. Generally, there were five single or pairs of buttons depending on the cut. Very much in vogue were pegged sleeves with narrow round cuffs.² (See Illustration 1.)

For day wear, the half-dress coat was similar to the full, but differed in being worn buttoned. The arrangement of the buttons was such that it would fasten higher towards the neck than would the evening type if worn closed. This half-dress style was no longer fashionable by the 1860's.³

Next was the morning coat, described as being between a dress and frock coat in style. In essence, instead of being cutaway, the skirts sloped down and back in a marked curve from the front opening to form broad tails behind. These, too, reached to the backs of the knees and were constructed of separate pieces of fabric that joined the body of the garment at the waist. In the 1850's, these were usually single-breasted. The collar/lapel arrangement was folded over and deeply rolled with the two areas separated by a "V" notch. The lapels,
Illustration 1: Civilian Dress Coat for Evening Wear, Late 1850's, Early 1860's.
themselves, were long. Pockets were located in the pleated tails or under flaps at the waist. On occasion, there was also an external breast pocket on the left side.⁵ (See Illustration 2.)

By the 1860's, several changes had occurred. The collar/lapel construction remained essentially the same, but the collar was somewhat narrower, and the lapels were not as long (except in some examples for summer wear). The front opening was less curved, and the angle of the opening at the hem of the skirt could be rounded or squared. Double-breasted versions were more common than previously, and five single or pairs of buttons were standard. By this time, the main pockets were more likely to be at the waist and flapped, and the breast pocket increased in popularity. Pegged sleeves, too were fashionable.⁶ (See Illustration 3.)

The third type, the riding coat, was either a single or double-breasted cutaway that was worn closed. If single-breasted, there were usually four buttons, but the double-breasted versions often had more than four pairs. These garments had a rolled, fold-over collar/lapel construction with the lapels being fairly short and separated from the collar with a "V" notch. The sleeves were cut full and cuffless. Towards the end of the 1850's, this style of coat was being superseded by the morning type which began functioning for both walking and riding apparel.⁷ (See Illustration 4.)

The frock coat constitutes the fourth type encountered. In the 1850's, these could be either single or double-breasted with five single or pairs of buttons being normal and fastening the front opening fairly high. This caused the lapels to be relatively short. These lapels were wider than the collar and separated from it with only a
Illustration 2: Civilian Morning Coat, 1850's.
Illustration 3: Civilian Morning Coat, 1860's.
Illustration 4: Civilian Riding Coat, 1850's.
narrow slit. The collar itself was a low, fold-over type. Long skirts encompassed the legs and met on the line of the front opening thus eliminating any cutaway effect. Within the skirts' pleats to the back were the main pockets, and, on occasion, a small, external breast pocket graced the left side. Although sometimes small cuffs without openings were seen, the sleeves were generally not constructed with such features.  

In the 1860's, frock coats remained virtually unchanged. As with the other coat types, pegged sleeves became popular. Also, the waists were less fitted, and the skirts were cut straighter and, so, less full. (See Illustrations 5 and 6.)

Finally, in the 1850's, there were two kinds of coat, which, while essentially the same style, possessed distinctive differences. These were the lounge and the tweedside. The lounge of the period was loose fitting, single-breasted, and long enough to cover the seat of the trousers. The waist was slightly accented. There was no seam at that point, as the garment's length was created by extending the main body panels rather than attaching separate skirts. The front opening hung straight, and in back, while there were no pleats, there was a short, central vent. The front opening buttoned fairly high causing the lapels to be relatively short. Separated by a "V" notch, both collar and lapels folded over and were wide. The hem/front opening angle was rounded. Pockets were found at the waist either horizontally beneath flaps or vertically in the side seams. A left-hand external breast pocket was also common. Sleeves were cuffless and full. (See Illustration 7.)
Illustration 5: Civilian Single-Breasted Frock Coat, 1860's.
Illustration 6: Civilian Double-Breasted Frock Coat, 1860's.
Illustration 7: Civilian Lounge Coat, 1850's.
The tweedside or "baggy sack" differed from the lounge in the following respects. The waist was not accented, and the length extended to mid-thigh. Frequently, there were patch pockets located on the left breast and on either side below the waist. Also, these coats were often made without a central back seam, and if so, there was no vent. Three or four buttons were common.\(^\text{17}\) (See Illustration 8.)

By the 1860's, the lounge and tweedside types were fairly synonymous. The distinctive attributes once peculiar to each were now interchanged, and there were new characteristics as well. The number of buttons varied from as many as five to as few as one in what were considered more stylish versions. Although the collar remained a low, fold-over type, these coats could be constructed with or without lapels. Rear vents, too, were optional. In line with the fashion trends of the day, the sleeves were pegged.\(^\text{18}\) (See Illustration 9.)

There are a couple of characteristics common to all of the above garments. Such were rarely completely lined. As a rule, only the sleeves and those areas that were visible received this treatment. Also, the hems were left with a raw edge.\(^\text{19}\)

**Waistcoats**

During the 1850's, waistcoats (vests) were divided into day and evening styles. The day type could be either single or double-breasted. Those with the former method of closure could have either a rolled, shawl collar/lapel construction with which the two areas were not separated, or the newer, flat laying collars with stepped lapels.
Illustration 8: Civilian Tweedside Coat, 1850's.
Illustration 9: Civilian Lounge/Tweedside/Sack Coat, 1860's.
These were sometimes of a different fabric. The hem/front opening area was slightly cut back to form a small, inverted "V" gap. The depth of the neck opening varied according to season. In essence, buttoning higher in winter, there was a correspondingly shallower neck region with the reverse being the case for summer wear. Needless to say, this effected the length of the lapels. Six buttons were common. Also, welted pockets were frequently found towards the waist on both sides of the front and sometimes there was a left breast pocket as well.\(^{22}\) (See Illustrations 10 and 13.)

The double-breasted versions were basically the same except for the following. If constructed with demarcation between collar and lapels, the lapels were cut extremely wide with points that frequently buttoned down. As with the single-breasted version, the depth of the neck opening varied according to season. Its configuration could be either a "V" or "U" shape. There were usually three or four pairs of buttons, and the hem was cut straight.\(^{23}\) (See Illustration 11.)

The evening vest was always single-breasted. The collar/lapels were a deeply rolled, shawl type which created a deep "V" neck opening. These were occasionally a different color. Anywhere from four to six buttons were used. The front hem was cut straight without a gap, and usually, there was a pocket on each side of the front opening towards the waist.\(^{24}\) (See Illustration 12.)

By the 1860's, the following changes had occurred. With single-breasted day vests, the inverted "V" gap of the hem/front opening area was eliminated, the hem being cut virtually straight. The neck opening was cut fairly shallow with resultant shorter lapels.\(^{25}\)
Illustration 10: Civilian Single-Breasted Vest for Winter, 1850's.  

Illustration 11: Civilian Double-Breasted Vest for Summer, 1850's.  

Illustration 12: Civilian Vest for Evening Wear, 1850's, Early 1860's.
Illustration 13: Civilian Single-Breasted Vest, Early 1860's, Reflecting Stylistic Features of Both That and Previous Decade.
In addition, two new styles of single-breasted vest were becoming popular. That termed the "American Vest" in England was of the same basic pattern but lacked collar and lapels. These fastened fairly high. The other type was the "French Vest". With these, the lapels were not cut separately, and consequently, they did not lie totally flat. These also closed high and employed from five to eight buttons. \(^{30}\) (See Illustration 14.)

The double-breasted waistcoat of this era possessed an extremely stepped collar/lapel arrangement. Whereas the lapel might be as wide as four inches, the collar could be as narrow as one and a half. The lapel points were commonly stitched down. At this time, four pairs of buttons were the general rule. \(^{31}\)

Evening vests changed very little. A small cutaway at the base was introduced. Also, the number of buttons was fairly standardized at four. \(^{32}\)

Throughout this period, the backs of all vests were constructed of a different, lighter weight fabric. In addition, they were belted in the rear so that the fit could be adjusted. \(^{33}\)

**Trousers**

By the mid-1850's, normal trousers were cut straight and long. Generally, they seem to have fit rather snugly through the hips, but could be either tight or loose fitting through the leg. \(^{34}\) Those labeled "American" trousers in Britain were fashionable. These were, "...gathered into a narrow waistband with pockets in the side seams."
Illustration 14: Confederate Officer's Military Vest Cut According to Civilian "American" Vest Pattern.
and "...may be worn without braces as the waistband may be fastened behind by buckle and strap." Side seam pockets appear to have been virtually universal during the period. After 1850, true vents in the rear were not considered stylish, and a waistband which was continuous all the way around was emerging in addition to the buckling type. The seats of pants were generally constructed with an inserted pentagonal panel on either side of the rear seam. Slits or vents at the outside of the cuffs, previously stylish, were also no longer considered to be so. All trousers had a central fly which buttoned. The buttons, themselves, for both the fly and suspenders (if worn), were generally black japanned metal, but they could be of bright brass. (See Illustration 15.)

During the 1860's, everyday pants remained pretty much the same. Those with loose fitting legs were the most common for day wear during the first half of the decade. Also, a new pocket style was evolving. With this, the main opening was horizontal, but because there was a rounded flap, there was a slight vertical opening as well. Except for evening wear, however, these were not common for civilian pants until after 1865.

Evening trousers of both decades were cut to fit tight. While the rounded flap style of pocket emerged in the 1860's, evening pants of the 1850's usually possessed a "cash" pocket. This is described as a 'semicircular' pocket opening in the front." An additional type of trouser appeared in the late 1850's, and continued to be worn through the mid-sixties. This was the pegged type for day wear. In essence, such were cut full in the hips and thighs
Illustration 15: Civilian Trousers, 1850's. Early 1860's.
and then tapered radically to fit tight at the ankles. The purpose was supposedly to aesthetically mirror the tapered effect of the pegged coat sleeves.\textsuperscript{41}
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CHAPTER IV

NORTHERN UNIFORMS

As a working knowledge of civilian clothing is required, so is an understanding of the basic types of Northern military uniforms and their attributes. These can be divided into three categories: those issued by the central government, those issued by the various states to the volunteer regiments, and those privately procured by volunteer units. Clothing of Federal government origin accounts for the vast majority of uniforms worn during the period covered in the paper. As a result, only certain pertinent types of state and privately procured uniforms will be examined. With central government clothing, there was a high level of standardization in terms of types and their attributes in accordance with the regulations. For example, with Federal enlisted mens' frock coats, any variations encountered would be minor.

Federal Issue

The Single-Breasted Frock Coat

The single-breasted frock coat was that prescribed for full-dress for dismounted United States Regulars. It was, however, commonly issued to state volunteers as well, and soldiers of either status
frequently wore them for field service. This was a long garment with skirts extending roughly one half to two thirds of the way from the waist to the knees. Except in the area of the two back-pieces, the skirts were cut separate and attached to the upper body at the waist. At the points where these separate panels joined the two back pieces below the waist, there were pleats, and between these, there was a long central vent. At the top of each pleat at the tackover, a large, decorative button was affixed. In the back inside the linings of the skirts, there were pockets which were accessible internally. The hems were left with a raw edge. Fastening from the waist to the throat with nine buttons, these coats lacked lapels. The collar was a stand-up type of two-piece construction. About one and a half inches in height, these collars had angled front edges with points that could be either sharply angled or very slightly rounded. The upper bodies of these garments were formed by six panels which created a fitted appearance. Cut from two pieces, each sleeve had a seam running up the front and the back. The rear seam was left open at the cuff and fastened with two small buttons. Dark blue in overall color, there was decorative piping in the appropriate service branch hue around the cuffs and collar. Also, it was intended that brass shoulder scales adorn these coats. These and the fittings to which they attached, however, were generally removed for wear in the field.¹ (See Illustration 16.)

As will be seen, a coat of this same basic type was also worn in Confederate service. There were, however, considerable differences in attributes which readily distinguishes between Northern and Southern versions.
Illustration 16: United States Army Regulation Frock Coat.
The Uniform Jacket

Although frequently referred to as a shell jacket, this article, designated as full-dress for mounted troops, is more appropriately termed the uniform jacket. As with the single-breasted frock coat, this was worn by regulars and state troops alike for field as well as parade duty. The cut was short (waist length) and fitted, with body construction of six panels. Each sleeve was made from two pieces of fabric resulting in seams up both the front and back. Like the previous type, the rear seam was left open at the cuff and fastened with two buttons. Also single-breasted, the front opening closed from the hem to the neck with twelve small buttons thus eliminating lapels. Of two piece construction, the collar was an extremely high stand-up type with angled front and points. The hem of the uniform jacket was very distinctive. Cut higher on the sides, it dropped severely to form a pointed configuration in both front and back. In the rear, at the bottom of the side-body seams, were what were termed pillows. These were padded projections designed to support the waist belt and keep the garment from pulling out from beneath it. While the overall base color was again dark blue, jackets of this type were literally covered with decorative piping of contrasting hue designating branch of service. Such was found around the cuffs, along the hem, over the pillows, up the front opening and rear side-body seams, and about the base, front and top of the collar. In addition, within the trim delineating the collar, there was more piping in the form of two bars on each side. At the rearmost end of each, a small, decorative button was mounted.
Shoulder scales were also to be worn with the uniform jacket, but, as with the frock coat, these were generally removed for field service. This large number of unique and distinctive attributes readily identifies this garment and distinguishes it from any Confederate military jackets. (See Illustration 17.)

The Sack Coat

The sack coat was by far the most common coat or jacket type worn in the Union army. Designed especially for fatigue wear, these were sported by all troops regardless of service branch. Loose and unflatteringly, these coats hung straight from the shoulders to a length slightly longer than that of the sleeves. In essence, as with the civilian lounge from which this type evolved, the length was such that the seat of the pants would be covered. Construction consisted of three panels. The two foreparts extended around to the left and right rear quarters and there joined a third section which formed the back of the garment. Consequently, there was no rear center seam or vent. Like the previous garments, the sleeves were cut from two pieces of material which resulted in the same seam locations. The rear seam, however, was technically not slit at the cuff, but at that point the angle of the cuff was rounded off slightly with the effect that a small opening of sorts was created. There were no buttons here. Sack coats were single-breasted and fastened with four buttons from the neck to a point about three-quarters of the way down the front. The hem/front opening angle was severely rounded. The collar was a simple, fairly narrow
Illustration 17: United States Army Regulation Uniform Jacket.
fold-over style with rounded points. Internally, in the left forepart, there was a large pocket the presence of which was indicated by the top-stitching which secured it through the outer body section. Top-stitching was also employed on all edges and the article was hemmed. Made of dark blue flannel, sack coats possessed no trim denoting branch of service.⁵ (See Illustration 18.)

These articles were quite distinctive. While a garment of this basic type saw very limited wear by Southern troops, the Federal sack coat differed greatly from any of the types commonly worn in Confederate service. Even between it and its rare Southern counterpart, there were major dissimilarities in attributes which readily differentiated one from the other.

The Shell Jacket

The Federal shell jacket or roundabout was a fitted garment of roughly waist length. Its construction consisted of six body panels with sleeves of two pieces. The bottom of the rear sleeve seam was left open and fastened with two buttons. The hem line was cut straight. Secured with eight or ten buttons from the hem to the neck, the front opening was single-breasted. The stand-up collar was squared at the front. Constructed of dark blue fabric, there does not seem to have been any trim.⁶ (See Illustration 19.)

This jacket is the same basic type as that most commonly worn in Confederate service. Northern and Southern shell jackets can, however, be distinguished between in the photographs. The dark shade the Feder-
Illustration 18: United States Army Regulation Sack Coat.
al version will appear is enough to readily distinguish it from the majority of Southern manufacture. With those Confederate examples which, because of their actual dark color appear a dark shade as well, variation in attributes serves to establish a correct provenance.

In addition, given the Union version's history, it would be impossible for such to even appear on Confederate soldiers except, perhaps, in very late war photographs, and even with these, scant consideration should be given to the possibility as it is extremely remote. The Federal shell jacket was designated for members of the signal corps. This group was not officially organized until March 3, 1863. Prior to this, soldiers acting in the capacity of signalmen were on detached duty from other service branches and undoubtedly wore the uniform of their original command. Furthermore, a distinctive signal corps uniform such as that described was not authorized until extremely late in the conflict, and even then, evidence indicates that not all members received them. This late period of issue combined with the small number of men actually wearing these in a small unit and their general role of not being front line troops makes it extremely unlikely that any of the dark examples of this jacket type seen on Confederate troops is of Northern origin. In essence, the supply of these to the front would have been quite small and of short duration at the end of the war with the limited number of troops wearing them generally not being in a position to be taken prisoner. Consequently, even if there was any inclination on the part of Southern soldiers to procure and wear these, there was very little time or opportunity for them to do so. They simply were not readily available.
Federal Trousers

From March, 1858, to December, 1861, dark blue was the prescribed color for trousers for enlisted troops. Prior to this and after, sky blue was the regulation hue. Because of the comparatively small size of the prewar standing army, only a limited number of dark blue pants existed at the commencement of hostilities. In fact, there is belief that the supply of these was never sufficient to clothe even the regulars who, as a result, still wore articles of the earlier sky blue.¹⁰

This point is brought up, because, as will be seen, a fair number of trousers worn by Confederates in the photographs are a dark shade. That any of these are of Federal origin is an impossibility when one considers the limited number of dark blue Union pants that existed, the short time frame during the war of only eight months in which they were issued, and, in conjunction, the fact that the earliest photograph examined was taken nine months after their official issue ceased. In fact, the reverse is true. With the sky blue color long established at the times the images were recorded, the dark shade of a pair of trousers supports that they are of Southern origin and probably representative of either dark gray or dark blue Confederate issue.

On the other hand, the readoption of the sky blue color for Union wear intensifies the problem of differentiating between Northern and Southern manufacture in the photographs. This is because the same color was issued in the South as regulation, and, in turn, (as previously stated) in a black and white image, this color is indistinguishable from lighter gray pants which were also issued. Furthermore,
trousers are basically trousers, and in general terms, the types commonly worn by each side were similar in their general characteristics. Fortunately, as will be shown, between Confederate and Federal pants, considerable variation existed in their specific attributes. When visible, these distinctive features firmly establish place of origin.

In the effort to determine what, if any, differences in attributes really existed between them, hands on work was required with Northern as well as Southern trousers. The U.S. regulation trousers examined included both prewar examples (pre 1858) and pairs dating directly to the era of conflict. Throughout, there was a marked degree of standardization with the few variations encountered appearing on articles from both time frames. From the extant examples studied and what has been written the following characteristics can be determined to be indicative of Federal issue pants.

As stated, the color of Northern trousers after December, 1861, was sky blue. This was not the same as what would be termed sky blue today. It was considerably darker, and after wear, it had a tendency to take on a greenish caste. The fabric itself was heavy, kersey wool.¹¹

These garments were cut quite full and long enough that the cuff broke over the shoe and almost dragged on the ground behind. There was a central fly that fastened with five buttons, inclusive of that for the waistband. Support was achieved with suspenders.¹² (See Illustration 20.)

Two distinct pocket styles were employed; the side seam and the frog or wing. It is debated which was more frequently used, but all
Illustration 20: United States Army Regulation Trousers for Dismounted Wear.
indications point to the side seam as being, far and away, the dominant pattern. All examples examined had this kind. Also, logic dictates that these were the most common. Given mass production, side seam pockets would be the easier to make, require less time and material, and, as a result, be less costly. In essence, their construction basically involved leaving the side seam open for a distance below the waistband, hemming the pocket edge, and sewing in the lining. Simply a vertical slit, the top of the opening began from one half to one inch below the waistband seam.\textsuperscript{14} (See Illustration 21.)

With the frog style, there was a combined vertical and horizontal opening of equal length which resulted in a squared flap. This flap was fastened closed with a button at the corner of the two opening angles. It should be pointed out that it has been suggested that this type of pocket was not used on Federal issue at all, and those pants that have them are representative of items either distributed by the states or privately procured.\textsuperscript{15} (See Illustration 21.)

At least sometimes, with trousers designed for mounted wear, there were no major pockets at all.\textsuperscript{16}

From all examples studied and from other sources, it is evident that watch pockets were universal.\textsuperscript{17} As with the main pockets, there were two different styles. One basically consisted of a slit in the waistband seam.\textsuperscript{18} With the other, although the opening was still in the waistband seam itself, a small welt was applied that extended up and over the bottom edge of the waistband.\textsuperscript{19} In either case, the watch pockets were located on the right hand side. (See Illustration 21.)
Illustration 21: Variation in Pocket Construction for United States Army Regulation Trousers.
As mentioned, the flies of these garments buttoned shut. The fly proper fastened with four buttons affixed to the right side of the opening. These joined with an internal panel and were not visible when the fly was closed. Another button, above, secured the ends of the waistband and was exposed through the left end of the band when secured. A pair for mounted issue had two buttons (one over the other) which finished closing the fly in the same manner.21

The front ends of the waistband were squared. In following the band around to the rear, it could taper slightly in width, but generally did not. The width itself varied from one and one quarter to one and three quarters inches. In back, both the waistband and the upper part of the central rear seam were split to create a vent. Here, also, the ends of the band were squared, and in each on either side of the vent, there was an eyelet. Through these ran a lace that was tied to adjust the fit. None of the examples observed possessed belted backs. Such supposedly existed, but indications are that they were quite rare and found only on trousers for mounted wear.22 (See Illustration 20.)

In the seat, there were inevitably pieced in panels. Again, two variations existed. By far the most common were those that extended in from the side seams and met at the rear center seam with the lower edges angling down to form a point at the center of the trouser's seat.23 A variation existed which, while more common on prewar versions, was observed on a pair dating to the conflict. Consisting of two squared panels meeting at the rear center seam, these did not extend to either side seam. Instead, they were set in so that an
additional, vertical seam runs down from the waistband on each quarter, and then, with an inward right angle towards the center, a horizontal seam was formed across the seat. For mounted wear, the crotch, seat, and inner legs to the cuff were to be reinforced by applying another layer of fabric. (See Illustration 22.)

The cuffs of Federal trousers were cut square. There was inevitably a small slit or vent at that point on each side seam. With mounted issue, there was usually a strap extending down from the cuff which ran from seam to seam. When worn, this passed under the instep of the foot.

The buttons of Federal pants were of tinned iron with four holes and a depressed center. Those for the fly were 9/16ths in diameter, and those for the waistband and suspenders were 5/8ths inches. There were six suspender buttons. Four were affixed to the front with a pair being evenly spaced between the side seam and fly opening on either side. The remaining two were mounted in back on each side of the vent. (See Illustration 20.)

As to trim on Federal trousers, those for privates had none. For corporals, a half inch strip of worsted lace ran down each side seam from waist to cuff. Sergeants' pants were also adorned with lace in the same manner, but for them, the width was one and a half inches. This trim was to be of the service branch color, excepting the later infantry sky blue version with which it was to be dark blue.

The above attributes define Federal issue trousers. As mentioned, there is a high degree of standardization with these as witnessed with the extant examples and described in the written sources. An examination of photographs of Union troops strongly supports this. On very
Illustration 22: Variation in Seat Construction for United States Army Regulation Trousers.29
rare occasions in the images, a variation is detectable, but these are truly exceptions to the rule and probably indicative of items of state issue or privately procured.

State Issue and Privately Procured Uniforms

State Issue Shell Jackets

Through February, 1862, some Northern states which were able to do so supplied their volunteer troops with state uniforms. At that point, the Federal government temporarily put an end to the procedure, but as of July, 1862, certain states were again allowed to issue their own clothing. From this time, at least, however, the practice was usually only allowed for a newly organized unit's initial issue. After that, upon being accepted for active Federal duty, they were to receive the standard central government issue previously described. As of March 31, 1864, the issue of state uniforms was again authorized against, this time permanently. 30

Of the various types of coats and jackets given out at the state level, one, the shell jacket, was the same basic type as that most commonly worn in Confederate service. Consequently, it will be discussed in order to understand it and be able to discern if any are worn by Confederate soldiers in the photographs. These were commonly issued to New York troops, and men from Illinois and Indiana also received a fair number. In addition, such were occasionally sported by men from Ohio. 31
In terms of basic construction, these were the same or very similar to the shell jackets later issued to members of the Signal Corps. Because of this, only the more specific attributes of the state versions will be discussed. The New York shell jacket was presented regularly to that state's troops during those periods when authorized by the central government. After July, 1862, (and undoubtedly in a number of instances prior) however, its wear primarily represented only a soldier's initial issue ultimately to be replaced with a central government uniform after acceptance into Federal service. These were very standardized and possessed distinctive characteristics. Eight buttons extending down from the neck closed the front to a point about two or three inches short of the hem, with the hem/front opening angle being severely rounded. From the sides to the front, the hem itself seems to have angled down slightly. The front edge of the stand-up collar angled back. Epaulets adorned the shoulders, and belt loops were mounted on either side at the waist. Some, at least, had external, welted breast pockets on the right side. A dark blue in base color, the collar, epaulets, and belt loops were trimmed in bright, light blue piping. (See Illustration 23.)

The Illinois version was issued fairly regularly until February, 1862. At that time the central government took over the responsibility of clothing that state's troops and officially continued to do so even after repealing the ban in July. Some Illinois units, however, still received the state jacket as initial issue through 1862. This garment was very similar to that of New York, but variations could exist in attributes. Generally, they possessed epaulets, belt loops, an
external left breast pocket, and nine buttons to close the front. Evidence, however, indicates that sometimes the first three of these attributes were not always incorporated, and there might only be eight buttons. Decorative trim around the collar also seems to have been optional. The hem/front opening angle could be either rounded or squared, with the front hem line cut fairly straight. The front edge of the collar was gently rounded. The backs of the cuffs were slit and buttoned. The base color of this jacket was also dark blue.$^{34}$

About October, 1861, Indiana began to issue her volunteers dark blue shell jackets. Apparently untrimmed, these were of standard cut and construction. There were nine front buttons, and the slit cuffs each fastened with two. At one point, probably in July, 1862, the state was allowed to reissue clothing to its men actually in the field. At this time, many of the garments sent were already regulation pattern frock coats, and by Fall, 1862, the central government sack coat was the most common type presented to Indiana soldiers. The shell jacket was relegated to a minor, supplementary status.$^{35}$

With Ohio volunteers, most received uniforms conforming to Federal regulations, but at some point after 1863, certain units including the 30th, 34th, 35th, 36th, 64th, 65th, and 77th infantry regiments, received shell jackets from their home state. Drawings reconstructing the jackets of the 30th and 35th Ohio show attributes that are both the same and different. Each closes with nine buttons and has a fairly high collar. Both are dark blue in base color and have hems which drop slightly to create a shallow pointed effect. Here, the similarities stop. The front edge of the collar of the 30th's is cut square, while
that of the 35th's is angled. The hem/front opening angle of the former is rounded, and that of the latter is clipped to form an inverted "V" notch. While the 30th's lacks trim, that of the 35th is covered with white piping around the cuffs and collar and along the hem and front opening. At least that of the lower numbered regiment had three decorative buttons at the back of each cuff. To further point out the variations that existed in Ohio shell jackets, those worn by the 77th infantry had eleven buttons.\textsuperscript{36}

As with the Federal shell jacket, given the history of the state issue versions, there is very little reason for concern that any of the dark jackets worn by Southern soldiers in the photographs originated from one of these states and represent captured articles. Again, even if there was an inclination on the part of Confederate troops to procure and wear such, the time and opportunity to acquire them was extremely limited. For a long period prior to the date of the first photograph examined, the number of state jackets available on an individual basis (as in taking one from a prisoner or casualty) would have been minimal. Because of the ban on issuing state clothing between February and July, 1862, the vast majority of troops from New York, Illinois, and Indiana would have been in Federal issue. The units raised during this period would have received such initially, and those raised previously would undoubtedly have long had their state clothing replaced. Excepting the rare occurrence of Indiana resupplying some of her people actually on active service with state jackets, and perhaps a few other isolated and infrequent incidents of other states doing the
same, after July, the only units wearing state shell jackets would have been those newly raised. The availability of these is decreased when it is recalled that their wear was only for short duration until replaced. Limiting the number even more is the fact that after July, Indiana was rapidly phasing out their issue, and Illinois was offering them only on a limited basis as the central government had officially taken over clothing her volunteers. Furthermore, very few Illinois troops served in the Virginia theater. Finally, because these jackets were primarily offered only as initial issue prior to leaving the state, there would have been very few if any actual stores of these near the front available for capture.

With the Ohio jackets, the same basic arguments of minimal availability in terms of time and numbers holds true. Their issue, although to troops actually in the field, seems to have been a one shot situation only to a limited number of units. In turn, of the commands that received these, only one has been identified as serving in the Virginia theater at the time of issue.

Given the nature of the issue and wear of these jackets, the possibility that any would turn up on Confederate prisoners or casualties in the photographs is extremely remote. Furthermore, in the unlikely situation that any of these are worn, there is even less possibility that they would be misidentified as Confederate. Despite being the same basic type, each of the Northern versions possesses distinctive attributes either singularly or combined that would mark their place of origin.
Zouave Uniforms

Usually privately procured, the zouave uniform was another type worn by both Federal and Confederate volunteers. Of Arabic pattern, essentially the jackets and pants were the same stylistically for each side, with many distinctive variations in attributes for each unit. The jackets were basically characterized by an extremely short length and, frequently, a dramatically undulating hem line. The number of buttons could range from zero to many on the front opening, but generally, even if present, they were purely decorative with the garment fastening only at the neck. Most commonly, these were collarless. Although dark blue was the most encountered hue, base colors could vary considerably. The most noticeable feature usually observed was an incredible amount of decorative trim of contrasting tone. (See Illustration 24.)

Two types of pants could be worn with this jacket. The more appropriate but less common were those of true zouave pattern. These are described as,

...like nothing normally tailored in this country. They can best be likened to a flaring skirt that falls well below knee level and whose bottom is sewn together except for holes large enough to admit the leg at either end. These trousers, naturally extremely full, were gathered at the waist with pleats. (See Illustration 25.)

More commonly worn with the zouave jacket were what were termed chasseur trousers. These,

...were full but cut in the conventional manner. They were gathered at the waist with pleats, and below the knee into wide cuffs fastened by buckles or buttons. They were always worn with gaiters of some sort.

It was common to decorate the fronts of chasseur trousers
Illustration 24: Zouave Jacket as Worn By 9th New York Volunteer Infantry (Hawkin's Zouaves).
Illustration 25: Zouave Trousers.
with knots made of cord or lace, and to run stripes of the same down each side. (See Illustration 78.)

These also seem to have been made with extremely pegged cuffs.

With the exception of a few elite units on either side, these uniforms were not worn after the first months of the war. Consequently, for the same reasons of limited numbers, time, and opportunity combined with the much later dates of the photographs, there are no grounds for believing that any of this garment type seen in the images is of Northern origin. Even if the situation arose in which a Confederate soldier might procure one of these, it is highly doubtful that it would be worn due to their distinctive and impractical nature.

Other Northern Uniform Articles

Vests

Vests were not prescribed by Federal regulations for issue to enlisted men. Yet, photographs do show them being worn. These must be items privately procured on an individual basis, or, perhaps, they are holdovers of state issue. In the case of portrait views, some might be studio props. Because those worn with the regulation uniform were very similar if not the same in style and cut as their Confederate counterparts, the reader is referred to the chapter on Southern uniforms. The only major difference between Federal and Confederate was in color. Union versions were dark blue.

A type of vest as distinctive as the rest of the outfit was commonly worn with the zouave uniform. While commonly creating the illusion
of fastening up the front, many actually closed beneath the arm with buttons, ties, or buckles.  

Headgear

The types of hats and caps worn by Northern soldiers were essentially the same in style as those sported by Confederates, and so, these patterns will be described in detail later in the chapter dealing with Southern uniforms. In terms of military caps, although that type labeled a kepi was worn in volunteer units and by officers, that referred to as a forage or fatigue style was the one designated in the Federal regulations. As with other uniform articles, most Northern soldiers received these following their initial state issue. While conforming to a basic pattern, there was variation in the lesser attributes of these caps such as the cut of the visor and the height of the crown. The main feature usually distinguishing these from Southern versions was the dark blue color and lack of decorative trim of contrasting hue.  

Another type of hat prescribed by Federal regulations was the dress or Hardee hat. Also worn in the field, this was a black felt surrounded by a medium width brim. The crown was quite high with a slight taper to the sides. Depending on service branch, the brim was pinned up on one side or the other. This hat style was not issued to Confederate troops.  

Union troops also wore civilian style hats of felt or straw (the former being more common). In some cases at least these were issued
Forage or Fatigue Cap.  
Dress or Hardee Hat.

Illustration 26: United States Army Regulation Headgear.
with the result that a unit's headgear was of uniform style. With the zouave regiments, a fez and turban were sometimes worn.

**Footwear**

The shoes prescribed by the regulations and most commonly worn by Northern soldiers were termed Jefferson bootees. Lacing up the front generally via four pairs of eyelets, these were ankle height. Black in color, these were constructed of heavy leather with the rough side out. Although issued to both dismounted and mounted troops, there was an additional type designated for horsemen. This was a medium height, pull-on boot of Wellington style. They were to be worn under the trousers.48 (See Illustration 27.)

High, pull-on boots were not authorized but were worn by mounted troops with great frequency. Although certainly some units were issued these, the members of most units acquired theirs privately on an individual basis. Consequently, there was a great diversity of patterns.49 (See Illustration 27.)

Leggings were also worn by foot troops. Although most conformed to the same basic pattern and concept, there was considerable variation in construction. Some were of leather while others were of canvas. Some buckled, some laced, and others buttoned. Of course, those worn with the zouave uniform were very distinctive. With Union troops, the frequency of their issue and wear diminished as the war progressed, the soldiers preferring to tuck their cuffs into their socks, roll them up, or simply let them hang loose.50 (See Illustration 28.)
Illustration 27: United States Army Regulation and Nonregulation Footwear.
Illustration 28: United States Army and Volunteer Leggings. 52.
Greatcoats

One final item of central government issue that needs to be mentioned is the greatcoat. While similar in basic design, two distinct versions exist: one for dismounted troops and the other for mounted. Made of heavy, sky blue kersey wool, each sort extended in length to below the knee and possessed a cape. Also, both styles were of four panel construction. In essence, each forepart was cut to include the areas created by the separate side-bodies of other garments. Extending around to the rear quarters, each forepart met with one of two back-pieces which, in turn, joined with each other to form a central back seam. The length was attained by extending these four panels rather than adding separate skirt pieces. The capes were fashioned from a single piece of fabric. The sleeves were made from two. In each case, the backs were belted so that the fit could be adjusted, and a long, central rear vent existed below the waist. Large turned-back cuffs were features common to each pattern. Top-stitching was employed on all edges except the hem which was left raw. Here the similarities ceased. Whereas the cape of the dismounted version was only to reach the elbow when the arm was extended, that for the mounted type was to reach the cuff when the arm was in a like position. With the former, the front of the cape closed with six or seven buttons, while with the latter, twelve were employed to secure it. The front opening of the body of the foot soldier's version closed in single-breasted fashion with five buttons. The horseman's was double-breasted, fastening with six pairs of buttons. While each style possessed a very high collar,
there was variation here as well. The dismounted kind had a stand-up type with a squared front edge. This was heavily top-stitched throughout causing a quilted effect. The coat for mounted wear had a stand-and-fall or fold-over type. The greatcoat was commonly worn by both regulars and volunteers. It was designed for cold weather usage and was employed for both parade and field duty. (See Illustration 29.)

The above described uniform articles represent either those most commonly worn in Federal service or those that bear some resemblance to Southern military clothing. Other garments were certainly in evidence, but such saw limited service and were either too specialized and distinctive to warrant discussion or their wear does not fall within the time frame examined in this study. For instance, at the very beginning of the war a number of Northern states issued gray shell jackets to their volunteers. This practice, however, ceased early on at a time too far removed from that of the earliest photographs to give them consideration.
Illustration 29: United States Army Regulation Greatcoat for Dismounted Wear.
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CHAPTER V

THE CONFEDERATE UNIFORM

As mentioned, an in depth study of extant versions of the items one is attempting to locate and identify in the photographs is necessary. For this paper, original Confederate uniform articles were examined. In the course of research, a total of thirty-eight coats and jackets, nineteen pairs of trousers, six vests, twenty-three caps and hats, six pairs of shoes and boots, and one cape, attributed to Southern enlisted men were worked with. Generally, this revealed a number of different types within each category, the distinctive attributes of which readily distinguish them from civilian and Federal clothing. The majority of these were studied "hands on" which allowed all aspects to be scrutinized. Some, however, were on display. These could not be observed as thoroughly, and certain details were not always discernible with the result that in the course of reading this paper, the reader will sometimes find that the total number of examples within a given category of attribute does not equal the total number of garments in the sample. Unless otherwise noted, types and attributes were ordered in accordance with frequency of appearance. In instances where equal numbers of two or more different types or attributes were encountered, their placement in the typology was based on considerations of written documentation,
practicality, and/or shared similarities with previously established types and attributes. Barring the ability to do this, their place was chosen arbitrarily. This typology and the analysis of the uniforms in the photographs is based on the data acquired from these existing specimens. Because of this, in conjunction with the fact that all types and, where possible, their attributes are illustrated, unless otherwise indicated, these garments will be documented in the illustrations.

In addition, certain aspects are not formally typed. Included are buttons and fabrics, as these technically constitute separate entities in themselves deserving and requiring their own separate typologies. Such are merely described comparatively. Also not typed are the colors of fabrics and the various sewing techniques used. Because of various factors discussed later, many garments no longer reflect their original hues. Consequently, any effort to define what they initially were and categorize them appropriately would prove a study in futility. As to the sewing techniques, these are so varied in many cases that they defy being ranked in any organized fashion. These two aspects will, also, only be described.

When only a single example of a given type exists, no typology of attributes will be formed for the simple reason that there is no grounds for comparison. The garment's features will merely be described with emphasis on those marking it as a distinct type. Also, when all garments representative of a specific type share the same attribute without variation, generally, the feature in question will
not formally be given a style designation. Under the circumstances, it is to be assumed by the reader that such characteristics represent Style A in light of the possibility that future research may reveal a garment with variant attributes indicative of Style B or even C.

The uniforms studied include all known articles available for examination, and the ninety-three items to be described form a large sample representative of the range of clothing worn during the war. Furthermore, enhancing and supporting the representative nature of the sample is the fact that there is no readily accounting for why one soldier's outfit, or parts of it, have survived, and others have not. The factors that would explain this are extremely multifaceted with such intangible aspects as personal emotion, whim, and/or belief on the part of the wearer or his descendants undoubtedly playing a part. In essence, plain uniforms, those of lesser quality, or ones in relatively poor condition are just as likely to be extant as those that are fancy, superior, or pristeen. This factor in association with size, mark the sample as exemplary and illustrative of the reality of the situation.

Furthermore, the uniforms described are not limited only to those worn in the Army of Northern Virginia. Such restrictions would have resulted in a sample too small to be representative, and it would have defied the establishment of a valid typology. Consequently, all garments that were encountered, regardless of the specific force or region in which they were worn, are included. By doing so, the size of the sample was increased, thus allowing a more effective and thorough basis for establishing and comparing variations. A more complete picture of Confederate uniforms is attained as is a more solid foundation for
interpreting what is witnessed in the photographs. It will be stated here that after examination and comparison, no identifiable differences were encountered between uniforms provenanced to the Army of Northern Virginia and those worn elsewhere. This validates the inclusion of outfits attributed, for instance, to the Army of Tennessee, in the sample and marks it as representative of the entire Confederate military establishment.

A few of the garments studied date to early in the conflict, and are included in the sample as well. They allow a basis against which uniforms of later periods can be compared to determine what, if any, changes in styles, attributes, and quality occurred.

With both the photographs and extant uniform items offering representative samples of reality, an even stronger image of how the common Confederate soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia actually appeared is achieved. A situation is created in which comparison can be made between two diverse sources enabling us to ascertain the validity of each in and of itself. Still, given the varied factors effecting each, it should in no way be expected that the specific data complement each other in terms of such things as the frequency and order of attributes defined in the photographs matching that of the established typology. Still, much does, and much that does not can be accounted for. More importantly, however, is that in terms of the more general information offered, pertinent to the overall purpose of this study, photographs and uniform articles mirror each other perfectly. Thus, in support of each other, even more weight is given to the argument that the Southern
enlisted man in the Virginia theater was well appointed with regards to clothing.

**Coats and Jackets**

**Type A: The Enlisted Man's Double-Breasted Frock Coat**

Six examples of enlisted men's double-breasted frock coats were examined. These are designated as Type A, not because of the frequency of their existence, but rather because it is the style officially designated by the central government as Confederate regulation for all enlisted men regardless of service branch. The regulations state.

The uniform coat shall be a double-breasted tunic of gray cloth, known as cadet gray, with the skirt extending halfway between the hip and the knee; two rows of buttons on the breast, 7 in each row; the distance between the rows 4 inches at top and 3 inches at bottom; stand-up collar to rise no higher than to permit the chin to turn freely over it; to hook in front at the bottom, and slope thence backwards at an angle of 30 degrees on each side; cuffs 2-1/2 inches deep at the underseam, to button with two small buttons, and to be slightly pointed on the upper part of the arm; pockets in the folds of the skirts. The collar and cuffs to be of the color prescribed for facings for the respective arms of the service, and the edges of the tunic to be trimmed throughout with the same colored cloth. Narrow lining in the skirts of tunic of gray material. For front line troops, the facing colors referred to were light blue for infantry, red for artillery, and yellow for cavalry. It is interesting to note that the official illustrations for these coats show three cuff buttons, and an official tailor's plate presents a pattern for skirts longer than those indicated. (See Illustration 31.)

The most noticeable attribute of a double-breasted Confederate or
Illustration 30: An Enlisted Man's Double-Breasted Frock Coat (Type A).
Illustration 31: Official Tailor's Plate for Double-Breasted Frock Coat.
any other style of frock coat is the long length. With the examples studied, all would reach at least three quarters of the way to the knees from the hips. This length is created by the attachment of two skirt panels to the upper body of the coat at the waist. Meeting in front (thus completely closing the garment) these extend either way around to the back of the coat where each joins with one of two narrow, additional panels and creates a pleat. These two rear sections are extensions of the two back-pieces of the coat's body and, as such, are not separately cut. In turn, from the waist down, the two back-pieces are not sewn together with the result that a long, central vent is formed. Two aspects of the skirts of Confederate double-breasted frock coats that distinguish them from civilian versions of the 1860's and the Federal single-breasted type should be noted here. They are cut fuller with the result that there is more flare, and the bottom edge is inevitably hemmed.5 (See Illustrations 30 and 31.)

Usually sewn into each pleat is a "side-edge". This is an angled strip of fabric creating a vertical flap falsely indicating the opening to a pocket in the skirt. These are not found on civilian or Federal frock coats of the era. Two variations of side-edge patterns were discerned. With either style, at the lower ends a decorative button was mounted, and another was found at the top of each pleat at the waist. One example, while not having side-edges, still had buttons affixed as such. This particular arrangement of purely decorative fasteners is sometimes witnessed on civilian coats, but generally, like the Federal issue single-breasted form, only the two at the waist exist. (See Illustration 32.)
Illustration 32: Pleat Construction for Double-Breasted Frock Coats.
It is interesting that despite the fact that no access could be gained to them externally, with the five examples where such could be discerned, all do, in fact, have pockets on either side in the skirts. These are inside the linings. The openings for them consist of a vertical slit in the seams where the lining panels of the skirts join those of the back-piece extensions. In essence, the pockets are actually located where the side-edges indicate, but the wearer could not gain access to them via what seemed apparent.

There is a final attribute of the pleat area which, found on most examples, is quite curious. At the hem of the pleat, a small, triangular section of fabric is pieced in. No logical explanation for this has been found. (See Illustration 32.)

A second key attribute to frock coats in general is their fitted quality. With the Southern military double-breasted type, however, this is more accentuated than with the civilian styles of the 1860's and the Federal single-breasted model. The affect is created by the cut and assembly of the main panels forming the upper body portion. Generally, construction involves six principal sections. To begin with, there are two foreparts whose foremost edge is cut on a curve to conform with the shape of the chest. Each extends around to a point beneath the arms where they connect with two small sections, the side-bodies, which comprise the left and right rear quarters of the back. These run only from the waist to the bottom back of the armholes, and the rearmost edge of each is cut on a severe curve. It is to these four panels and the button stands (to be discussed shortly) that the two main skirt sections are attached at the waist. Continuing
around to the back, the side-bodies each meet with one of the two back-pieces which, in turn, join to form a central rear seam. Cut much longer to extend from the shoulder to the hem, these last two panels complete the circumference of both the body and the skirts. When the different sections are combined, the result is a coat that snugly conforms to the torso to the waist and then flares out into full skirts. (See Illustrations 30, 31, and 33.)

With one example, while the same effect is achieved, the method of doing so is different. Instead of there being six main body panels, there are only four. In essence, the foreparts and side-bodies are combined and cut as a single piece. Thus, the side seams beneath the arms are eliminated, and the foreparts actually extend around to the left and right rear of the garment. This is a much earlier method of frock coat construction not employed on civilian or U.S. Government types during the period discussed.\(^{12}\) (See Illustration 33.)

The fitted nature of Confederate double-breasted frock coats is frequently enhanced with darts, and the use of such is labeled Style A construction. The tailor's plate shows one extending up from the waist in each forepart. Such, the Area A location, were observed on two of the surviving examples, and two additional locations for these devices were noted.\(^{13}\) One of the two conforming to the official pattern and a third have darts in front that extend down from the collar base.\(^{14}\) This is Area B. In addition, the coat with these at both waist and collar and a fourth example have such, constituting Area C, on either side in back which extend from the waist down into the skirts.\(^{15}\)

The attribute defining these coats as a distinctive type is the
Style A. Six Main Panels. Five Examples. 16

Style B. Four Main Panels. One Example. 17

Illustration 33: Torso Panel Arrangement and Construction for Double-Breasted Frock Coats (Cross-sectioned at Waist).
double-breasted manner of closing the front. This marks them as radically different from anything issued to Northern enlisted troops by the U.S. government. As we all know, this style involves two separate rows of buttons with (in the cases of men's fashion) the left side overlapping the right and fastening to it. Achieving this overlap requires increasing the width of the two foreparts, and this was accomplished in one of two ways. Usually, a button stand, an additional long, curved, fairly narrow strip of fabric, was sewn to the foremost edge of each of the main front sections. With one example, the same effect was attained by simply adding to the width of the foreparts and cutting the whole as a single piece. The fitted quality created by the curve of the added areas with the more common method was achieved via a central dart running down from the neck opening. (See Illustrations 30, 31, 33, and 34.)

In conjunction with their double-breasted nature is another noticeable attribute which differentiates between them and their civilian counterparts. When buttoned, the garment's front opening is completely closed to the neck. Consequently, there are no lapels. Also, the upper edge of the button stand, or additional fabric, is cut at an angle creating a shallow "V" effect that basically conforms to the base of the collar when fastened. (See Illustrations 30, 31, and 34.)

As to the buttons themselves, there are the requisite two rows which extend from the waist to the neck. In all six cases, the uppermost buttons are set further apart than those at the bottom in accordance with the regulations. Also conforming to official dictates is the fact that with five examples there are seven pairs of buttons. The
Illustration 34: Front Construction for Double-Breasted Frock Coats.

Style A. With Button Stand. 18
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Style B. Nine Pairs of Buttons. One Example. 20

Style B. Bottom Button in Seam. Two Examples. 22

Style A. Without Pocket. Five Examples. 24
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One Example.

Style A. Seven Pairs of Buttons. 21
Five Examples.

Style A. Bottom Button above Seam. Four Examples. 23

Style B. With Pocket. One Example. 25
remaining coat possess nine. This increased number of buttons is another feature that distinguishes the Southern double-breasted frock coat from the civilian version. With the three coats that actually still have them, the buttons are brass, and the patterns are distinctly Confederate military. As such, they present another feature which identifies these garments as different from any civilian or Federal types. (See Illustration 34.)

An additional aspect of how these coats fasten is variation in where the bottommost buttons and buttonholes are located. Most frequently, these are found slightly above the waist seam. With two coats, however, the buttons are mounted directly on the seam, and their holes are in the seam itself. In essence, a small section of the waist seam is left open, and one less separate buttonhole was needed. (See Illustration 34.)

Another key attribute which is distinctively military is that all possess stand-up collars. In terms of their actual configuration, three different patterns were discerned. Style A is that prescribed by the regulations. Also, while most were fashioned from two pieces of fabric, they can be formed from a single section. (See Illustrations 35 and 36.)

Sleeves are all of the same configuration. Cut full in the upper arm and elbow, they then taper radically to the cuff. Two distinct methods of construction were, however, observed. Usually, they consist of two pieces which, when sewn together and attached to the body of the coat, results in seams that run up both the front and back. The variation involves the entire sleeve being cut as a single piece. These are
Illustration 35: Collar Patterns and Construction for Double-Breasted Frock Coats.
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Illustration 36: Collar Construction for Double-Breasted Frock Coats.

Style A. Two Piece. Five Examples. 31

Style B. One Piece. One Example. 32
simply folded on the line where the front seam would be if of two panel construction, and the two edges are sewn together. The result is only a single seam running up the back of the arm. This latter method was not employed on Federal frock coats. (See Illustration 37.)

In conjunction, two variations in the form of the shoulder were ascertained. The circumference of the upper sleeve is commonly cut larger than the armhole in the coats' bodies. Consequently, there is an excess of material which is collected at the top of the shoulder to create a gathered effect. Less frequent are ungathered shoulders. (See Illustration 37.)

As to the construction of the cuffs, most commonly the rear seam was sewn shut at that point. There is not a functional slit. With two of these, however, there are three buttons on each cuff creating the illusion that they do open and close. With two other examples of this type of construction, a large number of purely decorative fasteners are in evidence. A fifth coat with this cuff style possesses no buttons at all. Whether it was originally made without them or they have been lost is impossible to determine. Whatever the case, the nonfunctional cuff and the number of buttons employed at that point are features which can mark a Confederate double-breasted frock coat as different from anything worn by Northern troops. Still, functional, slit cuffs are not unknown for this garment type. One example with such was observed, but it was different from any Federal type in that it secured with three instead of two buttons. In addition, the method of construction was noticeably different from that encountered on Northern coats or jackets. (See Illustrations 38 and 39.)
Illustration 37: Sleeve Construction for Double-Breasted Frock Coats.
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Five Examples.\textsuperscript{37}
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\textit{Illustration 38}: Cuff Construction for Double-Breasted Frock Coats.
Another distinctively military attribute of these coats is the use of decorative trim. Witnessed on three examples, such is found on cuffs and collars. As to the former area, those with represent Style B construction for this locale, and three distinct forms were noted. That form designated Style A conforms to the regulations in its configuration and in the sense that it involves an appliqued piece of fabric of a solid, contrasting hue. In the two instances where this style was observed, however, the color was black rather than the prescribed light blue. Style B cuff trim consists of gold braid piping extending up the rear seam of the sleeve and resolving itself in a trefoil motif. Such can be affixed either over other piping or an additional appliqued piece of material of contrasting color. With the example where the first style was observed, the additional piping was black. In the instance where the applique was seen, it was of sky blue. This was the only occasion in which the official infantry trim color was observed on a coat or jacket. Style C is also created by using piping. This is applied so as to delineate the configuration of the regulation pattern. It must be noted that this style was not witnessed by itself. It appeared on an example which also combined Style A and B. Because this sort of trim is, in fact, found on other types of Confederate military garments by itself, in all probability, it was to be found as such on this type as well, and consequently, will be defined as a separate style. The Style A and B forms of trim are distinctively different from anything issued by the U.S. Government. (See Illustration 39.)

As to collar trim, this was seen on two examples and its presence
on this coat type is termed Style B collar construction. In both instances, this conformed to the regulations in that a solid, contrasting hued fabric was employed. Unlike the regulations, however, in both instances, the color is black instead of light blue. (See Illustration 35.)

Two of the coats belonged to sergeants and possess the appropriate rank designations in the form of chevrons on the upper sleeves. On one, these are of 1/2 inch bias tape sewn directly to the sleeve. Now a dark green, quite probably these have faded, and the original color was black. (Later in the paper colors will be discussed fully.) The other coat is interesting in that the chevrons are of 1/4 inch gold braid. These, too, are sewn directly to the sleeve without backing.

Another attribute observed on one example was an external breast pocket. Located on the left side, this was of welted construction and set at an angle. (See Illustration 34.)

In constructing these coats, the use of top-stitching was infrequent, and then, it was only employed on isolated areas. On one example, this was found only around the base of the collar. Another possessed such only on the front opening of the skirt below the waist. On the third coat that has top-stitching, it was located only along the front opening above the waist and along the edges of the rear vent.

As to fibre content, two types of fabric were used to make the outer sections of these coats, and there is extreme color variation. The cloth in three examples is 100% wool. With two of these, the color
is dark gray with a distinct bluish cast.\textsuperscript{51} The other is a greenish/grayish hue.\textsuperscript{52} The material of the remaining three coats is a cotton/wool blend known as woolen jeans. One is a medium charcoal gray with flecks of darker gray and white which create a salt and pepper effect.\textsuperscript{53} Another is brownish with a faint gray cast.\textsuperscript{54} The last presents a greenish/grayish tint.\textsuperscript{55} All of these materials are a tight, refined weave. With five examples, the weight is very heavy.\textsuperscript{56} With the remaining, the weight would be classed as medium.\textsuperscript{57}

Regarding the internal construction of these coats, with the five examples where such could be discerned, all were completely lined, a feature distinguishing them from civilian and Federal coats. Four of these were of six panel construction, and the cut of the lining conformed to this.\textsuperscript{58} In the case of the four panel variant, the lining was also cut on the same lines as the outer pattern except in the rear sections. Fashioned as a single piece, there is no central back seam to the inner material.\textsuperscript{59}

Only one example was lined throughout with the same fabric, a now green, polished cotton.\textsuperscript{60} In the remaining coats, there are differences in the types of material employed between the upper body, skirts, and sleeves. With one, the lining of the upper portion and sleeves are of white cotton, and in the skirts, there is black polished cotton.\textsuperscript{61} With another, while the skirts are lined with a now green polished cotton, the sleeves are white cotton.\textsuperscript{62} The inner body and skirts of yet another are a plaid cotton print with sleeves of a different cotton print of indeterminable design.\textsuperscript{63} The last example
possesses a dark brown cotton body lining with that of the sleeves being white cotton. The skirt lining of this coat appears to be a postwar replacement.  

Of those coats with which the internal construction was observable, three have heavily quilted foreparts and side-bodies, which will be designated Style A construction for this aspect. Internal, left-hand breast pockets were found on four. A fifth example had an internal pocket on either side. In each instance, these are of welted construction. Coat hangers, narrow strips of cloth, are sometimes encountered inside the collars.

Type C: The Enlisted Man's Single-Breasted Frock Coat

Although not next in frequency and type, in order to maintain an overall ease of description and sense of continuity, the single-breasted frock coat will be discussed here. This type is essentially the same as the previous with one major difference. Needless to say, it is single-breasted. Three examples were located and examined, and while all were basically identical in terms of being of the same general pattern, each presented some very distinctive attributes. In turn, various attributes with each, either singularly or collectively, readily distinguish these garments from their civilian and Northern military counterparts.

Again, the length is the first noticeable characteristic. Equivalent to that of the regulation type, the single-breasted version's is achieved by the same method of construction. The two main skirt panels
Illustration 40: An Enlisted Man's Single-Breasted Frock Coat (Type C).
are cut separate and attached to the upper body at the waist. With two examples, the skirts were fashioned rather full with the result that there is considerable flare to them.70 With the third, the cut of the skirts is not as extreme, and as such, is more in keeping with the then current civilian trends and similar to the Federal type.71 The standard two pleats are in evidence to the rear of all. On the examples where such could be determined (one was on display) pleat construction incorporates side-edges and buttons. Both styles of side-edge as found on the double-breasted type are represented, and the positioning of the buttons is the same. On one, the curious triangular inset at the bottom of the pleat exists. All have central vents, and all are hemmed. Hemmed skirts and the existence of side-edges are features which identify the Confederate single-breasted frock coat from the civilian and Federal issue versions, and while lacking side-edges, civilian coats of this nature might occasionally still have a decorative button mounted lower along each pleat, the U.S. Government type did not. (See Illustrations 40 and 41.)

Returning to the side-edges, with one example, these falsely indicate the presence of pockets altogether. There simply are none even inside in the lining.72 At the same time, with the other coat, the side-edges were not fake. The wearer could actually gain access to pockets in the skirts through them.73 These two forms are labeled Styles B and A, respectively.

As with the previous type, there is a fitted quality to these. In each case, this was achieved via the same six panel method usually found on the double-breasted version. Darts could also be employed to
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Style A. With Side Edge. Two Examples.
enhance this characteristic, and their existence represents Style B construction. One example had such in front extending down the breast from the collar, Area A, and in back running down from the waist into the skirts, Area B.\(^79\) (See Illustration 40.)

The single-breasted manner of closing is the key attribute distinguishing this from the previous type. In essence, there is only a single row of buttons up the front center line from the waist to the neck. With two of the examples, the single-breasted effect was, for all practical purposes, attained by simply leaving off the button stands which created the additional overlap on the double-breasted coats. In the case of the third coat, there is actually a button stand sewn to the front vertical edge of each forepart. As such, the construction is similar to that normally seen on double-breasted coats, but there is not as much overlap with the result being a single-breasted way of closing. While button stands were employed on quality civilian single-breasted frock coats, they are not seen on those of U.S. Government issue. (See Illustration 42.)

In conjunction with the above attribute of being single-breasted, as already mentioned, there is the fact that when closed these fasten from the waist all the way to the neck. This eliminates lapels and distinguishes the Southern military type from the civilian. As to the number of buttons used to secure the front, two examples have eight.\(^80\) The remaining possesses seven.\(^81\) As seen on the extant coats, the number of fasteners marks these garments as different from both civilian and Federal issue types. Like the double-breasted coats, the bottommost buttons and their respective holes can be placed direct-
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ly on the waist seam or slightly above it. The former method is represented by one example.\textsuperscript{87} The other two are of the latter form of construction.\textsuperscript{88} As to the buttons themselves, such are completely missing on one example.\textsuperscript{89} The other two possess U.S. military types.\textsuperscript{90} With one of these, however, the pattern is prewar.\textsuperscript{91}

United States buttons on Confederate coats will be discussed in greater detail later. (See Illustrations 42 and 44.)

Another major attribute that marks these coats as different from civilian styles is their stand-up collars. Two distinct patterns were observed, and both of these were quite different from those used on the Federal military version. Also, where discernible, the collars are of two piece construction. (See Illustration 43.)

As with the Type A coats, the sleeves can be of one or two pieces (constituting construction Styles B and A, respectively), and in either case, the cut and assembly are the same as with the previous type as well. Differentiating the two examples with two piece sleeves from Federal issue is the fact that neither have slit cuffs. That, unlike the Federal version in having a single piece sleeve, does have a cuff which is left open. The slit, however, is not functional. The stitching securing the two extant buttons also holds both edges of the opening closed. With the other two garments, one has buttons (the exact number indeterminable as now missing) along the rear seam of the cuff creating the illusion of a functional opening. That remaining has buttons of an even more purely decorative nature which will be discussed later. None of the coats have sleeves that are gathered at the shoulder. (See Illustration 45.)
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Illustration 44: Front and Shoulder Construction for Single-Breasted Frock Coats.
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Decorative trim is another attribute observed on two of these garments. The very presence of such is an additional feature that distinguishes between military and civilian, and the styles employed are markedly different from that used on regulation Federal coats of this type. In turn, a complete lack of trim as witnessed on the third example, also differentiates between Northern and Southern versions. As to the coats with, its inclusion on cuffs is designated Style A construction for this area, and two distinct forms were noted. One has cuffs of solid black. These, however, lack the point prescribed by the regulations. They are merely banded with an appliqued piece of fabric of equal width all around. The other possesses two parallel lines of black tape piping encircling the cuff with a row of four purely decorative buttons between. This same tape is liberally applied elsewhere on this coat, and all additional areas treated with it illustrate Style B construction for each separate location. It is found over each shoulder, around each button and buttonhole, extending out to either side across the breast, and along the top, front, and base of the collar. The amount of trim on this particular coat is traditionally accounted for by attributing it to a musician. Added decorative features were common on such soldiers' uniforms. Yet, it is also possible that this coat is representative of that worn by the regiment as a whole.\(^{103}\) (See Illustrations 43, 44, and 45.)

With the single-breasted types also, there is considerable variation in the types of fabric used to make their outer portions and their color. One is of medium weight, 100% wool which is now a greenish/gray color.\(^{104}\) Another is of a heavy, cotton/wool, jeans blend that now exhibits a basically brown tone with grayish cast.\(^{105}\) The fibre
content of the third is difficult to discern, but it is probably 100% wool. It, too, is now a greenish hue with a definite gray cast indicative of its original color. These hues are attributes which distinguish the Southern from the Northern military coats. In all three cases, the weave of the fabric was tight and refined.

As to the stitching used in making these coats, only one was top-stitched. Such treatment was applied to every edge throughout the garment.

In the two instances where such could be discerned, each coat was completely lined. This, too, defines these as different from their civilian and Federal counterparts. Again, however, different fabrics were used to line different areas. With one, the inner skirts are of black cotton, the two back-pieces are lined with light brown polished cotton, the side-bodies and foreparts are backed with the same fabric used for the exterior of the coat, and the sleeves are of white cotton. The lining of the second coat's body and skirts is of red cotton. The sleeves are of the same fabric as the first.

The interior of one example is heavily quilted in the foreparts and side-bodies, and as such illustrates Style A construction for this area. With this, however, there are no internal breast pockets. The unpadded coat possesses welted pockets internally, making it Style A in this sense.

Type B: The Enlisted Man's Shell Jacket

Although not prescribed in the central government regulations, the shell jacket was issued at that level and by the states with such fre-
Illustration 46: An Enlisted Man's Shell Jacket (Type B)
Illustration 47: An Enlisted Man's Shell Jacket (Type B).
Illustration 48: An Enlisted Man's Shell Jacket (Type B).
quency that it was by far the most common type worn by Confederate enlisted men in all branches of the service. It could easily be termed the unofficial regulation style for Southern forces. A total of twenty-five extant examples were examined in the course of research, and although all conformed to the same basic concept, there was a considerable degree of variation in attributes. As with the single-breasted frock coats, many of these attributes are distinctive and readily mark the Southern shell jacket as different from Northern versions. Also, this garment type was radically unlike anything worn in civilian life.

As the long length is the first thing one notices about a frock coat, it is the shortness of the shell jacket that initially catches the eye. At most, the hem extends only a couple of inches below the waist. It is said that the shell jacket is, basically, a single-breasted frock coat without the skirts, and, to a certain degree, this is true. If one left off the skirts and cut off the extended length of the two back-pieces on a single-breasted frock coat, one would have a garment approximating the shell jacket. In actuality, these are usually cut slightly longer than the length that would be achieved by leaving off the skirts of a Type C coat. In addition, the configurations found in the hemlines usually distinguish this type as more than a shortened frock coat. Regarding the front hems, these can either be cut straight across or angled up slightly towards the sides from the front opening. In turn, either pattern can be found in association with one of three rear hemline styles. To the back, the cut can be straight across as well. There can also be either a shallow, round-
ed, or "V" angled dip. With this latter variation, the depth and degree of the angle comes nowhere close to the extremeness of that of the Federal uniform jacket. It is not overly common to find a straight cut front in conjunction with a straight cut back. (See Illustrations 49 and 50.)

Like the frock coats, the shell jacket is a fitted garment. In most cases, this quality is achieved via the same method of six panel construction. Two variations creating the same effect were, however, observed. They can be of four panel design. As with the variant Type A coat, this involves cutting the foreparts and side-bodies as one piece, thus eliminating the seams beneath the arms. The other method of construction consists of five sections. The two back-pieces are cut on the fold as one which results in there being no central back seam. One of the two jackets of this pattern is documented as being an English import. Because both share additional unique attributes not witnessed on other examples, it is quite probable that the second example was made in England as well, and this feature is indicative of jackets originating from that country. Both the four and five panel styles are distinctly Southern. (See Illustrations 46, 47, 48, and 51.)

The fit can also be enhanced through the use of darts, and their employment is designated Style B construction. Four examples had such extending down from the collar into the breast, Area A. One possesses them running up from the waist in front, Area B. With another, darts are located in both locations just described.

There is also variation found in the cut of the hem/front opening
Illustration 49: Front and Rear Hemline Styles for Shell Jackets.
Illustration 50: Combined Front and Rear Hemline Styles for Shell Jackets (Shown in Profile).
angle. Four distinct patterns were encountered. That most frequently observed is a sharp angle of more or less 90 degrees depending on the cut of the hem and curve of the front opening itself. Rivaling this, however, is a large, rounded hem/front opening angle. In addition, one encounters examples where, although rounded, the radius is slight. The final variation involves clipping the points at an angle which, when the jacket is fastened, results in an open, inverted "V" motif. (See Illustration 52.)

As already indicated, these jackets are single-breasted. Double-breasted types exist, but all indications are that these were strictly for mounted officers. When closed, the enlisted man's garment fastened from just above the hem (the actual distance varying depending on the cut of the hem/front opening angle) to the neck. As a result, there are no lapels. The number of buttons can range from five to nine. With those having less than eight we have an attribute which, in itself, readily distinguishes them from Northern versions. Most commonly witnessed are jackets with nine buttons. Nine examples possess this number.\(^{134}\) Jackets with seven fasteners total five.\(^{135}\) Equaling this figure are versions with six.\(^{136}\) Three garments have eight.\(^ {137}\) And, the remaining three have five.\(^ {138}\) These are labeled Styles A - E, respectively, in terms of button count. It has been asserted and in some circles accepted as fact that the number of buttons on a jacket is indicative of the field force in which it was worn. For instance, jackets worn in the Army of Northern Virginia supposedly had nine buttons, while those sported in the Army of Tennessee had seven. After examining the extant examples, it is
Illustration 52: Hem/Front Opening Angles for Shell Jackets.
clear that at least for the Army of Northern Virginia there was no standard number of buttons. Of fourteen jackets firmly provenanced to the Virginia theater, only four have nine fasteners; two have eight; three have seven; two have six; and, one has five.143

As to the buttons themselves, there are a fair number of types. Most frequently encountered are Confederate state patterns. Such were witnessed on ten examples.144 Five jackets have fasteners of U.S. Army origin.145 On four more, there are Confederate central government types.146 Two have brass civilian forms.147 On another, they are of leather.148 On the two remaining garments that still possess buttons, with one, they are wood, and with the other, wood or bone, but this writer seriously questions whether these are original to the articles; they may well be postwar replacements given their impeccable condition.149 The use of Southern central government or state military buttons or civilian types constitutes markedly Confederate attributes for many of these jackets. As mentioned, the presence of U.S. buttons on Southern clothing will be discussed in more detail later.

Another distinctly military attribute of the shell jacket is the stand-up collar possessed by all. Among the sample, however, no less than eight different styles were observed. Like the previous coat types, construction can involve either one or two pieces. More common, collars of two sections reflect the Style A form.150 Those of one are indicative of Style B.151 (See Illustration 53.)

The basic cut and construction of the sleeves is also the same as witnessed on the frock coats. They are pegged and of either one or two pieces. The latter pattern dominates and is defined as Style A.152
Illustration 53: Collar Patterns for Shell Jackets.
Also, the shoulders may or may not present a gathered effect. The ungathered are in the majority and constitute the Style A form. On only one example was the rear of the cuff slit, and in this instance, closing with two buttons, it was actually functional. Cuff buttons in any capacity are uncommon. Only two examples have such, falsely indicating a slit cuff. One other possesses a couple that are purely decorative. This almost universal lack of cuff openings, and the general absence of buttons at that point are features which distinguish the majority of Confederate shell jackets from their Federal counterparts. (See Illustration 54.)

As to the types of buttons employed on the cuffs, all were military. With three jackets, the patterns reflect Southern state issue. The fourth, that with the functional cuff, has a U.S. Army type.

Attributes fairly common to this garment type are epaulets, and their presence is termed Style B for this aspect of construction. These were actually observed on seven examples. An eighth originally possessed them, but they were cut off. In all instances but one, and designated Form A, these are functional in that they button at the base of the collar and can be used to secure the shoulder slings of equipment. With the exception, Form B, being sewn down all around, the epaulets are purely decorative. In terms of configuration, three distinct styles were determined. (See Illustration 55.)

Belt loops are another attribute encountered with relative frequency on shell jackets, and their inclusion on a garment is indicative of Style B construction in this sense. These were seen on six of the
Illustration 54: Cuff Construction for Shell Jackets.
Illustration 55: Epaulet Patterns and Construction for Shell Jackets.
examples examined. Also, their original presence was detected on a seventh, but they were removed. Each jacket possesses two, with one affixed on each side at the waist. Their purpose was not so much to actually support the waist belt as it was to keep the short hem from pulling out from beneath it. Two different methods of construction were noted. With one form, A, both ends of the loop are sewn down as with the loops on modern trousers. The other form, B, consists of having the loop sewn down only on the bottom end. The top is secured with a button. In terms of shape, three different patterns were observed. That labeled Style A was witnessed only in conjunction with the first method of construction, while Styles B and C were seen only in those instances where the loop buttoned. (See Illustrations 48 and 56.)

Noted on twelve examples, some form of decorative trim is commonly seen on shell jackets. Such can be found on collars, cuffs, epaulets, front openings, hems, and pockets. With the first three locations, decoration can involve either solid, contrasting colored panels, or, more frequently, piping of a different hue. As with the frock coats, the former style is distinctively Southern. With front openings, hems, and pockets, piping, only, is employed. Very few shell jackets possess trim in all these areas. For instance, while one might have adorned cuffs and collar, another will have trim on the collar only, and yet a third may have such only on its epaulets. Excepting epaulets, the use of decoration in any form in each separate location constitutes Style B construction for it, with Style A represented by the plain examples. With the epaulets, being an additional feature themselves and commonly observed with trim, their construction with decorative aspects is des-
Illustration 56: Belt Loop Patterns and Construction for Shell Jackets.
igned as Style A. It should be noted that in no instance was any form of decoration witnessed on belt loops.

As to the solid type, on cuffs, this involves an applique over the end of the sleeve whose pointed configuration is the same as that prescribed in the regulations. Contrasting colored epaulets and, usually, collars, are constructed as such initially simply using a different hued fabric. With one example, however, a separate appliqued panel was superimposed over an existing collar. (See Illustrations 55, 57, and 58.)

Piping can involve one of three different materials: tape, smooth cord, or twisted cord. When applied to cuffs, it is done so as to outline the same pointed configuration created by the solid style. On collars, piping is generally found either along the top, front, and base, or just the top and front. One example, however, has it only along the bottom. With epaulets, this sort of trim was attached around the edges thus outlining the shape. On pockets, it is found along the edge of the opening. On three examples, the collar piping continued down the edges of the front opening. With one of these, it continued around the entire hem. Piping along the front opening is only seen in conjunction with piping on the collar. (See Illustrations 55, 57, and 58.)

Trim color is black for all but one example attributed to infantry. The exception has trim of dark blue. The light blue prescribed by the regulations was not observed on any garment of this type. On artillery jackets, however, the decoration is the designated red. One example has yellow trim. This particular jacket is
Illustration 57: Styles of Cuff Trim - Style B Cuff Construction for Shell Jackets.
Illustration 58: Styles of Collar Trim - Style B Collar Construction for Shell Jackets.
not provenanced with regards to unit or service branch, but the color indicates that it was probably sported by a cavalryman. The use of black and dark blue trim is a feature that distinguishes a number of Confederate jackets from the Federal versions discussed.

Only one jacket possesses rank insignia. Belonging to a sergeant, there are the appropriate three chevrons. These are constructed of bias tape sewn directly to the sleeve. The color, now green, was undoubtedly originally black.198

While not a common attribute, external pockets were observed on three of these jackets. One of these has the pocket on the left front.199 Another's is on the right.200 The third has pockets on both sides.201 In each case, they are located roughly midway between hem and collar. All are of welted construction. With two examples, these pockets are set at an angle.202 The other is horizontal.203 (See Illustration 59.)

The shell jacket can be constructed so that there is no visible stitching. Seven examples are made in this way.204 Visible top-stitching, however, is more commonly seen and can be employed on all or just part of the garment. With eight jackets, all edges (cuffs, hems, front opening, collar, etc.) are top-stitched.205 On eight, only portions received this treatment. Two have such on hem, front opening, and collar.206 One has this on the collar, front opening, and cuffs.207 With a fourth, this form of construction is seen only on the hem and front opening.208 A fifth is top-stitched only on the front opening and collar.209 Another has it only on the hem.210 On the seventh, only the cuffs possess it.211 And on the last, it is
Illustration 59: Front Construction for Shell Jackets.
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seen only on the front opening. Two additional jackets have a double row of top-stitching on the right edge of the front opening; one row on either side of the line of buttons. One of these is the jacket of English origin while the other is that which shares its attribute of single piece back construction. Consequently, because both also share this unique feature of double top-stitching, it is quite possible that this manner of construction is also indicative of English made jackets. One of these has, in addition, a normal single row of top-stitching around its collar.

Several different fabrics were employed in making these jackets. In conjunction, these present a number of colors. Thirteen are of 100% wool. Within this group, eight are true gray ranging in shade from a medium hue to dark charcoal. Three are dark gray with a distinct bluish cast. Another is a light, bluish gray. The last jacket of all wool is a greenish color with a gray cast.

With eleven more jackets, the fabric is a cotton/wool blend. In the case of at least eight of these, the material is that referred to as woolen jeans. The most frequently encountered color, represented by six examples, is the same predominant green with gray tint as observed on the one all-wool garment. Three are the tan color commonly termed "butternut". One is gray with a decided greenish quality. The last is a dark brownish gray. It is doubtful if any of these reflect their original color, which in all likelihood was gray, or grayer than that seen.

With all of the above, despite fibre content, the weave is tight
and refined. The weight ranges from medium to almost that of a heavy blanket. The heavier weight fabrics predominate.

One of the above garments is of interest in terms of the material from which it was made. The weave and weight of the fabric are identical throughout. At the same time, however, while they are very close, two different colors are evident between various sections. It is obvious that this jacket was fashioned from two separate bolts of the same cloth which came from different dye lots.  

Only one example can be classified as a true homespun in the sense that the fabric was actually woven at home. This is apparent from its rather crude quality. Yet, despite it coarseness, the weave is tight and the weight is heavy. The exact fibre content is indiscernible, although much, if not all, of it is cotton or linen. The color is a dark tan, and it is the only example in all the coats and jackets examined, that this writer believes was probably originally this hue.  

Whatever the colors of these jackets are now, or were originally, all are distinctively Confederate, and as such, constitute another important attribute.

Regarding internal construction, with the twenty-two examples where such could be discerned, all but two were completely lined. With all, the cut of the linings conforms to that of the outer body. Fifteen jackets are lined throughout with what can be termed the standard Confederate material for this aspect of construction, white cotton. As linings go, these are quite heavy. The exact weaves vary. With some, there is a noticeable twill, others have a linen-like appearance, and still others give the impression of a lightweight canvas.
Two more jackets are lined with fabrics that match throughout, but differ from those just described. One inside is made of light brown polished cotton. The other, the homespun article, is lined with basically the same material used for the outer portions only it is of a lighter weight.

Three examples have mixed linings in that the sleeves and body are of different cloth. With each, the arms are constructed of the same white cotton previously mentioned, but with the torso area, there is considerable variation. One is lined with dark brown cotton. The second is of light brown and white cotton flannel plaid. The third is cotton with a brown and beige windowpane motif.

As stated, two of the jackets are only partially lined. With one, only the foreparts received this treatment. With the other, the side-bodies were lined as well. In each case, the fabric forming the interior is identical to that used for the outer sections.

With those jackets whose interior sections could be examined, internal pockets were almost universal, and their inclusion represents Style A construction. Ten had such initially constructed with the jacket on the left side. One of these has a second added later on the right. Another has a single pocket made with the garment on the right. A second with a pocket initially placed on the right has another later added to the left. An added right hand pocket was also witnessed on one originally made without any. Six examples had pockets set in both sides when initially tailored. Only two jackets totally lacked these features and as such are indicative of Style B construction in this sense. In all, three
different styles of pocket were noted. Weltsed versions are the most common. Far less frequent were patch types. Such are generally representative of additions, but one garment seemingly was originally made with such. The jacket of probable English manufacture offers the third style which is unique and might be an additional distinction of articles originating there. This involves a vertical slit in the seam where the facing and lining meet. (See Illustration 60.)

Type D: The Enlisted Man’s Tailcoat

The tailcoat, while not frequently encountered, was a distinct type of Confederate coat, and so, needs to be discussed. Representative of volunteer wear, these cutaways (also known as swallow tails or claw hammers) are generally believed to have been worn only during the first months of the war. Consequently, they are not considered indicative of true field uniforms. Yet, one of the two examples examined was being worn on active service as late as May, 1862. (See Illustrations 61 and 62).

