© 2008

Michael K. Heaney

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

UNCOUNTED COSTS:
THE CIVIL WAR'S IMPACT ON AN INFANTRY COMPANY'S MEN AND THEIR FAMILIES

by Michael K. Heaney

A Dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in History

written under the direction of

Prof. William O'Neill

and approved by

Prof. William O'Neill

Prof. John W. Chambers

Prof. Michael A. Rockland

Prof. Louise K. Barnett

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May, 2008

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Uncounted Costs:
The Civil War's Impact on an Infantry Company's Men and Their Families

by Michael K. Heaney

Dissertation Director:
Professor William O'Neill

Much scholarship has focused on the experiences of soldiers in the American Civil War (1861-1865), and of those left behind on the home front. About 3 million men served in uniform during the war, and an even larger circle of family members – wives, parents, children, siblings – were significantly affected. Yet *no* significant body of scholarship has been devoted to describing the post-war lives of common soldiers or their loved ones.

This work is a modest attempt to begin correcting that deficiency. It focuses on 100 volunteers who comprised a Union infantry company from rural New Jersey, and their family members. Relying primarily on information obtained from federal pension files, the study describes the lives these people led over the balance of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth.

The work first portrays the region and times the men grew up in, compares the volunteers as a group with all men who served in the Union Army, and examines their motivations for going to war and their particular wartime experiences. This section concludes that the company was in most respects typical of the Union Army, except for suffering an unusually high casualty rate; more than 40% of its volunteers died from wounds or disease. (A high-casualty company was chosen intentionally for the study.)

The work then investigates what can be determined about discrete aspects of the veterans' and/or their family members' post-war lives, including: health and longevity;

domestic and marital patterns; residence and migration; work, income, and wealth accumulation; pension claiming; post-war adjustment issues and dysfunction; and veterans' memories of the war, and the meanings they attributed to it.

The work demonstrates that the life courses of the company's surviving veterans, and of many of their loved ones (especially parents and wives), were generally difficult and economically tenuous, and often physically and/or emotionally painful. Though veterans and their wives displayed remarkable resilience and adaptability – many looking back with satisfaction at their wartime accomplishments and sacrifices - their post-war lives were frequently hard and sometimes bleak: war's "uncounted costs".

PREFACE

In actuality, I began work on this dissertation nearly forty-three years ago. During an alcohol-enhanced reverie in November, 1965, at our BOQ (bachelor officers quarters) in Brownsville, New Jersey, home of Fort Dix, I and three other junior Army officers made a pact with each other to call the Pentagon the next day and volunteer for duty in Viet Nam. (One of our group had boasted he had the telephone number of a particular Major, allegedly in charge of all overseas assignments for junior officers. The rest of us doubted this, but it turned out he did.) We made the call, and eventually we all went. I arrived "in country," at my assigned unit, the 1st Air Cavalry Division, on Christmas Day, 1965.

Over the next five months as a rifle platoon leader, until I was wounded, I "studied war". More than anything else, I learned about what one of our Vietnamese enemies referred to as *thân phân của tình yêu* - or loosely, "the sorrow of war".

Why we fought - why that small group of us "decided" that night to go (if that is what we did) - is a question I have thought about a lot in the intervening years. I have also thought about the question's darker companion, What did the war do to us? In some ways, I am no closer today to figuring out a clear answer to the first question than I was in 1965. All the stock reasons usually trotted out are true enough in one way or another, but none truly satisfies. I am always left in the end with a long inventory of Things That Made It Likely I would go, but no booming revelation as to what the determining factor, or magic mix of factors, was in my case. The best answers I have ever come across lie in literature, not history, especially in the writings of veterans. That may have to do. (In this work, I nevertheless wrestle with the issue of why the men of the Civil War company I have investigated decided to go, and examine some of the relevant scholarship. The reader will reach his or her own conclusions. See Chapter 4.)

I am much more confident about answers to the second question: what the

war – any war - costs soldiers and their families. On the afternoon of May 16, 1966, on a lonely ridge above Vinh Than Valley in Viet Nam's Central Highlands, in ominous, overcast weather, ten of my men abruptly paid what is sometimes unthinkingly called "the ultimate price". That is what the war did to them, and the cost was dear indeed. But in "ultimate" terms, they may have been the luckier ones.

That must sound heartless. But for sixteen years, from September, 1985 to, as it happened, *September 11, 2001*, I worked with hospitalized Vietnam veterans diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (whatever that may be; see Chapter 10), and usually suffering from physical wounds as well. That experience has made it very hard for me to assess such things as ultimate prices. Personally, I am glad I survived the war, though the cost of survival for me and for those who have stood by me has been considerable. But there are some who come out differently on this hard calculation. Their lives a shambles, they claim they would prefer to be actually dead than live lives of dead-men walking. (I sometimes think of such fellows as war's tragic vampires: Bram Stoker's "nosferatu," the Un-dead. The current war, with its swath of IED-induced brain shatterings, adds almost daily to this sorry column. Added to PTSD is the new buzzword, "TBI," or Traumatic Brain Injury.) As in every generation of war survivors, some of the Un-dead have acted on their assessments. They answer Hamlet's existential question by concluding that in their case it may indeed be nobler to oppose troubles by ending them for good, thereby escaping "The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks/That flesh is heir to." I understand their point. Dead or alive, the costs are high.

When I finally got into the academic world, relatively late in career life, I continued to be a bit driven by my interest in these subjects. Driven by ghosts, I suppose: by what Viet Nam War memoirist, Phil Caputo, once described as his dreamt-up "platoon of crippled corpses...disciplined soldiers to and beyond the end…stay[ing] in step even in death." Like Caputo, I seem to have fallen into the role of "Officer of the Dead". This may be morbid, but I see it as just another coping skill, a way of keeping faith with my aging, ageless, 19-year-old

brothers. It is also a sort of grand conceit for my role in this project: teller of tales of dead men and women who populate pages. Like it or not, that is what all of us historians are: officers of the dead.

Much of my decade of teaching has focused on the Viet Nam War, on war in general, and particularly on war's human costs: veterans histories, and the histories of those who surround, love, worry about, and care for soldiers. I must say, though, that with so many oppressed and marginalized subsets of humanity competing for scholarly attention in recent years, the voices of dead and dying foot soldiers - the "boots" - have been somewhat muted. (Once, in this very regard, I found myself on the receiving end of a powerfully muting female gaze. The lookist was an academic looking over my application for a teaching job. The gaze erupted when I helpfully observed that I too, though an old white male, belonged to a "specially encouraged" category of applicant – "disabled veteran" - and that it said so right in her institution's deeply correct advertisement for the position. I got good glare but no work.)

Things have begun to get better on the soldier front. We are once again mired in conflict. Pundits of both the left and right, relieved this time of any burden of actual fighting, have been weighing in with pronouncements about how the present wars do or do not compare with Viet Nam, or how the War on Terror does or does not finally reveal our nation's hidden imperial agenda. Often (not always) overlooked in all this is the plight of what Caputo called "the universal soldier": the grunt who always does the fighting while the rest of us solemnly limn the borders of the great issues at stake, and plumb the rules of the next new "Great Game".

While high-minded debate rages in the hall of mirrors, I have (for several years now) been down here communing with the shades of a very small, unnoticed group of long-dead, mostly low-born men, and the long-dead, mostly low-born women who loved them. When I began delving into Civil War pension files at the National Archives, I intended to look only for signs of veteran maladjustment and post-traumatic dysfunction. I wanted to show (as Eric Dean has convincingly done for one *literally* crazy bunch; see Chapter 9) that the Civil

War caused in these men the same things that it caused for the members of my generation who went off to war.

But the more I found out about my subjects, the more I came to see them as the whole, complicated human beings they of course were. The men were not only wounded, sick, or traumatized veterans of a brutal war – though virtually all fell into at least one of those categories. They were also sons, husbands, brothers, and fathers; workers, shirkers, and providers; successful careerists and bankrupt failures; faithful spouses, lovers, and philanderers; prayerful believers and scoffers; men of honest and even noble mien, as well as cads and crooks; brave and quiet sufferers, boasters, and whiners; paragons of sober and righteous living, and disagreeably "vicious" drunks. I also unexpectedly discovered in the pension files many of their female counterparts, and enough data to discern most of their stories as well. The "women of Company A" – mothers, wives, daughters, sisters - deflected, supported, dearly loved, or struggled gamely against, all these men and their varied male natures.

And each one, male and female, shared one profoundly shaping experience: the war. It marked their lives, usually from a young age, and changed things forever. Though there were positive and life-affirming aspects to this, the overwhelming evidence of this study is that the costs virtually all of them paid for three years' exposure to war were exceedingly high. I also discovered that even though these costs were generally well-reckoned and adjusted within the small communities in which most of the people I studied resided – monuments cropped up just about everywhere; "old" veterans were revered and their war stories solicited; money, food, jobs, and prayers were freely handed around – *they have been almost completely lost to today's historians* (just as, for different reasons, the human costs of today's wars are lost to most of us).

That became the story I wanted to tell, but placed in the larger setting of as full a picture of these men and women as I could possibly tease out of the historical record. Professional historians have done many great things, I believe, in the last three or four

decades. Not the least of these has been to discover, and *restore*, many of the small voices once lost to History's grand narrative. This work continues in that tradition. It is an effort to give voice to a few of history's common soldiers, in hopes that their stories will stand for the stories of many others. Unlike most generations of Americans, unlike most of us, these men and their families had a rendezvous with destiny most terrible and tragic. They did not ask for that destiny but, as Lincoln said, "the war came". This work is about the men who chose to go and fight it, and the cost they and their families paid. We owe it to them, as we owe it to today's soldiers and their loved ones, to learn about and to weigh those costs carefully. They are costs that should never remain uncounted.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND DEDICATION

I am grateful to the Rutgers University History and American Studies Departments for help and *patience* over the years since I began the quest for a Ph.D. I was advised, when I started in 1988 at age 45, that the politically correct term for me (even back then) was "unconventionally-aged student". I must now be "superannuated student," which has a better ring. I especially thank the following, for their various kinds and degrees of good influence on me: John Chambers, Al Howard, Tom Slaughter (now moved elsewhere), Michael Rockland, Bill O'Neill, Dawn Ruskai, Helene Grynberg, Angus Gillespie, Jim Livingston, Jackson Lears, Ziva Gallili, Susan Schrepfer, and Paul Clemens.

Most of my teaching to date has been done at Trinity College (Connecticut). There I enjoyed the collegiality and encouragement of several persons: Jonathan Elukin, Jack Chatfield, Michael Lestz, Rhoda Adam, Gigi St. John, Margaret Lindsay, and Michael Schub stand out. Three individuals in the college's administrative sector were also always supportive, and interested in my overall welfare: Jimmy Jones (the President), Martha Burke, and Andy Miller.

I received a great deal of help from numerous unnamed workers at the National Archives: file retrievers, counter clerks, security guards, volunteers. Most had somehow avoided inoculation with the federal government's sorry-that's-our-policy vaccine, and provided many moments of spontaneous human warmth during my stays at the capital.