The first noticeable attribute of the tailcoat defining it as a distinct type is its cutaway hemline. Resembling the civilian dress and riding coats in this aspect, in essence, there are no fronts or sides to the skirts. There is only a vented tail with pleats at the back of the garment. Depending on intended use, the length of the tails can vary considerably. With one example for mounted wear, they extend barely enough to cover the seat of the pants. The second coat was worn by an infantryman, and its tail would hang to about two thirds
Illustration 60: Internal Pocket Construction for Shell Jackets.
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Illustration 61: An Enlisted Man's Tailcoat (Type D) for Dismounted Wear.
Illustration 62: An Enlisted Man's Tailcoat (Type D) for Mounted Wear. 249
of the way to the backs of the knees. These differences are designated Styles B and A respectively. Unlike frock coats, there are no side-edges set in the pleats. In fact, neither had pockets in the tails at all. Of interest is the fact that one of these was the only coat or jacket encountered whose hem consisted of a raw edge. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

As with the other coats and jackets, the tailed type is quite fitted. This was achieved with the typical six panel construction. As with other garments, darts can also be employed to enhance the fit. One has these running up from the waist on either side of the front opening and another set extending down from the collar onto the breast. The use of darts represents Style A construction for this type, and their locations are defined as A and B in the order described. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

These are single-breasted garments. In distinctly military fashion, the front opening closes from the waist to the neck without lapels. One fastens with nine buttons, Style A pattern, and the other with eight, Style B. Of interest, however, is that although in reality single-breasted, there are three rows of buttons which creates the illusion of their being triple-breasted. On either side of the row which actually close the front, there is another of purely decorative nature. This feature, too, is witnessed only on military dress of the period. With one example, where a slight remnant of the skirt panels is left in front, the bottommost button and buttonhole are set in the waist seam, constituting Style B placement. On the other, Style A, they are affixed a bit above the hem. In each instance the buttons
themselves are Southern state military type which constitutes a definite identifying attribute. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

Each possesses the distinctly military stand-up collar which in each case is the same configuration; a top edge angles down slightly from back to front meeting with a vertical front edge. Both are of two piece construction. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

Each has sleeves of two panel construction whose pegged configuration is the same as on other Confederate coats and jackets. Neither has an open cuff to the back and neither gives the illusion of fastening by having buttons along the base of the rear seam. Also, there are no gathered shoulders. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

In terms of decorative trim, there is an abundance on each creating, to say the least, a very flashy, distinctly military appearance. With both, such is found on the cuffs, collars, breasts, and tails, and consequently, the use of decoration in each separate area constitutes Style A construction for it. In addition, with one, there is also trim simulating shoulder boards which, because it is not universal and not commonly encountered on other types, will be termed Style B construction for this region. Cording was employed for the decoration on one coat. On the other, tape and contrasting colored panels were used. Both possess an excess of functionless buttons. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

Both cord and tape are used to similar effect on the breast areas. Surrounding each working button and buttonhole of the central line, a double row of piping extends out to either side across the breast to connect with a decorative fastener opposite. This basic pattern in
association with the superfluous buttons is designated as Style A breast trim. With one of the coats, an additional motif exists in conjunction creating a variation. Beneath each of the nonfunctional buttons, a trefoil design is fashioned. With both coats, the decoration in this locale is black. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

Differences exist in the forms of collar trim. With the coat for dismounted wear and representing Style A trim for this area, there is a solid, contrasting black collar. With the other, indicative of Style B, the top, front, and bottom edge, are piped with the same cording used on the breast. In each instance, a double row of trim runs back horizontally from the front edge on the midline and terminates with a decorative button. Again, with the coat for mounted wear the black cording is formed in a trefoil motif beneath the nonfunctional fastener. On the other garment, the piping is fashioned with gold tape. Because this design, common to both, was not observed independently from other collar decoration, it will not be designated as a third, separate style. It is simply considered an additional feature in conjunction with and further defining the two already established. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

Cuff and tail trim again show differences between the two garments. With the dismounted version, appliqued black plackets are affixed in each locale creating the illusion of functional cuffs and pockets in a form not previously encountered. Sewn within each is a series of geometrical patterns of gold tape conforming to the shape of the applique. In turn, within each of these, a purely decorative button is mounted. This form of trim is designated Style A for both
regions. As indicated, the Style B forms as observed on the coat for mounted wear are considerably different. On both the cuffs and tails, the piping is ordered to create a series of three chevrons with the same trefoil design as elsewhere at the ends of each. Also, a superfluous button is sewn to each apex. (See Illustrations 61 and 62.)

The final decorative feature is witnessed on the longer coat. A double row of gold tape over black is attached to each shoulder creating the effect of shoulder boards. This is termed Style A trim for this area. (See Illustration 61.)

The fabrics used in making these coats differ. One is of a cotton/wool blend, now a greenish hue with gray cast. The other is of 100% wool and gray with a green tint. Because Northern militia and volunteer units wore similar coats early in the conflict, the color can not be said to be a distinct Confederate attribute. The wearing of this type by Federal soldiers on campaign, however, had long ceased prior to the date the first photograph presented was taken. In fact, by that time, it is unlikely that many if any Southern troops were still wearing these. Consequently, comparison of color and other attributes is not really an issue.

Internally, only one was completely lined. With both it and that partially treated, as with other coats and jackets, there are considerable differences in the fabrics between various parts of the garments' interiors. With one, the body and tails are filled with black polished cotton, and the sleeves are an orange (possibly floral) cotton print. This same coat has heavily quilted foreparts and side-bodies, and this constitutes Style A construction for this area.
The remaining, unpadded, example presents a real hodgepodge of fabrics. The tails are a now dark green polished cotton. In the body, the two back-pieces are unlined. Working towards the front, the side-bodies are of white cotton. The foreparts are lined with the same material comprising the outer portions of the coat. The sleeves contain the same fabric as the side-bodies. 255

With the coat just described, the lining is cut on the same pattern as the outer sections. In the case of the other, the inner construction conformed to the outer except in the tails. The cut of the lining there defies written description and the reader is referred to the illustration.

Neither garment possesses internal breast pockets. One has a coat hanger sewn inside the collar. 256 Top-stitching was not observed in either case.

Type E: The Enlisted Man's Sack Coat

The sack coat is probably the most elusive of Confederate garments. Very little is known about this type, and references to its existence are extremely infrequent. As only one example was located and examined, its attributes can only be described and compared to civilian and Federal versions and to other Confederate types. Consequently, while distinguishing attributes marking this as a distinct type can be noted, there is no data base on which to establish a typology of variant characteristics within the type itself. We are limited to describing the features witnessed on this single example.
Illustration 63: An Enlisted Man's Sack Coat (Type E).
As with previously discussed coats and jackets, a key attribute marking this as a distinct type is the length. Like civilian and Federal versions, this is such that basically the seat of the trousers would be covered. Also, comparable with other sack coat types, the hem of this example is cut straight all around. Unlike the Federal model, however, the hem/front opening angle is squared. (See Illustration 63.)

As pointed out earlier, a noticeable feature of all sack coats is their loose, unfitted nature, and that viewed is no exception. The entire article would hang straight down from the shoulders. Unlike the Northern type, however, this is of four panel construction. The foreparts are cut like the U.S. sort to incorporate the areas of the side-bodies, thus eliminating a seam beneath each arm. Unlike the Federal government's however, the back is formed from two pieces instead of one, with the result that there is a central back seam. Despite the presence of the seam, there is no vent. (See Illustration 63.)

The studied coat is single-breasted, and in keeping with sack coat style, closes with a minimal number of only four buttons. These are civilian in origin and extremely large. When secured, the front opening fastens from the neck to a point about two-thirds of the way down to the hem. (See Illustration 63.)

One attribute marking this coat as different from its civilian and Federal counterparts is its typically Confederate military, stand-up collar. While of pieced construction, this is technically formed from two panels. It is of consistent height all around with a squared front
edge. Of solid black in contrast with the rest of the coat, this standard style of Confederate trim constitutes its only decorative aspect. Its presence is an additional feature distinguishing it from civilian and Federal models. (See Illustration 63.)

The sleeves are made differently from the Northern type in that they are of one piece construction, and the cuff is cut straight. There is no cuff slit, nor are there buttons falsely indicating such. (See Illustration 63.)

Also, unlike the Federal garment, the coat possesses an external breast pocket on the left side. Set at an angle about midway down, it is welted. (See Illustration 63.)

In making this coat, top-stitching was employed on all edges. Because of a few rather unrefined construction features this article appears to be homemade. The fibre content is a cotton/wool blend, and it is a tight, fairly refined, and quite heavy weave. The color is now a dirty tan.

As to the internal construction, the entire coat is lined with a material very similar to that used for the outer portions. It is cut on the same pattern. There is no internal pocket.

**Type F: The Enlisted Man’s Zouave Jacket**

A militia and volunteer style, the zouave jacket was generally only seen during the early war period, although a few elite units may have attempted to continue wearing it for longer. While completely different in every aspect from anything worn in civilian life, as pointed
Illustration 64: An Enlisted Man's Zouave Jacket (Type F).
out, this type of jacket was sported in some Federal regiments with the basic attributes being the same as those worn in Southern service. Apart from general attributes which define these as a definite type, there is nothing standard about these garments. Each is quite distinctive. In terms of colors, patterns of trim, buttons, cuts, construction, etc., the zouave style of one command is likely to appear as different as night and day when compared to that of another. In essence, so similar, yet, so varied, if a Northern and Southern version were laid side by side, without documentation, it might well be impossible to determine which was which. This, in itself, makes establishing a typology difficult at best, either between Northern and Southern examples, or even between those worn by one side. Furthermore, because only one Confederate zouave jacket was located, forming a typology of differing lesser characteristics is impossible. Quite simply, as there is nothing to compare this with except Federal versions and other Confederate types, we can only describe this one extant article, noting the general attributes defining it as a distinct type and commenting on its own inherent particularistic details.

As with the other types, a major attribute that one immediately notices with zouave jackets is the length. These were cut extremely short, and the example viewed is no exception. It would barely reach the waist of its wearer. Also observed on this specimen is the exaggerated, undulating hemline sometimes found on this sort, and the swept back, open configuration of the bottom of the front opening. (See Illustration 64.)

As with most other coat and jacket types, this too, is fitted.
This quality is attained through the standard six panel form of construction. There are, however, no darts. (See Illustration 64.)

The extant jacket is "single-breasted", thus conforming to the normal zouave pattern. The term "single-breasted", however, is not really appropriate, because in keeping with the style, it does not button. In fact, this does not ever possess any of the purely decorative buttons sometimes seen on the front openings of others of this kind. Also viewed on this article and indicative of the style is the complete lack of a collar. (See Illustration 64.)

The sleeves of this jacket are cut as one piece. The rear of the cuff is slit at the seam, but does not actually open and close, because three decorative buttons are sewn through both edges. The buttons, themselves, are a typical rounded zouave type. In addition, the rear angles of the cuffs are rounded off. (See Illustration 64.)

A major characteristic of any zouave jacket is an overabundance of decorative trim of contrasting color. That examined is covered with yellow tape. Such appears around the cuffs, hem, neck, and along the front opening. In addition, this material is employed to create motifs on each breast and on the back. Those in front resemble musical treble clef signs. (See Illustration 64.)

The fabric of the coat over which this trim is applied is a high quality, medium weight satinet. The color is a navy blue so dark that it appears black. This, combined with the yellow trim creates a very flashy garment.

Internally, the torso region is lined with black polished cotton. The inner sleeves are of white cotton. The cut of the lining conforms
to that of the outer sections. There is no internal pocket. There is, however, a coat hanger as seen on some frock and tailcoats.

**Trousers**

**Type A: Standard Enlisted Man's Style**

A total of seventeen examples of what can be termed standard enlisted men's trousers were examined. In terms of basic style, these are very similar to those worn by Federal troops. They are cut full and long with straight legs. There is a waistband, a buttoning central fly, and usually, two front pockets. Beyond this, there exists an incredible number of differences that distinguish between Confederate pants and those of both Northern military or civilian origin.

The first noticeable difference can be seen in the pockets. A total of six distinctive styles were observed. The two most commonly encountered are what will be termed (for the lack of a better phrase) half-winged. In essence, these are a modified frog or wing pocket that differ from the Federal type in that while still creating a flap, the lengths of the vertical and horizontal openings are not equal. With the first style, the horizontal is roughly half the length of the vertical. With the second, exactly the reverse is true, although the vertical edge may equal about two-thirds the span of the horizontal. The corners of the flaps in either case may or may not be secured with
Illustration 65: A Pair of Enlisted Man's Trousers (Type A).
a button, and both forms were encountered with equal frequency. With those not having a fastener, another feature is encountered which differentiates these pockets from Federal ones. (See Illustration 66.)

The next style, also very different from civilian and Federal forms, consists of a simple horizontal slit. These are constructed in the waistband seam. Of interest is the fact that one of the pairs only has a single pocket of this sort on the right side.260 (See Illustration 66.)

After this, that most commonly encountered was a full frog or wing type. In configuration, these are the same as those on Northern pants. Yet, a major variation exists with the majority of Confederate pockets of this style. They do not button. Only one specimen was witnessed that did. (See Illustration 66.)

The fifth style viewed is very chic in that it represents a sort that would become extremely fashionable for civilian wear only after the war. In essence, this is a half-wing pattern with the vertical edge of the opening being half the length of the horizontal, but instead of an angled flap, the corner is noticeably rounded off. These do not button. In all aspects, this style is radically different from those on Northern trousers. (See Illustration 66.)

The final style is the same slit, side seam sort characteristic of civilian and most Northern military pants. From the surviving examples, it would seem that this form of pocket was not commonly used on Southern military pants. Only one pair with such was observed. (See Illustration 66.)

Unlike Federal issue, watch pockets were not universal to Confeder-
Illustration 66: Main Pocket Styles for Type A Trousers.
ate trousers. For this feature, those without are defined as repre-
senting Style A construction and those with, Style B. Only nine ex-
amples possess such and there is extreme variation. Most commonly en-
countered are those consisting of a simple slit in the waistband seam
as with Northern types. Next in frequency are watch pockets that are
constructed internally in the lining of the pants and so are not vis-
able. Because of this, though labeled Style B, these are not il-
illustrated. One sort, that designated Style C, is the same as the other
Northern pattern in that set in the waistband seam, there is a welt
affixed up and over the bottom of the waistband itself. Three addi-
tional styles were encountered. While distinctly different in form and
construction, all share the feature of being cut directly in the waist-
band rather than being positioned in its seam. (See Illustration 67.)

The next location on Confederate trousers where key differences are
noted between them and their Northern counterparts is the cuffs. Of
major importance is the fact that on none of the examples examined are
the cuffs slit. In addition, while most are cut straight, several
pairs have cuffs fashioned so as to angle down towards the back. Also
of interest is the fact that with a number of examples the inside of
the cuff is reinforced with a panel of heavy canvas and the inclusion
of such is termed Style B construction for this area. Viewed on pairs
attributed to infantry as well as mounted troops, in most instances
this reinforcement is located primarily in the forward part of the
cuff. The exact reason for the inclusion of these panels is difficult
to discern. Positioned as they are on the front inside with the hem
folding up and over the bottom edge, they do nothing to protect the
Illustration 67: Watch Pocket Styles for Type A Trousers.
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cuffs themselves from damage or wear. Consequently, this leaves only the probability that they functioned to protect the wearer. But, even if so, they are of limited value in that they only extend up about seven or eight inches. Nevertheless, they exist on Southern pants and do not on Northern. (See Illustrations 68 and 69.)

Another feature differentiating Confederate military trousers from those of civilian and Federal origin is the almost universal presence of belted seats. Only one of the extant pairs did not have this feature and is representative of the Style B form in this aspect. These belts consist of two tabs of fabric, mounted in the rear just below the waistband, which buckle together across the rear center seam so the fit can be adjusted. Four distinct patterns were noted. In no instance were there laces in addition to these, nor did the pair without have laces. (See Illustrations 70 and 71.)

Pertaining to the seats of these trousers, there is considerable variation in their construction. Four distinct methods were observed. Frequently, the rear area is cut as a single piece in conjunction with the rear leg panels, with no separate sections fitted in. This is quite different from civilian or Federal pants. Slightly more often, however, portions of the backs of trousers are cut apart and pieced in. The panel form labeled Style B is the same as that encountered on civilian and most Federal trousers in that the same pattern is employed. More common and distinctly Confederate is the Style A form. With this, the separate sections are a triangular configuration which do not extend all the way to either side seam. There is extreme variation in the size of these inserts. They can be large and very
Illustration 68: Cuff Styles for Type A and Type B Trousers.
Illustration 69: Styles of Internal Cuff Reinforcements - Style B
Construction for Type A Trousers.
Illustration 70: Typical Belt Construction for Seats of Type A Trousers.
Illustration 71: Belt Tab Patterns for Type A Trousers.
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noticeable, or they can be so tiny that they are virtually hidden by
the belt. As to the remaining method, this involves two vertical pan­
els that extend down from the waistband to approximately the knee and
incorporate the crotch area as well. This was executed in conjunction
with a variation on the Style B method. (See Illustration 72.)

Darts are another feature that can exist on Confederate trousers,
but are not seen on Northern. Six examples have such and their exist­
ence reflects Style B construction. These are located to the rear with
one on either quarter. 287

Returning to pieced in areas, a curious feature was witnessed on
several specimens. There are separate panels incorporated in the con­
struction of the rear of the crotch. Exclusive of the example also
exemplary of Style C paneled seat construction, this involves piecing
in a basically triangular section. Variation, however, exists in the
sizes, exact shapes, and the number of separate pieces employed. Upon
viewing these, the immediate reaction is to believe that evidence of
wear, tear, and repair is being observed. When one realizes, however,
that there is no other indication of damage in that locale and that the
fabric is a perfect match with that of the rest of the garment, it is
obvious that such is not the case. After this, the next conclusion
drawn is that here are examples that reflect a shortage of fabric in
the Confederacy. In essence, when cut, the seamstress or tailor
scrimped in order to get more out of the width of the cloth and later
added these sections from scraps. This idea proved untenable when the
provenance of one of these pairs was ascertained. These are of pre or
early war vintage and belonged to a member of the Washington Artillery
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of New Orleans. This was a very elite and moneyed command in which, at that time, each member had their uniforms privately tailored. Considering their source and date, at which point fabric shortages, if any, were minimal, there had to be another explanation. There is. It is surmised by this writer that instead of this feature reflecting an inferior pair of trousers, it, in fact, is representative of those of very high quality, and the pieced in crotches are practical and functional. As we all know, through the course of normal wear, this area is the first to give out on a pair of pants. It is felt that these panels were put in to expedite repair when that time came. All one would have to do is remove the worn section and replace it with a new one. This would be just as easy as, and certainly more sightly than, patching the area. The subject of ease brings up another point against these reflecting a shortage of material. Whatever the seamstress or tailor may have saved in fabric was lost in the extra effort involved with this sort of construction. As to the pair in which the crotch, seat, and rear inner leg were pieced with the same panel, again, this was a functional and practical method of construction. These are a late war specimen also worn by a member of the Washington Artillery, and as such, were employed for mounted service. Consequently, not only was the crotch likely to wear out, but the seat and inner legs were susceptible to wear as well. Again, instead of serious patching, all that had to be done in the case of needed repairs was to replace the two panels. Pieced crotches are not an aspect of Federal issue trousers. (See Illustrations 72 and 73.)

Another difference between Confederate and Federal trousers is that
Illustration 73: Crotch Construction for Type A Trousers.
not all of Southern origin are made to be supported with suspenders. Three such examples, labeled Style B in this sense, were studied. In addition, with those meant to be worn with suspenders, Style A, almost universally, the placement of the buttons for their attachment differs radically from Federal issue in terms of the two front pairs. The innermost of each pair is roughly centered between the fly opening and the side seam. The outermost is usually affixed directly over the side seam, but can be mounted just a hair forward. Only one example has the second button located noticeably closer in. (See Illustration 65.)

As to fly construction, usually, as with Federal pants, there are four buttons to secure the fly proper, and this constitutes the Style A count. In one instance, however, there are only three - Style B. With another pair, there are five - Style C. In all cases, an additional panel backs the left inside of the opening. It is through this that the buttons fasten with the result that they are not visible when the front is closed. In most instances, between the buttonholes, the rear panel is stitched to the front. This is the same construction method used on Northern trousers. Viewed slightly less frequently are two distinctly Confederate forms of fly assembly. On several examples, the vertical edges along the opening of the main front section and the backing panel are also sewn together. The third style received neither this treatment nor the stitching between the buttonholes. The inner piece is secured only at the top, bottom, and inner edge. (See Illustration 74.)

Above the fly proper, the ends of the waistband button together to
Style A. Tacked.  
Six Examples. 302

Style B. Closed.  
Four Examples. 303

Style C. Open.  
One Example. 304

Illustration 74: Fly Construction for Type A Trousers (Shown in Vertical Cross-Section).
complete the closure of the opening. With most, the waistband is secured with a single button which, mounted on the right, passes through the left, and so, is visible when fastened. This is the same method employed on Federal issue. Other ways of closing the waistband, however, exist. Not uncommonly, the button is affixed on the left inside and meets with a hole on the right. The result, when closed, is that the button is not seen. In addition to this, there can be more than one button employed to perform the function. In essence, there are two main fasteners with one over the other. With one example, when secured, one is visible while the other is not. With another, assembly is such that neither would be seen when buttoned. Furthermore, there is an extending tab on the right side with one or two additional buttons or buttonholes which when closed are internal. (See Illustration 75.)

The configurations of the front ends of the waistbands can vary considerably. Four different patterns were ascertained. A fair number are squared as with Federal models. Frequently, the ends are rounded in one of two ways. The first simply involves rounding off the upper corner. With the second (also with a rounded upper corner) the band extends a little beyond the edge of the fly and then curves back in to meet it. The result is a semicircular pattern. Also noted on one pair is what can be termed a clipped end. In essence, this is much the same as the squared type, but the upper point is cut off at a forty-five degree angle, thus creating a third edge. (See Illustration 75.)

The suspender, fly, and waistband buttons, themselves, on Confederate trousers are very different from those on Union trousers and fre-
Illustration 75: Front Waistband Patterns and Construction for Type A Trousers.
sequently, civilian as well. As to those used for suspenders, they are
inevitably 5/8ths to 11/16ths of an inch in diameter and have a de­
pressed center with four holes. Most commonly, these are of black,
hard rubber. After this, with equal frequency, one encounters
such either of bone or black, japanned metal. One example has
suspenders buttons of hardened leather. Another possesses an
extremely mixed collection of hard rubber, bone, and blackened metal,
indicating severe loss and replacement.

With waistband buttons, the same pattern and size are used.
Again, black, hard rubber is the material most frequently employed to
make these. Next, bone versions are the most commonly encoun­
tered. Then, there are those of black, japanned metal. The
same example with leather suspender buttons possesses a leather
fastener here as well.

The majority of specimens have fly buttons of the same size and
style as those found elsewhere. A number of examples, however,
have smaller fasteners of 1/2 to 9/16ths of an inch in diameter. Still, the pattern on these remains the same as the larger sorts.
Again, hard rubber types predominate. Bone follows in order of
frequency. And, in keeping, those of black, japanned metal
are next. As with suspender buttons, one pair has a mixed set.

Another has buttons of wood. And, the last has leather
fasteners.

Because of the consistent frequency with which they appear and the
standardization of pattern, there can be little doubt that the hard
rubber buttons, the bone, and despite their probable civilian origin,
the japanned versions, as well, are indicative of Confederate issue. This is confirmed with the example that has such a mixed sample. In the course of replacement, one of the three types was always used. There are no additional, odd buttons of differing pattern or material.

Returning to the waistbands, the width of these in front can vary anywhere between one and one quarter to a wide two inches. In addition, usually, Confederate waistbands taper as they extend around to the rear. The degree of taper can differ between a minimal 1/8th and an extreme one and 1/8th of an inch. Only two examples have waistbands of equal thickness all the way around.

Vented backs are not universal to Confederate trousers. Several examples not possessing this feature are thus distinguished from their Federal counterparts. With these, the two sections comprising the waistband are sewn together in back. With one of these, however, the width at this point is decreased by dishing out the upper edge. (See Illustration 76.)

On those where a vent exists, such are not always as extreme as those seen on Northern issue. With a number of specimens, only the waistband itself is split. The opening does not extend down into the rear center seam. (See Illustration 76.)

With those that possess a vent of one form or another, there is variation in the ends of the waistbands at this point. Three distinct patterns were noted. Most commonly, the ends are squared off as with the Union type. Slightly less frequent are versions where the rear ends taper gradually in a curved cut. Next in order, are ends with which the corners are noticeably rounded off. (See Illustration 76.)
Illustration 76: Rear Waistband Patterns and Construction for Type A Trousers.
Witnessed on eleven examples, trim of contrasting color is common on the side seams of Confederate trousers. In this respect, those with are defined as representing Style A construction, and those without, Style B. In no instance, however, do these decorative features comply with the regulations. Two different materials are employed: smooth cording or tape. The former is more common, having been witnessed on six specimens. In terms of color, five of these are red. One is beige (perhaps originally yellow). In those cases where tape is employed, with four pairs, the color is black. On one of these, the tape is velvet. On another the trim is black tape over gold. Three of these pairs are attributed to infantryman. The fourth pair is unprovenanced. The last example is quite interesting in that worn by an infantryman, they have gold tape, but this tape covers a strip of yellow cording indicating cavalry issue. These, in conjunction with one of the corded pairs with which the color is red, but which are also provenanced to an infantryman, and those with the beige (?) piping worn by an artilleryman, perhaps offers a rare glimpse of possible Confederate shortages. In essence, nobody seemed too concerned about issuing trousers constructed for one service branch to another. On the other hand, it is possible that these colors represent a particular regiment's chosen color scheme in which the regulations were ignored. It is interesting to note that with the pair with which the wearer went to the trouble to cover the yellow cording, it was done with a gold tape not presenting too great a distinction. At the same time, these pants were worn with the flashy tailcoat with considerable gold trim. Consequently, it is likely that this addition was made more
for the reason of having the trousers match the coat rather than covering the original cording. One pair with side seam trim has cording along the top of the waistband as well. This represents Style B construction for this area. Now green, this was probably originally black.\textsuperscript{344}

Finally, there is the matter of the fabrics used to construct these garments and their colors. As with previous articles, there is considerable variation. Three different materials are in evidence. Represented by ten examples, 100% wool is the fibre content most frequently encountered.\textsuperscript{345} Next, four pairs are of the cotton/wool blend known as woolen jeans.\textsuperscript{346} The remaining three are homespun in the truest sense of the word with an exact fibre content that is difficult to discern.\textsuperscript{347} They possess a good deal of cotton or flax and there might well be some wool incorporated.

As to the weight of the fabrics, with one exception, those of wool are quite heavy with some equivalent to a blanket weight. The final woolen example, a satinettes, is fairly lightweight.\textsuperscript{348} The jeans trousers are also a very heavy weight similar to blanket material, and the fabric of the homespun trousers is quite thick as well. With those of wool or jeans, the weaves are quite tight and refined. The homespun versions, while coarser, are nonetheless, tightly woven.

Regarding colors, six of the wool pants are shades of gray. Three of these are a dark charcoal hue.\textsuperscript{349} The other three are gray with a distinct bluish cast. Of these, two are fairly dark.\textsuperscript{350} The other is very light.\textsuperscript{351} The remaining woolen trousers are shades of blue. Two pair can be described as a dark medium or light navy blue.\textsuperscript{352} Another borders between a dark sky and a medium blue.\textsuperscript{353} The last
pair is a royal blue. The four pairs of woolen jeans also reflect a diversity of color. One example is a dark gray with darker gray and white flecks creating a salt and pepper effect. Two pairs are now a brownish gray cast. The fourth is a decidedly greenish hue.

All three of the homespun versions are the tan color referred to as "butternut". It is quite likely that this was their original shade.

Internally, the flies, waistbands, and pocket linings, are inevitably of some form of cotton. One pair, constituting Style B construction, is completely lined throughout.

Type B: Trousers for Mounted Wear

Only one example of this trouser type was located with the result that like the sack coat and zouave jacket, there are no grounds for establishing a comparative typology of variant attributes. Only this single pair can be described, noting the distinctive features defining it as a specific type. While this pair is similar in basic cut and construction to those just described, there are noticeable characteristics that mark them as different in terms of appearance and function and constitute their classification as a specific type. Certain of the previous type were worn for mounted service, but these were expressly designed for that activity.

The overall cut is such that these pants are slightly fuller through the seat and hips to allow constant, comfortable sitting on a
Illustration 77: A Pair of Enlisted Man's Trousers for Mounted Wear (Type B).
horse. This results in the pattern of the legs being somewhat tapered, but this aspect is minimal and certainly does not warrant their being labeled as pegged. (See Illustration 77.)

Unlike the previous type, but like some Federal versions for the same function, there are no main pockets. There is only a small watch pocket. Its form is identical to Style A for the preceding type. (See Illustration 77.)

The cuffs of these trousers present a very unusual attribute not witnessed on any other type - Confederate, civilian, or Federal - and quite possibly unique to this particular pair or those of the wearer's particular command. Still, this feature is indicative of the function for which they were manufactured. The cuffs are externally reinforced with an eight inch wide band of leather. In addition, this and the underlying fabric are split at the outer seams and are closed with three brass buttons. This is a really practical aspect in that both the cuffs of the pants and the wearer's ankles are protected. It negates having to wear boots. There is a decided Spanish or Mexican influence here, and one can not help but wonder if the wearer or designer spent time on the American Southern Plains prior to the war. (See Illustrations 68 and 77.)

As with other Confederate pants, these have a belted back. The pattern of the belt tab is the same as that labeled Style B for the previous type. In constructing the back, no separate, pieced in panels are employed. There are, however, darts on either side to enhance the fit. (See Illustration 77.)

The crotch, lower seat, and inner legs are reinforced with an addi-
tional layer of fabric. This is a true indication of their use for mounted activities. (See Illustration 77.)

These are meant to be worn with suspenders, and the locations for the buttons for these are in the places already described as uniquely Confederate. The fly proper closes with four buttons. Above it, the waistband fastens with two. When secured, one button is visible while the other is not. In front, the ends of the waistband are cut square. As the waistband extends around to the rear, there is a noticeable taper. In back, the two waistband sections are sewn together with the result that there is no vent. (See Illustration 77.)

Regarding the buttons on these pants, those for the suspenders and waistband are a mixture of 5/8ths to 11/16ths inch bone and hard rubber of the pattern described earlier. The fly buttons are the same pattern, but of the smaller size already mentioned for the previous type.

There is black, smooth cord piping along each side seam. The fabric used to make the trousers themselves, is a fairly heavy 100% wool that is a medium gray in color. A mixture of cotton materials is employed for the lining.

**Type C: Chasseur Trousers**

Like other garments, only one pair of Confederate chasseur trousers was located and examined, and so, again, a typology of variant attributes can not be created. The garment can only be defined as a specific type based on the characteristics of this particular example. In keeping with the chasseur style, those examined are cut quite full
Illustration 78: A Pair of Enlisted Man's Chasseur Trousers (Type C).
through the hips and legs. In fact, they are full enough to require pleats at the waist both front and back. The legs are straight and full length. (See Illustration 78.)

There are two main pockets of the side seam style. Of interest is that these are set fairly far down from the waist in comparison with others of this kind. There is also a watch pocket whose construction is the same as Style A on Type A trousers. (See Illustration 78.)

The cuffs of these pants also offer a notable feature characteristic of the type. Being extremely full, they are gathered into a band at the ankle. This band is split at the outer seam and buckles closed. (See Illustration 78.)

Unlike most Confederate trousers, these do not have the typical belt tabs in back. Instead, in the manner popular with civilian wear, the waistband itself forms a belt at that point and buckles. This closes over a vent. (See Illustration 78.)

The waistband itself is of equal width all around. In front, when closed, the visible end is squared. Securing this is a button affixed to the right side and passing through the left so that it is seen when fastened. The fly proper closes with four buttons. (See Illustration 78.)

The buttons themselves are interesting in that those for the fly are not typical. A half inch in diameter and of black, japanned metal, there are only two holes instead of the usual four. The remaining buttons for suspenders and waistband are the same japanned type of the larger form already discussed. The suspender buttons are affixed in the usual Confederate manner with the outermost of each front pair over
the side seam. (See Illustration 78.)

These are made of a fairly heavy 100% wool, the color of which is a true sky blue. There is no trim. The lining sections are of cotton.

Vests

Type A: The Enlisted Man's Military Vest

Although vests were prescribed for issue in certain Southern state regulations, they were not by the central government. Consequently, some, at least, of those examined must represent privately procured items. As mentioned earlier, in basic cut and construction, there was probably little if any difference between Confederate and Federal enlisted men's types other than color. There were, however, very distinct differences between military and civilian vests. While displaying variant attributes, all six of the enlisted men's vests examined can be categorized as the same type.

As with civilian styles of the period, military vests were cut quite short. Those viewed would barely extend below the waist line. With these, the front hemlines angle up towards the sides with varying degrees of extremeness. In each instance, the hem/front opening configuration is a sharp angle. There are no openings or gaps at this point. With four distinct patterns noted, the rear hemlines show serious differences in cut. (See Illustrations 79 and 80.)

When worn these garments would offer a fitted appearance. This is created by a combination of two and sometimes three methods. Partial-
Illustration 79: An Enlisted Man's Vest (Type A). 362
Illustration 80: Rear Hemline Styles for Vests.
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ly, this is achieved through the cut of the different sections. All are single-breasted, and there can be either three or four main panels. In either case, there are two foreparts which, meeting at the front opening, extend around to a point directly beneath each arm. Here, they meet the back which can consist of one or two pieces. In the latter instances, there is a central rear seam. Apart from this seam, the other vertical edges are cut and sewn on a slight curve to enhance the fit. What is not attained in fit through the cut, is gained through the use of a belt in back. With equal frequency, these belts can either buckle or tie. Two different belt patterns exist. In addition, as with other articles of clothing, darts can be employed. Existing on two examples, their presence reflects Style B construction. Both have such extending up from the hem in front - Area A placement. Also, one has these devices running down the front from each armhole - Area C. The other has darts coming down from either side of the collar front - Area B. (See Illustrations 79, 81, 82, and 83.)

Of interest is the placement of the shoulder seams. Whereas coats and jackets inevitably have this seam angling down from the collar off the back of the shoulder, this pattern of construction is employed on only three of the vests. With the remaining three, the seam runs directly along the top of the shoulder. (See Illustration 81.)

As mentioned, all examples are single-breasted. Distinguishing these from civilian vests is the fact that when closed, they fasten from the hem to the neck. There are no lapels, nor are there lowered neck openings. Most frequently, there are nine buttons, which constitutes Style A in terms of count. Two versions, however,
Style A Back Construction.
Two Piece. Three Examples. \(^{368}\)

Style A Shoulder Construction.
Seam off Shoulder. Three Examples. \(^{370}\)

Style B Back Construction.
One Piece. Three Examples. \(^{369}\)

Style B Shoulder Construction.
Seam on Shoulder. Three Examples. \(^{371}\)

**Illustration 81**: Back and Shoulder Construction for Vests.
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Illustration 82: Belt Construction for Vests.
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Illustration 83: Belt Patterns for Vesta.
illustrate Style B, only having eight.\textsuperscript{376} Excepting, occasionally, the "French" type, the increased number of buttons also distinguishes Confederate military vests from civilian. (See Illustration 79.)

As to the buttons themselves, three examples have Southern military types.\textsuperscript{377} Two possess United States buttons.\textsuperscript{378} One has civilian.\textsuperscript{379} Of interest is the manner in which the buttons are attached on one specimen. Instead of being sewn on, they are strung in accordance with an earlier military method. In essence, a single cord, running down the inside of the front opening, holds all the buttons in place by looping through their shanks. This facilitated ease of removal in order to polish them.\textsuperscript{380}

Distinctly military are the stand-up collars viewed on all examples. Three different patterns were noted. With four of these construction involves two pieces, and these represent Style A construction.\textsuperscript{381} The remaining two, indicative of Style B, are of one piece.\textsuperscript{382} (See Illustration 84.)

External, welted pockets exist on all examples. Universally, there is one on either side of the front near the waist. In addition, three vests have a third pocket of this type located on the left breast.\textsuperscript{383} For this aspect, those with the breast pocket are labeled Style A, and those without, B. (See Illustrations 79 and 85.)

Top-stitching is the predominant sewing form used in making the fronts of these vests. The type termed edge-stitching was employed on the collars and front openings of four.\textsuperscript{384} One of these has a second row slightly further in creating a double top-stitched effect.\textsuperscript{385} Also, this same garment and one other have an additional row to
Illustration 84: Collar Patterns for Vests.
Illustration 85: Front Construction for Vests.
the right of the button line like that seen on two of the shell jackets. Three of these same vests have edge-stitched front hems. The fourth has a hem partially treated in this manner. One of these and another have top-stitched hems in back. Finally, with four specimens, various areas of the armholes are constructed this way. With three, it is only in the front. One of these is only partially sewn in this way. The fourth shows this method only in back.

In the construction of the foreparts of one of these garments, serious piecing is involved. This offers one of the very few indications of Southern shortages witnessed with any of the studied examples. When one considers, however, that we are discussing what is probably a non-issue garment, this is really not terribly serious. It is not as though a central government or state issue coat or jacket made in this way was encountered. In any case, despite the pieced foreparts, the vest as a whole is beautifully fashioned. (See Illustration 85.)

As to the primary fabrics used for these vests, four are of 100% wool. Two are of a cotton/wool jeans blend. With one possible exception, the attribute distinguishing these garments from Federal versions is their color. Five are various shades of gray. Two are gray with a decided bluish cast. One is brown with a grayish tint. Another is gray with a serious greenish quality. The fifth is charcoal gray with white and darker gray flecks causing a salt and pepper effect. The last example is interesting. It is a dark sky blue. Given the color, the extremely heavy weight of the fabric,
its U.S. buttons, and obvious homemade construction, there can be lit-
tle doubt that this article was fashioned from what was once a Federal
greatcoat. Still, while its color is not indicative of Confederate
vests, it is not exemplary of Federal ones either. 403

Typical of all vests of the era, the backs are made of a fabric
different from the fronts. In all instances, this is a form of cot-
ton. With three versions, it is a polished type. 404 With two, it is
a cotton canvas material. 405 The sixth is a twilled weave. 406 As
to color, witnessed on three vests, shades of tan are the most common-
ly employed hues. 407 Two are dark brown. 408 The last is an un-
bleached cotton making it off-white. 409

As to the internal construction of these garments, the cuts of the
linings conform to those of the outer sections. Most commonly, these
are of a white, cotton canvas-like fabric. 410 One example, however,
is lined with white polished cotton. 411 Another is a mix of the
white and dark brown cotton. 412 Of interest is the fact that the
inner foreparts of one garment are heavily padded. 413 For this
aspect of construction, this is labeled Style B.

Caps and Hats

Type A: The Kepi

For enlisted men’s headgear, the central government regulations
prescribed a French pattern kepi, and this type was also designated by
a number of states as well. As defined in the former, initially, the
Illustration 86: Enlisted Men's Headgear.
crown and sides were to be cadet gray with the banding at the base of the appropriate service branch color. Early in 1862, the color scheme was changed. The crown and sides were to be of service branch hue with the headband navy blue in all cases. The regimental number, in brass, was to be affixed to the front. As mentioned, the kepi was worn only to a limited extent in Northern service, but it was quite common with Confederate forces. At the same time, this was a distinctly military style not worn in civilian life. A total of eight kepis were examined, and all conform in basic pattern to the regulations and each other. There was, however, a diversity of colors with a number being nonregulation in this sense. 418

The kepi is a visored cap. In profile, when worn, those examined would appear semirigid with the front edge vertical and the rear sloping forward to a higher level with the result that the small, circular crown is set at a forward tilt. Although the degree can vary, where the sides meet the crown, they roll in in such a way that the crown itself is depressed. Inside the crown is a rigid panel. 419 (See Illustration 86.)

As stated, these caps are visored. In each case, the cuts of the bills conform to the same pattern; flat and squared with corners rounded off (slightly more in some instances than others). Typifying Style A construction, most are fashioned from leather. 420 Some, however, indicative of Style B, are of laminated cardboard and covered with a painted fabric. 421 Despite the materials used, the majority of these visors have bound edges. 422 This aspect will be termed Style A construction. Less common is Style B involving unbound bills. 423
The color, in all instances, is black. (See Illustration 86.)

With half the sample, a small button is affixed to the headband on either side.\textsuperscript{424} Whether or not the remaining examples originally possessed these and they are now missing is difficult to discern, but indications are that some, at least, may never have had such.\textsuperscript{425} Accepting this possibility, those with will be termed Style A and those without, Style B. With Federal caps of this type, an adjustable chin strap was generally attached to these buttons. With these Southern versions, however, only one example has such a device.\textsuperscript{426} This is of black leather with two leather keepers. Another has a leather thong attached in lieu of a proper chin strap.\textsuperscript{427} Whether this represents a field replacement of an earlier and more correct one or simply a field addition (with the buttons to which it attaches having been purely decorative or added themselves) is impossible to discern. Whatever the case, because it seems a logical inclusion, the existence of a functional chin strap, whatever its form, will be designated Style A for this aspect of construction. (See Illustration 86.)

Style B involves the presence of a nonfunctional, purely decorative device which creates the illusion of a chin strap. This form was witnessed on two specimens. With one, this consists of a narrow strand of gold braid over a wider strip of black tape or lace sewn directly to the front of the headband.\textsuperscript{428} This example has buttons in conjunction with this which, given the situation, are simply decorative as well. The second version has a false chin strap of thin black cording over a wider length of black painted canvas. This, too, is attached directly to the front of the cap. There are no buttons on this.\textsuperscript{429}
Those without chin straps of any sort will be termed Style C with regards to this aspect of assembly. Three categorized as such lack the buttons as well. Whether or not chin straps originally existed in association with now missing buttons and have gone the same route (which would be the logical course if the buttons were lost) or they simply never were, can not be determined. As pointed out, however, there are indications that with some, the buttons may never have existed, and if this is the case, neither would the chin straps. Also, in light of the false forms, it is quite likely that some had none at all. With one last example, there are buttons but no strap. Again, it is impossible to ascertain if such was ever present. It may well be a matter of its being lost. At the same time, however, it might well be that it never existed and the buttons are purely decorative.

As to the fabrics employed in these caps, six are of 100% wool. Two are cotton/wool blends. In terms of colors, the two of mixed fibre content are a solid hue overall which is now tannish in nature. In terms of plain versus decorated caps, the unadorned, solid colored examples are designated as reflecting Style B construction. With the all-wool examples three conform to the central government regulations in their color schemes. These and others with decorative features illustrate Style A. Two, worn by artillerymen, have red crowns and sides and navy blue headbands as designated in the later regulations. The third, worn by infantryman, has the gray crown with light blue headband as prescribed earlier in the war. These color schemes constitute a decorative aspect, and in this sense,
this form of contrasting hues will be termed the Style A trim pattern. A variation on this, and designated Style B, was observed on one example. Belonging to an artilleryman, this kepi has a red headband and crown in association with bluish gray sides. A fifth cap has trim in the truest sense of the word in conjunction with the Style A form. Also worn by a follower of Saint Barbara this involves a red crown and sides with a sky blue headband. In association are two locations where piping is applied, and this constitutes two additional styles of trim used together with a third. Encompassing the entire cap along the top of the headband is a narrow strand of gold braid. In addition, from this point up to the edge of the crown a length of this same material is found in front, back, and on either side. The only instance in which piping was seen on a kepi, these are designated Styles C and D respectively. The Style D form of application with this makes it appear an officer's cap worn by a lieutenant, but documentation indicates otherwise.

Like the first two mentioned, the last is a solid color overall. Of interest, however, is the fact that it is navy blue. This is likely an early war militia version, and the issue and wear of such to and by Confederate forces was not unknown. Apart from this, the colors of these caps or the combinations thereof are indicative of Southern forms of this type, and as such, constitute an important distinguishing attribute. Also, two examples possess brass military hat devices indicating the command in which they were worn.

This researcher was only able to view the internal construction of four of these. In each case, they are lined. Two have linings of
Another is of burlap or buckram. The last is of note in having a gathered leather lining. This same feature was witnessed on officers' kepis not included in this study.

**Type C: The Forage Cap**

Although not next in frequency and type the forage cap will be discussed next, because of similarities with the kepi. Despite similar attributes, however, there are distinctive features which warrant defining the forage cap as a separate form. Not prescribed in the central government regulations, this style was, nevertheless, worn with some frequency. Also, in basic pattern this was the same sort most commonly issued by the Federal central government. At the same time, nothing resembling the forage cap was sported for civilian wear. Three examples of this type were located and examined.

A major attribute differentiating between these forage caps and the kepis is that they would not appear the same when worn. Forage caps do not present a semirigid effect. In essence, while the front is still cut straight and vertical, it is higher. In turn, the back is still cut slightly higher than the front so that the crown angles forward. The result when worn is that the crown flops forward increasing the angle and creating a noticeably crumpled effect to the front. The heights can vary considerably, but comparatively between themselves and the kepis two general ranges are discernible. Most commonly, these are of medium height. Two examples fall within this category which is labeled Style A construction. This is comparable with the Federal Model 1861 pattern. Style B involves an extremely tall crown.
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Observed with one example, this is equivalent to the Model 1859 Federal issue.\footnote{449} This particular style could have a stiffening agent added for dress purposes which would make it appear a rigid shako type. For field use, however, this was generally removed. Needless to say, the higher the crown the more pronounced is the tilt as it falls forward. With the Style B sort, this can be so extreme that the crown will actually rest on the visor. (See Illustrations 86 and 87.)

Another feature often distinguishing the forage cap from the kepi is that at the top edge the sides do not roll in to form a depressed crown. Instead, there is a welt at this point. Observed on two versions, this is termed Style A for this aspect of assembly, and it is the same as used on Federal issue.\footnote{450} Rolled sides and depressed crowns can, however, exist. Seen on one specimen, the degree of severity is not as great as that of most kepis and this is not a characteristic of Northern central government issue.\footnote{451} This form is designated Style B. (See Illustrations 86 and 87.)

Like the kepi, these are visored, but only two of the examples retain this feature. Two different patterns were noted. The first, Style A, is the same as that on the previous type.\footnote{452} Style B involves a rounded rather than square configuration. Also, instead of lying flat, when affixed, this angles down and is convex in nature.\footnote{453} Both forms were used with Federal forage caps.\footnote{454} Caps with a Style B visor in association with a Style B crown will be designated as Style B forage caps. (See Illustrations 86 and 87.)

Also like the kepi, the visors can be of leather or painted, waterproof fabric over a stiffening agent. These are labeled Styles A
and B respectively for this aspect of construction. In either case, these are bound and black in color. Only one example has a chin strap and side buttons. The chin device is the same pattern as that observed on the single kepi. Differentiating between Southern and Northern chin straps is the fact that the latter inevitably have a small brass buckle in addition to the keepers while the Southern types do not. Whether or not the other two examples originally possessed buttons and chin straps is impossible to say, but like the previous type, it is entirely possible they did not. Accepting this, versions with and without this feature will be designated Styles A and B respectively. False, decorative chin devices were not witnessed on this form of cap. (See Illustrations 86 and 87.)

All three examples are of 100% wool. One is a solid, medium gray—an attribute readily distinguishing it and, needless to say, many others, from their Federal counterparts. Another of the specimens, however, is navy blue, making it in many ways virtually identical to those worn by Northern soldiers. Like the kepi of this color, this probably is an example of early war militia wear. These untrimmed caps illustrate Style A construction.

The third example, reflecting Style B, is extremely multicolored, incorporating all the decorative aspects described for the previous type and more. The color scheme employed in constructing the body is the same as Style B form of the preceding type, in that the headband, sides, and crown are each a different hue. The first area is aqua, the second, black, and the third, gray. Because it is the only example using contrasting colored sections in any form, this will be designated
Style A for this type, but it is difficult to imagine that in actuality the Style A pattern for kepis was not more common. In conjunction with this is decorative piping, applied in three different locations, and thus constituting three different styles in association. The first, B, involves contrasting hued cording around the top edge of the headband. Style C takes the form of vertical piping extending up from the headband to the edge of the crown. This is positioned only on the front. With Style D, we witness a new form of trim. The welt around the crown is of contrasting color. In each location, this trim is red. Also on this cap is an abundance of brass military hat emblems signifying the unit in which it was worn. 459 (See Illustration 87.)

As one was on display, the insides of only two could be examined. Both are lined with forms of cotton. The navy blue version's interior is a print indicating that it is not of Federal origin. 460

Type B: Felt Hats

Seven examples of this basic type were encountered. Although felt hats were certainly actually issued, many were privately procured with the result that there is no prescribed, distinctively military pattern. All conform to the numerous and varied civilian styles then in vogue, and the choice of pattern was frequently a matter of personal preference or simply what was available. Because of the large number of styles then extant in conjunction with the relatively small number of the sample, and because there is nothing distinctly military or Confederate in terms of basic pattern with any of the examples viewed,
no attempt will be made to establish a formal typology for these. The type will simply be defined and the examined specimens described.

Because of their sometimes nondescript nature resulting from general wear and tear, hats of this type were commonly collectively referred to as "slouch" hats. Two basic attributes define them as a basic type. They are made of felt and possess an all-encompassing brim.

One particular pattern accounts for over half the sample. Whether this is indicative of issue or simple popularity is impossible to say. In each instance, these have brims of three and a half to four inches wide with a noticeable upward roll all around. In each case, the edge is bound. The crowns are medium height and rounded. With three, hat bands of ribbon surround the base. All are now a greenish/brownish color. One is of interest in that it has one side of its brim folded up and held in place with a loop and button. On the upturned surface, there is an embroidered five point star of military nature. (See Illustration 86.)

With two of the remaining examples, there is little to describe in terms of pattern. Both are quite nondescript; true "slouch" hats in every sense. One, however, was also worn with the brim turned up on one side.

The final example is quite distinctive. This has a very broad, flat, bound brim. The sides rise straight to a medium height to meet a flat crown. Brass military hat devices designating the unit in which it was worn are in abundance. This hat too is now a greenish/brownish color.
Type D: Quilted Hats

Three examples of quilted hats were examined. While all conform to the same basic concept of design and construction, and as such have basic features in common, there are few specific attributes shared between these hats. At the same time, each has a number of specific attributes which are unique and which by themselves and combined mark each article as quite different from the others. Because these are so singularly distinctive and varied, no effort will be made to establish a typology for particularistic details. The hats will simply be described comparatively and the type defined.

As stated, there are very general common features. All possess a medium height crown in association with an all-encompassing brim. The type is not, however, defined by pattern. It is a matter of the materials employed and the method of construction. These are made of woven fabric and quilted.

The first has a brim of about four inches in width with the edge bound with tape. There is the same upward roll all around as with the first four felt hats discussed. Here, heavy quilting exists in the form of a tight continuous spiraling pattern from the edge to the base of the crown. Constructed as separate sections, the crown and brim are sewn together. The domed crown is also quilted. With it, construction consists of four triangular panels stitched together with their apexes meeting at the top. Within each panel is a quilted motif of progressively smaller concentric triangles. Around the base there exists a hat band of ribbon. While the fibre content of the fabric is difficult
to determine, its color is the same greenish/brownish tint witnessed with previous hats. This is the only example with which the internal areas could be viewed thoroughly. There is a lining involving alternating tan and brown panels cut on the same lines as the exterior. These, however, are not quilted. (See Illustration 86.)

With the next example, the brim of about three inches in width is quilted in the same spiral fashion as the previous version. This hat's brim, however, is flat, and a tight binding stitch was employed on the edge rather than tape. As to the crown, while technically not quilted in the sense of having sewn patterns, between the outer section and lining is an additional inner layer of heavy canvas. The construction of the front, back, and sides consists of a single panel forming a cylinder. This rises to join with a circular section which constitutes the top and gives the crown a flat configuration. This latter area is not quilted, nor are there any additional layers of material. As with the previous example, the crown is sewn to the brim. At the point where the two areas meet, there is a ribbon hat band. This hat is of heavy, black cotton, and the lining appears to be of the same fabric.

With the last example, while the brim has the upward roll witnessed on other hats, it is comparatively narrow. Again, the edge is bound, but with a braided material. The brim's construction is radically different from those already mentioned. It is fashioned from four separate quarters and pieced together. Quilted, the stitching creating this radiates out across the width of the brim in tightly spaced rows from the base of the crown to the edge. Again, the crown is made sepa-
rately and sewn to the brim. With it, the construction of the front, back, and sides also involves four separate sections. Each is a quadrangular pattern which when joined create a slight taper towards the top. These pieces are also quilted with the stitching consisting of parallel, vertical rows running from top to bottom. The top edges of these four sections join with a circular panel forming the top of the crown. In conjunction with the slightly tapered sides, this creates a moderately rounded configuration to the crown overall. The panel forming the top is not quilted. Surrounding the hat just below the seam for the crown section are nine bound eyelets - obviously for ventilation - and a woven or braided hat band encompasses the base. The fabric used is a woolen/jeans whose color is now a grayish/greenish/brownish tone. As this was on display, nothing could be determined about the lining. 466

Type E: Straw Hats

Although worn with seemingly less frequency than other forms, straw hats were, nevertheless, worn. Only one example of this rather fragile type was located, and it is of special interest not only for having survived, but also for the fact that it is constructed of pine straw (needles). Unlike more common versions actually fashioned from straw, these needles are not woven together. Instead, multiple needles are gathered in rows in which the individual "straws" overlap each other to various degrees, and, in turn, these rows are sewn together with thread. The stitching pattern is of interest in that multiple threads
starting from the central point of the crown, spiral out over it, down the sides, and across the brim to the edge, creating a pinwheel effect when viewed from above. (See Illustration 87.)

In overall configuration, the pattern of the hat is quite similar to the later "skimmer" with which we are all familiar. The brim is flat and about three and a half inches in width. The sides of the crown rise fairly vertically to a relatively low height of about three and a half inches. The top is flat. This particular specimen possesses neither a hat band or bound edge. While the inside could not be viewed, given the general nature of the hat, it is doubtful that it is lined. (See Illustration 87.)

Type F: Zouave Cap

Only one example of this type was located and examined. A visor-less, soft (non-rigid) item, its general appearance is between that of a stocking cap and a fez. It is, however, unlike either form in that the fabric is woven rather than knit or felted. While the general, overall color is red, there is a darker, brownish plaid motif woven in. At the top, a knotted tassel of what appears to be simple straw is attached.

Type G: Jockey Cap

The single specimen of a "jockey cap" located is an odd article in that no precedent for its wear militarily has been encountered. Conse-
quently, whether it is actually military in nature or merely a civilian cap worn in service is impossible to determine. In any case, it conforms to a civilian style worn for hunting. (See Illustration 87.)

The construction of the crown involves four panels; two larger ones forming the sides and meeting in back at a central, rear seam, and two smaller which constitute the front. The basic overall shape of the crown is rounded. A separate, pieced in headband is affixed at the base. At the bottom of this is a reeded welt acting as a stiffening or shaping agent. Of note is a large, six point star appliqued over the crown. (See Illustration 87.)

While lacking either chin strap or buttons, there is a visor. Of the same rounded, convex, downward angled pattern as described for one of the forage caps, this is covered with the same fabric from which the rest of the cap is made. This material is 100% wool and navy blue in hue. No details could be discerned about the item's internal construction. (See Illustration 87.)

Footwear

Type A: Confederate Military Bootee

This shoe type was that most commonly worn in Confederate service. While many Southern made military shoes were undoubtedly patterned identically after the Federal model, the one pair examined, while similar in basic design to its Northern counterpart, presented some noticeable differences.
Illustration 88. Enlisted Men’s Footwear.

- Boots: Type B.470
- Lowcuts: Type C.468
- Bootees: Type A.469
As with the Union version, these are of heavy black leather. Roughly ankle height, they lace up the front, but with six rather than four pairs of lace holes. The toe is plain. The sole is a heavy double thickness, and there is a short, stacked heel.

In addition to the variant number of lace holes, an aspect one notices immediately is the manner in which the instep area is made. With Federal examples, the quarters are fashioned from a single piece which wraps around the heel. On each side, these extend forward to overlap the toe/vamp/tongue section, also cut as a single piece, on the outside. With the pair studied, the rear edge of the toe/vamp piece is sewn over the front edges of the quarters, and the tongue is cut as a separate part and sewn beneath the toe/vamp panel. The quarters, themselves, are separate sections which, when put together, create a seam up the back of the heel. Returning to the toe, it is more tapered and rounded than on Federal versions.471 (See Illustration 88.)

To the back, the visible stitching securing the inner heel lining is of a different configuration than the Northern. Also, at this point, the shoe is more fitted to conform to the heel of the wearer.472 (See Illustration 88.)

In addition, there are notable differences in the way in which the soles are made. Unlike the Northern type with two thicknesses of leather extending the entire length of the shoe, the second, outer layer on these amounts to a half sole running from beneath the arch to the toe. This is certainly practical in that it would allow for greater comfort by being more flexible, and it would facilitate ease of repair if needed. Finally, whereas the Federal type has only a single row of stitching or pegs, this pair possesses a double row of the
latter. Such could not but help create a sturdier, more rugged shoe. (See Illustration 88.)

Type B: Boots for Mounted Wear

Mirroring the Northern practice, Southern regulations prescribe an ankle boot for mounted wear, but not higher styles. No examples of the regulation pattern were located, and only a single pair of a high, nonregulation form attributed to an enlisted man were found. Whether or not these were actually issued or privately obtained is impossible to say, although the latter seems likely. They are, however, decidedly military in cut. As with high, individually acquired Federal boots, there was most certainly a wide variety of different styles worn by Southern horsemen. In all probability, these were at least similar if not identical in pattern to Northern versions. Because of this in conjunction with only the one pair having been observed, no effort will be made to establish a typology of variant styles and attributes. The boots examined will only be described.

These are very high with "Napoleon" tops. In essence, the backs of the tops are cut out to accommodate bending the knees with comfort while the fronts are left higher in the form of flaps extending up and over the front of the knee and offering additional protection to that area. The toe/vamp section is cut as a single piece, and as such presents a plain appearance. The configuration is such that the toe is fairly pointed with the vamp being severely angled and straight—obviously to facilitate ease of putting on. The quarters are also
fashioned from a single piece which wraps around the heel and joins with the section just described at the instep with vertical seams on either side. The tops are formed from a single piece with the seam running up the back. Boot straps are affixed internally. Each of the three sections comprising the uppers is of extremely heavy, stiff, black leather. (See Illustration 88.)

Like the uppers, the soles are incredibly heavy and stiff. These are fashioned from two thicknesses of leather. The stacked heel is short in length, but quite high. Both the soles and heels are pegged. (See Illustration 88.)

Type C: Low Cut Shoes

As with the previous examples, only one pair of this type was located. These are interesting in that initially believed to be of civilian origin, a study of civilian shoes failed to reveal any form resembling these which had not been long out of fashion. Consequently, despite the lack of any military precedence as well, this combined with their heavy, plain construction, indicates the strong possibility that they are Southern military issue, at least on a state or militia level.

As with other military shoes, these have a plain toe. This and the vamp section with the tongue included are cut as a single piece. The shape of the toe itself is bluntly rounded. The tongue is of interest in that it comes to a point and for some reason is split. Whether or not it was originally constructed in this way or if this is an example of field modification, perhaps for comfort, is impossible to say. (See Illustration 88.)
The quarters, cut as a single piece, extend around to meet the toe/vamp section at the arch/instep area. Of interest, however, is the fact that the panels containing the lace holes are separate and not fashioned as part of the quarters. Starting from the sole at the arch, these extend up over the instep on either side for the purpose of tying with two pairs of lace holes. In doing so, they cover the juncture of the quarters and the toe/vamp sections. (See Illustration 88.)

As indicated, the key attribute defining these as a distinct type is their low cut. They do not lace as high as the bootee. From the top of the instep, the sides dip a fair degree before again sweeping up relatively high at the back of the heel. (See Illustration 88.)

The soles are constructed of a double thickness of leather running the entire length of the shoe. The short heels are stacked and low. The color and material, overall, is black leather. (See Illustration 88.)

Type D: Canvas Shoes with Leather Soles

As will be seen, according to the written sources, one of the few articles which actually seems to have been in short supply on occasion were shoes, although as will also be seen, the photographs support that the shortages were nowhere near as bad as is generally believed. In any case, in an effort to conserve leather, shoes (or parts thereof) were sometimes fashioned from other materials. One such form consists of leather soles with predominantly canvas uppers.

One pair, fitting the description, was located. Although labeled
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as civilian, this same pattern is known to have been worn in the field, and those examined, in all probability, are quite similar, if not exactly the same, as those actually issued.

As mentioned, the uppers are primarily of canvas. Extending up to ankle height, these lace up the front through four sets of holes. Basic construction involves two pieces of fabric sewn together up the back of the heel and down the center line of the vamp/toe. In addition, the toe is reinforced with a small appliqued panel of leather which has the smooth side out. Around the lacing opening runs a strip of leather with the rough side out which reinforces the holes. There is no tongue. The soles are a relatively lightweight, double thickness of leather. The heels are short in length, stacked, and low. (See Illustration 89.)

The overall effect is similar to that of a modern, high-top tennis shoe with leather instead of rubber toes and soles. In certain aspects, these must have been quite practical. There can be no doubt that in hot weather on long marches they were very comfortable. Yet, given their lightweight construction, they could not have had a life span comparable in length to the undoubtedly sturdier all-leather boot. In a combat situation in heavy brush with the inherent snags, they certainly could not have held up well. Also, in cold or wet weather, they must have been next to useless in terms of warmth or keeping feet dry.

Type E: Leather Shoes with Wooden Soles

Shoes with leather uppers and wooden soles and heels are also exem-
plary of occasional leather shortages or the efforts to conserve such in the South. Obviously, the most distinguishing attribute of this type is their wooden soles and heels. With the single pair of this sort that was examined, both of these sections are cut as one from a single block of wood. In form, they present the same appearance as a normal leather sole and heel. In addition, steel or iron cleats of horseshoe configuration are set recessed into the heels and around the toes. That in the latter area is of three separate pieces and extends back to beneath the arch. Secured with nails with raised heads causing a hobnailed effect, these served to create traction and prevent wear. (See Illustration 89.)

Constructed of black leather with the rough side out, the ankle height uppers share attributes with both the normal Confederate bootees and the canvas and leather shoes already discussed. Like the latter, they are tongueless and lace via four sets of holes. Like the former, the single piece toe/vamp section is sewn over the front edges of the quarters. Also like the Type A shoe, the pattern of the visible stitching securing the heel lining is the same. The quarters, however, are fashioned from a single piece of leather which merely wraps around the back of the heel with the result that like Federal shoes there is no heel seam and this area is not fitted to the foot. The uppers are attached to the soles with small, closely spaced nails all around. (See Illustration 89.)

Type F: Canvas Shoes with Wooden Soles

With shoes whose construction involves canvas uppers and wooden
soles, we witness the ultimate in conserving leather. Only a small amount is used to reinforce the fabric. The soles of these are the same as those just described for the previous type except that they lack the metal cleats. In basic style, the canvas uppers conform to the same pattern as earlier mentioned shoes in being ankle height and lacing up the front. There are three pairs of lace holes. Again, no tongue exists. Like the previous canvas type, there is a small leather toe panel appliqued over the canvas. The only other leather consists of a narrow binding along the edges to be laced closed and around the tops. Unlike the earlier canvas shoes, this binding does not incorporate the holes for the laces and as such, does not serve as a reinforcement in this sense. The holes are merely punched through the fabric below the leather. The canvas portions are comprised of two sections. The quarters and heel are cut as a single piece extending forward after wrapping around the back of the foot and meeting the panel forming the toe/vamp section at vertical seams on either side above the arch. The material is undyed while what little leather exists is black. (See Illustration 89.)

Both these and the preceding version with wooden soles are interesting. If worn under certain circumstances, either pair would prove tolerably serviceable. In fact, it is quite probable that a fair number of Southern soldiers from rural areas or lower economic levels wore wooden clogs regularly in civilian life, and so, were familiar with footwear of this nature. At the same time, however, no matter how used to wooden shoes one was, such were totally impractical for wear in many military situations. Although references to their issue exist, it is
truly difficult to imagine wearing wooden soled shoes for day after day on long marches without doing more harm than good to one's feet, and consequently, one must seriously question how frequently they were presented to troops actively on campaign in the field. It is also hard to believe that such shoes would have held up under such circumstances without the soles splitting, warping, or simply wearing down at a rate faster than leather. Too, in the case of the canvas models, given the inflexibility of the soles, it would not take long due to the stress created by wear for the uppers to tear and part company with them. Logic dictates that when necessity required the issue of these shoes, they were primarily given to troops on garrison duty or, at least, in semipermanent camps; situations calling for far less marching and thus, making this type of footwear sufficient and freeing up supplies of better shoes for commands on more active duty. Whatever the position of the recipient, it is obvious that footwear of this nature was intended only as a stopgap measure until more suitable shoes could be procured.

Leggings

Very little is known about Confederate leggings other than that they were worn despite their not being mentioned in the regulations. Undoubtedly, many of the pairs sported were issued on the state level or privately procured. According to one source, very few if any seem to have survived. This writer was certainly unable to locate a pair.
Consequently there is nothing to even describe let alone establish a typology for, and it can only be assumed that they were probably similar, if not identical, to their Northern counterparts. The reader is referred to the earlier passages in which Federal styles are discussed and illustrated.

**Winter Dress**

**Type A: Greatcoats**

Only one example of a Confederate enlisted man's greatcoat was located, but unfortunately, access to it was refused. Consequently, for this one section, the written sources and illustrations will be relied on to offer a brief description of this garment type. Whereas Federal versions offer enough major differences in attributes between mounted and dismounted forms to warrant their being classified separately, such is not the case with Southern examples. There are only two features differentiating between greatcoats worn by Confederate foot troops and horsemen, and these are not significant enough to allow them to be categorized as two distinct types.

No information has been found concerning the exact cut, number of panels, etc., involved in construction. The regulations from which much of the following is derived are quite vague, and the "Official" plates illustrating these are primitive at best. They were, however, long garments extending to below the knees like their Federal counterparts. A major attribute distinguishing the Southern foot soldier's
greatcoat from the Northern is that they were to be double-breasted instead of single. The Confederate model for mounted wear closed in the same manner. The number of buttons employed to close the front openings is nowhere specifically signified. The regulations state only that there were to be eighteen, but does not mention how many, if any, of these were to go on the capes. At the same time, while the numbers on the bodies of the coats proper are blocked from view, the official plate clearly shows the cape for the dismounted version as having seven buttons and that for the mounted with nine. This means that the figure of eighteen cited in the regulations pertains only to those on the coat proper and is not inclusive of those for the capes. In essence, as both capes have an uneven number of buttons, if either amount were deducted from a total of eighteen, it would leave an uneven number to close the front of a double-breasted coat. Needless to say, this simply does not work. Therefore, the front openings of the bodies of both the dismounted and mounted versions fastened with nine pairs of buttons. This figure distinguishes the Confederate form for horsemen from its Northern counterpart.478

As already indicated, both Confederate versions possessed capes, the respective lengths of which were equivalent to those of Federal issue. With arm extended, the dismounted form was to reach the elbow while the mounted was to meet the wrist. This difference in the lengths of the capes and the variation in the number of buttons employed on them are the only attributes that distinguish between the two models. In turn, the number of fasteners on the mounted form marks the Southern version as different from the Federal. At the same time, the
seven button foot model is distinguished from the Northern form with six.

Another feature of the Confederate greatcoat that is distinctive is the lack of turndown cuffs. Also, both forms were to possess stand-up collars which for the horseman's garment distinguishes it from its Northern opposite number with its stand-and-fall collar. Finally, as prescribed by the regulations, the color was to be cadet gray.

Type B: Capes

It is stated that Southern soldiers often found a cape by itself to be sufficient protection from the elements. In some instances, these seem to have been acquired by simply removing them from a greatcoat. In others, they were made specifically as capes to begin with.

One Confederate enlisted man's cape was located and examined. It is impossible to determine if this particular example was originally part of a greatcoat that varied somewhat in pattern from the regulations, or was constructed only as a cape initially. There are features lending support to either possibility. Rather crudely made in certain aspects, it is, nevertheless, very Southern military in form. (See Illustration 90.)

Belonging to an artilleryman, this garment would reach to the wrist as prescribed for mounted troops. Its construction involves three panels; two foreparts and a back-piece. Each front section meets an edge of the back at a seam running along the top of the shoulder from the neck and down each side. Single-breasted, the front closes to the
neck with three large – one and 1/8th inch – civilian pattern buttons. Both sides of the front opening are top-stitched. While the hem is left raw it is stay-stitched close to the edge to prevent unraveling. (See Illustration 90.)

In association, there is a stand-up collar, the height of which is considerable at two and 3/4ths inches all around. Its squared front edges overlap to completely enclose the neck when the front is buttoned. Around all edges, the collar is top-stitched, and within the border created by this, there is additional top-stitching in a sawtooth like motif. Of note is the fact that this latter stitching does not go all the way through the collar. It is only visible on the outside layer. As with many coats and jackets, this section of the cape is fashioned from two pieces of fabric. (See Illustration 90.)

Internally, this cape is lined with a now brownish (probably originally brown and red) plaid cotton gauzelike material. While this lining is hemmed, it is not attached to the bottom edge of the outer part.

If this cape was originally part of a greatcoat, then, several more differences can be noted between Confederate and Federal versions. The multi-panel construction is not seen on Northern examples, nor is the raw edge. Also, the sawtooth top-stitching is at odds with the multiple rows of parallel, horizontal top-stitching found on U.S. models for dismounted troops. Finally, again, the number of buttons is a distinguishable feature. On the other hand, if this was specially produced as just a cape to begin with, then we witness a garment type not worn by Northern enlisted men.
Concluding Comments on Confederate Uniforms

Color

Much has been written about Southern "butternut" colored uniforms – too much! A dye supposedly resorted to out of need when supplies of gray ran out, this hue is defined as rusty brown or tan. As pointed out, a fair number of garments in this sample are now such a color. Of these, however, this writer will accept that only three pairs of trousers and one jacket were initially so. It is interesting that all four of these articles are homespun in the truest sense and homemade. As such, while military, they can not be considered representative of actual "issue". As to the remaining uniform items of this shade, all indications are that they were originally gray, and a number of factors, singly or combined, have played a part in altering their appearance. Such include the physical nature of the fabric itself, the type of dye used, simple fading from sun and rain, cleaning, sweat, and staining.

Of special note is the fact that all garments now exhibiting brownish/tannish tones are cotton/wool blends. None of the all-wool articles show the slightest hint of these hues. With the blends, the weave consists of a woolen warp and a cotton weft which results in the woolen fibres dominating the outer or right side of the fabric, while the cotton ones are more noticeable on the wrong or reverse side. In turn, with most, if not all, of these coats and jackets, the material was clearly dyed in the thread rather than in the piece, and only the
woolen yarns received treatment. The cotton ones are from what is
termed Brown Cotton (not the white we normally think of) which is natu­
really a rusty brown/tan hue. Neither dyed nor bleached, these were
simply spun and used in a natural state. Contrasting fibres in con­
junction with the nature of the weave result in the outer side of the
material being gray (totally or at least predominantly depending on the
nature of the yarn and the exact weave) while the reverse side is
decidedly brown. This method of weaving and dyeing is a major factor
in the color change. Through wear, the woolen, surface fibres wore
down to expose the cotton beneath, resulting in a garment that appears
brown instead of its original gray.

Another factor entering in is the dye employed. Having only been
invented in 1857, colorfast versions were quite new at the time of the
Civil War. Apart from North Carolina, the Southern states were not
noted for their textile industries. Consequently, the new dye types
were undoubtedly in short supply, and the older ones were resorted to.
With these, there were undoubtedly differences in the levels of quali­
ity. A garment treated with non-colorfast dye, even of good quality,
when subjected to the rigors of constant outdoor wear, will rapidly
wash out in the rain and/or fade in the sunlight. Add to this the
chemical effects of that common cleansing agent of the day, lye soap,
and a once gray cotton/wool uniform could easily turn brown or tan.
With the tinted in the thread blends that are now brown/tan, it is
obvious that the same or a very similar dye was used on each. Fading
of the gray woolen fibres, in addition to their wear, and in conjunc­
tion with the brown cotton, has progressively increased the effect
of these garments appearing brown.

In effect, the transition of these uniforms from gray to brown in terms of weave, wear, and dye, was not unlike that of a modern pair of blue jeans, the fabric of which is a direct descendent of the woolen jeans from which at least most of these were fashioned. The material for the newer form is also dyed in the thread. As we all know, as a pair of blue jeans grows older, the once dominant dark blue strands fade to light blue, and the white of the reverse side becomes increasingly exposed through wear to the outer surface. This can progress to the point where the white dominates the blue or what remains of it.

If treated with the same form of dye, these same processes would effect even cotton/wool blends tinted in the piece following weaving. Regardless of the type of dye used, relatively speaking, cotton will not hold a color as well as wool. Certain dyes when used on two distinctly different fabrics at once probably will not take well with one or both, and are even more prone to fading or washing out. Even if the dye does take well initially, the factors of water, cleaning, and sun, will reduce the cotton fibres back to a more natural color state faster than the woolen, which, in the case of these uniforms, would alter the entire material to a state nearer to that of having been dyed in the thread originally. Of course, following this, the gray would fade and continue to wear down exposing the discolored, brownish cotton resulting in the garment presenting a brown appearance. Basically, given the particular form of dye used on these uniforms obviously did not take well with the woolen yarns, it certainly would have set even less well with the cotton.
That this is what happened to these uniforms is evident from several examples. With one, when looked at quickly or from a distance, it at first seems a light brown or tan. But when examined closely, it is apparent that the woolen surface fibres are still a faint gray and simply faded and worn. Their condition is such that their color is dominated by the brown cotton beneath. A second example initially appears even browner. This uniform was subjected to laboratory analysis with the verdict being that it was originally gray. Close scrutiny reveals the faintest of gray casts to the wool, but again, because of fading and wear, the brown cotton behind prevails in color. With two more, the overall surface hue is truly tannish, yet in a couple of isolated areas on each, small patches of a fuzzy gray nap remain to indicate the original color. Finally, having discussed the above which represent one end of the spectrum, there exists another uniform which by comparison is in pristine condition. With it, the outer surface has undergone relatively little wear, and there is no doubt in the observer's mind and eye when observing it that the overall hue is gray. At the same time, the reverse side of the fabric is decidedly brown.

Sweat undoubtedly played at least one role and possibly two in the transformation. Certainly it caused a degree of brown staining especially of the cotton fibres. Also, it is quite possible that the salts of perspiration produced a chemical effect that helped break down the particular form of gray dye employed on these garments. Thus, both fibres in the blend would be effected adversely in different ways by the same element.
A final factor undoubtedly played a role in changing the color of many a garment despite its fibre content, but this, too, would have especially effected articles made with cotton. This involves being indelibly stained with clay. We all possess clothing which in contrast to the original hue has an area or two which are now permanently a brownish cast because of Southern clay. Imagine falling into a mudhole of such on the march, fording muddy streams, living, working, and fighting in it in earthworks, and frequently being forced to sleep in it, and the resultant effects this would have on a uniform's color. Because of the naturally oily quality of wool, such stains do not as readily permanently set, and can often be brushed or soaked out, but the reverse is true for cotton. Clay could easily indelibly stain an already brown cotton, thereby enhancing its color and in instances (not witnessed) where white cotton may have been used in the weave, one can imagine the results. Actually the effects of both dirt and sweat can be seen in the majority of once white, white cotton linings of jackets and pants. Due to staining, they exhibit shades ranging from noticeably off-white through various tones of a sickly yellowish/tannish hue, to actual brown. Even so, such a fate could befall an all-wool uniform. That such occurred is related by one soldier who witnessed an incident in which this was the result. He recounts a story of a comrade who had just acquired a resplendent new uniform of "Crenshaw" gray (gray wool with a distinct bluish cast). Shortly thereafter, he fell into a mudhole on the march and was completely immersed. From that point, the outfit was rather derogatorily described as "...thenceforward exhibiting a sickly, jaundiced, butternut hue,
like the clothes some backwoods cracker regiments wore when they first came to Virginia." 

A question that arises over some of these now brown/tan but originally gray uniforms is just when the transition in color occurred. Did it actually happen during the war, or are the simple effects of time and age being witnessed? All of the above explanations would certainly indicate that it took place during the conflict itself. It is, however, quite possible that the transformation in some instances was not complete at that point, and the effects of later influences are also being seen. That garments underwent total change in the field is evident from one soldier's reference to his cap having "faded to a dirty yellow", and this is in conjunction with an earlier reference to his cap being gray. 

It is also apparent from another quote indicating that even senior officers did not escape this transformation of uniform color. The figure mentioned is Longstreet, second only to Lee, and he is described in "...his once gray uniform [that] had changed to brown." 

This all leads to the question of what about real butternut or brown garments. There is no doubt that uniforms of this hue were actually issued, but it must be asked with what frequency. All indications are that such were nowhere near as common as is generally believed. To begin with, they make up only a very small percentage of the total sample of surviving examples, and none of these can be considered as actual issue uniforms. Furthermore, none of these appear to actually have been dyed at all. Their color results from the heavy use of brown cotton left in a natural state. Also, as will be seen, in
most primary accounts in which Confederate soldiers refer to the color of their outfits, it is gray. References to the issue and wear of butternut are encountered in Southern sources, but they are not common, and each is interesting due to the light it throws on the situation.

In the story already recounted of the soldier falling in the mud, it is indicated that certain units were wearing butternut uniforms. The implication, however, is that there were not many, it was only an initial outfit replaced with gray, and the color was not held in high regard. This dislike of the hue appears to have been universal.

In the only Southern soldier's account found in which it is stated that such was common he voices his extreme dislike of both the hue and the fabric itself. At the same time, while it is difficult to ascertain with certainty what this writer considered "common" (the quote is fairly vague and generalized without reference to a particular time period or defining the degree of frequency) indications are that his statement pertains only to his particular brigade late in the conflict. Writing of the Battle of Fredericksburg, a soldier described two new North Carolina regiments coming on the field dressed in homespun. While not recording the color or defining his interpretation of what constituted homespun, it is quite possible that these were brown or tan. In any case, he refers to them as "...presenting to the fastidious eye of us veterans a very unsoldierly appearance." Again, in addition to the clear disapproval of their, at least, being homespun, there is the strong implication that such were not common. It is highly unlikely that he would have taken the time to note the fact if they had been.
As to the actual issue of butternut or brown uniforms, it is known that North Carolina did issue some on occasion, and it is quite possible that it is to these that the above quote refers. With the North Carolina garments, however, there is evidence that they were issued as secondary uniforms for summer wear. If so, this is certainly not indicative of material shortages or production problems. When the extant uniform articles of an Alabama soldier are observed, it is quite possible that brown or tan garb was worn as a second, supplementary uniform by other troops as well. Although homemade, in addition to his butternut trousers, this man also possessed a pair of beautiful dark blue 100% wool with red trim.

Encountered on occasion are Federal references observing that some Southern troops were dressed in brown. This might seem a contradiction and be taken as evidence that such was common, but it is easily explained. These sources never state a percentage of frequency, and it could just as easily be a matter of the color being rare that elicited comment. Even if not, and possibly some of the witnessed uniforms actually were brown or tan initially, more than likely what they were seeing were units or individuals wearing once gray uniforms that had turned degrees of brown from wear. This would seem the case in light of the scarcity of Southern military references to this hue and extant uniform items that originally exhibited it. In essence, in most instances, the same garments are undoubtedly simply being viewed differently by the two parties involved. Whereas the Federal observer saw them briefly in the heat of battle and assumed, without knowing, that this was their natural, original state, the Confederate wearer per-
ceived his uniform as gray, because this was the way it was issued. Despite color transformation, he continued to think of it as such.

As also mentioned, a fair number of the uniform items examined are now predominately shades of green. With these, there can be no doubt that they were originally gray. In support, these do not fall into the category of butternut - inevitably referred to as brown or tan, but never green. At the same time, apart from a few early war uniforms that actually were green, there are no references to Southern uniforms of this color. Consequently, given the large number of existing green garments from various period of the war, which, if they had actually been this hue, would have certainly evoked comment somewhere, but do not, they must have been a different color at that point. They were gray and have faded or oxidized with age. Although there exist all-wool articles now this shade, most that appear so are cotton/wool blends. All of the 100% wool garments and the majority of the mixed fibre ones were dyed in the piece, and it is quite apparent that a dye different from and superior to that used on the now brownish items was employed. It took better with both the wool and cotton fibres, although the woolen have held it better through the years, and the original hue is much more evident in them. In essence, while both have turned color, the wool has done so much less than the cotton. The 100% wool uniforms all still display a noticeable gray cast surpassing that in any of the blends, and with the blends with which the surfaces are not terribly worn, the wool is quite gray. At the same time, the cotton threads are much greener than the woolen in all the mixes, and in those with worn exteriors, this hue dominates. That all of these,
despite fibre content, were originally very gray is confirmed by two
dyed in the piece examples of mixed fibre content. Through a rip
in one and a split seam in the other, access was gained to view the
reverse sides of the fabric. In both instances, there is a radical
difference in color. Although greenish tones still exist, each is
predominantly a dark gray very much in contrast with the exterior hue.
The implication of the inside being so gray and, so, closer to the
original shade (undoubtedly the gray was initially even more pro-
nounced) is that most if not all the change occurred after the war, and
these have just faded or oxidized with age. Of the factors effecting
the now brownish garments in the field, only sunlight could have ef-
fected the dyed in the piece exterior so much more than the interior.
Surface wear, in association, could enhance the change but it would not
account for it by itself. Some transition in color may have occurred
during the war itself, but in light of the complete lack of documenta-
tion for greenish uniforms, it would seem to have been extremely
minimal. For all practical purposes, these now greenish dyed in the
piece uniforms remained gray throughout the conflict with the exposed
surface fibres altering color with age.

As indicated, this dye that has turned green was occasionally em-
ployed to dye cotton/wool blends in the thread. Again, only the woolen
fibres received coloring, and the brown cotton were left in a natural
state. With one example with which the external woolen strands are
generally in good condition, but faded to a greenish tone, there are,
nevertheless, areas reflecting wear. In these, the cotton is ex-
posed, and the hue is distinctly brown. Although no examples were
encountered with which it had occurred in entirety, it is undoubtedly such that the effects of surface wear to the woolen fibres colored with this dye in the thread as described, would have effected the overall hue as well. As indicated, with this particular dye, the wool would have faded extremely little, if at all, during the war itself, but when dyed in the thread, they could have worn down to expose the natural, brown cotton beneath. Depending on degree, this would result, at the time, in a garment of gray with distinct brownish casts or vice-versa. Thus, it is quite possible that some uniforms, at least, even when treated with this superior dye, appeared brown or brownish to observers when they were, in fact, originally gray. Whatever the weave or dyeing technique, this now green dye should not be interpreted as inferior. It must be remembered that Federal sky blue garments also turned a greenish cast after wear.

The remaining garments of 100% wool which make up the majority of the sample, seem to still retain their original color. These were obviously treated with dyes altogether different from those described which took very well, and quite probably, the fact that they are all-wool has helped in sustaining their original shades. While presenting a wide spectrum of tones, most of these can be categorized as one of two shades of gray. They are either a form of charcoal or they possess a distinct bluish cast. Very few articles appear the light or medium true gray that has come to be associated with Confederate uniforms in the public mind.

In closing these passages, in light of the extant examples, it is evident that the vast majority of Southern uniforms were issued in one
shade of gray or another. Some, because of fibre content combined with
the nature of the dye and the effects of wear, undoubtedly turned color
during the war giving rise to and increasing the belief in the concept
that actually brown uniforms were issued regularly. In fact, true
initially brown or "butternut" uniforms, while existing, did so on a
very limited basis.

A Summarization of Data Acquired from Extant Confederate
Enlisted Men's Uniforms

It is clear from the various uniform articles described that, in
terms of attributes for each given type, there was considerable varia-
tion. No two garments in the same category are identical. Two factors
basically account for much of this. First, this clothing originated
from a number of diverse sources. As indicated, some are obviously
homemade, and perhaps some others reflecting a superior level of seam-
stressing were produced by mothers, wives, or sisters as well. One
garment was privately tailored, and it is probable that some others,
like the tailcoats, zouave jackets, and especially the vests, were
too. Undoubtedly, a fair number represent the issues of the vari-
ous states, and others emanated from the central government. In addi-
tion, at least one and probably two English made imports exist in the
sample. Apart from these, the homemade articles, and the tailored
item, however, the source of most of these garments can not be dis-
cerned with any certainty. For instance, it is generally impossible to
distinguish between a tailor made article and one of actual issue, and
there is evidence that the existence of state buttons does not decidedly signify state manufacture. In any case, this diversity of origins, in itself, easily accounts for variations, but when the size of the sample relative to the incredible number actually worn is considered in conjunction with the fact that all periods of the war are represented, such differences are to be expected and are not of any consequence.

A third factor, in association with the above, helps in explaining some of the variations at least on early war specimens. This involves the fact that many units at that point made efforts to wear distinctive uniforms creating an identity and an esprit de corps. Although to a much lesser degree, certain commands probably attempted to maintain the wear of a particular outfit into the later periods. In light of this, variation in attributes should not be construed as a lack of standardization. For proof, all that need be done is observe the uniforms of the British Army in which every regiment had its distinctive facing and button colors, and pattern of lace. And, even within each unit, the uniforms of the elite companies possessed additional distinguishing features.

Yet, even though the combined attributes of a garment come together to create an article different in overall appearance from another of the same type, there is a fair degree of standardization between the attributes themselves if isolated and compared out of context. There are distinct, definable patterns that were adhered to. There were limits. There were parameters. For example, while there are different forms and combinations of trim in different locations on shell jackets, there is a set number of forms it can take on cuffs, and if cuff trim
exists, it conforms to one of these. Also, while there are wide differences in the number of buttons a shell jacket can possess, there are never more than nine or less than five. In essence, although there is nothing approximating the overall sense of complete standardization seen with Federal issue, there is nothing indicating any sense of anarchy in design. There were rules or guidelines that were followed and resulted in Confederate uniforms being distinctly Confederate uniforms.

At the same time, while variation exists in the attributes constituting detail, there is a strong sense of standardization in terms of general types and the basic features that define them as such. Apart from the odd or specialty garments like the tail and sack coats, zouave jacket, and chasseur trousers, the shell jacket and, to a lesser degree, one of the two types of frock coats were the norm. Any of these three when worn with Type A pants constitutes a standard Confederate uniform in terms of general style and cut for any period of the war.

Of interest, too, is the fact that the surviving examples reflect a fairly good sense of overall uniformity for the given individual. There are thirteen instances in which both the coat or jacket and trousers of a particular soldier still exist: while outfits with components of different hues and fabrics should in no way be interpreted as reflecting a negative situation, with six of these, both are of exactly the same material. Furthermore, with two of these uniforms, there are vests that match as well.

A noticeable feature of the extant garments is their high quality. Apart from a few of the homemade items and those tinted with a particular form of dye, each is impeccably constructed from high grade materi-
als. Even the homemade examples are solidly fashioned from durable fabrics. They are just a bit crude. As to those treated with the mentioned dye, this is the only fault one can find with them. Otherwise, they too are well made, and the quality of the fabric itself in terms of weave and fibres is quite fine. On the whole, Confederate uniforms are far superior to Federal with regards to construction and material. For example, there are such added treatments to the frock coats as complete linings and hemmed skirts. With a number of pairs of trousers, the reinforced cuffs are witnessed. Also, there is the incredibly heavy weight of most of the fabrics which, in the case of coats and jackets, is commonly combined with an equally impressive complete heavy lining. It is difficult to imagine anyone being overly cold when clad in these. The weight is such that undoubtedly many Southern soldiers did find only a cape to be sufficient additional clothing for inclement weather. In fact, it would seem that the wear of these uniforms in warm weather would present more of a problem in that they must have been responsible for overheating. Anyway, reflecting quality, strength, durability, and warmth, these garments were made to be serviceable in and stand the test of the severe conditions inherent to hard campaigning.

Also, these Southern uniforms have a tendency to be more stylish than their Northern counterparts. A fair number have features reflecting the latest in both military and civilian fashion trends. The French pattern kepi adopted as the official form of headgear and commonly worn (albeit not always in accordance with the regulation color schemes) was then considered de rigueur. Nowhere, however, are the
efforts to be stylish more evident than with the trousers. A high percentage possess attributes of recent form. For example, there is the universal lack of cuff slits, and with several, there are sharp looking angled cuffs as well. Absent on a good number are rear vents, and with a couple, there are the rounded pockets only then coming into vogue. Still, while showing new stylistic concepts, the features of these trousers combine to form distinctive garments readily definable as Confederate military. By comparison, there are many aspects of Federal regulation pants that were extremely outdated, undoubtedly indicating the basic conservatism of the U.S. Army. In a more general sense, the fitted nature of the vast majority of Confederate coats and jackets could only enhance the soldierly appearance of their wearers. While some might consider this with frock coats to be out of date with regards to period fashion, it is, nevertheless, a feature one would expect in a military garment, and for such, it is really quite stylish.

Within the sample, apart from some shoes, there is no evidence of decline in the methods of construction or the nature of the materials as the war progressed. The same high standards of workmanship and quality of fabrics were maintained on garments dating from the end of the war as on those from other periods of it. There is only minimal evidence of possible shortages with none but that pertaining to shoes potentially indicating any substantial problems. Much of what little there is reflects the civilian rather than the military situation. Also, there are alternative explanations to account for the relatively few and minor features that could be interpreted as indicative of a lack of materials.
Already mentioned are the trousers which appear to have been issued to service branches other than those for which they were intended. If these are indicative of a shortage, the problem certainly was not a major one. There are only three pairs, and while pants with the appropriate trim may not have been on hand, there were, nevertheless, pants to issue. Furthermore, the trousers in question are all of very high quality, and the additional time and material required to execute the decorative aspects in the first place does not support that any real shortages existed. Also, as pointed out, there are other possible explanations to account for these.

One thing that some might consider as evidence of shortages are the homemade garments. It could be argued that if the state or central governments had been keeping up with supply, there would have been no need for soldiers to have to procure uniforms from the homefront. At the same time, however, the homemade items form only a small percentage of the sample, indicating in itself that if their existence reflects a problem, it was not serious. Also, as stated, one individual having homemade trousers also had an additional pair of very high quality. At least in his case, they represent a surplus. As noted, several pieces are home woven as well. There are, however, a couple of others which, although homemade, were fashioned from quality fabrics. Consequently, this tends to support that while actual government production may have lagged a bit, the materials for manufacture were available not only for the military but for the homefront as well. These factors indicate that homemade uniforms are not representative of any serious supply problems in the Confederacy. In fact, their very
existence can be used to argue the reverse. Any minor shortages in one sphere of production and supply were readily made up in another, and matters were kept on an even keel.

Privately tailored uniforms might also be taken as a sign of shortages for the same basic reasons as the homemade. If the various governments were keeping up with supply, then, having these made would have been unnecessary. The one pair of trousers that can definitely be said to be tailored, and probably some other garments not readily discernible as such, however, represent the early war period when, as mentioned, many units desired a distinctive uniform that required private tailoring. The trousers belonged to an individual from just such a unit. As such, these and other tailored garments from this point in the war can not be seen as indicating shortages. At that same time, government production was just being established and had not yet gotten into full swing. As a result, while the actual outlay may not have met demands, this can not be interpreted to mean shortages in the true sense. In any case, during the first months of the conflict, having a uniform privately tailored was undoubtedly more often a matter of choice rather than need. Any such clothing emanating at a later date actually indicates, at least, a surplus of materials. The fact that individual tailors were able to acquire quality fabric does not lend support to the idea that real shortages existed elsewhere. Also, any articles dating to a later period still may well have been privately procured, despite sufficient supplies from the governments, in an effort to maintain the wear of a distinctive uniform within a particular command. Finally, as with the homemade items, it can be argued
that their very existence indicates that if any shortages in production existed on one level, they were being made up on another, thus solving any problems that may have existed. The bottom line is that privately tailored uniforms, whatever their date, can not be taken as a sign of any major shortages.

Another feature witnessed on several garments that might be used to argue that shortages existed are areas where the fabric required piecing to enable construction. In essence, it appears that there was not enough material to cut a portion as a single section, and the area was fashioned from two separate pieces of the same cloth resulting in a seam where there normally would not have been one. The nature of the garments and the piecing itself is interesting because of the light thrown on the situation. What there is in this sense is not representative of serious problems (there are only four examples and with all but one it is minor) and there are explanations other than shortages to account for them. In the cases of a coat and a jacket with which this technique is witnessed, both are homemade. With one, the process involves a section to increase the length of the inner panel on each two piece sleeve. Nicely executed, given its origin and somewhat crude overall nature, it is quite possible that this simply represents an error on the part of the maker when cut. With the second, it is the collar that is pieced. This seems to be the result of efforts to construct this area in the contrasting color that it is. In essence, the rest of the coat is well made from good fabric. As a collar does not require much material and the cloth for it can always be gleaned from the scraps of the larger sections, it can not be accepted that this
pieced area indicates any true shortage. The means to employ a plain collar with better results were at hand. Still, while the seamstress undoubtedly had enough material to do this, she opted for a contrasting colored collar due either to choice or request. She either aimed to please or believed it would look nicer despite its having to be pieced.

The third pieced item, a vest, is that upon which the technique is most evident. With it, each of the two foreparts are constructed from three sections of cloth. While clearly representing the lack of enough material to cut each front section as a single piece, it must be considered that this vest, in all probability, does not represent an issue item, and it is rather unnecessary as well. At the same time, the construction is perfectly symmetrical and beautifully executed; so much so, in fact, that a viewer without knowledge of period clothing might easily believe it was intentional. Anyway, rather than indicate a shortage, it is more likely that this shows frugal use of material. In other words, a nice additional, superfluous piece of clothing was created from the scraps of more essential items.

Finally, there is a pair of trousers with which the corner of the rounded flap is pieced with a very tiny section. Two equally viable explanations exist for this, neither of which support the concept of serious shortages. First, one might imagine the maker laying out the pattern and realizing that there was almost, but not quite, all of the required amount to cut an entire front section for a pant leg. What to do? Scrap a large section of fabric and cut another for so minimal a problem, or go ahead and use it with a small, added section. This could very easily be a case of witnessing the age old adage of
"Waste not, want not" in action. At the same time, the area pieced is one fairly prone to rips and tears. As such, this might just as easily be an example of a damaged garment beautifully repaired. Neither scenario lends support to the idea that the construction of these trousers reflects a shortage of material.

Next, there is the matter of the civilian and U.S. buttons that appear on Confederate coats and jackets with some frequency. Some of these possibly do indicate shortages of this particular item. There are, however, alternative arguments that would account for the presence of at least most of these and support that their existence represents something other than a scarcity of Confederate military fasteners. As to the four with civilian forms, one is an early war specimen with plain, cast brass buttons which we know from photographic evidence to be original to the garment. Yet, this jacket was made at a point when undoubtedly government production of more military types had not gotten geared up. Also, although plain, these bright brass buttons do lend themselves to a military garment and do not look out of place. As such, they may well have been chosen despite a sufficient supply of more military versions. Because of these factors, no stigma should be attached to their use. Another article, dating from midwar, possesses brass civilian buttons, which if original, would tend to indicate a shortage of more military types. Still, there is nothing really unmilitary with their appearance in conjunction with the jacket. The third example has civilian buttons of hard leather. This, too, however, is an early war specimen, and as such, again, it is likely that we are simply witnessing a matter of the manufacture of other types not yet
being in full swing rather than a true shortage. These, too, are un-
doubtedly original to this jacket as they are the same as those on
matching trousers. The final item, whose buttons are of an undeter-
mined material, dates from late in the conflict and is homemade. While
the nice fabric from which it is fashioned was obviously available to
the seamstress, it would appear that military buttons were not. Under
the circumstances, she substituted civilian. As mentioned, one jacket
now has wooden fasteners, and another has such of wood or bone, but as
also indicated, they do not appear to be original. In concluding,
apart from those with wood and/or bone, with three out of four jackets
and coats with civilian buttons, their presence is explainable and not
indicative of any real shortages. As will be seen, there is as yet
another argument that could account for the mid and late war examples
as well.

Regarding the U.S. buttons, with two examples, they are probably
original to the garment. One is attributed to a Kentucky militia
unit. If so, this would support an early or possibly even a prewar
provenance. As such, in conjunction with the fact that Kentucky did
not secede, U.S. buttons are almost to be expected. With the other,
there are U.S. Rifleman buttons. While probably worn by Federal
sharpshooters between 1861 - 1865, these were no longer a regulation
pattern when the war began, and were not at all common. Given this
limited supply and the prewar dates of issue, these were probably
acquired from existing stores and used on this particular coat initial-
ly. As to the remaining five coats and jackets with U.S. buttons,
arguments based on the individual provenance of each against their
representing shortages are not possible. Still, there is an explana-
tion for their presence in general which also serves as an additional,
alternative argument for both some of the civilian and even possibly,
the Federal buttons already described. Following the war, Confederate
veterans were allowed to still wear their uniforms and did, but all
Southern military buttons (as symbolic emblems of the cause) had to be
covered or removed and replaced. This undoubtedly accounts for the
existence of U.S. patterns on at least some of the unaccounted for
eamples with them, and quite possibly for some of the others, too.
Replacement with U.S. buttons would be logical for several reasons. To
begin with, they offered a practical alternative. Being the same as,
or similar to Confederate buttons in size, they would have worked well
and negated having to redo buttonholes. Visually, from a distance,
their use would have maintained the intended military appearance of a
coat or jacket. Finally, and not insignificantly, they would have
created the impression of renewed loyalty whether real or feigned. Use
of civilian buttons could easily be due to of the same situation. One
last observance pertinent to these particular garments is of interest.
With each, all buttons are of exactly the same pattern. There are no
mixed sets indicating gradual loss and replacement. Consequently,
whenever they were sewn on, it was all at the same time and the choice
was intentional. In closing, there are reasons for the existence of
these two basic types of button other than shortages. Granted, it is
possible that one or two may be indicative of occasional problems with
manufacture and supply, but in light of the alternative explanations
applicable to all, it can not be accepted that there was any major want
of these items, and the presence of these button types on extant garments should not be taken as a sign of problems. With all of the remaining coats and jackets which still have buttons, twenty, the majority of which date from later periods of the war, the patterns are distinctly Confederate military.

Last, there is the issue of shoes, of which there are three pairs made of atypical military substances. There is no denying that these do, in fact, represent a shortage of materials. Sufficient decent shoes do seem to have been one of the few items that some Confederate troops did lack on occasion, but as will be shown later, the situation was nowhere near as grave as many believe, at least not in the Army of Northern Virginia. Still, as argued for the homemade uniforms, their very existence indicates that any shortages were met through alternative means thus eliminating them, and as pointed out, under certain circumstances, such footwear would serve its purpose sufficiently if not always comfortably. There is, however, one interesting feature that all three pairs of canvas or leather and wood share. Two show no indication at all of ever having been worn, and with the third, evidence of such is so minimal that what is seen could just as easily be the result of age and poor storage between the war and museum acquisition. In any case, everything points to the fact that the first two and quite possibly the third as well were never issued. They never personally belonged to anyone for actual use. Consequently, they must have been found in stores at some point – probably following the war – and kept, but why? It is obvious that it was not to wear them. This leaves only one answer. They were retained, because by their very
nature, they were curiosities. Thus, it is quite probable that their present existence is more the result of their strange construction than the fact that they were common. Consequently, the high percentage of these oddities in relation to more normal footwear within the sample, can not be construed as meaning that their wear was frequent and there were serious shortages. In fact, that they were not issued supports that they were not needed. There were sufficient supplies of more serviceable shoes after all. To reiterate, this is not to say that such shoes were never issued, but additional evidence to be brought up later maintains that the need for their employment, at least in the Army of Northern Virginia, was rare. Actually, if the third pair was actually issued, their present condition supports that they were not worn for long. This, in turn, lends credibility to the idea that when offered, they were meant to be a stopgap measure only. In essence, if worn, this pair was obviously replaced with something more serviceable at a very early date. At that point, they were kept only because they were so odd. There would be no other reason to retain them.

On the other hand, the pair of proper military bootees must be recalled. These are quality shoes far superior in all aspects to Federal issue. More fitted in the heel and with a more flexible sole, these certainly offered the wearer greater comfort. They are, in addition, more sturdily constructed, especially in the soles which are also practically designed to facilitate ease of repair if needed. Also, it should be noted that these date to late in the war.

The use of cotton/wool blends should in no way be taken as a sign of any real shortages. Granted, the employment of such could be inter-
interpreted to indicate a lack of wool which required supplementary cotton fibres to produce a finished weave. Yet, if so, we witness at least the ability to adapt, use the materials at hand, and thus nullify any needs. Conversely, where is it written that military uniforms need be made of 100% wool? These blends are in no way inferior fabrics, and no stigma should be attached to them. In fact, the weave offers several advantages that could easily induce someone to produce it despite a sufficient supply of wool. It is very tight and stiff (there is not the elasticity found in all-wool materials) making it less prone to rips and tears, and in general, it would wear better. Also, this mixture of fibres makes it less susceptible to potential shrinkage which, in turn, makes it easier to clean. The same would allow much quicker drying when wet. In conjunction, the weight is such that it would be just as warm, and the rigid weave may well have served to cut sharp winds better. And, unless it faded severely, it presented an appearance as nice as all-wool. Finally, because uniforms of this material are as equally represented in the early periods as they are in the late, it is clear that this was not something resorted to only later because of a lack of woolen yarn. It should be noted that today in the fashion world, this fabric commands a very high price.

This leaves only that apparently inferior form of dye to be discussed. The question is, was it truly a poor quality in itself, or was it only inferior in a comparative sense with new and better forms? Given the recent advent of the better, colorfast types, it is quite possible that this was a compound that had been employed successfully for years, and its use was continued as a matter of course. Under
normal, civilian conditions, it may well have been more than adequate, but it must be remembered that in the field, a uniform is subjected to far more than what is considered normal. In essence, what has proved ample for everyday wear, did not hold up under the duress of hard campaigning. Of course, this is purely speculative as the formula for this particular dye has not been determined. Thus, it might represent an ad hoc supplementary form that really was not good. Still, until further analysis confirms this, alternative explanations exist, and in light of the quote referring to Longstreet's coat, it is quite probable that fabrics treated with this dye were not considered inferior, and relegated to lesser individuals. With him (as with all officers) we have an individual required to purchase his own uniform, and who could afford the best. The best was certainly available for an officer of this stature at this point in the war - late June, 1862.

After having discussed these relatively few garments with features that might be interpreted as problematic, a look at the remaining uniforms constituting the majority is in order. These lend strong support to the arguments already stated. Given the large number of well made items dating from all periods possessing unnecessary features, and even being unnecessary in themselves, requiring additional materials, not to mention considerable added time to manufacture, there is solid evidence supporting the argument that military shortages in terms of clothing were never a serious issue. For instance, of five shell jackets, the sack coat, and four pairs of trousers dating from 1864 or later, two of the shell jackets, the sack coat, and three pairs of trousers were still constructed with decorative trim. There is no apparent decrease
in the number of jackets with epaulets or belt loops from beginning to end. While nine button shell jackets were certainly not necessary, they are as equally represented in the later era as they are in the earlier periods with the number with Confederate military buttons also being the same. To produce this feature required almost twice the amount of buttons and time that a five button version would have. The fact that the vast majority of Southern jackets and coats are completely lined is of note. While we can bank on the fact that there was not a shortage of cotton in the secessionist states, the extra time and facilities required to weave the fabric and then construct these linings does not support a problem with clothing supply in general or the means of producing it. These garments could have been made without linings. Three out of four U.S. sack coats were. The existence of nonregulation and unnecessary vests strongly supports that fabric shortages were not a real problem. Although one is pieced and another seems to be entirely fashioned from a Federal greatcoat, there are two that are beautifully made of 100% wool and two more of exquisite construction of cotton/wool blends. In addition, these later two match the rest of what are complete uniforms. Of the total sample of six vests, three have Confederate military buttons. This would seem a rather high percentage given the general, nonregulation nature of these items, and it further supports that buttons were not lacking. Also, as an aside, it is interesting to note that although one vest was fashioned from a Federal greatcoat, this greatcoat was not utilized as it was meant to be. Its fabric was used for an alternative, additional piece of clothing. Even unusual uniform items were being produced and
worn at the end. The flashy chasseur trousers were sported by a soldier when he surrendered at Appomattox. The fact that at least three of the nine frock coats in the sample can be provenanced to the last months of the struggle is very telling. In comparison to a shell jacket, a considerable amount of extra time and material was involved in making each. Yet, nevertheless, they were still being made.

As to the condition of the surviving examples, several have noticeable rips and tears, but, in at least most instances, these seem to be the result of wounds received by the individuals when wearing them. A couple of specimens are fairly deteriorated, but their poor condition appears to be more the result of improper care between the war and museum acquisition rather than field wear. In essence, other than the fading of some and basic surface wear, very little evidence of damage sustained in the field was encountered. All in all, their present condition supports that these garments were well made from quality materials, and Confederate soldiers were regularly supplied.

Excepting zouave trousers, this sample reflects the normal, standard (and some not so standard) forms of Confederate enlisted men's coats, jackets, pants, etc., and the basic attributes defining them as distinctive types. As to the more detailed aspects and their variations within each category such as collar styles, patterns of trim, number of buttons, etc., other forms undoubtedly existed. A few new ones (to be described and added to the count later) were revealed in the photographs. Still, they are few, and it is felt that those considered normal or typical have been discussed, as well as the majority of odd variants. In any case, further research will fill in
any gaps that might exist.

In concluding this section, the extant garments reflect the common Confederate soldier as being well dressed in quality uniforms throughout the war. There is no serious evidence of privation and need or inferior materials and products. Nor, is there any indication that the situation ever changed for the worse.
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Citing jacket attributed to Dimitry, Museum of the Confederacy.
Citing unprovenanced jacket, Smithsonian.

Citing jackets attributed to Dimitry, Gilmore, Lapham, Greer, Barnes, McDonald, Royal, Goodwin, Tucker, and E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey and two unprovenanced jackets, Smithsonian; Dolan, Confederate Museum; and unprovenanced jacket, Manassas.

Citing jacket attributed to J.W. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing unprovenanced jacket, Smithsonian.

Citing jacket attributed to Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing jacket attributed to Diggs, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing jacket attributed to Taylor, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing jacket attributed to Anderson, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing jacket attributed to Beard, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing jackets attributed to Taylor, Lapham, Beard, McDonald, Royal, Glennan, Anderson, and J.W. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; and two unprovenanced jackets, Smithsonian.

Citing jacket attributed to J.W. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing jacket attributed to Greer, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing jacket attributed to Dimitry, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing jacket attributed to Dolan, Confederate Museum.

Citing jackets attributed to Gilmore, Barnes, Goodwin, Tucker, and E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; and Ramsey, Smithsonian.

Citing jacket attributed to Diggs, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced jacket, Smithsonian.

Citing jacket attributed to Ramsey, Smithsonian.

Citing jackets attributed to Dimitry, Gilmore, Taylor, Lapham, Beard, Greer, Barnes, McDonald, Royal, J.W. Jenkins, Tucker, Anderson, and E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; and two unprovenanced jackets, Smithsonian.

Citing jackets attributed to J.W. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey, Smithsonian; and Dolan, Confederate Museum.
Citing jacket attributed to Glennan, Museum of the Confederacy.

After coat attributed to Private Richard A. Weaver, Warrenton Rifles, 17th Virginia Infantry, in his possession when died of fever May 15, 1862, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

After coat attributed to Francis A. Dickens, 6th Virginia Cavalry, from North Carolina Military Institute, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

Citing coat attributed to Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing coat attributed to Dickens, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing coat attributed to Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy.

Tbid.

Tbid.

Citing coat attributed to Dickens, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing coat attributed to Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy.

After coat attributed to Corporal T.V. Brooke, 3rd Company, Richmond Howitzers, worn when he surrendered at Appomattox, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

After jacket attributed to James L. Clark, Maryland Guard, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.


Citing trousers attributed to M. Glennan, with artillery attached to 36th North Carolina Infantry, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia; and Private William Stanton Pilcher, Richmond Otey Battery, 13th Virginia Artillery Battalion, procured while on sick leave in Richmond, 1864/65 (Todd, vol. 2, 1263), Manassas National Battlefield Park, Manassas, Virginia.


Citing trousers attributed to Beck and Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to E.C. Jenkins, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Glennan, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Diggs, Goodwin, member of Washington Artillery, and Beck (two pairs), Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey and two unprovenanced pairs, Smithsonian; Hightower, Fredericksburg; and Pilcher and unprovenanced pair, Manassas.
Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Glennan, E.C. Jenkins, and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to J.A. West of Georgia, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

Citing trousers attributed to Glennan, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Smithsonian.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Diggs, Goodwin, and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and unprovenanced pair, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Glennan and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; Pilcher, Manassas; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Beck, Goodwin, Glennan, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Diggs, Glennan, Beck, and Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy; Hightower, Fredericksburg; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to E.C. Jenkins and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher and unprovenanced pair, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Diggs, Beck, E.C. Jenkins, and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; and Ramsey and two unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.
Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Glennan, and Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck (two pairs), Lester, Diggs, Glennan, Goodwin, E.C. Jenkins, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey and two unprovenanced pairs, Smithsonian; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to Ramsey, Smithsonian.

Note: This variation in fly construction was not detected until later in research. Consequently, not all examples are included in the counts. Still it is believed that the ordering is representative of the frequency with which the different styles occur.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Glennan, E.C. Jenkins, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Diggs, Beck, and Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck (two pairs), Lester, and Diggs, Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; Pilcher and unprovenanced pair, Manassas; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Goodwin, E.C. Jenkins, and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to Glennan, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.
Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Goodwin, E.C. Jenkins, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; and Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to Diggs and Glennan, Museum of the Confederacy; unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck (two pairs) and Lester, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Diggs, Glennan, and Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey and two unprovenanced pairs, Smithsonian; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Diggs, Glennan, Beck, Goodwin, and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced pair, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Lapham, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Lester, Lapham, Diggs, and Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy; Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and unprovenanced pair, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Glennan, Beck, E.C. Jenkins, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Diggs, Glennan, and Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced pair, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Lapham, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.
Citing trousers attributed to Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Glennan, Beck, Goodwin, E.C. Jenkins, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; two unprovenanced pairs, Smithsonian; Pilcher, Manassas; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Museum of the Confederacy; and Ramsey, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Glennan, Beck, E.C. Jenkins, and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; two unprovenanced pairs, Smithsonian; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck (not tapered as per illustration), Goodwin, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester and Diggs, Museum of the Confederacy; and Ramsey (not tapered as per illustration), Smithsonian.

Citing unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Beck (two pairs), Lapham, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to E.C. Jenkins and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy; Hightower, Fredericksburg; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

Citing trousers attributed to Glennan, Goodwin, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Beck, Goodwin, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing trousers attributed to Glennan, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing trousers attributed to Lester and E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; Hightower, Fredericksburg; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.
341. Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

342. Citing unprovenanced trousers, Smithsonian.

343. Citing trousers attributed to Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy.

344. Citing unprovenanced trousers, Smithsonian.

345. Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Beck, Glennan, Goodwin, Weaver, and member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy; Pilcher and unprovenanced pair, Manassas; and Ramsey and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

346. Citing trousers attributed to Lester and E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; Hightower, Fredericksburg; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

347. Citing trousers attributed to Beck and Diggs, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

348. Citing trousers attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

349. Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Glennan, and Weaver, Museum of the Confederacy.

350. Citing trousers attributed to Beck, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced pair, Smithsonian.

351. Citing trousers attributed to Pilcher, Manassas.

352. Citing trousers attributed to Goodwin, Museum of the Confederacy; and Ramsey, Smithsonian.

353. Citing unprovenanced trousers, Manassas.

354. Citing trousers attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

355. Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

356. Citing trousers attributed to E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

357. Citing unprovenanced trousers, Smithsonian.

358. Citing trousers attributed to Beck and Diggs, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced trousers, Smithsonian.
Citing trousers attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

After trousers attributed to West, Museum of the Confederacy.

After trousers attributed to Corporal T.V. Brooke, 3rd Company, Richmond Howitzers, worn when surrendered at Appomattox. The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

After vest attributed to Abner Harrison, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

Citing vests attributed to M. Page Lapham, Washington Artillery, New Orleans, Louisiana, in his possession when mortally wounded at Drewry's Bluff, May 14, 1864, and Ben Taylor Worthington, 18th Mississippi Infantry, then to Company H, 1st Mississippi Cavalry till end of war. The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

Citing vests attributed to Harrison and August Leftwich of Virginia, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

Citing vest attributed to First Sergeant John W. Lester, Company E, 10th Georgia Battalion, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

Citing vest attributed to First Sergeant William Hightower, 23rd Virginia Infantry, in his possession when mortally wounded at Chancellorsville, May 3, 1863, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Citing vests attributed to Lester, Lapham, and Worthington, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vests attributed to Worthington, Harrison, and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lester and Lapham, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vests attributed to Harrison and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vests attributed to Lester, Lapham and Worthington, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lester, Worthington, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lapham and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.
Citing vests attributed to Lapham, Worthington, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vests attributed to Lester and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Harrison and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lapham, Worthington, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vest attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vest attributed to Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lester, Worthington, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vests attributed to Lapham and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lapham, Worthington, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lester, Worthington, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vests attributed to Worthington, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lapham, Worthington, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vest attributed to Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vest attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Lester and Worthington, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Worthington and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

Citing vest attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing vests attributed to Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.
393 Ibid.; Worthington and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.
394 Citing vest attributed to Hightower, Fredericksburg.
395 Citing vest attributed to Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.
396 Citing vest attributed to Lapham, Museum of the Confederacy.
397 Citing vests attributed to Lapham, Worthington, Leftwich, and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.
398 Citing vests attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.
399 Citing vests attributed to Lapham and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.
400 Citing vests attributed to Hightower, Fredericksburg.
401 Citing vest attributed to Worthington, Museum of the Confederacy.
402 Citing vest attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.
403 Citing vest attributed to Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.
404 Citing vests attributed to Worthington and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.
405 Citing vests attributed to Lapham and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.
406 Citing vest attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.
407 Citing vests attributed to Lapham and Worthington, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.
408 Citing vests attributed to Lester and Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.
409 Citing vest attributed to Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy.
410 Citing vests attributed to Lapham, Worthington, and Leftwich, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.
411 Citing vest attributed to Harrison, Museum of the Confederacy.
412 Citing vest attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.
413 Citing vest attributed to Worthington, Museum of the Confederacy.
After kepi attributed to member of Clinton Guard, Louisiana, Louisiana Historical Association Confederate Museum, New Orleans, Louisiana.

After forage cap attributed to Private/Ensign Richard Edward Wright, 44th Virginia Infantry, worn when killed at Peebles Farm, September 30, 1864, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.


C.S. War Department, Uniform and Dress, p. 5, and citing "General Orders No. 4" as ordered by the Secretary of War and issued by S. Cooper, Adjutant and Inspector General, War Department, January 24, 1862, appearing as an unnumbered erratum in Uniform and Dress.


Citing kepis attributed to member of Clinton Guard and member of Washington Artillery, Confederate Museum; Crew and Bowman, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing kepis attributed to Chalaron, Confederate Museum; and Barksdale and Royall, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepis attributed to Chalaron and member of Clinton Guard, Confederate Museum; Barksdale, Royall, and Bowman, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing kepis attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Confederate Museum; and Crew, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepis attributed to member of Clinton Guard and member of Washington Artillery, Confederate Museum; and Crew and Barksdale, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepis attributed to Royall and Bowman, Museum of the Confederacy; Pilcher, Manassas; and Chalaron, Confederate Museum.
Citing kepi attributed to member of Clinton Guard, Confederate Museum.

Citing kepi attributed to Crew, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepi attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Confederate Museum.

Citing kepi attributed to Chalaron, Confederate Museum.

Citing kepis attributed to Royall and Bowman, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing kepi attributed to Barksdale, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepis attributed to member of Clinton Guard and member of Washington Artillery, Confederate Museum; Barksdale, Royall, and Bowman, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing kepis attributed to Chalaron, Confederate Museum; and Crew, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepis attributed to Barksdale, Museum of the Confederacy; and Pilcher, Manassas.

Citing kepi attributed to member of Clinton Guard, Confederate Museum.

Citing kepi attributed to Royall, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepi attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Confederate Museum.

Citing kepi attributed to Bowman, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepis attributed to member of Clinton Guard, and member of Washington Artillery, Confederate Museum.

Citing kepis attributed to Crew and Royall, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepi attributed to Barksdale, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing kepi attributed to Bowman, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing forage caps attributed to Wright and Corporal Samuel E. Williams, who left this specimen at home upon receiving a new one, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.


After hat attributed to James J. Lampton, Company K, 13th Mississippi Infantry, made in 1863 by his sister, Miss Josephine and worn by him when killed, July, 1864, Louisiana Historical Association Confederate Museum, New Orleans, Louisiana.


Citing forage caps attributed to Palmer and Williams, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing forage cap attributed to Wright, Museum of the Confederacy.

Ibid.

Citing forage cap attributed to Palmer, Museum of the Confederacy.


Citing forage caps attributed to Wright and Palmer, Museum of the Confederacy.


Citing forage cap attributed to Wright, Museum of the Confederacy.

Citing forage cap attributed to Williams, Museum of the Confederacy.
459 Citing forage cap attributed to Palmer, Museum of the Confederacy.

460 Citing forage caps attributed to Wright and Williams, Museum of the Confederacy.

461 Citing hats attributed to Brooke, John Solden, and James Wilson Poague, Company C, 1st Virginia Cavalry, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia; and William H. Tennison of Mississippi, died a prisoner at Camp Chase, Ohio, Louisiana Historical Association Confederate Museum, New Orleans, Louisiana.

462 Citing hats attributed to Richard W. Habersham of Georgia and Edwin Calhoun of South Carolina, worn when wounded at Trevelyan Station, June 12, 1864, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

463 Citing hat attributed to Private Clement Newton Bassett, 8th Texas Cavalry (Terry's Texas Rangers) worn at Murfreesboro (Stone's River) December 31, 1862 through January 2, 1863, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

464 Citing hat attributed to Codwise, Museum of the Confederacy.


466 Citing hat attributed to Landon Cheek of Mississippi, Louisiana Historical Association Confederate Museum, New Orleans, Louisiana.

467 Citing cap attributed to Louisiana Zouaves, Louisiana Historical Association Confederate Museum, New Orleans, Louisiana.

468 After shoes attributed to Private George Lyles, Company E, 17th Virginia Infantry, worn when wounded at Second Manassas, August 29–30, 1862, Manassas National Battlefield Park, Manassas, Virginia.


470 After boots attributed to John Thomas McKenna, 1st Company, Richmond Howitzers, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.


474. C.S. War Department, Regulations for Army of Confederate States, pp. 107, 404.


478. C.S. War Department, Uniform and Dress, citing plate appearing as number 9 in unnumbered sequence; and C.S. War Department, Regulations for Army of Confederate States, p. 406.

479. C.S. War Department, Uniform and Dress, citing plate appearing as number 9 in unnumbered sequence; and C.S. War Department, Regulations for Army of Confederate States, p. 406.

480. C.S. War Department, Uniform and Dress, citing plate appearing as number 9 in unnumbered sequence; and C.S. War Department, Regulations for Army of Confederate States, p. 406.


482. After cape attributed to M. Glennan, with artillery attached to 36th North Carolina Infantry, The Museum of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia.

483. Citing trousers attributed to Diggs and Beck, Museum of the Confederacy; and unprovenanced matching jacket and trousers, Smithsonian.


485. Citing coat attributed to member of Kentucky Militia, Smithsonian.

486. Citing uniform attributed to Hightower, Fredericksburg.

487. Citing jackets attributed to Anderson and Diggs, Museum of the Confederacy.

488. Citing coat attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy.

489. Pougher, personal communication.


493 Stiles, *Four Years*, p. 85.


497 Ibid.

498 Citing two pairs of trousers attributed to Beck, Museum of the Confederacy.

499 Citing coat attributed to Blandford and jacket attributed to Taylor, Museum of the Confederacy.

500 Citing unprovenanced uniform, Smithsonian.

501 Citing trousers attributed to member of Washington Artillery, Museum of the Confederacy.

502 Citing uniforms attributed to Lester and E.C. Jenkins, Museum of the Confederacy; two unprovenanced uniforms, Smithsonian; Hightower, Fredericksburg; and Pilcher, Manassas.

503 Citing uniforms attributed to Lester, Museum of the Confederacy; and Hightower, Fredericksburg.

504 Citing jacket attributed to Diggs and coat attributed to Brooke, Museum of the Confederacy.

505 Citing trousers attributed to Lapham, Museum of the Confederacy.
CHAPTER VI

EQUIPMENT

There are a number of major pieces of equipment that, serving essential functions, were required by each Confederate soldier in the field. For an infantryman (artillery and cavalry will be discussed later) this included a cartridge box, cap box, bayonet, waist belt, haversack, canteen, and bedroll or knapsack. Various smaller, equally essential items, such as eating utensils, a sewing kit, tools for one's firearm, etc., were certainly carried as well as more personal articles, but as these would have been tucked away in one of the above mentioned pieces of gear, and so, not likely to be visible in the photographs, these will not be discussed.

For several reasons, no effort will be made to type the various examples of equipment within each category. Taking knapsacks as an example, the number of variant patterns produced is fairly extensive (one source defines no less than seventeen different Federal types alone), and to describe each would not only take a great deal of time, it would be pointless in light of the purpose of this study. In essence, while many distinct Northern and Southern types were manufactured, in most cases, each conforms to the same basic design concept with the result that some are quite similar with only minor distin-
guishing attributes not discernible in the photographs. Furthermore, most if not all of the more common, standard, types issued to Federal troops were copied in the South which makes it even more impossible to determine the origin of many items. This lends a decided generic quality to these items. Unlike uniforms, equipment did not as readily (if at all) define a soldier as Confederate or Federal. It is more important, consequently, to determine if an individual possessed certain items rather than ascertain from whence it came. Still, in the course of analyzing the photographs, if the origin of a particular piece is discernible, it will be noted. In any case, in this chapter only the basic categories of essential gear will be defined in conjunction with the function which made them necessary. For further information, the reader is referred to Frederick Todd's *American Military Equipage, 1851-1872*.

For infantry, the cartridge box was truly an essential accouterment. Constructed of heavy leather, these were designed to be carried on the waist belt or suspended from a shoulder sling. Its function was to carry, and more importantly, to protect a soldier's ammunition. The majority of Civil War cartridges were of paper and so, quite fragile. The cartridge box served to keep them dry, prevent breakage, and help eliminate the possibility of premature ignition. In addition, it kept one's ammunition together and organized to enhance ease and speed of loading. When not in action, these were carried on the right rear hip. In combat, they were shifted to the front of the body for ease of access.

The infantry cartridge box is one item of equipment between which Southern and Northern versions can sometimes be distinguished in the
Illustration 91: Typical Confederate Cartridge Box for Wear on Belt or Shoulder Sling (Shown without Brass C.S. Plate on Flap).
Illustration 92: English Made Enfield Pattern Cartridge Box.
photographs. Standard Federal types generally had a brass plate marked "US" affixed to the box flap or the same letters were embossed directly on the leather. At the same time, while Confederate types might have a plate or embossing marked "CS" such were not common, and most Southern boxes had plain flaps.

In conjunction with the cartridge box, a cap box was needed. Again of fairly heavy leather, these were comparatively small and worn on the waist belt on the right front side. There was little distinction between types in terms of designs for particular types of weapons or branches of the service. Their function was to carry and protect the tiny percussion caps used to ignite the cartridges. Certainly less fragile than the cartridges themselves, the caps nevertheless needed protection from moisture, and their small size dictated that they have a separate container to keep them together and facilitate ease of loading.

The bayonet was a third necessary piece of equipment. Depending on the weapon, two basic types existed; socket and sabre. Their role, needless to say, was as an extension of the firearm in hand to hand combat. They could double as spits for cooking or candle holders. These were usually carried in a leather scabbard and worn suspended from the waist belt on the left side by means of various patterns of leather frogs.

In addition to the above, a haversack was required. These were normally canvas bags of envelope like construction that buttoned or buckled shut. Suspended from a shoulder sling, these were generally worn across the body on the left side. The material could either be
Illustration 93: Typical Confederate Cap Box 3.
Illustration 94: English Made Enfield Bayonets and Scabbards.
Top; Socket Type. Bottom; Sabre Type.
left natural or waterproofed with black paint. In these, a soldier carried his rations, eating utensils, and any other small military or personal items he chose to tote.

Next, a canteen was of the utmost importance for maintaining a water supply. These came in an incredible number of patterns, but were usually constructed of tin and sometimes wood. Also carried on a shoulder sling, these too were worn on the left side with the haversack. In conjunction with the canteen and the haversack, a tin cup was commonly externally tied to one or the other.

Finally, a bedroll or knapsack was carried. The former simply consisted of one’s blankets rolled up with any extra clothing inside. Usually, this was fashioned into a long loop and worn over the left shoulder. Other methods of carriage, such as a shortened roll with a sling, however, existed. The knapsack served as an alternate means of carrying blankets and extra clothing. As pointed out, an incredible number of patterns existed, but two basic types, hard and soft, can be defined. With the hard, a rigid frame was inserted to create a squared, box like appearance. The soft did not have this. Its shape was basically dictated by what was placed in it and how it was packed.

For artillery and cavalry, the trappings were different. To begin with, both had alternative means of carrying their equipment; a horse or gun limber. Consequently, far less was probably actually carried by the individual.

Normally, artillerymen did not carry shoulder arms. Instead, they relied on pistols and sabres (and these were often dispensed with as unnecessary) which resulted in some differences in the equipment. For
Illustration 95: Haversacks. Left; Federal Pattern of Painted Canvas, but Undoubtedly Copied in the Confederacy. Right; Confederate Model of Unpainted canvas.
Illustration 97: Rigid or "Hard" Knapsack as Worn by New York Militia, but Similar to Patterns Worn by Southern Troops.
Illustration 99: Volunteer or Militia Single-Bag "Soft" Knapsack – Typical of Similar Patterns Worn by Both Sides.
the pistol, a holster was needed and worn on the specialized waist belt designed to support the edged weapon. A cartridge box was necessary, but such would have been much smaller than those issued to foot troops. Also, a cap box was required which was no different from those worn by other service branches. As with infantrymen, a haversack and canteen would be in evidence. Although a backpack would seem unlikely because unnecessary, certainly some form of bedroll was possessed. An additional, completely different set of equipment was also required by artillerymen for servicing their gun, but this will not be discussed, because, belonging more to the gun or the gun crew as a whole rather than the individual, it can not be considered personal.

As to cavalry, at least one pistol and a sabre were carried, and as with the artillerymen, such necessitated wear of a holster, cartridge box, and cap box on a specialized waist belt. Shoulder arms were carried far less frequently by Southern horsemen than by Northern. When used, they were commonly of infantry pattern, although carbines specially designed for mounted troops were certainly issued. If a carbine were possessed, a broad leather shoulder sling was worn to support it. Despite the type of shoulder arm, a larger cartridge box was needed. This could conform to one of the special patterns for mounted use with a carbine or if an infantry type weapon were carried an infantry style box would probably also have been worn. Such may have been carried in addition to that for the pistol or the pistol box could have been eliminated with its contents carried in the larger version. Bayonets were not needed.

A canteen was certainly still carried. Whether or not haversacks
were worn or the items usually carried in such were stored in saddle bags is difficult to say. Quite probably, both methods were employed. Needless to say, knapsacks were not required. A bedroll tied to the saddle served in its stead.

A great deal has been written about how much of the above mentioned gear was frequently left on the side of the road somewhere as unnecessary, with the result that many troops rarely carried many of these things. For infantry, some would have us believe that only a haversack, tin cup, bedroll, and one's weapon were all that was normally sported. This borders on the ridiculous. While one can understand lightening the load on a hot summer's march by discarding items such as great coats or extra blankets not immediately required, all the mentioned articles had functions crucial to maintaining body and soul on the march and in battle. An individual might get along without one or two of these things for awhile if lost or damaged, but the situation undoubtedly would have been rectified as soon as possible. In any case, it is very difficult to imagine officers and noncoms allowing the wanton disposal of this equipage, or veteran troops believing that they could get along without these items.
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5 Todd, American Military Equipage, vol. 1, pp. 212, 213, after illustration by George Woodbridge; and Thomas, Confederate Sketchbook, p. 11, citing illustration by author.

6 Todd, American Military Equipage, vol. 1, p. 215, after illustrations; and Lord, Collector's Encyclopedia, p. 74, after photograph.

7 Todd, American Military Equipage, vol. 1, p. 205, after illustration.

8 After example in author's collection.

CHAPTER VII

THE WELL APPOINTED CONFEDERATE ENLISTED
MAN IN THE ARMY OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Having described Confederate enlisted men's uniforms in detail and given a brief account of essential equipment, it is possible to establish a hypothetical image of what the common soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia should have looked like in terms of what he wore and carried. With the creation of this portrayal, a point of reference is had against which the clothing and equipment of the individuals in the photographs can be compared.

Based on the data derived from research and presented in the previous chapters, the following four illustrations represent well uniformed and equipped Confederate enlisted men. While the two infantrymen are deemed typical in every respect, it should be noted that the cavalryman and artilleryman are shown with all possible weaponry and related accoutrements. As indicated, such things as the cavalryman's carbine and the artilleryman's side-arms were not always carried. Still, they were part of the trappings of a fair number, and because of this, they have been included and the portrayals are accurate. At the same time, such items as haversacks and canteens are not shown as these probably would have remained with the horse or limber. Apart from these articles of
Illustration 100: Confederate Infantryman, 1862-1865.
Illustration 101: Confederate Infantryman, 1862-1865.
Illustration 102: Confederate Artilleryman, 1862-1865.
Illustration 103: Confederate Cavalryman, 1862-1865.
equipment, other details such as clothing are typical of all.

Having established a hypothesis to be tested in the photographs, the same can be tested in the ground, and the findings should mirror the conclusions drawn from the images. As will be seen, while equipment was rarely interred with the dead, they were buried in complete uniforms (exclusive of caps or hats). As shown, each garment type has distinct attributes in the form of number, type, and position of buttons, and these buttons should have survived in some discernible pattern in the archaeological record. In the case of trousers and vests, the buckles for belt tabs should remain as well. In essence, in those situations in which it is absolutely necessary to disinter a Confederate soldier, the excavator should be able to determine exactly what was worn, create a reconstruction, and be able to define individual and even group uniformity.

For instance, five to nine buttons only above the waist would indicate a shell jacket, with two more in the shoulder regions defining epaulets. Eight buttons in a line above the waist and four more below it and beneath the body would point to a single-breasted frock coat having been worn. Four buttons would mark a sack coat, two rows, a double-breasted frock coat, three, a tailcoat, and odd patterned or unusually placed, a zouave jacket.

Even with trousers, because of the distinctiveness of the buttons used, place of origin can be easily established. In addition, the number of them and their placement will define much. Such things as whether or not suspenders were worn or if the pockets buttoned can be ascertained. How the fly closed and waistband secured can also be
determined. The presence of a buckle beneath the body speaks for itself as do buttons or buckles found near the ankles.

It is not unlikely that shoes will still exist for which, given the major differences in the construction of many Southern forms, the archaeologist should be able to establish type and origin. It is even possible that remnants of fabric will survive - such is not unheard of - which would offer data on the weave, weight, and perhaps, even the color.

While the above can be gleaned about uniforms from burial sites, information about equipment can be attained from the investigation of camp areas and battlefields. As will be seen, a considerable amount of equipage was lost or discarded for different reasons in the course of action. The findings of relic hunters show that much was also disposed of in camp - undoubtedly when worn out and replaced. Actually, the excavation of trash pits in camp areas will, in many instances, undoubtedly reveal information about uniforms as well, as old ones would have been discarded upon the issue of new. Returning to gear, preliminary research has shown that with small items that will have survived in the archaeological record, such as the buttons or studs used to secure cartridge box flaps, there are many distinctive Confederate patterns which vary widely in size, shape, and material. Finding a number of such small items which are the same at a given location would point not only to Southern made items, but to a uniformity in equipage. This, in turn, would offer insight into manufacture, supply, and technology, in addition to defining the immediate material culture.
Items found on a battlefield will also help us understand what happened and, perhaps, even how or why it happened. A great deal of preliminary work, however, is necessary for establishing definitive typologies for these lesser fittings, generally considered (even by relic hunters) as junk. This, in itself, will allow increased knowledge of Confederate production and technology.
CHAPTER VIII

A PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF PRIMARY SOURCES

COMMENTING ON THE STATE OF THE COMMON CONFEDERATE SOLDIER

IN THE ARMY OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA

Having related the prevailing historical views on the image of the common Confederate soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia, the question remains, what is the basis for these beliefs? For the answer, we must turn to the primary documents. At first glance, there are some period quotes that would, depending on interpretation, tend to support that soldiers in the Army of Northern Virginia were, in fact, hurting for clothing and equipment. A close analysis of these documents, however, generally reveals that this was not the case, and the few instances of actual need were isolated and limited. Furthermore, some of these negative sources are suspect. At the same time, there is considerable documentation, which historians have ignored, recording that the troops were well supplied. Writings describing the condition of Southern soldiers can be divided into three categories. First, there are the accounts of civilians who at some point were in close proximity to the army. Secondly, there are the words of the Confederate soldiers themselves. Finally, there are the impressions of Southern troops left by disassociated military personnel such as
foreign observers and Federal soldiers.

The Civilian Impression of the Confederate Soldier

To begin with, let us look at how the civilian populace viewed Confederate troops. Universally, these initially seem very critical. Several such recollections are as follows.

They looked like an army of tramps, but in spite of their raggedness they had an air and dash that the Yankees could never achieve for all their fine uniforms. They were dirty, unshaven and hairy, ...

Another witness reported, "...A dirtier, filthier, more unsavory set of human beings never strolled through a town...". A third commentary refers to the Army of Northern Virginia as a "horde of ragamuffins". In addition, there is the following account left by a man of education pertaining to Confederate troops in Pennsylvania in 1863.

Most of the men were exceedingly dirty, some ragged, some without shoes, and some surrounded by the skeleton of what was once an entire hat, affording unmistakable evidence that they stood in great need of having their scanty wardrobe replenished; and hence the eagerness with which they inquired after shoes, hat and clothing stores, and their disappointment when they were informed that goods of that description were not to be had in town; and it ought not to have surprised us that they actually took shoes and hats from the persons of some of our Franklin County cousins, whom they considered more able to endure the loss than we, whilst they permitted us to escape that infliction.

To a civilian's eyes and mindset, these quotes are probably fairly accurate. The problem lies with the recorders themselves in that they are indeed civilians and unaware of the realities of war. The people who left these impressions were basically from nice, rural areas, who, until the Army of Northern Virginia passed through their region, probably had not seen many if any soldiers actually on campaign. In es-
sence, they were unused to seeing real soldiers, and they suffered from a preconceived notion, based on limited contact, of how troops should appear. If they had actually seen any before, for most, it was a matter of watching a white gloved, spit and polish drill unit at the county fair, or seeing a newly mustered command leave for the front in their fine new uniforms and equipment. They maintained a fantasy image, with all the glitter, shine, and romance, of how soldiers should appear. This, of course, was nowhere near reality.

In the last three quotes (the only ones dated) a major emphasis is placed on the Confederate troops being dirty, and this was very likely the case. Prior to Antietam and Gettysburg (the points in time to which these quotes refer) the soldiers under consideration had just carried out some very long, hard marches over dusty roads when dry and muddy ones when wet, and in the case of the latter campaign, in extremely hot temperatures. Without the opportunity to launder their garments, the result was an army whose members were, indeed, in want of a bath and doing some washing. Yet, being dirty, in and of itself, does not signify that the men were deficient in uniforms and equipment, or that any articles of either in their possession had digressed beyond a state that a good cleaning would not cure.

Weight of emphasis is next placed on the fact that they looked like "tramps" and "ragamuffins". Their being dirty would certainly enhance both these impressions. As to the former term, while not having the word "tramp" as a noun, a contemporary edition of Webster's dictionary does define it as a verb meaning "To travel; to wander or stroll." "Tramper" is the noun form (from which it would seem the term "tramp"
is a shortened, colloquial variation) and this is referred to as "A stroller; a vagrant or vagabond." These two descriptive nouns are given very similar definitions. For the former, it is "An idle wanderer; a vagabond, one who strolls from place to place; a sturdy beggar; one who has no settled habitation, or who does not abide in it." The very nature of the appearance of a soldier well kitted out for a hard campaign goes far to create the same impression defined by Webster. With all the various pieces of equipment slung and strapped to their persons, there can be little doubt that they did create the illusion of destitute, migrant individuals who carried all their worldly possessions with them. In fact, in a certain sense, this is exactly what they were. They were men frequently on the march who carried only that which was necessary to survive in their current lifestyle. Again, however, this does not indicate a deficiency in or poor state of clothing and equipment. In fact, the more a soldier carried, the more this image would be enhanced.5

As to "ragamuffin", Webster's defines this as "A paltry fellow; a mean wretch." While "paltry" can mean ragged, it is also indicative of "mean; vile; worthless;" etc. In turn, "mean" possesses a number of definitions conveying basically the same implication; "Wanting dignity; low in rank or birth;", "base", "contemptible", "Of little value; humble; poor;". A "wretch" is simply "A miserable person; one sunk in deepest distress." In any case, while "ragamuffin" might imply actually being ragged, it can just as easily indicate something really quite different — in essence, a simple low-life — without necessarily meaning that physical trappings are in poor condition. In this sense, this is
probably a fairly apt description of Confederate or any other soldiers on campaign who are dirty, hungry, ill-kempt, in ill-fitting issue uniforms, with all their gear on them. In essence, they could easily appear destitute, "low in rank", "base", "Of little value; humble; poor;", etc., in a civilian mindset without actually being so in a military, and without being deficient in anything.  

One of the dated quotes refers to raggedness, shoelessness, etc., and a need for clothing because of wear and tear on that immediately possessed. This detailed description, however, is intriguing in that there is a noticeable difference between the use of the word "most" when referring to the Confederates being dirty, and, simply, "some" when commenting on raggedness and lack of shoes. We have no idea how many "some" implies, but in conjunction with the previous use of "most" it strongly indicates a much lesser figure. In any case, the implication is that only "some" were ragged and only "some" were shoeless. Considering the amount of marching these men had done in the weeks previous to the writer's observations, it is not unlikely that "some" had worn out a pair of shoes or torn a pair of trousers. Yet, there is no indication that these men were not initially issued what they required prior to the onset of the campaign, and it certainly does not indicate that the Southern troops as a whole were deficient in anything. It must also be remembered that at the times when these quotes were recorded the Army of Northern Virginia was in the process of invading the North. The supply lines were stretched extremely thin at best. Consequently, failure to fill any needs for shoes or uniforms was undoubtedly far more a matter of not being able to get requisite
items to the troops rather than the items not actually existing.

To sum up, the impressions left by civilian witnesses are not ter-
ribly acceptable for the simple reason that they did not understand
what they were seeing. What they were actually saying in their
reminiscences is that they were shocked at the reality of how a
fighting army appeared on campaign. That which they observed was
typical of any army on hard, active service at any point in history.
There is no indication that they saw anything out of the ordinary or
any serious signs of want, need, or deficiency. They simply saw
reality, and it surprised them due to their own ignorance and naivete.

The Confederate Soldier's Impression of Himself

There are a number of detailed reminiscences left by Confederate
soldiers of the Army of Northern Virginia pertaining to how they viewed
themselves, and what they wore and carried. Probably the most oft
cited of such passages are those penned by Carlton McCarthy. His ex-
pose begins with a description of the soldier's equipage early in the
war.

The volunteer of 1861 made extensive preparations for the
field. Boots, he thought, were an absolute necessity, and the
heavier the soles and longer the tops the better. His pants
were stuffed inside the tops of his boots, of course. A
double-breasted coat, heavily wadded, with two rows of big
brass buttons and a long skirt, was considered comfortable. A
small stiff cap, with a narrow brim, took the place of the
comfortable "felt" or the shining and towering tile worn in
civilian life.

Then over all was a huge overcoat, long and heavy, with a
cape reaching nearly to the waist. On his back he strapped a
knapsack containing a full stock of underwear, soap, towels,
comb, brush, looking-glass, tooth-brush, paper and envelopes,
pens, ink, pencils, blacking, photographs, smoking and chewing
tobacco, pipes, twine, string and cotton strips for wounds and other emergencies, needles and thread, buttons, knife, fork and spoon, and many other things as each man's idea of what he was to encounter varied. On the outside of the knapsack, solidly folded, were two great blankets and a rubber or oil-cloth. This knapsack, &c., weighed from fifteen to twenty-five pounds, and sometimes even more. All seemed to think it was impossible to have too many or too heavy clothes, or to have too many conveniences, and each had an idea that to be a good soldier he must be provided against every possible emergency.

In addition to the knapsack, each man had a haversack, more or less costly, some of cloth and some of fine morocco, and stored with provisions always, as though he expected any moment to receive orders to march across the great desert, and supply his own wants on the way. A canteen was thought indispensable, and at the outset it was thought very prudent to keep it full of water. Many, expecting terrific hand to hand encounters, carried revolvers, and even bowie-knives.

Merino shirts (and flannel) were thought to be the right thing, but experience demonstrated the contrary.

In addition to each man's private luggage, each mess, generally composed of from five to ten men who were drawn together by similar tastes and associations, had its outfit, consisting of a large camp chest containing skillet, frying pan, coffee boiler, bucket for lard, coffee box, salt box, sugar box, meal box, flour box, knives, forks, spoons, plates, cups, &c., &c. These chests were so large that 8 or 10 of them filled up an army wagon, and were so heavy that two strong men had all they could do to get one of them into the wagon. In addition to the chest each mess owned an axe, water bucket, and bread tray. Then the tents of each company, and the little sheet-iron stoves, and the stove pipe, and the trunks and valises of the company officers, made an immense pile of stuff, so that each company had a small wagon train of its own.

All thought money was absolutely necessary, and for awhile rations were disdained, and the mess supplied with the best that could be bought with the mess fund. Gloves were thought to be good things to have in winter time, and the favorite style was buck gauntlets with long cuffs.

Quite a large number had a "boy" along to do the cooking and washing. Think of it? a Confederate soldier with a body servant all his own, to bring him a drink of water, black his boots, dust his clothes, cook his corn bread and bacon, and put wood on his fire. Never was there fonder admiration than these darkies displayed for their masters.

Paralleling this account is another by John H. Worsham.

Each man, besides his equipment of gun, &c., had a pistol and bowie knife, a knapsack, canteen, tea cup, haversack, &c.
In our knapsack we carried our fatigue jacket, one or two blankets, an oil cloth, several pairs of white gloves, several suits of underclothing, collars, neckties, handkerchiefs, &c. Each mess purchased a mess chest. Ours was of oak, large and commodious, having several trays. We had in it a dozen knives and forks, two or three butcher knives, a dozen large and a dozen small spoons, several kitchen spoons, a dozen tea cups and saucers, a dozen plates, several dishes and bowls, a sugar dish, a cream pitcher, salt and pepper cruets, a tin box containing a dozen boxes of assorted spices, a dozen glasses, a sifter, a coffee tin, &c. We had also a frying pan, a coffee pot, a camp kettle, a tea pot and a bread oven that was subsequently dubbed 'the spider'. Our uniforms were of the finest quality of cadet cloth and gold lace.

Certainly, much of that described in these discourses such as extra weapons, additional clothing, and, especially, the over- abundance of mess gear was superfluous, unnecessary, and impractical. Remembering that these troops were predominantly civilians recently turned soldiers, that which is clear from these quotes is that they suffered from the same ignorance and naivete about the harsh realities of hard campaigning as did those who did not put on a uniform. They wanted the creature comforts of home and did not understand the uselessness of much of that which they brought with them. It is also apparent from the mention of such items as blacking and white gloves that they too maintained a romantic storybook concept of how a soldier should appear and were attempting to create and maintain the same impression. Worsham comments that radical changes came about, and McCarthy enlightens us as to what these supposedly were.

The change came rapidly and stayed not until the transformation was complete. Nor was the change attributable alone to the orders of the general officers. The men soon learned the inconvenience and danger of so much luggage, and as they became more experienced, vied with each other in reducing themselves to light marching trim.

Experience soon demonstrated that boots were not agreeable on a long march. ... And so, good, strong, broad-bottomed and big flat heeled brogues or brogans succeeded the boots.

A short waisted, single breasted jacket usurped the place
of the long tail coat, and became universal. The enemy noticed this peculiarity, and called the Confederates gray jackets,...

Caps were destined to hold out longer than some other uncomfortable things, but they finally yielded to the demands of comfort and common sense, and a good soft felt hat was worn instead. ...

Overcoats an experienced man would think an absolute necessity for men exposed to the rigors of a Northern Virginia winter, but they grew scarcer and scarcer. ... Some clung to their overcoats to the last, but the majority got tired lugging them around, and either discarded them altogether, or trusted to capturing one about the time it would be needed. Nearly every overcoat in the army in the latter years was one of Uncle Sam's, captured from his boys.

The knapsack vanished early in the struggle. ... One blanket to each man was found to be as much as could be carried, and amply sufficient for the severest weather. ...

The haversack held its own to the last, and was found practical and useful. ... Somehow or other, many men managed to do without the haversack, and carried absolutely nothing but what they wore and had in their pockets. The infantry threw away their heavy cap-boxes and cartridge-boxes, and carried their caps and cartridges in their pockets. Canteens were very useful at times, but they were as a general thing discarded. ... A good strong tin cup was found better than a canteen,...

Gloves to any but a mounted man were found useless, worse than useless. ... they were discarded.

The camp chest soon vanished. ... One skillet and a couple of frying pans, a bag for flour or meal, another bag for salt, sugar and coffee, divided by a knot tied between, served the purpose as well. The skillet passed from mess to mess. Each mess generally owned a frying pan, but often one served a company.

The oilcloth was found to be as good as the wooded tray for making up the dough. The water bucket held its own to the last!

Tents were rarely seen. ... Two men slept together, each had a blanket and an oilcloth. One oilcloth went next to the ground. The two laid on this, covered themselves with two blankets, protected from the rain with the second oilcloth on top, and slept very comfortably through rain, snow or hail, as it might be.

Reduced to the minimum, the private soldier consisted of one man, one hat, one jacket, one shirt, one pair of pants, one pair of drawers, one pair of shoes, and one pair of socks. His baggage was one blanket, one rubber blanket, and one haversack. The haversack generally contained smoking tobacco and a pipe and generally a small piece of soap, with temporary additions of apples, persimmons, blackberries, and such other commodities as he could pick up on the march.
The company property consisted of two or three skillets and frying pans, which were sometimes carried in the wagon, but oftener in the hands of the soldiers. The infantrymen generally preferred to stick the handle of the frying pan in the barrel of a musket, and so carry it. . . .

The infantry found out that bayonets were not of much use, and did not hesitate to throw them, with the scabbard, away.

The artillerymen, who started out with heavy sabers hanging to their belts, stuck them up in the mud as they marched, and left them to the ordnance officers to pick up and turn over to the cavalry.

The cavalrymen found sabres very tiresome when swung to the belt, and adopted the plan of fastening them to the saddle on the left side, with the hilt in front and in reach of the hand. Finally, sabres got very scarce even among the cavalrymen, who relied more and more on their short rifles.

No soldiers ever marched with less to encumber them. . . . Instead of growling and deserting, they laughed at their own bare feet, ragged clothes and pinched faces, . . .

While this quote reflects a serious change in attitude about what was necessary in the field, it is so polarized, so extreme, that it is just as absurd as the description of what was initially thought important. Certainly, the kit was reduced from its early war state, but McCarthy lightens it far too much and would have the reader believe that such was universal. There probably were occasional individuals who, without forethought, believed they could get along without the items mentioned, but imagine their chagrin upon going into action and finding their ammunition ruined by breakage or moisture, and we can picture the patience of those who retained their canteens wearing thin after several requests for a drink. The result would be that anyone who did so would quickly regret having tossed their cartridge box or canteen in the bushes along the road. In any case, a happy medium as to the amount of equipment carried is far more realistic, and, as will be seen in the following quotes which challenge McCarthy's on this topic, such was the situation.
At the same time, the quote is interesting in its implication throughout that if the Confederate soldier did not have something, it was because he did not want it. It was not a matter of its not being available. It is not until the last couple of lines that there is any reference to privation, and these lines lose a lot of their impetus in light of earlier comments. In essence, if McCarthy is to be believed, then because of wanton disposal of equipment and clothing or mistreatment of it, the Confederate soldier had no one to blame but himself for any needs he may have had. Any shortages were due to the soldier's wastefulness rather than unavailability.

Another problem with the McCarthy quote is that it is very general in its tone. Not only is it filled with all-encompassing, blanket statements, there are no dates. This leads to the natural conclusion that the writer's comments apply to the entire period of the war after the first few months. This is too sweeping and general to be accepted as fact, as it has. Other equally general and vague comments exist describing the plight of the common Confederate soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia. Worsham's account continues, "How great the change as the "cruel war" dragged along! All the soldier's sumptuous outfit had been lost, the soldiers were often ragged, without shoes, hungry and glad of a single blanket as baggage."\(^10\) Another statement by Frank H. Foote reads, "He managed to get along very well in rags and tatters, half shoeless, if necessary."\(^11\) Such lines are virtually worthless. For a correct and meaningful assessment of the situation, those comments referring to a specific time, place, and situation must be examined. Fortunately, a fair number of these exist, and they offer
interesting insights into the true state of affairs.

Alexander Hunter left the following description of the 17th Virginia Infantry on the Second Manassas/Antietam campaigns, August and September, 1862.

Every knapsack and all camp equipage were left behind and in light marching order, with sixty rounds of ammunition, a blanket over our shoulders, and five days' rations in our haversacks, we headed for the Rapidan River. ...

My, my, what a set of ragamuffins (the members of the Seventeenth Virginia) looked! ...

None had any underclothing. My costume consisted of a pair of ragged trousers, a stained, dirty jacket, and an old hat, the brim pinned up with a thorn. A begrimed blanket over my shoulder, a greased, smeared cotton haversack full of apples and corn, a cartridge box full, and a musket completed my outfit. I was bare-footed and had stone bruises on each foot.

Some of my comrades were a little better dressed, some were worse. I was the average. But there was not one there who would not have been 'run in' by the police had he appeared on the streets of any populous city, and fined next day for undue exposure.

Edgar Warfield, in whose reminiscences Hunter's comments were made, continues,

I was not entirely shoeless, for I had the soles of my shoes held to the uppers by pieces of bandages, which I had to renew quite often. But I was good and ragged, all right! My hat I had found at a farm house in Virginia. It was part of a straw that had been painted or varnished black, and half of the rim was missing. It took the place of a good brown felt hat that I had up to within a few days of our entering on Maryland soil and that I lost one night when, tired and footsore, I was allowed by the driver of one of the wagons of our regiment to get in and ride. Crawling out just before daybreak I found that my hat was missing. It had evidently fallen out during the night.

Writing about the same period, George S. Bernard suffered the same problems with his shoes as did Warfield.

An incident occurred on this night march that I have often recalled: My shoes had begun to give out, and I had to fasten the soles to the upper leathers by making holes through each and tying them together with leather shoe-strings passed through these holes, a device that did not serve to prevent gravel and sand from freely entering the shoes to my great
Randolf Abbott Shotwell reported fighting from Second Manassas through Antietam without shoes of any kind. He also described the Southern troops at this point as, "the half-clad, half-shod, half-fed, half-armed, unshaven, unshorn, unkempt, uncouth-looking, sunbrowned, battle-scarred, "Rebel rag-tag"." At the same time, he left the following description of himself.

As I entered the carpeted apartment, I was somewhat startled at seeing before me a tall, gaunt, barefooted specimen of the "Rebel Genus." One foot bandaged with an old blanket, hair long and ill-combed, cap slouching over one eye, and faded to a dirty yellow; pantaloons in tatters, and one leg shorter than the other; collarless, cravatless, clean-shirt-less - a hard-looking fellow! ... And then all at once, I felt a mingled rush of surprised mortification, and amusement as I realized that the hard looking chap was - myself in a large mirror!

Jno. E. Crow reported on his personal condition during this same period.

In crossing the Potomac at Leesburg I lost my shoes, and I went through the Maryland campaign bare-footed. Those of us in this deplorable fix had not only to contend with sore and tender bottoms of our feet, but our feet were also sunburned and blistered on top, which was equally painful. Going through Frederick city I was in a dilapidated condition indeed. My cap had no brim. The sleeves of my jacket were worn out and were ragged at the elbows, and I was bare-footed and dirty.

Also commenting on the Maryland venture was David E. Johnston who stated there were "hundreds shoeless and more becoming so", and he himself made the march barefooted.

As the army went into winter quarters around Fredericksburg later that same year, such comments continued. Shotwell wrote that the winter of 1862-1863 was one of considerable privation for Confederate troops as a whole stating, "...our infantry is shamefully ill-fed and
But as winter was now severely present, the army suffered exceedingly for want of proper clothing and equipage. Protracted rains and howling sleet storms fell with chilling fury on the half-clad, unhoused soldiers, many of whom were a long time even without tents. Not one man in two dozen, had an overcoat or more than one blanket. I suffered untold horrors from the inclemency of the weather, and the inadequacy of my clothing.  

Robert A. Moore made various entries in his diary pertaining to the situation. On November 13th, he remarked, "Have learned this evening that clothing & shoes cannot be gotten from the government. The army stands in great need, of shoes in particular.", and on November 29th, "Souldiers badly clad for winter.", and again on December 4th, "The winter has been quite cold to-day. The army is in quite a bad condition to receive it.".  

William E. Cameron reported on the state of his comrades in his notebook as of April 19th, 1863,  

...in the matter of dress it seemed that they were not precisely in that condition in which they would have liked to make their appearance at home. There was scarcely one of them but was ornamented by a large patch upon his pants, the odd shapes and divers colors of which, to say nothing of their material - some of them being made of leather or oil cloth - would often provoke a laugh despite your sympathy for the poor fellows who wore them.  

Pertaining to the same period, an oft cited reference frequently used to show the poor condition of Confederate troops is that left by a Louisiana officer.  

Among 1500 men reported for duty there are 400 totally without covering of any kind for their feet. These men, of course, can render no effective service, as it is impossible for them to keep up with the column in a march over frozen ground. There are a large number of men who have not a single blanket. There are some without a particle of underclothing, having neither shirts, drawers, nor socks, while overcoats, from their rarity, are objects of curiosity.  

Walter Harrison commented on the state of Pickett's Division during
mid-February, 1863.

During this continued march of ten days, the ground was covered with either snow or sleet, and hundreds of the men were without shoes or blankets. Overcoats were unknown. Many of the men were shod with only the improvised moccasin of raw beef-hide; and their heads covered with little else more rain-proof than a shock of matted hair, rather fantastically, if uncomfortably, embellished with pendent icicles.23

The above references represent the vast majority of the truly negative accounts that were located. Especially interesting is that, excepting Cameron's statement, all date to the same six month period. During this time, there do actually seem to have been some problems. Some troops were in sincere need, but as will be pointed out, this need was limited, and the problem stemmed more from the failure of the supply system itself rather than the requisite items simply being nonexistent. Before continuing, a brief narrative of the activities of the Army of Northern Virginia is necessary to understand the situation. Between August and December, 1862, this force was involved in some very serious campaigning. On August 9th, Jackson's Corps was engaged at Cedar Mountain, Virginia. Later in the month, from the evening of the 28th through the 30th, the army fought at Manassas, and on the following day, part of it was again in action at Chantilly. In September, the force invaded Maryland where on the 14th, much of it engaged at South Mountain, and on the 15th, additional elements captured Harper's Ferry. On the 17th, the entire force was committed to the particularly vicious battle of Antietam. This was followed by a respite as Lee pulled his forces back into Virginia and ultimately took up a position at Fredericksburg. There, on December 13th, the entire army was again committed to a major engagement. In essence, there were
four months involving an incredible amount of marching and seven serious fights. Needless to say, such activity will take its toll on uniforms, equipment, and shoe leather.

At the same time, there was a serious breakdown in the supply system itself. Quite simply, the quarter-masters in the field were not going through proper channels with the result that, while supplies were sent on a regular basis, they were far from enough, because the Quarter-Master General in Richmond was officially unaware of the situation due to his not having received proper requisitions in accordance with the system. As soon as this problem was rectified, the supplies came in. All shoes possessed by the quarter-master's bureau were forwarded in December, and additional, large quantities of shoes were impressed from speculators in Richmond. As of January, as many as 5,000 each of the needed articles were being sent daily.24

In conjunction, E.P. Alexander commented on another aspect of the problem, "Our scarcities were due entirely to insufficient railroad transportation."25 This clearly implies that the materials existed. There were simply problems in getting them to the troops.

Another factor in the breakdown of the supply system existed. From the beginning, a number of Southern states had opted to supply their own troops rather than rely on the central government. In the case of Louisiana, this decision ultimately had ill effects on her troops in the field. Having previously supplied her sons in Virginia well, at the time in question, New Orleans and much of Louisiana had recently come under Federal occupation. Consequently, the ability to supply her troops no longer existed. They were forced to switch to relying on the
central government for what was needed, and there was a breakdown for awhile as the transition was made. The earlier cited comments by the Louisiana officer have been frequently employed very loosely to describe the whole of the Confederate Army and reflect that this was its frequent condition. In fact, it only is applicable to one group of troops at a specific time in an unusual set of circumstances. At the same time, even the indomitable North Carolina which normally took exceptionally good care of her people was having trouble with their system of supply. Also, since October, the central government had been attempting to take over responsibility for supplying all troops and its problems were compounded by the loss of such sources of manufacture as Louisiana which had been supplying it as well as her own men. In essence, with the breakdown of earlier systems and the instigation of a new one, there was a period of major transition undoubtedly suffering from the problems inherent to such which took awhile to get worked out and running smoothly.  

Even during this period, the situation was nowhere near as bad as it seems. As stated, by January large quantities of supplies were being received at a steady rate. Earlier, in December, prior to the Battle of Fredericksburg, in a letter to Jefferson Davis, Lee, himself, stated that the army "was never in better health or in better condition for battle than now." Even the already cited quotes, initially seeming so negative, do not portray a terribly bleak picture of privation when closely analyzed. It is apparent that the troops were really only in dire need of three items. There can be no doubt that during this time some men required shoes, and as the weather changed, blankets
and greatcoats were in demand. But what of the rest of their kit? Close scrutiny of their comments alone or in conjunction with others they made indicates that they were not wanting much if anything else.