I was never lonely at the end of my Washington workday, however, thanks to the hospitality of two Virginia couples with whom I was always invited to lodge: Mimi and Tony O'Neill, and my Russian-Uzbek friends, Sergey and Lyena Nesterov. (Sergey, a veteran of the Soviet War in Afghanistan, instinctively understood why I needed to do this work.) Much more than hosts, these folks were always an inspiration, genuinely interested in my research and constantly asking questions.

Closer to home, I was aided by librarians and archivists at the New Jersey State Library and State Archives, and the Hunterdon County (New Jersey) Library. I also want to single out for thanks two especially helpful persons, Roxanne Carkhuff and John Kuhl, respectively Recording and Corresponding Secretary of the Hunterdon County Historical Society. This organization is a gem of its kind.

Thanks as well to those officials at the Hartford, Connecticut, regional office of the Bureau of Veterans Affairs, who handled my request for certain errant pension files; it was their first such request, and they processed it with a minimum of fuss and without contacting Homeland Security. (I can now confess that it was I who turned the large framed photograph of Our Leader, the combat-averse George W. Bush, toward the lobby wall when no one was looking. Perhaps it's been left that way.)

My non-academic friends and especially my family, of course, have had the most important and direct affect on me in all this work: they have needled me, and made it *possible* for me, to finish it. They were the ones who incurred the "uncounted costs" of an aging doctoral candidate's over-ambitious and perfectionist effort to get the "damn thing" done. They know who they are, and I am grateful.

At the top of the friends-and-family list goes my wife, Lucia. We had barely met when I embarked on this grand graduate adventure 20 years ago, and over the course of it we courted, married, produced two wonderful boys (in addition to the three wonderful older children I already had), moved three times, and made many solemn commitments to see the project through. Lucia knows what it is to stand by a sometimes-a-shambles vet, and to *keep* standing, "face toward the enemy".

You've never let me down, Lucia, and I have noticed. This work, like me, is dedicated to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract of the Dissertation ii

Preface iv

Acknowledgment and Dedication ix

Introduction xiii

Part I – To War: The Volunteers of Company A, and the War They Fought 1

Chapter 1 – Hunterdon County and the Men Of Company A 2

Chapter 2 – Mindsets: The Men's Education, Literacy, and Politics 48

Chapter 3 – Company A at War 74

Chapter 4 – Why They Fought 115

Part II – Veterans: The Men Who Came Home, and the Post-War Lives They Led 153

Chapter 5 – Health and Longevity 155

Chapter 6 – Marriage and Family 241

Chapter 7 – Residence, Migration, Work, and Wealth 276

Chapter 8 – Pensions 329

Chapter 9 – Veterans at Leisure: the GAR 378

Chapter 10 – Dysfunction 400

Part III – Loved Ones: Families of Lost Soldiers, and the Prices They Paid 454

Chapter 11 – Widows 455

Chapter 12 – Mothers & Fathers 476

Chapter 13 – Fathers 530

Chapter 14 – Siblings & Orphan 565

Chapter 15 – Domestic Discord 579

Conclusion 618

Endnotes 628

Bibliography (including Abbreviations Used and Glossary) 660

Appendix A – Roster of Men of Company A, 15th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry Regiment* 669

Appendix B – Notes on Roster Sources and Composition, Company A, 15th NJ Volunteer Infantry Regiment 686

Appendix C - Notes on Union Army Organization, the 15th NJ Volunteer Infantry Regiment and its 10 Companies, and Other Union Regiments Raised from New Jersey and Hunterdon County 693

Curriculum Vitae 700

*Note on Company A Soldier and Family Member References

Unless otherwise indicated (usually by footnote citing another source), *all references* in this work to soldiers of Company A, 15th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry Regiment, or to their family members, have been generated directly from documents in their official federal pension files. These references are extensive, and appear throughout the work. To save space and avoid redundancy, references to or about these soldiers and family members are not otherwise identified by source, or footnoted, *but may be found and reviewed by examining the pertinent pension file(s) associated with the soldier or family member*.

The pension files were originally compiled in separate folders, by officials of the federal Pension Office (PO), in Washington, DC, and are now stored primarily at NARA, in their original condition. The NARA files are indexed, and retrievable, by the pension claimant's original application number or pension award number. The numbers for each soldier and family member (who submitted an application), as well as a more detailed explanation of NARA's Civil War pension filing system, are set forth in Appendix A.

In the following pages, whenever the full life story, or a significant, pertinent *portion* of the story, of a particular volunteer or family member is set out in comprehensive fashion, the first paragraph of the story/portion is preceded by the individual's name, in **bold**.

INTRODUCTION

SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES

> On the 23d [of June, 1865],…we took the train from Washington, and reached Trenton [New Jersey] at noon the next day. The ladies and citizens, upon our arrival, gave us a handsome repast and reception. The services rendered by the regiment for their country were gratefully acknowledged by several speakers. * * * We then had a review, and were marched to a camping place to the east of the city. The following week we were paid off, and disbanded.
>
> * * *
>
> The war ended. The survivors of the Fifteenth sought their homes, happy to return to citizen life. We rejoiced that the great rebellion had been crushed out, and looked forward to a glorious future for our country. * * * …[N]one regretted the sacrifices we had made. The scars we carried were from honorable wounds received in behalf of a noble cause. We should share in the common blessings of our favored land, and would value them all the more because our sufferings and toil had contributed to secure them.
>
> Alanson A. Haines, Regimental Chaplain, 1883[1]

Writing a decade and a half after the event, Alanson A. Haines, who had served through the last three years of the war as Chaplain of the 15th New Jersey Volunteer Regiment, painted a subdued and anticlimactic picture of the unit's final march into its home territory. Perhaps this is exactly how the men of the unit felt that summer day in 1865. Several of them had served continuously since the unit's organization nearly three years before. In those three years they had participated in a lifetime's worth of campaigning: they had marched more than two thousand miles on foot in all kinds of weather and terrain, hefting gear that weighed as much as seventy pounds per man; slept often on ground with nothing more than a blanket and a comrade's body warmth against the elements; participated in thirty major battles (including the devastating mutual slaughter of the Wilderness Campaign, culminating in the Battle of Spotsylvania Courthouse), as well as countless smaller skirmishes; seen two-fifths of their original comrades succumb to terrible

[1]Alanson A. Haines, *Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers* (New York, 1883) 316-17, 320.

wounds, camp diseases, the vagaries of contemporary medical treatment, or no known cause at all; and been dogged increasingly by ill-health and exhaustion - developing overall the veneer of hardness and sense of resignation that comprise a soldier's last defense.

One senses the mood of welcoming crowds was more respectful than cheerful; more inclined to thank God silently and hand out food than to say much out loud to the members of the thinned horde of thin men that trudged before them. And as the men traveled closer to home – a rural, agricultural area of northwestern New Jersey centered on Hunterdon County - there must have been mothers and fathers in the crowd, some siblings, here and there a wife (or a sweetheart who would shortly be betrothed, or at least pregnant), and numerous children of various ages. Now the flow of letters would be stanched; the soldiers' diaries closed and put away; the war correspondents' dispatches to hometown newspapers left off. The horde was coming home - victorious perhaps, as such things go, but not triumphal.

What became of these men and their families in the years that followed? Did they manage to throw off the effects of three years of war and separation, and pick up the threads of their pre-war lives? Or were things somehow changed forever, either for the men who went or for their loved ones at home, or for both? Did these American Civil War veterans and their families experience the changing features of late-19th and early-20th century United States society in the same way, with similar results, as their non-veteran fellows? Or did the combined effects of war's three-year interruption of their lives act to diminish (or perhaps even improve) their life outcomes, as compared to those of their civilian peers?

These are large questions: the kind to which surviving evidence yields only tantalizingly incomplete answers. But the questions are important, and deserve investigation. Warfare, and its long-term effect on combatants and their familial circles, will undoubtedly continue as far into the human future as we can reliably see. (Americans are once again involved in a horrid war as these words are written.) We owe it to ourselves, as a race, better to understand war-making's longer-term consequences, particularly the

"uncounted" costs that may be imposed on the returning veteran and his - and in today's military world, *her* - intimates.

And indeed there are ways to get at the larger issues, empirical questions that can be posed. Were these Civil War veterans, for example, successful at getting and keeping post-war jobs, and did the work they got allow them to sustain themselves and their families? Did they end up accumulating property, have estates - even modest ones - to pass on to heirs when they died; or did they fall into poverty and institutionalization? What were their marriages like, and their child-producing patterns; did they get divorced? Did they remain in the communities where they were born and raised, or did they leave (and where did they go)? What were their politics? Their church affiliations and their beliefs? Did they get drunk, abuse their wives, commit breaches of the law? How was their long-term health; when did they die, and from what causes? And as they grew older, how did they remember the war and their part in it? What post-war adjustments did their experience of war's terrors oblige them to make? Did they pay a price for their special part in the nation's history, and if they did, how steep a price was it?

Despite the emergence of new social history, and the re-emergence of military history, scholarly treatment of these war-related questions, both large and particular, has been notably sparse, at least for veterans of the American Civil War. (By contrast, scholarship regarding *wartime* experience, and the Civil War in general - as well as popular writing on these subjects - is a virtual embarrassment of riches.)[2] As social historian, Maris Vinovskis, remarked nearly twenty years ago:

> Despite the popularity of military history, little effort has been made to study the demographic and socioeconomic impact of war on society. A prime example is the neglect of the American Civil War by social historians. * * * Indeed, most of the so-called new social historians have ignored the possible influence of the Civil War on the life course of nineteenth-century

[2] Noted Civil War scholar, James McPherson, has estimated that the war is "by far the most-written about event in American history," accounting for "[s]ome fifty thousand publications...in the past 130 years." McPherson, foreword, *Upon the Tented Field*, Bernard A. Olsen, ed. (Red Bank: Historic Projects, 1993) 7.

Americans.[3]

Since then, the situation has not much changed.[4] Part of the problem has been a lack of sufficiently detailed demographic data on America's Civil War generation in general, and on its soldiers in particular. One way to begin addressing the problem is by careful scrutiny and analysis of small, sample populations of veterans - such as groups of veterans who served together in a single military unit, or who joined up from a single town or region (in the case of the Civil War, these two criteria being usually conjoined) - and then, using the data obtained, by making comparisons with data similarly obtained for other such small groupings, or (to the extent it is available) with data for the population at large. Gradually, a sufficiently large database might be built up in this way to justify more confident descriptions of the characteristics and experiences of Civil War soldiers and veterans.

---

[3] Maris A. Vinovskis, introduction, *Toward a Social History of the American Civil War*, Maris A. Vinovskis, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990) vii. See also in same collection: Vinovskis, "Have Social Historians Lost the Civil War? Some Preliminary Demographic Speculations," 1-3; and Thomas R. Kemp, "Community and War: The Civil War Experience of Two New Hampshire Towns," 31.

The situation has begun gradually to change in the decade since Vinovskis made his observation, at least with respect to describing larger demographic patterns among the Civil War veteran community as a whole, and the post-war lives of disabled or dysfunctional veterans. See, for example, Robert W. Fogel, "New Sources and New Techniques for the Study of Secular Trends in Nutritional Status, Health, Mortality, and the Process of Aging," *Historical Methods* 26, No. 1 (Winter 1993): 1-44, which, relying on a large sample of pension claim files and census data, includes an analysis of post-war health and mortality among Union veterans; Dora L. Costa, *The Evolution of Retirement: An American Economic History, 1880-1990* (Chicago: U. of Chicago P, 1998), which includes data regarding veteran occupational and retirement patterns, mortality, and the impact of the federal pension system (as well as detailed appendix regarding use of federal pension files, from which "[m]uch of the life history of an individual can be reconstructed" (197); and David A. Gerber, ed., *Disabled Veterans in History* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2000), which devotes three chapters to disabled Civil War veteran topics (Gerber observing that "[d]isabled veterans are neglected figures in the histories of war and peace, and the historical scholarship about them at present is fragmentary" [1]).

A recent joint study by the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation attempted to link wartime trauma and postwar medical problems among Union soldiers, by sampling 15,000 veterans pension files; the study was summarized by Aaron Levin, "Civil War Trauma Led to Combination of Nervous and Physical Disease," *Psychiatric News* 41, No. 4 (April 21, 2006).

[4] But see the newly published collection, Larry M. Logue and Michael Barton, eds., *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader* (New York: New York UP, 2007). A very useful compilation and review of both old and emerging scholarship (some of which has been incorporated in this dissertation), much of *The Civil War Veteran* nevertheless consists of re-publication of old articles or portions of early books, dating as far back as 1918. The editors reiterate Vinovkis's 1990 lament, observing that "[t]here has been no Bell Wiley for the study of Civil War veterans" (2; see also next footnote).

Indeed, with regard to soldiers and their *wartime* experiences, the process has been underway for some time.[5] But with regard to veterans and their *post-war* lives, the process has barely begun. Even more glaring than social historians' comparative neglect of the larger "demographic and socioeconomic impact of the war on society," has been the virtually complete absence of study focusing on the post-war life courses of *individual* veterans and their families, or even on small *groups* of veterans from discrete military units or geographical areas.[6] The present study is a small, initial step in that direction. When joined

---

[5] See, for example, Bell Ervin Wiley's use of small unit samples to support many of the statistical descriptions and profiles in his two classic works, *The Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1943), and *The Life of Billy Yank: The Common Soldier of the Union* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1952). See also Vinovskis, 13, and *fn* 22.

[6] I have found only two studies that attempt to follow or describe aspects of the post-war lives of veterans from discrete units or regions, and none that looks at individual post-war lives in any detail.

Kemp's chapter in *Toward a Social History of the American Civil War* (note 4, above) is a community study that focuses on the war's impact on two New England towns, concluding that the fiscal and emotional consequences of the war left both communities "dazed" by "a painful scar that was only gradually healed over with the passage of time" (77). Kemp describes, in *statistical* terms, the trauma suffered by the residents of the two towns who served in the Union Army (defined by five events: death, wounds, capture, desertion, and discharge for disability), concluding merely that "a substantial number...clearly had a traumatic war experience that greatly affected their lives and the lives of those close to them" (74). Although noting that high percentages of these veterans eventually received federal pensions, or moved away from their home communities, Kemp does not otherwise attempt to investigate the particular post-war lives of individuals among the subject population, or to describe in what ways they may have been "greatly affected" by their war trauma.

Lawrence A. Kreiser, Jr., "A Socioeconomic Study of Veterans of the 103rd Ohio Volunteer Regiment After the War," *Ohio History* 107 (Summer-Autumn 1998), 171-184, looks primarily at economic and fertility factors among a subset of veterans of one northern unit, and concludes that their wartime experience may actually have *improved* aspects of their post-war lives. From a total regimental roster of about 1,000 men, organized for the study into three categories (officer, non-commissioned officer, and enlisted man), the author randomly selected a sample of sixty-one (from among 417 soldiers he was able to find in both 1860 and 1870 censuses). Using census information (marital status, age, family size, occupation, place of birth, and wealth), he compared the sixty-one subjects as of each census date. Relying almost exclusively on the 174% overall increase in the sample's reported average wealth between 1860 and 1870, and on job-holding patterns, Kreiser concluded, "In general, soldiers of the 103rd made a successful transition to civilian society after the conclusion of the Civil War." While provocative, the study raises more questions than it answers. For example, how severe was the combat experience of this unit? According to RLACW (495), it experienced only a moderate level of casualties: 39 were killed in action and 109 died from non-combat causes (the 15th New Jersey's comparable numbers were 240, six times as high, and 132). As Kreiser notes, "...the postwar effects of severe disease and physical wounds [were] beyond the scope of the study." What were the post-war experiences of the more than half of the regiment who could not be found in both censuses, and does their absence imply anything about less stable or productive post-war outcomes for this subset? Since most of the men were most likely in their teens in 1860, living with their parents and having had little opportunity to accumulate personal wealth, is a 174% increase in that wealth by 1870 a significant indicator of "success"? What of non-economic factors (Kreiser notes without comment that the married men in his sample produced children at only half the national rate: two, instead of four, per family)? And what became of the sixty-one men of the sample after 1870 (which was, after all, only five years after the war's end, when most were still in their late 20s or 30s)?

Two other recent studies deal with aspects of severe *dysfunction* among discrete groups of Civil War veterans. In *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War* (Cambridge: Harvard

with other such "micro" studies that may be accomplished in future, and integrated with "macro" work presently underway by several scholars, we may someday gain an adequate understanding of the role the Civil War played in the post-war lives of by far the largest (per capita) group of Americans ever to take up arms, or ever to see their husbands, sons, brothers, and fathers go off to fight.[7]

The principal primary source used for this study was the subject veterans' (and their families') original federal pension claim files, most of which are stored at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), in Washington, D.C. (A small number of files have been transferred to the Bureau of Veterans Affairs - formerly the Veterans Administration, and referred to in this work as "VA" - and were reviewed at the Bureau's regional office in Hartford, Connecticut.) Files for nearly every man listed *in any source* as having served for any period of time with Company A, 15th New Jersey Volunteer Regiment, between 1862 (when the unit was formed) and the end of the war, *for whom any pension claim was later made* (whether by himself, his widow, child, sibling, or parent) were identified, about 150 in all. Most of the 150 indexed files were successfully located, and

---

UP, 1997), Eric T. Dean, Jr., relying primarily on the patient records and federal pension claim files of 291 veterans who wound up in Indiana's Central State Hospital (an insane asylum), assesses the prevalence among Civil War soldiers of what would today be labeled Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. James Marten, in "Nomads in Blue: Disabled Veterans and Alcohol at the National Home" (Gerber, 275), describes the problem of alcoholism and alcohol abuse among veterans admitted to various branches of the federal government's National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. Dean's book, in particular, contains compelling descriptions of individual veteran's post-war experiences and life outcomes, as well as useful statistics, but both studies necessarily focus on non-representative, institutionalized groups, whose common denominator is not unit or home community, but illness or dysfunction.

For an interesting study of the significant influence of their *WWII and Korean War* experience on the post-war lives of a group of veterans from Berkeley, California, see Glen H. Elder, Jr., "Military Times and Turning Points in Men's Lives," *Developmental Psychology*, 22 (March, 1986), 233-45. Elder concludes that, in general, the wartime experiences of these children of the Great Depression generation "turned some men toward a brighter future, even as it produced a tragic side for others in damaged health or death" (233).

[7] Even if we could glean from Civil War sources the same level of factual data available to researchers studying the effects of modern wars, interpretation of that data might still be endlessly debated, as each new generation, goaded by its historians, seeks to reinvent war's lessons. A cautionary case in point is the current controversy over the uniqueness of the Vietnam War's impact on American veterans and their families, a debate carried on with equal intensity in popular and scholarly sources. (See, for example, the contending sources analyzed in Chapter 11 of this work.) The controversy rages despite an historically unprecedented surfeit of objective data and subjective narrative of every kind (or perhaps, because of it).

reviewed in detail. (See Appendix A for complete information on NARA and VA files and protocol, Company A roster and organization, and related information.) Time taken to review discrete files, including recording pertinent data; copying or summarizing key portions of text; photocopying key documents; and engaging the retrieval process itself, averaged from 2 to 3 hours per soldier, or a total of about nine 40-hour work-weeks, expended at NARA and elsewhere. This time investment was necessary to achieve the level of detail sought for the study.

The total number of men ultimately determined to have served with the company at some point during the war totaled about 194, consisting of 100 original 3-year volunteers, and about 94 replacements of various kinds, including recruits, draftees, substitutes, and men transferred from other units. (An additional 30 men, whose names were not included in any official or unofficial company roster, were nevertheless identified by a NARA source as having served for some period with the company. Most of the 30 generated pension files, all which were examined. [These files are included among the 150 identified in the previous paragraph.] *None* turned out to have any significant connection with the company; their connection was either non-existent, or extremely transient; in one case, the purported Civil War soldier was actually a pensioner of the Spanish-American War! The 30 are thus not included in the total company roster of 194, stated above.) Accordingly, useful federal pension files and at least some individual or family data were recovered for nearly two-thirds of Company A's *total* wartime roster. (Most files contained a significant amount of data, and all information concerning the veteran and his immediate family members, including wives, children, parents, and siblings, was gathered and collated.)

After gathering data from available pension and other records, I decided to limit this study to the company's 100 *original volunteers*, all of whom enlisted with the company in the summer of 1862. This was done for three reasons. First, the surviving original men generally served a longer, usually much longer, tour of duty than the company's

replacements, and suffered the war's rigors from its second year until its conclusion.[8] As expected, a significantly higher percentage of this subset generated pension claims (74 of 100, or 74% for all original volunteers, as compared to only 47 of 94, or 50%, for all categories of replacements), which in turn provided more complete and more representative coverage for the group.

Second, the original 100 were much more likely than most of the replacements to share a common background and home community and, I believed, were somewhat more likely to have shared similar motives for enlisting and similar attitudes toward the war. This meant that the influence of these variables on their post-war lives and attitudes would be less diverse, which might in turn enhance the usefulness of comparisons among these men. It also spared me the effort of dealing with the *significantly* different and varying circumstances and post-war experiences of the approximately 50 transferees, draftees, and substitutes who ultimately joined Company A, and of trying to integrate their data and stories into the main body of the work.

Even among the men themselves, there developed an enlistment "class consciousness" of sorts, according to which original volunteers often viewed later replacements as being less motivated by patriotism than by financial inducement or legal compulsion. Or they simply - and of course accurately - saw the later men as having borne much less of the company's burden of service, risk, and loss.[9] (This bias, partly justified, may

---

[8] This is reflected in the much higher overall attrition rate suffered by this cohort (see generally, Chapter 3). Of the original 100, 42 died during the war, and another 21 incurred sufficiently debilitating wounds or illness to be discharged as unfit or remained hospitalized at war's end: a total attrition rate of nearly two/thirds (63%). (This attrition rate does not include the 7 members of the company who were injured or sickened badly enough to be transferred to the VRC.) The comparable attrition rate for all other categories of Company A men combined was only about 11% (8 died during the war, and 2 were discharged from hospital, from a total of 107 replacements whose outcomes are known).