Hunter's comments are interesting. He describes the general lack of underwear, his own ragged trousers, lack of shoes, and he fails to mention several key items of equipment when telling us of what he carried. The reader is left with the impression that this man did not have much, and that which he did possess was in pitiful condition. Yet, here we have a man who has also just finished saying that "Every knapsack and all camp equipage were left behind". The obvious implication is that Hunter and his comrades had more equipment and were ordered to leave it. The reference to knapsacks is the most enlightening. The impression is that these were quite common in his unit which is interesting in itself as most would have us believe that these were generally discarded in favor of the bedroll. Furthermore, the fact that these knapsacks were retained indicates that they still served a necessary function. In essence, a soldier would not keep this particular item if he did not have something to carry in it such as additional clothes and blankets. At the same time Hunter reports having backpacks, he fails to mention other essential items such as a canteen, cap box, and bayonet. There is a serious inconsistency here. It is extremely difficult to imagine that troops would retain their knapsacks when a bedroll would suffice yet not have the three articles just mentioned. There are two ways of accounting for this. Hunter does not definitely state that he, personally, possessed a backpack,
but as pointed out he indicates that they were a common item in his unit. If in fact he did have one himself, then it must be accepted that his failure to mention the other articles was an oversight. If he did not have one, but most everyone else did, then, perhaps his description of what he carried is correct, but strongly implies that, really, he was an exception to the rule in not having the additional pieces of equipment. As to that which he says he has, apart from the ragged trousers, there is nothing wrong with anything except that it is dirty. In fact, excepting his lack of shoes, this is where the major emphasis of his complaints is placed. His account becomes somewhat suspect when it is realized that one of the garments examined and described was worn by a member of the 17th Virginia only about two and a half months earlier. This is the beautiful tailcoat with gold trim.

Warfield's comments are also of interest. He states that he presented a ragged appearance and describes in great detail the condition of his shoes and hat. Yet, this is all he mentions as being in poor shape. It must be asked if the rest of his outfit was in an equally bad state, why did he not mention it as well. His failure to do so strongly indicates that all he considered ragged about his appearance was, in fact, his shoes and hat. As to the latter article, he makes a point of saying that he had a good one, but lost it.

Bernard's recollections are of note. It was only one week until his quarter-master, "...delivered to me a handsome pair of shoes which fit exactly, and were nice enough (I thought) for a gentleman to wear to a ball - the last pair of a lot he had that day purchased in Frederick city." Additional comments by Bernard indicate that apart
from shoes, neither he or the rest of his command were lacking much if anything. During a halt on the march he mentions "...taking off our baggage and accoutrements". While he himself says he carried a bedroll, he also states that for the purpose of a reconnaissance by the brigade, "Men went without knapsacks or blankets.", and an additional remark about going into action at Second Manassas refers to the unit unslinging knapsacks. Finally, he left this account of his outfit's involvement during the Battle of South Mountain. Having already been engaged,

The firing now seemed to have entirely ceased, when one of our men exclaimed, 'Look yonder, boys! They are coming across the field!' Immediately upon which the command ran down our line, 'Fix bayonets, men! Fix bayonets!!' followed in a few seconds by another, 'Fall back, men! Fall back!!' when there was a general grabbing up of guns, blankets, knapsacks, canteens, &c., and a backward movement.

There does not seem to have been any lack of equipage in this command. This quote is also of importance in lending support to statements to be made later in this study. It is quite clear that while on the firing line, equipment, not immediately essential, was removed, and thus, in terms of the photographs, a fair amount of gear that was actually carried might not appear on the men themselves. Getting back to the main line of thought, not only is it evident that Bernard and his comrades were well equipped, all indications are that they were also well uniformed. While literally spending pages discussing the problems with shoes, he never once mentions his or anyone else's clothing being in poor condition or that anything else was needed. We can only accept that, in fact, everything else was possessed and in good condition.

Then, there are the additional comments made by Shotwell. Refer-
ring to the period of August, 1862, he described his gear.

I was never strong, and the weight of gun, bayonet, cartridge box, cap box, blanket, canteen, tin cup, and such small articles of toilet as I chanced to have, all weighed me down until I had to gasp for breath, and so chafed my shoulders and breast - the straps keeping my clothes pressed tight against my flesh - that I could not bear to have anything touch them.\(^{32}\)

It is obvious that Shotwell had all of the essentials. He only fails to mention a waist belt and a haversack. That he carried a bayonet and a cap box indicates that he definitely had a waist belt. His "small articles of toilet" were probably tucked away in a haversack he mentioned earlier in his narrative. As to his clothing, it is clear from the earlier quotation that Shotwell could have used a new pair of trousers. He does, however, refer to his cap (undoubtedly meaning a military forage or kepi pattern) and his shirt. At the same time, while there is no reference to a military coat or jacket he does state that he had one as of August, 1861, December, 1861, Spring, 1862, and early December, 1862. In addition, he commented on his equipment straps pressing his clothes against his body, indicating that more than a shirt was worn during this period. As will be seen, Shotwell was a complainer, and if he did not have a coat or jacket at this point, it seems unlikely that he would have failed to mention it. In any case, all that Shotwell seems to have required was shoes, like some others at this point, and new pants.\(^{33}\)

As to Crow's account, by his own admission he had a pair of shoes and lost them. Regarding his clothing, he only mentions problems with his jacket and cap. After the Battle of Antietam, Crow was befriended by a young lady who in the time it took him to "sip" a cup of coffee
while enjoying a cigar, put a new brim on his cap and had "...the elbows both patched in the neatest way." One must ask just how bad the jacket really was to be mended so quickly and easily. Earlier, at South Mountain this same writer refers to how he and a comrade "buckled on our accoutrements" upon going into action. He does not once mention anything wrong with his trousers so we must accept that they were in good condition.

Johnston left the following account describing Confederate troops at this point in the war.

A musket, cartridge box, with forty rounds of cartridges, cloth haversack, blanket and canteen made up the Confederate soldier's equipment. No man was allowed a change of clothing, nor could he have carried it. A gray cap, jacket, trousers and colored shirt - calico mostly - made up a private's wardrobe. When a clean shirt became necessary, we took off the soiled one, went to the water, usually without soap, gave it a little rubbing, and if the sun was shining, hung the shirt on a bush to dry, while the wearer sought the shade to give the shirt a chance. The method of carrying our few assets was to roll them in a blanket, tying each end of the roll, which was then swung over the shoulder. At night this blanket was unrolled and wrapped around its owner, who found a place on the ground with his cartridge box for a pillow.

Johnston fails to mention a cap box, bayonet, and waist belt. Whether he actually did not possess these articles or it is an oversight is impossible to say. In any case, he is otherwise well appointed in terms of equipment and especially clothing. In fact, it is quite possible from his description that all his uniform articles may have matched in color and fabric. His reference to the gray cap indicates he wore either a kepi or forage style. Of note is the line "No man was allowed a change of clothing,". Obviously his unit possessed additional clothing, but was ordered to travel light. The fact that there is no evidence of complaint except for the shoe situation, indicates that
the rest of Johnston's kit was in good order.

Moving on to the comments pertinent to the winter of 1862-1863 we encounter the same situation. Again, there is Shotwell. For clothing during the early part of the winter he refers to having "...nothing but a cotton jacket and pants, thin shirt, and a shoddy blanket." His concept of nothing seems to at least include a complete uniform. It is interesting to note that throughout his narrative, Shotwell complains about everything and goes into considerable detail about exactly what was wrong. Here, his complaint is that his garments are of cotton and not warm enough, but he is surprisingly silent as to their condition. Consequently, one must wonder if this is the same uniform he wore on the Maryland campaign or if it is a more recent issue. It is hard to imagine in light of his other comments, that if these were the same ragged trousers of an earlier date, he would not have commented on their additional ineffectiveness to combat cold due to their poor condition. That such is possible is evident from the fact that he consistently bemoans his situation in the cold and obviously dislikes his uniform for its inability to combat it. Yet, a bit later in his narrative he suddenly has a new pair of pants whose issue he has neglected to mention. One would think, considering his ardent disapproval of his previous trousers, he would be ecstatic over receiving new ones and not fail to mention it. They simply materialize in the following.

Stood sentry last night, and was so chilly and numb that I failed to perceive my new pantaloons were aflame until quite half a foot of one leg was charred and destroyed. A most annoying occurrence, when I consider that I shall not be able to obtain another pair for several months.

It is somewhat suspicious that, in the course of only a few months,
Shotwell managed to possess two pairs of trousers with one leg shorter than the other. Also, commenting on waking up after a snowfall he says, "Shoes, hats, and sometimes coats were hidden somewhere under the snow, but it was not a pleasant task to run about in stocking feet and shirtsleeves hunting for them." Here, it is clear that complete uniforms are possessed, but one must ask why, if it is so damned cold, and snowing too, coats and shoes are not being worn to sleep in? There are two answers, either it was not as cold as we have been led to believe, or the men in question had sufficient extra blankets to keep them warm. Either is very telling.

Moore's statements are rather contradictory. Three days after stating that there was no clothing or shoes to be had from the government, he says, "Have been drawing clothing, have also received a part of our blankets." This was less than two weeks prior to his line, "Soldiers badly clad for winter.", and a later statement to the same effect. The obvious implication here, and with Shotwell's also, is not that the troops did not have uniforms, but simply that they did not have sufficient extra seasonal clothing.

Cameron only reports that trousers needed replacing. Considering this quote dates from April 19, 1863, it is quite possible that the trousers he witnessed were issued three or four months earlier in December or January, and during the ensuing time, simple wear and tear had again taken their toll. It is hard to conceive that these men were still wearing the same garments that they had in the fall. With the effects of the hard campaigning combined with the long winter, trousers would undoubtedly have been in a state beyond mending with a simple
patch. Also, this is the only problem mentioned (which in light of a quote to be discussed may not indicate a problem at all) so, it must be accepted that others did not exist.

As to the Louisiana troops, the brigade immediately received "1000 shoes, and complete suits".42

The records of the 7th Louisiana show that they were issued "English shoes", "Confederate shoes", "canvas shoes", and "wood sole shoes".43 As to the last two types, this is the only reference this writer has found so far pertaining to their actual wear in the Army of Northern Virginia. Whatever the quality of the shoes, the quick response to resupplying this command indicates no shortages existed. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while the officer went into great detail describing what was required in the unit, he never mentions uniforms. Yet, "complete suits" indicates that uniforms as well as shirts, underwear, etc., were issued. In addition, the figure of 1,000 would have created a surplus in Hays' Louisiana Brigade at this point, because the roll was well beneath this number.

With Harrison's report on Pickett's Division, while it is apparent that these men stood in need, apart from hats, the three things they required were shoes, greatcoats, and blankets. Again, this implies that they had everything else, and it was not a matter of not having clothing, but rather, simply not having enough to meet inclement weather.

Writing of this same time period, some writers have indicated that there was no problem at all or that it was limited. William M. Norman left the following account.
On the 23rd of December our company got one tent. We moved our camp on the 24th and got another tent. Our company also got a fine lot of clothing, blankets, and shoes from our kind relatives in Surry County. We divided with many in the regiment who were without shoes. We had also drawn some government clothing, so by Christmas Day I think all had shoes and blankets, and about half had good bell tents.

Our army was tolerably well clothed and fed. We received many good boxes full of good eatables, fruit, clothing, etc., during the winter. We built a chimney to our tents, and some of the boys who had no tents would dig holes or caves in the earth, cover them over with split logs, leaves, and dirt, and make themselves quite comfortable. We lived in this way until the middle of February. It was a very cold and disagreeable winter. Our boys seemed to enjoy themselves very well and all was quiet.

Although there is indication that clothes and shoes were needed by members of Norman's unit, the situation seems to have been well taken care of. Granted, they had to rely on sources other than the government for a fair amount of what was required, but there is no indication of any serious problems at all. Unfortunately, we do not know if the garments sent from their home county were of military or civilian pattern.

A Louisiana soldier described his command's stay in the Shenandoah Valley during October.

We spent a pleasant month and over at Winchester, during the period of Indian summer, living on bacon and autumn corn, getting new clothing - reading books aloud, or telling campfire stories, and generally enjoying the superb climate of Virginia, as much as if there were no bloody battle-fields to dream of in the future.

Here, we have troops with no complaints of the situation and receiving uniform issues during this period. It should be emphasized that these are Louisiana troops. There is certainly no indication of any problems.

There are also the comments of LeGrand James Wilson referring to
early autumn, 1862. While his unit was not technically part of the Army of Northern Virginia as yet, it was still operating in the Richmond/Fredericksburg area.

Col. Miller had succeeded in getting his entire regiment uniformed and otherwise equipped, and we were now pretty well drilled, and ready for active service, and were getting anxious to see it.

And, shortly after, he states,

Every man and officer was in his new uniform, and guns and accoutrements as bright as silver dollars.

And, in December,

Our regiment was ordered back to camp south of the city, in time to make ourselves comfortable for the winter, and get ready for Christmas. This was the jolliest, merriest Christmas we spent during the war. The railroads were all intact, and many boxes of good things were brought from home by returning comrades who had been on sick furloughs, and the lucky man always divided his good things and the 42nd Miss. had been in and around Richmond so long the boys knew all the avenues of ingress and egress, and could get anything they wanted.

Again, there is certainly no problem in this command. New uniforms and equipment were issued them, and everything seems quite satisfactory. An interesting anecdote that offers insight into the situation during the winter of 1862-63 by reflecting that it was really not bad, follows. Apparently the illicit trade between Southern and Northern soldiers across the Rappahannock River was considerable. One item coveted by Confederate traders was Federal greatcoats which were frequently received. Yet, upon obtaining such, Southern soldiers were not in the habit of keeping them themselves or giving or bartering them to their comrades. Instead, they were commonly taken or sent to Richmond for sale. The obvious implication is that either the weather was not severe enough to really need them, or they already possessed sufficient
winter clothing, and the transaction for Federal overcoats was strictly a financial venture plain and simple.\textsuperscript{49}

From these various statements, several things are evident. Some, but not all units suffered some privation during this period. The situation, however, does seem to have been rectified with all expediency. In addition, what was required was primarily limited to shoes and additional winter items such as greatcoats and extra blankets. There does not appear to have been much if any problem with other uniform and equipment items. Furthermore, the articles needed do not transcend those required by any army after several months of hard campaigning and about to encounter a change of season with a supply system that is not functioning effectively or efficiently (a problem encountered by most armies at some point in the course of any given conflict). In essence, uniforms and equipment wear out and supply lines break down. It is one of the simple, realistic truths of warfare. With "...their clothes all in patches...begrimed with mud...some even already with no boots and bands of hay tied round their feet,..." we have an exemplary comment.\textsuperscript{50} No, this does not refer to the Army of Northern Virginia, but rather to the state of the elite British Cavalry Division (inclusive of the famed Light Brigade) with winter approaching in the Crimea several years earlier. Returning to Virginia, even the inclemency of the weather does not really seem to have caused more than discomfort as the vast majority certainly survived the winter despite any deficiencies.

Having examined this period, what of other times during the conflict? Research reveals very few specific negative comments pertinent to other points reflecting any real need. Just prior to the Wilder-
ness/Spotsylvania campaign, May, 1864, Marcus B. Toney stated that as
of May 1st, "many of the soldiers were without shoes", but in a passage
referring to only a few days later, while saying the army was "ill
clad", he contradicts himself and neutralizes the meaning and effect of
the first comment by stating "Many of the men were nearly barefooted;". While both lines indicate a problem with footwear, there is
a big difference between "without shoes" and "nearly barefooted." At
the same time, he does say that a large number of haversacks and knap-
sacks disappeared from the Federal dead after the first day's fighting,
and he mentions a comrade who procured a pair of shoes from a Northern
casualty. The following is Toney's description of Confederate
prisoners (of which he was one) captured at Spotsylvania. "We were in
a sorry plight to meet such an array of tinseled regalia. Many of our
men were hatless, shoeless, and coatless, and were covered with mud
from the trenches." While Toney is clearly indicating that there
were some problems at this point, with regards to the last quote, an
examination of the circumstances under which these men were taken
prisoner undoubtedly accounts for at least some of what was reported
missing. In essence, many of the hatless, shoeless, and coatless
probably possessed these items immediately prior to their captivity.
Having for several days occupied a heavily entrenched, fixed position,
these men were surprised and overrun by a massive Federal assault at
first light. Given the nature of the situation, undoubtedly many
Confederates did not have time to properly array themselves prior to
attempting to meet the onslaught. Under the circumstances, it is easy
to imagine startled troops, many probably still asleep or having just
woken up, desperately grabbing only for that which was immediately
essential, gun and ammunition. In any case, it is interesting to compare Toney's comments with another that will follow painting a completely different picture. It should also be noted that at this same time, Toney, himself, possessed both a greatcoat and a brand new tailor-made uniform of jeans.54

Thomas G. Jones left the following description of the Confederate soldiers at Petersburg.

The winter of 1864-65 was one of marked severity, making duty of any kind very arduous. The clothing of the Confederate troops, which at best was hardly sufficient, had become threadbare and tattered, and they were often without shoes.33

Even though this statement refers to a particular time period, it is, nevertheless, very general and sweeping in nature. Jones does refer to a lack of shoes, and clothing being threadbare (no real problem in itself) and tattered, but the implication of this in conjunction with the word "sufficient" tends to indicate a situation similar to the winter of 1862-63. There were uniforms and equipments. There simply were not enough additional articles such as greatcoats to help them effectively withstand the elements.

Writing of the winter of 1863-64, McHenry Howard left the following enlightening account of the shoe situation. In an effort to literally save shoe leather, trained cobblers throughout the army were organized into a special unit whose duty was to repair and alter shoes. Howard stated,

A careful estimate and report of the saving of the issue of shoes to our brigade during the winter was made to the higher authorities at one time, but I am afraid to say from memory what the saving was confidently stated to have been, certainly several hundred pairs; besides, the men's feet were kept in better condition by the correction of ill fitting shoes. On the march back from Gettysburg in the summer before, the "bare-
footed" men of the division - not literally that except in the case of some, but those whose shoes were worn out or whose feet were sore from wearing bad shoes or other causes -

While this quote does indicate a problem with footwear, several things are apparent. The army was aware of the potentiality of shoe problems and was doing what it could to avoid them. Their efforts seem to have met with success given several hundred pairs were saved for a single brigade alone. Taking into account the generally extremely under-strengthed nature of most Confederate brigades at this point in the war, this is not an inconsiderable figure. More important, however, is Howard's pointing out that "barefooted" frequently did not mean so literally. Here we have a definite note of caution for any historian interpreting Confederate documents, and this offers grounds to question the use of the term in previous quotes. It is quite likely that some were not totally shoeless. Also, it is quite possible in light of this definition that the discrepancy in Toney's memoirs is accounted for.

The above comments are the only ones truly indicating problems and again shoes are the main issue. Many additional statements exist which initially seem to indicate privation and need, but upon close analysis it is found that there was, in fact, nothing wanting at all. G.H. Baskett left the following general description of the common Confederate infantryman.

A face browned by exposure and heavily bearded, or for some weeks unshaven, begrimed with dust and sweat, and marked here and there with the darker stains of powder - a face whose stolid and even melancholy composure is easily broken into ripples of good humor or quickly flushed in the fervor and abandon of the charge; a frame tough and sinewy, and trained by hardship to surprising powers of endurance; a form, the shapeliness of which is hidden by its encumberments, suggesting in its careless and unaffected pose a languorous indisposition to exertion, yet a latent, lion-like strength and a terrible energy of action when aroused. Around the upper part
of the face is a fringe of unkempt hair, and above this an old wool hat, worn and weather-beaten, the flaccid brim of which falls limp upon the shoulders behind, and is folded back in front against the elongated and crumpled crown. Over a soiled shirt, which is unbuttoned and buttonless at the collar, is a ragged gray jacket that does not reach to the hips, with sleeves some inches too short. Below this trousers of a nondescript color, without form and almost void, are held in place by a leather belt, to which is attached the cartridge box that rests behind the right hip, and the bayonet scabbard which dangles on the left. Just above the ankles each trouser leg is tied closely to the limb - a la Zouave - and beneath reaches of dirty socks disappear in a pair of badly used and curiously contorted shoes. Between the jacket and the waistband of the trousers, or the supporting belt, there appears a puffy display of cotton shirt which works out further with every hitch made by Johnny in his effort to keep his pantaloons in place. Across his body from his left shoulder there is a roll of threadbare blanket, the ends tied together resting on or falling below the right hip. This blanket is Johnny's bed. Whenever he arises he takes up his bed and walks. Within this roll is a shirt, his only extra article of clothing. In action the blanket roll is thrown further back, and the cartridge box is drawn forward, frequently in front of the body. From the right shoulder, across the body, pass two straps, one cloth the other leather, making a cross with blanket roll on breast and back. These straps support respectively a greasy cloth haversack and a flannel covered canteen, captured from the yankees. Attached to the haversack strap is a tin cup, while in addition to some other odds and ends of camp trumpery, there hangs over his back a frying pan, an invaluable utensil with which the soldier would be loth to part.

With his trusty gun in hand - an Enfield rifle, also captured from the enemy and substituted for the old flintlock musket or the shot-gun with which he was originally armed - Johnny Reb, thus imperfectly sketched, stands in his shreds and patches a marvelous ensemble - picturesque, grotesque, unique - the model citizen soldier, the military hero of the nineteenth century. There is none of the tinsel or the trappings of the professional about him. From an esthetic military point of view he must appear a sorry looking soldier.

While going into great detail, this is really an extremely general, all-encompassing description. It refers to no particular field force at no specific time with the result that it conveys the impression that every Confederate soldier consistently appeared exactly this way every day of the week for four years. One almost gets the feeling that the troops wore the same uniform and carried the same equipment in the same
condition throughout the conflict, or, if new items were issued, they were presented in an already worn state. Certainly, new uniforms were issued, and the overall appearance in terms of condition was far better, at least at times. On the other hand, if accurate in a general sense as to what was worn and carried, as opposed to its condition, apart from failure to mention cap boxes, every necessary uniform and equipment article is accounted for. Not mentioning cap boxes is another example of how sweeping this quote is in that such were carried. Of special note is the fact that while referring to "badly used and curiously contorted shoes", he never once comments on anyone being without footwear. The whole nature of this statement is such that even though Baskett says it describes the Confederate troops in general, its all-encompassing nature combined with its extreme detail, leads the reader to wonder if the writer is not actually describing himself at his lowest point and considering his personal state as representative of Southern troops as a whole at all times. In any case, that Baskett is not really complaining is apparent from a continuation of his statement, "He doesn't care a copper whether anybody likes his looks or not. He is the most independent soldier that ever belonged to an organized army. ...He may be outre and ill-fashioned in dress, but he has sublimated his poverty and rags." 58

As to more specific statements in terms of time and place there is, once again, Shotwell. Throughout his narrative, from the time of his enlistment, he consistently paints a bleak picture. Yet close examination of his comments makes it apparent that he seldom truly needed anything. Upon joining the army in the summer of 1861, he left the following itinerary of what he was issued.
Anticipating a battle next day, I told Captain Wampler he had better look to my outfit. It proved a "not fit," and gave me my first lesson in military subordination, for nothing but direct orders could have made me don the miserable garments thrown out to me; to wit: an ugly grey cap, with a round top flopping on the brows like a pig's ear; a short grey jacket, cunningly contrived to reveal six inches of shirt in front and rear between it and the grey coffee sacks of pantaloons; and a pair of coarse brogan shoes, three sizes too large, shaped like a brickbat, and about as comfortable. In this delectable rig I felt as awkward and ungainly as a modern parlour knight in ancient chain-armor.

A pair of musty blankets, a rough cartridge box, cap pouch, and canteen, all home-made, a rusty old flint-lock musket, altered to percussion, and a canvas haversack completed my military outfit.

Welcome to the army Mr. Shotwell! Short of mentioning a bayonet, there is nothing Shotwell lacked. It is very evident that he simply did not like that which he was issued.

In December, 1861, he describes himself as he went on picket duty.

With a shudder I took up my gun and blankets and set out upon the perilous service; though well knowing that I was not capable nor properly equipped therefor. Despite my overgrown proportions, or perhaps in consequence of them I was physically weak, and altogether unused to hardship of any sort: besides being not only thinly clad, in jacket and pantaloons, but without overcoat, oilcloth, or underclothing except the thin cotton garments I had worn all summer.

Apart from a greatcoat, there is nothing lacking in this description. His reference to blankets (plural) would certainly indicate that he was not going to freeze to death.

In the spring of 1862, he describes himself upon leaving hospital after an illness.

The first day I was allowed to venture out, I donned my old greasy cap, rusty shoes, and an old overcoat - indescribably ugly in pattern and material which served to hide the lack of a decent jacket and shirt.

Again, Shotwell has everything he needed in terms of a uniform, even a greatcoat which suddenly has seemingly materialized out of nowhere.
This is interesting. We just heard him bitterly complaining about the lack of a greatcoat, yet, like the trousers in an earlier statement of his, one suddenly appears without his having commented on its issue. This is rather strange. One would think he would not fail to mention something he desired so much. To make matters worse, obviously having one, all he can do is complain about its cut and fabric. As to the rest of his outfit, his cap is only dirty. His jacket and shirt, he says, are not decent. We have no idea what this entails but given Shotwell's tendency to complain, it is quite possibly a matter of their only being dirty as well, or at least something that is not terribly serious. Referring to a time only "48 hours" after returning to camp, Shotwell continues with a description of what he possessed when orders arrived to move out. "Even without any sort of burthen, I must have suffered dreadfully; but think of carrying a heavy musket, bayonet, cartridge box, with 60 cartridges in it, cap box, canteen, blankets, knapsack, change of clothes, small toilet articles, and food for three days! More than 100 pounds to be carried all day long..." While this weight is clearly an exaggeration unless Shotwell was trucking even more items than described, (and this writer is curious as to what type of cartridge box would hold sixty rounds) this quote is extremely interesting. All that is not mentioned is a haversack, but in light of the reference to having a knapsack this is not terribly crucial and he may have simply neglected to mention it. More important is the sudden appearance of a "change of clothes" and the plural "blankets". There is no doubt that Shotwell is well appointed.

Having already related his account of himself during the Maryland operations, Shotwell left the following statement pertinent to the
Gettysburg campaign during the summer of 1863.

Then, when one's clothing is utterly saturated with perspiration mixing with the dust in a grimy paste; and above all, weighs the heavy musket, the muffling blankets, griping waist band and belt (upon which hang the heavy cartridge and cap boxes) and the chafing canteen straps — is it strange that one sees hundreds of men gasping for breath, and lolling out their tongues like madmen?

This is an intriguing statement in that Shotwell seems to be referring both to himself, specifically, and to other troops as well in terms of what was carried as far as equipment. All but two essential items are mentioned. While the writer fails to refer to a bayonet, he has mentioned having one twice before. Considering this, it is quite probable that he had one at this time, too, and his failure to mention it is another oversight, and certainly, other troops were in possession of this item. He also fails again to refer to a haversack, which even McCarthy says was one item usually retained, but the reference to canteen straps (plural) indicates that one was probably carried and the failure to mention it is also an oversight. A canteen would have only a single strap, but worn in conjunction with the haversack, two straps would cross the body together. In any case, apart from possibly not having a bayonet and haversack, there is nothing wanting here. Furthermore, given Shotwell's tendency to complain about everything, it is noteworthy that he does not comment on the condition of his uniform. As a result, we can assume that it was in good shape and there was simply nothing negative for him to say.

What is readily clear from Shotwell's reminiscences is that he simply did not like army life and the physical trappings that went with it. Apart from lacking a pair of shoes and having ragged trousers at one point, and wanting additional warm clothing, he was really never
without anything. As is evident from the following quotes and several of the previous ones, being dirty was a major issue with him.

I can truthfully say I suffered more from coarse dirty food, dirty blankets and clothes; unwashed linen, (often marching and fighting for weeks without opportunity to wash our faces once a day,) and the ineradicable camp-vermin, than from all other hardships of the service.

and,

Months on months they were without a change of underclothing, or a chance to wash that they had worn so long, hence it became actually coated with grease and dust, moistened with daily perspiration under the broiling sun. 64

Much of Shotwell's complaining can be attributed to his personal background. From a fairly well off Southern family, he left college in the north to enlist. Being very well dressed with long, immaculately kept hair, one gets the impression that he was every bit a vain dandy. In his first encounter with Confederate troops, he describes them as "Rough, uncouth-looking, shaggy-bearded men". 65 From this, there can be no doubt that he was somewhat of a snobbish dilettante who felt most of his comrades were beneath him. He was truly upset when he realized that for practicality's sake he must cut his hair to a short length. Shotwell, is in fact, that soldier common to all armies, the griper. With all of the constant complaining encountered when reading his works, one is amazed that he stuck it out as he seems a prime candidate for desertion, so great is his dislike of army life. 66

With Shotwell, we get a glimpse of what undoubtedly prompted complaints from other troops. These were citizen soldiers gone off to war with delusions of grandeur who were slapped in the face with a hard dose of the realities of campaign life. The situation was simply not what they expected. In this respect, the image the soldiers maintained
of themselves was little different from that of the civilian populace which viewed them. Except during the opening months, there were not the clean, well kept, fancy uniforms that they believed they would have. While giving up their early war, excess creature comforts, they did not like it. They were used to a different, more comfortable lifestyle which allowed better hygiene and the ability to replace, on their own, items they needed. The very fact that these men could write the accounts they did indicates that many were at least of middle class or higher social levels, and as such, even more unprepared for the realities of life in the field.

Along the same line as Shotwell, writing of a time as late as February, 1865, Frank H. Foote (responsible for an earlier negative general quote) described a foraging venture with a comrade in which he mentions tin cups, haversacks, and a blanket before concluding, "This load consisted of 124 turnips, two rifles and accoutrements, ammunition, two knapsacks, one peck of peas, one ax, two haversacks, etc." Talking of a time shortly before, he refers to the issue of bread with additional telling comments.

Not having knapsacks and haversacks that would turn snow or sleet, it would get wet, then musty and unfit to eat. I have seen soldiers leaving camp with one loaf in the knapsack and one in the haversack, whilst the third one was spitted on a fixed bayonet, ready for use when wanted.

There is certainly no lack of equipment at this late date. The author goes on to describe his own mutilation of his shoes which resulted in his being barefoot.

One of my shoes rubbed my heel sore. I cut a hole in it, and that made it worse. I finally cut the whole heel out, and then it wouldn't stay on; so, pulling it off, I trudged along in wet and cold, and was soon overcome with a chill.
He offers the additional enlightening lines pertaining to the shoe situation in general.

Our shoes, especially those made by the Confederate department, were pitiable specimens indeed. Generally made of green or at best half-cured leather, they soon took to roaming; after a week's wear the heel would be on the side, at an angle to the foot, and the vamp, in turn, would try to do duty as a sole. It was impossible to keep them straight, and to judge by your tracks you could hardly tell whether you were going or coming. They conformed to the weather also. While hot and dry they would shrink like parchment, and when wet they just "slopped" all over your feet. English-made shoes were nearly as bad. They were lined and stuffed with stiff paper, and after fording a few times they usually came to pieces. I have seen men while in winter quarters take a piece of beef hide, soak it well and then fit it over their shoes, hair part inside. These they allowed to dry on the feet, so as to retain the shape of the foot, and also to prevent contracting too much. When well made, they answered the purpose very well, and when the march came in the spring of the year they would cut them off and they would have a well-broke new shoe to trudge the pike in.

In light of the fact that orders were given to make rawhide shoes during the winter of 1862-1863, this is an extremely interesting comment. It makes one wonder how many men were really shoeless with only these makeshift affairs, and how many thought to be shoeless really had them, but they were not visible under the rawhide. As Foote describes it, this was a very practical procedure. In addition to conditioning the shoes, such would save wear and create extra warmth.

The same writer left the following account of the uniforms worn.

Our hats and caps were taken from "our friends, the enemy," and you could see all styles, shapes and makes, generally ornamented with letters denoting the command of the owner. The "alpine hat" or "Excelsior", of New York, was the most common, and were preferred to all others. Caps were not sought after, as they neither turned sun nor rain. Slouch hats are peculiar to the South, and were affected a great deal. We also had palmetto, pine straw and quilted cloth hats. At Petersburg our captain went up to Richmond and purchased some thirty-odd hats for his company, paying for the same ninety dollars each. "Oh, what a swell we did cut." They were a drab color, and took well as long as the weather
was fine.

The first rain took out all pretension of style, and in place of a neat, nobby-looking hat, we were the possessors of a limp mass of rabbit fur and glue. When the sun shone out the hats, in spite of all contrary efforts, dried to suit themselves, and cracked when again pressed into shape, and before long drooped again and fell to pieces as we trudged the ways of the march. Our buttons were made of wood, and soon parted company with our wretched garments. In camp we boiled our underwear in the mess kettle.... These clothes being always of heavy and coarse material, always dried rough. To obviate the disagreeable feeling and to prevent chafing, we rubbed them around smooth-barked saplings. On the winter marches we fared wretchedly, for our clothing was not "overly warm," nor was it material that would turn water readily. When we got into camp we were soon comfortable before huge fires. ...

In the absence of pocket handkerchiefs, we had to slip our nose on our rough coat sleeves, which soon produced an inflamed organ, rivaling John Barleycorn in that respect.

Our clothes, mostly cotton, were coarse and heavy, and of every hue and cut - not a full uniform of one material except those of the staff. The prevailing color was what is familiarly known as "butternut," a dry dye made from copperas. ...Many of the soldiers would, on the summer's march, throw away their blankets and superfluous clothing, trusting to luck to provide others ere winter set in.

Unfortunately, this is a general quote in that no specific time reference is given, and the reader is not sure if Foote is talking of the army as a whole or just his immediate unit. Evidence to be discussed later, however, tends to support he is discussing only his particular brigade. In any case, the lines are quite informative. It is clear that apart from hats, there is no want of uniforms. The complaints, like Shotwell's, center on things like color and quality of fabric. At the same time, there is no mention of any being in poor condition. The reference to the uniforms being "mostly cotton" is of note. It would be easy to interpret this as meaning that most of the uniforms worn were all cotton, but a more probable interpretation is that the weave in any given uniform was primarily of cotton, but other fibres (undoubtedly wool) were also incorporated. This is also the only quote
indicating butternut uniforms as being common. To reiterate, while we can not be certain, indications are that he refers only to his particular brigade, and not to the Army as a whole. Whatever, the bottom line is that the troops are uniformed and there is no indication of problems in terms of raggedness etc., except for the loss of buttons. Regarding the buttons, this is the only encountered reference to wooden fasteners being employed. Certainly such were not common. Only one of the extant jackets has these, and another possibly does, but as pointed out, there is question about their originality to the garments. Also, as will be seen, these do not appear in the photographs. In light of other references indicating that butternut was rare, and the just stated support that wooden buttons were too, despite the general nature of this quote, one can not help but feel that, like Baskett, Foote is really only describing a particular issue at a specific point in the conflict. We know that all Confederate troops did not wear butternut, cotton/wool blend garments with wooden buttons throughout the conflict, and it is very unlikely that every issue Foote or his unit received was of this nature.

In conjunction with the just cited statement, Foote offers some extremely enlightening insight into the maintenance of uniforms.

Socks were patched at heels and toes to save wear, as were our trousers. It was a common sight to see all sorts of re-enforcements to the men’s seats. On a pair of brown or butternut-colored trousers you would see a huge heart, square or star-shaped patch, according to the whim of the owner. It is obvious that the writer is describing putting on patches at points susceptible to wear (undoubtedly when first issued and new) in an effort to protect trousers and increase their life span, rather than attempting to repair damage already done. If this was really done, and
there is no reason to believe that it was not, it would explain at
least some of the accounts in which observers viewed the Confederate
troops as ragged. Reinforcing patches would certainly create this
impression, when in fact there was nothing wrong at all.

Other statements exist which indicate that there was nothing want­
ing in terms of equipment and uniforms. An entry in Moore's diary
dated July 29, 1863, within a month after the Battle of Gettysburg,
reads, "The army is improving very fast indeed & will soon be in fine
condition again. Is being well supplied with shoes and clothing." 73

Wilson left the following lines about going into winter camp in 1863.

Winter was rapidly approaching, the nights were becoming fear­
fully cold, we were needing our winter clothing and extra
blankets which were far in the rear to shield us against the
blasts of an early winter. 74

From this, it is evident that all his unit requires is its additional
winter clothing which it actually has. It just has not caught up with
them. Wilson also penned the following description of breaking winter
camp in the spring of 1864.

Soon orders are sent down to us to begin to strip our­selves and have our baggage in condition to be shipped back to
our depots in Richmond at a moment's warning. These orders
created considerable excitement, and we go to work in earnest,
packing our winter goods, and camp conveniences that we cannot
carry on the march. The first day of May we shipped our bag­
gage, reserving only such things as we have learned from expe­
rience that we must have on the march, to protect ourselves
from the changes of the weather, and cook our scant rations.
May 3rd, three days rations are issued and ordered to be
cooked and tents are struck at daylight next morning. 75

While not going into specific details as to what the members of the
unit actually possessed, it is quite apparent that a considerable
amount of extra equipment and clothing was on hand and simply left in
storage for the duration of the summer campaign. The line referring to
taking things with them for changes in the weather strongly implies that they took additional clothing, blankets, or specialized gear. In any case, there is no indication of need here at all.

Writing of the same time, Willie Dame recorded this description of his unit breaking winter camp.

The packing was not done in "Saratoga trunks," nor were the things piles of furs and winter luxuries. The "things" consisted of whatever, above absolute necessaries, had been accumulated in winter quarters; a fiddle, a chessboard, a set of quoits, an extra blanket, or shirt, or pair of shoes, that any favored child of Fortune had been able to get hold of during the winter. Everything like this must go. It did not take long to roll up all the "extras" into bundles, strap them up and pitch them into the wagon.76

This account parallels Wilson's exactly. While Dame clearly implies that their "extras" were not considerable, it is very obvious that some, at least, had additional clothing, equipment, and even shoes, and it was placed in storage until needed for the next winter. When marching orders were actually received Dame says,

The fellows instantly scattered, every man to his quarters, and for a few minutes nothing could be seen but the getting down and rolling up of "flys" from over the log pens they had covered, rolling up blankets, getting together of each man's traps where he could put his hands on them.77

Here is the second instance of units possessing tentage at this rather late date in the conflict and carrying it with them in the field. If there are doubts that tentage was fairly common for Confederate troops at this point all one need do is view the photographs of the prisoner of war camp for Southern troops at the "Punch Bowl". Canvas is in absolute abundance in a number of views, and it stretches the imagination that this was supplied by the captors.78 The uniforms of the outfit are described as a "...simple, gray uniform - which consisted of jacket and pants...".79 Wearing this, Dame proceeds to describe what he
considers a typical artilleryman on campaign during this period.

...in less than two hours after the order was given the wagon was gone, and the men left in campaign "trim."

This meant that each man had, left, one blanket, one small haversack, one change of underclothes, a canteen, cup and plate, of tin, a knife and fork, and the clothes in which he stood. When ready to march, the blanket, rolled lengthwise, the ends brought together and strapped, hung from the left shoulder across under right arm, the haversack—furnished with towel, soap, comb, knife and fork in various pockets, a change of underclothes in the main division, and whatever rations we happened to have in the other—hung on the left hip; the canteen, cup and plate, tied together, hung on the right; toothbrush, "at will," stuck in two button holes of jacket or in haversack; tobacco bag hung to a breast button, pipe in pocket. In this rig, — into which a fellow could get in just two minutes from a state of rest, — the Confederate soldier considered himself all right, and ready for anything; in this he marched, and in this he fought. Like the terrapin — "all he had he carried on his back" — and this all weighed about seven or eight pounds.

It is apparent that in Dame's battery the men did not carry side arms, as there is no mention of either them or the requisite accoutrements. Apart from these items, which were not absolutely necessary for artillerymen, the writer and his comrades were very well equipped and dressed. Of note is the description of the elaborate, compartmentalized haversack. Robert Stiles, a comrade of Dames, took exception to the plate, knife, and fork, in that he states he never carried such himself. He preferred to eat directly from the frying pan. Otherwise, he does not disagree with Dame's comments. 81

Apart from a very generalized statement that the troops were "poorly supplied with clothes", the only negative statements in his account are as follows. 82

Our uniform was a short jacket coming down only to the waist, hence a hole in the seat of the pants was conspicuous, and was regarded as not suited to the dignity and soldierly appearance of a Howitzer. For one to go around with such a hole showing — any longer than he could help it — was considered a want of respect to his comrades. Public opinion demand—
ed that these holes be stopped up as soon as possible. Sitting about on rough surfaces – as stumps, logs, rocks, and the ground – made many breaks in the integrity of pants, and caused need of frequent repairs, for ours was not as those of the ancient Hebrews to whom Moses said, "Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee" – ours waxed very old, before we could get another pair, and were easily rubbed through. The more sedate men were content with a plain, unpretentious patch, but this did not satisfy the youngsters, whose aesthetic souls yearned for "they know not what," until Ben Lambert showed them. One morning he appeared at roll call with a large patch in the shape of a heart transfixed with an arrow, done out of red flannel. This at once won the admiration and envy of the soldiers. They now saw what they wished, in the way of a patch, and proceeded to get it. Each one set his ingenuity to work to devise something unique. Soon the results began to appear. Upon the seats of one, and another, and another, were displayed figures of birds, beasts and men – a spread eagle, a cow, a horse, a cannon. One artist depicted a "Cupid" with his bow, and just across on the other hip a heart pierced with an arrow from Cupid's bow – all wrought out of red flannel and sewed on as patches to cover the holes in the pants, and, at the same time, present a pleasing appearance. By and by these devices increased in number, and when the company was fallen in for roll call the line, seen from the rear, presented a very gay and festive effect.

One morning, a General, who happened in camp – the gallant soldier, and merry Irishman, General Pat Finnegan, was standing, with our Captain, in front of the line, hearing roll call.

That done, the Orderly Sergeant gave the order, "'Bout face!" The rear of the line was thus turned toward General Finnegan. When that art gallery – in red flannel – was suddenly displayed to his delighted eyes the General nearly laughed himself into a fit.

"Oh, boys," he cried out, "don't ever turn your backs upon the enemy. Sure they'll git ye – red makes a devil of a good target. But I wouldn't have missed this for the world."

This is a wonderful yarn, and in the words of a friend, "If it ain't true, it ought'a be." But, compare this with the previously stated accounts of Cameron and Foote. Apart from the humorous aspects, it is essentially the same. Garishly shaped patches of odd fabrics were applied to the seats of trousers. At the same time, there are noticeable differences between the three. While Cameron clearly refers only to his immediate comrades, Foote relates that these patches were quite
common, with Dame indicating they were unique to his unit. Certainly, the "General" would have been aware of such endeavors and not reacted as he did if they were not unusual. Of interest is the fact that Cameron and Foote were from the same brigade, and consequently, their accounts support each other. If Dame (writing of a point in time roughly the same as Foote) is correct, however, in stating that this practice was unique, it would mean that while undoubtedly existing in Cameron's and Foote's unit, the latter's implying it was common, actually indicates that it was only so in their particular command. This tends to support that Foote's more generalized statements on other topics are pertinent only to his brigade and not the army as a whole. In any case, these discrepancies are explainable. It is possible that Dame's comrade, Lambert, saw a member of the other two men's outfit with trousers so treated and emulated it, letting his friends think he was the originator of the concept. Thus, these patches could be common, in that many in Cameron's and Foote's unit employed them, and unique in that only their brigade and Dame's battery opted for such artistic features. The bottom line is that these patches were not used with frequency throughout the entire army.

There is another discrepancy between Cameron and Foote. Cameron says these appliques were used to cover already existing holes, while Foote indicates that they were put on to prevent them. There are two possible explanations for this. Cameron's account comes from his journal, and it was recorded upon returning to camp after a fairly long absence. He seems surprised by all of this. If this state of affairs existed previously he would have known of it and not bothered to mention it. This was his first encounter with the procedure, and it could
very well be that in his ignorance he simply assumed that they covered holes when in fact they were preventative. If so, there really was nothing wrong with his comrades' trousers.

The alternative explanation can be found in the fact that Cameron is referring to a time at least a year earlier than Foote. The function of the patch may have changed during the interim. Whereas they did cover actual holes at the time Cameron discusses them, it is quite possible that later, the concept was carried a step further, and they were used as a matter of course to prevent wear as Foote describes them. As pointed out, because both quotes refer to the same brigade, they do support each other and there is no reason to doubt them. In addition, Foote's comments are so detailed and unusual, there is a solid ring of truth to them. There is no reason to doubt that the patches were employed for the reasons he mentions.

Still, there is another explanation to account for the similarity of Dame's story with the other two. Dame's version may be suspect. It is possible that he borrowed this particular story from the other's material in order to spin a good yarn. As stated, Cameron's comes from his wartime journal, and there is no reason to doubt it except, perhaps, in the particulars of the patch's function. It was also the first to be published. Foote's followed, but, again, because he refers to the same unit as Cameron and offers such unique detail, there is no reason to question it either. Dame's was the last to go into print, and one must ask if he did not read one of the other accounts prior to publishing. This stands as a possible example of writers of postwar memoirs drawing on each other for information. This issue will be discussed later in greater depth.
Taking these quotes at face value, as indicated, Cameron's and Dame's state the patches were used to cover actual holes. In each instance, however, this is the only problem referred to. All else seems fine. Furthermore, Dame treats this entire issue in a humorous vein as if it were nothing serious. This, combined with his other comments gives no support to his statement about the troops "being poorly supplied with clothes". With Foote, the patches existed only to prevent wear. The only problem here is the implication that if the soldiers took the time to do this, there was some concern about being reissued. Still, this is not terribly serious and there were no immediate problems.

An interesting aside to Dame's story is to ask where the apparent abundance of red flannel came from. In accordance with the traditional viewpoint, this should have been a rare and expensive fabric. An intriguing explanation, however, exists. As red was the designated service branch color for artillery, and from the surviving examples, it is evident that artillerymen, more so than others, employed the appropriate hue, it is possible that a supply of this material was maintained to trim uniforms issued in a plain generic state. Two examples in the sample worn by artillerymen - the English made jacket and the other which is probably English made as well - had their red trim added later. In essence, generic jackets were embellished after issue with the service branch color. Whether or not this accounts for the presence of the red flannel in Dame's camp is impossible to say but it is a good possibility. Whatever the reason, however, it is interesting and telling that such a quantity of this fabric existed at all.

Other, lesser quotes allude to the fact that even late in the war
the situation was not bad. During the Battle of the Crater at Petersburg, Bernard tells of his unit taking off "knapsacks, bedrolls and other baggage" upon going into action. Taken prisoner during the last days of the war during the retreat from Petersburg, Johnston relates, "Immediately upon our capture, the Federal soldiers stripped many of our men of all their good hats, boots and small trinkets." This speaks for itself at this point. Charles T. Loehr also commented on his being taken prisoner during the Battle of Five Forks which occurred on April 1, 1865.

Landing at the wharf, we were formed in open line for inspection; that is, we had to empty our pockets and lay our baggage on the ground before us, while the Federal sergeants amused themselves by kicking overcoats, blankets, oilcloths, canteens, and everything that had a U.S. on it, into the bay. This left us in a sad condition, for there was very little in our possession that had not been the property of the United States, at one time or another, and became ours by the many victories and captures we had helped to gain.

Two things are apparent here. To begin with, Loehr states that most of their remaining equipment was of Federal origin. That which he describes, however, is all of a very impersonal nature. It is simply serviceable equipment. Apart from greatcoats, there is no mention of wearing Federal uniform articles. Also, there is no reference to any of this Northern gear having been taken from Union dead or prisoners. It is simply referred to as having been captured. Given the large quantities of such that Loehr leads us to believe were present, it is far more likely that this came from captured Federal stores rather than individuals. More important, however, is the fact that having been captives for four days and been transported all the way from Five Forks, Virginia, to Point Lookout, Maryland, these troops still re-
tained a considerable amount of gear regardless of where it came from. This, in turn, indicates that there was no sense of want among these men prior to their imprisonment.

Such quotes as related above have been interpreted and employed to convey the severity of the situation when, as pointed out, in most instances no such situation really existed, and in the few instances reflecting actual need, it is quite limited. Basically, because the soldiers recalled that things were bad, the historian accepts this at face value saying, too, that affairs were terrible without looking further at what the troops were really saying. One leading historian is a case in point. He offers the following comments in conjunction with his statements on clothing deficiencies. While there is no provenance for these in terms of the field force they refer to, they are, nonetheless, typical of the historical interpretation.

Bettie I send you a couple of shirts and a pair of drawers. Use them as you please. I had rather wear your make. The reason I drew them was that they are so much cheaper than you can make them. You can use them in making clothes for the children.

What is evident from this statement is that this particular soldier actually has an excess of clothing. He is receiving it from two separate sources and can afford to dispense with some of it. The comment itself dates from the spring of 1864.

Another such comment used by this historian follows.

Me Joe and Grace all got together yesterday for the first time. Grace was the gladest fellow to see us that ever came along he... is all most naked his breeches is in strings all he has got fit to ware is a over shirt Joe gave him a par of drass [drawers] & shirt I gave him a par of breeches all I have except what I have on.

While this indicates that a soldier was in dire need, it only refers to
the plight of one single individual who in comparison with his comrades is obviously the exception to the rule. His friends actually possess an excess of clothing which leads one to believe that the needy soldier's state must have come about under extenuating circumstances.

Finally, this comment is presented.

I sold my pants, vest, shoes, & drawers for sixtyone dollars so you see I am flush again. ... You will have to make me more pants and drawers, if you can raise the material make two pair of pants & four pair of drawers & I will have A pair of pants & two pair of drawers for sale in that way will get mine clear... if you could make up a good supply of pants vests shirts and drawers, I could be detailed out to come after them.

While here, we have a situation in which some of this fellow's comrades are needy enough to purchase clothing from him, this particular individual is obviously well off not to mention running a going financial concern. In addition, he has only sold one extra set of clothing and asks immediately only for an additional pair of trousers and two pairs of underwear which tends to indicate that not too many men in his command are really in dire straits.

In the previously cited quotes, there have been several references to the use of captured Federal items. Baskett says his canteen and Enfield rifle came from this source, Loehr states that the majority of equipage very late in the war was of Northern origin, Foote refers to captured hats, McCarthy to Federal greatcoats, and Toney to haversacks, knapsacks, and a pair of shoes. Apart from Toney's, none of these accounts relate how these items were acquired. We do not know if they were issued out of captured Union stores or if they were acquired personally from a fallen foe or prisoner. As stated, with Loehr, the former is likely the case. Given the generic quality of shoes and many
items of equipment, the issue of such from captured Federal stores to Confederate troops would have been the sensible and practical thing to do whether or not there was any shortage of such items of Southern manufacture. These were valuable and serviceable items very similar if not the same as those produced in the Confederacy. In actuality, considering that both sides prescribed the same color of trousers in their regulations, even the issue of Federal pants taken from supply depots would be the logical thing to do no matter what the situation. Socks, shirts, and underwear from Northern stores could also be given out. There is no stigma attached to this, and would, in itself, not necessarily have reflected any shortages. On the other hand, the secondary sources belabor the point that the Southern troops were so frequently in dire need that they resorted to robbing prisoners and the dead to obtain what they required. The impression is established that all Southern troops were a pack of ghouls. As has already been pointed out, instances of real privation were limited in terms of what was needed and few in number. Consequently, it must be asked, just how frequent this practice on the part of Confederate troops really was as it would seem unnecessary.

In analyzing what might be taken from a captured or fallen foe, articles can essentially be divided into two categories, personal and impersonal. The former grouping would include shirts, underwear, pants, coats, money, keepsakes, etc. The latter entails cartridge boxes, canteens, weapons, blankets, and other items of issue equipment. Falling into somewhat of a gray zone between the two are shoes, hats and greatcoats. Propriety and upbringing dictate that at least personal items should not touched. With the impersonal, however, we
have rather generic, serviceable, and reusable items which practicality says should be procured and not let go to waste. In the case of the dead, such would be removed in any case prior to interment, and also, much of this same sort of thing would be taken from prisoners. Basically, whereas the removal of personal items is an impropriety that carries a stigma and sense of repugnance, the acquisition of the impersonal is not, at least not to the same degree. The few pertinent statements of the soldiers themselves are enlightening.

Foote recalls,

Often in the thickest of the fray it was not uncommon to see a soldier grasp a haversack from the ground or displace it from a dead enemy, and quickly swing it to his shoulder, and its contents shared with others at the close of the action if he survived.

Another Confederate at Gettysburg tells of being "...detailed by Capt. Hero to gather food from the dead Federal infantry, whose haversacks were furnished with three day's ration." It is very clear from these statements that it was not the haversacks that were wanted, but rather the food they contained.

After the Battle of Chancellorsville, May, 1863, William E. Cameron described the situation.

At every turn of the road we came upon long squads of prisoners and wagon trains of guns and accoutrements, while so precipitate was the retreat that at every step we found the most valuable articles thrown away in the flight. Nearly every man in the regiment supplied himself with a rubber cloth, and a Yankee 'shelter tent,' and the camp is supplied with an unlimited assortment of Yankee stationery.

This statement is interesting for several reasons. To begin with there was obviously a considerable amount of stuff around that could have been procured, but primarily all that seems to have been taken were rubber blankets, shelter halves and stationery - all impersonal. While
nice items to possess the first two things do not fall into the category of absolute necessities. They are really additional luxury items. In light of the fact that these were the articles sought, it must be accepted that these men were otherwise well uniformed and equipped. This, in turn, is of import, because these men just came out of their winter quarters of 1862-1863 indicating that any needs that had existed during that period were met. There is no mention of robbing the dead or even taking from the abundant number of prisoners. That which was obtained was picked up from the ground after being discarded.

A Confederate cavalryman left the following comments pertaining to the use of captured Federal items.

An old Confederate carbine or sabre, such as were first issued to the cavalry, would be a curiosity now. They were soon thrown away, for our men "borrowed" their arms and equipments from the Federal troopers. They began this exercise early in the war, and pursued it industriously until nearly every company was well supplied. Along in 1864, Sheridan's people protested against this business, and it became more difficult to pursue it with success. But the work had been accomplished, and on many well fought fields these Southern men from South Carolina and North Carolina and Virginia, met the brave mounted infantry [sic?] of Sheridan's command with arms and ammunition and saddles and bridles, and often horses, that were rich trophies of battle.

This statement is enlightening for a couple of reasons. If there was any body of troops in a position to procure and use Federal gear, it was the cavalry who through their fast movement and raiding, got places ahead of others and would have had first choice of whatever they wished to take. Still, despite this, all that is mentioned are very impersonal items such as weapons and tack, quite impersonal and undoubtedly from captured stores rather than individuals. Horses were a legitimate prize of war. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that these items were obtained not from need, but simply from a desire for something
better. These troops had carbines and sabres and merely exchanged them for a preferred form. There is no indication of need, just preference. Also, while obviously in a position to attain other things, there is no reference to utilizing captured Federal uniforms or other articles of a personal nature.

McCarthy offers these lines pertaining to the topic.

It was found that it was inconvenient to "change" the underwear too often, and the disposition not to change grew, as the knapsack was found to gall the back and shoulders, and weary the men before half the march was accomplished. It was found that the better way was to dress out and out, and wear that outfit until the enemy's knapsacks or the folks at home supplied a change. Certainly it did not pay to carry around clean clothes while waiting for the time to use them.

While there is reference here to acquiring items from the enemy, it only refers to taking underwear and then, only from knapsacks. We do not know if the person relieved of such was living or dead, or if knapsacks were discarded or stacked as was frequently the case. Anyway, it is clear that this underclothing was not taken directly from their person. Basically, while procuring a personal article, it came from an impersonal source. Furthermore, there is no mention at all in McCarthy's narrative of equipment, uniforms, or even shoes being acquired from individual enemies. Even in terms of the underwear, one must ask just how common such practices really were. While having encountered instances in which men needed these garments, there is no reference to them having procured new in this way, and the fact that they did still need these things, or any other, points out that they did not indulge in this activity. Also, we have encountered a number of references to knapsacks being carried indicating that changes of clothing were probably on hand, and a couple of statements actually mentioning changes of
underwear have been cited. Furthermore, one noted historian, while believing all else was in short supply, states that there was never a lack of shirts, underwear, and socks. Consequently, because of this combined with the rather suspect, generalized nature of much of the rest of what McCarthy says, not too much emphasis should be placed on this testimony.

After stating that uniforms and equipment were frequently appropriated from Federal dead, one current writer argues his case with the following statement left by Edward A. Moore.

To give an idea of the ready access we had to the enemy's stores, I had been the possessor of nine gum-blankets within the past three weeks, and no such article as a gum-blanket was ever manufactured in the South. Any soldier carrying a Confederate canteen was at once recognized as a new recruit, as it required but a short time to secure one of superior quality from a dead foeman on a battlefield.

Apart from the fact that this does not lend too much support to the historian's statement (referring only to two impersonal items) this quote is of interest for several reasons. It is very evident that the gum-blankets are not coming from Union casualties, but rather from "stores". The only reference to anything else Northern and actually removed from a corpse is to canteens. But, like the matter of the cavalry gear, it is not a matter of need as it is apparent that Confederate made canteens were being issued. It is purely preference. Still, here is a comment referring to a particular piece of equipment being taken from Federal dead.

Other sources do exist that indicate that dead troops, even Confederates, were robbed. In conjunction with his shoe problems after Second Manassas, Bernard recalls,

The next morning it was my purpose to provide myself with
a pair of shoes from some dead Federal soldier, but upon inquiring I soon discovered that I ought to have set about this at a much earlier hour, as there had been during the night and early morning a very general removing of shoes, not only from the Federal dead, but also from many of the dead Confederates.

It is clear that all that is being taken are shoes and nothing else - and this at the time when a lack of shoes is a problem for some. Shotwell commented on these activities several times. Writing of the aftermath of the Battle of Savage Station, at Gaines Mill, June 29, 1862, he recorded,

Clothing in plenty was scattered about; including piles of new Yankee uniforms never yet issued to the troops. Immense piles of boxes of cartridges, etc., were found, and fully ten thousand finely finished small arms for which our men gladly exchanged their old fashioned muskets. Considerable sums of money, and a large number of valuable watches were obtained from the bodies of the dead. One man got $5,000 in greenbacks and five or six fine gold watches. It was a disgrace to him to confess it! No man who stayed in the ranks and did his duty had much chance to pick up plunder.

While commenting that a great quantity of materials, especially unissued uniforms, were laying about for the taking, Shotwell only mentions exchanging firearms (an acceptable procedure) and robbing the dead of their valuables. There is no reference to anything else having been taken. In terms of the valuables, it is quite evident that Shotwell strongly disapproved, and for one man to get as much as $5,000 himself indicates that very few individuals were involved in this activity or that the Union soldiers were carrying an overabundance of cash which seems extremely unlikely. It should be noted that this was at a point roughly only a month prior to that six month period in which there was some need of certain items, yet at this point it does not seem to have set in. In actuality, only a few ghoulish individuals are concerned about valuables.
Shotwell commented further on the subject, relating the following incident after the fight at Second Manassas. Having surprised someone robbing a corpse and chased him off, he said,

Afterwards it was gratifying to remember that the vile scamp ran towards the Yankee lines, and therefore he must have been a Yankee; though unhappily the Southern Army was not lacking in the shameless battlefield ghouls; for rarely on the morning after a battle were the dead, (Confederates as well as Yankees) not found stripped of all outer clothing, and frequently even of their underclothes! Much of this was ascribed to the negro camp followers; but the generality of negroes have too much superstitious dread of the dead to do much prowling.

This is a very intriguing statement which speaks for itself. Foote, writing of the later war period, penned similar lines.

I have seen hundreds of dead Federals, and many Confederates, too, stripped of every vestige of clothing. Even the wounded were robbed of their outer clothing sometimes. No matter if the underwear was soaked with life-blood, reeking with vermin and the filth of a long campaign, it was readily taken and used, because needed, and beat none badly. This robbery of the gallant dead was not done as a desecration, but on the ground of personal suffering and need of the living, and the plea was advanced that the garment was of no further service to the dead. It seems barbarous and terrible that the brave who fell in defense of their cause should thus be maltreated, but it is claimed that the exigencies of the times palliated it to some extent, even if it did not justify it altogether. Even the Confederate dead, clad in his wretched raiment, fared but little better if friends were not near to prevent it. It is easily seen by whom these ghastly trophies were sought and obtained. Such ghouls belong to all armies, and are the dread of the wounded. The character of the Southern soldier, those to the manner born, in every detail of the war, was above reproach. They never robbed the living nor stripped the dead. They endured personal suffering and misery in preference to the use of such vile means of obtaining comfort. Brave, gallant and chivalrous; generous at all times, either in victory or defeat, the instinct of their breeding showed forth in most conspicuous forms.

History records that in all countries and communities, and nowhere oftener shown up than in armies, is an element - a disturbing one - who bring upon their associates odium and reproach by overt acts, which condemn all as a whole. For these we can offer no excuse. As they were for us and with us, we must be content to abide the sequence of circumstances.
beyond our control. We shared their glory, for many of them were brave as the bravest, as far as that goes, and can claim but personal participation only.100

It is very evident from these two statements that both Shotwell and Foote seriously disapproved of appropriating items in this manner. Furthermore, given Foote's feelings, it supports that the Federal hats he refers to were not acquired in this way. As to the frequency with which this occurred, Shotwell says it was commonplace after every battle, but he just refers to the dead without giving any specific number. Foote, on the other hand, implies that these activities were only indicative of the later period of the war, and says that he saw hundreds who were victimized in this way. This figure actually indicates the relative infrequency of such conduct when one considers the number of battles and the thousands upon thousands of casualties incurred by both sides during the last year of the conflict. Foote further implies that it really was the work of just a few and not typical of the vast majority of Southern soldiers.

In a continuation of his narrative, even Bernard in his quest for shoes offers additional support that Confederate soldiers were repulsed at the idea of removing items from corpses.

So I abandoned all hope of getting a pair until, on my way, with a party of my regiment, from the wagons to the place of rendezvous, we came to a dead Confederate lying near the roadway, on whose feet were a pair of good shoes. Noticing this, one of our party, pointing to the dead man, said to me, "There is a pair of shoes that will fit you." I went to this poor fellow's feet, untied one of his shoes and began to pull it off. This was, of course, not easy work, and whilst engaged at it I suddenly fully realized what I was doing - taking a dead man's shoes, and these the shoes of a dead Confederate! I at once stopped, and swore I would go bare-footed before I would do an act which was so repugnant to my feelings. 101

In conjunction, as shown, any needs of the troops were limited to
begin with, which supports that such conduct was not common. It was not necessary! In addition, with those soldiers who occasionally mention real, personal requirements, it is clear that they did not resort to such activities to rectify their situation. Bernard abandoned his attempt, and McCarthy only tells of taking underwear from enemy knapsacks - a far cry from removing it from an individual.

Whereas there are those quotes stating that Federal dead were stripped of everything, personal and impersonal, these are indirect statements. Although the writer reports that it occurred, witnessed the aftermath, or in one instance, actually saw it happen (but not by a Confederate) there is never any reference to actually wearing personal articles acquired in this manner, or that these chroniclers even knew someone who did. In fact, excepting the report of the underwear, which did not come directly from individuals, there are no references at all to personal items being employed. At the same time, while there are statements that Union greatcoats, hats and shoes were worn, apart from Bernard's and Toney's accounts, again, we do not know how they were come by, and in any case, these are not truly personal articles. In the majority of instances wherein things of Northern origin are mentioned as being carried, they are of the impersonal sort. Excepting Moore's account, when it is stated how canteens, oil cloths, tents, etc., were attained, they were inevitably picked up loose on the ground after being lost or discarded, or came from stores. In light of availability in this way, Moore's lines that canteens were taken from Federal dead are suspect. One must also question him on the grounds of why gum-blankets could be got in abundance from stores, but not canteens.

Another reference, Baskett's, is suspicious in terms of describing
Federal gear. The statement that his canteen had a leather sling (while perhaps a replacement) tends to indicate that in reality this may have been a Southern made item copied from a Northern version. Not being able to tell the difference, Baskett considered it Federal. This, in turn, would imply that it was issued to him. As will be seen, whereas Union canteens normally possessed slings of cotton fabric, those of Southern issue frequently had a strap of leather. As to his weapon, both sides commonly used the Enfield, although in the South, it was so common that it verged on being the official issue firearm. Considering this, perhaps Baskett's was captured, but if so, what difference does it make as exactly the same thing was being issued.

Also, Bernard's statements (generally felt to be honest and reliable) about robbing shoes are questionable with regards to the frequency with which he says it occurred. After stating that none could be had because all had already been taken, it is curious that suddenly he comes across a body still retaining a nice pair. Had this corpse been in some remote area, this would not be so strange, but when it is accepted that it was lying along what was obviously a well traveled road over which many troops had undoubtedly passed, it must be asked why, if the shoe problem was so severe and the activity so common, this pair had not been removed also.

There are several other good reasons why Federal clothing would not have been worn. To begin with, general orders were issued against doing so. While this indicates that it was undoubtedly done at some point (hence the need for orders against it) it was obviously nipped in the bud. Secondly, for reasons all too obvious to go into, by wearing a Federal uniform, the individual was flirting with poten-
tial personal disaster. The reader is probably asking what about the wear of Union greatcoats. In essence, the occasional use of these could be gotten away with given the circumstances in which they would be employed. Until the Petersburg siege, armies went into winter quarters during which time many troops would not have had contact with the enemy. As a result, such could be worn without too much concern.

Finally, although Foote says it occurred despite this, the condition of most articles of clothing removed from a dead person would probably not be fit to wear. It must be remembered that upon death, the body loses control of its functions with the result that pants and underwear would be particularly repugnant. In addition, these men died violently. Their garments would have been in poor condition either from the projectile that hit them or the resultant blood, etc. In essence, such an article would not be in any better condition than that already possessed, and in all probability, it would be in far worse shape. Someone would have to be truly desperate and without scruples to even consider taking such garments, let alone actually doing it.

To summarize, the actual stealing and wearing of personal items from Federal dead was, in reality, extremely minimal. There were orders against it, it was not safe, given the article's probable condition, nothing would be resolved, and it was simply not necessary. Finally, most Confederate soldiers were revolted at the very idea. In addition, there are no references to personal items being acquired from prisoners. Though impersonal gear was employed on occasion, the actual removal of even this from an individual seems to have been quite infrequent as well. Again, basically, all indications are that it was really unnecessary.
Regarding the matter of wearing civilian clothing, there is no definite reference at all to this being practiced. When garments are described, they are inevitably Confederate military. There are a few remotely possible and vague references pertinent to this topic. One account records that a company received clothing from home. It is quite possible that this refers only to such items as socks, shirts, underwear, etc. At the same time, the fact this shipment was sent to an entire company rather than an individual tends to indicate that if coats, jackets, and pants were included, they were probably of a military cut. On an individual basis, there are the two accounts about receiving homemade outfits from wives. With these, while the exact pattern is not mentioned, one gets the impression that they were military in nature.

To sum up the state of the Confederate enlisted man in the Army of Northern Virginia in terms of how he viewed his situation, while a number of accounts bemoan the state of affairs, analysis of them indicates that real deficiencies were quite minimal. There was only one fairly short period of any actual need, and even during this time, wants were limited to a few specific items only within certain units. This situation seems to have been rectified effectively. The problems of sufficient shoes and greatcoats does appear to have reemerged on occasion, but these are the only ones, and again, the matters were resolved. Certainly, at times, isolated commands undoubtedly required certain articles of clothing or equipment, but this is merely typical of all armies at all times. It is the nature of war.

At the same time, there are the comments in which nothing seems to be wanting, and all are content. Of interest, although a count was not
kept, is the large number of sources in which the condition of the troops is never even mentioned. The reader can only conclude that everything was, in fact, in order, and there was nothing to say regarding the matter.

An important aspect of the preceding quotes that is mentioned repeatedly and further supports these arguments, is the frequent carrying of backpacks or knapsacks. As stated earlier, unless one has extra clothing, blankets, and gear, this particular item would be useless and discarded. Yet, all indications are that they were retained and used commonly.

As to the use of Federal items, this was primarily limited to those of an impersonal nature, and this appears to have been infrequent. Furthermore, in most instances, this material did not come from Northern dead or prisoners. Northern uniforms were certainly not worn. It should be noted that, in reality, very few sources bring up this topic either which adds additional weight to the argument that such activities and uses were not commonplace. The wearing of civilian clothing seems to have been equally limited.

To reiterate, deficiencies were isolated and minimal. In many quotes, problems are more in the mindset of the individual rather than anything real. Again, it is necessary to say that these were citizen soldiers unaware of and unused to the harsh realities of campaign life. The vast majority were youths who had severed ties with mother's apron strings and the luxuries of home for the first time. When they realized that twelve place dinner settings, an abundance of extra clothing, and extra weaponry could not be carried along, and they had to make do on their own with relatively little which occasionally was
not in the exact condition or of the quality they would have wished, they complained. But, there was really nothing out of the ordinary to complain about. Their situation was merely typical of the nature of the business.

Military Personnel Outside the Army of Northern Virginia View

The Confederate Soldier

Having discussed the impressions left by civilians, and the Confederate soldiers themselves, there remains the issue of how Southern troops appeared to foreign military observers and members of the Northern forces. These are quite enlightening, and the manner in which some of these have been used by historians is of note.

Of interest are the descriptions left by Lieutenant-Colonel James Arthur Lyon Freemantle of Her Majesty's Coldstream Guards. With him we receive the professional opinion of a detached, third party relating to Southern troops during the Gettysburg campaign. A couple of his statements are often poorly employed by historians as evidence of the plight of the Confederate enlisted man. One pertains to Pennsylvanian civilians watching elements of the army pass.

Others were pointing and laughing at Hood's ragged Jacks who were passing at the time. This division, well known for its fighting qualities, is composed of Texans, Alabamians, and Arkansians, and they are certainly a queer lot to look at. They carry less than any other troops; many of them have only got an old piece of carpet or rug as baggage; many have discarded their shoes in the mud; all are ragged and dirty, but full of good humor and confidence in themselves and in their general, Hood.

The second set of lines is very generalized.

I did not think much of the appearance of the Northern
troops. They are certainly dressed in proper uniform, but their clothes are badly fitted, and they are often round-shouldered, dirty, and slovenly in appearance; in fact, bad imitations of soldiers. Now, the Confederate has no ambition to imitate the regular soldier at all. He looks the genuine Rebel; but in spite of his barefeet, his ragged clothes, his old rug, and toothbrush stuck like a rose in his buttonhole, he has a sort of devil-may-care, reckless, self-confident look, which is decidedly taking.

Several things are of note with these comments. To begin with, the first part of the first account is sometimes not included. If it is, emphasis is not put on the obvious fact that these troops are considered the exception to the rule. They are not typical. Furthermore, it is evident that their appearance is a matter of choice rather than need. The second quote is very general in tone and by itself tends to intimate that the entire army looked this way. Actually, in light of comparable details between the two, such as the carpets, and additional descriptions left by this Briton, it is evident that he really is only referring to Hood's division, as well, in this second account. The reference to rags is of interest for several reasons. First of all, as will be seen, by Freemantle's own description, everyone else in the army is well appointed, with the implication that they have blankets. As such, it must be asked why some of Hood's people had to resort to pieces of carpet. Secondly, it must be asked where so many pieces of carpet came from. In fact, what Freemantle saw were not rugs at all. Given the Texas/Southwestern origins of much of this command, that which Freemantle witnessed were undoubtedly Mexican or Indian blankets - very practical, serviceable, hard wearing items. Because of the heavy, stiff nature of them, frequently with striped motifs, such blankets could easily be mistaken for common throw rugs popular during the period. While unaware of it, Freemantle actually observed an
example of ethnicity in the Army of Northern Virginia.

The following comments are generally ignored by historians.

We soon began to catch up the sick and broken-down men of the army, but not in great numbers. Most of them were well shod, though I saw two without shoes.

and later, referring to another group,

The soldiers of this [Pender's] division are a remarkably fine body of men, and look quite seasoned and ready for any work. Their clothing is serviceable, so also are their boots; but there is the usual utter absence of uniformity as to color and shape of their garments and hats; gray of all shades, and brown clothing, with felt hats, predominate.

After a conversation with two wounded Louisiana officers Freemantle recounted their talk.

At no period of the war, they say, have the men been so well equipped, so well clothed, so eager for a fight, or as confident of success - a very different state of affairs from that which characterized the Maryland invasion of last year, when half the army were barefooted stragglers, and many of the remainder unwilling and reluctant to cross the Potomac.

Describing the brigades of Semmes and Barksdale, Freemantle penned, "All were well shod and efficiently clothed." Finally, he notes an individual regiment.

I particularly observed the marching today of the 21st Mississippi, which was uncommonly good. This regiment all wear short round jackets, a most unusual circumstance, for they are generally unpopular in the South.

These descriptions are truly enlightening. Only two men barefoot with repeated references that shoes were not lacking! Despite the fact there was a diversity of colors and cuts in Pender's command all are defined as well appointed in terms of clothing and one additional regiment at least seems to be uniformly dressed. Even with Pender's outfit, given the fact that an entire division is being described, variation in cuts and colors is to be expected and not indicative of prob-
lems. Furthermore, the references to grays and browns supports that all are wearing Confederate military dress whatever the pattern or hue. Whether or not the brown garments were originally this shade or had faded from gray is impossible to say, but the latter is probable. The statements of the Louisiana officers add solid support to the arguments that while some problems had existed during the later part of the previous year, they were rectified. In fact, things were better than ever. Also, from their lines it is evident that shoes were the only real problem during the Antietam venture. They certainly fail to mention any others specifically. In any case, there is absolutely no evidence of any need at this point.

Of a definitely intriguing nature is the reference to the 21st Mississippi wearing "short round jackets". This is clearly the shell jacket which is being described which would not seem unusual except for the fact that Freemantle says it is. This clearly implies that frock coats were being worn with much greater frequency than is generally supposed.

There is another statement left us by the Guards officer that is of interest. "The knapsacks of the men still bear the names of the Massachusetts, Vermont, New Jersey, or other regiments to which they originally belonged." This is the only reference Freemantle makes to utilizing anything of Federal origin, and it is a very impersonal item. In light of this, he certainly would have remarked had Federal uniforms or other objects of Northern origin been in evidence. More important, however, is the fact that the troops are actually carrying them at all. As previously indicated, the use of a knapsack only makes sense if you have a considerable amount of additional clothing and
equipment to carry.

Freemantle ends on the following note which speaks for itself. "With respect to the supply of arms, cannon, powder, and military stores, the Confederates are under no alarm whatever." 111

Conveying the same impression are several accounts left by Federal soldiers. One, referring to Confederate prisoners after Gettysburg, is of interest in that just prior to its use in the source in which it appears, the author describes in traditional manner the sorry plight of the typical Southern soldier, and completely ignores the import of this statement. 112 Recorded by Charles Francis Adams, 1st Massachusetts Cavalry, this comment conveys his impressions of a mixed lot of 500 prisoners his unit was detailed to guard after the battle. In comparison to Union troops, Adams felt they were,

...as well armed, better clothed and as well fed. The spirit of his army was much better than that of ours, and I saw no evidence of their ever having been on short rations or demoralized by want or misfortune. Their tone was the very best. 113

Another author, who belabors the poor condition of Southern troops offers an equally contradictory quote. Left us by an Ohio officer, it describes Confederate prisoners after the Battle of the Wilderness, May, 1864.

...we had the pleasure of seeing about four thousand prisoners passing us on their way to the rear. They seemed completely surprised, which is a wonder for old troops. As to their appearance, they were all clad in neat gray jackets and pantaloons with entire seats. In contrast, we were in rags, scarcely one of us having a complete garment of any sort. 114

This is of note because it refers to the same body of men that Toney (responsible for a potentially negative statement) was undoubtedly a part of. Note the contrast. At the same time, while accepted as truth
by the writer, this comment is simply dismissed with the statement, "This must have been virtually the only time when captured Confederates were better dressed than their captors." The band leader of Collis' Pennsylvania Zouaves left his account of Confederate prisoners taken in December, 1863, which closely parallels those just mentioned.

The prisoners here taken were better clothed than any we had before seen; all were provided with overcoats and jackets of much better material than our own. They were of English manufacture, a much darker blue than the U.S. and they furnished conclusive evidence of successful blockade running.

From these statements, it is obvious that on more than one occasion Southern soldiers were so well appointed that their image surpassed even that of their Northern captors. Here we have three different statements from different times (one recorded late in the conflict and two midway) which consistently agree. With the last, we do not know exactly how many Confederate soldiers this refers to, but with the first two, there is reference to 500 and "about four thousand", respectively. This is clear indication that the prisoners seen were not isolated examples, but rather representative of the state of the Army of Northern Virginia as a whole, and that state was very good. Granted, the Pennsylvania soldier indicates that other prisoners he had seen were not as well appointed as those described. What difference in degree this involves, we do not know, but those at least that he refers to are well off indeed, and in light of the other comments, they do not seem to be an exception.

Of interest in the second quote is the reference to the extremely ragged appearance of the Federal troops. This goes far to show that in reality this state is merely typical of warfare. Here are members of the supposedly superior Northern war machine whose description of them-
selves differs not at all from the Southern soldier's impression of himself. Such lines are commonly encountered in the course of examining Federal documents.

Concluding Comments on Primary Quotes

In concluding this chapter, after analyzing the three genres of quotes dealing with the image of the common Confederate soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia, it is clear that any real deficiencies were isolated cases, limited to only a few specific items in particular units for short duration, and in reality the exception to the rule. The civilians and the Confederate soldiers, unused to the realities of warfare, are extremely naive and in most cases point out problems where none exist. Also, there are the views of professional foreign observers and Federal troops which paint a very contradictory picture indeed.

It is only the civilian statements and some of those emanating from the enlisted men that paint bleak portrayals, and it is on these that the current historical views are based. While utilizing such to create the current impression, those comments in which no problems are recorded are generally ignored. Furthermore, a number of quotes have been misinterpreted or taken at a blatant face value without really reading what the writer was actually saying. If the soldier says it was bad, that seems to be good enough for the historian to say it was bad as well without delving further into what was actually said. This has led to a very incorrect interpretation. In addition, in the course of promoting this image, the historians seem hard pressed to come up with
additional data confirming their stand. It is amazing how frequently McCarthy's statements, and McCarthy's alone, are used to say this is how the average Confederate soldier appeared. Also, there is the comment of the Louisiana officer which is repeatedly employed to portray all Confederate soldiers at all points of the war for which it is completely inappropriate. In essence, the current viewpoint is founded on a limited amount of source material which historians have overemphasized or badly interpreted or is of suspect nature in light of the additional documentation which is grossly ignored.