[9] As compared with the 34 months served by surviving original volunteers, Company A's surviving *recruits* served an average of only 14-1/2 months, and *substitutes and draftees*, all of whom were mustered into the company in 1965, an average of only 3 months. (See Chapter 3.) Haines reports that substitutes and draftees were "scorned" by the original men of the company. This is consistent with McPherson's observation that "the pre-bounty veterans of 1861 and 1862…viewed many of the bounty men and substitutes of 1864 as 'off-scourings of northern slums…dregs of every nation…branded felons…thieves, burglars, and vagabonds.'" James McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom* (New York: Oxford UP, 1988) 606.

have been unjustly aggravated by 19th century Nativism; a high proportion of Company A's substitutes, for example, were immigrant, urban Germans, many with little facility in English, or immigrant, urban Irish, inevitably Catholic and often lampooned in local, Hunterdon newspapers.) The 44 "recruit" replacements constituted a middle ground; they were more likely than other replacements to come from - and return after the war to - areas in or near Hunterdon County, and generally served for longer periods with the company than other replacements.

And third, adding the data from another 80 or so files would have greatly expanded the time and text required to complete this already lengthy work, and diluted the degree of focus and detail I hoped to sustain in this initial effort. The research data for all replacements has nevertheless been collected and collated, and will hopefully be of use in future renditions of the present study.

* * *

The main body of the work is divided into three parts and fifteen chapters; each part begins with a brief introduction describing the part's constituent chapters. In general, Part I, "To War" (Chapters 1 though 4), sets the stage for the study. It describes the region from which Company A was raised, the men themselves and their likely motives for joining up, and the company's nearly three-year war experience.

Part II, "Veterans" (Chapters 5 through 10), narrates the fortunes of the company's surviving volunteers in the years following the war. Its chapters are organized topically, and cover the men's health; domestic life; migration, work life, and property accumulation; pension-claiming experience; memories and views of the war; and "dysfunction" (post-war adjustment problems).

Finally, Part III, "Loved Ones" (Chapters 11 through 15) describes the post-war lives of many of the men's immediate family members. (Since this information came largely from

widows' and parents' pension applications, the lives portrayed are mainly those of Company A wives who became widows, and of "dependent" parents who lost their son in the war.)

A Conclusion follows Part III.

* * *

A note on style and theory. The style of the present work is intended to be relatively straightforward and narrative. I have tried to avoid the use of jargon, and the overuse of currently fashionable theories or organizing conceits (such as the trinitarian orthodoxy of race, class and gender). It is not that I have failed altogether to benefit from scholastic immersion in these waters, only that I have found them a bit turbid and chilly as places to swim. In the river of history, we should all be able to open our eyes under water. More importantly, we should also be able to feel the warmth of our common – and I believe timeless and universal - humanity.

Though anyone embarked on academic research is tempted to commit venal versions of Hawthorne's "Unpardonable Sin" - to become, that is, "...a cold observer, looking on mankind as the subject of [our] experiment, and, at length, converting man and woman to [such] puppets...as were demanded for [our] study"[10] - I have tried to resist this temptation, as well as its opposite: embracing and glorifying my subjects as larger-than-life heroes and heroines. I must confess, though, that I've spent so much time communing with these shades of the past that they have endeared themselves to me, despite the deplorable ways a few of them behaved while on earth.

My goal has simply been to avoid objectifying the men and women studied, whether as the white, mostly working class, and gendered "constructs" some would try to make of them today, or as the quaint, romantic old soldiers and long-suffering widows they sometimes made of themselves. My hope has been rather to "reincarnate" the players in this piece as the whole men and women they once were (in the Hebrew Bible's sense of that word

[10] Nathaniel Hawthorne, "Ethan Brand," orig. pub. in *Boston Museum* magazine, January 5, 1850.

- to put flesh back on their dry bones), and in so doing to allow the humanity we share with them to emerge, for better or for worse, of its own account. Insofar as it can be done, I have sought to let them tell their own stories, from their own perspectives. In the words of the late twentieth-century poet, Larry Levis:

> I'm going to put Johnny…right here
> In front of you on this page so that
> You won't mistake him for something else,
> An idea, for example.

PART I

TO WAR: THE VOLUNTEERS OF COMPANY A, AND THE WAR THEY FOUGHT

Part I sets the scene for the work, and follows the men of Company A through the war. Chapter 1 describes the northern venue (Hunterdon County, New Jersey) where most of the unit's original volunteers were raised, and introduces the men themselves, comparing them with Union soldiers in general. Chapter 2 develops the known specifics of the men's prewar educational and political worlds, in the rural New Jersey context where most of them obtained what little schooling they were able to manage, and formed their earliest political and ideological beliefs. Chapter 3 relates the men's nearly three-year wartime experience, the many hardships and losses they endured, and their military achievements. Chapter 4 concludes Part I with thoughts about why the men went to war and why, once there, nearly all of them determined to stick it out.

CHAPTER 1

HUNTERDON COUNTY AND THE MEN OF COMPANY A

Hunterdon County

> It has been nearly two and one-half centuries since the first pioneers settled in the region which is now known as Hunterdon County, New Jersey. During that long period most of the inhabitants of the county have been primarily interested in agriculture or in occupations supplemental to it. Their welfare, economic and otherwise, has depended to a large degree to the present day on their ability to till the soil and to raise domestic animals.
>
> * * *
>
> The history of Hunterdon County could be written in terms of its religious, educational, cultural, and institutional growth; but this would not tell the fundamental story. …Hunterdon is rural.
>
> Hubert G. Schmidt, *Rural Hunterdon: An Agricultural History*, 1945

Most of the nineteenth-century men and families whose stories are told in this work were born and grew up in a relatively "quiet" area of northwestern New Jersey. The state is a mid-Atlantic jurisdiction, a crossroads territory that by the time of the Civil War contained a varied mix of regional cultures and dialects, ethnicities, newcomers and old settlers, geographies and landscapes, and politics. Flat, marshy, and "barren" in the south - its southern tip extending below the Mason-Dixon line - New Jersey's topography rises steadily toward the north, folding finally into a region of low mountains and clear lakes. Even geologically, it is something of a borderland; the glacial advance of the most recent ice age – the so-called Wisconsin Glaciation, which ended a mere 10,000 years ago - covered the upper third of the state, creating much of that region's present-day surface characteristics.

New Jersey's state culture, if one can speak in such terms, has been less clearly defined, and more mixed and borrowed, than that of its northeastern sister states. The state has no national-scale city, but has always enjoyed metropolitan exposure to both New York City and Philadelphia. The Congregational and Puritan spirituality of the culturally

hegemonic "New England Way" was always focused further north, its theological capital at Yale in New Haven and its literary and intellectual font in Boston. (Historically, New Jersey did offer a liturgically similar Presbyterianism, and in the small central town of Princeton had early launched a singular university - then called the College of New Jersey – along with a preeminent seminary.) But the state was never dominated by the "Yankee" characteristics that seemed to prevail among New England states, and remained at the time of the Civil War a society and polity unto itself.

The state's mid-nineteenth-century politics especially reflected this unique, middle region status. Anti-war Democrats and "Copperheads," especially among laboring-class immigrants, and within its more urbanized areas, were generally stronger and more vocal than they were elsewhere in the Union. In the north's mid-war presidential election, New Jersey was the only state that cast its electoral votes for a Democrat: its favorite son, the Union General who Lincoln believed had a case of "the slows," George McClellan. (The fractious nature of New Jersey and Hunterdon County's pre-war political life is covered in greater detail in Chapter 2.)

Company A's volunteers came almost exclusively from a middle region of this middle state: the rural, west central county of Hunterdon. The county lies in an area of low, rolling hills; gentle, tributary streams and rivers; and relatively flat fields and meadows. To the west, the county borders Pennsylvania, separated by a 25-mile long, meandering stretch of the south-flowing Delaware River. (Along this length, the river is less than a mile wide and relatively shallow.) To the north lies Warren County; to the east, Somerset; and to the south, Mercer (the county seat of which is also the state capital, Trenton).[1]

An area that had been sparsely populated by tribes of Lenni-Lenapi in pre-Columbian days, the county, beginning in the early eighteenth century, was gradually explored and settled by Europeans. By the time of the Civil War, Hunterdon remained predominantly agricultural and, like northwestern New Jersey in general, somewhat removed from the state's principal commercial routes and centers, and relatively thinly

populated. The region's major waterway, the Delaware, becomes unnavigable by deep-draft vessels in the vicinity of the county's southern tip, at Lambertville, and the county's next town upriver, Frenchtown, never achieved the size or commercial growth of either Lambertville or Flemington, the county seat. The region's primary overland corridor, connecting the Philadelphia-Trenton area to the south, with the New York City-Newark area to the northeast, lay ten miles beyond Hunterdon's borders, to the southeast. Although, in hopes of promoting commercial development, local residents made periodic efforts during the nineteenth century to link the county more closely with regional transportation networks, none was particularly successful, and even today much of the county retains its original rural character.

The first Europeans to set up significant, permanent settlements in the county consisted of two distinct immigrant streams, moving from other areas of New Jersey in the early 1700s. From southern and southeastern parts of the state, English and Scotch-Irish settlers established footholds in the county's southern sections (present-day Kingwood and Amwell Townships).[2] From eastern New Jersey, Dutch settlers moving gradually up the Raritan River from the Atlantic coast eventually reached the county's eastern fringe (present-day Readington Township).

Hard on the heels of these initial migrations came smaller numbers of German settlers who, by the mid-1700s, had occupied additional areas in the eastern half of the county. By 1790, according to the first federal census, Hunterdon County's population stood at 14,849, a population density of about 34 persons per square mile (the density of the new nation as a whole was only about 4-1/2 persons per square mile).

Migration into the county, like European migration into the newly formed United States in general, slowed in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In the 1830s and 1840s, however, new waves of predominantly Irish and German immigrants, fleeing famine conditions or political unrest in Europe, reached American shores, and many of these

made their way to Hunterdon, the Irish settling primarily in the southern portion of the county around Lambertville, the Germans spreading more uniformly throughout the county.

Although Hunterdon's ethnic composition would be further altered in the late 1800s by an influx of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, and in the early 1900s by a wave of "back-to-the-landers" migrating internally from urban areas, its overwhelmingly English, Scotch-Irish, and German/Dutch cast was firmly in place by the time of the Civil War. Total county population, which had grown steadily since 1790, had more than doubled by 1860, to 33,654, increasing population density to about 77 persons per square mile. (In the same 70-year period, total U.S. population had grown *eightfold*, although the nation's overall population density, because of its still immense and growing territory, remained at a relatively low, 10.6 persons per square mile).

At mid-century, the county's population was still rural and sparse by today's standards. If the average household in 1860 consisted of three persons, there would have been about 11,000 households in the county and, if equally distributed over the county's entire area of about 437 square miles, each household would have occupied a 26-acre parcel of land - an area more than 1,000 feet on a side. This was in fact the approximate acreage of a medium-sized farm in that period (see below), and is equivalent to the area of nearly twenty modern football fields.

Of course, residents were not evenly distributed over the county's land mass - there were several more thickly settled villages, towns, and "corners" - but overall residents' home and work experiences, especially for farm families, were relatively isolated. Moreover, undoubtedly much more than is the case today, people tended to grow up where they were born, to know their neighbors well, and to rely on them for social activity and for help when needed.

Hunterdon's black population, never large, declined between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the number of slaves among it dwindled rapidly in the first half of the nineteenth. (Slavery in New Jersey was formally ended by the State Assembly in 1804,

whose "Act for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery" emancipated all children born to slave parents after July 4 of that year.) Never a large institution in Hunterdon, slavery dwindled rapidly after the 1804 legislation. In 1790, blacks in the county totaled only about 7% of the population (approximately 1,000), about 85% of whom were slaves. By 1860, total black population had dropped to 800 (less than 3% of the county total), of whom only four were listed by the census as slaves.

The county's pre-war population, like that of the United States in general, was overwhelmingly Protestant, consisting, in Hunterdon's case, of a mix of older, traditional denominations (Presbyterian, Lutheran and Reformed Dutch), and more recent, evangelical ones inspired in part by the Second Great Awakening of the first half of the nineteenth century (Baptist and Methodist-Episcopal). A small group of English Quakers, from a southern portion of New Jersey bordering Philadelphia, had early settled in a central region of Hunterdon (Kingwood Township) that came to be called Quakertown. There were apparently only one or two established Roman Catholic churches in the county at mid-century[3], and no Jewish synagogues. Although no precise, county-wide inventory of churches or church membership exists, it appears from available evidence that there were at least eighty churches spread throughout the county when the war began, the most numerous – probably constituting about a third – being Methodist Episcopal. (See detailed discussion of churches and religion in Chapter 4.) The congregations of these churches were typically small, their members well acquainted with one another. If a quarter of the county's 1860 population of about 34,000 were active church members (mostly likely a high estimate), each church would have served an average congregation numbering about 100 souls.

The ubiquity of churches and, and the era's cultural emphasis on character and proper moral conduct, did not of course mean the county was without its share of vice and "vicious" institutions. Distilleries also flourished throughout Hunterdon, and numerous taverns and saloons existed in larger towns and villages, and at many major road and railroad junctions. Schmidt notes that by 1857, "there were…over fifty licensed taverns in

the county, and the number increased somewhat over the next decade."[4] Prostitution and organized crime were reportedly not unknown in the county. A recent local history of Lambertville, for example, contains an undated nineteenth-century photograph of "Belmont House," a large two-storey structure at the center of town (ironically bounded on one side by Church Street), over the caption: "First built…in 1797…as…dwelling and store…[t]he building's...functions…changed over the years, including conversion to apartment house, whorehouse, and [bootlegger] hideaway…."[5]

Small public schoolhouses - "common schools" - also existed in every corner of the county, although school attendance during this period was voluntary and irregular, and competed with families' need to put school-age children to work in the household economy, especially in the case of farming. (See Chapter 2 for details of county schools and schooling.) The plowing and planting season usually began in May (as early as March for a few crops, such as potatoes), and the harvesting and storing season could last well into November (the busiest months generally being May and June for planting, and September and October for harvesting).[6] Farming was extremely labor-intensive in this pre-machinery era, and also tended to peak at certain key times of the year, when no worker could be spared. (Of course, family-sustaining *household* chores continued throughout the year, and fell mainly to the females of the household. "A man works but from sun to sun; a woman's work is never done".)

Hunterdon's economy, like that of the rest of the rest of the country, was largely agricultural, and the vast majority of its mid-nineteenth Century residents were either engaged directly in family farming, or pursued related trades. By 1860, according to the federal census, there were 2,651 farms in the county. Two-thirds of these consisted of what the census deemed "family-sized" holdings of between 10 and 99 acres; another 60 were small farms of less than 10 acres. 773 farms, almost a third of the total, comprised large enterprises of 100 acres or more. The majority of farms were owner-occupied and family-run, with non-family farmhands often hired seasonally to assist, especially on larger holdings. A

smaller number of farmers leased land from others for farming purposes. (Census figures did not distinguish between owner-worked and tenant-worked farms until 1880; in that year, the census indicated that only a quarter to a third of Hunterdon's farms were worked by non-owning "renters".) All forms of manufacturing included in the federal census in 1860, taken together, revealed a relatively small, non-farming labor force in the county of 998, or only about 3% of the total population. ("Manufacturing" - literally, "making by hand" - was at the time a more broadly defined category than it is now, incorporating virtually all forms of manual or trade work other than farming and transportation-related jobs.) Hunterdon's mid-century manufacturing sector included sawmills, grain mills, plow and other farm-implement making, iron and copper mining, stove manufacture, forges and foundries[7], limestone kilns[8], blacksmiths, pottery making, wood-product manufacture (barrels, pails, etc), cabinet making, tanning, shoemaking, saddle and harness making, textile and clothes making, alcoholic beverage fermenting, glass making, carpentry, masonry, and piano making.

Inns, blacksmith shops, and general stores were ubiquitous, providing the setting for much of the era's public and social life. (Blacksmiths, cab and carriage "sheds," harness shops, saddleries, and liveries - all centered on travel by horse - were of course as common as gasoline stations and automobile service garages are today. The Beers Atlas specifically identifies fifty-one blacksmith shops ["B.S.S."] operating throughout the county in 1873, and there were undoubtedly many more not shown.) These sites, along with churches, were also primary nodes in the informal networks of communication that characterized the county's village and crossroad life at mid-century. (More modern communication systems were rapidly appearing nonetheless: there were twenty-six local post offices in the county by 1827, and telegraph connections reached Lambertville in 1846, and Flemington in 1855). While increasingly exposed to competition from larger regional markets, as well as from urban retail centers (Philadelphia and Easton, in neighboring Pennsylvania, and Trenton and New Brunswick, in New Jersey), the county's two principal towns, Lambertville and Flemington,

managed to maintain their position as the county's primary retail centers, and its principal markets for locally grown produce and manufactured goods, well beyond the mid-1800s.

In many ways, then, Hunterdon County at mid-nineteenth century was characteristic of the young United States in general: still managing to retain much of its character as a Jeffersonian idyll of yeoman farmers, God-fearing church-goers, and family- and community-centered neighbors. But the nation was beginning to be fundamentally altered – a change that would disrupt many traditional patterns during the later lifetimes of the county men who were about to go to war. Even so, in 1860 that change was only just beginning to take shape, and had not yet much impacted the bucolic western reaches of the state. Like the war, it would come soon enough.

The War

The Civil War came to New Jersey, and to Hunterdon County in particular, in much the same way it came to the rest of the North. As will be discussed in more detail elsewhere, political opinion and "war fever" in the state quickly consolidated behind Lincoln, despite the anti-war or "Copperhead" sentiments of many residents. (Lincoln passed through the state by train on February 21, 1861, on his way from Illinois to the White House, and most New Jerseyans who heard him speak en route between Newark and Trenton, according to contemporary accounts, "could not resist the spell of the man".[9]) Even though controlled by Democrats who blamed the new president and his "Black Republicans" for the anti-southern feeling leading up to the war, the state's legislature and executive responded promptly to Lincoln's initial call for state militia to proceed at once to Washington, after the South's firing on Fort Sumter.

Democratic Governor Charles S. Olden, himself a Quaker, immediately dispelled any doubts about how the state (and the party) he led should react to the crisis. On April 17, he issued a proclamation in direct reply to Lincoln, "detach[ing] from the militia of this State FOUR REGIMENTS…to serve as infantrymen or riflemen [in federal service] for a period of

three months".[10] In the event, four militia units were hastily brought up to strength (at this point in the war, about 750 men per regiment, or a total of about 3,000), re-designated the 1st through 4th Regiments, New Jersey Militia, and on May 7 became the first northern militia units to reach the capital.

By July, Union forces concentrated in the Washington area numbered about 35,000. The North's urge to "do something" soon produced the debacle of the first Battle of Bull Run, on July 21. In comparison with later main force battles, Bull Run was a relatively light engagement, each side losing fewer than a thousand men killed or mortally wounded. (New Jersey's four regiments did not directly participate in the action.) But as McPherson points out, Confederate success (at what it called First Manassas) "was one of the most decisive tactical victories of the war….postpon[ing] for eight months any further Union efforts to invade Virginia's heartland".[11] At least in Union circles, it slowly began to become clear that the war would go on longer, and require more and better trained soldiers, than had been anticipated at the war's start.

This realization was not immediate. It took a series of tentative and inconclusive actions over the following year by Lincoln's new eastern army commander, George B. McClellan, to prompt both a renewed search for a capable military leader and a more organized effort to recruit and retain troops. McClellan was appointed immediately after Bull Run, to replace General Irvin McDowell. McClellan, after leading his troops in two major – and unsuccessful - back-to-back campaigns to take Richmond in the summer of 1862, and failing decisively to follow up his army's first great – and extremely costly – victory at Antietam in September, was sacked by Lincoln in October.

According to the regiment's chaplain, Haines, Governor Olden had "again and again" offered Lincoln more troops from New Jersey after the start of the war, but the offer had been declined. Writing in 1883, Haines painted a gloomy picture of the way things had looked to northerners in the summer of 1862. Haines also conveys an interesting perspective: it was *Washington* that had misunderstood the reasons for the unsuccessful

course of the war to date, and that had failed to appreciated the willingness of the people to undergo further sacrifice. The people of the North themselves (as well as their state leaders), though greatly troubled by events, knew what had to be done and were ready to do it.

> The magnitude of the struggle did not seem to be comprehended at Washington, and by the nation, for a whole year after the breaking out of hostilities. * * *
>
> Many disasters had befallen the Union armies. The delusive dream of a short war was passing away. The return of peace seemed more and more remote as month after month passed on. The spirits of the people were very greatly depressed. * * * The Union forces were everywhere falling back, while the Confederates were assuming the offensive. The time was critical. * * *
>
> The sentiment prevailed that this state of things was unnecessary, and that the nation possessed the power to cope with the rebellion and maintain the integrity of the Union. More ready, perhaps, than the general government supposed, were the people for greater sacrifices, and to recruit the army till its numbers were more imposing and overwhelming. Wise men saw from afar that this was no time for hesitation and half-way measures.
>
> At this juncture, eighteen Governors of loyal States addressed President Lincoln with the request that he should at once appeal to the patriotism of the country and call for a [sufficiently large] force.... In response to this representation, the President's call was issued for three hundred thousand men, to be enlisted for three years....[12]

In fact, as Haines could not have known, in July of 1862 the governors had been *requested*, by a somewhat desperate Secretary of State Seward, to gather on short notice in New York City to discuss the growing manpower problem, and it was *Seward* who proposed the plan for new troops (and who drafted and even back-dated the "governors' appeal" to Lincoln). The President then played his part in the staged arrangement, "responding" with a massive call for three-year enlistments. The governors themselves had been doubtful about the prospect of recruiting so many men for such long terms of service.[13] Nevertheless, they did the best they could.