Granted, at face value a limited number of period statements do seem potentially damning. Apart from the obvious naivete of the recorder, there is another factor accounting for some of this. Some at least are over-exaggerated with the intent of purposely promoting this image. Why? Many of the accounts were penned in the postwar period — after the war was lost. Those who had truly believed may have needed to justify their sincere involvement and sacrifices. They needed an excuse, and at least part of that excuse lay in saying they did not have the materials necessary to pull it off. They required an explanation, and their saying they suffered great privations partly gave them what they required. Foote, who complains, but lacks nothing, blatantly attributed defeat to a lack of material needs.\(^{117}\) It is an interesting two-edged concept, for proof of which all we need do is become aware of how some compared themselves to the Revolutionary War patriots at Valley Forge (both during and after the conflict) and are still so compared by modern historians.\(^ {118}\) If they had won, they could say they did it despite deficiencies, and if they lost, they had a reason
for it. Even in defeat, however, their statements of need in fact enhanced their heroic stature and devotion to the cause. They could relate that they persevered, despite, until the end. This mindset can be termed "Valley Forge Syndrome", and it is a definite element of the postwar "Lost Cause" phenomenon.

In support, it is interesting to note that the writers of memoirs, in some cases, drew upon each other and additional sources for their references. Already mentioned is the possibility that one version of the trouser patch story was borrowed. While not fully researched and documentable at this point, readers well versed in Civil War history will be familiar with the following story. This particular version comes from Toney's accounts.

On the morning of May 6 about sunrise one of our boys came into the lines with a pair of boots on his arm. He said that he had been trying all night to get the boots, but that every time he attempted to pull them off the soldier would open his eyes. He died just before this, and our comrade got the boots.

This same story (or a variation of it) of waiting for the Yankee to die in order to get his shoes reappears in a number of accounts referring to different units in different theaters at different times during the war. While the story of the patched trouser seats is arguably legitimate, this particular yarn (even if only retold once) pushes credibility too far. It is truly difficult to imagine anyone this ghoulish and desperate. If this fellow was set on procuring shoes in this manner, certainly other opportunities existed to get a pair off of someone who was already dead. If, on the other hand, there was something very special about this particular pair, given the obvious unbalanced mindset of this Confederate it is hard to believe that he
actually sat and waited. Why did he not just take them, or worse, simply kill the Federal if he felt the situation required him to actually be dead? In any case, this borrowing from one another only serves to limit even more the number of valid accounts pertinent to the topic and the incidents they relate. While creating the illusion of an abundance of such occurrences, in fact, only one version, at best, can have any legitimacy.

As indicated these writers also drew from sources other than those penned by their comrades. This is very curious. As an example, Warfield relates the following attributed to a Northern writer.

Their dress consisted of nearly every imaginable color and style, the butternut predominating. Some had blue blouses which they had doubtless stripped from the Union dead. Hats, or the skeletons of what had been hats, surmounted their poorly covered heads.

Many were ragged and shoeless, affording unmistakable evidence that their wardrobe sadly needed to be replenished.

While perhaps the most negative statement presented so far, no credibility whatsoever can be given it. This is supposedly in reference to the Maryland campaign, 1862. Compare it with the civilian quote on page 324 commenting on the Gettysburg venture. The entire latter portion is a paraphrase. In addition, if the earlier parts are also a paraphrase, or if the entire quote as Warfield presents it is not the original upon which the civilian version, itself, was based, then it is extremely possible that Warfield himself is guilty of actually fabricating a document by combining two separate sources. Whether Warfield is responsible for this or he simply accepted an already bastardized quote in good faith, it is evident that this account was seriously tampered with. This destroys any credibility this statement may have
Whatever the exact situation, the only reason for doing this would be to stress and overemphasize an issue when no legitimate documentation relating the same was at hand. In essence, that described bears no resemblance to reality. At the same time, the very fact these lines were included at all, whatever their pedigree, actually reduces rather than enhances the validity of what Warfield is attempting to say. It must be asked why, if the situation discussed was actually the state of affairs, did Warfield, who was involved firsthand and so able to comment on it himself, have to rely on the supposed comments of a Northern writer? It is interesting to note that while Warfield attempts to paint a bleak picture of his existence, that which he relates firsthand about himself and his comrades comes nowhere close to the extremeness of these lines. It can only be concluded that Warfield, a veteran campaigner, never witnessed anything like this himself. Other examples of this reliance on additional materials exist in his account.121

Shotwell, the soldier who would have us believe suffered every imaginable hardship, also felt it necessary to include a damning description by a Northern "correspondent". Here too, the negative extremeness of the quote surpasses anything Shotwell himself records. For the same reasons as with Warfield, one must question why Shotwell felt a need to include this in his narration. Again, the only answer is that he was attempting to overemphasize the point and create a picture of something he, himself, never experienced.122

Apart from seriously damaging (if not destroying) the credibility of these accounts, this reliance on outside sources produces results
similar to those in which the writers borrow from each other. It be­
comes apparent that the already minimal number of actual incidents of
need is reduced further. As stated, for these veteran soldier/writers
to resort to this ploy indicates a dearth of such situations in their
own personal experiences. This in turn immediately supports that oc­
currences of privation were even less common.

In closing, the photographs support these conclusions drawn from
the written sources by showing no evidence at all of any serious defi­
ciencies or problems. In fact, the lack of photographic evidence is
such that it indicates that even with the few incidents of seemingly
legitimate problems recorded in the documents, the situations were
nowhere near as extreme as the writers would have us believe. In the
images, apart from a pair of shoes, there is no evidence of Confederate
troops removing clothing or equipment from their own dead. There are
few instances of civilian clothing being worn. There is only a single
example of anything certifiably Federal being employed. And, there are
only a few instances of uniforms showing any wear and tear at all. The
vast majority are appropriately attired in Confederate uniforms which
are in very good condition, and there is every indication that they are
well equipped. In essence, the photographs, which must be believed,
offer a completely contradictory view to that currently prevailing in
historical circles. The impression is one that mirrors the accounts
left by Freemantle and Union soldiers. There is no evidence of want or
privation.
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CHAPTER IX

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON THE PHOTOGRAPHS

There are several preliminary topics pertinent to the photographs as a whole that need be touched on so the reader can better understand the various views and the analysis of them. First, there is the matter of presentation. The casualty and prisoner-of-war images are discussed separately, but within each genre they are arranged chronologically. For each battle, related views are grouped according to location. A grouping may consist of a single photograph or several. The groupings, themselves, are primarily those established by William A. Frassanito in his three studies already referred to.

Each photograph is designated by a three letter code such as ABA. The first letter refers to the battle; in this case Antietam. The second indicates the particular group within the whole of the Antietam collection. The third letter identifies a specific image within the group. These group and photograph designations are consecutively ordered. In turn, each figure within a group is given a consecutive number by which he can be identified. It should be noted that frequently the same figure appears in more than one view in a grouping.

For any given individual, even if photographed from several angles, it must be remembered that in no instance can all aspects of his cloth-
ing be defined and categorized within the framework of the established typology. Despite its three dimensional qualities, the physical nature of a photograph is two dimensional, and only those details captured within the limits of the camera angle can be discerned. For example, with an individual facing the camera, only the front of his uniform can be examined. There is no way of telling what the back looks like. In conjunction, additional problems are sometimes encountered. Lighting, position of the subject, distance of the camera, condition of the photograph, clarity, and physical obstructions in the image itself that block certain aspects from view, all effect what can actually be discerned. Many details are simply not visible, and in some instances, even features that should be evident can not be defined. In essence, only those uniform details actually visible can be described. If a particular aspect is not discussed, it is because it can not be seen. This results in the amount of data acquired from the different views and the individuals in them varying considerably. Despite these technical problems, with the vast majority enough detail is present to make a sound assessment of what is worn.

The ability to define equipment is effected by these same problems, especially camera angle in association with the subject's positioning. Whereas clothing completely encompasses the body so that pants and jackets can generally be discerned whatever the camera angle, this is not the case with equipment. It is basically positioned at a specific point, and so, is easily blocked from view. For instance, while it is often possible to determine what is or is not present on a soldier's right side, nothing can be said about what is on his left. No gear at all may exist on the right, but this can not be interpreted to mean
that there is none at all. A canteen and haversack may well be present on his left, but they are simply not visible.

In conjunction, there is an entirely different, additional set of historical factors effecting the very presence of equipment and creating extra problems in determining what was actually carried. Undoubtedly, the gear seen in most images is not representative of complete field kits. A lot of equipment that should be present is not. This, however, is not to say that it did not exist. Its absence is easily accounted for.

Many of the casualty views were recorded two or three days after the deaths of the men shown. In the interim, a considerable amount of activity had occurred in relation to them which resulted in much of what they carried being removed. Such included policing the battlefield, preparation for burial, and possibly, in some instances, robbing their corpses.

Policing the field was a standard practice after an engagement. Detachments of troops collected items of military value such as weapons, ammunition, etc. That this activity has occurred in the majority of instances is apparent from the almost total lack of firearms in the views. In those instances where weapons are seen, in most cases, these are believed to be props set up by the photographer for affect. This writer generally subscribes to this idea, and consequently, in only a couple of instances will remarks be made about firearms in the views.

In those images in which the individuals obviously lie in the positions and places in which they actually fell, it is interesting to compare what equipment is present with that which is missing. This, in turn, lends insight into the behavior of the policing troops. They did
not want to touch the bodies any more than necessary. The equipage seen is usually that carried on cross belts over the shoulders; articles that would require considerable movement of the bodies to remove. At the same time, a common article rarely seen in any of the casualty photographs is the waist belt. As pointed out, the belt would support cap box, bayonet, and sometimes a waist mounted cartridge box, all of which are also rarely seen in this genre of photograph. The bayonets especially would have been high priority items marked for retrieval along with their respective firearms. Collecting waist mounted equipage was certainly easier than shoulder carriage items in terms of having to handle the deceased. All one had to do was unfasten the buckle and pull the belt out from beneath. That this was the nature of the activity is apparent when one observes that the vast majority of the cartridge boxes that remain are those worn on a shoulder sling. It must be accepted that in most situations, the attitude of the policing details was to get only that which was easily acquired and leave the rest for the actual burial details who had to move the bodies in any case.

That the burial details finished the process is evident when views of troops lying where they fell are compared with those in which the individuals have been moved and are prepared for interment. In these images, it is rare indeed to see any equipment at all. That more equipment was actually carried than is often witnessed is evident from those views taken more closely to the end of the fighting. The Fredericksburg and some of the Spotsylvania images, for instance, were recorded shortly after the engagements. The incredible contrast in the
amount of equipment that is present clearly indicates that the policing
details had not as yet started to seriously undertake their duties.

Actual robbery of the dead may occasionally account for some miss-
ing items as well. That this has occurred in at least some of the
views is evident from the large number of turned out pockets. Turned
out pockets, however, indicate that the robber was more interested in
valuables than equipment, and any gear acquired in this fashion would
have been secondary and of minimal quantity. In those views where a
large number of figures have had their pockets gone through, it is
likely that this represents the activities of only one or two ghoulish
individuals, and is not reflective of the general nature of troops as a
whole. Someone bent on robbing valuables would check everyone in his
efforts, and this could be done relatively quickly. But, one must ask,
how many, if any, cartridge or cap boxes a single person would have
taken?

On the other hand, turned out pockets, in many cases, are just as
likely to indicate acts of humanity rather than depravity. Many may be
accounted for by comrades who were searching for valuables and senti-
mental items to send home to the family. Some may be accounted for as
the result of burial details making an honest effort to locate some
form of identification. If not for this reason, then for the simple
one that valuables certainly would not have been interred with the
body.

The explanations for missing gear just related pertain to post
death activities. Absent equipment can be accounted for in other
ways. An individual may not have actually been carrying everything he
normally did on campaign at the time of death. Frequently, upon going
into action, entire units would lighten their kit by shedding that which was considered unessential for the impending activities. Items commonly removed prior to fighting were backpacks and bedrolls, and Bernard indicates that other items were commonly taken off as well. Also, much gear may have been lost in the course of battle itself or damaged or discarded prior to death. Many of the individuals pictured may not have been killed instantly. If this were the case, it would be natural after receiving a serious wound to remove equipment no longer necessary in an effort to achieve some comfort. That much gear was lost or discarded even on the firing line is clear when one views the incredible number of articles scattered on the ground in the Fredericksburg view.

The reader might ask why, if the above scenarios occurred, in those views where policing details have been at work, are seemingly essential pieces of equipment of military value still lying on the ground when they would have been easy to collect? There are two explanations. First, these items may not have been of a serviceable pattern and so, were considered valueless. More likely, however, is the fact that they are probably damaged and of no use. The very fact that they are lying on the ground supports this as they were obviously discarded.

With the prisoner-of-war photographs, it is interesting to note that a considerable amount of equipment in the form of canteens, haversacks, bedrolls, and knapsacks, is still retained. Yet, not everybody has such, but this is not to say they did not upon going into action. What is undoubtedly being observed in many cases is the result of variation in the attitudes and behavior of the captors. Certain men taken
prisoner by one group of Federals may well have been forced to shed all their gear, while others, after being searched and relieved of items such as weapons, ammunition, and related accoutrements, were obviously allowed to retain those items needed to simply survive; containers for water and food, blankets, and extra clothing. Two previous quotes support this. Johnston gives the impression that when captured he and his comrades were immediately relieved of everything. With Loehr's group, however, the men seem to have retained a considerable amount of gear until their actual arrival at the prisoner-of-war camp at Point Lookout, Maryland.

For reasons additional to those discussed already, more gear is likely to be present in the prisoner images than is seen. In a number of views, the subjects are tightly clustered with many sitting and creating the impression of being rather stationary. In such a situation, it would be natural for at least some of them to remove their equipage and merely keep it beside them. That this has in fact occurred is evident from the fair number of items on the ground, in different views, which obviously belong to someone. In any case, given the close packed nature of the group in relation with this tendency to remove equipment, it must be asked how much is not actually worn, but exists on the ground and is blocked from view.

Also, as with the casualty views, perhaps some gear actually possessed was not carried when taken prisoner. It may have been put aside, lost in the fighting, or discarded. Some equipment for members of the cavalry and artillery undoubtedly stayed with their horses or limbers.
There are a number of legitimate explanations accounting for the absence of equipment in the photographs that are not generally applicable to clothing. This results in there being a somewhat different set of rules for its analysis. Whereas the circumstances just described can greatly effect the presence of equipment, they should not effect clothing. Theoretically, excepting hats, with uniforms, all uniform articles should be present regardless. If not, they need be specifically accounted for as they indicate unique situations and activities other than those of policing and burial details, etc. Missing gear can be accounted for in a broader sense as generally all individuals in a grouping were effected by the same factors and reflect the same situation. Because of the various factors playing on the presence of equipment, and the fact that in many instances it probably exists and is just not visible, it is meaningless to point out each soldier with whom equipment or a specific piece of it is not in evidence. Only that which is clearly there will be discussed on an individual basis. What is not there will, for the most part, be accounted for in a more general sense in light of the overall situation apparent in each grouping, each of which is unique in recording specific moments in time and relating specific stories with varied circumstances which will be noted.

Those readers familiar with Civil War photography will notice as they progress through the following sections that several well known views are not included. These are omitted for the following reasons. Some Antietam casualty images are not shown, because they are merely variations of better versions that are reproduced, and examination of them reveals no additional data that would warrant their inclusion.
Another photograph - quite new in terms of its publication history - reportedly made at Antietam and clearly showing Confederate soldiers, is also not contained herein, because it has not been provenanced to the satisfaction of this writer. Finally, several panoramic images of Confederate prisoners-of-war are not reproduced due to the distance of the camera from the subject having been so great that it is impossible to ascertain any detail.

To prevent repetition for each specified case, there are several general arguments that need to be stated and kept in mind about the analysis of shadings in relation to defining the types and origins of garments. These are of importance with regards to trousers when there is a lack of distinctive hard details. If the shading of a pair of trousers is identical to that of a coat or jacket which is clearly Southern military, there can be no doubt that the pants, despite a lack of detail, are Southern military as well and represent a matching uniform component. If they were Federal or civilian, it would be virtually impossible for them to reflect the same tonality. In cases where two or more pairs of pants can be judged to be identical medium tones (similar to that which Federal sky blue trousers would appear) but do not offer conclusive hard details or match the wearers' jackets, it can still be said that the pants are at least military in origin. If they were individually procured civilian garments, there would be no chance of their matching in shade. In conjunction, the presence of a single, definable hard detail that is distinctly Confederate on only one pair will support that all are in fact Southern military. Actually, even if no hard details are apparent in such a situation, there is no reason to
believe that as military trousers they are anything other than Southern issue. It has already been shown in analyzing the quotes that the wearing of Federal uniform items was extremely rare at best. Sky blue was the regulation color in any case, and this color and medium gray will appear a similar shade in a black and white photograph. Also, in circumstances where there is a lack of hard details, while there are none to define trousers as Confederate, there are also none to support they are Federal. Furthermore, if the coats or jackets of the individuals match each other as well and are clearly Confederate, it strongly supports that the trousers are Confederate as well. Even accepting the remote possibility that such trousers are Federal, given the obvious abhorrence of most Confederate soldiers to robbing the dead, the fact that they match tends to indicate they were issued from captured stores rather than removed from a corpse.

As to dark hued trousers, the same arguments hold true. In actuality, given the rarity of dark blue Northern pants, the very fact that they are dark belies the possibility of their being Federal. If they match other pairs in shade and/or coats and jackets clearly Confederate, again, there can be no doubt that they are Southern issue items. In reality, dark hued pants are either Confederate dark blue or dark, charcoal gray, both of which were observed with frequency in the sample of surviving garments.

Instances occur in which dark shaded jackets appear, which, because of their shade, might be interpreted by some to be Federal. In most instances, the presence of distinctly Confederate attributes or the lack of Federal ones soundly provenance these articles. There are,
however, occasions in which the visible hard details are not enough in themselves to firmly establish origin. As pointed out, the very fact in itself that such Northern jackets were available only on an extremely limited basis during the time frame with which this study deals in association with the fact that the majority of Southern soldiers were not prone to robbing corpses and Federal garments appear to have been little worn in any case, there are no grounds for concerns that these are Northern jackets. If this is not enough, additional factors further argue against their being so. Dark charcoal gray jackets appear with frequency in the sample of surviving specimens, and in a black and white image, these would appear very similar to dark blue. Consequently, as with medium and dark shaded trousers, a dark toned jacket is not necessarily indicative of its being Federal. In the instances where details can be discerned, they inevitably indicate Southern manufacture. As a result, there is no reason to believe that those not offering details are not Confederate as well. Finally, as with trousers, while these jackets do not present typically Confederate attributes, they do not present Federal ones either. In essence, there is no reason to believe a jacket is Federal just because it is dark.

Taking these arguments a step further, if two dark jackets are in evidence which match in shade and basic attributes, but with which more specific features can not be defined, despite this, there can be no doubt that they are Confederate. In association with previous arguments, it stretches credibility that two men in the same unit procured the same unusual jackets, wore them, and then were killed or captured together. Advancing this same argument yet another step, if matching
dark jackets are worn in conjunction with dark pants that match each other and the jackets, all can be soundly provenanced as Southern in origin. This combination of types and color is not representative of Northern uniforms.

The above are general arguments and explanations applicable to a number of views or figures throughout the presentation. They are stated here in an effort to avoid unnecessary redundancy in the course of the following text. Keeping these in mind, we can proceed to the photographs.
CHAPTER X

THE CASUALTY PHOTOGRAPHS

Antietam, September 17, 1862

The photographs discussed in this section were taken by Alexander Gardner on September 19 and 21, 1862. Recorded on the Confederate left, center, and right, these offer a good sense of sampling over space in that all key areas of the battlefield were documented, and consequently, this collection is representative of the entire Army of Northern Virginia. As the images were made two and four days after the action, they are not the best for discerning equipment. The noticeable absence of firearms in these views makes it clear that the field was policed by the occupying Union troops prior to Gardner's arrival on the scene. Also, missing on most figures are waist belts and the cap boxes, bayonets, and waist mounted cartridge boxes they supported. These were undoubtedly removed when the firearms were collected to retrieve accompanying ammunition and bayonets. In certain views, it is apparent that the casualties are gathered for burial, and virtually all equipment was removed. It is also known that following the battle, civilian souvenir hunters swarmed over the area. That the figures were probably scavenged either by Federal troops or civilians is evident from the number of men whose pockets are turned out. In any case, whether due
to policing, souvenir hunting, preparation for interment, or scavenging, much equipment that should be present is not, but it is accountable.¹

**Group AA: Photographs A, B, C, D, and E**

Most, if not all, of the men shown were members of Brigadier-General William E. Starke’s Louisiana Brigade consisting of the 1st, 2nd, 9th, 10th, and 15th Louisiana Regiments and the 1st Louisiana Battalion of infantry. The location is on the Miller Farm along the Hagerstown Pike at the northern end of the battlefield. Many of the men in the background of AAA are those that appear in AAB, AAC, and AAD. Those in AAE were photographed from roughly the same position as those in AAA, but the camera was faced in the opposite direction along the fence.²

A total of twenty-two figures offer detail in terms of uniforms and, in some instances, equipment. As to uniforms, in a group sense these views present an extremely mixed bag. Only two men can be discerned to wear garments that match. It is quite likely that the variety of uniforms reflects the supply problems being suffered by Louisiana at this point. No longer receiving from a single source, these garments represent different issues and origins with the result that there is a real hodgepodge. Yet, at the same time, all identifiable clothing articles are Confederate military, and on an individual basis the men are well uniformed.

It is in the first view that two figures, 3 and 4, wear the same outfits. The short lengths and their fastening to the neck identifies
"View in the Field, on the west side of Hagerstown road, after the Battle of Antietam," (original title) "Confederate dead along the Hagerstown Pike." (modern title)
"View on Battle-field: Group of Louisiana Regiment, as they fell, at Battle of Antietam. The contest at this point had been very severe."
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"Confederate Soldiers, as they fell inside the fence, on the Hagerstown road, at the Battle of Antietam," (original title) "Confederate dead along the Hagerstown Pike." (modern title)
the upper garments as shell jackets. Each is an identical dark/medium shade indicating that they are the same and Southern military. Visible on figure 3's is a top-stitched front opening, and Style B trim on a buttonless, closed cuff.

Each also wears trousers of a matching lighter, medium shade. Their being the same tone supports that they are military. While no further detail can be gleaned from figure 3's, figure 4's offer sufficient hard details to define them as Confederate. Most noticeable is that the fly closes with only three buttons. The waistband fastens in the Style A manner with the visible end being the Style B configuration. A watch pocket in the waistband seam is apparent to the right of the fly, but the exact pattern is indiscernible.

Despite there being only two men dressed the same, there are ten who wear uniforms with which the trousers and coats/jackets are an identical shade. In association with obviously Confederate military coats and jackets, this alone confirms that the trousers are Confederate military as well, even if no other details can be discerned. Figure 2 is clad as such. His jacket possesses attributes consistent with the Confederate shell type. It is an appropriate medium shade, a proper short length, and fastens to the neck. The front opening, itself, closes with five metal buttons. There is a Style B hem/front opening configuration, with neither area showing evidence of top-stitching or trim. While also not top-stitched, the cuffs do, however, have Style B trim. There is no evidence of an external pocket on the right side. As indicated, in itself, the fact the pants perfectly match the jacket indicates they are Southern military. An additional detail lends further testimony of their origin. From the way the lining is pulled
out, it is clear that the pockets are the Style B pattern. Also, although difficult to discern with certainty, it is possible that piping adorns the side seams.

Figure 6 wears a uniform the components of which match. The medium shade, short length, and stand-up collar establish that a Confederate shell jacket is worn. Of note and offering additional support for the garment's origin is the dark, contrasting Style A trim on the cuff.

Only a small section of trouser leg is visible. Yet, the shading of the area conforms to that of the jacket. This is enough to confirm that they are a uniform article and Confederate military.

The next figure, 10, wears a uniform whose components are the same tint. The exact type of coat/jacket can not be determined. The seven to eight closely spaced buttons combined with the cut of the front opening, however, indicate that it is single breasted, fastens to the neck, and thus, is military. When these facts are considered in conjunction with the medium shade, there can be no doubt that it is Confederate. Both the front opening and the cuffs are untrimmed.

Other than that their shade matches that of the coat/jacket perfectly, and they lack trim, no details can be discerned from the pants. As with figure 6, however, their identical hue is enough to confirm them as part of a military uniform of Southern origin.

Also completely uniformed in medium shade garments is figure 12. Here, too, it is apparent from the hue, short length, and closure to the neck, that a Confederate shell jacket is worn. In addition to these attributes, dark, contrasting Style A trim is in evidence on the closed cuff which lacks buttons. Given this, it is tempting to say that figures 6 and 12 are dressed the same, but close examination re-
veals that while similar, the configurations of the cuff motifs are not the same. Several other features can be discerned from this jacket. It is lined, the front opening and hem are top-stitched, but the cuffs are not, the hem/front opening angle is a Style A pattern, and the front opening is untrimmed.

The identical shade of the trousers confirms them as part of a Confederate uniform. Furthermore, there is no cuff slit, and the waistband closes in the Style B fashion. When fastened, the visible end of the waistband conforms to the Style A pattern.

With figure 14, there is another individual whose uniform parts are an identical dark/medium tone. Apart from this, the only definable attribute of the upper body garment is its short length. In conjunction with the shade, however, this is enough to establish it as a Southern shell jacket.

The trousers possess Style A pockets. This, in addition to the shading confirms that they too are Confederate military. These do not have piping.

Figure 15 also wears a uniform whose components are the same medium hue. That he sports a Confederate shell jacket is clear from the garment's shade, short length, and manner of closing to the neck. The cuffs are plain, and there are no epaulets.

Again, the identical shade of the trousers confirms their being Southern military. In addition, these have Style A pockets. The waistband closes in accordance with the Style A manner with a Style C end. Also visible are dark suspender buttons, indicating either the hard rubber or black, japanned type.

As with the previous individuals, figure 16 wears a complete, match-
ing uniform. His, however, is a dark shade. The short length indicates that a shell jacket is worn. That it is Confederate is confirmed by the dark trousers which match in tone and possess a belted back.

Figure 19 is dressed in the same manner with matching medium toned trousers and jacket indicating a Confederate uniform. That it is a shell jacket is evident from the short length and the fact that it buttons to the neck. The cuffs are plain.

The shading confirms the trouser's Southern military nature. In addition, they have either Style B or E pockets. Again, there is no trim.

Figure 22 is likewise clad in matching uniform components. The medium tint, short length and method of closure to the neck denote that a Confederate shell jacket is worn. This has a Style A hem/front opening angle. The plain cuff is closed and does not have buttons.

In addition to their shade which confirms their being part of a Southern uniform, the trousers do not have a cuff slit. These have Style F pockets, and the waistband fastens in the Style A fashion. There is no evidence of trim.

Finally, as to individuals whose coats/jackets and pants match in shade, there is figure 13. His upper body garment is truly one of the most interesting articles encountered in this study. Its medium length places it in the sack coat category as does the number and positioning of the buttons (four to five) which close the front opening from the waist to the neck. Of interest is the possibility that it is collarless. If a collar is present, it is certainly a stand-up type and blocked from view by the equipment straps. Either would identify it as a military garment. Also of note is the dark trim down the right side
of the front opening only, which seems rather pointless as it would be covered up when the coat was buttoned. Additionally there is a welted pocket about midway to the waist in the right front panel. A squared hem/front opening angle is in evidence. There is no top-stitching on either the plain, closed, buttonless cuffs or the front opening. That the coat and pants are truly military is confirmed by the forage cap that is worn. Its dark/medium tone is identical to both articles making it clear that a completely matching uniform is worn in every sense. All in all an interesting coat with a couple of unprecedented features, but undoubtedly Confederate military.

The trousers themselves have a waistband which fastens in the Style A manner with the visible end being the Style A pattern as well. A watch pocket of indeterminate style is set in the waistband seam on the right side. There is no evidence of suspender buttons. All indications are that the main pockets open on more than one side, but the exact cut can not be discerned.

Of the remaining ten men, figures 1, 7, 11, and 20, wear Confederate shell jackets, but their trousers do not match. In each case, the type of jacket is apparent from the short length and the manner of closure to the neck. For figures 1 and 11, the medium shade, and for figure 7, the dark/medium tone, define them as Southern military. Figure 20's jacket is extremely dark. Indicating its Southern origins, however, is the fact that it has either a plaid or print lining. Also evident is a Style G collar. Figure 1's possesses a stand-up collar as well, but it is of indeterminate style. The garment of the first individual closes with seven metal buttons and has an external welted breast pocket in the left front panel. The cuffs and front opening are
plain. There are no epaulets, but belt loops exist. These are of Style B construction and Style C configuration.

The jacket of figure 11 is top-stitched along the front opening but not around the cuffs. It has sleeves of two piece construction, with plain, closed, buttonless cuffs. This front opening is also untrimmed.

As to the trousers worn by these four men, those of figures 1 and 11 are a dark/medium hue; too dark to be of Federal origin. Those on figures 7 and 20 are a medium tone. Three pairs, 1's, 7's and 11's, display attributes confirming their Southern military nature. Figure 1's have Style D pockets and a Style C end to the waistband. The pants of figure 7 have Style B pockets, and 11's have Style A. Also with 11's, there is no cuff slit. Figure 20's pants have Style F pockets, and, again, there is no cuff slit. While both attributes are found on Confederate trousers, even in association they are not enough to firmly establish a Southern martial provenance. They could indicate a civilian source. Still, this is only a possibility, and they are definitely not Federal. Those on figures 11 and 20 are not trimmed.

Three men in the group wear frock coats. Those on figures 5 and 18 are the single-breasted type, while that on figure 17 is double-breasted. In all three instances, the long length indicates the basic style, and each closes to the neck in military fashion. With 5 and 18, the cut of the front opening marks them as single-breasted, and their shading (dark/medium and medium respectively) define their Southern nature. Both have plain cuffs. The front opening of 5's is top-stitched, but 18's is not. Also discernible on figure 5's coat is a stand-up collar of Style B configuration. There are metal buttons and an external pocket on the right side, marking a new attribute for this
type. Figure 18's does not have an external pocket, at least on the left side.

With figure 17, the wide expanse of fabric to the right of the lefthand row of the five closely spaced visible metal buttons confirms its double-breasted nature. The positions of the buttons indicate that not all are seen, but exactly how many additional ones there are is impossible to determine. This coat is extremely dark, but the fact that it is double-breasted marks it as Confederate military.

Regarding the trousers of these three men, with figure 5's there are no details other than that they are a medium shade. Figure 18's are a dark shade which, despite the lack of additional details indicates they are not Federal. Those worn by figure 17 possess a very light tint - too light to be Federal. These have Style D pockets, and their being Confederate is further confirmed by the extremely wide waistband.

As to what is worn on the upper body by figure 8, nothing concrete can be determined. It is a short garment whose hem is worn over the top of the pants, but this is all that can be seen. It is just as possible that this is a vest as it is a short jacket. Nothing at all can be determined about what figure 21 has on in terms of jackets or coats.

The same indiscernibility holds true for both men's trousers. Other than that they are a medium shade, all that can be defined about figure 8's is that there are large openings for the pockets along the side seam. This could indicate either Style A, D, or F construction. Only a dark/medium tint can be ascertained for the pants of figure 21. These are, however, too dark for Federal issue.

The final figure to be discussed, 9, is also one of the most inter-
esting in the entire study. He is the only individual wearing a zouave jacket. Of a medium shade, this garment is an appropriate short length. Consistent with the zouave type are the extremely large, rounded hem/front opening angles. The front opening itself closes with only two metal buttons, which, though unusual for this type, is not out of the question. Two additional attributes confirm its style. Decorative piping is visible on the left front panel, the front opening and hem, and most importantly, the jacket is collarless.

While the medium toned trousers are not of zouave pattern, they do possess distinctly Confederate military attributes. The pattern and shade of the fly buttons indicate that they are the typical Confederate hard rubber types. Also, there is a Style C method of waistband closure.

Other articles of clothing include a number of military caps. The aforementioned forage cap of figure 3 is a true Style B pattern. There is contrasting colored piping around the flat crown. At the same time, it lacks a chin strap of any form and buttons. Figure 9 wears a kepi whose medium shaded deeply rolled and semi-rigid appearing crown is in contrast with a dark headband. The tone of the crown is identical to that of the jacket, further confirming the latter article's military character. This same cap also lacks buttons and any type of chin strap. Figure 12 also sports a martial cap. Although the exact type can not be defined, it does possess a squared brim. In addition, in SAB a forage cap (identifiable from its crumpled nature and flat crown) lies on the ground. This has a squared visor. Another cap, of the kepi pattern, is on the ground in SAD. Its type is marked by its deeply rolled crown. Again, there is a squared brim. These both
appear to be a dark/medium shade which would mark them as Southern. A felt hat lies by figure 1's head.

Vests are seen on figures 2 and 22. The shading of 2's is identical to the rest of his uniform indicating a truly nice outfit with all components matching. Initially, that worn by figure 22 also appears to be the same hue as the rest of his clothing, but closer examination reveals it to have a different, coarser texture and is probably woolen jeans. Unfortunately, the upper part of this garment can not be seen so it can not be definitely said to be a true military pattern even though its tint and tightly spaced metallic buttons are consistent with such. Both articles possess the typical squared hem/front opening angles.

On sixteen individuals, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 20, where such is not obscured from view, shirts are in evidence. Underwear can be seen on figures 4 and 9.

The feet of figures 1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, are visible, and all but figure 16 have shoes on. Those on figures 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, and 22, are definitely military bootees. The shoes worn by figure 20 are not clear. They are either a low cut type or they are worn with leggings which partially cover them. Leggings are clearly in evidence on four other men, 6, 8, 9, and 15. Socks are obscured from view on all but figure 16 who is shoeless. The fact that he wears socks, however, indicates that, initially, he too had shoes but they were removed. Of interest is that two loose shoes lie in the left foreground of the same photograph.

Despite the fact that these men have been policed, etc., some equipment is still worn, all of which is of a shoulder carriage
Cartridge boxes can be seen on figures 2 and 5, and the cut straps for one are evident on figure 13. Haversacks appear on figures 6, 13, 15, 18, and 19. A second strap, indicating that a canteen is carried but not visible is also discernible on figure 13. While neither is visible in themselves, the two slings apparent on figure 12 establish that he, too, has a canteen and haversack. Bedrolls are worn by figures 6, 7, and 19, and of special interest is the hard backpack carried by figure 10.

In addition to the equipment actually worn, there are a number of pieces loose on the ground. Five blankets and a bedroll are readily discernible. A total of four more cartridge boxes are also visible, as are two waist belts and a tin cup.

While there is an almost total lack of uniformity in a group sense in these views, there is, nevertheless, a good degree on an individual level. Of the twenty men whose upper body garments can be discerned, all wear Confederate coats or jackets. Also, seventeen of twenty-two pairs of trousers can be firmly identified as Southern military. With the five remaining pairs, there is simply not enough detail to provenance them. Still, while there is no data to establish that they are Confederate military, there is nothing to indicate that they are anything else. In fact, because of the shades of two and the lack of a cuff slit on another, three pairs are at least definitely not Federal. Furthermore, in light of the fact that with the trousers with which distinctive details can be seen, their attributes clearly mark them as Confederate, there is no reason to believe that the additional pairs are not as well. In addition to all definable items being Southern military, there are ten individuals who sport uniforms with which the
jackets and pants are of the same material, and with one of these, there is a matching military cap as well. Another man wears a cap that is the same hue as his jacket, and one has a vest that is identical to the rest of his outfit. All but one are well shod.

Group AB: Photograph A

These seven Confederates lie to the south of the Miller Farm's infamous cornfield at the northern end of the battlefield. Although impossible to say with certainty, they are quite possibly members of Brigadier-General Harry T. Hays Louisiana Brigade. This unit, consisting of the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 14th Louisiana Regiments of infantry, is known to have engaged in this locale and taken heavy casualties.

Due to the distance of the camera from the subjects, it is impossible to discern much detail. Figures 2 and 5 wear Confederate shell jackets which match in a medium shade. The shade itself combined with the short length identifies them as such. Figure 2's is lined with a light colored fabric and has plain cuffs. Figure 1 sports a light toned article, which with its short length identifies it as a Confederate shell jacket as well. It also has plain cuffs. In a shirt only is figure 4. What the remaining individuals wear is impossible to determine, as they are blocked from view.

Other than shading, and figure 2's being untrimmed, no hard details can be discerned from the pants, but the tones are quite telling in themselves. The light hue of figure 1's and the medium of figure 5's match the respective upper body garments perfectly indicating they are
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part of a Confederate uniform. In turn those of figures 4 and 6 are identical to 5's showing that they, too, are Confederate military. Figures 2 and 7 have on light colored trousers which match and can be discerned as Southern military from this and a comparison to the darker pants worn by the Federal troops behind them. Figure 3's are covered.

All seven men wear shoes. Those on figure 6 are definitely military bootees. Of interest is the fact that figure 4 has only his right shoe on with the left only in a sock. As with figure 16 in the previous group, this indicates that originally a left shoe was had and was either lost in the fighting or removed. Linking figures 2 and 7 are the medium shade leggings worn by each. Shirts can be seen on figures 4 and 5.

As to equipment, little is actually worn. Interestingly, figures 2 and 5 still have waist belts which support rather small cartridge boxes. This factor offers an additional link between the two men. Also of note is that figure 7 carries a backpack which is evident from the large bulge beneath the blanket that covers him. On the ground are six cartridge boxes, a canteen, four blankets, additional clothing, and a lot of unidentifiable articles.

Despite a lack of details and the initial impression of a second mix and match array of clothing there is a good sense of uniformity on both an individual and group basis. Of the four men whose upper bodies can be seen, three wear Confederate jackets. Of the six visible pairs of trousers, all can be defined as Southern military. Two of the men have outfits consisting of matching jackets and pants. Between the men, two out of three jackets are the same, and five out of six pairs
of trousers can be divided into two distinct groups of like articles. In fact, only three different uniform combinations can be defined for seven men. Given the fact that as many as five different regiments (perhaps more) are represented, this indicates that there was an overall feeling of uniformity for these commands. The initial feeling of a lack of group uniformity is created by the limited number of different articles being worn in different combinations in conjunction with the fact that not all can be seen. It is probable that if more data were discernible the sense of group uniformity would be enhanced to a greater degree. In conclusion, all but one are well appointed in terms of footwear.

Group AC: Photographs A and B

These two views were recorded about one hundred yards apart on the Mumma Farm towards the northern end of the battlefield. The location is known to have been a staging area, successively, for the brigades of Generals Alfred H. Colquitt, Roswell S. Ripley, and Samuel Garland. The first of these units consisted of the 6th, 23rd, 27th, and 28th Georgia and the 13th Alabama Infantry regiments. Ripley's Brigade was comprised of the 4th and 44th Georgia and the 1st and 3rd North Carolina Infantry regiments. The 5th, 12th, 13th, 20th, and 23rd North Carolina Infantry regiments made up Garland's command. Although there was no infantry combat in this area, these regiments reportedly took casualties from artillery fire as they prepared to move up to the front lines.10
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Much equipment has been removed from these men, and excepting the lone figure in ACB, they are collected for burial. In ACA, only the first six men offer detail.

From the perfectly matching medium shades, short lengths, and their closing to the neck, it is clear that figures 1, 4, and 5, wear identical Confederate shell jackets. A fair amount of detail can be acquired from these three garments. From the spacing, figure 1's possessed six to seven metal buttons. It also has an external welted pocket near the waist on the righthand side. Of interest is the overly full cut of the sleeve. The cuffs are plain as is the front opening. The hem/front opening angle conforms to Style B. Figure 4's jacket also has an extremely full cut sleeve which further links him to figure 1. Again, the cuffs are plain, but here they can be seen to be closed and without buttons as well. The untrimmed collar is either a Style B or D configuration. Less detail is forthcoming from figure 5, but offering additional ties between these men's jackets is the fact that his too has a Style B hem/front opening angle.

Further linking the three individuals are their trousers. Not only do their shades match each other, they are identical to the respective jackets indicating not only that the trousers are Southern military and each individual is well dressed in a uniform whose components match, but also a strong sense of uniformity between these men. There can be no doubt that all represent the same unit. Those of figures 1 and 4 are made without piping. While no further detail can be had from the pants of figures 4 and 5, additional data can be gleaned from figure 1's. Though possessing Style F pockets, the top of the opening begins
well below the bottom of the waistband which offers extra proof of their Southern origin. The waistband itself closes in the Style A manner. The fly buttons, of which there are only three, are quite white, indicating the strong probability of their being bone. At the same time, a dark suspender button can be seen which is likely hard rubber or japanned metal. The suspenders themselves, though unfastened, are also visible.

Again, from the perfectly matching dark/medium shade, short length, and their closing to the neck, it is evident that figures 2 and 3 wear identical Confederate shell jackets. That on figure 2 has a Style C collar. This same article has plain cuffs.

As with the first group of figures in this view, the trousers of 2 and 3 match each other and the jackets perfectly in terms of hue. Consequently, each must be accepted as Southern uniform articles. The fly buttons of figure 3's pants are also noticeably white indicating the probability of their being bone. Figure 2's are clearly supported by suspenders.

Figure 6 wears a very dark shell jacket which is determinable from the short length and its fastening to the neck. It is lined, but a curious feature is that the lining extends to the edge of the front opening. There are no internal facing panels. Apart from this, there are no further details that can be defined. Despite the dark tone, there is nothing to indicate that this jacket is of Federal manufacture. At the same time, the odd lining supports that it it is Confederate, and it is probably a very dark gray in color.

A dark/medium shade, 6's trousers do not match his jacket, But,
their tone does match that of figures 2 and 3 perfectly. This indicates that all three wear the same pants, but figure 6 sports a variant jacket. Suspenders are also seen.

Regarding other items of clothing that can be discerned, of special interest is the kepi or forage cap with the dark, contrasting headband lying on the stomach of figure 4. In terms of shade, its crown matches the jacket and pants perfectly, thus enhancing the uniformity of the individual. In addition, there is a squared visor, and buttons retain a functional chin strap. Shirts are apparent on figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. It is interesting to note that even the shirts of figures 2 and 3 match each other. Figure 3 also sports a vest of a dark tone. No further details, however, can be defined from it except that the tightly spaced metal buttons support the probability of its being a military pattern. All six individuals have military bootees, and socks can be discerned on figures 1, 2, 3, and 6.

Some equipment is in evidence on figures 3, 4, 5, and 6. Shoulder slings for cartridge boxes are visible on the first three. Also, an additional shoulder strap can be seen around the neck of figure 5. From the way it is draped, it appears to be a dark or painted fabric which probably supports a haversack. A sling is also evident on figure 6.

Figure 7 is one of the most difficult to work with, because of the camera angle, his being covered by a blanket, and the condition he is in. One's initial reaction is that he lacks a coat or jacket and wears only a shirt. Close examination, however, reveals that he did wear a jacket or coat at the time he was hit. This assessment comes from a comparison of his two sleeves. The left is obviously that of a shirt
which is rolled up. There is a marked contrast between this and the right. To begin with, the right is not rolled up, which is somewhat odd although it is certainly not impossible that it simply came unrolled at some point. More significantly, it is a different, heavier fabric, and the cuff construction is that of a coat or jacket rather than a shirt. Also, the visible seam looks to run up the back of the arm as with an over garment rather than under the arm as it would on a shirt. Finally, the right sleeve is a slightly darker shade than the left. Obviously the victim of artillery fire, there are two ways to account for this state. He may not have been killed instantly and was in the process of removing his coat or jacket when he died, with the result that it is only on one arm, or the force of the explosion literally blew most of it off of him. In any case, he did possess a garment in addition to his shirt, the shade of which supports its being Confederate military.

As to the rest of his outfit, while not much detail is discernible, he does seem to have been well appointed in terms of clothing. His trousers are a dark/medium hue, too dark to be Northern. The collar of an undershirt is visible. On the ground above his left knee, a military bootee can be seen.

With this group of figures, there is a strong sense of uniformity with the separate individuals and between them. All wear Confederate jackets, and six pairs of trousers can be solidly confirmed as Southern military as well. The remaining pair is too dark for Federal issue, and while there are no visible Confederate attributes, there are no civilian ones either. Consequently, there is no reason to doubt they
are Southern military also. In fact, their shade is comparable with
the darker pairs in the first image which are clearly Confederate.
This tends to support that this additional pair is as well.

Furthermore, on an individual level, five men wear uniforms with
which the components match including one with a military cap that is
also the same tone. In turn, these five can be divided into two groups
in each of which the entire outfits are the same. With one of these,
even the shirts are identical. A sixth man wears pants which are the
same as those in one of these classifications. The sense of group
uniformity is heightened even more by glancing down the row of bodies
in ACA and realizing that in terms of shading, the remaining uniforms
of roughly twenty more men differ very little, if at all, from those of
the first six. Finally, all are well appointed with military shoes.

Group AD: Photograph A

This lone Confederate was photographed on the southern part of the
Miller Farm about one-hundred yards from the Smoketown Road. The
high, plain, stand-up collar and medium shading indicate that his coat
or jacket is Confederate military. Plain cuffs and a lack of epaulets
are noticeable as well. Clearly identifiable as a shell jacket because
of its short length is an additional garment that is draped over his
right side. This second jacket matches that worn perfectly both in
tone and texture. Not only does this define the type actually worn, it
offers sound evidence that coats and jackets were removed and lost for
one reason or another in the course of fighting. The second jacket has
"A Contrast: Federal buried, Confederate unburied, where they fell, on Battle-field of Antietam." (original title) "Scene of Sedgwick's advance and the grave of Lt. John A. Clark, Seventh Michigan, view looking toward the West Woods." (modern title)
fairly tightly spaced buttons and a top-stitched front opening. That
the loose garment is the same indicates that at least some members of
this man's unit were uniformly dressed.

As to the rest of his outfit, not too much hard data is forthcoming. His trousers are slightly darker than his jacket. He wears military bootees, and something is draped over his left shoulder.

**Group AE: Photographs A and B**

These Confederate dead were photographed on the Mumma Farm by the West Woods near the Dunker Church. Some of the men may have been members of Captain W.W. Parker's (Virginia) Battery of Colonel S.D. Lee's Artillery Battalion. Others may be from the 2nd and 7th South Carolina Regiments of infantry of General Joseph B. Kershaw's Brigade and the 3rd Arkansas and 27th North Carolina Infantry Regiments of Colonel Van H. Manning's Brigade. All these units are known to have been heavily engaged on this part of the field. The figures in the background of AEB are the same as those in AEA. While eight men can be seen in AEA, only seven offer any detail. Excluding those in the background of AEB, there are six bodies in evidence. Only three, however, are useful for supplying data.15

In AEA, figures 3 and 5 wear matching shell jackets. Each is an appropriate short length, fastens to the neck, and presents the same dark/medium tone. The spacing indicates that figure 3's jacket closes with nine metal buttons. It also has a Style A hem/front opening angle, with the front opening itself being plain. The cuffs are
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untrimmed as well, and they are closed and without buttons. Figure 5's is lined with a dark fabric.

For the same reasons of length, shade, and method of closure, it is apparent that figures 4 and 7 wear identical shell jackets which are a slightly darker tone than those of the first two mentioned individuals. On figure 7's, a stand-up collar of indeterminate pattern is evident. The same can be seen not to have epaulets. Both have untrimmed cuffs and those of figure 4 are of closed construction without buttons. Because of the darker shades the reader is likely to question the origins of all four of these garments. That they are Confederate is supported by the fact that at this point in the conflict, the only real possible alternative is that they are New York state issue, but examination reveals none of the attributes so distinctive to that Federal jacket. In fact, because of the nine buttons on figure 3's jacket and its matching figure 5's, it is quite evident that these too are definitely Southern.

Confirming that these jackets are, in fact, Confederate and enhancing the sense of uniformity are the trousers. In each pairing, their hues match not only each other but the respective jackets as well. This, combined with the fact that they are too dark to be Federal issue indicates that complete, matching uniforms are worn and that both pants and jackets are Confederate military. Other attributes can be discerned from the trousers. Those on figures 3, 5, and 7, lack trim. A dark, probably hard rubber or japanned metal, suspender button is visible just a bit forward of the side seam on figure 3's. On both 3's and 5's, the main opening to the pockets is along the side seam indicating they are either of Style A or F construction. Figure 4's trousers have
either Style B or D pockets and a Style A waistband end.

Figures 1 and 2 wear the same jackets. That they are the same - the shell type - and Confederate, is evident from their shortness, matching medium shade, closure to the neck, and very full sleeves. On figure 1's, the spacing of the visible metal buttons indicates a total of nine altogether. The front opening of the same is top-stitched and untrimmed. Figure 6 does not wear a jacket or coat.

There are no similarities in color with the trousers of these three individuals either between themselves or their wearers' jackets. Those of figure 1 are an extremely light shade and lack piping. That they are Confederate military is clear from the Style A pockets. Figure 2's are a medium shade, darker than his jacket. These have Style D pockets. Also noticeable is a very light colored suspender button affixed to a very wide waistband which does not conform to Federal issue. The pants of figure 6, also a light tone and untrimmed, have Style F pockets, the top of the opening of which commences far down from the base of the waistband. This, combined with the light colored suspender button set directly over the side seam in true Confederate fashion reflects their Southern military nature.

In AEB, figures 8 and 9 wear Confederate shell jackets of a similar medium shade, but they are not the same. While the tones indicate the origins, the type is defined by the short lengths and manner of closure to the necks. In addition, with figure 8's, a stand-up collar is evident. This same garment possesses metal buttons, a Style A hem/front opening angle, and plain cuffs. With figure 9, Style A cuff trim is apparent. Nothing can be determined in terms of coat or jacket for
Although little hard detail can be gleaned from them, the shading of the trousers on figures 8, 9, and 10, offer a nice sense of uniformity. Each pair is the same dark/medium hue which is darker than either of the two visible jackets. The fact that they match so well and are too dark for Federal issue indicates that they are Southern military uniform articles. Seen on figure 9’s trousers are very light colored, probably bone, fly buttons.

As to other clothing items, shirts are apparent on all but figure 2 whose jacket remains buttoned. Of the three visible pairs of feet, shoes of the military bootee pattern can be seen on figures 1 and 5. Figure 4 only has socks on, but as with previous individuals, this clearly supports that he initially had shoes upon going into action and they have been removed. Of interest is the fact that figures 5 and 6 wear vests of the same dark shade. That they are of military style is evident from the fact that each buttons up to the neck.

Very little equipment is in evidence. Figure 2 still wears a waist belt which supports a cap box and an additional unidentifiable object on his right side. A shoulder carriage cartridge box is worn by figure 3. The sling for another cartridge box is visible on figure 7.

In these views, there is a good sense of uniformity on an individual level, and a good degree between the men. The eight visible jackets and all the trousers are decidedly Confederate. Four men wear uniforms with matching components. These same men can be divided into two groupings in which the uniforms in each are the same. Between these two groupings, despite obvious differences in attributes, there is a strong
similarity in shade. What might be seen here are two separate issues to a unit attempting to maintain a distinct uniform. In addition, there are partial uniform matches with two who wear the same jackets and three others whose trousers are the same. What is undoubtedly being observed with these five men is the same issue of jackets and different ones of pants and vice-versa.

It is noteworthy that only five different jackets can be defined in an area in which at least five different commands were engaged, which supports that the various jackets represent the various units and these were well uniformed in a group sense. This is confirmed by photograph AFA in which all eight bodies are on their backs and aligned in the same direction with no additional corpses anywhere in the immediate vicinity. These men have been collected from other points. They do not represent members of the same command who fell in this one spot.

The only problem in these images is the lack of shoes on one man. At the same time, with the other two men whose feet are visible, both have military pattern footwear.

Group AF: Photographs A and B

These two views were taken along the Sunken Road at the center of the battlefield. AFA shows the position held by the 2nd North Carolina Infantry, and AFB is of the location where the 14th North Carolina Infantry fought. Both regiments were part of General G.B. Anderson's Brigade.18

Three figures offer detail in AFA, and there is a good sense of
Photograph AFA

"Confederate dead in Bloody Lane, view looking northeast." (modern title)
"Confederate dead in Bloody Lane." (modern title)\textsuperscript{20}
uniformity. Figures 1 and 3 are clad identically. Each wears the same Confederate shell jacket. This is apparent from the perfectly matching medium shades, their closing to the neck, and the short lengths. The hem of figure 1's garment is actually visible, while that of figure 3's is not. Still, the short length of 3's is easily definable from the straight, uncrumpled manner in which it hangs open. In addition, from the spacing of the metal buttons themselves on figure 1, and the spacing of the buttonholes on 3, it is evident that each closes with nine fasteners. Both have top-stitched front openings with figure 1's being untrimmed, and the hem of figure 1's is top-stitched as well. Extra features can be discerned from figure 1's jacket. It has a Style A hem/front opening angle and it possesses epaulets. This latter attribute is obscured from view by equipment straps on figure 3. Also, figure 1's has plain closed cuffs without buttons or top-stitching.

Each wears trousers of a perfectly matching medium shade slightly lighter than their jackets. This indicates that they are military uniform items. That they are in fact Confederate is apparent from the Style A pockets on figure 1's pair. This same article of clothing was constructed without decorative piping.

Figure 2 is quite interesting in comparison with figures 1 and 3. He too wears a medium hued shell jacket with pants of a slightly lighter tone, but his is an altogether different uniform. That he sports a Confederate shell jacket is apparent from the garment's shade, short length and manner of closing to the neck. As with the men already mentioned, the spacing indicates that this closed with nine buttons which are metal. The plain front opening appears to be top-stitched.
Like figure 1's jacket, figure 2's has epaulets. These, however, are a dark contrasting color. Also of note is the Style A trim on the cuff which is closed and does not have buttons.

From the definable attributes, it is very clear that figure 2's trousers are Confederate military. They possess either a Style C pocket or are pocketless. There is no cuff slit. Close examination reveals that they have a belted back, the end of which is just visible above the trim on his sleeve. Like figure 1's, these are untrimmed.

In the second view, the short lengths indicate that figures 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 wear shell jackets whose shading in each case confirms their Southern origin. Those on figures 8 and 10 are a matching medium tone while those of figures 4, 5, 6, and 9, are an identical darker hue. In the instances where the front openings can be observed - figures 6, 8, 9, and 10 - it is clear that each closes to the neck in military fashion. That of figure 6 fastens with either eight or nine metal buttons. Figure 8's has metal buttons as well, but the number is indiscernible. A plain stand-up collar can be detected on figure 4's jacket, which does not have epaulets or belt loops, and figure 5's has a Style A hem/front opening configuration. Little can be discerned about figure 7's garment. It fastens to the neck, possesses a stand-up collar in accordance with military style, lacks epaulets, and its tone is the same as that seen on figures 4, 5, 6, and 9. Consequently, it too is probably a shell jacket and the same as the four mentioned already. Whatever its exact type, it is undoubtedly Southern military.

As to the trousers of these men, figures 4, 5, 6, and 9 wear pairs that match in a medium shade which is lighter than their jackets. This
completes a nice sense of uniformity between these four men and confirms the military nature of their trousers. That they are in fact Confederate is evident from attributes visible on figures' 4 and 5. The former's clearly have a belted back and Style A pockets. The fly buttons on figure 5's are a very light color suggesting the probability that they are bone. More importantly, however, is that the waistband is secured in the Style B manner. The trousers worn by figures 8 and 10 also match each other in tone. These are a medium tint darker than the jackets. While no further detail is forthcoming, their matching in conjunction with matching jackets supports that they are issue uniform articles and Confederate. Figure 7's pants are completely obscured from view.

Other definable clothing items include vests on figures 1, 2, and 5. With those worn by the first two, the fact that each buttons to the neck confirms their military pattern, and the shading of each is consistent with Southern garments. In fact, the tone of figure 1's is identical to that of his jacket. Further supporting its military nature is the close spacing of the buttons indicating that the front opening closed with a large number in accordance with military fashion. All that can be determined about figure 5's vest is that it is a dark shade and has tightly spaced buttons.

Shirts are visible on figures 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10. The feet of six individuals can be seen, and five of these, 1, 4, 8, 9, and 10, have shoes. Those of the last four are clearly military bootees. Figure 2 does not have shoes, but as with already mentioned individuals, he does have socks again supporting that he initially had footwear, but they have been removed. Underwear is definable on figures 3
and 5. The only piece of headgear that can be seen is a slouch hat beneath figure 2's head.

For Antietam photographs, there is a fair amount of equipment present. In view AFA, it appears that the policing details primarily concerned themselves with weapons. Figures 1, 3, 7, and 8, still possess shoulder carriage cartridge boxes. Two more cartridge boxes - one on a waist belt - lie in the foreground of AFA. Another waist belt can also be seen there, and figure 1 still wears his. Figure 3 carries a haversack and an uncovered tin canteen of indeterminate pattern. Of note with figure 3 is that he wears an unusual soft knapsack which appears to be entirely of unpainted fabric inclusive of the shoulder straps. Another backpack is on the ground in the same view. At least six blankets can be seen on the ground. Also, figure 7 has a bedroll.

With this group, there is excellent uniformity on both an individual and group level. All jackets and visible pants are Confederate military. Furthermore, for ten individuals, four distinct uniforms are in evidence, all of which, excepting figure 2's, match at least one other. An interesting possibility suggests itself as to figure 2's uniform in conjunction with those of figures 1 and 3. While obviously not the same, it is, nevertheless, similar. The shading combination of medium jacket with lighter medium trousers, the type of jacket, the number of buttons, and the presence of epaulets, might link this man with the other two. In essence, he is wearing the same uniform with some variations. It is possible that as with the preceding photographs, we are witnessing members of the same unit in which there was an effort to maintain an overall sense of uniformity, but their
garments represent different issues with inherent differences in each. Also, in the first image, there is a large amount of equipment that indicates these men were well supplied in this sense. The only problem in these views is the missing pair of shoes, and as will be seen, this is not a problem.

Group AG: Photographs A and B

These two images were recorded at the southern end of the battlefield. AGA is of a position near the Sherrick Farm, and the men are probably from General Micah Jenkin's South Carolina Brigade. This command consisted of the 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 6th South Carolina Regiments, the 4th South Carolina Battalion, and the Palmetto Sharpshooters. AGB was recorded some distance away, but it is impossible to determine exactly where or what troops are represented.21

From its short length, close spacing of the metal buttons, method of closure to the neck, stand-up collar, and light/medium tone, it is evident that figure 1 wears a Confederate shell jacket. Both the collar and cuffs are untrimmed. Little can be determined about his trousers other than that they are the same shade as his jacket. This, however, clearly confirms their being Southern military.

Figure 2 wears a single-breasted frock coat which is apparent from the long length and button arrangement. From the spacing of the holes this garment fastened to the neck with either six or seven buttons. There is also a collar of the Style B pattern. The front opening is top-stitched, and the cuffs are plain. These factors combined with the
"View on Battle-field of Antietam, near Sherrick's House, where the Seventy-ninth New York Volunteers fought after they crossed the creek; group of dead Confederates." (original title) "Confederate dead near the Sherrick farm." (modern title)
"Confederate Soldiers, as they fell, near the Burnside Bridge, at the Battle of Antietam." (original title) "Confederate dead on the southern portion of the battlefield." (modern title)
coat's medium shade soundly identify it as Confederate military. There is no evidence of an external pocket on the left side.

As with figure 1, the shading of the trousers is identical to the coat. This, in itself, confirms them as Southern military, and this is supported by some of the additional attributes that can be discerned. They have a Style D pocket. The waistband is extremely narrow and is secured in accordance with the Style A method. The waistband button and that for the suspenders are a very light color indicating the probability that they are bone.

As to additional garments in this view, of interest is the forage cap or kepi worn by figure 2. Whatever the exact type, the brim is squared. Both men wear shirts. Shoes of the military bootee pattern are in evidence on each. Of note is the extremely long heel observable on figure 1's footwear.

Regarding equipment, the sling for a shoulder mounted cartridge box is definable on figure 2. Curiously, this seems to have been worn beneath the coat as the end is seen protruding from beneath it at the waist. This, in turn, makes it clear that the box itself has been unbuckled from the sling. Also visible at this man's side is a haversack.

Figures 3 and 4 wear uniforms that are identical in every sense. From the matching dark shades, short lengths and manner of closure to the neck, it is evident that shell jackets are worn. That on figure 3 has a Style B hem/front opening angle, with neither area showing evidence of top-stitching, and figure 4's is lined. From the spacing of the holes and metal fasteners on figure 3's jacket, these closed with either seven or eight buttons. Figure 3's garment is constructed with
plain, closed cuffs without decorative buttons. The dark shade might be interpreted to mean that these are Federal in origin. There are, however, no discernible Northern attributes to them, and the very fact they match indicates a Southern origin.

Confirming them as Confederate military are the trousers. These are also a dark shade perfectly matching both each other and the jackets. This clearly indicates that they are parts of complete uniforms in which the components are of the same fabric. This, combined with their being too dark for Federal issue, and that a dark shell jacket with matching pants would be unusual for Federal wear (if such was ever worn at all), and that both individuals wear exactly the same uniform, indicates that these are Southern. Further confirming their military and Southern provenance is the light colored tape piping on the side seam of figure 4's pair, their lack of a cuff slit, and the Style C configuration of the waistband ends on figure 3's. In addition, closing in the Style A manner, the waistband button of 3's is a light color and configuration to support that it is bone. Fly and suspender buttons of the same light color are also visible on figure 4's pants. Despite the angle, the dark hue of the trousers makes it impossible to determine the pocket style. Of interest, however, is the way in which the pockets have been gone through. Instead of simply reaching into them, whoever was responsible cut through the pants at the bottom of the pocket lining and pulled it out through the hole. In any case, from the combined attributes of jackets and trousers, there can be no doubt that these are Confederate uniforms. They are undoubtedly a very dark gray in color.
As to other visible articles of clothing, each wears a shirt which heightens the sense of uniformity in that even they, in terms of shade, match each other perfectly. Both wear military bootees. Each also wears socks.

Some equipment is still in evidence. Both have shoulder carriage cartridge boxes. Also, on figure 3, a haversack and lightweight bedroll can be detected.

All in all, there is an excellent sense of uniformity in these views on an individual basis, and in the case of the last two men, between them. Three distinct uniforms are witnessed with which all the components of each clearly match and are definitely Confederate. With the two figures in AGB, these men appear to still be in the original positions in which they fell. This being the case combined with their completely matching outfits tends to strongly support that their entire unit was dressed in such an outstanding manner. All are well appointed with footwear.

Comments on Missing Jackets and Shoes in Antietam Photographs

In images ABA and AEA, individuals appear without jackets. Although possible they did not have them, a couple of explanations exist to suggest that both possessed them going into action but were taken off by the individuals themselves. In each instance, it might well be that the men were not killed instantly, and in an effort to achieve some comfort or examine their wounds, the jackets were removed. For the man in AEA, as stated, an artillery battery was in action at this
location which is certainly attested to by the presence of the gun lumber. Upon going into action, it was not uncommon for members of gun crews to remove their jackets due to the excessive heat generated by a rapidly fired piece of ordnance. This could be done with less fear of losing the garment as the battery maintained a fairly stationary position and one had a place to put his coat or jacket (i.e., with the lumber or caisson) while performing his duties. Also, given the positions generally taken up by artillery, this could be done with less fear of being misidentified. In any case, that jackets and coats were removed during battle for one reason or another is supported by the extra garment draped over the man in ADA. Even if they did not possess them they represent a small percentage of the total number of men in these views.

A total of three figures from views AAD, AEA, and AFA are shown wearing socks but no shoes, and a fourth man in ABA has on only a single shoe. As pointed out the socks indicate that shoes were initially possessed upon going into action. The obvious implication, consequently, is that someone else needed shoes and removed them. In light of the traditional historical beliefs about the Army of Northern Virginia's deficiency in shoes, and that these photographs were recorded at a point when the problem does in fact seem to have been real, it would be easy to reason that Confederate troops, themselves, were responsible for removing these from their own fallen comrades. It is highly unlikely, however, that this was the situation.

The locations in all four views were the scenes of extremely heavy fighting. Under the circumstances, it is hardly likely that troops
would have had either the opportunity or inclination to even consider removing shoes from their own casualties. There were simply far more pressing matters to occupy their attention. Furthermore, when hostilities ceased in these locales, each was firmly occupied by Federal troops. In essence, there certainly was not any opportunity to scavenge for shoes following the fighting. At the same time, an interesting fact is that a considerable number of Union troops are said to have been in dire need of shoes themselves at this point in the campaign. Considering this in conjunction with the fact that Federal forces held these areas at the end of the day, and thus had the opportunity to leisurely scavenge, it is probable that they and not the Confederate soldiers removed these shoes.

Fredericksburg, May 3, 1863

Although technically a separate action for several reasons, the engagement at Fredericksburg, on May 3, 1863, was an extension of the Battle of Chancellorsville which had raged since May 1, several miles to the west. Although only one photograph of Confederate casualties was recorded, it is unique because of the incredibly short time lapse of less than twenty minutes between when the fighting in the area ended and when the photographer, A.J. Russell, arrived on the scene. Consequently, there had been no time for clean up procedures or scavenging, and a great deal of equipment is in evidence. A comparison of the incredible amount of gear in the foreground in relation to only three individuals (one almost completely obscured from view by the second)
clearly indicates how much equipment was actually removed and lost on a firing line in the course of battle. The position is that held by Brigadier-General William Barksdale's Brigade consisting of the 13th, 17th, 18th, and 21st Mississippi Infantry Regiments.25

In terms of uniforms, that worn by figure 1 is unmistakably a Confederate shell jacket. This is attested to by the article's short length, method of closure to the neck, dark/medium shade, and stand-up collar. The collar itself is of the Style C configuration. The plain front fastens with five metal buttons, and possesses a Style A hem/front opening angle. Visible on the closed cuff is a dark, contrasting band of piping. This does not form the pointed motif as per the Style A in the established typology. Instead, it simply encircles the cuff at an equal distance from its edge all around. Also, there is no evidence of buttons on the cuff nor does this or any other area show signs of top-stitching. Finally, there is no external pocket on the right side.

Apart from the shading, little can be determined about the trousers. The tone, however, is significant in that it is identical to the jacket clearly indicating that they are part of a Confederate uniform. Also noticeable (and a Confederate trouser attribute) is the Style C method of fly construction.

Figure 2 wears a double-breasted frock coat. This is apparent from the wide width of fabric to the left of the righthand row of buttons. Although the hem can not actually be seen, the draping of the garment indicates that it is long. That it is Confederate military is apparent from its fastening to the neck, stand-up collar, medium or dark/medium
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Confederate Dead of Barksdale's Mississippi Brigade, Fredericksburg. (Modern title)
shade, and number of metal buttons. Five buttons are actually visible with a gap between the fourth and fifth indicating the original existence of a sixth. Because of the angle and the folds in the coat, it is impossible to determine if there were more, but all indications point that such was likely. All that can be determined about the trousers is that they are the same tone as the coat indicating that they too are Confederate military as they are obviously part of a uniform with matching components.

Regarding other clothing items, both wear shirts. Figure 1 has a military vest on of a shade much lighter than the rest of his uniform. This tone combined with its manner of fastening to the neck with nine metal buttons, and the stand-up collar, define it as Southern military. The collar, itself, is the Style B pattern. The hem and front opening are top-stitched. Of interest is the hem/front opening angle of a previously unobserved style. It is noticeably rounded. While figure 2's feet cannot be seen, figure 1 clearly wears shoes.

As to equipment, figure 1 is well appointed. He has a shoulder carriage cartridge box, and the slings for both haversack and canteen can be defined. The Confederate made tin drum canteen to his left appears to be attached to one of these. Primarily because of shadows and camera angle very little equipment can be discerned on figure 2. Only a narrow strap coming from beneath his left arm can be defined.

There is an incredible amount of gear lying around. Despite the fact a waist belt can not be seen on figure 1, one lies on the ground beside him with a bayonet scabbard attached and probably a cap box as well. A second belt can also be discerned in the foreground, and an
Enfield bayonet sticks out of the ground. There are four haversacks. Three additional canteens are witnessed. Two are covered elliptical tin and the other is of painted tin or a wooden drum type. A shoulder slung cartridge box is to be seen, as is another of an odd pattern. In general shape it appears to be an English Enfield type, but the specific attributes do not support its being such. Also evident are a bedroll, at least two unrolled blankets, and a quilt. A tin cup sits on the wall. There is a slouch hat by figure 2's head, and a kepi lies in the road. That it is this type is evident by the somewhat rigid appearance it offers even unworn. It has buttons, a functional chin strap, a squared visor, and is lined. Although it was stated that generally the subject of firearms would not be discussed, this view gives a clear indication of how well armed Barksdale's troops were. Of the seven rifled muskets closest to the camera, four are English made Enfields and three are U.S. Springfields or Southern copies thereof.

In this view, a good sense of uniformity is had on an individual basis as each wears a complete Confederate uniform in which the components of coats, jackets, and trousers match. In addition, the amount of equipment both worn and lying about clearly supports that these Mississippians were well appointed in this sense.

Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1863

All casualty images recorded at Gettysburg were taken by Alexander Gardner or two of his assistants, Timothy O'Sullivan and James Gibson. These photographs were made on July 5 and 6, 1863. Consequently, taken two and three days after the battle, the same problems regarding equip-
ment that were encountered with the Antietam views exist with these. It is evident that policing the field was near completion and interment of the dead was well underway by the time Gardner and his crew started work. Many of the bodies are laid out for burial with all gear removed. The number of turned out pockets attests to their having been gone over.27

Group GA: Photographs A, B, C, D, E, F, and G

These images were taken at the southern end of the battlefield on the lower slope of Big Round Top and along a stream at its base, Plum Run. The fighting here on July 2, was vicious enough to earn the locale the name "Slaughter Pen". Despite the degree of activity, only the 44th Alabama can be identified as having been engaged at any of the specific points recorded by the photographers. This unit was part of Brigadier-General E. McIver Law's Brigade which also contained the 4th, 15th, 47th and 48th Alabama regiments. As a result, it is possible that some, at least, of the men shown represent some of these four additional commands. A total of twelve individuals are seen in these seven views.28

In GAA and GAB, apparent from the short length, its buttoning to the neck, and light shade, figure 1 wears a Confederate shell jacket. The spacing indicates that it possesses nine buttons which are metal. It also has a Style A hem/front opening angle.

As the shade of his trousers is identical to that of his jacket, they are obviously a matching uniform component and of Southern origin. This is supported by the dark suspender button set just a hair
Group GA
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"Dead Confederate Soldiers in the Slaughter Pen at the Foot of Round Top." (original title) "Dead Confederate soldier in the Slaughter Pen." (modern title)
"Dead Confederate Soldiers in the Slaughter Pen at the Foot of Round Top." (original title) "Confederate dead in the Slaughter Pen." (modern title)
forward of the side seam. These have Style F pockets.

Figure 2, in GAB only, also wears a Confederate shell jacket, but it is a darker hue. This tone combined with its short length, fastening to the neck, and the stand-up collar confirm its origin and type. In addition, the cuffs are untrimmed, and there is no external righthand pocket. As with figure 1, the shading of 2's trousers is the same as the jacket indicating they too are Southern military. These also have Style F pockets.

As to remaining clothing, both men wear shirts. Each also sports military bootees for footwear. Figure 2 wears socks.

Some equipment is in evidence. Figure 1 carries a shoulder slung cartridge box, and he still wears a waist belt. Because of shadows, it is impossible to determine with certainty if this supports a cap box. Yet, at the point on the belt where one would expect to find one, there is a noticeable dark bulge indicating that its presence is likely. On figure 2, there is a thin strap running over his right shoulder for either a canteen or haversack. Any lack of canteens in these views might be accounted for by a historical fact. Just prior to engaging, details were detached from the brigade with collected canteens to fetch water. From the 15th Alabama, at least, the twenty-two men assigned to the task had not returned by the time the brigade went into action. The fact that it required twenty-two men to perform this duty for a single regiment indicates an abundance of this particular article of equipment. Consequently, any lack of canteens in this group of images might be accounted for by this factor. An additional dark wide sling runs across figure 2's chest in the spot where one would expect to find a cartridge box strap. Whether or not this is, is difficult to deter-
mine. The item possesses a large frame buckle, and the manner in which it is wrinkled indicates that it is made of fabric rather than leather. If it is a cartridge box strap, it offers a rare glimpse of possible shortages of materials in the South. In essence, a fabric sling is substituted for a leather one. Boxes with this type of strap have been witnessed, but the frequency with which they were issued is unknown. In light of the data to be presented in this study, however, they were not common.

The three individuals in GAC do not offer much specific detail, but a few things of a more general nature can be determined. Figure 5 wears a dark colored shell jacket. Its length, method of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar define it as such. The collar itself is of the Style G pattern. Also, there is Style A cuff trim. These attributes combined with a total lack of any distinctively Federal features mark it as of Southern origin.

His trousers are a medium shade. They possess Style A pockets that button. Both the pocket and forward most suspender buttons are light hues and as such are probably bone. These facts confirm these pants are Southern military.

Figure 4 wears a shell jacket, also, which is evident from its short length. Although no other hard details are discernible, it is a dark tone identical to figure 5's jacket. There are no hard details available from his trousers, but, like his jacket, their tone is also the same as the pants of figure 5. Consequently it must be accepted that both wear the same uniform and the components of figure 4's are, in fact, Confederate.

Figure 3 wears a Confederate shell jacket evident from the short
"Slaughter Pen, Foot of Round Top, Gettysburg, July, 1863." (original title) "View in the Slaughter Pen at the foot of Big Round Top." (modern title)
length, light/medium shade, and manner of closure to the neck. He also has on pants of a medium shade which conform to the hues of those on figures 4 and 5, and as such are undoubtedly Confederate.

All three individuals wear shirts. Apart from this, no other information is forthcoming about clothing except that figures 4 and 5 have shoes. Their type, however, can not be defined. As to equipment, on figure 5 there is a sling over his right shoulder, a Confederate tin drum canteen by his head, and a second canteen of the same pattern by his hand.

In photograph GAD, the lone figure 6 offers absolutely superb detail. He clearly is clad in a Confederate shell jacket. Its short length, medium to dark/medium shade, and its closing to the neck immediately attest to this. From the spacing, the front opening fastens with eight or nine buttons. There is a typical undyed or bleached lining and a Style A internal pocket. The cuffs are plain and the edges of these and the front opening are top-stitched.

The untrimmed trousers are a medium shade. Because it is difficult to determine the lighting angle and the obvious shadows, it is hard to say if these match his jacket or not. They might, but it is certainly possible that the jacket is darker. In any case, from the Style A pockets, there is no doubt that they are Confederate. Of interest is the noticeable texture in combination with a seemingly heavy weight which identifies the fabric as woolen jeans. Also of note is one of the rare instances of a garment in need of repair. The side seam just below the pocket is split out.

As to his other garments, he clearly wears a military vest of a dark shade. That it is such is evident from its buttoning to the neck
"All over now - Confederate sharpshooter at foot of Round Top." (original title) "Dead Confederate soldier." (modern title)
and the stand-up collar. The collar itself has a rounded point - a style not encountered with the existing specimens. What its overall configuration is is impossible to ascertain. This garment, too, is lined with a typical white or undyed material. In addition to the vest, he has a shirt and military bootees. There is no evidence of any equipment.

In view GAG, only a small section of the front opening of figure 7's upper garment can be seen with the result that its exact type is indefinable. The medium shade combined with the tight spacing of the four visible metal buttons, however, indicate that it is Confederate military. His trousers are also a medium shade. Whether or not these match the coat/jacket is impossible to determine as neither article can be viewed together in the same photograph. They are, however, close, and their being of the same fabric is not out of the question. Apart from their tone, no other details can be discerned about these pants, and so, their provenance can not be established.

With figures 8, 9, and 10, there is an incredible sense of uniformity. Figures 9 and 10 wear identically shaded dark shell jackets. Each is the appropriate short length, closes to the neck, and has a plain stand-up collar. On figure 9, the collar can be seen to be of the Style D configuration. Both have cuffs trimmed in the Style B fashion, and lack epaulets. Also, the spacing indicates that 9's garment closes with seven buttons which are metal. This man's jacket is also lined. Figure 8 does not wear a jacket, but close examination reveals a dark fabric object (whose tone matches the jackets of figures 9 and 10) beneath his right arm and shoulder. It is entirely possible that this is his jacket. This will be discussed later.
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"in Slaughter Pen, foot of Round Top," (original title) "Scene in the woods at the northwestern base of Big Round Top." (modern title)
"in Slaughter Pen, foot of Round Top," (original title) "Scene in the woods at the foot of Big Round Top." (modern title)
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"in Slaughter Pen, foot of Round Top," (original title) "Scene in the woods at the foot of Big Round Top." (modern title)
All three wear trousers whose dark shade matches both each other and the jackets indicating that complete uniforms of the same material are worn and that both pants and jackets are Confederate military items. In essence, the fact that there are three pairs of trousers too dark for Federal issue worn with matching jackets which show no discernible Northern attributes clearly identifies the origins. In addition, the fly and suspender buttons offer strong support for their provenance and further evidence that each are the same. All fasteners are a very noticeable white (quite probably bone) with those for the suspenders equalling those for the fly in diameter. The outermost suspender button on the right of figure 9 is clearly mounted directly over the side seam or just a tad forward of it. Also of note is that the fly proper of figure 8's pants closes with only three buttons, and the waistband is secured in the Style B manner. With both figures 8 and 9, the visible ends of the waistbands when fastened are of the Style A pattern. Style A pockets are definable on figures 9 and 10. It is also apparent from these same two pairs that there is no side seam piping. Figure 4's do not appear to have a watch pocket.

The exact type of figure 11's coat/jacket can not be determined due to the camera angle in which much of it is obscured from view. Nothing can be said with certainty about its shade either because of serious stains. It could be an extremely light hue or a medium one. Whatever the exact tone, either combined with the fact the garment has a stand-up collar indicates that it is Southern military. Also, it lacks epaulets. Nothing can be determined about his pants other than that they are a medium hue or stained with the same matter as the coat or
jacket. It is, however, quite possible they match the upper body garment.

Figure 12 is visible only from the waist down. He wears medium shaded untrimmed trousers with Style F pockets, and the single, visible suspender button is grayish tint. These attributes tend to indicate the possibility of Federal origin. At the same time, however, the incredibly wide waistband and possible lack of a watch pocket tends to support that they are Confederate. Unfortunately this is not enough data to establish them as such, and they must remain unprovenanced with the possibility that they are Union.

As to other clothing articles, shirts can be seen on figures 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12. Figures 8 and 9 clearly wear suspenders. The feet of figures 7, 8, 9, and 12, are visible and all wear shoes. Those on figures 9 and 12 conform to the military bootee type. Of note are the white leggings on figures 8 and 9 which, interestingly, in the latter instance, are worn beneath the pants' cuffs.

The only equipment in evidence actually on an individual is a shoulder sling for a cartridge box on figure 9. Of note is the fact that it has been cut to remove the box itself. Other items are detectable on the ground. A slouch hat lies beside figure 11's head. By figure 7's legs there is another dark shell jacket. It is a short length and has tightly spaced metal buttons. It is also lined with an undyed or bleached fabric. At figure 10's left side is an odd article. Initially, it appears to be a hard pack, but if it is, it is a very small size.