New Jersey's quota of the 300,000 men Lincoln had called for was 10,478. Though prepared to draft these men, authorities were gratified to discover that the state's entire share appeared likely be supplied entirely by volunteers. Five "rendezvous" camps were quickly established throughout the state, at Trenton, Beverly, Freehold, Newark, and Flemington, and men from surrounding counties directed to report to each. Five all-volunteer, three-year regiments, designated the 11th through 15th New Jersey Volunteer

Infantry Regiments, were soon subscribed, and by the fall of 1862 all were on their way to the war theater.[14] According to Haines:

> The New Jersey authorities took action without delay. Governor Olden…called at once for four regiments of infantry – one from each of the four military divisions. [As indicated above, the call was actually expanded to include five regiments; the fifth was put together from recruits who had signed up from across the state, before the state's military quota had been determined.] One of these divisions comprised the [northwestern New Jersey] counties of Warren, Sussex, Somerset, Morris and Hunterdon.
>
> Patriotic citizens in [these] counties signified their readiness to co-operate with the Governor in the raising of a regiment. They proposed to him the name of Samuel Fowler…of Sussex County for…Colonel…and requested that he might be authorized at once to enlist men…. With great force of character, and possessing a wonderful influence over young men, Colonel Fowler selected his recruiting officers…and enlistments began. * * *
>
> Never was a regiment enlisted so quickly in the state. Sussex County furnished three companies; Warren, Hunterdon, and Morris, each two; and Somerset one.

One of the two companies from Hunterdon was Company A. (The other 15th New Jersey company supplied by Hunterdon was Company G, raised primarily from the Frenchtown area along the western, Delaware River side of the county).[15]

The Men of Company A

Almost all of the original hundred men of Company A, 15th New Jersey Volunteer Regiment, came from Hunterdon County, many from the area in and around the Town of Flemington, the more or less centrally situated county seat. The great majority had been born there. They were much like hundreds of thousands of other (mostly) young Americans who were joining up to fight, and their families had much in common with families throughout the young nation.

By 1862, the year in which the company was formed, the strength and organization of Union Army units had become fairly standardized. The vast bulk of the armies on both sides consisted of dismounted or "foot" infantry – men with rifles - always the elemental ingredient of land forces. (The other major branches, both much smaller, were artillery and cavalry.) The basic infantry unit was the regiment, which, according to federal regulation, comprised an allowable maximum of 1,025 men (including officers) and an allowable

minimum of 845, most regiments leaving their "rendezvous" (mustering in) locations with about 1,000.[16] (There were several levels of organization above the regiment, including Brigade, Division, Corps, and Army; see Appendix C for a more detailed explanation, and for Company A's place in the overall Union military structure.)

The regiment was administered and led by a "Field and Staff" group (headquarters) consisting of a maximum of 15 officers and men, all of whom were authorized mounts (horses). At the head of the regiment was a Colonel, followed in rank (in a standard unit) by a Lieutenant Colonel and a Major (expected, in order, to assume command in the absence of the Colonel), an Adjutant (for administrative and clerical duties), a Quartermaster (for supply, shelter, and provisioning), one Surgeon (in the rank of Major), two Assistant Surgeons (Captains), and a Chaplain. These nine all held their positions as commissioned officers. (Commissioned officers served by formal appointment of the state governor, called a "commission".) In addition, the regimental commander had several non-commissioned staff, including a Sergeant-Major, Quartermaster's Sergeant, Commissary-Sergeant, Hospital Steward, and two Principal Musicians; six "NCOs" in all. (NCOs, or non-commissioned officers, were enlisted men – men serving under a fixed-term contract or "enlistment agreement" – who outranked Private soldiers and had a supervisory or leadership role over them.)

As Wiley has pointed out, "The Regiment figured prominently in Billy Yank's loyalties."[17] This was particularly true of longer-serving regiments (like the 15th New Jersey), raised early in the war and subjected over time to some of its hardest fighting. When these regiments inevitably became dangerously depleted later in the war, and the War Department considered disbanding them and allocating their survivors among newly formed units, the measure "aroused a howl of protest" and was largely abandoned. (Instead, depleted regiments were simply augmented with new replacements, or by men cajoled into re-enlisting after their term of service in another unit had expired.)

The standard Civil War infantry regiment consisted of ten companies of about 100 men each (101 was the maximum standard number allowed, 83 the minimum). Companies were designated "A" through "K" (the letter "J" was not used, possibly because in script it was too easily confused with the letter "I"). Each standard infantry company was commanded by a cadre of commissioned and non-commissioned officers. Commissioned officers consisted of a Captain, and a 1st and 2nd Lieutenant. The Captain served as overall commander of the company, his responsibilities, in case of death, absence, or incapacity, devolving upon his lieutenants (or non-commissioned officers), in order of rank.

The company's non-commissioned officers were normally promoted to leadership positions by their officers or, particularly early in the war, by election of the men of the company, and did not require a state commission to hold their rank. In standard companies, according to US Army regulations, these positions consisted, in order of descending rank, of one First Sergeant, four Sergeants, and eight Corporals. All remaining men in the company served in the essentially equivalent ranks of Musician (2), Wagoner (1), and Private (maximum of 82 and minimum of 64). The chief practical distinction between officers and enlisted men (a designation that, as mentioned above, included non-commissioned officers) was that the latter were bound by their enlistment contracts for a specified term of service (three years in the case of Company A volunteers), whereas officers were legally free to resign their commissions at any time (though this was of course frowned upon), they being bound to serve only as long as “honor” required, or health allowed.

There were no expressly designated staff or support positions at the company level (except perhaps Musician and Wagoner), but men would be detailed from time to time to perform such necessary chores as ground clearing and road building, retrieving casualties from the battlefield and burying the dead, or performing quartermaster or commissary duties (e.g., driving supply wagons, foraging for food or other supplies, tending the regiment's herd of cattle, setting up living quarters, cooking and serving). Men in the company with musical ability were awarded the rank of Musician, and were expected to participate in the

regimental band when summoned by one of the Field and Staff's Principal Musicians. Such written record-keeping or official communicating as was performed at company level – at times a considerable function - would generally be done by its officers.

Although they are not much mentioned in either military historiography or popular accounts, there were apparently at least two organizational levels *below* that of company. According to Wiley, each infantry company was further divided into two platoons, and each platoon into two sections. Each of these subunits was presumably placed under the supervision of one the company's NCOs, four sergeants being available for assignment to lead the company's four sections (about 24 men each at full strength), and two corporals being available to assist each sergeant; that is, to supervise about a dozen privates.[18] (No mention of platoon or section has been found in any of Company A's wartime or post-war writings or documents reviewed for this project, or in either of the 15th New Jersey's unit histories, which suggests that as an organizational dimension of military life, platoons and sections had little impact on the men's experience. On the other hand, the documents indicate that the company's men often coalesced into *informal* subgroups - "messmates," "bunkmates," "tentmates" - which may have functioned as alternative groupings to Wiley's formal subunits.)

In regiment-sized formations, whether in the field or on the parade ground, companies formed up "on line" from right to left (from the soldiers' perspective, looking forward "toward the enemy"), with Company A comprising the extreme right end, or flank, of the line. When the regiment formed up into ranks, or "fell in," Company A would therefore take its position and form up first, and the men of the other nine companies would, in sequence, have to look to their right and line up, or "dress," in alignment with Company A's ranks. Military tradition deemed the regiment's "anchoring" position on the far right - Company A's position - the place of honor, and the unit considered most experienced or reliable was selected to assemble there (how this privilege could be determined in a new regiment that had never seen action is an open question).

Consistent with the Union standard for company strength, Company A prepared to enter service in late summer of 1862 with an initial roster, or "Muster Roll," of exactly one hundred officers and men. According to the ROMNJ record, all one hundred were "commissioned or enrolled" (i.e., either received officer appointment from the governor or signed an enlistment agreement with the state) during the three-week period between July 22 and August 15. Ninety-seven of the hundred were actually mustered in on August 25, the formal date set for the ceremony at Fair Oaks Campground in Flemington. (Mustering in was the formal ceremony in which officers and men were sworn into military service by a U.S. Army officer, and officially designated a company under federal jurisdiction, thereby formally beginning their 3-year period of service. The campground was a large tract northwest of town, which had served before the war for horse races and county fairs.) The three remaining men who had previously enrolled, Privates William Agin, Andrew Clawson, and William Jackson, failed to show up for muster, and were afterwards carried on the Muster Roll as deserters.[19]

William Agin. Agin, an unmarried man from West Amwell (see Map 2 for the location of this and other Hunterdon County place names, towns, and townships), managed to catch up with the company about two months later, while it was encamped at Tenallytown, Maryland, and was permitted to muster in at that time (October 28, 1862). More than two years later, on February 14, 1865, he deserted again "from hospital," this time for good. Ironically, when Agin finally "skedaddled," the war was only about *two months* from ending and all of the company's hard fighting was done. Agin had endured almost all of it and had even become sufficiently sick or wounded to be hospitalized in the process. Apparently, he'd simply had enough. Disqualified by this last-minute desertion from receiving a pension, no application or other trace of Agin's post-war life has been found.

Andrew Clawson. Clawson's case of "desertion" is intriguing. He was born in 1838, and had grown up in Fairmount, in Tewksbury Township, a rural area in the northeastern corner of Hunterdon County. Before the war, Clawson had worked as a laborer

or farmhand, and as a young man had met his future wife, Catherine Seals. At some point in late 1860 (they were not yet married), the couple became intimate and conceived a child, who was born in July of the following year (1861). Five weeks later, the couple married; he was 23, she was in her early 20s. But the ceremony took place *a hundred miles from Clawson's home*, in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania (a rugged territory in the extreme northeast corner of the state), and was performed by a *Justice of the Peace* rather than a "Minister of the Gospel". (Only one other Company A marriage is known to have been performed by a civil official rather than a minister.) What had brought the couple so far from New Jersey? Had Andrew attempted to flee paternal responsibility, or the prospect of an unwanted marriage? Had Catherine tracked him down and, with newborn in hand, cajoled him into a quick civil ceremony far from home and family? In any case, before another year was out, the couple and their infant had returned to Clawson's home territory, taking up residence on "Schooley's Mountain," a section of Morris County about five miles north of Tewksbury's Fairmount area and the Hunterdon County border.

But by the summer of 1862, it appears that Clawson (again?) wanted out. On July 30, he traveled across the county line and on to Flemington, about 20 miles from Schooley's Mountain, and volunteered for service with Company A. *He misreported his marital status to the enlistment officer as "Single" and gave no current residence address.* (Every other original volunteer, at enrollment, reported the town from which he enlisted. This, and marital status, had important legal consequences in determining the correct recipient of pay or bounties paid to family members on a soldier's account, and in determining town and county credit toward official recruitment quotas.) The most likely explanation for Clawson's misstatement and omission is that he intended to join up and disappear into the war, leaving wife and baby behind, and that he chose the relatively distant, Flemington-based company (instead of a Morris County-based one) to make it less likely his wife would find out. This evasion plan did not stop him, apparently, from enjoying a last roll in the hay with Catherine. At about the same time he was deciding to sign up and leave town, Catherine

became pregnant with her second child (who would be born nine months later, in April, 1863).

Somehow, Clawson's wife must have got wind of the plot. It is possible that even before her husband's August 25 reporting date, she knew or suspected that she was once again pregnant, which may have prompted her to be even more alert to any abandonment contemplated by her spouse. Whatever the case, Clawson failed to show up for muster on August 25, apparently choosing in the end to desert country rather than wife.

More than a year later, his second child born and things presumably better arranged on the domestic front, Clawson finally did catch up with the company, at its second winter encampment near Brandy Station, Virginia. Apparently skilled at getting others to give him what he wanted, he was permitted to muster in at that time, and joined the company's ranks on November 18, 1863. Once in, he served honorably with the company through the end of the war, and was grievously wounded at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 8, 1964 (gunshot wounds to shoulder and chest, puncturing his right lung). He eventually persuaded the War Department to rescind its record of his desertion, clearing the way for a pension. (No formal basis for the rescission appears in the record, but it is likely that Clawson's wound, disability, and otherwise creditable service during the last 1-1/2 years of the war were deemed reason enough to excuse it.) He patched things up with Catherine as well,(the couple produced a third child in 1867), and remained with her until she died.

William Jackson. William Jackson, the third original volunteer who failed to make muster, had signed on as an unmarried man from Lambertville, but was simply never heard from again. Like many deserters of the period, he probably disappeared into one of the nation's growing urban centers, or simply "lit out for the territories," his anonymity or a new identity relatively assured in either case.

Abraham Lattarette. One further and fascinating case of "desertion" deserves mention; that of Abraham Lattarette (variously spelled Latourette and LaTourette, one of the few francophone surnames in the company. He was from Readington Township in

Hunterdon County, an area replete with Latterettes.[20]). On August 24, 1861, the first year of the war, Lattarette had mustered in as a 3-year volunteer with Company D, 16th Cavalry Regiment. (In fact, there was another Readington Latterette - Henry - in the same horse company; he may have been Abraham's brother or other relative, but available records do not disclose this detail.)

The 16th Cavalry was comprised entirely of New Jersey men, but was initially placed under federal and not state leadership. Arriving at the front late in the campaign season, it saw little action in 1861. In February of 1862, it was restored to the command of New Jersey military authorities, and redesignated the 1st New Jersey Cavalry Regiment. Two months later, on April 3, just before the opening of the year's campaigning, the regiment was greatly enlarged by the addition of the members of another Cavalry Regiment, the 3rd New York. (Despite its name, the New York unit was also comprised almost entirely of New Jersey volunteers, who had probably wanted to serve in a cavalry outfit but who had joined up at a time when their home state had not yet mustered in any state-led cavalry regiments.)

On April 15, 1862, just after this consolidation of units, Lattarette deserted the 1st NJ Cavalry. A short time later, the regiment was committed to action. Whether he was discouraged by the prospect of finally having to endure real campaigning, or discomfited at the sudden infusion of so many strangers (even though they were mostly fellow Jerseymen), will never be known.

Meantime, Lattarette made his way back to Hunterdon County and, on August 25, mustered in as a 3-year volunteer a *second* time, on this occasion with the newly-forming A Company of the 15th NJ Infantry! He of course would not have disclosed to the enlisting officer that he was already under contract for wartime service and had deserted his assigned unit four months previously. In an era with only handwritten records, and no regular forms of personal identification or military affiliation, there was no easy way for his - or any other volunteer's - service status to be checked. (Moreover, it was unlikely that anyone voluntarily putting himself in harm's way, especially by joining up with a hard-marching infantry unit,

would be suspected of having recently deserted from a cavalry unit where he at least had had the luxury of riding a horse.) Perhaps Lattarette suffered pangs of conscience, and somehow calculated that, while unable to bring himself to return to his original unit, he could make up for everything by starting over with a new one.

Somehow, he was found out. (A reasonable speculation is that he shared his status with his intimates, or that one or more of them may have been aware of his earlier enlistment - there were, after all, other men from Readington in the company - and that one of them turned him in to the authorities or, more likely, persuaded him to come clean.) At some point he was given the opportunity to return to his first unit, and in the 1st NJ Cavalry's records, he is listed simply as having "returned to duty from A Company, 15th NJ Regt," on February 8, 1863.[21]

But the tale does not end there. Latterette served with the 1st NJ Cavalry through the balance of the war. On May 31, 1865, about a month after the war's conclusion, the bulk of the regiment's men was mustered out, at its camp in Cloud's Mills, Virginia. Latterette was not one of them, however, possibly because the government calculated he still owed further service after several months of being unaccounted for. On June 25, a month later, after having served for most of the war in one capacity or another and managing to survive it, he deserted again! Had he held on for one additional month of desultory camp duty, he would have been mustered out with all remaining 1st NJ Cavalry men, on July 24. But he did not, and in so doing denied himself any post-war benefit he may have attained as a veteran - and denied posterity the opportunity to learn his fate.

Latterette's and Agin's examples, however, do show that not all deserters were alike. Some, like Agin, held on almost till the end, enduring all of the very worst fighting and suffering the company underwent; he almost certainly would have survived the company's final two months of campaigning, had he stuck it out. And some, like Latterette, must have re-thought the decision to abandon comrades, and found the courage voluntarily to come

back to face the fighting, and the war, and to endure the ever-present prospect of death until it ended.[22]

* * *

Company A's cadre, or leadership, was organized along lines that had also become standard for the Union Army by this period of the war: three commissioned and thirteen non-commissioned officers.[23] The company's three original commissioned officers were Captain Lambert Boeman, 1st Lieutenant Thomas P. Stout, and 2nd Lieutenant John R. Emery. (In military usage, a 1st Lieutenant outranks a 2nd Lieutenant.) According to Haines, the regiment's "Captains and 1st Lieutenants were selected from the several counties [where their companies had been raised], and earned their commissions by successfully enlisting their companies." The regiment's commanding officer, Col. Fowler, on the other hand, "demanded the privilege of nominating the 2nd Lieutenants from non-commissioned officers of New Jersey regiments now in the field, who had seen service." It appears that Fowler did so with respect to six of the regiment's ten initial 2nd Lieutenants, all six being transferred from other, active units, primarily the 7th NJ Infantry.[24] The regiment's four remaining 2nd Lieutenants, however, including 2/Lt John Emery of Company A, appear to have been nominated either by the company's other two officers, or possibly even voted on by the company's men.[25] Emery was an obvious candidate, by virtue of an unusually advanced education and early professional training, and his family's standing in the Flemington community. (Emery's story is told in Chapter 7.)

Company A's thirteen original non-commissioned officers were: First Sergeant George C. Justice; Sergeants Manuel Kline, David Hicks, Lucian Vorhees, and William Sloan; and Corporals William T. Barber, James J. Bullock, William B. Dungan, Warren Dunham, Paul Kuhl, John Kutter, Albert Reading, and Levi Runyon. If something like Wiley's platoon and section organization in fact existed in the company - there is no evidence for it either way - it probably resulted in one sergeant being assigned to supervise each of the company's two sections (about 24 men each), and one corporal being assigned to supervise

half – a dozen men – of each section. The First Sergeant, as remains true today, would have had a general supervisory role over the entire company's complement of enlisted men, supplementing and supporting the officers, coordinating the efforts of the other NCOs, and serving as the enlisted men's direct liaison with their captain.

There were two Musicians in the company, Thomas R. Gregory and John W. Parrish. This designation was considered a separate enlisted rank (equivalent to Private), just as the ranks of "Chaplain" or "Surgeon" were deemed distinct officer ranks, though not ones in the command chain.

The remaining eighty-nine men were enrolled in the rank of Private. (The original one hundred Company A men who mustered in in August, 1862, are referred to throughout this work as "originals" or "volunteers," to distinguish them from four other categories of soldiers - recruits, draftees ["drafted men" in Civil War parlance], substitutes, and men transferred into the company from other units. Men in the four latter categories joined the company as replacements after its formation; in the more genteel language of the day, they were referred to as "additions" rather than "replacements". See Appendix A.)

Recruits consisted mainly of men induced to "volunteer" for replacement service, and promised bonuses or bounties, and began entering service with the Company in November and December, 1863 (when the original volunteers had been in the field for more than a year). Draftees and substitutes only began to reach the company in the early months of the war's final year (1865), following enforcement of conscription in the North beginning in the summer of 1863. (Substitutes were men who took the place of a particular draftee, in return for a fee paid by the latter.) About 10 soldiers were transferred *into* the company from other units (primarily, from other companies in the same regiment), a process which began in the war's first year and continued until the end.[26] Company A additions totaled 94: 44 recruits; 36 substitutes; 4 drafted men; and 10 men transferred into the company from other units.[27] (See Appendix A for a detailed breakdown of Company A's complete roster.)

In summary then, nearly 200 men, divided about evenly between original 3-year volunteers, and shorter-duration replacements or additions, saw service with Company A during the course of the Civil War. Of the replacements, almost half consisted of recruits who served mid-length tours of duty; more than two-fifths consisted of draftees and substitutes who served very short tours in the last few months of the war; and a final tenth transferred into the company from various sources, and served tours of varying length.

As mentioned in the introduction, it was decided for purposes of this study to confine the soldier population to be examined in detail *to the original 100 volunteers who made up the company in 1862, and their immediate families.* Each original enlisted man contracted for a three-year tour of duty (which would have expired in the late summer of 1865), and therefore all originals who survived - and who were not medically discharged, hospitalized, or "invalided" into a reserve unit - served with the company until the end of the war in April, 1865. Where useful and possible from available data, however, comparisons will sometimes be drawn between the characteristics of that group as a whole, and those of the entire complement of men who served with the company at any time (or their families), or between them and particular subcategories of the total (e.g., all substitutes).

* * *

What sort of men signed up in 1862 for three years of wartime service with Company A, 15th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry Regiment? How did they compare with Union soldiers in general? As numerous commentators have pointed out, the 2-million-man Northern Army was in many respects representative of the male population from which it was drawn (a predominantly adult, white, native-born cohort from all twenty-three of the Union states, totaling about 3.5 million males between the ages of 18 and 45).