There is a good sense of uniformity in these views on an individual
basis. With ten out of eleven men whose upper bodies are visible, Confederate jackets are actually worn. As indicated, the eleventh individual is in shirt sleeves, but it is quite possible that his jacket is beneath him. Also, an additional dark jacket lies nearby. As to trousers, nine pairs can definitely be said to be Confederate. Of those remaining, there is simply no data forthcoming from two, and so, while there is nothing to support their being Southern military, there is also nothing to indicate they are Federal or civilian. In essence they are just as likely to be Confederate as anything else. With the last pair, the possibility exists that they are Federal in origin. Still, this is only a possibility. They are definitely military. Also on an individual basis, there are five men who wear uniforms in which the components match. On a group level, there are five soldiers whose uniforms are the same as at least one other creating a fair degree of uniformity in this sense. At the same time, considering that several of these views were recorded fairly far apart and in two out of three cases in which there is more than one individual for comparison uniforms can be deemed to match, the group sense of uniformity is really pretty good. Also, all are well shod.

Group GB: Photographs A, B, C, D, E, and F

These five views are said to show the same individual in two different locations. It is asserted that the first four images were recorded with the body in the position in which it was originally found. Then, for the probable sake of creating a more dramatic, artistic view,
he was moved about forty yards to the east on the blanket seen in GBF for the two final photographs which are amongst the most famous of Civil War death studies. The location for both sequences is the Devil's Den about two-hundred yards west of where the previous group was taken. The reputed single individual probably represents either the 1st Texas or the 17th Georgia Infantry Regiments, both of which are known to have been engaged in this immediate area. 37

Initially, the viewer is struck with the similarities between the man in the first four views and the one in the second two with the result that it appears that they are the same person. A close examination, however, reveals details indicating that, in fact, two separate men were photographed. For the sake of argument let us discuss the similarities. In each sequence we see a person of the same youthful age with dark hair of approximately the same length. In both instances, the individual lies in almost the same position in that he is on his back with the right leg extended and the left drawn up. In both sets, the subject wears a single-breasted frock coat (more on this later), and a leather sling crosses the body from over the right shoulder and passes beneath the left arm. Finally in each photograph a white fabric object lies on the man's stomach indicating the location of his wound.

While these are striking similarities, they are not substantial enough to support that these are the same men. The age is typical of many Civil War soldiers, and dark hair was certainly not uncommon. As to the length of the hair it would not be surprising if everyone in the entire company had a similar haircut as it is probable that one in-
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vidual in the outfit acted as barber for all. The position of the body is of little consequence. As certainly will have been noticed at this point, the majority of the casualties in the different photographs lie on their backs. That one leg would be extended and the other drawn up is natural and not an unlikely position to be in. That the same coat and piece of equipment is apparent is insignificant in terms of saying these are the same men. It is just as likely that we are viewing two men of the same unit who were identically kitted out in these regards. The two locations, as stated are only roughly forty yards apart and consequently, it would not be unlikely that two separate individuals from the same unit fell in these different places. The fact that the white cloth appears on the stomachs in each instance is more difficult to account for, yet it would not be out of the question that two different men received stomach wounds at roughly the same location and attempted to administer aid to themselves with a piece of white cloth.

Several facts indicate that these are not the same men. To begin with, the soldier in the first sequence clearly wears leggings which have come undone. That these would have remained in place in the course of moving the body is very unlikely. Yet upon viewing the individual in the second series, it is quite apparent that the cuff of his left trouser leg is tucked into something which is still in place and encircles the entire ankle. It seems improbable that the photographers took the time to resecure the legging especially when so little of it would show. More importantly, however, that worn by the man in the second sequence does not appear to be a legging. Its extreme bulkiness indicates that a sock is worn with the cuff tucked into it.
While the same coat is worn in both views, there are two minor variations in their construction. The first concerns the large and interesting patch pocket on the left breast noticeable in each instance. In both sequences the top opening for this feature is positioned between the third and fourth button. They are however of different depths. The pocket seen in the first series extends down almost to the waist seam where the skirts are sewn to the upper body. The pocket in the second set extends down only as far as the bottom buttonhole which is placed fairly far above the waist seam. A more noticeable difference is to be witnessed in the spacing of the buttonholes themselves. In both sequences there is an unobstructed view from a fairly direct angle of the left front openings of the garments. In the first set, the first four buttonholes from the waist up are evenly spaced. Then the span between the fourth and fifth is greatly reduced, and the distance from the fifth to the sixth is also less, but not as much. There is no indication of folds or bends in the fabric that would create a distortion of these distances. With the coat in the second series, the buttonholes are placed at fairly regular intervals down the entire front.

Another noticeable difference between the two groupings is that the man in the first clearly carries a haversack which can be seen above his left shoulder beside his head and the strap for this is visible running around his neck. There is no evidence of this piece of equipment in the second series. Of course, it is possible that if the body was relocated, this article may have been removed, but one must ask why when if such were the case the photographers took such great pains to
place other pieces of gear around as props and at the same time, left the leather sling in place.

One of the strongest indications that these are not the same individuals is to be seen in the pants. In the first series of four views, three distinctly different camera angles were employed which certainly involved different lighting angles and, quite probably, exposure times. Yet, in each instance the shade of the pants is identical to that of the coat. Furthermore, in all reproductions of these views in various volumes involving different processes, paper, etc., the trousers inevitably are the same tone as the coat. This seems highly unlikely if in fact they are not of the same fabric. That they are is confirmed by one very clear reproduction of one of the images in which not only are the shades the same, the texture of the material is also very evident for each article, and it is identical. This consists of a rough, heavy weave which in all probability is a cotton/wool blend.

In the second set of two photographs, although there is not much variation in camera angle, there is in terms of distance from the subject. In each view there is a marked contrast between the shade of the trousers and that of the coat. This contrast also remains consistent despite the source of the image and the obvious differences in how it was reproduced. Furthermore, in one of these versions, while the exact same texture can be discerned for the coat, it can not for the pants.

If the above facts do not convince the viewer that two different men are being seen, all we need do is examine their physical features. To begin with, the individual in the first series is of a much slighter build. More important, however, is an indisputable difference in the
facial features. The man in the first set has a short, extremely dished, and turned up nose. The man in the second has a long, narrow nose which borders on being Roman in profile.

A final argument involves the idea that this man was moved on the blanket visible in ABF. To begin with, this blanket appears in only one of the two variations of the photograph. If the body were moved on it this would involve first shooting the image with it in place, and then moving the individual a second time to remove the blanket. That the body was not moved a second time is quite apparent from the fact that not only is it in exactly the same position, even every wrinkle in the man's uniform is identical in each version. That he was moved and repositioned so perfectly is impossible. In actuality, close examination of ABF reveals that the blanket does not extend beneath the person. It is merely laid out next to him to create the illusion. For the inevitable sake of argument, if this were the same man, it is possible that he was transported on the blanket and shifted from it prior to the first photograph being taken for which the blanket itself was left in the view. For the second image it was removed. This is the only sequence of events that would account for the body itself not having been shifted between the two photographs. Still, there has been enough evidence to support that these are not the same men and accepting this, it is likely that the blanket was merely employed as a prop. That props were employed when working with both and that each set of views was contrived to a certain degree is apparent from various pieces of equipment that have obviously been moved around or which appear in one version within each set, but not another.
Having established that two separate individuals are to be seen in this group, we can now discuss what is worn and carried. As stated, each wears the same single-breasted, Confederate military frock coat, which is quite apparent from the long length, separately cut and attached skirts, medium shade, and single row of fasteners which close the garment to the neck. In both instances, there are six buttons, with the bottommost set above the waist seam. Stand-up collars of indeterminate pattern are also evident on both. Of special interest are the large, external patch pockets on the left breasts which are a previously unencountered attribute and clearly Southern. With each, the front opening is top-stitched very close to the edge in a manner frequently encountered on Confederate vests, but not previously witnessed on coats. At the same time, the plain cuffs show no evidence of any form of this sewing method. The rough, heavy texture indicates the strong probability that these are of woolen jeans.

As to the trousers, those on figure 1 are clearly Confederate military from the fact that they match the coat so perfectly in terms of shade and texture. Additional details, however, are not forthcoming. With figure 2's pants, again there are no definable details apart from their being of a lighter hue and different fabric than the coat. Considering this, it is impossible to give them a provenance, but there is no reason to believe they are not Southern military.

Other articles of clothing include shirts for both men. That worn by figure 1 has a checked pattern. As stated, this same man has leggings and figure 2 in all probability has heavy socks on. While figure 2's feet are not visible, those of figure 1 are. He clearly wears
Confederate made military bootees. The toe/vamp section is affixed over the front edges of the quarters rather than beneath them.

Regarding equipment, both have the already mentioned leather shoulder sling passing across their bodies. Considering that figure 1 also has a haversack with an obviously fabric sling, there can be little doubt that the leather ones support canteens.

Other equipment lies scattered about. Accepting that these views were, to a degree, set up, it is impossible to determine if any of this actually belonged to the men shown. Yet, these items were probably found in the area and may represent equipment carried by their unit if not personally. In the first set of four images, a fatigue cap or kepi is very noticeable. This is lined and has a squared visor. A tin cup is also present. There is also a jumble of fabric articles to be seen in the foreground of ABC, which although indefinable, give the impression that a bedroll or backpack was undone and its contents scattered about. By figure 2 there is also a fair amount of gear. A detached elliptical canteen whose large keepers and small size indicate its Southern origin and a cartridge box lie beside his left knee in ABE. His head rests on a soft backpack, which, considering this is a different individual who was not moved, is quite likely to actually be his. A very glossy but indefinable item lies behind him.

In this group, there is a nice sense of uniformity on an individual basis with figure 1 who wears a complete matching uniform inclusive of a single-breasted frock coat. Leggings are worn, and possibly the military cap is his as well. Between the two figures, there is a sense of uniformity in that each wears the same coat and at least one item of
equipment is the same. As to equipment, that discerned on figure 1 indicates that he is well appointed, and it is possible that some of the gear around figure 2 is actually his with the result that there is probably no lack with him either. Only figure 2's trousers remain in question, but this is again simply due to a lack of detail. They are just as likely to be Confederate as anything else.

Group GC: Photographs A, B, and C*

These three images show the same fifteen men from different angles. They were made at the southern end of the battlefield about one mile northwest of Big Round Top. The exact location is a field on the Rose Farm, and the men are from the brigades of Generals Paul J. Semmes and Joseph B. Kershaw. From the former unit, the 10th, 51st, and 53rd Georgia Infantry engaged here. From Kershaw's outfit, the 15th South Carolina fought in this locale. As the figures have been prepared for interment, no equipment is present except two blankets covering bodies.44

Primarily, this collection of fifteen individuals presents a mix and match impression in terms of uniforms. Yet, several articles of clothing worn by different men can be deemed the same. Figures 3, 4, and 13, wear identical Confederate shell jackets. Their type and origin is established by the matching medium shades, short lengths, manner

* Group GC and the following, GD, were recorded on the same part of the battlefield. Because of the number of both figures and images, and because two distinct groupings of each can be formed, they will be discussed separately.
"A Harvest of Death." (original title) "Confederate dead gathered for burial at the southwestern edge of the Rose Woods." (modern title)
"Confederate dead at the edge of the Rose Woods." (modern title)
of fastening to the neck, and stand-up collars. From the identical spacings it is apparent that each closes with eight buttons. These are metal. All three have plain front openings showing no evidence of top-stitching. As to other attributes, the same can not be seen consistently on all three because of camera angles, etc., but various ones can be detected on at least two at the same time which offer further support that they are, indeed, identical garments. While the cut of figure 13's collar can not be established, those on figures 3 and 4 are either a Style E or F pattern. The jackets of figures 4 and 13 both have untrimmed epaulets. In each case, these taper, and with 13 these can be seen to conform to the Style B pattern, and they are top-stitched around the edges. Both these jackets have Style B hem/front opening angles. Also noticeable on 4's are plain cuffs. On 13's there is no evidence of external pockets.

While these individuals have identical jackets, only 3 and 4 wear the same trousers. These are an identical dark tone. The waistband of figure 4's trousers can be seen to secure in accordance with the Style C method. With both, the main button would be visible when closed, and with each, the visible end of the waistband when fastened is of the Style A pattern. That both pairs are Southern military is confirmed by their being too dark for Federal issue. In the case of figure 3, this is further supported by their Style A pockets and the absence of a cuff slit. The fly buttons are a light shade and as such are probably bone. Figure 4's have a mixed set of buttons in that those for suspenders and the fly proper are also a light shade, while that which fastens the waistband is a very dark hue, indicating hard rubber or japanned metal. Figure 3's pants are untrimmed.
The trousers of figure 13 are altogether different. These are a medium tone slightly lighter than the jacket. These also have light tinted suspender buttons. Confirming their Confederate military nature are the Style A pockets which button and the lack of a cuff slit. These, too, are constructed without piping.

There are four additional shell jackets worn in these views which are similar in tone to those described but not quite the same. At the same time, while each possesses certain attributes that are the same as seen on the three already mentioned, each also has such that mark them as different from the first three and each other as well. These are worn by figures 2, 8, 11, and 12. In addition to their shades which identify them as Confederate, their type is defined by the short lengths, method of closure to the neck, and stand-up collars. Apparent from the spacing of the buttonholes on 11's and the metal buttons, themselves, on 12's each of these jackets possesses eight or nine fasteners. Both have plain front openings. Separating them from the first group of three is the fact that each has a Style C hem/front opening angle. Separating these two from each other, but in some instances the same as the first three, are the following attributes. Figure 11's jacket has plain Style B epaulets, but figure 12's does not have any. At the same time, figure 12's is not top-stitched along the front opening whereas that worn by 11 has received this treatment around the hem, front opening, and plain cuffs. This garment is also lined with the typical Southern undyed or bleached fabric. Figure 12's is made without an external righthand pocket.

As to the trousers worn by figures 11 and 12, those of the latter
are a dark tone. This is too dark for Federal issue, and so, they must be accepted as Confederate. Supporting this is the manner in which the pocket lining is pulled out indicating that the main opening is horizontal. This points to their being Style B, C, or E, anyone of which is typically Confederate. The pants of figure 11 are a medium shade, a tad darker than the jacket, and untrimmed. These have Style F pockets. That they are Southern military is confirmed by the positioning of the left front pair of suspender buttons. The first is affixed roughly centered between the fly opening and the side seam. The second and outermost is mounted directly over the side seam itself. Furthermore, there is no cuff slit.

As to the jackets worn by figures 2 and 8 the same situation is encountered in that there are attributes present which are the same as on some previously described, but there are also those which distinguish them from the earlier and each other as different items. Neither are top-stitched. Both have Style B hem/front opening angles and plain closed cuffs without buttons. The number of buttons on the front opening can not be determined for figure 8's jacket, but on figure 2's there are nine. Also, the collar pattern of figure 8's is indefinable, but that on figure 2 is consistent with the Style C configuration. This in itself marks this garment as different, but an additional feature of the collar clearly defining it as such is the Style B trim. Figure 8's collar is plain. Another noticeable and distinguishing attribute of figure 2's garment are the external welted pockets on both the left and right breast. Returning to figure 8, although difficult to discern with any certainty, it appears that his jacket possesses
epaulets. Whether or not figure 2's has them is impossible to determine due to his shoulders being obscured from view. It is evident, however, that the front opening of his jacket is untrimmed.

Regarding the trousers worn by each of these men, both match the respective jackets perfectly in terms of shade. This confirms their being Confederate military in that they are obviously matching uniform components. They also present variant attributes showing that, like the jackets, they, themselves, are not the same. Those worn by figure 2 have Style B pockets, while those on figure 8 have Style A. In addition to the pockets, further supporting the Southern nature of figure 8's is the absence of a cuff slit. Figure 2's do not have piping.

Another individual, 6, wears a uniform which is complete in the sense that both jacket and pants are identical in terms of their shades. Both are a medium tone, considerably lighter than that of the jackets already described. This, combined with the short length, method of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar mark the upper body garment's type and provenance. The collar itself conforms to the Style D pattern and is untrimmed. The spacing of the buttons is tight, but the number can not be determined. There is a Style B hem/front opening angle, and at least both these areas are top-stitched. There is not an external pocket on the left.

As to his trousers, apart from their shade and lack of trim, the only detail that can be discerned is that they are supported by suspenders. As with previous uniforms, however, the fact that their tone matches that of the jacket so perfectly indicates that they are a uniform article of Southern manufacture.
Figures 14 and 15 wear the same uniforms. Each has on a Confederate shell jacket of an identical shade (ranging from medium to dark medium depending on the version viewed). The type is again defined by the short length and the fact that each closes to the neck. Further supporting that they are, indeed, the same is the fact that the fairly tight button spacings are identical on both. The buttons on 14's jacket are clearly metal. This same garment was made without epaulets. Figure 15's has a Style B hem/front opening angle.

Their trousers match in a shade which is lighter than the jackets. This indicates that they are uniform articles. That they are, in fact, the same, is supported by each having Style D pockets. Whether or not these button can not be discerned. Although the style can not be determined, the lining for a watch pocket is to be seen on the pair worn by figure 14. This same pair is supported by suspenders. The fact that these pants are identical and are worn with coats that are also the same leaves little room for doubt that they are of Southern origin despite the tint and pocket style.

Also, in terms of garments that match, although their jackets are completely different, the trousers worn by figure 10 are exactly the same as those already described for figure 11. In addition to being the exact same shade and untrimmed, these also possess Style F pockets. The buttons on both 10 and 11, which appear a different tone depending on the view examined, are nevertheless, consistently the same shade within each separate image. Also, with 10, the outermost suspender button on the right side is mounted directly over the side seam. The waistband is secured in the Style A fashion, and when closed
the visible end is of the Style A pattern. Their shade matching 11's combined with other identical attributes identify these as Confederate military.

Figure 10's upper body garment is a shell jacket evident from the short length, manner of closing to the neck, and plain, stand-up collar. Clearly from the spacing of the holes, this garment fastens with nine buttons. The plain cuffs are closed and do not have decorative buttons. There is not a lefthand external pocket. It is an extremely dark tone, but there is nothing about it such as epaulets, trim, or a pocket that would support that it is not Confederate military.

Each of the remaining uniforms are unique in and of themselves in that they do not match any others, and with only one do the components match. Figure 1 wears a single-breasted Confederate military frock coat. Its medium shade, manner of fastening to the neck, stand-up collar, and long length confirm this. It should be noted that the skirts are pulled back beneath his head - obviously the result of having been dragged from some other position. The collar has an angled front edge and as such conforms to the Style B pattern. The cuffs are plain. What is odd about this coat is the number of buttons that close the front opening. There are only four. The front opening, itself, is not top-stitched. What the object is draped over his left shoulder and seemingly attached to the base of the coat's collar is impossible to determine. One's initial reaction is that it is a cape, but examination reveals it to be a lighter shade. Its tone is not a substantial argument against its being such, but it is truly difficult to imagine that a cape was worn during the incredible heat at Gettysburg.
Regarding his trousers, they are the same shade as the coat, indicating they are Confederate military. They have Style F pockets. The buttons for the suspenders are a very glaring light hue indicating they are probably bone.

Nothing can be determined about what figure 9 wears on the upper part of his body due to its being obscured from view in all three images. As to figures 5 and 7, neither wears a jacket or a coat. Regarding the trousers of these three men, all are different from each other. Those worn by figure 9 are a dark shade which is too dark for Federal issue. Those of figure 5 are a dark/medium tone, also too dark to be Northern in origin. These have Style F pockets. While it is impossible to say with certainty, it appears that this pair has piping. If so, this, in conjunction with the shade would indicate they are Southern military. Of interest are the trousers worn by figure 7. A medium shade and untrimmed, these are pocketless at least on the right side. Although no suspenders are in evidence, a single suspender button can be observed affixed directly over the side seam in accordance with Confederate military fashion. These are undoubtedly Southern military in origin.

As to other articles of clothing, only the jacketless figure 5 wears a vest. This fastens to the neck and lacks lapels in accordance with military fashion. A dark shade, this does not match his trousers.

Apart from figure 9 whose upper body area can not be seen, all these individuals wear shirts. The feet of all but figures 2 and 4 can be seen. Figures 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 14, all wear military shoes conforming to the bootee style. Those on figure 1 are clearly
Confederate in that there are only two pairs of lace holes. Figures 8, 9, 11, and 15, also wear shoes but the type can not be determined. Those on figure 8 do, however, appear to be very worn. This is the only instance of shoes in poor condition in the entire sample. Figure 10 is shoeless. He does, however, wear socks, which, as with previous individuals, indicates he possessed shoes initially when going into action. While on the topic, figures 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, and 14, also wear socks. In all other instances, these articles of footwear are blocked from view. Of note in terms of footwear is the fact that figure 11 wears light colored leggings. A felt slouch hat covers figure 5's face, and another lies on the ground by figure 15.

Although there are better photographs for ascertaining group uniformity amongst Confederate troops, there is, nevertheless, a good degree on an individual basis here. Of the twelve visible coats and jackets, all are Confederate military. With trousers, thirteen pairs can definitely be said to be Confederate as well. Another is, in all probability, Southern military as well. As to the final pair, while no hard details can be defined, they are too dark to be Federal, and as previously argued, they are just as likely to be Confederate as civilian. Also on an individual basis, there are four men who sport uniforms with matching components. All but one have shoes, and this man, another with damaged shoes, and the two without jackets present the only real problems in these views.

On a group level, while none too great, there is a certain degree of uniformity. There are two groups of two men who wear identical uniforms. A third man wears a jacket that is the same as those in one
of these categories. Also, although wearing different jackets, two more men have identical trousers on.

Still, as far as complete uniforms are concerned in terms of both jackets and pants of one man being the same as those of another there is very little uniformity. Inclusive of the two men without coats or jackets and the figure whose torso can not be seen, as many as thirteen distinct outfits are in evidence. This great variety can be accounted for in two ways. Partially this is explained by there being perhaps as many as four different regiments represented, but this would not account for the greater number of differences observed. Consequently, it is probable that a number of different issues are being witnessed within each command. This is supported by the men who wear the same jackets but not pants and vice-versa. To a lesser degree this is also supported by the number of individuals who sport shell jackets which are obviously different, but which are a similar shade and share various attributes but not all. This implies that some attempt was being made to maintain a sense of uniformity within at least one of these regiments, but, in terms of specific details was not possible as each issue was marked with its own distinctive attributes.

Group GD: Photographs A, B, C, D, E, F, and G

The first six of these views show the same group of nineteen men from various angles. These are the collection of bodies that can be seen on the horizon in GCB. The seventh photograph is of an additional lone figure who lies further north of the main group. Figure 7 will
not be discussed as it is obvious from the sword scabbard at his left side worn in association with a double-breasted frock coat, that he is an officer. As with the individuals in the previous group all but figure 20 have been laid out for burial with the result that all equipment has been removed. There is a good sense of uniformity with these men on an individual basis and, unlike their comrades to the south, between individuals. 48

Figures 1, 3, 4, and 6, are dressed alike in dark/medium Confederate shell jackets. In each case, in addition to the shade, the type is indicated by the short length and method of closure to the neck. With figures 3 and 4, stand-up collars are visible and that of the latter individual is a Style A configuration. Also, it is a darker, contrasting color indicating Style B collar trim. This same jacket closes with nine metal buttons, the spacing of which is identical to the metal buttons on figure 1. Both these jackets have plain closed cuffs without buttons. Figure 4’s has a Style C hem/front opening angle. The hem itself appears to be cut straight all around indicating the Style D pattern. There is no evidence of top-stitching on the hem or the cuffs or front opening. Also, this same garment does not have belt loops or an external pocket on the right.

The trousers of these four men are an identical medium tone much lighter than the jackets. This shading confirms their being military. Details discernible on those of figures 1, 3, and 4, confirm they are Confederate, and support that they are the same. This, in turn further supports that the jackets themselves are identical. The pants on both figures 1 and 3 have Style A pockets. The full pocket configuration of
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figure 4's can not be seen, but it is evident that the main opening runs along the side seam, and given the perfectly matching shades, this undoubtedly indicates the same pocket style. All three pairs have fairly wide waistbands. In addition, the buttons on figures 1 and 3 are a dark shade indicating the likelihood of their being hard rubber or japanned metal. Noticeable on figure 3's is that the end of the waistband which would be internal when fastened extends beyond the edge of the fly and has two buttons affixed to it. When closed, these fasteners would be external and thus visible. The end of the waistband that would be seen when secured is of the Style B pattern. This same attribute can be witnessed on the pants of figure 1. Also, both 1's and 3's trousers are untrimmed. Apart from their matching shading, no other detail can be discerned about the trousers of figure 6.

A second group of four individuals, 15, 16, 18, and 19, are also dressed alike in coats or jackets of a matching dark/medium shade. Unfortunately, the exact type can not be established for these garments because in each instance, the hems are blocked from view. That they are Confederate military is evident from the tone, single-breasted methods of closure to the neck, and the stand-up collars visible on each. The collars of figures 15, 16, and 18, are of the Style G pattern as per shell jackets. The visible cuff of figure 16's jacket has two buttons, but it is impossible to tell if they are functional or decorative. This same garment closes with at least six metal buttons. Apart from their being an identical medium shade lighter than the coats/jackets, no detail can be discerned about the trousers. The fact, however that they are the same hue indicates at least that they
are military, and in light of the fact there are four pairs worn with obviously Southern jackets or coats, there can be no doubt the pants are Southern as well.

The uniforms of figures 10 and 11 also match each other. That both wear Confederate shell jackets is apparent from the medium shade, short lengths, and manner of closure to the neck. In each case, they fasten with nine buttons, which with figure 11 are clearly metal. Both are top-stitched on at least the front opening, and both possess Style C hem/front opening angles. Each front opening, itself, is untrimmed.

Their trousers match each other and the jackets in tone verifying that they are Confederate military articles. Additional details are forthcoming from figure 11's. These have light colored fly buttons which are probably bone. More indicative of their Southern nature, however, is the fact that the waistband is secured in accordance with the Style C method. When fastened, the main button would be internal.

Two other figures wear identical coats. These are figures 13 and 14 who are clad in double-breasted frock coats. Each presents an identical texture as well as medium shade. The texture indicates the fabric is woolen jeans. The long length of figure 13's is clearly evident, and although the hem can not be seen on figure 14's its long length is apparent from the manner in which the skirts slope away from the vent in back and fall along his sides. Both have stand-up collars of indeterminate style. That they fasten to the neck and are double-breasted is established by the button arrangement on figure 14's garment. Two closely spaced metal buttons can be seen beneath his shoulder on the left side. The height on the garment at which they are
affixed establishes that the coat closes to the neck, and the fact they are placed so far over on the left front confirms that the coat is double-breasted. Although it is impossible to say with certainty, of interest is that the skirts on figure 13's coat appear to possess neither side edges or pleats.

Whereas these men's coats are identical, their trousers are not. Figure 14's are a very light tone which is all that can be determined about them. Figure 13's however are exactly the same shade and texture as his coat, verifying that they are Southern military. Additional data supports this. They have Style A pockets, and the visible, light colored, suspender button is mounted directly over the side seam.

Two individuals, 5 and 9, wear uniforms in which the respective jackets and pants match each other perfectly, but these outfits do not match each other or any other in the group. Figure 5 wears a Confederate shell jacket which is evident from the medium shade, short length, method of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar. The latter attribute is the Style G pattern. The front is fastened with six buttons. Also noticeable is a Style B hem/front opening angle. In addition to being the exact shade as the jacket, figure 5's trousers are untrimmed and do not have a cuff slit. They are Confederate military.

As to figure 9's clothing, the short length, dark/medium shade, and stand-up collar indicate that a Confederate shell jacket is worn. The collar is the Style B configuration. The pants are the exact same hue indicating a complete uniform with matching components. The fly buttons, the only discernible hard detail, are a very light tone and probably bone. Still despite the lack of detail, enough data is present to
establish both articles as Southern military.

Three men, 12, 17, and 20, wear uniforms in which the jackets and trousers do not match each other or any one else's. Figure 12 has on a Confederate shell jacket of a medium shade. Its short length and manner of closing to the neck with metal buttons establishes its type in conjunction with its tone. This has a Style A hem/front opening angle. Both the closed, buttonless cuffs and the front opening are plain. Also, neither of these areas or the hem show evidence of top-stitching.

His untrimmed trousers are a slightly darker hue. Confirming they are Confederate military is the fact they have Style A pockets. Also, there is no evidence that these were to be worn with suspenders.

Figure 17 wears a dark/medium Confederate shell jacket whose shade combined with its short length, closure to the neck with five to six metal buttons, and stand-up collar define it as such. The collar itself is of the Style F configuration and plain. The edges of the untrimmed front opening are top-stitched, and where this meets the hem, there is a Style C angle. Of interest are the lighter, contrasting colored chevrons on his right sleeve indicating his status as a noncommissioned officer. Nothing can be discerned about his trousers other than that they are light tone, too light to be Federal.

With figure 20, we again have an individual wearing a Confederate shell jacket. Its medium tint, short length, and method of closure to the neck confirm its type and origin. In addition, the buttonhole spacing is very tight, the front opening and plain cuffs are top-stitched, and there is a Style A hem/front opening angle. Other than
that they are a medium shade, slightly lighter than the jacket, the only definable detail of his pants is that the main opening to the pockets is along the side seam. This indicates that they are either of Style A or F construction.

Figure 2 is of interest in that he too wears a double-breasted frock coat. His, however, is a dark hue. Confirming it as this type is the row of metal buttons set far over on the left front side with a wide expanse of fabric to the right of it. There are seven buttons in this line conforming to Confederate regulations. In addition, the garment fastens to the neck and has a stand-up collar. Although its hem can not actually be seen, the way the front falls open and drapes down indicates a long length. Nothing can be determined about his trousers other than that they are a medium shade, which is identical to that of figures 1, 3, 4, and 6, and have light colored suspender buttons. This supports their being Confederate military as well.

This leaves figure 8. Very little can be discerned about him despite his full exposure from different angles in two views. His trousers are also the same medium shade as those on figures 1, 3, 4, and 6, indicating they, too, are Southern issue. It is tempting to say that he wears a shell jacket that matches in tone, but it is entirely possible that he does not wear a jacket at all and is clad only in a shirt. There simply are no definable details.

As to other clothing articles, only figure 17 wears a vest. This matches the shade of his jacket perfectly and closes to the neck in accordance with military fashion. Of the men where such is not blocked from view, figures 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 20, have
shirts on. The feet of sixteen men are visible and in each instance, shoes are worn. Those on figures 1, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18, are of indeterminate type, while those worn by figures 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 20, are military bootees. Figure 10 wears low cut shoes. Socks can be detected on figures 5, 10, and 12. Figures 1 and 3 wear leggins. In the former instance, these are white and in the latter they are a darker shade.

With the exception of figure 20 and the undescribed figure 7, all equipment has been removed. In fact, in the first six images, the only piece of equipment that can be seen even on the ground is a British Enfield type cartridge box that lies at the feet of figures 5 and 6. These two men are, however, covered with blankets. Figure 20 wears a waist belt and beside him lies one of the most unusual accoutrements encountered in the study. This is a cartridge box, the general pattern and shape of which conform to the British Enfield type. There are, however, two very interesting and unusual features to it. First of all, it does not have the standard, tight fitting inner flap. Instead, there are two long ears that attached to the sides which fold over beneath the main flap. More intriguing, however, is that it has a cap box mounted directly on the front of the box proper that would be beneath the main flap when it was closed. More interesting even yet is the fact that although the flap of this cap box seems to be normal, tanned leather, the leather employed in constructing the body of the item retains medium length fur. From the shape of the spout and its being uncovered, the elliptical tin canteen on the ground appears to be Southern made.
As stated and shown, there is a good individual sense of uniformity in these views, and the group sense is far superior to that of their comrades further down the field. Individually, with nineteen men, eighteen definitely wear Confederate coats or jackets. With the remaining man, it is simply impossible to determine what he wears. As to trousers, sixteen pairs can be firmly identified as Southern military. The remaining three pairs simply present no data whereby they can be firmly provenanced. Two pairs, however, are too light to be Federal. As per previous arguments, there is no reason to believe these two pairs of trousers are anything but Confederate as well. Also, on an individual basis, there are four men who sport uniforms with which the components match. All are well shod.

Between the men, there are three groupings of identical uniforms encompassing ten men. Two additional soldiers, although wearing different pants, have identical Type A coats. Two additional men in variant coats and jackets wear the same pants as the first group of four individuals. Still, when these four distinct outfits are combined with the seven additional figures each uniquely attired in and of himself, there remains a total of eleven different uniforms in evidence which again indicate a mix and match situation on a group level. This state of affairs is heightened when it is considered that all efforts to link uniforms in this series with those in Group GC have met with failure. The bottom line is that in a total of ten photographs representing only four different regiments, there are no less than twenty-four different uniform combinations. Thus, while these men were well dressed on an individual basis, their respective commands presented a
hodgepodge appearance. Still, those units who fought on the northern part of the field were better appointed in a group sense than those to the south.

Group GE: Photographs A and B

These two images were recorded somewhere on or near the Rose Farm. The exact locations have not been determined. Consequently, it is impossible to even venture a guess as to which units these men belonged to. Nor, is there any link between the two views themselves, but for the sake of convenience, they will be dealt with together.

In image GEA, the viewer is once again presented with a seemingly hodgepodge of uniforms. There is, however, a certain sense of uniformity. Although he is the only one that does so, figure 1 wears a Confederate uniform in which the jacket and pants match in a dark/medium tone. The shading combined with the short length denote that he does have on a jacket which is Southern military. This has plain closed cuffs without buttons. The fact that the trousers match the jacket verifies that they too are military and of the same origin. The only hard detail that can be discerned supports this. There is no cuff slit.

Other items that are the same in this view are the dark toned shell jackets on figures 2 and 3. That they are this type is verified by their short lengths and manner of closure to the necks. That worn by figure 2 has a Style C hem/front opening angle. Despite the dark shades, there is nothing to suggest that these are of Federal origin,
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"Confederate soldiers who had evidently been shelled by our batteries on Round Top," (original title) "Confederate dead, probably on or near the Rose farm." (modern title)
"Unfinished Confederate grave near the centre of the battlefield."
(original title) "Unfinished Confederate grave, probably on the
Rose farm." (modern title)
and given the number of dark jackets already discussed that are clearly Southern, there is no reason to believe that these are not as well.

While the jackets of these two individuals match, their trousers do not. Of a medium hue, those worn by figure 2 are darker than figure 3's. The only discernible detail on 2's are that when fastened, the visible end of the waistband offers a Style A pattern, and they are supported with suspenders. That figure 3's are clearly Confederate and military is confirmed by the Style A pockets. Both pairs are untrimmed.

Figure 4 also wears a dark/medium toned Southern shell jacket whose shade is identical to that on figure 1. The tone verifies its origins, and the type is evident from its short length and its fastening to the neck. This article lacks an external pocket on the right side. In addition to their medium shade, lighter than the jacket, several features can be determined about his trousers. To begin with, they are untrimmed. Suspenders can be seen and the visible buttons supporting them are a very dark shade indicative of hard rubber or japanned metal. Last of all, confirming their Southern military nature are the Style B pockets.

As to other articles of clothing, figure 1 wears a vest of indeterminate type the shade of which is much lighter than the rest of his outfit. All four wear shirts and all have shoes on. Those on figure 1 are of indiscernible pattern, while those of figures 2 and 4 are military bootees. Figure 3's are interesting in that it is possible they are canvas with leather soles. While of military pattern in that they are ankle high, close examination reveals that the material employed
for the uppers is pulled and slightly wrinkled indicating that it is lightweight in nature and, thus, possibly fabric. Socks are also in evidence on figure 4. A broad brimmed straw or felt hat lies on the ground.

The only equipment that can be detected is on figures 1 and 3. With figure 1, only a covered tin elliptical canteen is visible, but 3 is well appointed. It is clear from the positions of the bodies that these individuals have been collected for burial. Consequently, the absence of gear on figures 2 and 4 is explained, but why figure 3 still retains a considerable amount is a mystery. There are two acceptable explanations. His body was moved to this location by a different detail who simply did not bother to remove his equipment or, he lies where he originally fell, is untouched, and the other three were moved to his vicinity and stripped in the process. In any case, a waist cartridge box and a cap box are to be seen. The presence of those items indicates that a waist belt must be worn as well, although such is not visible. The cap box is interesting because of its very square shape which is not a typical pattern and supports its being of Southern origin. In addition, a haversack lies on his stomach.

Of the five individuals in GEC, the jackets/coats of figures 5 and 9 are totally obscured from view. Those worn by the remaining figures, however, are identical shell jackets. These three garments are an identical dark shade and all have plain, closed, top-stitched cuffs without buttons. That they are this type is evident from the short length, manner of fastening to the neck, and stand-up collar of figure 3's in conjunction with the shared attributes described. There are no
definable features to suggest that these are Federal despite their dark hue. In fact, in addition to dark shades not necessarily indicating Northern issue as previously pointed out, the lack of a functional cuff on all three supports that these are Southern made. Actually, the very fact they match in shade supports their being Confederate as it is extremely doubtful that three different men procured the same rare Northern garments and were killed and buried together.

Unlike the jackets, there is no sense of uniformity with the trousers. Those that can be seen are on figures 7, 8, and 9, and do not match either each other or the respective jackets. Figure 7's are a medium shade, and untrimmed, but the lack of a cuff slit indicates they are not Federal issue. Apart from being a dark/medium shade, too dark to be Federal, nothing can be determined about figure 8's trousers. With figure 9, even a shade is impossible to determine due to there being only a small section of cuff visible. Still, although it is difficult to determine with any certainty, there does not appear to be a cuff slit with his either. These, too, do not have piping.

As to other clothing, nothing can be discerned other than footwear which is visible on figures 5, 7, 8, and 9. All have shoes on, and of these, those worn by the last three men are military bootees. Of interest are figure 8's which are higher than usual. While it cannot be said with certainty, it is possible that these are English military as this height is consistent with such. Socks can also be seen on figures 7 and 8.

These views present an interesting sense of uniformity. Individually, of the seven discernible jackets, all are Confederate issue.
With the seven visible pairs of pants, however, only three can be firmly provenanced as such. With the remaining four pairs, there is simply not enough data to establish their place of origin. Still, two pairs can definitely be said not to be Federal and a third is probably not as well. As argued previously, however, despite a lack of hard details, there is no reason to believe that these four pairs are anything but Confederate military. Only one man wears a uniform with matching components.

At the same time, while no two wear complete uniforms that are identical, the seven jackets can be organized into three groupings in which they can be deemed the same. For a total of nine individuals, this is a very acceptable figure. In essence, as far as upper body wear is concerned, these men are well uniformed in a group sense as well as an individual one. The explanation is obvious. We are witnessing a classic example of trousers wearing out faster than jackets. Men from three different commands are observed who, within each grouping, wear jackets dating from the same issue and source. While these have survived, the trousers have long since been replaced at various intervals and represent different issues and sources with the result that none match. Finally, there is no evidence of a lack of footwear in these two images.

Additional Comments on Missing Articles in the Gettysburg Views

In the Gettysburg photographs, we have witnessed three men, figure 8 in Group GA, and figures 5 and 7 in Group GC, who do not wear jack-
ets. Also, it is possible that figure 3 in Group GD also lacks such a garment. With the first of these individuals, it has already been pointed out that the dark, fabric object beneath his shoulder is quite possibly his jacket. If so, it indicates that he was not killed instantly and the garment was removed and placed beneath him for comfort during his last moments. This same situation may well have occurred for the other of these men as well. Removal of such after receiving a serious wound would be a very normal action. Also, however, the heat at Gettysburg was extremely intense. It is just as possible that these individuals removed their jackets or coats in an effort to combat it. Not a very military procedure, mind you, but very possible and supported by the loose jacket in GAE. Furthermore, figure 8 in Group GA and figure 5 in Group GC are otherwise too well appointed not to have had jackets. The first man is obviously a part of a very well uniformed command in that his remaining clothing perfectly matches that of two other men in the same views. Consequently, if he did not have a jacket initially upon going into action, there must be a very legitimate reason for it. With figure 5 in GC we see a man who despite the lack of a jacket wears a military vest. It is difficult to imagine that he possessed and retained such an item but did not have a coat or jacket. As has been pointed out, extra, unworn jackets do appear indicating that for one reason or another, they were taken off during battle and lost.

Figure 10 in GC wears socks but no shoes. As mentioned in other instances, this clearly implies that he initially had shoes but they were removed. The part of the battlefield on which these views were
recorded was ultimately taken by the Confederates and remained behind their lines for the duration of the engagement. In fact, it is believed that these men were prepared for burial by their own comrades. Consequently, because the time and opportunity were available, it must be accepted that this fellow's shoes were probably taken by one of his own needy comrades. Thus, we have the only likely instance of Southern troops robbing the dead in this entire study.

Spotsylvania, May 8 – 20, 1864

These photographs were recorded on the morning of May 20, 1864, by Timothy O'Sullivan while in the employ of Alexander Gardner, and show Confederate casualties from the Battle of Harris's Farm fought on the previous day. This action was part of the larger Battle of Spotsylvania which began on May 8. Because O'Sullivan was on the scene so quickly, these views offer some excellent data on equipment.

Group SA: Photographs A, B, C, D, and E

These images were taken near and at the Alsop House at the center of the battlefield. Heavily engaged in the area was the brigade of General Stephen D. Ramseur. This unit consisted of the 2nd, 4th, 14th, and 30th North Carolina Infantry Regiments. At least some of the men in these views were probably part of Ramseur's command. Of note is the fact that O'Sullivan obviously was following the policing and burial details. Figures 1 and 2 who both sport an incredible amount of equip-
ment were clearly initially photographed where they fell. Each, however, also appears in a later image bereft of all gear. The man on the stretcher in SAD is figure 1, and in SAE, the man laying perpendicular to the row of bodies about halfway up it is figure 2. These views offer firm support that it was the general practice to remove all vestiges of equipment prior to interment. 61

There is an excellent degree of uniformity in these views on an individual basis and a good sense between the individuals. Figures 1 and 2 are dressed identically in dark/medium shaded Confederate shell jackets. Their tones, short lengths, closure to the necks, and stand-up collars mark their origin and type. The collars, themselves, are either a Style B or D pattern and appear to be plain. The spacing indicates that the fronts of each garment close with eight metal buttons. Epaulets exist on both. While there is no top-stitching in either case along the front openings, which are untrimmed, it is apparent that the cuffs of figure 2's jacket are constructed in this way. It is impossible to tell if figure 2's cuffs are top-stitched or not, but from his jacket it can be discerned that the sleeves are of two piece construction. In both instances it is evident that the cuffs are plain, and those of figure 2 are clearly closed and lack buttons. Figure 1's jacket is also lined with a fairly dark, solid colored fabric, and on either side there are Style A internal breast pockets.

Each also wears untrimmed trousers the shades of which are identical to the jackets indicating they are matching uniform components and Confederate military. With figure 2 in SAE, one's immediate reaction is that the jacket and pants do not match in hue, but comparison of the
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"Scene at Mrs. Allsop's Pine Forest, near Spotsylvania, on the morning of the 20th May, after Ewell's Corps had been repulsed in their attack of the 19th on the right." (original title) "Confederate dead near Mrs. Allsop's house, Spotsylvania." (modern title)
"Dead Confederate soldier, near Mrs. Alsop's house, Spotsylvania." (modern title)
"Dead Confederate soldier, near Mrs. Alsop's house, Spotsylvania." (modern title)
"Scene at Mrs. Alsop's house, Spotsylvania." (modern title)
"Confederate dead, laid out for burial near Mrs. Alsop's house, Spotsylvania." (modern title)
"1st Mass. Heavy Artillery Bury the Dead at Mrs. Allsop's House, Pine Forest near Spottsylvania Court House, After the battle of 19th May, 1864." (original title) "Members of the 1st Massachusetts Heavy Artillery burying the dead at Mrs. Alsop's house, Spotsylvania." (modern title)
right front of the jacket with the knees of the pants which are receiving the same light shows that they are in fact the same. The initial feeling that the jacket is darker is the result of shadows. Furthermore, in SAA and SAC, it is quite evident that his trousers match his jacket in tone and in the latter view even the texture of the fabric can be determined to be the same. Figure 1's trousers also initially appear to be a different shade but examination reveals that two factors account for this. The knees and fronts on the lower legs are covered with mud, and it is evident that the barrier he lies against is casting a shadow which reaches to about mid-thigh. Additional details support that they are the same and of Southern military origin. Both have Style A pockets. With figure 1, there is no cuff slit.

Figures 6 and 7 wear the same Confederate shell jackets. That they are this type is evident from their matching medium shades, short lengths, manner of closure to the necks, and stand-up collars. These collars offer additional evidence supporting that these jackets are the same. Both are untrimmed and conform to the Style C pattern. The plain cuffs of figure 6's garment are clearly top-stitched, and closed, but it is possible that buttons are present. This part of the jacket is blocked from view with figure 7. Also, discernible on figure 6's but not on 7's for the same reason, is a Style B hem/front opening angle, with the latter area being undecorated. There is no external righthand pocket.

As to their trousers, these match neither each other or the jackets. Figure 6's are darker and figure 7's are slightly lighter than the respective jackets. Figure 6's are too dark for Federal issue and
confirming they are Confederate is the obvious lack of a cuff slit. From the stiffened nature of the front of the cuff, it is evident that there is a Style A or B internal reinforcement. Furthermore, the waistband and fly buttons are a dark color indicating the probability that they are hard rubber or japanned metal. The waistband itself is secured in accordance with the Style A method. The pockets are not completely visible, but it is apparent that there is a large vertical opening at the side seam showing them to be either Style A, D, or F. These are untrimmed. That figure 7’s pants are Confederate also is clear from the Style C pockets combined with the very dark hued fly buttons. There is no indication that these were to be worn with suspenders.

Figure 4 wears a Confederate shell jacket, which is again obvious from the light shade, short length, manner of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar. This last attribute conforms to the Style C pattern. This garment is also top-stitched along the front opening which is untrimmed.

His pants match his jacket perfectly in terms of both shade and texture indicating they are Confederate military. Although the pockets, themselves, again can not be seen, the way their linings are pulled out indicates that the main opening is horizontal. Thus, they are either of Style B, C, or E construction. These pants are worn with suspenders and the buttons for them are a dark tone.

Figure 5 wears a Southern shell jacket which is a dark/medium tone. It is the appropriate short length, fastens to the neck, and has a plain stand-up collar in accordance with this type. Also noticeable is an extreme Style B hem/front opening angle. Both the hem and un-
trimmed front opening are top-stitched. The trimmed, closed, buttonless cuffs, however, are not. The trim consists of dark piping (probably black), but the exact configuration can not be defined. There is no external pocket on the right side.

His untrimmed trousers are a medium shade which is lighter than the jacket. These have either Style A or D pockets that button. Indicating that they are Southern is the fact that they are worn without suspenders and have dark colored fly buttons, but more importantly, there is no cuff slit.

Figure 3 offers some very nice detail which identifies his clothing items as unmistakably Confederate military. From the light shade, manner of closure to the neck, short length, and stand-up collar it is quite evident he wears a shell jacket of Southern manufacture. The top-stitched collar itself is either a Style B or D configuration. Although it is missing most of its metal buttons, it is apparent from the spacing that eight were originally employed to close the untrimmed front opening. This area is top-stitched, and there is a Style A hem/front opening angle. Although difficult to discern, because not completely visible, it is evident from the way the fabric is bunched on the right shoulder that epaulets are present. The cuffs are plain. Also noticeable is a typically Confederate lining of undyed or bleached fabric, and although it is difficult to tell with certainty, there seems to be a Style A internal breast pocket on the left side.

His trousers offer some interesting data. Their dark tone is too extreme for them to be of Federal origin. Furthermore, there are several attributes confirming they are Southern military. They possess Style E pockets. While the visible suspender button is seemingly a
fairly light shade, this appears to be more the result of reflection rather than being indicative of its true hue. Its actual configuration is identical to the hard rubber types examined on extant examples. The waistband is secured in the Style A method with the visible end conforming to the Style B pattern. Of note is the fact that these also have internal cuff reinforcements. Here, however, they are of the Style C pattern. About a quarter of the way up from the cuff to the knee a very heavy basting stitch causing the leg to pucker can be seen. Also, from that point down to the cuff the pant leg appears noticeably stiffer and heavier indicating the presence of another piece of fabric backing it.

With figure 8, although little specific detail can be detected, we have another individual wearing a Confederate shell jacket. Its type and origin are marked by the short length, manner of closure to the neck, stand-up collar, and light shade. While impossible to say with certainty there appears to be a Style B hem/front opening angle.

His trousers match his jacket perfectly in shade, indicating they are Confederate military. These are worn with suspenders. Also, the pocket opening is primarily horizontal and thus either the Style B, C, or E pattern.

As to other clothing articles, both figures 2 and 3 wear Confederate military vests of a light shade. The tone and texture of figure 3's matches his jacket perfectly. Both vests close to the neck and have stand-up collars. Figure 3's collar conforms to the Style A pattern, while that of figure 2 has a rounded point similar to that seen on an earlier Gettysburg figure. Although the exact number can not be seen, the spacing indicates that figure 2's vest probably fastened with
ten very small, metal, probably civilian, buttons. In the case of figure 3, the buttons themselves are all missing but the nubs of thread where they were attached can be seen. Despite the fact that the intervals between these can be established it is difficult to determine the exact number of buttons due to the hem/front opening angle. Two possibilities exist. It is possible that the corner is folded under, in which case there are ten buttons. This, however, does not really appear to be the situation. It appears more that the hem/front opening angle is clipped so that when fastened there would be an open, inverted "V" notch. If this atypical attribute exists, then there are nine buttons. Also noticeable on figure 3's vest is a double row of top-stitching along the side of the front opening where the buttons should be. This article also has welted pockets set near the waist. Figure 4 also wears a dark hued vest but nothing can be determined about its pattern.

Shirts are clearly visible on figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Such is obscured from view on figure 6. The feet of seven men can be seen (8's are blocked from view) and all wear shoes. Those on figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, are military bootees. The exact style of figure 7's can not be determined as the tops are covered by leggings. Figure 4 wears his trousers tucked into his socks. The only piece of headgear in evidence is a felt hat lying by the head of figure 2. Whether or not this is actually his is impossible to say. Clearly visible on it, however, is a bound brim, and, of interest, is the presence of a tassled military hat cord. Figure 3 sports a scarf.

With figures 1 and 2, the viewer is allowed an outstanding vision
of well equipped Confederate soldiers. Both wear waist belts which support identical cartridge boxes. From their plain flaps showing no indication that a plate has been removed, and their rather large size, it is probable that these are of Southern origin. With figure 2, a cap box is also present. Because the belt is still in place on figure 1 and there is not a cap box visible where one obviously should be, it must be accepted that he did not have one. A couple of comments are in order about figure 1's belt. A number of viewers have asserted that the buckle is Federal. After magnified examination of several different versions of this view, nothing can be discerned that would support this. The only definable aspect to the motif is that there is an "S". This "S", however, is located directly in the center, and as such, does not conform to Federal issue. To continue, each carries an elliptical tin bullseye canteen. That they are of Southern manufacture is supported by the facts that neither is covered and each is carried on a leather sling. Confirming the Confederate origins of figure 1's is the unusual long and narrow spout which does not conform to Federal types.

Two more canteens lie beside figure 1. One (broken) is a drum type probably of wood given the crisp nature of the break without evidence of denting. The other is an uncovered tin elliptical with leather sling. Also, what appears to be a tin jug is present. A haversack is very much in evidence on figure 1, and possibly a second is beneath his head. The straps for two of these items can be discerned on figure 2. Of special note is the fact that both men wear backpacks. The shoulder straps for these are clearly visible on each, and on the first individual, the bedroll affixed to the top of the pack can be seen behind his
left shoulder.

As stated there is nice uniformity in these views. Two men are uniformed alike in outfits whose components match. Two other individuals also are dressed in matching jackets and trousers. Two additional men wear the same jackets. This gives a total of six distinct uniforms for eight men with one being partially the same as another. At the same time, on an individual basis, each man is well appointed. All articles of clothing are Confederate military, and all are well shod. The only problems with any of these garments is missing buttons. Figure 3's vest is completely void of fasteners as is figure 5's jacket. With figure 3's jacket, a couple of buttons are also missing. In addition to being well clothed, in the two instances where gear is present, it is quite apparent that these men were incredibly well equipped. The only unaccountable item is a cap box for figure 1. Even more important is the fact that much of the equipment is of Southern manufacture.

Petersburg, April 2, 1865

The entire collection of Petersburg casualty photographs was recorded by Thomas C. Roche in and near Fort Mahone. Officially designated Battery 29, this installation was part of the Confederate defense line around the city. All of the images were made on the morning after the engagement of April 2nd, after the position was occupied by Federal troops. Initially, the fort itself was manned by part of the 53rd North Carolina Infantry and a battery whose identity has been lost. It has not been discerned what units occupied the
trenches in the vicinity. Also, during the course of the day, other unidentified commands were fed into the fight at this point. Consequently, the men in these views undoubtedly represent a number of different units whose designations remain undetermined.  

Despite the fact that Roche was on the scene so quickly, it is evident that cleanup procedures were well underway by the time he arrived. There are no firearms visible in many of the photographs, and most of the weapons in the remaining views are thought to be props. That so many of the images do not show firearms, yet some were still available for props - no less than four in PCF - indicates that Roche was working right alongside the policing and burial details. Also, from turned out pockets, it is evident that some of the men have been searched for whatever reason. Of note in showing how far policing the area had progressed is the fact that in a position that was heavily fought over, there are no Federal casualties. In any case, as with earlier groups of images, because of the cleanup process, much equipment that should be present is missing. There is another argument to account for the lack of accoutrements in this particular collection that will be discussed later.

Group PA: Photographs A, B, C, D, and E

The two men in these views in close proximity to each other offer excellent data on Confederate uniforms, especially in terms of jackets. Of interest is the fact that both jackets share a number of identical attributes, yet, there are a few noticeable minor differences. That they wear Confederate shell jackets is evident from the medium to
Photograph PAA

"A dead rebel soldier as he lay in the trenches before Petersburg, Va., April 2d actually April 3, 1865. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va. 1865." (original title)
Photograph PAB

No known title.\textsuperscript{71}

Figure.
Photograph PAC

No known title.⁷²

Figures.
"A dead rebel soldier, as he lay on the foot passage in the trenches of fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation.' Part of a broken musket and a bayonet stuck in the bank. The marks and spots on his face are blood oozing from the wound in his head. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va. 1865." (original title)
"A dead rebel soldier, as he lay in the trenches of Fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'Fort Damnation.' This view was taken after the storming of Petersburgh, Va. 1865." (original title)
dark/medium shades (depending on which reproduced version one examines), the short lengths, methods of closure to the necks, and stand-up collars. The tones of these two jackets are very close if not exactly the same. The same holds true for the texture of the fabrics. Each is top-stitched around the plain cuffs, collars, and front openings. In both instances, the sleeves are of two piece construction with the cuffs closed and buttonless. Figure 2's jacket clearly fastens with eight metal buttons, and from the spacing of the two, visible on the first man's, it is apparent that his does also. With each, there is a typical undyed or bleached lining, and on 2's a Style A internal breast pocket can be seen on the left side. Both of these jackets have untrimmed epaulets. Finally, 2's is constructed without an external pocket on the right side.

In all basic senses, these are identical garments, but for one somewhat noticeable difference and two more that are of less importance. As stated each has a stand-up collar, which, in each instance has a rounded point. Yet, the configurations are not the same. Figure 1's is of the Style C pattern, while figure 2's conforms to the Style F. Regarding the two lesser differences, first there is the fact that the stepped feature between the base of the collar and the horizontal edge of the front opening on figure 1's garment is much more extreme than on figure 2's. There is also a noticeable variation in the manner of construction of the areas where the top edge of the facing meets the internal base of the collar. In the case of figure 1, there is an added yoke, while with figure 2, this feature is missing. His jacket's facing butts up against the base of the collar.

Because these two jackets are otherwise so alike (and even the
collars are not that dissimilar in that each has a rounded point) it is
difficult to believe that they did not come from the same source. In
all likelihood, we are viewing two different issues of the same
garment, each of which was made by a different tailor or seamstress.
It is even possible that they are representative of the same issue and
simply constructed by different people. Certainly the variation in the
depth of the stepped aspect of the collar is insignificant enough to
warrant this assessment and it is quite possible that the variation in
the manufacture of the facing/collar area is as well. In any case, for
all practical purposes, these men are wearing basically the same
garments which creates a definite sense of uniformity between them as
far as their jackets are concerned.

As to their trousers, each is a similar light/medium shade but
there are definite differences in the hard details. Figure 1's have
Style D pockets that button. The waistband fastens in accordance with
the Style A method and the visible end when closed is of the Style A
configuration. Two factors confirm that these pants are Confederate
military. First they have bone buttons on the waistband and for the
suspenders. More important, there is no slit in the cuff. These are
untrimmed.

As to figure 2's trousers the pockets are difficult to discern.
Initially they appear to be Style F in pattern, but close examination
reveals them to be otherwise. They are Style A in construction, and
they button. In SAD the point of the pocket flap is visible, and in
SAE it is evident that the main, side pocket opening does not run back
into the side seam. Furthermore, just the trace of a dark hued button
can be discerned. That these are Style A and not Style D can be deter-
mined from the way the pocket pulls and the fact that the area at the base of the waistband is clearly visible without there being any evidence of a major horizontal pocket opening in addition to the vertical. This pocket style confirms their being Confederate military in nature. Further support is supplied by the fact that these have an incredibly wide waistband the width of which is too extreme for Federal issue. Initially, figure 2's pants show no indication of being worn with suspenders. There are no buttons for such where they should be. Yet, in view SAE, it is apparent that suspenders are hanging down beneath the right rear hip and are attached to the back of the trousers. It is obvious that in the course of fighting or being killed, at least the right front suspender buttons became detached. These pants are also untrimmed.

As to other articles, both men wear shirts. For footwear, each has on military bootees and socks. There is no equipment in evidence on figure 2, but on figure 1 two shoulder slings can be detected. The one over the left shoulder clearly supports a haversack, and the other over the right is of thin leather and undoubtedly supports a canteen. In addition another large, glossy, painted or rubberized haversack lies nearby, and a tin cup is in close proximity. Of note is the fact that this same individual clutches an Enfield rifle ramrod under his right arm. This clearly indicates that the Springfield rifled musket beside him in SAB is a prop. At the same time, it is possible that the Enfield visible in SAA and partially so in SAB (although moved) was actually his. If so, however, examination of the weapon reveals that it too was employed as a prop by Roche. The gun in SAA is clearly missing
its muzzle, and an Enfield with exactly the same damage appears in SAD, but it is not in evidence in SAC. The damage to the piece clearly points to why it was not picked up by the policing parties.

Of note in these images are two of the rare instances in the sample of uniforms reflecting wear and tear. In each instance, it involves the cuffs of the men's jackets. The right cuff on figure 2 is obviously quite frayed. On figure 1, it appears that the juncture of the sleeve lining to the body on the left cuff wore out. This is apparent from the second row of top-stitching a short way up the sleeve which is clearly not there on the other. In this instance, however, despite the fact that the garment is damaged, it appears to have been very nicely repaired in an extremely professional manner.

There is a very decent sense of uniformity in these views on an individual basis in that both men clearly wear Confederate military garments. This feeling of uniformity carries over between the two in that both wear jackets that are virtually the same. As to their trousers despite the fact that there are major differences in construction, both pairs are a similar light tone which contrasts with the hues of the jackets. Whether or not these are actually similar in color is impossible to say, but they could be. If they are, then the sense of uniformity between the two men is even more enhanced.

**Group PB: Photographs A, B, C, D, E, and F**

These six images show four separate men. Because no two appear together in the same view, it is impossible to make any statements
Photograph PBA

"Rebel soldier, killed in the Trenches of Fort Mahone, called by the Soldiers 'Fort Damnation.' This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va., April 2d, 1865." (original title)
Photograph PBB

Title same as previous photograph.

Figure.
"This view was taken in the rebel trenches, the morning after the Storming of Petersburgh, Va., April 2d, 1865, and shows a dead rebel soldier who must have died instantly, his left temple and part of the head was carried away by a shell or solid shot, his blanket is across his breast tied up in the usual way, and his musket by his side, his rations lay scattered all around him. Half way up the side of the embankment is a foot passage and the bottom of the trench contains about two feet of water, our soldiers had to charge across these works." (original title)
"C.S. soldier killed by a shell in the trenches of Fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation.' This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va. 1865." (original title)
Photograph PBE

"A dead rebel soldier as he lay in the trenches of fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation.' This soldier must have been killed by a fragment of shell that exploded close by, as he is covered all over with mud and blood. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburgh, Va. 1865." (original title)
"A dead rebel soldier, as he lay in the trenches of fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation.' This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburgh, Va. 1865." (original title)
about uniformity between them. There is, however, a good sense of uniformity on an individual level.

That figure 1 wears a Confederate shell jacket is evident from the article's medium shade, short length, manner of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar. In addition, there are untrimmed epaulets, and a Style C hem/front opening angle is apparent. There is no top-stitching in evidence on this jacket's cuffs, hem, or front opening. Of interest are the cuffs. To begin with they are slit in accordance with the Style B method of construction and fasten with two buttons. Also noticeable is a band of dark piping around them. This runs parallel to the edge of the cuff and lacks the pointed motif witnessed on the extant examples. The number of buttons that would fasten the front cannot be determined as they are all missing. Thus we see another example of a garment in need of minor repairs.

Apart from their shading and being untrimmed, nothing definite can be discerned about his trousers. Their tone, however, is identical to that of his jacket indicating that they are Southern military. The pockets clearly have a major vertical opening along the side seam. At the same time, although it can not actually be seen, the way the pocket pulls indicates that there is also a horizontal opening. This indicates they are either Style A or D.

Figure 2 wears a Confederate shell jacket whose dark/medium tone, short length, manner of closure to the neck and stand-up collar define it as such. This garment also has plain epaulets which are possibly of the Style C pattern. In addition, the sleeves are of two piece construction, and there is a Style A hem/front opening angle. There is no
evidence of top-stitching on the cuff which is closed, buttonless, and untrimmed.

As to the trousers, they are a much lighter medium tone and do not have piping. That they are Confederate military is apparent from the Style D pockets that do not button and the absence of a cuff slit. Also, there is clearly no external watch pocket. These are supported by suspenders, the buttons for which are a light hue and as such, probably bone.

With figure 3, a Confederate shell jacket is also worn. Its type and origin are confirmed by the medium tone, short length, manner of fastening to the neck, and stand-up collar. The plain collar itself conforms to the Style G pattern. This jacket also has a Style A hem/front opening angle, and these two locales and the cuffs are untrimmed and top-stitched. The cuffs are constructed closed and do not have buttons. There is no evidence of epaulets.

Nothing can be determined about his pants other than their shade and the fact that they are not piped. Their tone however is identical to the jacket. They are thus undoubtedly Confederate military.

Figure 4, too, sports a shell jacket. His is a dark hue. The type is confirmed by the short length and stand-up collar. The latter attribute supports that it also closes to the neck. Both the collar and the cuffs are plain and there are no epaulets. Despite its dark tone, there is nothing about this garment to indicate that it is of Northern origin, and as such, must be accepted as Southern.

The identical shading of the trousers confirms that both they and the jacket are Confederate. They are too dark for Federal issue and
they clearly indicate that a complete uniform whose components match is being worn. These are untrimmed. The only other detail that can be discerned is that there is a major opening to the pocket along the side seam. Thus, they are either of the Style A, D, or F construction.

As to other articles of clothing, figures 2 and 3 wear vests. That worn by figure 2 presents exactly the same shade and texture as his trousers which in itself marks it as military despite the fact that the upper part of the front opening and collar can not be seen. At the same time, however, the very tight spacing of the three visible buttonholes indicates that it possesses more fasteners than found on civilian versions, and it probably does close all the way up the front. Like some other clothing items in recent groups of images, there are no buttons where some should clearly be in evidence. Figure 3's vest is darker than the rest of his outfit. It is, however, clearly military in that it closes to the neck and has a stand-up collar.

All four men wear shirts. Figure 3's feet can not be seen, but all three of the remaining individuals wear shoes. Those on figures 1 and 2 are clearly military bootees. The exact style of figure 4's can not be determined due to his wearing leggings. Figure 1 has his trousers tucked into his socks.

A fair amount of equipment can be seen in these views. The sling for a shoulder carriage cartridge box can be seen on figure 1, and an additional sling for either a canteen or haversack is present. Beside him and partially underneath is a waist belt with a Confederate made cap box on it. That it is of Southern origin is apparent from the single belt loop on its back.
With figure 2, there are two slings over the right shoulder indicating that both a haversack and canteen are carried. The one is quite obviously a narrow leather strap which is typical of Southern canteens. Also, he lies on an unfastened waist belt which supports a cartridge box. Finally, he clearly wears a bedroll. This is of interest in that an embroidered "S" is evident near the end. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine if this is preceded by a "U" or a "C".

Figure 3's only discernible piece of equipment is a haversack. Another item lies between his right knee and elbow which appears to be a canteen, but it is impossible to say if it is with certainty.

Last of all, with figure 4, two shoulder straps pass over his right shoulder. Again, this supports that both a canteen and haversack are carried. He also wears a bedroll. By his head lies a slouch hat whose close proximity may indicate that it is his.

While it is impossible to determine any group uniformity in these views, as mentioned there is a nice sense on an individual level. Three men wear outfits in which the two main components match. With the remaining man, we witness a pair of trousers and vest that are identical in shade and texture. All articles of clothing are Confederate military. Also, from what can be seen of equipment these men are well appointed.

Group PC: Photographs A, B, C, D, and E

In these five views, there are six figures in evidence. On an individual basis, there is a good sense of uniformity. The medium
"A dead rebel soldier, bare footed, killed by a shell, which tore his side out, the entrails are protruding from his side. Shows a foot passage half way up the side of the bank. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburgh, Va. 1865." (original title)
"This view was taken in the trenches of the rebel fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation,' the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va., April 2d, 1865, and shows a boy about 14 years, who must have been asleep when the attack was made, as he is but partially dressed; he was killed as he came out from a bomb proof; he has on the rebel grey uniform." (original title)
"Rebel soldiers killed in the trenches of fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation.' This view shows the construction of the bomb proofs and covered passages, which branch off in every direction. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va. 1865." (original title)
"A dead rebel soldier, as he lay in the trenches of fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation.' This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburgh, Va. 1865." (original title)
"This picture is a good view of the covered ways inside the rebel fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation.' The Union soldiers had to charge up and down these obstructions. In the foreground centre is a dead rebel soldier sticking out through the debris, and further on lies another confederate soldier. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va. 1865."

(Original title)
Original title unknown, but probably identical to previous photograph.
shade, short length, the manner of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar, make it evident that figure 1 wears a Confederate shell jacket. The collar itself conforms to either the Style B, D, or G pattern. The hem/front opening angle is rounded, but the degree is not discernible. At least the collar and plain front opening are top-stitched. From the spacing of the holes in the latter area, there are nine buttons. The plain cuffs are closed and do not have buttons. Also, the garment is lined, and there is an internal left breast pocket, but the style can not be determined.

Because they are so covered with mud, nothing can be ascertained about the shade of his trousers. They possess Style D pockets, and are to be worn with suspenders. That they are of Southern origin is evident from the obvious lack of a cuff slit.

Figure 2 wears a Confederate shell jacket which is apparent for the same reasons as the first man. A medium shade, his uniform is interesting in that for him we have one of the few instances in which the photographer bothered to note the color. It is gray. The collar conforms to the Style D pattern. Evident from the holes, the front is secured with either eight or nine buttons. Both the collar and plain front opening, at least, are top-stitched. The sleeves are of two piece construction. Also, there are no epaulets and a typical undyed or bleached lining can be seen.

The shading of his untrimmed trousers is identical to his jacket, and consequently, must be gray as well. This clearly marks them as Confederate military. These have Style D pockets that button. The waistband is secured in accordance with the Style A method, and the configuration of the visible end when fastened is Style C. The butt-
tons, for the waistband and suspenders, are a mixed light and dark hue indicating the possibility of various hard rubber or japanned metal and bone. In true Confederate fashion, the outermost suspender button is mounted directly over the side seam. Suspenders themselves, however, do not appear to be worn. There is no cuff slit.

Figure 3 wears a double-breasted frock coat. The type and origin are apparent from the long length - the skirts are crumpled over his left arm - the wide step between the base of the stand-up collar and the front opening edge (which closes to the neck) indicating a severe overlap, and the medium shade. The untrimmed collar itself conforms to the Style A configuration, and from the spacing of the buttonholes, it is evident that the coat closed with the regulation seven pairs of fasteners. A welted, external breast pocket can be seen on the left side. Atypical of Southern frock coats is the undyed or bleached lining.

His trousers match his coat perfectly in tone. This, combined with other details, clearly identifies them as Southern military. They have Style D pockets with no indication of buttoning. The waistband fastens in the Style A manner, and the pattern of the exposed end when secured is Style B. The button for the waistband is a dark hue. The cuffs are noteworthy in that in addition to lacking a slit, they are lined with a reinforcement panel. This is apparent from the stiff, straight, unwrinkled nature of the lower pant's leg which is in total contrast to the rest of the garment in terms of the way the fabric drapes. This, in turn supports that the reinforcements are the Style C pattern. They do not have piping.

Figure 4, in close proximity to 3, also wears a Southern double-
breasted frock coat. Again, it is clear that the step between the base of the collar and the edge of the front opening is severely wide, and in conjunction, it is evident that the garment closes to the neck. The coat's long length can be discerned from the crumpled skirts visible below his right arm. The cuffs are plain, closed, and seemingly lack buttons. Like 3's, it is lined with an undyed or bleached fabric. This, however, is a different coat than that previously described. It is a darker, dark/medium shade, and the spacing of the holes indicates that it closed with nine pairs of buttons.

While his coat is different, figure 4's pants are identical to 3's. They are the same shade, untrimmed, and possess several additional distinctive matching attributes. There is again a lack of a cuff slit, and it is evident for the same reasons as with 3 that the cuffs have a Style C internal reinforcement. Also, there are Style D pockets. Another feature linking the two pairs is the noticeable flaring cut of each from the thigh to below the knee at which point they taper a bit to the cuff. These are the only examples of stylish, semi-pegged trousers in the photographic sample.

Figure 5 also wears a Confederate double-breasted frock coat. Its medium shade, long length, method of closure to the neck with two rows of buttons (buttonholes appear on each side of the front opening), and stand-up collar define it as such. The plain collar angles down, indicating a Style C configuration despite the front edge not being seen. From the spacing of the holes it would seem there were five pairs of buttons. Little else can be determined about it other than there is no evidence of top-stitching on the front opening.

The shading of his untrimmed trousers is exactly the same as his
coat, confirming that they are Confederate military. Although the exact style of pocket can not be determined, the way that the lining is pulled out indicates that they are either of B, C, or E construction. Either further supports their being Confederate and military. No other details can be discerned.

Figure 6 wears a Confederate shell jacket whose medium shade, short length, and manner of closure to the neck define it as such. The cuffs are trimmed, but the exact style can not be defined. In PCE, the decoration appears to be piping, but in PCF, it looks like a solid applique. It is possible that both forms are present in association. Apart from this, all that can be discerned about it is that it is lined with the typical light toned fabric, and there does not appear to be an internal breast pocket on the left side.

The shade of his trousers matches that of his jacket perfectly indicating they too are Confederate military. Supporting this are their Style A pockets which button. No other details are forthcoming.

In this group, figures 2, 3, 5, and 6, wear vests and all but 5's are a military cut, but in no instance do any of these match any of the other articles of clothing. Those of figures 2, 3, and 6, fasten to the neck in accordance with military fashion, and on the first two, stand-up collars can be seen. Figure 2's has an angled point, but the exact style can not be determined. Figure 3's is extremely low in height. The vest of figure 6 has a sharply angled hem/front opening area, while that of figure 2 is, very interestingly, rounded. With figure 3's a welted waist and breast pocket can be seen. Figure 6's also has at least welted waist pockets. Top-stitching along the front opening is apparent on figure 3's garment. The vest of figure 2 is not
constructed in this way. Whether 6's was or not can not be discerned. Only with figure 2 can the number of buttons be ascertained. While missing most, the spacing of the two that can be seen indicates there were six, total.

The vests of figures 2 and 3 present interesting features. While clearly of a military style, neither is made of a military fabric. That worn by figure 2 is clearly a dark colored heavy waled corduroy. In the case of figure 3's, of note is the dark, fairly wide stripe running horizontally near the hem. The impression is that this was fashioned from a military blanket. Both are probably homemade. Figure 5's vest is obviously civilian. It is evident from there being both buttons and holes on each side of the front opening that it is double-breasted. Furthermore, the fabric appears to be plaid or checked.

As to other clothing items, shirts are in evidence on figures 1, 2, 3, and 4, but are obscured from view on the remaining men. Figures 3, 4, and 5, wear military bootees. A loose shoe lies by figure 5's feet and another lies at the feet of figure 6. This man wears shoes but the type is obscured by his leggings. Figure 1 is extremely interesting in that he is the only individual in the entire sample who is actually barefoot. At the same time, figure 2 is shoeless, but he does have a sock on one foot which tends to indicate that he possessed shoes. The lack of footwear for these two men will be discussed in greater detail later. Figure 1 wears a felt hat. The only other article of clothing in evidence is another felt hat at the feet of figure 6.

The only equipment actually worn is on figure 5. A single strap extends over his right shoulder. Because of its width, this probably
supports a haversack. Also noticeable on him is a bedroll. In other views two loose blankets are seen.

As stated there is an outstanding sense of uniformity with these men on an individual basis. Four of them wear uniforms in which the main components match each other. In all instances, regardless of whether they match or not, jackets and trousers are Confederate military. On a group basis, little can be said as only one view presents two men together. Still, in this, while their coats are different, their pants are identical. At the same time, however, both do wear double-breasted frock coats. This, in conjunction with the matching pants indicates these men belonged to the same unit which was making an effort at overall uniformity. In essence we are witnessing the same issue of trousers worn with different issues of the same distinctive coat type. The instances of missing buttons are again the only evidence of wear and tear on any of these garments. Whether or not the two vests of odd materials are actually reflective of fabric shortages, is impossible to say. Even if they are, it is of little consequence as vests are really only an extra, unnecessary item and none of the other garments show any indication of being made of strange materials. More important, is the mere fact they have vests whatever their nature. Even more significant, however, is that three out of six men wear double-breasted frock coats and two have very stylish trousers.

Group PD: Photographs A, B, C, D, and E

These five photographs show three different men lying very close to
"A Rebel soldier killed in the trenches before Petersburgh. The spots and marks on his face, are blood issuing from his mouth and nose. The wound is in the head, caused by a fragment of shell. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburgh, Va. 1865. (original title)"
Original title almost identical to that of previous photograph.
"Rebel artillery soldiers, killed in the trenches of fort Mahone, called by the soldiers 'fort Damnation,' at the storming of Petersburg, Va., April 2nd, 1865. The one in the foreground has U.S. belts on, probably taken from a Union soldier prisoner; his uniform is grey cloth trimmed with red. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburg, Va. 1865." (original title)
"A dead rebel soldier, inside the Union picket lines. This view was taken the morning after the storming of Petersburgh, Va. 1865."

(original title)
Original title same as with previous photograph.
each other. Figure 1 is one of the most interesting in the entire study for a number of reasons. To begin with, he offers one of the other rare instances in which the color of his uniform was noted. It is gray with red trim. As his trousers match his jacket perfectly in shade, and the photographer did not note their being a different hue, it must be accepted that they too are gray and a complete uniform in which the components match is worn.

That a shell jacket is worn is evident from the short length, method of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar. This latter attribute conforms to the Style F pattern. Of note is the fact that it is a solid contrasting color reflecting Style B trim. Partially it must be to this that Roche was referring when he noted the red. The photographer's statement must also refer to the contrasting colored piping which appears around the slit breast pocket on the left front side. This appears to be the same shade as the collar. The pocket, itself, is interesting in that it does not have the wide welt typical of external shell jacket pockets. The plain front opening of this garment is also of note in that there is a double row of top-stitching on the side where the buttons should be. The collar and cuffs, however, are not top-stitched. The cuffs are also plain, closed, and do not have buttons. There are no buttons in evidence along the front opening, but the spacing of the nubs of thread that remain indicate there were originally eight or nine. This article is also lined. There are no epaulets.

His untrimmed matching trousers present distinctive Confederate attributes. There is no cuff slit, and they have Style A pockets. The
ends of the waistband are of the Style A pattern, and the waistband fastens in accordance with the Style B method. The fly is secured with four buttons. These trousers offer one of the few instances of a garment being severely damaged. The right knee was badly ripped at some point. At the same time, however, the rend was very nicely patched from the inside.

Figure 2 does not wear a jacket. In addition, because of their very dark shade nothing can be determined about his trousers other than that they have light toned suspender buttons.

Figure 3 is also clad in a Confederate shell jacket which is evident from its medium shade, short length, manner of closure to the neck and stand-up collar. The collar conforms to the Style D pattern. Both the plain, closed, buttonless cuffs and the front opening are top-stitched. From the spacing of the holes, this garment was fastened with either six or seven buttons. It is lined with the typical undyed or bleached fabric.

That his trousers are Confederate military is evident from the fact that they perfectly match his jacket in terms of shade. Other Confederate attributes are present as well. There are Style D pockets with no indication of buttoning. The visible suspender button is an appropriately light tone for bone. Most defining, however, is the absence of a cuff slit. These are not trimmed.

As to other articles of clothing, both figures 2 and 3 wear vests. The former's is a very dark shade with a sharply angled hem/front opening area. A welted waist and breast pocket are in evidence. This article does not, however, button to the neck in accordance with mili-
tary style. Instead, the front closes only to a point slightly more than halfway up from the hem. At this point there are civilian style lapels. Although it is possible that this is a military colored vest fashioned on civilian lines, it is more likely to simply be a civilian vest.

On the other hand, the vest worn by figure 3 is decidedly military. Of a much lighter hue that the rest of his outfit, it clearly fastens to the neck and has a stand-up collar. It is impossible to determine the cut of the collar or define any other details about this garment except that the spacing of the two visible buttonholes is fairly tight.

All three men wear shirts. That on figure 1 has a very small checked pattern to it. Figures 1 and 3 sport military bootees, with those of the first individual clearly being Confederate made. The toe/vamp section is sewn over the front edges of the quarters. Figure 2 offers the only example in the casualty photographs of someone wearing boots. These appear to be quality items. Also in evidence on figures 1 and 3 are socks. Of special interest is the fact that figure 3 wears a cape. This is exactly the same shade as the rest of his outfit. It also closes with three buttons just like the extant example that was studied. There can be little doubt that this is Confederate issue. There is also a felt hat directly beneath his head. Another felt hat lies on the ground between him and figure 1 as does a forage cap. It is impossible, however, to determine if the cap is Southern or Northern.

The equipment in these views is of interest, especially with regards to figure 1, who carries a large amount. He has an unusual,
overly large waterproof haversack which is identical to that by figure 1 in PAA-C. An additional unpainted haversack can be seen beneath his left shoulder. The straps for both this and the short bedroll beneath the larger haversack are clearly visible over his right shoulder. An elliptical, tin, bullseye type canteen is also carried which from the facts that it is uncovered and supported by a leather sling is quite probably of Southern manufacture. From the description of his uniform, it is evident that this man was an artilleryman, and the gear just described is appropriate for such. Yet, there is more! Protruding from beneath the large haversack is a bayonet scabbard. Its very presence indicates that a waist belt was worn, but is simply not visible. Last, but not least, he carries a shoulder sling cartridge box. This is of the utmost interest as it is the only identifiable Federal item carried by anyone in the entire sample. A "U.S." plate is very apparent on the flap.

Returning to the large haversack, this particular item is noteworthy. No example of or reference to an article such as this has been located, and consequently, its exact function can not be determined. Two probabilities exist, however. It is quite possible, given his uniform, the haversack's large size, and its waterproof construction, that this is a gunner's haversack used to relay ammunition. Although it can not be provenanced directly to him, the broken sponge staff on the ground indicates that artillery was employed in the immediate vicinity, and again in light of his uniform, this supports that he was acting in the capacity of a gunner. At the same time, this haversack could simply be an unusual, oversized, and undocumented pattern that
allowed the soldier to carry more necessities. In size, it is comparable in capacity to a single-bag knapsack, and perhaps served the same function. If so, then, although an artilleryman by training, this man may represent a gunner who for one reason or another no longer had a piece to serve and was redesignated and reequipped as infantry.

In either case, the situation is quite interesting. If this is a gunner's haversack and the man is actually functioning in the capacity of an artilleryman which all indications lead us to believe, then we have an individual who is actually equipped for two completely different functions, and he has infantry equipment as well. That it was possible to supply him with additional gear to carry out a dual role is very telling. There was obviously a surplus of equipment around. Granted, the cartridge box is Federal, but in light of the fact that this man is obviously an artilleryman, there would have been no need for him to acquire such an item. Consequently, its existence undoubtedly is indicative of its having been issued to him from captured stores rather than his having procured it from a Federal casualty or prisoner.

On the other hand, if he was no longer serving as an artilleryman, and the haversack is simply an unusual pattern, several interesting things are still of note. For him to have been completely resupplied with a new and different set of gear also supports that there was no shortage of equipment. It is difficult to believe that an ex-artilleryman would receive such over regular infantry if the latter required these items and they were in short supply. Furthermore, if nothing else, this item's large size in conjunction with the fact that another haversack is worn as well tends to support that this man had a lot to
carry. No privation here!

At the same time, there is no evidence of equipment on figure 2. Described as an artilleryman, however, by Roche, this would account for its absence. The only piece of gear that can be seen on figure 3 is a cartridge box sling which has been cut. Of interest is that in view PDD a cartridge box with a cut shoulder strap lies in very close proximity.

In terms of uniformity in these views two out of three men are very well appointed. They wear complete Confederate uniforms in which the components match. With the third man, he lacks a jacket or coat, wears a civilian vest and there is no identifying his trousers. Yet, what he has on in conjunction with his fine boots indicates that he is at least well dressed even if not actually wearing any uniform articles. The fact that he is so well clad makes it hard to imagine that he did not possess a coat or jacket as well even if it was civilian in origin. Missing buttons on figure 1 are the only real problem.

Additional Comments on Missing Equipment, Shoes, and Clothing in the Petersburg Photographs

In order to further discuss and understand missing articles in the Petersburg images, additional information on the nature of the engagement at Fort Mahone must be presented. Following a heavy artillery barrage which began about midnight on the evening of April 1-2, the position was assaulted by Federal troops at first light. Initially, the Union forces overran the installation, but Confederate units to the rear were sent forward in a counterattack. For the remaining daylight
hours, fighting in the vicinity was fierce and seesawed back and forth. Ultimately, the Southerners retook the fort, but shortly after dark they were ordered to abandon it and join the retreat that marked the fall of Petersburg.92

The nature of the position and the engagement can be used to explain why some items are not seen in these views. Fort Mahone was a fixed position whose defending troops actually lived there or in the immediate vicinity. Consequently, it would have been rare, if ever, that they carried all their equipment around with them as on the march. Much gear would be kept in what passed as living quarters. Because the Federal attack was a surprise, when the Confederates fell in to defend their lines, it is likely that many only had time or only chose to grab essentials such as arms and ammunition. As a result, in addition to the work of later Union policing details, this would account for much equipment that is not present. In those views where some of the men are obviously well appointed in that they carry an abundance of gear, they probably represent the difference between troops who were there initially and those that were moved in from elsewhere and were much more likely to have all their things with them. Also, as stated, it is clear that the policing activities were well underway at the time of Roche's arrival. In certain groups of photographs like PD, it is also possible that figures 2 and 3 had already been dealt with while figure 1 had not. Roche was working right along with the fatigue parties.

There can be little doubt that many of the Southern soldiers were asleep when the attack began. Because of the urgency of the situation,
they would have hastily fallen in at their stations. In such a rush, the strong probability exists that some, at least, did not have time to get fully dressed prior to taking up their positions. Although the possibility exists that both figures 1 and 2 in Group PC may have had their footwear removed by needy comrades, or that figure 1 may not have had shoes to begin with, it is equally as likely that neither had time to put their shoes on when orders came to fall in. That figure 2 wears only one sock can be used to support this. Rather than accepting that the missing one came off when the shoe was removed, it could just as easily be a sign that he did not have time to put it or his shoes on. Roche believed this to be the case as is evident from his original caption which refers to "...a boy of about 14 years, who must have been asleep when the attack was made, as he is but partially dressed;". It is interesting to note that with Roche (who had been at the front for a considerable amount of time, and consequently, should have been aware of Confederate supply problems if they existed) the thought that figure 2 may not have had shoes or that they were taken out of need never entered his mind. It was simply a matter that he did not have time to get completely dressed. The fact that the visible sock is clean supports both that he possessed shoes and Roche's belief that the lad was killed early in the fight as he left the bomb proof.

That figure 1 in Group PC was killed early in the fight is evident from the fact that he was the victim of artillery fire. Roche comments on the fact that he is barefoot, but despite his tendency for long, descriptive captions, does not make anything of it one way or the other. In light of the photographer's comments on this view in conjunc-
tion with PCB, the argument that figure 1, also, did not have time to get his shoes on carries more weight than that which would imply that the shoes either did not exist at all or were taken.

Additional reasoning to support that the shoes were not removed is offered by the fact that the fighting at Fort Mahone was vicious, and although the Confederates ultimately retook the position, they quickly abandoned it. There would have been very little, if any, time or opportunity for someone to take them.

Although given the fact he wears a civilian cut vest and has on trousers for which a provenance cannot be established, and thus it is possible that he actually did not have a military coat or jacket, the same argument can be applied to figure 2's missing garment in Group PD. He quite possibly did not have time to put it on. The possibility also exists that he may have removed it himself for various reasons. He is described by Roche as an artilleryman, which the presence of boots tends to support, and it was not uncommon for such soldiers to remove coats and jackets while servicing their piece. On the other hand, he may have taken it off for reasons already discussed for other individuals earlier in this study. As stated, despite the nature of his existing clothing, he is too well dressed not to have had a coat or jacket of some sort.
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CHAPTER XI

THE PRISONER-OF-WAR PHOTOGRAPHS

Cedar Mountain, August 9, 1862

Group CMA: Photograph A

These Confederates were captured at Cedar Mountain, August 9, 1862. The image was recorded by Timothy H. O'Sullivan shortly after at nearby Culpepper, Virginia, where the men were temporarily confined. Additional information about this view is lacking. The four visible figures on the upper porch could belong to any unit in Jackson's Corps. One thing is evident, however. They are immaculately and seemingly identically attired.¹

Because of the camera distance from the subject, hard details are rather sparse. Yet, from the light shade, short length, manner of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar, it is apparent that figure 1 wears a Confederate shell jacket. The collar appears to be of the Style A pattern. Figures 2 and 4 wear garments which fasten in the same way indicating they are military. Their light shading which matches figure 1's jacket perfectly supports that they are Confederate and quite probably the same type of garment. Figure 3 is in shirt sleeves.
Photograph CMAA

Confederate Prisoners Captured at Cedar Mountain. (modern title)²

Figures.  1, 2, 3, 4
Trousers are not visible on any of the men themselves, but some soldiers have obviously done laundry, and two pairs hang out to dry on the railing. These are identical in terms of tones. Furthermore, although they can not be tied directly to the men themselves, they are also exactly the same shades as the jackets actually worn and, as such, are certainly Confederate military.

Other clothing items include kepis worn by figures 2 and 3. That they are this type of cap is apparent from the deeply rolled crown on figure 3's and the straight, vertical front on 2's. These also match each other perfectly in terms of tone, and they match both jackets and pants as well.

While no other readily identifiable details are forthcoming, those already mentioned are significant. Every article of clothing is an identical hue, and each man wears at least one item which can be linked in this sense to one of the same type on another. All indications are that all four men are uniformed identically in outfits whose components, inclusive of caps, are the same color and fabric.

Aldie, June 17-20, 1863

Group AA: Photograph A

This view was recorded by Timothy O'Sullivan while in the employ of Alexander Gardner. Taken at Fairfax Court House in June, 1863, it shows Confederate cavalrymen captured in the engagement at Aldie. The fighting in Aldie proper took place on June 17, as J.E.B. Stuart's cavalry screened Lee's columns on their advance north to Pennsylvania.
Immediately engaged on the Confederate side on that date was Brigadier-
General Fitzhugh Lee's Brigade under the temporary command of Colonel
Thomas T. Munford. This body of troops consisted of the 1st Maryland
Battalion and the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th Virginia Cavalry Regi-
ments. This action, however, was only the beginning of four days of
cavalry fighting in the vicinity, in which Stuart's remaining brigades
were engaged. Therefore, it is difficult to determine if these
prisoners represent only those from Munford's command actually taken at
Aldie on the first day or those captured from all the brigades over the
four day period. The description accompanying the view in Gardner's
Photographic Sketch Book of the Civil War says,

The fight in which they were taken, was hotly contested, and
took place at the upper end of the Bull Run range of hills, in
Loudoun County, in and around the village of Aldie. The
rebels were driven, and our cavalry left masters of the field
- not without serious loss to our side, as well as to the
enemy - a day or two after.

This statement can be interpreted either to mean that they represent
just Munford's command or members of the other four brigades as well.
In his report, Munford gives his total number of missing at sixty-three
men. Considering that at least a few of these individuals were
truly missing and not prisoners, the number in captivity was probably
slightly less than the total stated. This figure, however, is of no
assistance as it is impossible to determine how many men are actually
present in the group. There are at least fifty which would be consist-
tent with Munford's losses, but how many, if any, more there are behind
the first rows can not be ascertained. At the same time, because the
image was recorded at Fairfax Court House, roughly twenty-two miles as
the crow flies from where the fighting occurred, despite the lack of a
definite date for the photograph, it could not have been made prior to June 20th. Accepting that these prisoners were organized and moved immediately on the morning of the 18th, they would have arrived at Fairfax Court House that evening. In conjunction, O'Sullivan could not have been aware that potential subject matter even existed at that locale until the morning of the 19th. If he acted upon his information immediately, he would have spent the day preparing and traveling the approximately seventeen to eighteen miles from Washington to the site, and he could then photograph on the 20th. This, in turn, would allow time for any additional Confederates captured on the 18th to make the journey and be present as well. In any case, even with this short and rigid time schedule, it is quite possible that troops taken after the 17th are also included in the view.

Of note is that this is the only remaining image in which uniform colors were recorded. In Gardner's text, there is the description,

The majority of them are dressed in the dusty gray jacket and trousers, and drab felt hat usually worn by the rebel cavalry; some, however, show no change from the ordinary clothes of a civilian, being probably recruits or conscripts, although their appearance laid them open to the charge (often made during the war) of being irregulars, out for a day's amusement, with their friends in the cavalry, as one might go off for a day's shooting.

This is possibly based on O'Sullivan's comment that they were clad in the "shabby gray pants and jackets and worn felt hats worn by Rebel cavalry." Considering that a differentiation was made between those in uniform and those not, without reference to any other colors, it must be accepted that those in uniform wear gray and are thus clad in Confederate military garments. "Majority" refers to the number actually in uniform with those in civilian dress constituting the
minority. It does not mean that the majority of the uniforms, themselves, are gray with the implication of other colors existing as well. Twenty-eight men offer data in this view. Those obviously in civilian garb, figures 9, 14, 25, and 28, will only be discussed in a general sense later. Apart from these men, with one possible exception, on an individual basis, those remaining are well appointed in Southern military garments. In terms of uniformity between individuals, there is only a limited sense. Very little equipment is to be seen. The Union guards at either end of the group of prisoners offer a scale against which the shadings of the captive's outfits can be compared.

Only nine individuals wear the same uniform as another. Figures 1 and 2 are dressed alike. Each wears a Confederate shell jacket of the same medium tone. Both are appropriately short for this garment type, and fasten to the neck. With figure 1's, a Style A front hemline can be seen. This same article has plain, closed cuffs, without buttons.

Both men wear trousers of a lighter, medium tone which match each other. This clearly indicates that they are at least military. The tones, however, are very similar to those of the pants worn by the Federal guards. Still, while no additional hard details are forthcoming, in light of the photographer's statements these are undoubtedly gray.

Figures 3, 4, and 5, are dressed alike as well, wearing Confederate shell jackets of a matching medium hue which is lighter than those just described. The type and origin is defined by this shade in conjunction with the short lengths and manner of closing to the neck. All three have Style A front hemlines, figure 5's closes with eight or nine metal
buttons, and figure 3's has plain, closed, buttonless cuffs.

Like the previous group, little can be determined about their trousers. They are a matching lighter medium tone which identifies them as military, but as with the first group, this hue is very similar to that of the Union pants. Yet, keeping in mind the photographer's descriptions, they must be accepted as being gray. Figure 4's are untrimmed.

Two other figures that can be said to be dressed alike are 6 and 12. Each wears a Confederate shell jacket of a matching medium tone which is similar to but not the same as that of the previous group. The shade combined with the short lengths, and way of fastening to the neck defines both the type and its origin. Further linking the two jackets is the fact that each closes with six metal buttons. Discriminable on figure 6's garment is a slight Style A front hemline, and figure 12's can be seen to have a Style A hem/front opening angle. Also with this garment, a plain, stand-up collar is apparent and appears to conform to the Style A pattern. The cuffs are plain as well. There is no evidence of epaulets or an external left side pocket.

As to their trousers, once again, very little detail can be discerned. Both are a matching dark tone, which marks them as Southern military. Also, figure 12's have a Style A method of securing the waistband. It should be noted that one of the Federal guards to the viewer's right wears dark hued trousers. The fact that he is the only one wearing such out of nineteen Union soldiers whose pants are visible illustrates that his are nonregulation and unusual. Perhaps they were privately procured or are what is left of an odd initial state issue. In any case, it is strange that he is the only Federal to wear this shade of trousers, yet, as will be seen, they are fairly common for the
Southerners in this image. This supports that those on the prisoners are in fact of Confederate military origin. If rare on Federals, they would undoubtedly be rarer on Confederates. They are not. This in conjunction with the written descriptions indicates that, in fact, such are dark gray.

Figures 21 and 23 present an interesting situation in terms of their uniforms. Both wear Confederate shell jackets which clearly differ slightly in shade, but present identical hard details. Figure 21's garment is a medium tone, with 23's being lighter. These hues in conjunction with the short lengths, manner of closure to the necks, and stand-up collars, define the types and origins. Both collars are plain and conform to the Style D configuration. Each closes with nine metal buttons and possesses epaulets. There are Style A front hemlines in association with Style B hem/front opening angles. In addition, noticeable on 23's is a dip in the rear hemline indicating that it is either a Style B or C pattern and Style B or E overall. With this same jacket, plain, closed, buttonless cuffs are evident. Neither have external pockets on the left side.

Both sport trousers of a medium shade lighter than their jackets with 23's pair also being a tad lighter than 21's. Apart from their being untrimmed, the only discernible hard detail is seen on 23's. They clearly have flapped pockets that button, with a large opening along the side seam. Unfortunately, the top of the pocket is blocked from view so it can not be determined if it is Style A or D. Despite a lack of hard details, again, in light of the written description, these pants are undoubtedly gray and Confederate issue. Furthermore, the
degree of the difference in shading between the two is the same as with the jackets.

Because of the abundance of identical hard details between the jackets, despite variation in tonality, there can be no doubt that both, in fact, wear the same uniform. What is obviously being witnessed are separate issues of the same outfit reflecting different dye lots or the effects of fading or dirt through the increased wear of one over the other.

The medium hued jacket of 22 offers some nice detail. There is an untrimmed Style D collar, the front opening fastens with eight buttons, and there are epaulets. The front hemline conforms to the Style B cut, and there is a Style A hem/front opening angle. There is no evidence of an external pocket on the lefthand side. All that can be ascertained about his trousers are that they are a medium hue which is the same as others to be discussed.

Only one individual, figure 7, wears a uniform with which the components match. It is impossible to determine whether he wears a coat or jacket, but all indications are that it is short. That it is Confederate military is confirmed by its medium shade and manner of closing to the neck.

Although no details other than shade can be determined, his trousers match his coat or jacket perfectly in tone. This certainly marks them as a uniform item of Southern origin.

Nine other figures, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, and 27, wear Confederate shell jackets of variant tones ranging from light to dark. Excepting figure 18's (the single dark jacket) all are an acceptable cast for Southern uniform articles, and in all cases, it can be seen
that they are short and close to the neck. Figure 10's dark/medium toned jacket has a stand-up collar, a severe Style A front hemline, epaulets, and closes with nine metal buttons. Figure 11's, a medium tone, also fastens with nine metal buttons and has a Style A hem/front opening angle. Figure 13's is a light shade with a Style A hem/front opening angle, and a stand-up collar is also discernible. With 15's jacket, a medium shade, we can also see the plain, stand-up collar. This tapers from the back to the front, but the exact pattern is indiscernible. On this same garment, a Style B hem/front opening angle is apparent, and although it is impossible to say with certainty, there appear to be epaulets. The cuffs are plain. The jacket of figure 18 definitely has epaulets in addition to the plain, stand-up collar and a Style B hem/front opening angle. Despite its dark shade, apart from the epaulets which can be at least equally indicative of Southern jackets, there is nothing to indicate that this is of Federal origin, and, as has been seen, a number of confirmed Confederate jackets are this tone. Furthermore, there is again the written description which supports this is dark gray rather than dark blue. On the darker, medium shaded jacket of figure 19, a stand-up collar can be seen, as can a Style B hem/front opening angle and plain cuffs. Figure 20's dark/medium cast garment has a plain, stand-up collar, plain cuffs, and closes with six metal buttons. As to 24's darker medium toned jacket, its stand-up collar is a darker, contrasting color indicating Style B trim. These last three jackets were all constructed without epaulets. Because of the blurred nature of the photograph details of figure 27's jacket are difficult to define. It is a medium tone and has a stand-up
collar. There is a Style B front hemline and a Style A rear one, creating a Style D hemline overall. The untrimmed cuffs are closed and do not possess buttons.

As to the trousers of these men, figures 11, 13, and 15, sport pairs of a medium tone which match each other and those worn by figure 22. This marks them as military. Figure 27 also wears trousers of a medium shade but they are lighter. Again, recalling the description of the photographers, these are all undoubtedly gray despite their similarity in tone to those of the Federal guards. Figures 10, 18, and 19, wear matching dark/medium toned pants, and those of figures 20 and 24 are the same dark shade as those of figures 6 and 12. These are all too dark for regulation Federal issue, and for arguments already stated regarding the lone Northerner in dark trousers, these must be accepted as Southern military garments. With the trousers of figures 10, 15, and 27, it is evident they are not piped.

Of the remaining men in uniform, figure 16 is of interest for wearing a Confederate sack coat. This is marked as such by its length which covers the seat of the pants, its medium shade, manner of fastening to the neck, and its stand-up collar. This latter attribute is untrimmed. Conforming to that of the only extant example studied, it is squared and of equal height all around. The closed, buttonless cuffs are plain as well. There is no external lefthand pocket.

His untrimmed trousers are a medium tone which is identical to those worn by figure 15 next to him and several others in the view. For reasons already too often stated, these are undoubtedly Southern military items.

Two figures, 17 and 26, wear Confederate single-breasted frock
coats. Each is a medium shade consistent with that of Confederate garments, and each is a long length. The single-breasted nature of figure 17's is clearly visible, and the front opening closes to the neck with seven or eight buttons. The typical stand-up collar can be defined, and the cuffs are untrimmed. Of interest, is the external, welted breast pocket set midway down the front on the left side. Unlike most pockets of this sort as per other garment types the opening is totally horizontal rather than angled. As to figure 26's coat, it initially appears to have lapels, and so, be civilian, until it is realized that it is being worn open with the collar folded over. That it is single-breasted is apparent from the fact that the lapel-like facings are not wide. That it is, in fact, a military coat is evident from the cut of the lapel-like features and the collar. The former extend all the way to the waist unlike a civilian single-breasted frock coat. Also, the step between the collar and what is in reality the facing is a severely wider "V" than that seen on civilian wear, and it does not extend in as far. Confirming the coat as Southern military is its cuff trim. Not a style witnessed on the extant single-breasted examples, this consists of a solid colored, contrasting applique in the pointed regulation pattern. In addition, darker piping is applied over this delineating the upper edge. At the same time, the cuffs are closed and buttonless.

As to their trousers, nothing can be discerned about figure 17's other than that they are a medium shade which is lighter than his coat. Figure 26's untrimmed pants are also a medium tone lighter than his coat. With him we are privileged to have one of the few hard trouser details seen in this photograph which, in itself, identifies them
as Confederate military. They clearly have Style A pockets.

Another individual, figure 8, wears a medium shaded frock coat. It is an appropriate length, but it is impossible to determine if it is a military or civilian cut. There are simply not enough details. His trousers are a dark hue, but this is all that can be ascertained about them.

As to other articles of clothing for those in uniform, five figures, 7, 11, 13, 15, and 26, wear vests. Nothing can be determined about figure 7's other than that it is a dark tone. Figures 11 and 15 wear vests of differing medium shades which do not match any of their other garments. Although it can not be said with certainty, both seem to fasten high towards the neck, and as such are probably of military pattern. Figure 13's vest offers a little more detail. A dark/medium cast, this clearly fastens very far up, and in the lower half alone, five tightly spaced buttons can be seen. These factors leave little room for doubt that this garment is a standard military cut. Figure 26's vest is interesting. It matches his Southern trousers perfectly in shade, marking it as a military garment. Yet, it is not a military pattern. The "V" neck line without lapels identifies it as an "American Vest". It initially seems to have an inverted "V" notch at the hem/front opening point, but closer examination indicates that the last button or two are simply not fastened.

Shirts are apparent on figures 7, 8, 12, 16, 17, 18, and 26. Because of the ground cover, few feet can be seen. In uniform, figures 3, 19, 21, and 22, have shoes, and figures 18, 20, 23, and 26, wear boots. This relatively low number of boots for mounted troops is noteworthy. As to headgear, five men wear military caps. Those on figures
and 18 are kepis, while those on figures 4, 11, and 22, are the forage or fatigue pattern. That on figure 22 has a darker, contrasting colored hat band, with the crown matching his jacket in tone. Although difficult to say with certainty, the crown and headband of figure 18's appear to be different colors as well. The others are a solid hue overall. The caps of figures 6 and 11 are also a shade identical to their respective jackets. Chin straps can be detected on the headgear of figures 6, 11, 18, and 22, with 11's, at least, being functional. Buttons can be seen on 22's. On figure 18's a squared visor is apparent. The visor on 11's cap is the rounded pattern. The remaining men all wear various styles of felt hats.

Very little equipment is present. Figure 20 has a covered, tin, elliptical canteen. Single shoulder straps, indicating the existence of either a canteen or haversack, can be seen on figures 13, 17, 21, and 22. Of interest is that figure 17 still wears a waist belt.

As has been shown, there is very little sense of uniformity between individuals. There is a great variety of shades and attributes between jackets and coats. Still, with regard to tones, there does appear to be a better sense of standardization between trousers. In essence, the trousers of twenty-one men can be categorized into only four distinct groups in each of which the shadings are identical. There is a medium hue as seen on figures 1, 2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21, and 22. The pants of figures 10, 18, and 19, are a dark/medium, and a lighter medium shade is witnessed with figures 3, 4, 5, 7, 17, and 23. Finally, there are those of a dark cast worn by figures 6, 12, 20, and 24. While there are undoubtedly differences in hard details between some of these, there nevertheless seems to be a standardization in color.
While there is not a good sense of uniformity between the men because of the great variation in jackets and coats, there still exists an excellent sense on an individual basis. With everyone in a uniform, all components are Confederate military. As to O'Sullivan's reference to their outfits being "shabby", there is no glaring evidence of such in the photograph. Consequently, he could only have been referring to minor wear that was not picked up by the camera. Returning to the subject of overall uniformity between individuals, again, the question arises of whether these men represent only Munford's command or all five brigades of the cavalry corps. If the former, then it must be accepted that Munford's outfit offered a real mix and match appearance. If soldiers from the entire corps are present, then the seemingly great variety of uniforms is easily accounted for.

Regarding the four, possibly five individuals in civilian rig, Gardner's comments, stated earlier, are of note. These come from a man who spent a great deal of time at the front creating a photographic record. If there been any severe shortages requiring soldiers to resort to wearing civilian clothing, he most certainly would have been aware of it. Yet, the possibility that this was why these men were so attired does not enter his mind. These people were simply new recruits or conscripts as yet not uniformed, or possibly (here Gardner is cautious and diplomatic in his wording) local irregulars who joined up temporarily for some fun, and as such, would not be expected to be in uniform.

Regarding the lack of equipment in this view, it must be remembered that these are cavalrymen who would have carried most if not all of their gear (other than weapons and associated items) on their horses.
Undoubtedly relieved of their animals upon capture, much if not most of their trappings probably remained with their mounts, with the result that not too much should be expected to be seen.

Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1863

Group GA: Photograph A

Attributed to Matthew Brady, but most likely actually taken by one of his assistants, this image shows three Confederate prisoners at Gettysburg. As it was recorded on or about July 15, almost two weeks after the battle, it is felt that these men were probably stragglers captured during the retreat. As a result, there is no way of telling what units they represent. Despite the closeness of the camera, data available from the uniforms is limited because much is blocked from view by the large quantities of equipment. From this, a great deal of information can be gleaned. On an individual basis, the sense of uniformity is fairly good, but there is none between the men. 10

Figure 1 does not actually wear a coat or jacket. He does, however, carry one held by the collar and thrown over his left shoulder. This collar is a stand-up sort probably of the Style G pattern as designated for shell jackets. The collar pattern in conjunction with the cut of the front opening indicates it fastens to the neck. The type of garment itself can not be determined, but the few details in association with the medium shade mark it as Confederate military. Other than that they are a medium tone, lighter than the coat or jacket, nothing can be ascertained about his pants.
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Figures.

1  2  3
Figure 2 also wears a garment the exact type of which can not be determined with certainty as the hem is blocked from view. That it is Confederate military is evident from the medium shade, manner of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar which is of the Style A configuration as determined for shell jackets. The article is not overly long, indicating that it is either a shell jacket or sack coat. Given the rarity of the latter item, it is most likely a Type B jacket. There is no evidence of top-stitching on the cuffs or collar, nor is there any trim on either of these areas or the front opening. In addition, the cuffs are closed and buttonless. There are no epaulets.

Figure 2's pants are untrimmed and a medium tone slightly lighter than his jacket or coat. The only visible hard detail which clearly defines them as not being Federal is the lack of a cuff slit.

Figure 3 wears a dark shell jacket. Its type is defined by the short length, manner of closure, and stand-up collar. This also has plain, closed cuffs which are buttonless. The spacing of the few visible metal buttons on the front opening indicates that probably seven were employed to fasten the garment. Despite the article's dark hue, the nature of the cuff, absence of epaulets, and number of buttons mark this item as Confederate military.

The trousers match the jacket perfectly in tone. This clearly marks them as a uniform component and Confederate in origin. This is supported by the suspenders they are worn with. The sidemost extension of the "V" tab which fastens to the trouser waistband clearly attaches over the side seam indicating that the suspender buttons are affixed in accordance with Confederate military style.
As to other articles of clothing, all three wear shirts. Each also sports a felt hat. All have shoes. Those worn by figure 1 are military bootees, while those on figure 2 are of the low-cut type. The type worn by figure 3 is not discernible. In addition to shoes, socks can be detected on the first two men. Another garment is carried over the shoulder of figure 3. From its bulkiness, obvious long length, and the short vent, this appears to be an overcoat. There is not enough detail, however, to determine either its type or origin.

As mentioned, these men carry an abundance of equipment. All have tin canteens. The fact that none are covered supports the probability that they are of Southern manufacture. Those worn by figures 1 and 2 are elliptical and possibly of the "bullseye" pattern. The exact type on figure 3 can not be determined as very little of it can be seen. Figure 3 also has a large painted haversack. A haversack-like item is evident on figure 1, but no precedent has been found for this pattern. It is a rigid, squared configuration with inward folding flaps that close the top, and there is a very glossy finish. Both of these men also have tin cups, and an additional shoulder sling not attached to either of the previously named items can be seen on figure 3. With figure 2, a bedroll is apparent. Of the utmost interest is the fact that all three carry backpacks. That on figure 2 is very noticeable, and is a painted, soft type. It is impossible to determine, however, if it is of single or double bag construction. With figures 1 and 3, the actual bodies of the packs are not very visible, but in each instance, the shoulder straps are easily detected. On figure 3, a small part of the pack itself can be seen beneath his right elbow. From
this, it is evident that it is painted. With figure 1, nothing can be
seen of the actual pack body, but the bulge at his back, covered by the
cloth or jacket over his shoulder, certainly indicates its presence.

As indicated, the sense of uniformity in this view is limited to an
individual basis. None of the men are dressed alike. Only figure 3
wears a complete uniform in which the components match. It is however,
apparent that figures 1 and 2 do possess Confederate military coats or
jackets, and quite probably, figure 2's trousers can be categorized as
such also. In essence, the majority of clothing items can be classed
as Southern military. With those remaining, while there is nothing to
soundly define them as Confederate military, there is nothing to sug-
gest that they are Federal or civilian. All have shoes. The most im-
portant aspect of this photograph is the equipment present. All are
incredibly well appointed. The only possibly missing article is a
haversack for figure 2. Yet, considering this man carries both a bed-
roll and a backpack, there is not much need for this particular piece
of gear.

Belle Plain, Virginia, May, 1864

The entire series of prisoner-of-war images recorded at Belle
Plain, Virginia, was taken by members of Matthew Brady's crew, on May
16 or 17, 1864. The exact location was a large natural depression
known as the "Punch Bowl". Here, Confederate captives taken since May
5, at both the Wilderness and Spotsylvania, were collected prior to
transportation north.¹²
Because so many Confederate prisoners were gathered at Belle Plain, it is impossible to determine the specific units to which these men belonged. Rather than detract from the meaningfulness of this and the following views, however, this factor tends to heighten it, given the circumstances of the situation. Because so many men from so many different commands were held here, the specific unit is immaterial. What is important is that the sense of sampling is increased, and we can acquire an even greater feel for the appearance of the Army as a whole, as the entire force is represented.

On an individual (and to a lesser degree, group) basis, the five men offering data in this view are very well uniformed. Figure 1 wears a Confederate shell jacket which is evident from its dark/medium shade, short length, and stand-up collar which possesses Style B trim. His trousers are identical in tone to his jacket indicating they, too, are Confederate military as they are part of a uniform whose key components match.

Figure 2 also wears a Confederate shell jacket which is apparent for the same reasons. His is a lighter, medium shade. Also discernible is that his closes to the neck with eight metal buttons. The collar is of the Style A pattern and exhibits Style B trim. There are no epaulets. As with figure 1, there are no details available from his pants other than shade and their lack of trim. The tone, however, is also identical to the jacket again indicating they are Confederate military.

With figure 3, a Confederate shell jacket is sported as well. The
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origin and type is indicated by the dark/medium shade, and short
length. His untrimmed trousers present the same tonality as his jacket
which marks them as Southern and martial.

Figures 4 and 5 are dressed alike. The matching dark/medium
shades, short lengths, and plain, stand-up collars denote the wear of
Confederate shell jackets. In addition, their trousers match both each
other and the jackets in tone which confirms their Southern military
nature.

Headgear can be detected on four of these men. While figure 2
wears a felt hat, figures 3, 4, and 5, all sport forage caps. Height-
ening the sense of uniformity between figures 4 and 5 is the fact that
these are exactly the same tone as the rest of their uniforms. The
feet of figures 2 and 3 are visible and both wear shoes. While those
of 2 are of indeterminate type, 3's are military in pattern.

Equipment of some form is carried by all. Most noteworthy is the
soft backpack carried by figure 1. Figure 2 has either a blanket or
shelter half draped over his right arm. On figure 3, a bedroll, haver-
sack, and canteen can be detected. Figures 4 and 5 carry bedrolls as
well.

Despite a general lack of detail in this view, there is enough to
determine that all five men are well uniformed in Confederate military
garments. Unfortunately, only two versions of this view were located
and the nature of the reproductions did not lend themselves to this
type of data collection. It is possible that other prints would offer
more detail from a greater number of figures. As it is, it is evident
that the additional men in the middle distance possess a fair amount of
equipment. More importantly, there is a strong consistency in the
shadings of many of their coats or jackets. More work with this particular image is definitely called for, as there is a potential wealth of information in it.

**Group BPB: Photographs A and B**

These two views show basically the same group of men. Obviously having moved between exposures, figure 5 appears in only one image. Also, the first photograph does not encompass figure 1. There are nine individuals visible who again offer a mix and match uniform situation. While data for jackets/coats is fairly good, only shading can be determined for trousers, and given the nature of the view in terms of shadows and conditions, even this is difficult.

The exact type of figure 1's coat or jacket can not be determined. It is, however, Confederate military. This is evident from its light shade, stand-up collar, and single-breasted manner of closure to the neck. The cuffs are plain, closed, and buttonless. His trousers are a dark/medium to dark tone, and as such are not Federal.

Figure 3 clearly wears a Confederate shell jacket. It is a dark/medium tone, the appropriate short length, fastens to the neck, and has a stand-up collar. The rear hem dips in what must be the Style B or C configuration. Also to be seen is a Style A construction belt loop, and there are epaulets that taper indicating they are either the Style A or B pattern. These, the collar, and the cuffs are untrimmed. The cuffs are also closed and buttonless. Very little of his pants can be seen, but they are a dark/medium shade. It is probable that they match the jacket, but it can not be said with certainty.
"Confederate prisoners in the Punch Bowl." (modern title)
Southern Captives Detained in the Punch Bowl. (modern title)
Figure 4 sports a Confederate shell jacket which, again, is evident from the dark/medium tone, short length, method of closure to the neck and stand-up collar. This latter feature is plain as are the cuffs and front opening. The cuff construction is closed without decorative buttons. There are no epaulets. Nothing can be determined about his trousers other than that they are a shade too dark to be Federal.

With figure 5, a Confederate shell jacket is also worn. It is an appropriate light shade, it closes to the neck, and possesses a stand-up collar. Single-breasted, the spacing indicates that the front opening fastened with eight buttons. Despite the hem not being seen, there is an epaulet which defines the type. This feature tapers, indicating that it, too, is either the Style A or B pattern. Of interest is the fact that there is clearly only one which is on the left shoulder. So, we have another of the few examples of a damaged garment. Obviously the second epaulet has come loose. The cuffs are closed and lack buttons. They are also untrimmed as are the front-opening and the collar. There is no evidence of top-stitching on this garment, nor is there an external pocket on the right. Nothing can be determined about his pants other than that they are supported with suspenders.

Figure 6 sports a Confederate shell jacket as well. Its type and origin are marked by the dark/medium tone, short length, manner of closure to the neck, and stand-up collar. Although the actual hem can not be seen, the straight, unwrinkled way the front opening hangs supports that the garment is indeed short. The front opening itself is secured with six buttons. The cuffs are again plain, closed, and buttonless. There are no epaulets. His trousers are a dark/medium tone
the same as his jacket, and as such are Confederate.

Figure 7 also wears a coat or jacket the exact type of which can not be discerned. It is, however, Confederate military which is apparent from its light shade, manner of fastening to the neck, and plain, stand-up collar. The cuffs are the same construction as figure 6's and again there are no epaulets. His pants are a dark/medium hue, too dark to be Federal.

With figure 8 we also see a Confederate shell jacket being worn which is a fairly dark tone. The type is defined again, by the short length, way the front opening closes to the neck, and stand-up collar. Despite the dark hue, there are no visible attributes to suggest that this is Federal. There are no epaulets. The cuffs are closed and do not have buttons. There is, however, piping around them, but the exact style is indiscernible. There is also Style A collar trim. In both locations this decoration is very dark, and, as such, not consistent with Federal trim. His untrimmed pants are a light/medium tone.

Figures 2 and 9 do not wear jackets or coats. As to their trousers, figure 2's are a dark/medium shade. Those worn by figure 9 are very light and untrimmed. Neither are tones equivalent to Federal issue.

As to other articles of clothing, figures 2, 4, and 9, wear vests. While it is impossible to define the types worn by the first and last individuals, figure 4's is clearly Confederate military. It fastens to the neck and has a stand-up collar. Furthermore, its shade is identical to that of his jacket. Shirts can be seen on figures 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. With the exception of figure 8, all wear felt hats of various patterns. Of special interest is the hat worn by figure 3. He
is the only individual in the entire sample for whom an exact regimental designation can be established. Under magnification, there are metallic letters pinning up the brim of his hat stating "Al 4". Figure 8 wears a forage cap the tone of which matches his jacket perfectly. The visor on this is squared. The feet of figures 1, 2, and 7, are the only ones truly visible, but in each case shoes are worn. Figure 7's are a military bootee type. It is also evident that he wears socks. While figure 9's feet should be seen, the blurred, overexposed or faded nature of this portion of the view makes it impossible to determine what he is wearing. The only piece of equipment that can be detected is an uncovered elliptical tin canteen held by figure 6.

As stated, there is a hodgepodge of uniforms in these two images. The only men possibly clad alike are figures 1 and 7. The nature of the photograph does not allow for confirmation of this however. On an individual basis, only figure 6 and possibly figure 3 wear uniforms with which the components are the same fabric. At the same time, while the hard details distinguish the various uniform articles as different, there is a strong similarity between the shading of a number of them. For instance, the jackets of figures 3, 4, and 6, are noticeably close in tone, and the trousers of 2 and 6 and the jacket of 5 are similar to those of 1 and 7. Given the incredible number of prisoners detained at Belle Plain, it is probable that at least several different units are represented in these views. In essence, while the hard details clearly differentiate between the various garments, it is quite likely that a degree of standardization is being viewed in terms of colors and perhaps fabrics. If such is the case, it would support that the trousers
of similar tone are of Confederate military origin. Furthermore, of five pairs whose origin is open to question, their shades at least disavow their being Federal. All other identifiable items are clearly Southern.

Regarding the lack of coats or jackets on figures 2 and 9, it is possible that they did not actually possess such. At the same time, however, it is more probable that they simply are not wearing them at this point in time. Let us consider the setting. These men are temporarily leading a stationary existence. Also, from open coats or jackets on figures 4, 5, 6, and 8, it is apparently fairly warm. In essence, figures 2 and 9 may simply have removed theirs. Under the circumstances, there was no reason not to.

Group BPC: Photograph A

This panoramic view of a portion of the Punch Bowl shows an incredible number of Confederate prisoners. Because of the large number of troops and the size of the image, for ease of examination the full photograph is segmented and presented in six sections. Due to the distance of the subjects from the camera, very little fine detail can be discerned, but a considerable amount of important data is still offered.

Of interest is that a behavior pattern is evident in this view. Troops taken prisoner are put in a rather uncertain situation with an even more uncertain future. There can be no doubt that under such
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circumstances, comrades from the same command would attempt to keep together for the sake of mutual support. This is attested to by the fact that the majority of matching uniforms appear in small clusters or in close proximity to each other. In turn, this logical manner of behavior can be used in reverse to argue that in fact these men in like uniforms are from the same unit and indeed, their garments are identical.

There is a good sense of uniformity in this image between individuals. There is also a considerable amount of equipment in evidence. Offering various amounts of data are ninety soldiers. Of importance in analyzing this view is that on the ridge in the background there are a considerable number of Federal troops whose uniforms offer a scale against which garment shadings can be compared.

The largest group of men that wear identical uniforms includes figures 9, 16, 17, 30, 33, 34, and 38. In fairly close proximity to each other, all wear the same Confederate shell jackets which is evident from the identical dark/medium shades and short lengths. In addition, on the last three, stand-up collars can be discerned, which, in turn, indicates that these jackets close to the neck. All wear trousers of an identical medium tone which at least makes it apparent that they are military uniform articles.

Several other groupings of troops in which matching outfits are worn that are also identical to the first, at least in terms of shadings, can be established. Figures 62, 63, 64, and 65, form such a cluster. The same dark/medium shades for all and the short lengths discernible on figures 62, 63, and 65, make it clear that they, too,
sport Confederate shell jackets. That 64's is actually a shell jacket as well, despite its hem being unseen, is supported by the fact that like figures 63 and 65, he wears a forage cap or kepi whose tone is identical not only to the other two pieces of headgear, but also to his and the other three jackets as well. There can be no doubt that these men are appointed with the same clothing. Only on figures 62 and 65 can pants be seen. Both pairs are an identical medium tone indicating that they are uniform items.

Figures 80, 82, 83, and 84, form a third group dressed in this same combination of uniform components. For the same reasons of short lengths and matching dark/medium tones, it is apparent that figures 82, 83, and 84, wear Type B jackets. With the latter person, a stand-up collar is discernible. Although figure 80's jacket can not be seen, his closeness to the others and his trousers indicate he probably wears a like garment. The pants worn by him and the other three men are a perfectly matching medium tone.

Near the previous group is another consisting of figures 73, 75, and 85. The short lengths and identical dark/medium shades clearly show that the latter two individuals wear Confederate shell jackets. Although the hem can not be defined for figure 73, his nearness to figure 75 and the fact that his garment is an identical tone supports the probability that he wears the same. While figure 73's trousers are also obscured from view, those of the other two men are a matching medium hue.

Yet a fourth group of soldiers so dressed can be determined. This involves figures 46, 47, and 49, and each wears a jacket of the same
dark/medium tone indicating they are Southern military. That they are shell jackets is apparent from the short length of each. On those worn by figures 47 and 49, stand-up collars can be seen, and with the former, it is clear that the garment fastens to the neck. As to their trousers, they, too, sport pairs of an identical medium tone, indicating again, that they are military uniform items.

A final grouping consisting of two men, 45 and 67, can be established. The short lengths, stand-up collars, and matching dark/medium shades show that they wear Southern shell jackets. It is also apparent that figure 67's fastens to the neck. Again, each wears trousers of an identical medium tone marking them as uniform articles.

In addition to those just described, there are four men isolated from both each other and the aforementioned groupings who also sport at least similar uniforms. These are figures 18, 29, 58, and 88. With each, a Confederate shell jacket is worn which is evident from the short lengths and dark/medium shadings which are the same as those previous. On figure 88's garment, a stand-up collar is visible. All wear trousers of a medium tone which is the same as those previously described.

The above account for twenty-seven of the ninety men offering data—a considerable percentage. Granted, given the variation in specific attributes witnessed in previous photographs, it is quite doubtful that the uniforms in one grouping are exactly like those in another. Yet, the fact that all the garments are the same type with the tones of jackets and trousers matching each other, respectively, and the same shading combination appears between these components in each instance,
indicates that these are a standard Confederate uniform commonly issued at least at this point in the conflict. When compared to the vast majority of trousers worn by the Federal troops in the background, the tones of those on these Confederates is a slightly lighter hue. This, combined with the regularity with which they appear in the same combination with a much darker jacket supports that they are not only military, but of Southern origin as well.

There are two more groupings of soldiers, figures 4, 5, 7, and 8, and figures 14, and 15, (in fairly close proximity to each other, but separate) who sport outfits that are similar to, but not quite the same as, those already described. For the same reasons of matching shades and short lengths, these men, at least within each group, wear the same shell jackets. Theirs, however, are slightly darker than those already discussed. With figure 15, the typical stand-up collar is definable. The pants also match both within and between each group in a medium tone. But, like the jackets, they, too, are slightly darker than those worn by the twenty-seven men already described. Being the same hue indicates these trousers are issue articles and the fact they are worn in groupings with matching Confederate jackets identifies them as Southern also.

Two figures, 23 and 41, who are in fairly close proximity to each other, and a third isolated individual, 76, are clad in Confederate shell jackets of a shade that matches those of the two just mentioned groups. The tone denotes the origin, and the short lengths the type. The trousers of figures 23 and 41 are a medium tone that is the same as those worn by the first twenty-seven men. Figure 76's pants are
Two other men, 72 and 74, wear identical uniforms in which the combination of matching medium toned trousers with darker Confederate shell jackets are worn. The jackets, however, are quite dark and match none of those previously mentioned. The short length, in each case, denotes the type. Despite the dark shade which is similar to that seen on the Federal troops, and a lack of specific details, there is no reason to believe that these are not of Southern manufacture. We have already witnessed a number of dark jackets which were clearly Confederate, and these undoubtedly are as well. At this point in the war, Northern versions of this type were not common, and more to the point, it is unlikely that two men would have procured the same rare garment. Their matching trousers are also the same hue as those seen on the first twenty-seven individuals.

Three additional, isolated figures, 11, 32, and 56, are clad in the same manner in dark shell jackets, arguably Confederate for the same reasons. Their trousers, too, are an equivalent medium tone.

Two other men, also isolated, wear these dark shell jackets. These are figures 20 and 61. In each case, the short length defines the type, and a stand-up collar is definable on figure 61's. Again, for the same reasons, the dark hues can not be interpreted to denote Federal origins. Further linking these two men but setting them apart from all others are their trousers which match in a very light tone, which is far too light for Federal issue. This supports that both jackets and trousers worn in this combination are, in fact of Southern military origin.

In terms of uniforms with sharply contrasting shades between
jackets and trousers, there is another grouping of two figures, 35 and 37. That Confederate shell jackets are worn is evident from the identical dark/medium shades and short lengths. Figure 35's fastens to the neck, and on 37's, a stand-up collar can be seen. Their pants are very light like those of figures 20 and 61, and arguably Confederate for the same reasons.

From groups wearing contrasting uniform items, we move to six groups within each of which (with one exception) uniforms of a medium shade with matching components are worn. These six clusters of men can be lumped into two larger groupings.

The first of these consists of figures 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54. Evident from the short lengths and matching hues, each wears the same Confederate shell jacket. Stand-up collars can also be seen on the garments of figures 52, 53, and 54. With the exception of figure 52, all wear trousers that match both each other and the jackets perfectly in tone, denoting them as Confederate military issue. Figure 52's pants are slightly lighter and probably representative of a different issue.

Another group of two individuals, 66 and 71, are dressed the same as those just described. For the same reasons as previously, each wears a Confederate shell jacket, and with 66, a stand-up collar is apparent. Their trousers also match each other and the jackets perfectly indicating Southern military origin.

A third group consisting of figures 68 and 78 are also clad in these medium toned uniforms with matching components. This shade combined with the short lengths and stand-up collar on figure 68's define
both the origin and the type as Confederate shell jackets. As previously, the fact that the trousers are identical to each other and the jackets in terms of shades marks them as Confederate military as well.

Two isolated men, 28 and 40, are dressed in this same manner. The tones, short lengths, and the stand-up collar on 40 indicate that Southern shell jackets are worn. That their trousers also match each other and the jackets denotes their Confederate military nature.

The next group, figures 6, 19, and 21, are clad in medium shaded uniforms whose components match, but the tone of these is darker than those just described. For reasons of the identical hues and short lengths, it is apparent that each wears a Confederate shell jacket. Also, on figure 19's, a stand-up collar can be defined and figure 21's clearly fastens to the neck. As with the immediately preceding groups, that their pants are Confederate issue is apparent from their perfectly matching each other and the jackets. While figures 19 and 21 are close together, figure 6 is fairly removed, but all three are further linked by an additional uniform feature. Each wears a kepi of a shade that matches both each other and the rest of the uniform items. Very far from any of these men is a fourth figure, 81, who, while probably not a member of the same unit, is dressed identically to those three just described.

A second grouping consisting of figures 86 and 89 is attired in this same way (excepting the military caps) in uniforms with matching components which are the same hue as those just discussed. Each wears the same Confederate shell jacket which is confirmed by the matching
shades, short lengths, and stand-up collars. Their trousers which match each other and the jackets are thus confirmed as Southern issue.

Conforming to this same uniform scheme is a final group consisting of figures 55 and 57. Again, for the reasons of the identical, appropriate tones, short lengths, and stand-up collars, it is evident that Southern shell jackets are worn. Again, because the pants are the same hue as both each other and the jackets, their Confederate military nature is defined.

Also to be included with these groups is isolated figure 12. The medium tone identical to those just mentioned and the short length show that a Confederate shell jacket is worn. His trousers match his jacket as well, marking their Southern military origin.

As with earlier groupings, with these last twenty mentioned individuals, it is doubtful that the uniforms of one cluster are exactly the same as those in another in terms of hard details. In fact, as pointed out, two distinct, larger groupings can be formed between which there is a difference in shade. Still, they are similar, and twenty individuals form a large percentage of the total number of men offering data. As a result, these outfits must be considered as standard Confederate issue uniforms. Of note is the fact that, excepting figure 52, the first ten pairs of lighter medium shaded trousers are identical in tone to those worn by the first twenty-seven men in the dark/medium shell jackets. At the same time, the darker medium shaded pants of the remaining nine soldiers are the same hue as those sported by figures 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, and 15. The result is that in terms of color, there seems to be a considerable degree of standardization with Southern military trousers.
In association with these twenty men, there are two groups of two individuals each—figures 36 and 39, and figures 87 and 90, respectively—and two isolated figures 10 and 70, who wear Confederate shell jackets of the same exact shade as those nine in the darker medium garments. The type and origin is confirmed by the shade in combination with the short lengths. In addition, stand-up collars are to be seen on figures 36, 39, and 90, and with figure 39, the fact the garment fastens to the neck is also discernible. Their trousers are a dark/medium tone that do not match the jackets. They do, however, match each other. This in conjunction with the fact that they are too dark for Federal issue signifies that they are Confederate military.

Also linked with the twenty men in medium hued uniforms is a group of three figures, 22, 26, and 27 (in fairly close proximity to each other) who sport Confederate shell jackets of the same tone as those eleven of a lighter medium tone. The garment type is marked by their being the same appropriate shades and short lengths. Their trousers, while matching each other in a medium tone, are not the same as the jackets. They are slightly lighter. In fact, the shading combinations of their uniforms is the same as that worn by figure 52 whose pants do not match the others in his grouping. Their matching in shade marks these trousers as military issue, and their wear in association with matching Confederate jackets leaves no doubt as to their Southern origins.

Having so far accounted for seventy-four out of ninety individuals, the remaining men wear distinctive outfits, or, as in the cases of figures 24 and 25, what they wear on the upper part of their body is obscured from view. As to the trousers of these two men, nothing can
be seen of figure 24's. Figure 25's are the same dark/medium tone as those worn by such men as 36 and 39. For figure 59, the exact type of jacket or coat worn can not be discerned. It is, however a dark tone equivalent to the jackets sported by figures 20 and 61. His pants are blocked from view.

Of the thirteen remaining men, four wear uniforms in which the components match. Though isolated from each other, figures 2, 31, 48, and 79, wear uniforms of the same light shade. In each instance, this tone combined with a short length indicates that Confederate shell jackets are worn. With figures 2, 48, and 79, stand-up collars can be detected and with the latter it is also clear that the garment fastens to the neck. As stated, in each case, the trousers are the same tone as each other and the jackets indicating that they are Confederate issue.

Two additional figures, 3 and 43, wear Southern shell jackets of the same light tone as above, but have on trousers of variant shades. The tone and short lengths as well as the stand-up collar on figure 43, indicate the jacket type and place of origin. The trousers of figure 3 are a medium shade, darker than the jacket, and the same as worn in the group including figures 4 and 5. Figure 43's are also darker than his jacket, but a lighter medium tone than those on figure 3. This hue is equivalent to that seen in the group including figures 9, 16, 17, 30, 33, 34, and 38.

Two figures, 42 and 44, wear medium shaded Southern shell jackets evident from the tones, short lengths, and, with 42, the stand-up collar and manner of closing to the neck. Of note is that the collar is a
darker, contrasting hue indicating Style B trim. The shade of these garments is equivalent to that of the jackets worn in the group including figures 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54. As to their trousers, they neither match each other or the jackets. Figure 42's are a medium hue, darker than his jacket, and the same as those of figures 4, 5, 7, and 8. Figure 44's are lighter than his jacket creating a combination of shades the same as that witnessed on figure 52.

One remaining figure, 69, also wears a Confederate shell jacket, which is apparent from its medium shade and short length. This shade is identical to the jackets of the group including figure 68, with whom he sits, and 78 standing nearby. His trousers, however, are a light tone not matching either of his mentioned associates, but the same as those sported by such figures as 31, 48, and 79, the last of which sits on the other side of him.

Figure 77 is of interest, because he wears a Confederate sack coat. The light shade and medium length define the type, and worn in conjunction with a forage cap or kepi of an identical tone, there can be no doubt of its being Confederate military. His trousers are a slightly darker shade equivalent to those of the first twenty-seven men described.

Two figures, 13 and 60, wear frock coats, which is apparent from the long lengths of each. In neither instance, however, can it be discerned if they are double or single-breasted, and neither match in hue. Figure 13's is a medium tone, and 60's is a dark/medium shade. Both are consistent with Confederate garments. As to their trousers, each wears pairs of a medium tone equivalent to those worn by the first twenty-seven men.
The last of the ninety men to be discussed is figure 1. He is truly unique in terms of what he wears. On the upper body, he sports a dark toned, medium length coat. These features suggest the possibility that either a civilian or Federal sack coat is worn, but because no further details can be discerned, this must remain only a possibility. More definite, however, is that he wears the only confirmable pair of civilian trousers in this entire study. Even with his distance from the camera, it is quite evident that the fabric is a large, very loud plaid.

As to other articles of clothing, because most are turned away from the camera, it is difficult to define many shirts. Such can only be seen on figures 3, 4, 61, 63, 79, 81, and 85. In most instances as well, shoes are blocked from view either by the nature of the terrain or other men. Still, military bootees can be distinguished on figures 3, 4, 21, 37, 58, 60, 75, 80, 81, and 82. Shoes of an indeterminate type can be observed on figures 6, 8, 9, 44, 46, 52, 57, 70, 72, 79, 83, 85, and 86. Figure 35 wears low-cut shoes. In essence, all whose feet can be seen wear shoes. Socks can also be seen on figures 4, 35, 60, 75, 80, 81, and 82. Inclusive of those already mentioned, fourteen men sport military caps. Those on figures 19, 21, 35, 36, 38, 81, and 85, are of the forage or fatigue pattern. Those on figures 3, 6, 63, 64, 65, 67, and 79, are either forage caps or kepis. Excepting the ones on figures 3, 38, and 79, all match the wearers' jackets in tone. As to the remaining individuals, figures 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 66, 68, 69,
70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, and 90, have various styles of felt hats on. Figures 46 and 61 are without headgear. Because of blurring caused by movement, it is impossible to determine what the others wear. The only other article of clothing that can be defined is a cape on figure 63.

As mentioned, there is a fair amount of equipment in evidence. Haversacks are carried by figures 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 61, 62, 66, 70, 71, 72, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 88, 89, and 90. Figure 14 carries two haversacks. Canteens of uncovered tin are visible on figures 8, 14, 16, 17, 24, 26, 29, 31, 35, 40, 43, 46, 51, 54, 56, 70, 71, 72, 78, 80, 82, 85, 88, and 90. Cloth covered canteens are trucked by figures 12, 52, and 62. Figures 9, 27, and 57, carry canteens of indeterminate pattern, and figure 50 is of note for carrying the only other canteen in the entire study that is clearly a wooden drum type. Also, with three men, 36, 37, and 61, who clearly have haversacks, an additional shoulder sling is apparent indicating the presence of canteens as well. In reverse, with figures 27 and 51 who have canteens, an additional sling indicates haversacks are also present. On figures 3, 32, and 53, a single shoulder sling can be detected indicating the presence of either a canteen or haversack. A fair number of bedrolls are in evidence. Such can be seen on figures 1, 3, 6, 19, 24, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 46, 51, 54, 58, 59, 65, 69, 71, 72, 73, 80, and 87. Figure 60 has two. Loose, unrolled blankets are possessed by figures 2, 5, 7, 11, 15, 26, 27, 31, 50, 53, 56, 76, 78, and 82. Figure 55 has two. From the glossy finish, it is
apparent that figures 25 and 52 have gum blankets. There are also several backpacks. These are carried by figures 8, 57, 75, 80, 86, 87, and 89. Three additional, definable pieces of equipment that can be discerned are tin cups carried by figures 24 and 52, and a frying pan strapped to the back of the knapsack on figure 80. Figure 74 sits on an indefinable object - possibly a knapsack - and something is on the ground beside him.

As stated, there is a good sense of uniformity in this view. There are twenty-one distinct groupings of individuals in shell jackets and trousers accounting for sixty men. By adding groups together, this can be further broken down into ten distinct uniforms. Another fourteen men, isolated and not a part of any of these clusters can be said to be wearing one of these ten uniform combinations as well. Also, four separate individuals wear the light toned outfits which increases the number of definable uniforms to eleven. There are five isolated soldiers in odd mixes of jackets and pants whose combinations do not match others and increasing the number of distinctive uniforms to sixteen. With these five, however, each separate uniform article can be matched with those of other groups indicating they are just wearing different combinations of garments already classified in one of the previous eleven classifications. Furthermore, many uniform components in the eleven established outfits can be matched with others of another distinct combination. In fact, for the total number of men in shell jackets and trousers, eighty-three, there are only six identifiable shades of jackets and six of pants. The increased number of distinctive uniforms is created by these garments being worn in different combinations with each other. In addition to this, there are twenty-four men who
wear outfits in which the jackets and pants match each other. As stated, despite various of the twenty-one groupings matching each other in tones, it is doubtful if the uniforms of one are exactly like those in another in terms of number of buttons, collar styles, etc. Yet, the limited number of distinctive uniform shading combinations in conjunction with the even more limited number of tones for the two key components indicates a good degree of standardization in terms of the color of these garments. Add to this the fact that in each instance, the exact same jacket type is worn, and a strong sense of uniformity can be said to exist in the Army of Northern Virginia at this fairly late date in the war. All the jackets are definitely Confederate issue, and from the number of trousers matching each other and/or jackets, it is clear that these are Southern military as well.

As to equipment, again there is a nice sense with seventy-two men having at least one piece in evidence. Considering the situation, this is really good when it is taken into account that we do not know what was removed for or lost in battle or what various parties of Federal captors allowed them to keep. Furthermore, of interest is that of the twenty-one men without any apparent equipment, ten are sitting and appear to be quite sedentary. In such a situation, many would not keep their equipment on. It is likely that much lies on the ground beside them and is simply blocked from view. As stated, figure 74 sits by a large unidentifiable object, and an extra bedroll lies on the ground by figure 52. This line of reasoning might also incorporate many of the standing men as well.
White House Landing

Group WHLA: Photograph A

This view shows many of the roughly one-thousand Confederate prisoners detained at White House Landing, Virginia, in early June, 1864. About one half of the total are believed to have come from the brigades of Generals Thomas L. Clingman, William T. Wofford, and Goode Bryan, and were taken on June 1, at Cold Harbor. Clingman's command included the 8th, 31st, 51st, and 61st North Carolina Infantry Regiments. Bryan's was formed by the 10th, 50th, 51st, and 53rd Georgia Infantry Regiments. The 16th, 18th, and 24th Georgia Infantry Regiments, Cobbs' and Phillips' Georgia Legions, and the 3rd Battalion of Georgia Sharpshooters comprised Wofford's brigade. Of the remaining prisoners, about three-hundred from undesignated commands were captured on June 3rd, also at Cold Harbor. The rest were taken either at Cold Harbor or Totopotomy. The image itself was recorded on June 9 or 10, by Matthew Brady's crew. It rates as one of the best photographs of Confederate troops in the field with a total of forty-seven men offering good detail.18

As with the previous image, the behavior pattern of men from the same unit sticking together can be seen. Like uniforms appear in groupings. Unlike the previous view, there are specific details available confirming that the uniforms in a cluster are, indeed, the same. At the same time, it is also confirmed that uniforms similar or exactly the same in tone between two different groupings, do possess different attributes.
"View of Rebel Prisoners at White House Landing."

(Original title)
The light hued jackets of which only a few were seen in the prior photograph, are in abundance in this one. The largest group of men dressed alike wear Confederate shell jackets of this tone. This included figures 8, 10, 15, and 28. In each case, the matching shades denote that they are Southern, and the type is defined by the short lengths, manner of closure to the neck, and plain stand-up collars. With figures 8, 10, and 15, it is clear that the collars are a Style D cut. Details further linking figure 28 with the other three include the fact that both he and figure 8 have Style A construction belt loops. Also noticeable between figures 28 and 15 are the very full-cut sleeves. All four jackets have untrimmed cuffs, and with figures 8 and 15 these can be seen to be closed and buttonless as well. None have epaulets. With figure 28, there is a Style A front hemline and a Style A rear hemline which combine to create a Style A hemline overall. The hem/front opening angle of this garment is a Style A configuration as well. The buttons on figure 15's are metal and the tight spacing indicates a total of nine.

Also tying these men together are the trousers worn by each which match in a dark/medium tone. These are too dark for Federal issue. This, combined with the fact they match, indicates they are Southern military items. From figures 8's and 28's trousers it can be determined that they are not piped.

A fifth figure, 25, is probably dressed in this same uniform. He too wears a shell jacket which is evident from the short length, method of fastening to the neck, and stand-up collar. The light tone matching those just described confirms it as Confederate. The sleeves appear to be very full-cut and, although the exact pattern of the collar can not
be discerned, it does have a sharply angled point indicating the possibility it is also of the Style D pattern. Again, there are no epaulets.

Another possible link can be seen with his trousers. These appear very dark, but it is likely that this is more the result of shadows rather than being indicative of their true tone. In any case, they are too dark for Federal issue, and all indications are that they and the jacket are the same as those worn by the first four men.

Another group of men dressed alike and similar to those described includes figures 17, 19, and 45. Each also sports a Confederate shell jacket. The matching light shades confirm their origin. With figures 17 and 45, the hems can be seen and they are an appropriate short length, and while the hem of figure 19's is blocked from view, the way it hangs indicates that it too is short. This latter garment and figure 45's clearly fasten to the neck. In the case of 45's, the front opening is closed with five buttons. Both also have stand-up collars.

Although it can not be determined for figure 19's garment, figure 45's collar is a contrasting hue indicating Style B trim. As this is a medium tone, too light to be black indicating infantry and too dark for sky blue or yellow marking him as infantry or cavalry, it is undoubtedly red and the man is an artilleryman. As to figure 17's collar, nothing can be seen where one should be clearly visible if the same hue as his jacket. The only answer is that it too is a darker tone and is simply lost in the shadows. This, in turn, links figures 17 and 45 together. With figures 19 and 45 the cuff construction is plain, closed, and buttonless. Epaulets are absent on all three. A final
attribute can be seen on figure 45's jacket. There is an external, welted pocket on the left front positioned relatively low. Of interest is that it is set at an angle which is extremely sharp and pushes being horizontal. Also, it is constructed in such a way that its opening is designed for access with the left rather than the right hand as is usual. This area can not be seen on the other jackets. Another feature marking this group of jackets as different from the first is the lack of belt loops apparent on figure 17.

Although figure 17's trousers are blocked from view, those on figures 19 and 45 are a matching dark/medium tone which is the same as those of the first group. As they are alike and are too dark to be Union, they must be Southern issue.

Two additional figures, 20 and 21, who are in very close proximity to the previous three, are dressed alike in a manner that is similar but not the same as those just described. The light tones of the jackets match each other and those already mentioned. Although the hemlines in each instance can not be seen, the short lengths are evident from the way each hangs. It is very clear that each fastens to the neck and has a stand-up collar. These various attributes mark them as Confederate shell jackets. Supporting that these two garments are the same but different from those of the previous grouping is the fact that both have epaulets. With 20's, it can be seen that these taper, and so, are either the Style A or B pattern. They are also plain. Also marking these jackets as different from those prior is the solid, contrasting colored cuff trim on figure 21. This appears to be a simple banding without the point prescribed by regulations. A dark/medium
tone, for the same arguments advanced for figure 45's collar, this must be red indicating that this man and his comrade are artillerymen as well. This cuff is constructed closed without buttons.

Both these men wear dark/medium toned trousers which match each other and those previously described, and thus, for already stated reasons, must be accepted as Confederate issue. Because the trousers and jackets between this and the prior group are identical in hue, and the individuals are all, apparently, artillerymen, it is quite possible that all belong to the same outfit, and we are simply witnessing two different issues of jackets with variant attributes.

Another group wearing the light toned shell jackets includes figures 34, 39, and 40. The Southern origins and type is defined by the matching shades, short lengths, closures to the neck, and stand-up collars. As to collars, all are plain, and those on figures 34 and 40 are of the Style D configuration. All three have Style A front hemlines, and 34 and 39 have Style A rear hemlines, showing that the overall hemline is a Style A cut. From the spacing figure 34's garment closes with seven or eight metal buttons. Figure 40's buttons are metal as well. All three have plain cuffs and with figures 34 and 39, these can be seen to be closed and buttonless. None possess epaulets and again, from 34's it is apparent there are not belt loops. With 39's it is evident there is not an external pocket on the right side. Figure 34's jacket is also of note for showing the most severe example of damage to an article of clothing in the entire study. There is a large hole torn in the rear of the left shoulder.

Further linking these three men is the fact figures 34 and 39 wear
untrimmed light toned trousers that match each other. These appear just slightly darker in shade than their jackets. Whether this is the result of lighting effects or if they actually are a tad darker is impossible to say. In any case, they match each other, and this combined with the fact they are too light for Federal issue denotes them as Confederate military. Figure 40's are blocked from view.

An additional feature ties these three individuals together. All sport forage caps which match in hue but are darker than their other garments. While figure 40's is a slightly different pattern, those worn by figures 34 and 39 are the same.

Two final individuals isolated from each other and the above mentioned groups are dressed in light toned garments. These are figures 4 and 6. These shades combined with their attributes mark them as Southern military. With figure 4, the hem can not be seen, but, again, the manner in which it hangs indicates that it is short. This in conjunction with the fact that it fastens to the neck with metal buttons and has a stand-up collar marks it as a shell jacket. In the case of figure 6, apart from the tone, all that can be discerned is that it too closes to the throat and has a stand-up collar. This, at least, identifies it as Confederate military, and although it can not be said with any certainty, given the fact that all the other light toned garments are shells, it is quite probable this is as well. Neither have epaulets and both have plain, closed, buttonless cuffs.

As to their trousers, these match each other and those in the previous group perfectly, and as before, they appear a tad darker than the jackets. With figure 6's pair, there is no cuff slit. This with the
light matching tones confirms they are Confederate issue. It is also apparent that this pair is untrimmed.

The next group of men identically clad includes figures 7, 29, and 30. All wear shell jackets of the same medium shade. The hue is consistent for Southern military garments, and the type is confirmed by the short lengths, manner of closure to the neck, and stand-up collars. Although the exact style can not be determined, the collars of figures 29 and 30 have sharply angled points. In addition to the shading and general attributes linking these three jackets, there is the fact that all three have epaulets. Figure 30's fastens with eight metal buttons, and from the spacing of the holes, it is clear that 29's does also. Both of these have untrimmed front openings. Blocked from view on these two men, but seen on figure 7's jacket are Style A construction belt loops. Also noticeable on this jacket are very full-cut sleeves. The cuffs on figures 7 and 30 are clearly plain, and with the former, it is apparent that they are closed and buttonless as well. There is no indication of an external left side pocket on 29.

Each also wears trousers of a dark/medium tone which match each other and those of the first group of men described in the light hued jackets. As stated earlier, these are too dark for Federal issue, and because they match, they are obviously Southern military. A detail supports their Southern origin. Figure 30's have Style A pockets.

In terms of this shading combination of medium toned jackets with dark/medium toned trousers, two more men, 46 and 47, are dressed this way. Their jackets, however, are different from those just described. Their matching hues, short lengths and stand-up collars denote the type
and their origin. Figure 46's collar can be seen to be untrimmed. Further marking the two garments as the same are the Style B hem/front opening angles visible on each. Neither have epaulets and both have plain cuffs. With 46's, the untrimmed front is closed with eight buttons which appear to be of mixed patterns. His cuffs are closed and do not have buttons. There are no external pockets.

As their jackets match, so do their trousers. As mentioned, they are a dark/medium tone. For the same reasons as previously stated, this indicates that they are Confederate military.

Another grouping consists of figures 9, 12, and 13. All wear Confederate shell jackets that match perfectly in a medium shade. The tones combined with the fact that each fastens to the neck and has a stand-up collar identifies them as Confederate military. The tight single-breasted spacing of the two visible metal buttons on figure 9's shows that there were a fair number, probably eight or nine. Also, these three garments share the attribute of plain epaulets. It is this feature, witnessed only on shell jackets, that supports these are this type. With 9 and 12, these can be seen to taper indicating they are either a Style A or B pattern, and with 12 and 13 the buttons that fasten them are metal. In addition, all have plain cuffs, with those of figure 9 clearly closed and buttonless.

The trousers of figures 12 and 13 are blocked from view, but those of figure 9 are visible. They are a medium shade that matches that of his jacket perfectly. This confirms them as Confederate military.

Figures 31, 32, and 33, wear uniforms that are identical to each other. Their matching medium shades and short lengths define that each wears a Confederate shell jacket. In addition, various other at-
tributes are discernible on each. Those of figures 32 and 33 clearly close to the neck, and on figure 32's, the spacing of the visible buttons indicate a total of nine. Also, figure 32's possesses a Style G collar. All three have plain cuffs and those of figure 33 are closed and buttonless. Although figure 31's shoulders are blocked from view, figures 32 and 33 can be seen to lack epaulets.

All three wear trousers of a medium shade which match each other and the jackets, thus confirming they are Southern issue. With those on figure 31, a Style B pocket can be witnessed. This same pair and figure 32's are untrimmed.

The final group of men that can be said to be wearing the same uniforms includes figures 35, 36, and 37. All three have on jackets of an identical medium tone. This, combined with the short lengths visible on figures 35 and 37, define them as Confederate shell jackets. Although the hem can not be seen on figure 36, his extremely close proximity with the other two with the garment being an identical shade supports that his also is the same type of garment. All three fasten to the neck and have stand-up collars. With that of figure 35, the spacing indicates that the untrimmed front opening was secured with eight buttons. Figure 37's front opening can also be seen to be untrimmed. No epaulets exist and all have plain, closed, buttonless cuffs.

While figure 36's pants are blocked from view, those of figures 35 and 37 can be seen, and they match in the same medium tone. This is just a touch lighter than the jackets. With figure 37, it is evident that he has Style B pockets that button. This can be determined by the fact that his thumb is hooked in the bottom of the side opening which
is only a short distance beneath the waistband. This feature in conjunction with their matching figure 35's in shade supports the Confederate issue nature of both pairs.

There are six isolated figures, 1, 5, 11, 14, 18, and 23, whose uniforms do not match either each other or those already described, but which in each instance consist of components that are the same tone. With three of these, figures 1, 18, and 23, the garments worn on the upper bodies are clearly Confederate shell jackets. This is evident from the appropriate medium tones, short lengths, and manner of closing to the necks visible in each case. With figures 1 and 23, stand-up collars are discernible with that of the former individual conforming to the Style A pattern. Both figures 1 and 18 have plain closed buttonless cuffs. Also, with 18 there is a Style A hem/front opening angle and there are no belt loops. With figure 23, a number of other details can be observed. The tight spacing of the visible metal buttons indicates a total of nine along a piped front opening which supports the presence of Style A collar trim. There are plain epaulets which taper with a seemingly rounded end marking them as the Style B pattern. The ends are secured with metal buttons. Also, this garment has solid, contrasting colored closed cuffs whose pointed configuration identifies them as being the Style B pattern. There are no buttons here. Finally, there are no external pockets. In the case of figure 5, a shell jacket is also worn. The Confederate military nature is apparent from the medium shade and stand-up collar. While the hem is not visible, the type is defined by the presence of epaulets, the edges and interiors of which contrast with each other and the rest of the jacket indicating both Style A and B trim in association. Also, the
cuffs are plain, closed, and buttonless.

As to their trousers, as stated, in each instance they are the same shade as the jackets, and as such, must be accepted as Confederate military. With those worn by figures 1, 5, and 18, this is supported by the obvious lack of a cuff slit. Figure 1's and 18's are untrimmed. Also, figure 18's have pockets with at least a wide, side seam opening. Whether they are actually a Style F is impossible to determine due to a button near the top of the opening. Its presence might indicate that the pockets are either a Style A or D pattern, but it is difficult to tell if the button actually secures a flapped pocket or if it is a suspender button mounted over the side seam. Figure 23's waistband is secured in accordance with the Style A manner.

With the other two men who wear uniforms with matching components, it is impossible to determine whether they wear coats or jackets. Whatever the type, they are clearly Southern military. In each case, they are an appropriate medium shade, and each has a stand-up collar. Also, both have plain, closed cuffs without decorative buttons. Figure 11's does not have epaulets.

The only details available from the trousers are their shades. As mentioned, these match the coats/jackets perfectly and thus can be deemed Confederate military.

Five additional figures, 16, 22, 38, 41, and 43, wear Confederate shell jackets which are denoted by shade and visible hard details. All are an appropriate tone and 16's, 38's, 41's, and 43's short length. The type for 22's is marked by the presence of epaulets. The shade of figure 16's is difficult to determine due to an odd texture and the lighting. In some views it appears rather light while in others it has
a decided medium cast. There is a somewhat shiny texture to it that might indicate it is satinette. If so, such fabric would indicate a privately tailored garment. Those of figures 22, 38 and 41 can be defined as a medium tone and 43's is very dark. The jackets of figures 22, 41, and 43 clearly fasten to the neck and have stand-up collars. Figure 41's collar is the Style G pattern. Figure 22's front closes with eight metal buttons. With 38's, the spacing indicates that it has seven or eight of metal. The spacing on figure 43's marks it as having five, also of metal, and clearly defining it as Southern despite its shade. With figure 41's jacket, there is a Style A front hemline and this same garment also has epaulets. Figure 22's epaulets taper indicating they are either the Style A or B pattern. Epaulets do not exist on the jackets of figures 16 and 43. In addition, 16's was not made with belt loops. The cuffs of figures 16 and 41 are plain, with the latter being closed and buttonless. Figure 38's are also closed and do not have buttons. They do, however, have Style B cuff trim as per shell jackets. Figure 43's is pocketless, as is figure 22's, at least on the right.

As to the trousers of these individuals, figure 16's are a dark/medium hue the same as many of those already described. Matching others and too dark for Federal, these are Southern issue. Furthermore, they have Style B pockets and there is a suspender button affixed directly over the side seam. These are untrimmed. Figure 43's trousers are not visible, and all that can be discerned about figure 38's is that they are a medium shade slightly lighter than his jacket. This shade, combined with the buttoning, full frog Style D pocket, indicates the possibility that these might be of Federal origin.
Nothing can be seen of figure 22's pants.

Figure 2 wears a jacket or coat which is clearly a Confederate military garment, but the exact type can not be defined. It is a medium tone consistent with Southern shadings, and fastens to the neck in single-breasted fashion with a stand-up collar. It lacks epaulets and has plain cuffs. His trousers are a medium hue which is lighter than the jacket or coat. No other details are forthcoming.

Two individuals, figures 24 and 27, wear Confederate single-breasted frock coats. Both are an appropriate medium shade, long length, they fasten to the neck, and have stand-up collars. Figure 24's is interesting in that the length is somewhat shorter than normal, and he has his collar partially folded down. This is a dark contrasting hue, but because we are seeing the inside, it is impossible to determine if the outside is also a contrasting color or if this is simply representative of a dark lining. The cuffs are plain, closed, and lack buttons. Figure 27's coat closes with eight metal buttons. It is also constructed without an external pocket.

As to the trousers, figure 24's are a medium shade that matches that of the coat perfectly and defines them as Southern military. In addition, they have Style A pockets which supports their origin and type. Figure 27's are the dark/medium tone frequently encountered in this image and marking them as Confederate military.

A third figure, 3, also wears a Confederate frock coat, but because his back is to the camera, it is impossible to determine if it is a Type A or C garment. That it is Confederate and one of these types is evident from its medium tone, long length, and stand-up collar. Seen
from behind, the pleats and buttons at their tops can be witnessed. Whether or not there are side edges can not be determined. His trousers are completely blocked from view.

Of the three remaining men, 26, 42, and 44, what the former wears on the upper part of his body is blocked from view by a blanket draped over his shoulders. The other two are in shirt sleeves.

Figure 26's trousers are the same dark tone as figure 25's. As previously stated, these are possibly the same as the more common dark/medium shaded ones and only appear darker due to lighting. If not, the fact they match and are so dark supports they are Confederate issue. All that can be determined of figure 44's pants is that they are a medium tone. Figure 42's are blocked from view.

As to other garments, six figures, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 42, wear vests. Of these, those on figures 24, 27, and 42, can be said with certainty to be military. That worn by the former matches both his coat and trousers perfectly in shade which indicates that it is a uniform item. This garment, however, is interesting in that it does not fasten to the throat, but rather has a shallow, civilian style neck opening. Some of the buttons, however, are metal, and at least six were employed to fasten the front. Consequently, it must be accepted that this is a vest of military fabric and cut along civilian lines. Also of note with it, and not in fashion with either civilian or military wear is the inverted "V" notch at the hem/front opening point.

While the two metal buttons on a small expanse of fabric can be seen through the unfastened front of figure 27's coat, it is undoubtedly military as the tone is identical to the coat and the spacing of the
two visible fasteners is very tight.

Figure 42's vest is a very dark tone. This clearly closes to the neck and has a stand-up collar. That on figure 30 is a medium shade slightly lighter than his jacket. This is a civilian double-breasted type. The front opening edge angles over towards the right side, and, as such, is off center, and there are two rows of buttons. Figure 29's is also a civilian style. A very dark shade, this has a deep neck opening and what appears to be a shawl collar. It is single-breasted. All that can be determined about figure 22's vest is that it is a medium tone.

All the figures discussed wear caps or hats. Including those already mentioned, military caps can be seen on figures 6, 17, 26, 28, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, and 45. All are of the forage or fatigue pattern except figure 6's. His is a kepi which contrasts with the rest by presenting a semi-rigid shape and rolled crown. Those worn by figures 6, 26, 33, and 38 match the respective jackets perfectly in shade. With 36's, there is a contrasting colored headband in association with a crown that is the same shade as his jacket. Figure 17's has a contrasting hued headband as well. The caps of 6, 26, 28, 33, 34, and 40, are solid colors overall. Also, while 11's, 33's, and 40's, do not have chin straps, figures 6, 28, 34, and 36, do. With 28's and 34's, side buttons are visible and the latter's is clearly functional. Although a chin strap can not be defined on figure 39's cap, it does have buttons. On figures 6, 17, 26, 33, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 45, the visors are squared. Of interest are the metallic military devices plainly visible on the caps of figures 26 and 38. The remaining men
sport a variety of different styled felt hats. With that of figure 37, a metallic infantry bugle horn device is affixed to the front. Figure 27 wears his with both sides severely folded up creating the effect of a bicorn. This also has a metallic insignia on its front. On figure 2's, a tasseled military hat cord can be detected.

With a number of men, shirts are in evidence. These can be seen on figures 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 32, 35, 37, 42, 44, and 46. There are eighteen pairs of feet visible, and on all there are shoes. While those on figures 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 21, 24, and 33, are of indiscernible type, those on figures 4, 5, 18, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 46, and 47, are military bootees. Socks can be seen on figures 4, 18, and 47. Of note is the fact that figure 11 wears leggings. Figure 30 has a scarf.

There is also a considerable amount of equipment in evidence. Haversacks are clearly visible with figures 4, 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 37, 39, 41, and 43. Figure 36 also carries a haversack, but his is of interest in that it appears to be nonmilitary. There is a printed or embroidered pattern to it. Perhaps it is a carpet bag like item. Also carried by figure 33, and figure 31 as well, are large duffle bag like articles with shoulder straps. Tin canteens can be seen on figures 19, 21, 22, 23, 29, 33, 40, and 46. Those of 21, 33, and 46, are uncovered and elliptical while 19's and 29's are the same pattern but covered. From the perfectly circular bulge which is exactly the same diameter as figure 33's canteen, it is evident that figure 31 has a canteen as well which is inside his duffle bag. In addition, while what is actually suspended from them can not be seen, figures 2, 30, and 32, have two shoulder slings indicating the
presence of both a canteen and a haversack, and figures 3 and 24 each sport a single strap pointing to the presence of one or the other. On figure 41, with whom there is a haversack, a second strap is apparent that must support a canteen. Figure 4 who also has a clearly visible haversack, has two additional straps, one of which undoubtedly goes to a canteen, and figure 23, who has a haversack and a canteen in evidence has a third sling as well. Blankets or bedrolls are possessed by figures 10, 16, 26, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, and 38. Figure 30 has a gum blanket, and another regular blanket lies on the ground by him. There is some tinware in evidence. Figures 15 and 40 have tin cups, and another sits on the ground by figure 16. Figure 21 holds a boiler. In addition to his other gear, from the straps over each shoulder, it is apparent that figure 4 has a backpack on, and another of the rigid variety lies on the ground beside figure 21. Of special interest is the fact that figure 16 holds an additional coat or jacket over his right shoulder. An additional piece of gear is the toothbrush stuck in the buttonholes on figure 30's jacket. Figure 1 sits on what, because of its thickness, is probably another knapsack.

As stated, there is an excellent sense of uniformity in this image. On an individual basis, exclusive of the two men without coats or jackets and the one whose is covered by a blanket, all wear Confederate military coats or jackets. With the possible exception of a pair of Federal trousers, details indicate that the majority of pants can definitely be said to be Southern issue as well. In those few instances where trousers can not be definitely identified, it is strictly due to a lack of detail. Consequently, there is no reason to suppose that they are not Southern military.
Furthermore, of the forty-seven men in this image, twenty-six can be said to be wearing the same uniform as at least one other individual which creates a total of nine distinct uniform groupings. This number increases to twenty-nine individuals and ten groupings if figures 4 and 6 are accepted as wearing the same outfits and figure 25 is included with one of the established sets. This leaves fifteen men who are clad in distinctive outfits which do not match others and makes a total of twenty-five different uniforms in the view. This is not a terribly high figure when one considers the large number of different units these men undoubtedly represent.

This number of twenty-five distinct uniforms is made even more negligible when it is considered that the differences between many lies in the specific attributes, but coloration and basic cuts are the same. As to shadings and thus probably colors, only four can be established for the jackets. These are light, medium (with some minor variation), dark/medium, and dark. There are also only four definable shades of trousers; light, medium (again with some minor variation), a lighter medium, and dark/medium. A fifth tone of dark may exist if the trousers of figures 25 and 26 do not fall into the latter established category. In essence there appears, in all probability, to be a minimal number of actual uniform colors, and this combined with the number of individuals wearing the shell jackets does, in fact, establish an overall sense of uniformity with difference being created by specific attributes of different toned components being worn in different combinations with each other.

The only definable civilian items in evidence are a few vests. This, however, is of little consequence. As pointed out, vests were
not generally an issue item, and the wearing of one was simply to have an extra garment. As a result, if a civilian vest were worn beneath one's military coat or jacket it matters little as he is only affecting an extra item while still having the basic uniform articles.

Also as pointed out, there is a fair amount of equipment in evidence. A total of thirty-two men have at least one identifiable item visible. Of note is the fact that the majority of this (twenty cases) is seen on men who are standing. Of the ten sitting men with equipment, four do not actually have it on. They simply hold it or it lays beside them on the ground. This, again, raises the issue that sitting men would be more likely to remove their gear when in repose. This in turn leads to the question of how much additional equipment lies on the ground and is simply blocked from view. Additional objects which cannot be identified do lie on the ground beside figures 5, 6, 10, 18, and 20, increasing the number to thirty-six with some equipment. Also, as previously argued, some men undoubtedly had all their gear taken from them upon being captured while others were obviously allowed to retain those items necessary for basic creature comforts such as a canteen, blanket, and/or haversack for food or personal articles.

Petersburg/Five Forks, April 1, 1865

Group FFA: Photograph A

Little is ascertainable as to the history of this photograph. Traditionally, it is accepted that it shows Confederate prisoners cap-
tured at the Battle of Five Forks, April 1, 1865. There is no reason to question this, and consequently, the view was undoubtedly recorded in the Petersburg area. Most, if not all, of the men shown are members of General George Pickett's Division. This included the combined brigades of Matt Ransom and William Wallace made up of the 24th, 25th, 35th, 49th, and 56th North Carolina and the 17th, 18th, 22nd, 23rd, and 26th South Carolina, respectively. Also forming this division were the brigades of Generals Terry, Steuart, and Corse. The first of these was made up of the 1st, 3rd, 7th, and 11th Virginia. The second was formed by the 9th, 14th, 38th, and 57th Virginia. The last was comprised of the 15th, 17th, 29th, and 30th Virginia. All of the above were infantry regiments. Cavalry under Munford, Roberts, and Rooney Lee, as well as artillery under Willy Pegram was also present, but the nature of the equipment carried by the men in the picture indicates that they are foot soldiers. 20

Although the basic nature of the photograph does not allow much specific detail to be discerned, it can still be established that there is an excellent sense of uniformity both on an individual basis and between individuals. There is also a large amount of equipment present. Fifteen men offer detail.

Figures 5 and 11 are the first two men who can be judged as dressed alike. Each wears a Confederate shell jacket which matches in a medium tone. This shade, combined with the short lengths defines the origin and type. With figure 5's, the stand-up collar can also be seen.

Each wears trousers of the same medium cast as their jackets. Figure 11's can be seen to be untrimmed. Despite the lack of detail
Confederate Prisoners Captured at Five Forks. (modern title)
for these pants, this factor of matching components identifies both pairs as being Southern issue.

The next men clad the same are figures 6 and 12. Both wear dark hued shell jackets which is evident from the short lengths and stand-up collars. Despite their dark tone, because there is nothing to indicate they are Federal, because confirmed Confederate jackets can appear this shade, and because extremely few Federal jackets of this type were being worn at this point and for a considerable period prior, these are undoubtedly Confederate military garments.

Both also wear dark trousers which match each other, but are just slightly lighter than their jackets. Too dark for Federal issue, this factor combined with their being the same tone, marks them as Confederate military.

Also wearing the same dark hued shell jackets are figures 9 and 10. Again, with each, the type is marked by the short lengths and stand-up collars. For the same arguments as just stated, the dark shade apart, these are undoubtedly Southern issue. These men also wear trousers that match in a dark hue. These, however, are darker than those worn by the previous men and match the wearers' jackets as well. These factors of matching each other and the jackets, and being too dark for Federal regulation, clearly defines them as Confederate military, and further indicates the jackets are as well.

Another individual, figure 4, is quite probably dressed in the same manner as one of the two previous groups. His shell jacket, identified by its short length and stand-up collar, is the same dark shade as the four previously described figures.
His trousers, too, are a dark cast. Because of shadows, however, it is impossible to determine if they match either of the other two pairs or his jacket. In any case, they probably are the same as one or the other of the already mentioned shading groups. More to the point, they are too dark for Federal issue, and as such, are very probably Southern military.

Two more men, figures 7 and 8, are also dressed alike. Each sports a shell jacket of a dark/medium tone which match each other. This shade is consistent with Confederate garments (a comparison with the coats of the Federal captors shows it to be a lighter cast), and the type is indicated by the short lengths. With 7's, the stand-up collar can be detected, and with 8's, the cuffs are plain, closed, and buttonless.

As to their pants, they match each other as well, and they are the same dark tone as those worn by figures 9 and 10. For reasons already stated, these must be accepted as Confederate issue.

Two other figures, 13 and 15, are dressed at least similarly, if not exactly the same as, figures 7 and 8. Both wear Confederate shell jackets which match each other in the same dark/medium cast as the two previous individuals. Again, the type and origin is defined by this shade, combined with the short lengths and stand-up collars. With 15's it is evident there are no epaulets.

As with 7 and 8 also, their trousers match in the same dark shade, and as such, are certainly Southern issue.

While their uniforms are probably not exactly the same, because they are widely separated from each other, two figures, 1 and 3, wear a
combination of medium toned shell jackets and dark pants. In each instance, the type and origin of the upper body garment, is identified by the tone in conjunction with the short lengths and stand-up collars. Furthermore, the shades of these two jackets are identical to those of the jackets worn by figures 5 and 11.

As stated, their trousers are a dark tone. With figure 3, at least, this is the same shade as those worn by figures 6 and 12. This identifies his as Southern issue. Figure 1's, like 4's, appear to be the same as one of the two dark types so common in this view, and as such it is almost certain they are Southern issue as well. Shadows simply will not allow a definite assessment. They are, however, not Federal.

Figure 2 is the final figure wearing a shell jacket. The type is once again defined by the short length. Its shade is impossible to determine with any certainty, but it is either a dark/medium or dark tone. As such, it is quite likely that it is the same as some of the others in this view.

With his trousers, there is the same problem of interpreting their tone. They are, however, of one of the two dark variation, and as such should be considered Southern issue as well.

Finally, there is figure 14 who wears a Confederate frock coat. Because his back is to the camera, it is impossible to determine if it is a single or double-breasted type. That it is Confederate military, however, is indicated by its dark/medium shade, long length, and stand-up collar.

His trousers are the same tone as the darker of the two dark
varieties, and as such are definitely Confederate issue.

As to other articles of clothing, due to the stance of the figures, nothing can be seen of vests or shirts. All feet can be seen except 4's, and in each instance, shoes are worn. With the exception of 7 however, who has bootees on, the types can not be discerned. Also, figure 3 wears leggings. Regarding headgear, all but figures 1 and 8 wear felt hats. Figure 1 sports a military cap of indiscernible pattern which is the same shade as his jacket. Figure 8 wears a civilian workman's cap.

Already stated is the fact that there is a large amount of equipment in this view. Haversacks are apparent on figures 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 14. Uncovered, elliptical tin canteens are carried by figures 6, 11, 12, 13, and 15. Figure 9 also has a canteen of indiscernible pattern. Also, on figure 2, an additional sling can be seen indicating that he too has a canteen. With figures 3, 4, and 5, although what they support can not be determined, single shoulder slings can be seen indicating that either a canteen or haversack is present. A number of figures, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15, have bedrolls, and four figures, 1, 3, 5, and 14, have knapsacks. Of these figure 3's is a single-bag type which at this point in the war tends to indicate that it is of Southern manufacture. Also of interest regarding these knapsacks is the fact that those carried by figures 5 and 14 are incredibly large and fully packed, indicating extra clothing and/or blankets.

As shown there is a very nice sense of uniformity in this image on both an individual and group basis. With the remotely possible excep-
tion of two pairs of trousers, all clothing items are definitely Confederate, and in all likelihood, the pants in questions are as well. Uniformity is heightened when it is realized that in reality only three shades of shell jacket exist: medium, dark/medium, and dark. For trousers, there are also only three identifiable tones: medium, dark, and a lighter dark. The increased number of uniforms is a result of these three hues being worn in different combinations with each other. Even then, however, the majority of individuals in the view can be said to be wearing the exact same uniform as another. The large amount of visible equipment is noteworthy. It becomes even more so when it is realized we can see only one side of most of the men. We do not know what is carried on the other in addition to that which is evident. When it is considered that this view was recorded only a few days prior to the surrender of the army, the data from it is truly significant. The Army of Northern Virginia seems to have been well appointed right to the end.
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CHAPTER XII

THE SAMPLES COMPARED AND NEW ATTRIBUTES DEFINED

Having completed an analysis and description of what appears in the photographs, how does the information from them compare with the established typology? Comparison can be made in both a general and specific sense. In the first (which will be discussed in the following chapter) the two samples mirror each other perfectly. As to the specific, the frequency of particular types and attributes in the images matching the order of the typology, there are some aspects that do not line up. This, however, does not invalidate the typology, as there are a number of reasons accounting for such discrepancies. At the same time, there is an incredible amount of data between the two samples that matches perfectly.

Because of the extremely different nature of the two sources offering different samples, it should not be expected that they complement each other exactly in terms of specifics. In conjunction, enter a third sample - that which is actually discernible in the photographs. Whereas all or most attributes can be observed and noted with the existing garments, because they can be examined from at least a number of angles, the same can not be said for the uniforms in the photographs. Frequently, we can observe them only from a single
Much is blocked from view by physical obstructions, and much is obscured by the quality of the photograph itself. Basically, there is simply a lot that can not be seen, and the various factors effecting this situation actually create a third sample which is within another. In essence, it would be ludicrous to compare a sample within a sample with another sample and expect them to match each other perfectly in terms of particulars. This factor alone certainly accounts for many if not all discrepancies between the two main sources of data.

Following are examples, both negative and positive, of how the two samples compare. Before getting involved in this, however, a few words are in order as to how the comparisons were made. No two extant uniform items are identical, and as such, each constitutes a distinct garment representative of a specific issue at a specific time. Within the images, there are a large number of men who wear the same outfits which are undoubtedly indicative of the same issue at a given point. For comparison sake, however, three matching uniforms can not be tabulated as three. They constitute a single, distinct uniform, and as such count only as one. To compare them as three would drastically skew the picture. Accepting this, we can proceed.

In terms of coat, jacket, and trouser types, the ordered rate at which they appear in the images is close to that witnessed with the museum specimens. Shell jackets and Type A trousers are by far the most common in each source. As with the extant garments, frock coats appear next in frequency in the photographs. Unlike the existing articles, however, in the views, more single-breasted versions were noted than double. Still, the totals are not far off with ten Type B coats
and eight Type A. In addition, there are four frocks for which the exact form can not be established. The possibility that these are double-breasted is not out of the question. If so, then the frequency of presence between the two samples would line up. Despite the relatively late provenance of one of the museum items, it was not really expected that tailcoats would be seen in the images as they are primarily an early war style. After this, the order in which sack coats and zouave jackets appear is identical between the two sources.

More specifically, as a negative example, a comparison of the single-breasted frock coats in each sample will serve. Not a great deal of detail could be ascertained about this coat type in the photographs, and what was discernible did not always line up with the established typology. For instance, no Style A collar patterns were seen, but three of the Style B form were observed. Whereas cuff trim was prevalent on the existing coats, plain cuffs dominate in the photographs. In fact, only one of the single-breasted frock coats in the images had cuff trim at all, and this was a completely new form for this type. This discrepancy, however, can be accounted for if, in fact, the one existing coat really did belong to a musician, and the trim is indicative of his role. As such, the decoration should be considered unique, which, in turn, would point to the fact that plain cuffs actually were more common than trimmed. On the positive side, the button counts between the two samples line up fairly well. With the existing garments, two coats have eight buttons and one has seven. In the photographs, one has eight, one has seven to eight, and one has six to seven. In addition, two new counts were noted, six and four
button styles, which constitute new attributes that fall into place perfectly in terms of frequency when added to the established typology. While some of the above makes it seem that the two samples do not correlate, as stated, they should not be expected to. Still, certain aspects do match up, and others that do not can be accounted for.

On the positive side, the attributes of double-breasted frock coats, as observed in the photographs, appear in the same order of frequency as those of the extant versions. The A and B button counts line up. The one discernible collar shape is a Style A. Plain collars are dominant. In the one case where cuff construction could be determined, it was closed. No buttons were present at this location, but they may simply have been lost; a situation encountered with some of the museum articles.

Moving to shell jackets (that item found in abundance in both samples and allowing a greater basis for comparison) the two sources mirror each other in almost all aspects. In those instances in which they do not, there are generally very acceptable explanations. As with the extant jackets, the garments in the photographs show plain cuffs as being more common than trimmed, and with the decorated forms, the Style A trim appears more often than the Style B. Closed buttonless cuffs are far more apparent than those that are open with fasteners. The different cuts of hem/front opening angles appear in the same frequency order. There are more jackets without external pockets, epaulets, and belt loops than there are with. The forms the belt loops take in terms of construction also line up. Plain collars are more common than trimmed. It is, however, with collar trim that one of the truly major
discrepancies between the two samples is encountered. The majority seen in the images conform to the Style B form. There are only two examples of Style A. In association, only one jacket with a piped front opening was noted. These two variances can, however, be easily accounted for. Both forms of decoration appear only as narrow strips along the very edges of the jacket, with the collars sometimes also having such along the seam at the base. As such, it is entirely probable that more examples of this trim style are actually present in the photographs and are simply not being seen. It is not showing up, because it is lost in the contrasts and shadows of the edge in relation to what is behind it. Trim at the base of collars is undoubtedly being lost from view in creases and folds. That this is the case is supported by the fact that piped cuff trim is the most common for that area, and it stands to reason that this form was far more common on other locales as well. The cuff trim shows up better, because it contrasts with the same background on either side. It is not on the edge. The inability to detect piping on collars and front openings is undoubtedly enhanced by two additional factors. Many of the jackets are quite dark, reducing the degree of contrast, and at least some of the trim is red and not standing out.

The only two jacket attributes that are off between the two samples in terms of matching in ordered frequency are button counts and collar configurations. With the exception of the Style A nine button articles being the most oft encountered in both sources, these two attribute categories, as observed in each source, bear little resemblance to each other.
With trousers, excepting pocket styles and trim, the attributes observed in the photographs appear in the same order as in the established typology. For instance, the methods of waistband closure and the shapes of the waistband ends match up perfectly. The same is true for the presence of watch pockets and whether or not the pants were to be supported with suspenders. Where discernible, all trousers in the photographs have belted seats. Untrimmed, however, surpass trimmed. This is of interest because the discrepancy between the two samples is quite marked. Still, with those confirmed as having trim in the views, it takes the form of a relatively wide tape that is quite noticeable. As will be recalled, with a high percentage of the extant pants, the piping is a narrow cording, most commonly red. Consequently, two explanations are at hand to explain the absence of trouser trim in the photographs. Some may be red and just is not showing up in contrast. Also, many trousers are quite dark on which black piping would not be visible either. Another explanation can be found in the construction and materials of the pants themselves. The cording was sewn into the side seams of garments generally fashioned from very heavy fabric. As a result, there is often a rather deep seam in which the narrow piping could be lost from sight.

The pockets of the pants offer an interesting situation. Recalling the established typology, the six pocket types can be divided into two basic categories; those with which the opening is completely or predominantly vertical and those with which it is primarily or totally horizontal. The first classification includes Styles A and F, and the second, Styles B, C, and E. Style D will fit into either group.
Throughout the photographs, Style A is by far the most common, but next in frequency are Styles D and F, respectively. Of note is that all have a major vertical opening. Next in order comes the Style B form, followed by Styles C and then E, all of which have horizontal access. In essence, within the two basic categories, the order of frequency remains the same; A, D, and F, and B, C, and E. To a large degree, this conforms to the established typology, and the discrepancy of the two samples not matching perfectly is easily explained. The least common in the views are those with the horizontal openings, and it is because of the nature of their construction that they do not appear more often. They are more easily lost in wrinkles at the hips and waist and/or covered by even the short hemlines of the shell jackets. In essence, they simply are not as visible as the vertical forms.

To reiterate, the bottom line in comparing the specific data of the two samples is that it should not be expected that they match up. Yet, a very high percentage actually does, and much that does not seem to initially can be accounted for. All things considered, the typology as established is valid and representative. Offering support of this is the fact that in the course of examining the photographs, a few new attributes were encountered. In each instance, these new features fall into place perfectly with the typology as it exists. None appears with greater frequency than those already defined, thus disrupting the order as created. These new attributes are as follows.

Two new forms of cuff trim were discerned for shell jackets and will be labeled Styles C and D respectively. The first, represented by two examples, consists of a simple band of contrasting piping affixed a
short distance up from the edge of the cuff and remaining parallel to it all around. There is no point. The second involves a solid applique encircling the cuff and extending up a short way from the edge. Again, there is no point. (See Illustration 104.)

Also with shell jackets, variations in the construction of already defined external pockets were noted. First, there was a single example of piping completely encompassing a pocket opening. Secondly, a pocket with an opening that pushed being vertical was observed. (See Illustration 105.)

A number of new attributes were witnessed for single-breasted frock coats. As indicated, such coats with six and four buttons were seen, and these are designated as having Style C and D counts, respectively. Discerned on three coats were external breast pockets. As a result, single-breasted frock coats without this feature will be termed as being of Style A construction, and those with will be designated as Style B. In turn, two distinct forms of pocket existed. Two of the examples were welted and will be classified as Style A pockets. That remaining was a patch form that will be termed Style B. Finally for this garment type, two new patterns of cuff trim were observed in association with each other. This involved a solid applique over the cuff with the point as per the Style A form for the double-breasted versions. This is labeled Style C for the single-breasted type. Delining the shape of the applique along the upper edge was a band of piping. As specimens undoubtedly existed with just the piping alone, this will be called Style D cuff trim. (See Illustrations 104 and 106.)
Vests also presented several new features. Two examples exhibited rounded hem/front opening angles which will be termed Style B. Also witnessed were two vest collars with rounded points. Unfortunately, in neither instance could the overall shape of the collar be ascertained. Consequently, these can not be classified with a style designation, because it is impossible to say if one or two overall configurations exist. We can only compare rounded points to squared, and the sharply angled forms dominate in both samples. (See Illustration 107.)

Also, a completely new vest type was noted for enlisted men. This is the civilian cut "American Vest" fashioned from military fabric. It receives the designation of being a Type B vest. For this type, two patterns of hem/front opening angles were noted. There was the then fashionable squared pattern as seen on most vests of the period. This is Style A. On one, however, a clipped hem/front opening was viewed that would create an inverted "V" notch when fastened. It is interesting to see an outdated, unstylish attribute on a fashionable vest type only recently in vogue. This form will be labeled Style B. (See Illustrations 14 and 107.)

Finally, a single new feature was defined for both double-breasted frock coats and sack coats. With the former, an example with five pairs of buttons was detected, and will be classed as having a Style C count. One sack coat possessed piping along the front opening, and this will be called Style B construction for this garment type. (See Illustration 105.)
CHAPTER XIII

CONCLUSION

The casualty and prisoner-of-war photographs offer conclusive proof that the enlisted men of the Army of Northern Virginia did not suffer from a lack of proper clothing and equipment. Given the nature of the situation in which the views were recorded, if problems existed, they should be reflected, but they are not. Of the 344 men examined (143 casualties and 201 prisoners-of-war) the vast majority, at least, are clearly well appointed in Southern issue uniforms, and the condition of that issue is incredibly good. What few problems there are do not transcend what would be typical of any military force on active campaign. In fact, the negative evidence is so minimal as to be far less than typical. In concluding the study, because some of the articles described can not be firmly identified (particularly some trousers) the quantitative summaries of data will be presented in terms of worst and best case scenarios. As will be seen, even the worst are really quite good. Also, in the totals as presented, the four, possibly five, individuals in the Aldie image who sport civilian clothing will not be included unless otherwise noted. Their appearance is legitimately and historically accounted for with no stigma attached.

In summarizing the few evident problems, first there is the condi-
tion of the uniforms. There is absolutely no evidence of the troops being in rags and tatters. Only two garments in the entire sample show serious damage. A jacket has a severely ripped shoulder, and one knee on a pair of trousers was badly torn. In the latter instance, however, the rend was beautifully mended. It should be stated that rips are the result of accidents and as such, differ from extreme over wear resulting in a garment being threadbare or actually worn through. Tears can occur with new uniforms just as easily as with old. That only two such instances were noted, especially in light of the hard wear these outfits have obviously been subjected to, is remarkable, and it says a great deal about their quality and durability. The only other example of accidental damage is a jacket missing an epaulet — a very negligible situation. Evidence of wear is quite minimal. With one man, the side seam of his pants is split. Two individuals have frayed cuffs on their jackets, but again, with one, the area was nicely repaired. After this, the worst that is seen is a small number of jackets missing buttons. This is really to be expected under any circumstance and hardly constitutes a grave situation. Buttons do come loose and get lost.

The viewer may have noticed a few additional damaged garments in the casualty images. For instance, on figure 19 in Group AA, the right pant leg below the knee is horribly shredded, and figure 1 in Group GC has a large rip in the upper left leg of his trousers. The very nature of these and some other such rends, however, is not consistent with wear and tear. Each appears to be the result of and coincide with wounds. That this is the case is clear from the fact that this sort of damage is nonexistent in the prisoner-of-war views.
That there were shortages of footwear is not supported by the photographs. Evidence of such is almost completely lacking. Of 184 men whose feet can be seen only seven are without shoes. Of these, one man has one shoe remaining, and five others wear socks indicating that they had shoes prior to being killed. Only one individual is truly bare-foot. Furthermore, excepting one soldier in a Gettysburg view, the absence is easily accounted for in each instance in a manner that does not reflect production or supply problems in the Army of Northern Virginia. In essence, there is only a single discernible situation in which a Southern soldier required shoes, and out of need, removed a pair from a fallen comrade. In addition, with the footwear that actually exists, there is only one pair that can be determined to be extremely worn. Even with supply functioning smoothly, one would expect to see more. Finally, there is only one pair showing signs of being made of atypical materials, and there is no indication of any with wooden soles.

Coats, jackets, and trousers, decidedly not Confederate, are extremely rare. Apart from the men in the Aldie view, only a single figure can be discerned as truly wearing civilian pants. Because of his overall impression, another man might wear civilian trousers as well, but they could just as easily be Southern military. Worn with a civilian vest, without a jacket, and presenting no hard details, there is simply no way of telling one way or the other. There are two men who, perhaps, wear Federal trousers. Still, the same attributes that create this possibility can be found on Confederate issue as well, and consequently, these, too, are just as likely to be Southern. Finally,
the same man clearly in civilian pants, might also be wearing a United States sack coat. This garment, however, could just as easily be a civilian version or even a dark Confederate pattern. Again, there is simply a lack of conclusive data.

In addition to the trousers just mentioned, there is a relatively small number whose origin defies classification, because they, too, offer no defining hard details. There are thirteen pairs which are a medium shade that can not be matched with any other garment. While it is remotely possible that these are Federal or civilian, they are just as likely to be Confederate. Ten more pairs exhibit no physical attributes to mark their exact origin, but each is either too light or dark a tone to be Northern. Also, there are five pairs of medium hues which present some detail, but not enough for a firm assessment of provenance. Yet, with each, the details are sufficient to rule out their being Federal. While whether or not these last fifteen pairs are civilian or Confederate is open to question, they are just as likely to be the latter. In fact, when any of these questionable garments are viewed in light of these that do present defining attributes, there is no reason to believe that they are not Confederate. Excepting the one civilian pair, when it is considered that all other trousers (the vast majority) offer sufficient data to provenance them, and all are clearly Southern military, there are no grounds for doubt that, simply because of a lack of defining features, those remaining are anything but as well. In support, inclusive of the two men possibly in Federal pants and the one possibly in civilian, twenty-two of the individuals whose trousers are in question wear Southern military coats or jackets. This
indicates they are uniformed and their pants are probably Confederate issue also. Of the remaining nine men, eight do not wear coats or jackets, and one has his upper body blocked from view.

To summarize this situation in a quantitative sense, there are 317 men in the sample whose pants can be seen. Of these, one definitely sports a civilian pattern, and thirty-one have on pairs of questionable provenance, of which twenty-eight are probably Southern military. For the sake of argument, even in the remote possibility that the twenty-eight are not Confederate, this still adds up to only 10.08% of the total. Accepting that the twenty-eight are Confederate, and there is no reason to believe otherwise, the negative percentage is decreased to an insignificant 1.26. Of this figure, only one man, .315% of the total, can definitely be said to be wearing something other than Southern military trousers. In essence, there is no substantial indication of supply shortages forcing Confederate troops to resort to wearing civilian or Federal pants.

In the sample, there is a total of eleven men who appear without coats or jackets. Six of these are casualties whose missing garments are easily accounted for, and as shown, in support, additional unworn jackets are seen in a couple of views. With the five men who lack coats or jackets in the prisoner-of-war images, their situation is also explainable. All are in stationary positions in warm weather. As such, not wearing a coat or jacket should not be interpreted to mean they did not possess one. Furthermore, three of the total can definitely be said to have Confederate trousers, which points to the probability of their having had complete uniforms. For the sake
of argument, a worst case scenario will be made taking into account the remote possibility that these men actually did not have coats or jackets at the time they were photographed or immediately before. Exclusive of the one individual who might have on a Federal sack coat, there are 321 figures whose upper bodies are visible. The eleven men without coats and jackets constitute only a minimal 3.342% of this total. If it is accepted that these men were not lacking these articles, then the lone figure possibly in a Federal garment is the only representative of any need in this sense.

The situation with vests is of interest. These can be discerned on thirty-eight individuals, but of these, only four can be ascertained to be civilian. Recalling that vests were generally not an issue item and can be classified as an additional, actually superfluous, garment, wearing a civilian pattern is hardly a problem. Furthermore, with three of these men, complete Confederate uniforms are otherwise worn. As such, wearing an extra garment, no matter what its nature, beneath the coat or jacket, is certainly not indicative of any shortages. Apart from the civilian models, the only things witnessed with vests that might be interpreted by some as indicative of problems, but should not, are that several are missing buttons and two are constructed out of atypical materials. As with jackets, lost buttons are to be expected and do not constitute a serious issue. In fact, it is even less of one given the fact we are discussing additional and really unnecessary clothing. This same argument holds true for the two specimens made of odd fabric. While these might be construed as evidence of a shortage of more appropriate fabric, there are only two examples, and they are
of no consequence in light of the garment type and the history of its wear.

A true assessment of the situation with headgear can only be made from the prisoner-of-war views. From these, there is, again, no indication of any problems. Out of 201 figures, only four appear without hats or caps. Taking into account these men have just been involved in serious combat in which headgear could easily be lost, this is a very low figure indeed, and it should not be interpreted to mean these men lacked these articles altogether.

As pointed out, equipment is more difficult to assess due to the various activities that effected these soldiers and the situations in which they were photographed. Still, only three noticeable instances occur that possibly indicate shortages. One man clearly lacks a cap box, another carries a Federal cartridge box, and a third may have a fabric cartridge box sling. At the same time, however, it should be noted that two of these individuals are otherwise incredibly well appointed in terms of equipment. As such, in conjunction with the low total of only three examples, indications of problems with equipage are also quite insignificant.

The above are the only actual or possible problems with uniforms and equipment encountered in the photographs. In reality, they are few indeed and far less than what one would expect of any army at any time in history. When it is considered that these images are of troops on active campaign, subjecting clothing, footwear, and equipment to the ultimate test with supply depots and trains often far behind, the dearth of problems is absolutely remarkable. Given the fact that shoe
leather does have a tendency to wear out, and clothing does fray and get torn during the course of weeks and months of marching and fighting, even if there was more evidence of damaged and worn out garments, or the wearing of civilian clothing and even Federal trousers, it would be within acceptable limits. Actually, considering that Northern and Southern regulations prescribed sky blue trousers, it would be perfectly within reason for Confederate quartermasters to issue trousers from captured Federal stores to their own soldiers, but given the fact that only two men possibly wear U.S. pants, even this does not seem to have been a practice. Basically, comparing the state of the Army of Northern Virginia with other historic field forces, it is quite evident that it was better supplied and its troops better appointed than most.

Having discussed the few negative aspects of the photographs, the data will now be dealt with in a positive sense, starting with an analysis of the equipment situation. While more difficult to assess than uniforms, all indications point to troops in the Army of Northern Virginia being very well appointed with the necessary articles of gear. As indicated, differences in certain facets of the situation called for a variant set of criteria for evaluating equipage, and there are also distinctions that need be made in the guidelines for what appears in the casualty images as opposed to the prisoner-of-war. Consequently, it is necessary to discuss the two genres separately.

In the casualty views, it must be recalled that a number of factors have played upon the presence of equipment. Policing details, preparation for burial, and loss or removal in action prior to death have seriously effected what is witnessed. Furthermore, the very nature of
the photographs must be considered in that frequently little or no assessment at all can be made because what one is looking for is simply blocked from view, or, more often, only what was carried on one side of the body or the other can be determined. Right off, of the 143 casualties, seventy-three can be eliminated for the purpose of defining equipage, because they are laid out for burial, and with the majority (thirteen still retain a single piece of the shoulder carriage type) it is apparent that everything has been removed for interment. With an additional sixteen men, because their upper bodies are blocked from view, obscured, or blurred, it is impossible to ascertain if anything is carried at all. In the cases of another eleven individuals, while a piece or two can be discerned, for all practical purposes, they, too, can not be assessed because of obstructions or poor photograph quality. In essence, one-hundred figures are unsuitable for the purpose of defining the overall equipment situation, leaving only forty-three to work with. Of this remaining number, there are twenty-three with whom what is present on both sides is definable. Of these, seven, or 16.282% of the total, clearly have all or most of the equipment one would expect to see under any circumstance. Only three of the seven, 6.978%, however, can be defined as being uneffected by policing parties or other activities, because we know the images were recorded within a short time after death. Another eight individuals still retain some gear, but it is evident they have been seriously effected by policing details, etc. Taking into account the items of military value that would be removed during such activities, four figures, or 9.304%, possess all that might be expected to remain; a haversack, canteen, and
bedroll or knapsack. Accepting that certain items (particularly back­
packs and bedrolls, but other things as well) were removed and stacked
prior to engaging, an additional three figures, or 6.978%, who have
also been seriously policed, still have most of what can be expected
given the situation. A couple even retain shoulder carriage cartridge
boxes. The remaining soldier has a single sling for either a haversack
or canteen. All of this means that 32.564% of the usable sample can be
said to be actually well equipped or show every indication of having
been so initially.

This leaves eight men in this category who show no evidence of
having any accoutrements. All, however, have been heavily policed and
picked over. Furthermore, they, too, may have removed items prior to
action, or, in the case of four, as they were fighting in fixed posi­
tions, only essential gear was put on to begin with - that which the
fatigue details were most interested in.

In essence, with the figures with whom both sides of the body are
visible, the majority are well equipped, and there are good explana­
tions accounting for those that are not. Also it must be pointed out
that in images in which two of the men with a fair amount of gear are
seen and three without any at all, there are a lot of loose pieces
lying about on the ground.

There are twelve casualties with whom we can determine what is on
the right side, but can not say what is on the left. Of these, four,
or 9.304% of the total sample, are quite well appointed with what one
would expect to see on that area of the body. Three more men, or
6.978%, have at least some accoutrements remaining. While clearly se­
verely policed, all still have shoulder carriage cartridge boxes. This leaves five figures with no visible gear on the right side, but again, all can be defined as having been heavily searched by fatigue details, and one was fighting in a fixed position in which it was unlikely that unessential items were carried. The bottom line is that seeing only the right side of any of these men after the activities of policing, the only articles that we might possibly expect to see are shoulder slung cartridge boxes, and this is exactly what is present in several instances. To reiterate, bedrolls and knapsacks were commonly taken off, and we can not expect to see if haversacks and canteens exist on the left. What we should see on the right are items the policing parties were interested in collecting. Furthermore, of the men with no or only some equipment, six appear in views in which there is a considerable quantity lying about loose on the ground.

This leaves eight men with whom only what was carried on the left side can be ascertained. Of these, only one, or 2.326%, carries both a haversack and canteen. With three, or 6.978%, some gear is evident in that one has a haversack, another has a haversack and bedroll, and the third possesses a canteen. Four men remain in this category without any gear at all. Of the seven with no or only some equipage, however, all have been subjected to rigorous policing in addition to showing the effects of other activities. Also, in images in which six appear, there are large amounts of unassociated equipment on the ground. The other man without fought in a fixed position and is probably an artilleryman as well. As such, no gear should be expected.

To summarize the equipment situation with the forty-three casual-
ties with whom something can be assessed, twelve, or 27.912%, are clearly well appointed. Fourteen individuals, or 32.564%, still retain a large proportion of what they should have after serious policing or other postmortem activities. This leaves seventeen, or 39.542%, with whom no gear is actually seen. Still, of this number, thirteen, or 30.238%, have very apparently been gone over, and ten, or 23.26%, are shown with large amounts of gear scattered about them. When these men are combined (there is some overlap) they account for sixteen individuals or 37.216% of the usable casualty sample. In addition, several of these men fought in fixed positions, which also helps explain some of what is missing. In essence, of the total, 60.476% are actually well equipped or show every indication of having been so immediately before death. For 37.216%, there are legitimate explanations for absent accoutrements. As to the remaining figure, he is the one who fought in a fixed position and is, in all likelihood, an artilleryman. Thus, no gear should be expected. Consequently, given the various factors that have effected the presence of equipment in the images, the worst case scenario of 60.476% actually seen as being well appointed is really quite good. At the same time, taking into account the same factors, an argument can be made for 100% of the sample being well equipped.

A final explanation exists that would account for some of the errant gear in certain views. It is entirely possible that it really is present, but is simply not detectable. Most of the casualties lie on their backs. Most gear, whether carried on the left or right side was normally positioned to the rear. As a result, particular pieces may really be there, but are not visible, and the slings for them are lost
from view by being in shadows or creases, beneath clothing, or covered by other pieces of equipage. In actuality, it is really impossible to arrive at a 100% assessment of equipment for any figure no matter what the body angle or how clear the photograph. More equipment may even exist with those men who appear to be well appointed already.

That Confederate troops were well equipped and the arguments of discarding gear, the effects of policing, and the results of preparation for burial, etc., are valid is evident from viewing the three men who can be seen from both sides, were obviously photographed prior to the ravages of such activities, and went into battle fully laden. This group includes the one Fredericksburg and two Spotsylvania figures. All three are impeccably appointed, and the Fredericksburg image shows an abundance of extra, discarded gear as well. Chronologically, the Spotsylvania views were recorded relatively late in the conflict. Also, while it is difficult to tell in some instances if they were tampered with, some men in the Petersburg views are also well equipped, especially that fellow possibly kitted out to serve two separate functions.

Moving to the prisoners-of-war, the same basic factors effecting the presence of equipment are applicable. While policing details did their work on the casualties, the prisoners-of-war suffered an equivalent fate in that their guards took all leather and weapons related articles from them. As a result, all that can be expected in this genre of image are haversacks, canteens, and bedrolls or knapsacks. Even with these items, however, such may well have been purposely removed in action for reasons of comfort or damage, or simply lost, and
it is entirely likely that many of these same objects were also taken by guards. Already related are two very polarized primary accounts in which Confederate prisoners describe their treatment by Federal captors. In one, it is clear the Southerners were allowed to retain essential items until actually reaching a prison camp. In the other, they are immediately stripped of everything. Still, despite these different factors that effect the situation, all evidence from the prisoner-of-war views also points to Confederate soldiers being well equipped.

As with the casualties, the total number of Southern captives, 201, is not suitable for equipment analysis. Right off, although a few pieces of gear exist, all of the Aldie figures can be dispensed with, because they are cavalrymen whose equipage primarily stayed with their horses. The four Cedar Mountain figures can also be eliminated. They are stationary and not even fully dressed let alone kitted out with any gear they retain. This leaves 168 men of whom seven are completely blocked from view. Of the remaining 161, ten are stationary and sitting - a situation and position in which equipment would commonly be taken off - and while clearly not wearing any, we can not see what might be on the ground beside them. There are three individuals with whom only the right side can be assessed, and while no equipage is evident here this is not the normal position one would expect to observe haversacks or canteens. With a further thirteen, while some gear can be detected, they are, for all practical purposes, also blocked from view or the equipment that is visible probably obscures other items that are actually present. This leaves 135 figures with whom accoutrements can or can not be seen fairly clearly. Of this number,
118, of 87.438%, still possess at least some, and many have large amounts.

Like the casualty views, this genre can be broken down into categories of individuals with whom both sides can be seen and those with which only one side or the other is visible. Ninety-nine figures allow us to ascertain both sides of their bodies, and eighty-three can be discerned as still possessing at least some equipment. Of this number, twenty-two, or 16.302% of the total usable sample, retain all the gear one might expect under the circumstances. Another thirty-nine men, 28.889%, still have the majority of their accoutrements. Finally, an additional twenty-two figures, 16.302%, have at least one major piece of equipment in evidence. In essence, the men with gear in this classification represent 61.503% of the complete sample, with 45.191% clearly being well appointed or showing every indication of having been so. With the remainder, the explanations already related certainly account for much if not all that is not evident. An additional factor also enters in. Of those men with most or only some gear, twenty-eight, or 20.748%, wear bedrolls which, in at least some cases, probably block other items from view.

There are seven men with whom we can see the right side, but not the left, and while the type of equipment that might remain should not be expected in this location, all possess at least some. Here are examples of men who, obviously relieved of what was usually carried on the right, have shifted something generally worn on the left to a new position for the sake of convenience or to balance the load. This same phenomenon was also observed on prisoners with which both sides were
visible. While, because of the situation, we can not hope to make a complete assessment of the equipment actually carried, four men, or 2.964% of the total sample, can still be defined as having the majority of what can be expected. Of the remaining three, one sits on what appears to be a backpack, and another clearly wears a backpack, but the rest of the body is blocked for purposes of determining if anything else is present. The final individual carries a haversack on his right, and there is no way of discerning what is on his left. In summarizing this category, basically all seven men, or 5.187% of the total, show every indication of being well appointed in that much equipage is actually seen and what is not can be easily accounted for.

Finally, there are those troops with whom we can only discern the left side - that area where we could expect to observe the type of gear their captors may have allowed them to keep. Of the twenty-nine figures in this classification, only one seems to be lacking any accoutrements. Of the twenty-eight with, six, or 4.446%, of the complete sample definitely have all that could be hoped for. Six more still possess the majority of what might be expected. With this last six, three wear bedrolls that might hide other items, and it is possible that additional gear exists on the right. In any case, twelve men in this category, or 8.892% of the total, are actually well appointed or show every indication of being or having been so. The remaining sixteen men have at least one piece of equipment visible, and four wear bedrolls that might hide other items. Also, it is likely that some carry things on their right side as well.

To summarize the state of equipage in the prisoner-of-war photo-
graphs, only, seventeen men or 12.597% of the usable sample, show no immediate signs of having gear. On the other hand, twenty-eight figures, or 20.748%, clearly have everything that can be expected under the circumstance. An additional forty-nine men, or 36.309%, have the majority (with a fair number possibly - even probably - having more) and show every sign of having been impeccably appointed up until going into action. A further nineteen figures, or 14.079%, have at least some equipment visible, with the strong possibility of more being present and just not seeable being good. In essence, 57.057% of the sample are either actually well equipped or reflect every indication of having been or being so, and a strong argument can be made for another 14.079%, which, if accepted, raises the total to 71.136%. Even so, under the circumstances, and in light of the various factors that have undoubtedly effected the situation, the figure of 57.057% is quite remarkable.

There are some additional explanations that help account for any missing equipage in the prisoner views. There are clearly several artillerymen in the White House Landing photograph, and there are undoubtedly some present in the Belle Plain pictures. For reasons already stated, given their role, we should not expect them to have any gear. Also, many of the men in both these groups of images were captured while fighting in fixed positions in which many would not have carried everything they normally did. Finally, in these same two groups of photographs, we are seeing men who are basically in repose in a stationary situation. In the White House images, there are clearly men sitting in the foreground who do not actually wear gear, but have
it beside them on the ground. As pointed out, sitting men without equipage were eliminated from the total if it could not be seen if anything might be next to them. It is quite likely, however, that even some of the standing men without equipage actually on them may have some on the ground nearby.

That these arguments are valid is apparent when these views and the situations they reflect are compared with the Gettysburg and Five Forks photographs. These show a very different situation. To begin with, given the nature of the visible equipment, all the men in these pictures are clearly infantry. Next, the nature of the situation in which the men in both views were captured involved mobile, open field operations. Finally, it is apparent in each instance that the men shown are in the process of being transported or moved from one location to another. They are not in repose in a stationary situation. Accepting all of this, as it must be, observe the differences in terms of the amount of gear that is consistently visible on each individual. These men are truly well appointed in terms of the articles we might expect a prisoner to retain: haversacks, canteens, bedrolls, and knapsacks. The few items not visible are easily accounted for by being covered by that which is seen or existing on the opposite side of an individual and so, not detectable. All of these men are otherwise too well appointed not to possess the few items that are not evident. All things considered, the prisoner-of-war images strongly support the idea that Confederate troops in the Army of Northern Virginia were well supplied with equipment, and they maintained it.

To close these passages, a summary of the combined casualty and
prisoner-of-war equipment situation is called for. Between the two photographic categories, there are 178 men with whom the equipment situation can be assessed. Of these, forty figures, or 22.48% of the total, are impeccably appointed in light of the various circumstances. An additional sixty-three men, or 35.406%, show every indication of being or having been well equipped prior to their fate, which raises the total percentage to 57.886. Finally, there are, for instance, those casualties with some gear who clearly have been effected by serious policing, and many of which lie amongst large amounts of unassociated articles, and those prisoners-of-war with some equipage with whom other items are quite possibly present and just blocked from view. Accepting the likelihood that these men were or even are well appointed as well, a strong argument can be made that as much as 77.556% of the sample actually are or were properly equipped and did not want for any requisite items. When the various factors affecting the presence of gear are again considered, the figures presented are quite high. These same explanations undoubtedly account for the remainder of the sample.

While on the subject of equipment, there are several things observed in the images that are noteworthy and quite enlightening. One of these is the high percentage of shoulder carriage cartridge boxes. In all instances but one, the slings are clearly of leather. Furthermore, there is no apparent decrease in the employment of these leather slings between the mid and late war periods. It must be asked why, if the Confederacy was so short of leather that shoes could not be made, these basically unessential items requiring large hides to produce were
still being manufactured? Cartridge boxes could just as easily be worn on a waist belt. The presence of these items belies a shortage of this particular material.

A far more interesting aspect of equipment is the abundance of tin canteens. In the entire sample, only two can be defined as being of wood and another is possibly made of such, but it, too, is just as likely to be of tin. It has long been an accepted fact that Southern troops commonly carried wooden canteens, because of a shortage of materials and means of production. Yet, given the large percentage of tin versions, this does not seem to have been the case. As to the nature of the tin patterns, many are clearly examples of the "typical" Confederate drum type. The remaining, constituting the majority, are either smooth sided or bullseye type elliptical shapes. It might be considered by some that these represent captured Northern models, but examination reveals features pointing to their being Southern made copies. With a number, visible, specific attributes such as the shape of the spout, clearly support that this is the case. With the majority of those remaining, there are two general features that support this argument. First, a very high percentage are carried on thin leather slings. While it could be argued that the fabric slings as issued on Federal models eventually wore out and were replaced with more substantial leather ones, this still leaves the unanswered question of where did the leather come from? Furthermore, these slings appear with considerable frequency in the same form. They are inevitably fairly narrow and of finished leather which negates the possibility of their being field replacements. Equally significant is the fact that unlike
the Northern patterns, a very large number appear without fabric coverings. Again, it might be argued that what is seen are Northern models with the covers removed, but it must be asked why would they be taken off? Wear is the only acceptable explanation, but such appear too frequently to accept that this was the case. With the Federal types, the covers came in a variety of hues including dark blue, light blue, brown/tan, and even gray. As such the fabric did not present any distinguishing characteristic that would necessitate its removal. More importantly, the cover served a definite function by acting as insulation to keep the water cool. Consequently, if captured, there was no reason to remove a cover, and every reason to leave it on. In essence, the various features of these canteens, both singularly and combined, point to their being Southern made. In turn, given the large number that appear, this indicates that the requisite materials, tin and, again, leather, were not in short supply, nor were the means of manufacturing this particularly item. So, if this was the case, what of the traditional wooden model? In light of the evidence witnessed in the photographs in association with the dates on which they were taken, it is quite apparent that while the wooden patterns certainly existed, they were primarily used early in the conflict as a stopgap until production of more serviceable types was at a level to replace them. This production seems to have met the demand.

A final interesting aspect of equipment is the high ratio of backpacks to bedrolls. Again, traditionally, we have been led to believe that knapsacks were rarely, if ever, employed by Southern troops who opted, instead, to use the simple bedroll. Yet, while the bedroll
does, indeed, predominate in the images, the comparative number of backpacks is noteworthy. The combined number of bedrolls and knapsacks that can actually be associated with an individual (for both categories others lie about) total ninety-eight. Of these, twenty-two or 22.44%, are backpacks. In addition, there are two more items that men sit on in the prisoner views that, in all probability, are backpacks as well. If so, the percentage is increased to 24. In essence, almost one quarter of the individuals in the usable sample opted to retain this piece of equipment. More significant yet, is the fact that of the total, eleven of the definite instances and both of the probabilities appear in images recorded late in the war. As stated, there is no reason to retain a backpack unless you have something considerable to carry in it.

Having dealt with equipment, clothing is next on the agenda. On an individual basis there is an excellent sense of uniformity. There are 322 men whose upper bodies are visible, of which 311 wear coats or jackets. With only one exception, all such garments can be firmly identified as Southern military. In quantitative terms, this means that 96.41% of the usable sample clearly wear Confederate coats or jackets - a significant figure for a worst case scenario. Even if it is accepted that only half of the remaining number without coats or jackets actually possessed them (and certainly some did) then the percentage rises to 98.276%. If all eleven did, and there is no reason to believe otherwise, the figure increases to 99.831%.

Breaking down the total number by type, 265, or 85.595%, are shell jackets. An additional two garments, .646%, probably fall into this
same classification. Ten men, 3.23\%, wear single-breasted frock coats, and eight, 2.584\%, wear the double-breasted form. Another four individuals, 1.292\%, sport frock coats of indeterminate pattern. Thus, frock coats of one or the other type represent 7.106\% of the sample. Three, .969\%, of the garments observed are sack coats, and one, .323\%, is a zouave jacket. The remaining seventeen figures, 5.491\%, clearly wear Southern military coats or jackets, but the exact types can not be defined. To break this down a bit further in terms of actually identifiable types, there are 291 that can be categorized; 91.16\% are shell jackets, 7.568\% are frock coats, 1.032\% are sack coats, and .344\% are zouave jackets.

Regarding trousers, as indicated, 317 pairs can be seen. On the basis of visible hard details and/or matching shadings, no less than 279, or 87.885\%, can definitely be said to be Confederate military – also a substantial total for a worst case scenario. To this can be added four more pairs that are, in all probability, Southern military as well, and another two pairs for which the possibility of the same origin is very strong. If accepted as such, the figures increase to 285, or 89.775\%. Of the twenty-eight pairs that defy provenancing, as pointed out, fifteen are clearly not Federal and show no real indication of being anything other than Confederate. If they are acknowledged as Southern issue, the total rises to 300 men, or 95.5\%. If the other thirteen nondescript pairs are added, and there is no reason to believe that they are not Confederate as well, the sum increases to 313 men, or 98.595\%. This leaves only the single, confirmed civilian pair and the three whose origin is open to potentially serious conjecture of
being civilian or Federal. Still, as pointed out, even these last three could just as easily be Southern military as anything else, and consequently, it is possible to make a strong argument for as much as 99.54% of the sample having on Confederate pants. The worst case figure is excellent and the best case is phenomenal.

As already shown, the photographs show the footwear situation to be quite polarized from what traditional opinion has led us to believe. There are 184 visible pairs of feet, and of these (inclusive of the figure with only one shoe) 178 individuals, or 96.832%, have footwear of one sort or another. This breaks down as follows. Ninety-three, or 50.592%, clearly wear shoes of military pattern. Five, or 2.72%, wear boots. Three, possibly four men, or 2.476%, sport lowcut versions. And, one, or .544%, probably has on a pair of canvas and leather. As to the remaining seventy-five figures constituting 40.8% of the sample, the exact types can not be determined. In all forty-six instances, but one, in which it can be discerned if socks are worn, they are. There are also a fair number of leggings. Of the 197 men with whom it can be determined if such are worn or not, seventeen definitely do have them on, and another quite possibly does as well. This creates a percentage of 9.144 who possess these essentially unnecessary and not commonly issued items. Of interest is the fact that five of the examples appear in late war images. As an aside, it should be noted that it is commonly maintained that troops on both sides often tucked their pants' cuffs into their socks as an alternative to wearing leggings. While instances of this practice are encountered fairly frequently in views of Federal soldiers, they are extremely rare in those of Southern. The
photographic evidence indicates that, generally, Confederates wore their cuffs loose. Barring this, it was more common to roll them up rather than tuck them in.

As to headgear, it has already been shown, with 98.106% of the prisoners in caps or hats, there are no problems in this area. Of the men in uniform, there are, inclusive of casualties, 187 who sport caps or hats. Of this total, 144, or 77.04%, have some form of felt hat. Forty-two men, or 22.47%, wear military caps. One man, or .535%, has a cap that is truly civilian in pattern. An interesting aspect of the hats is that the vast majority retain their original shape, are in good condition, and seem to be of high quality. There is very little evidence of the "slouch hat" - the formless, battered, nondescript hunk of felt so often associated with Southern troops.

Regarding other clothing items, in all instances where discernible, shirts are worn. There are even a few examples of drawers to be seen. The situation with vests is noteworthy considering they are definable as extra articles. Of the 123 figures with whom it can be seen if vests are worn or not, thirty-eight, or 30.894%, do wear them. Given the nature of this garment, this is a significant figure. This total breaks down into twenty-three, or 60.536%, definitely being military in pattern, with two more, 5.264%, probably being a military cut as well. Only four, or 10.528%, can be defined as civilian. For the remaining nine, the exact type can not be determined.

Having summarized the various uniform components separately, they must be assessed in combination in order to ascertain the overall appearance of the Confederate enlisted man. There are 303 figures with
whom both the upper and lower body areas are visible, and of this sum, 269, or 88.77%, are clearly dressed in Confederate coats or jackets in association with Confederate trousers. An additional twenty-two individuals also wear coats or jackets that are decidedly Southern military, but a provenance can not be established for their pants. Still, there is no reason to believe these trousers are anything but Confederate, and the fact they are worn with proper coats or jackets tends to support this argument. If accepted as such, they account for another 7.26% of the sample which raises the total of well uniformed troops to 96.03%. The remaining figures are the eleven without coats or jackets and the one in civilian trousers and possibly a Federal coat. Of the eleven, however, three pairs of pants are definitely Confederate in origin, and if it is agreed that they initially possessed the missing garments, the percentage of well dressed soldiers increases to 97.02. In reality, only one figure, .33%, is decidedly not well appointed in terms of a uniform.

Another way of looking at this is to include those figures who are only partially visible. When added in, there are 336 men to work with. Of these, 269 are again assessed as wearing outfits with which both main components are Southern military, and as such, they account for 80.054% of the total. There are nineteen men with whom only the torso can be seen and thirteen with whom only the lower body is visible, but respectively either Confederate coats or jackets or pants are worn in each instance. Basically, these men show every indication of being well uniformed. When taken into consideration, they raise the percentage of nicely appointed troops to 89.577. To this sum can be
added the twenty-two men in Confederate coats or jackets and unproven-
nancable trousers, which takes the total up to 96.124%. Finally, there
are the three men lacking garments on the upper body, but who wear
Southern military pants. When figured in, 97.017% of the sample is
accounted for.

Despite the manner of tabulation, the results are basically the
same. A very large proportion are definitely well uniformed, and the
vast majority of those remaining show every indication of being so
also. The remaining, minimal percentage involves the man in civilian
pants and those without jackets, and one whose upper body is blocked
who sport trousers that are not identifiable.

A very interesting aspect of individual uniformity is the large
number of figures with which the components are obviously of the same
fabric. Of the 303 men who can be completely seen, 101, or 33.33%, are
dressed in this manner. There are an additional six men who are proba-
bly clad in the same way, but shadows or obstructions will not allow a
solid confirmation.

Along the same lines, there are other features that heighten the
sense of individual uniformity. Of the forty-two worn kepis and forage
caps, no less than twenty-eight, or 66.668%, are of a material that is
the same as the rest of the uniform or at least the coat or jacket.
Also, of the twenty-three military vests, nine, or 39.132% can be seen
to match the coats, jackets, and/or trousers they are worn with. This
is interesting in light of the fact that vests were not an item of
central government issue. Consequently, uniforms with matching vests
must be indicative of privately tailored, homemade, or possibly state
issue outfits.

Taking uniformity a step further, there is an excellent sense on a group basis. Exclusive of three figures who are completely covered and fourteen who appear singly in casualty views offering no grounds for comparison, unit uniformity can be determined from 322 individuals. In outfits with matching components, there are forty-two figures comprising 13.044% of the sample between which the uniform of one can be assessed as being identical to at least one other. Six additional men probably wear uniforms of the same material throughout which are also the same as another. These are men, for example, with whom we can see all of one figure and so determine that the jacket and pants are of the same fabric, and the jacket is clearly identical to that worn by another soldier, but the second man's trousers are blocked from view. Also, there are eight possibilities that can be considered for this category. These are individuals who appear isolated in the large Belle Plain view, but between whom the cuts and shadings of clothing are the same. Accepting the probables and possibles, 17.391% of the sample are either definitely dressed alike or show serious signs of being so in uniforms with matching components.

In addition to the above, while not wearing uniforms of the same material throughout, there are ninety-five figures who wear outfits the pants and coats or jackets of which, in association, clearly match other combinations of pants and coats or jackets. They represent another 29.503% of the sample. For the reasons just described, there are also seven men, equalling 2.174%, with whom this uniformity is probable and sixteen, or 4.969%, with whom it is a good possibility. If accept-
ed as such, the percentage of troops so clad increases to 36.646.

Finally, there are two soldiers comprising .621% of the total, who, because of shadows, can not be firmly assessed, but fall into one or the other of the two above categories. When taken into account, the total number of figures that can definitely be defined as completely dressed alike constitutes 43.168% of the sample. If the probables are entered in, the percentage is increased to 47.205. Accepting the possibles, the number rises to 54.658%.

In addition to the complete outfits that match others, there are a number that do so partially. There are twenty-one figures, or 6.522% of the total, who wear the same jacket or coat as another, but sport trousers that are not the same. In reverse, there are twenty-one who, while clad in matching pants, do not have the same coats or jackets (with some of these the upper body is blocked from view so the potential exists for complete uniformity). For another thirteen figures, or 4.037%, the possibility that the same trousers are worn is not out of the question. Finally, there are four men, 1.242% of the total, whose jackets match those of one grouping dressed alike, and whose pants are identical to those worn in a second set of like uniforms. In essence, these men wear different combinations of the same components that make up two other established groupings. This all tallies to forty-six figures, or 14.286% of the total, that are definitely partially clad the same, and thirteen individuals, or 4.038%, who are possibly partially dressed alike.

To summarize group uniformity, 43.168% of the sample are clearly completely uniformed alike, and another 4.037% are, in all probability,
dressed in this manner as well, which increases the total to 47.205%. Also, 6.522% at least wear jackets or coats that are identical. Given that trousers wear out more rapidly than coats and jackets, require more frequent replacement, and the regulation schedule of their issue was far greater than for coats and jackets, this does not really negatively color the sense of group uniformity. Taking into account those men whose uniforms possibly match, whose pants are definitely or possibly the same, and whose uniforms are simply different combinations of other like articles, a good argument for group uniformity can be made for as much as 72.981% of the sample. Still, even the figure of 43.168% is excellent in light of traditional beliefs. When it is considered that in many of the images we are witnessing a rather small number of individuals representative of a relatively large number of units, the sum of 43.168% is actually quite remarkable. Granted, there is strong evidence that some commands presented a real mix and match appearance at times, but generally there is sound support for the idea that the majority offered an overall sense of uniformity.

Adding to the sense of group uniformity are a couple of other aspects. Two men dressed alike in terms of pants and trousers also wear vests that match. Of the forty-two kepis and forage caps that are worn, twelve, or 28.572%, match at least one other in the same view. Furthermore, these are worn by men who are otherwise clothed alike as well.

Having discussed the uniforms in the views individually and in combination, it is necessary to again compare that which was gleaned from the photographs with that which was discerned from the extant
uniform articles. This time, however, the comparison will be of a more
general nature. As indicated, with the existing specimens, there was a
fairly high percentage of late war garments with extra added attributes
such as epaulets, trim, pockets, belt loops, high button counts, etc.
Also, a relatively large number of double-breasted frock coats were
provenanced to this time period. The presence of these things clearly
points to there having been no change in the nature of uniform manufac-
ture and supply from beginning to end. Validating these observations
is the fact that the same was noted in the photographs. The two sam-
ples mirror each other in this respect. In reality, it is apparent
from the photographs that the situation, instead of simply remaining
the same (excellent to begin with) actually improved as the war pro-
gressed.

As indicated, the images range in date from August, 1862, to April,
1865, a span of thirty-three months which roughly coincides with the
latter two thirds of the conflict. This is the time in which if prob-
lems existed and got worse, they should certainly be noticeable. The
period examined can be broken into two shorter time frames of sixteen
and seventeen months that are reflective of the middle and late years
of the war. The first of these includes the Cedar Mountain, Antietam,
Fredericksburg, Aldie, and Gettysburg views, and the latter consists of
the photographs recorded at Spotsylvania, Belle Plain, White House
Landing, Five Forks, and Petersburg. Accepting this breakdown, a
comparison is in order between the two, and for this purpose, that
garment that dominates both eras, the shell jacket, will be discussed.
Within each time span, the button counts will be tabulated and then
correlated in light of the other; so will the number of jackets clearly possessing or lacking the attributes of epaulets, cuff and collar trim, and belt loops.

The situation with buttons is noteworthy. In the earlier images there are fifty jackets with which the counts can be determined, and in the later, there are forty. The respective percentages to be presented are based on these figures which include those garments with which the exact total was indiscernible, but it could be established that there were eight or nine, seven or eight, etc. The breakdown for the mid-war era is twenty jackets with nine buttons, 40%, ten with eight to nine, 20%, four with eight, 8%, two with seven to eight, 4%, four with seven, 8%, three with six to seven, 6%, four with six, 8%, one with five to six, 2%, and two with five, 4%. For the later war, there are nine with nine, 22.5%, eight with eight to nine, 20%, thirteen with eight, 32.5%, four with seven to eight, 10%, zero with seven, one with six to seven, 2.5%, one with six, 2.5%, zero with five to six, and four with five, 10%. What is immediately apparent when comparing these figures is that between the two periods at either end of the spectrum, there is a marked decrease in the number of jackets with nine buttons, and an increase in those with five. Initially, this would appear to indicate a problem with the supply of fasteners with the result being that more emphasis was placed on producing jackets with less buttons. Other factors enter in, however, that show that this was not the case, and in fact, the reverse is true. While the nine button models are on the wane in the later views, there is a major increase in those with eight. The saving of only one button per garment is of little conse-
quence when four could be saved by making all jackets with five. At the same time, while the number of garments with five buttons increases during the late war, those with from five or six to seven markedly decline. Furthermore, although the actual percentage figures for five button jackets between the two eras indicates an increase, we are really only talking the difference between two and four examples. In essence, there are not a whole lot of this style in either period. If the data is tabulated differently with nine, eight to nine, and eight button jackets representing versions with high counts, seven to eight, eight, and six to seven, reflecting mid-range counts, and six, five to six, and five, being indicative of low range totals, it is apparent that jackets with the higher counts actually increase as the war progressed, and those with the lower decrease. Garments with large numbers of buttons account for 68% of the earlier examples and 75% of the later. In the mid-range category, respectively, the figures are 18% and 12.5%, and for the lower number styles, 14% and 12.5%.

Accepting that at least some of the seven to eight button grouping really have eight, and some of the six to seven button category really have six, the positive increase in percentages from the mid to late war periods is enhanced even more.

If those jackets with eight to nine buttons, seven to eight, etc., are eliminated, and only those with definitive counts are factored, the results are roughly the same. There are totals of thirty-four earlier period jackets and twenty-seven later upon which to formulate percentages. These can be broken down into classifications of garments with eight or nine fasteners, seven, and five or six, respectively representing high, mid, and low range counts. Calculated as such there is
an increase of from 70.584% to 81.488% for those with the high numbers between the two time spans. For the mid-range counts there is a serious decrease of from 11.764% to none. For the jackets with a low number of buttons, the figures stay roughly the same with 17.646% represented in the earlier period and 18.52% in the later. This difference of less than one percent is inconsequential given the arbitrary selection process inherent in the sample, and furthermore, overall, there is still a significant increase in the number of jackets with high button counts. No matter how the situation is viewed while nine button garments decreased and those with five increased in actuality, overall, jackets with more buttons increased and those with lower totals decreased (or at least stayed basically the same) as the conflict advanced.

An interesting situation exists with jackets made with epaulets in that between the two periods there is a noticeable increase in the number constructed with this feature. In the earlier era, a total of thirty-two garments can be defined as having epaulets or not. Of these, eleven, or 34.375%, possess this attribute and twenty-one, or 65.625%, do not. In the later views a total of fifty-two jackets breaks down into twenty-one, or 40.383%, with, and thirty-one, or 59.613%, without.

The same situation is encountered with belt loops. For the earlier time frame, the presence or absence of such can be detected on nine jackets with only one, or 11.111%, having them. In the later images, sixteen garments can be seen to have them or not, and eight, or 50%, do.

With jackets constructed with collar trim, we again see the same
sort of increase. In the mid-war views, twenty-eight jackets can be ascertained in terms of this feature with six, or 21.426% possessing such. In the late war photographs, thirty-two garments can be assessed with nine, or 28.125%, being constructed with this attribute.

This leaves cuff trim. With this, we witness the only decrease in an attribute. Still, it is insignificant. In the earlier images, there are fifty-eight jackets with which the presence of this can be discerned or not. Of this figure, twelve, or 17.148%, do have it in one form or another. In the later views, there is a total of fifty-eight jackets with eight, or 14.288% exhibiting this treatment. While there is a decrease of 2.86%, it really is quite minimal and explainable in terms of the sample being arbitrary. It is not significant enough to warrant consideration, and as such, while there is certainly no increase in this attribute between the two timeframes requisite materials, tin and, again, leather, were not in short supply, nor were the means of manufacturing this particularly item. So, if this was the case, what of the traditional wooden model? In light of the evidence witnessed in the photographs in association with the dates on which they were taken, it is quite apparent that while the wooden patterns certainly existed, they were primarily used early in the conflict as a stopgap until production of more serviceable types was at a level to replace them. This production seems to have met the demand.

A final interesting aspect of equipment is the high ratio of backpacks to bedrolls. Again, traditionally, we have been led to believe that knapsacks were rarely, if ever, employed by Southern troops who opted, instead, to use the simple bedroll. Yet, while the bedroll
without. They can however, be added in now, because the entire sample is being discussed. Out of 103 identifiable shell jackets in the mid-war views, thirty-two, or only 31.072%, exhibit one of these extra, unnecessary features. Of the later war total of eighty definable shell jackets, thirty-six, or 45%, show additional attributes. Even more significant is the following. In the earlier images, only three jackets, or 2.913%, have two of these features in combination. On the other hand, in the later views, there are ten, or 12.5%, with two of these attributes together. Furthermore, there are two, or 2.5%, with three extras in association, and even one, or 1.25%, with four. In essence, all indications point to the fact that Southern uniforms tended to get fancier and more complex between the middle and late periods.

Along the same lines, the situation with frock coats is of interest. Of the total of 119 identifiable coats and jackets in the mid-war photographs, thirteen, or 10.92%, are frocks. In the later images, of 171 identifiable garments, nine, or 5.265%, are Type A or C coats. While this clearly shows a decrease in the issue of these articles, the figure of over 5% is still considerable when one considers the thousands upon thousands of troops serving in the Army of Northern Virginia. Basically, one man in twenty or fifty per 1,000, wore a coat of this nature. A significant aspect of the situation, however, can be seen if the two time periods are broken down further into years, 1862, 1863, 1864, and 1865. For the first year, there are fifty-one identifiable coats and jackets of which four or 7.844% are frocks. In 1863, there is a noticeable increase with nine, or 13.041%, of the sixty-nine
definable garments being one of these types. In 1864, there is a severe decrease with such being represented by only five, or 3.52%, of the total of 142. But, in the 1865 images (taken only a few days prior to the end of the conflict) there are four frock coats comprising 13.792% of the twenty-nine identifiable coats and jackets. This is the highest percentage and frequency rate of all. It appears that the issue of these types increased between 1862 and 1863, decreased in 1864, and then increased again during the later stages.

So, what does all this mean? As argued for the existing uniform items, if there were shortages of materials and problems with manufacture, why was extra material and considerable extra time being used to create these more involved garments when simple, plain, five button shell jackets would be just as serviceable, save on time, effort, buttons, fabric, and cost, and still look nice? It is evident from the data acquired from the museum specimens and the photographs that these were not considerations. As an example, to produce an eight or nine button jacket obviously required considerably more fasteners (a relatively expensive item) than a five, and also necessitated the expenditure of a fair amount of extra time to hand sew the holes. That the eight button patterns predominate in the later views is of note, because experimentation has shown that these (along with the six button forms) are the most difficult to make in terms of properly positioning the fasteners and their holes. Nines and fives are the easiest. The increase in epaulets and belt loops is meaningful. While these could easily be made from scraps, they, too, still took a large amount of extra time. Furthermore, almost always, the epaulets needed additional
buttons and holes in different smaller sizes. Trim required extra fabric, often in more expensive colors, and frequently with collar trim and always with cuff, such was attached by hand. Again, more time was needed. Another noteworthy feature is that in every instance in which it could be discerned, the jackets appear to be completely lined. This, too, was unnecessary, but it was done.

The same arguments apply to frock coats. Here is a truly unnecessary garment in that a jacket would more than suffice in its place. Yet, frock coats were still being produced and issued with a fair degree of frequency right up until the end. They required almost twice as much fabric as a jacket, considerably more time to make, and, in the case of the double-breasted versions, as many as twice the number of buttons.

Another interesting comparison can be made between the mid and late war photographs. There is a significant rise in group uniformity. The men with whom a complete uniform comparison can be made total 144 in the earlier views and 178 in the later. Of the first number, forty-nine, or 34.006%, can definitely be defined as wearing the same outfit as another. For the later period, however, ninety men, or 50.58%, are uniformed alike. This is a solid and substantial increase of 16.574%. If the figures that are probably dressed the same are added in, raising the totals to fifty-two and 100 individuals, respectively, the percentages are 36.088 and 56.2. As such, a 20.112% increase in group uniformity is reflected.

Having presented a summation of the data from the photographs and compared it with that derived from the extant uniforms, how does this
same information compare with the period quotations? It has already been shown that the documents, themselves, upon reanalysis, do not reveal any serious problems, excepting shoes, blankets, and greatcoats during a period of several months in late 1862 and very early 1863. Even then, however, shortages of this limited number of items were brief and only effected isolated units. That the reanalysis of the quotations is sound, and that what few, minimal problems that may have existed were efficiently and effectively remedied, is solidly supported by the photographs which present a clear view of just how consistently well appointed these troops were. Even in the Antietam images which fall at the beginning of the period in which shoes, etc., were an issue for certain units, there is nothing noticeably amiss. The troops show every indication of being well equipped and shod, individual uniformity is excellent, and there is a high level of group uniformity as well.

A comparison of the photographs with the comments left us by military personnel outside of the Army of Northern Virginia is extremely enlightening in that they support each other perfectly. Freemantle's statements about the Gettysburg campaign are not only born out, they are positively surpassed. He noted a wide variety of uniforms in one command, and we witnessed some evidence of this mix and match impression in several views. At the same time, the Guards officer saw at least one regiment uniformly attired, and there are a number of Gettysburg images that show that group uniformity was not uncommon. His comments to the effect that everyone was well dressed and shod are confirmed. Of special note is his one negative reference to Hood's "ragged Jacks". The photographs indicate that even this command was
not as poorly turned out as Freemantle would lead us to believe, and if there were truly ragged members, they were the exception. The two figures in Group GB, whether 1st Texas or 17th Georgia, are representative of Hood's division. With them we see not only two men who are well dressed, but two men who are dressed alike in frock coats. Also, the men photographed in the "Slaughter Pen" were from the same command. The only noticeable problem with them is the one individual possibly in Federal trousers. Consequently, Freemantle's lines only refer to a limited few, or his idea of "ragged" really only refers to very minor aspects of appearance. The Gettysburg images also bear out the Federal officer's, Adams, account pertaining to Southern prisoners.

Of special interest are the contrasting comments of the Confederate, Tony, and the United States officer in reference to prisoners taken at Spotsylvania; the same men who are in the Belle Plain views, in which it is possible Tony, himself, might appear. These photographs support the Northerner's account, but not the Southerner's. The only resemblance there is to Tony's statements are two jacketless men in Group BPB, with whom the missing garments are easily accounted for, and the man in civilian trousers in Group BPC. This is truly inconsequential given other positive aspects of these pictures and the large number of men shown. No one else in any of the other Belle Plain images appears without a coat or jacket, and none at all are lacking the shoes Tony would have us believe were in such short supply. What we see are troops in the "neat gray jackets" described by the Federal officer. The troops again show every sign of being well equipped, and there is an excellent sense of both individual and group uniformity.
The photographs and the comments left us by impartial, outside military personnel mirror each other perfectly. In actuality, after reanalysis, the vast majority of period quotations also match what is seen in the images which indicates that their reinterpretation, as presented, is valid. In reverse, the statements of Freemantle and the Federal officers indicate that the interpretation of the photographs is correct, and as an arbitrary sample, they are representative of the state of the army as a whole. In essence, the conclusions drawn from the various sources are sound. Quotations, photographs, and extant uniforms support each other.

An aspect of the troops' appearance not touched upon is their grooming. In light of the traditional viewpoint, one would expect to see unkempt beards and long, stringy, dirty hair. This also, is not the case. Beards are relatively rare altogether. The majority appear clean shaven and seem to have performed this duty only a short time before. Also, most have very short hair. With the few examples of those with "long" hair, it is long only in comparison with the others. No one was seen with hair that did more than cover the tops of their ears. Whether these individuals maintained themselves as such for reasons of hygiene, practicality, or vanity, is immaterial. The point is that they did take care of themselves and presented a nice appearance in this sense as well as others.

To summarize and conclude, what have we seen? There are very few problems in terms of missing clothing or equipment, and for most of what is absent, there are legitimate explanations. Also, the condition of that which is present is almost always excellent. Instances of
damage or wear are rare indeed, and the nature of what is wrong is generally insignificant. There is no evidence of rags or tatters. The vast majority of the figures clearly wear nice, complete Confederate uniforms, presenting an outstanding sense of individual uniformity. Of the remaining men, constituting only a relatively small portion of the sample, most are those with whom a definitive total assessment can not be made, because of a lack of detail with trousers, missing coats or jackets, and/or bodies being partially obscured from view. Even with these troops, however, there is every indication that they, too, are or were properly attired in Southern military garments. There is only the most minimal evidence (much of which is inconclusive) that civilian and Federal clothing was ever worn or Northern equipage carried, which indicates that any tendency to do so, whatever the source, was extremely rare and infrequent. Even the situation with shoes is excellent with no real indication of their ever being in short supply. In addition to exceptional individual uniformity, there is a fine sense on the group level, which actually increases and points to, at least many, Confederate commands offering a good overall appearance. There is also an increase in the number of uniforms with extra, unnecessary attributes, between the middle and late periods. Furthermore, in the later views, there is a fairly large number of items that transcend the basic or what was required, such as frock coats, vests, leggings, backpacks, military caps, etc. In essence, there is no evidence of problems with materials, production output, or supply in the field. Demands were effectively met throughout the conflict. Rather than a bad situation getting worse, an already excellent state of affairs improved. The
common Confederate soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia was well equipped and well dressed in quality Southern made uniforms which were issued regularly and maintained in good condition. He bore no resemblance to his traditional portrait.

Having presented a reassessment of the nature of the material culture of the Confederate enlisted man, it is hoped that some important methods pertinent to approaching this sort of study have been shown as well. If one is going to examine and interpret historic material culture, the subject must be met employing a research scheme specifically oriented to material culture. This necessitates utilizing visual references in association with extant examples of that which is being studied. Certainly, documents should also be incorporated in the plan on an equal basis, but it is impossible to arrive at realistic conclusions based on this type of source alone. Within each of these three categories of research materials, the data must be viewed comparatively as a whole and then interpreted in relation to that acquired from the other sources. Only then can a true, balanced assessment be attained. Whether a study is conducted by an anthropologist or an historian, understanding material culture is an integral part of understanding military affairs. The distinctive and unique nature of the material culture effects, even dictates, behavior, and behavior, in turn, exerts a strong influence on events. Using such a research plan has allowed for a reinterpretation of what constituted the material culture of the common Confederate soldier in the Army of Northern Virginia. Having established just what it was that he wore and carried, we can now achieve a better understanding of both his behavior and its results.
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