The most notably unrepresentative aspect of the Union Army was that, until later in the war, it included very few African-Americans, who made up approximately 6% of the Northern population (or about a quarter million free black men of military age).[28] New Jersey's wartime black population underwent a uniquely marginalizing experience in this

regard, as no "colored" New Jersey regiments were mustered from the state at any time during the war. Unlike their peers in every other major Union state, black Jerseyans intent on military service were obliged either to enlist with *federal* regiments organized within the state, or to cross into nearby states (primarily Pennsylvania and New York) and muster into those states' units.[29]

The average age for all Union soldiers at enlistment probably hovered between twenty-five and twenty-six years of age. It was twenty-five according to RLACW, and "just under twenty-six", according to a modern authority. According to Wiley, the average age of men *serving* in the Union Army (which naturally rose as the war continued, and men who had enlisted at a younger age remained under arms) rose from 25.10 in July, 1862, to 26.32 in May, 1865. McPherson gives a *median* age of 23.5 for all Union soldiers at enlistment.[30]

The total *range* of soldiers' ages at enlistment, according to Wiley, ran from twelve to sixty-five, with most enlistees falling between the ages of eighteen and forty-five (the legal draft age range). The War Department in 1861 prohibited minors (those under eighteen) from enlisting without parental consent, and the following year banned their enlistment altogether; it also prohibited in 1862 the enlistment of anyone over the age of forty-five. (As Wiley points out, however, boys under eighteen and men over forty-five often lied about their age in order to enlist. In an era that preceded the official recording of birth, marriage, death, and other vital statistics, this was much more easily accomplished.) The largest single age group consisted of eighteen-year-olds (about 1/8th of the Army), all those under twenty-two accounting for about 2/5ths of the Army, and the numbers in each age group above eighteen gradually decreasing (diminishing, at age forty-four, for example, to only about 1.6% of total army strength). It was, as Wiley states, "a youthful army".[31]

The age profile of Company A's volunteers was generally consistent with these Army-wide statistics, but did vary in certain respects. (The age of 66 of the company's 100 volunteers could be reliably determined.) Overall, the men's average age on enlistment with the company was 24, slightly younger than the Union average. The largest single age group

comprised the 19-year-olds (eleven men), older by a year than the Union Army's largest age group; the median age was 21, two-and-one-half years lower than the Union median; and just over half the men (52%) were below the age of 22, 10% more than in the Union Army. They ranged in age from 16 (two men) to 50 (one). Overall then, the ages of the men of the company were slightly younger, and concentrated within a smaller and lower age range, than those of all Northern soldiers.

Concerning marital status, a reported 29% of Union soldiers were married at the time of their enlistment.[32] This is a smaller percentage than the record shows for Company A's volunteers (36%), but may not be significant. The number listed (and presumably having reporting themselves) as "Single" on the muster-in roll was 65; those listed as "Married" numbered 34; and one, the deserter William Young, failed to report after enlisting and had no marital status entered by his name. Comparison with subsequent pension records indicates that two of the men who reported being single at enlistment, John Clawson (see above) and Theodore Stryker, were in fact *married*; this brings the numbers to 63 single and 36 married.

Interestingly, a significant age gap separated the company's single and married men. (No comparable marital statistics for all Union soldiers were found.) The average enlistment age for single men was 20 (ranging from 16 to 42), while the average age for married men was 31 (ranging from 22 to 50). The median age of the single men was 19, and of the married men, 29. In other words, Company A began with no single man older than 42, no married man younger than 22, *and with a full decade, on average, separating the two groups*.

The Company's single men were indeed "a youthful group," while its married contingent was closer to middle age. Ninety percent of singles were twenty-three years old or younger, and their ages clustered sharply between 17 and 21 (thirty-two men). Ages of the married men, on the other hand, were much more widely distributed; the largest married age groups fell at 29 (four men) and 30 years of age (three), with no other married age group counting more than two individuals.

Of the twenty-eight married men for whom a record of prewar offspring was found, twenty-two, or nearly eighty percent, had children when they joined up. The oldest (earliest born) child of a company volunteer (who is attested by the historical record) was Anne Butler, the daughter of John Butler, Sr., and his wife, Charlotte (Hughes) Butler. Anne was born late in 1840, or possibly on New Years Day, 1841. (The precise date is unknown, but the Butlers were married in Dovington, England, on May 7, 1840, almost certainly after Charlotte had become pregnant: their daughter was baptized on January 1, 1841, less than 8 months after the wedding). Anne was 21 or 22 years old at the time of her father's enlistment. A total of at least fifty-two children were left behind with mothers or other family members when their fathers marched off to war. At least thirty-three of them (60%) would become fatherless before it was over: a particularly harsh datum in the calculus of Civil War suffering. Hardest hit was the family of George Justice, killed in 1864, who left behind his thirty-three year old wife, Sarah Ann (Hinkley), and seven children, aged four to sixteen.

One man, Abram Van Fleet, was married *during* the war, presumably while on furlough or in hospital. All but one of the surviving single volunteers who survived the war married afterward. Private James C. Palmer apparently remained unmarried for the balance of his life (he died in 1893, at the age of about 60).

Circumstances of age and domestic status may in fact have contributed to configuration of the company's initial cadre (its three officers and thirteen non-commissioned officers). The two highest ranking men in each category (the company's Captain and First Sergeant) were both older, married men, with children: Lambert Boeman, commissioned at about age 30, married and father of two daughters; and George Justice, enlisted at age 36, married and father of seven children. The two would be chiefly responsible for leading and setting an example for the rest of the company, as well as for tending to many of its routine, daily needs; their situations in domestic life corresponded with their "paternal" obligations toward the men.

By contrast, the two lower-ranking officers and all but one of the thirteen subordinate NCOs were much younger (19 to 22), and single. (One corporal, John A. Kutter, was 42 years old at enlistment, and married.) Their principal duties, at least until called upon to assume command from a dead or incapacitated superior, would consist in large part of providing a bridge between Boeman and Justice, on one hand, and the unit's private soldiers, on the other. They would have been expected to interpret to the latter the orders and desires of the former, and communicate back "up" the chain of command to the former the reactions and moods of the latter. It surely must have facilitated matters that these crucial intermediaries, at least in terms of age and marital status, were so similar to a majority of the men.

About three-quarters of the Union Army was composed of men born in the United States - unselfconsciously referred to in nineteenth-century usage as "native Americans". The largest numbers of foreign-born came from Germany (about 17.5%), Ireland (about 15%), and Canada and England (about 5% each). (By contrast, immigrant men in the Confederate Army, which drew from no large urban centers of immigration, are estimated to have numbered only about 4 or 5%.)[33]

Available records show the reported birthplace of all but one of Company A's one hundred original volunteers. Only three (3%) claimed foreign births, far fewer than the 25% Army-wide average. This was most likely due to the settled nature of the demographic factors described at the beginning of this Chapter. By 1862, Hunterdon County was a long-established agricultural region, somewhat off the main commercial thoroughfares running between metropolitan New York and Philadelphia and, with the exception of the growing transportation, milling, and manufacturing operations in Lambertville and a few other places in the county, lacking significant employment opportunities for new immigrants.

A very different picture might emerge, however, if the birthplace data for the company's approximately one hundred replacements were included. Although, as mentioned, their files have not been comprehensively culled for information, preliminary review shows

that at least seven substitutes, one recruit, and one transferee (a total of nine men) had foreign births. (The nine are from a sample of about thirty-five replacements.) Three of these were born in Germany, and six in Ireland. If this sample ratio (about one in four foreign born) remains constant for all company replacements, the overall percentage of immigrants serving with the company would increase from 3% to about 15%, a good deal closer to the 25% figure given for the entire Union Army.

This in turn raises a question that has not yet been addressed in the "macro" historiography of Union Army composition. Much has been made of the socializing and integrating affect of Civil War service on mid-nineteenth century immigrants, especially the huge numbers of Germans and Irish fleeing Europe in the 1840s and 1850s. It is undoubtedly true in part, and indeed there were several instances of Union regiments raised entirely from immigrant populations, some of which served as bravely and as long as any "native" unit.[34] But if Company A's experience is an indication, immigrants who joined predominantly native-born units signed on primarily as *substitutes*, entering service relatively late in the war (in Company A's case, during the war's last few months, after virtually all the hard fighting had been done). Not only did this cause some understandable marginalization of - even resentment toward - the new men by "old" veterans, it must also have limited the socialization opportunities of those new men who were immigrants - some of whom, the data suggests, spoke English poorly. This must at times have operated to discourage the melting of newly arrived Europeans into the flux of the Union pot.

Civil War volunteer units tended initially to be raised from relatively compact geographical areas and, as a result, the men of a particular unit, especially at the company level, typically knew many of their comrades prior to enlisting. In the first year of the war, many of the companies and regiments forwarded by states for service in the Union Army had been previously organized as state militia units, and already enjoyed a history of periodic drilling and meeting, and a mutual familiarity among members. When more active recruiting measures began, and wholly new units formed, they were initially composed

entirely of volunteers, who generally consisted of younger men from a local community (or from a particular neighborhood or ward of a city), urged or badgered to sign up by one or more local notables, often assisted by the region's leading dames.

But where, *exactly*, did a volunteer unit's men come from, and what may have been their pre-war relationships with each other? Despite the well-known elements of this aspect of the Civil War, no detailed or precise historical research or analysis seems to have been done concerning such questions. For at least one discrete unit, the data retrieved for this study provides partial answers.

As mentioned, the company's 100 volunteers were recruited almost exclusively from residences in Hunterdon County and the immediately adjacent region. Eighty men, it turns out, had also been *born* in the county, including eleven born in or near Flemington, the county seat.[35] Of the remaining twenty, eight were born in four adjoining or nearby New Jersey counties (Somerset, Mercer, Middlesex, and Morris); four in the neighboring state of Pennsylvania (including two born in Philadelphia); two in neighboring New York (one in Albany and one in New York City); and only five at a significantly greater remove (one in Indiana, one in Ireland, and three in England). Only William Young's birthplace and residence at enlistment remain unknown.

By the time the men enlisted in July and August of 1862, the geographical area over which they were distributed at birth had become even more concentrated. Now *more than ninety percent* resided within the county [91/99]. And of these, *a quarter* (twenty-four), lived in or near the county seat (either in the Town of Flemington itself, or in the surrounding Township of Raritan), an area that had probably been the principal focus of Captain Boeman's recruitment efforts.

Moreover, *eighty percent* of the remaining men (60 out of 75) were distributed fairly evenly over territory comprising only about *half* the remaining area of the county (its eastern half). (Thirty-four resided at enlistment in areas south of Flemington: Delaware, East Amwell, and West Amwell Townships, and the Town of Lambertville; and twenty-six lived in

areas north of Flemington: Lebanon, Readington, and Tewksbury Townships, and the Town of Clinton). Only seven men lived elsewhere in the county, in areas to the west: Bethlehem, Franklin, and Kingwood Townships. (The small number of men from the western portion of the county is partly explained by the fact that another 15th New Jersey company, Company G, was recruited primarily from the region in and around Frenchtown, a town situated on the Delaware River on the western border of Hunterdon County. Presumably, Company G drew heavily from the western sections of the county, just as Company A drew overwhelmingly from eastern areas.[36])

Only eight men enlisted from residences situated *beyond* Hunterdon's borders - four from Somerset County, two from Mercer, and two from Morris - and all but one of these non-Hunterdon residents lived in towns or townships that *bordered* Hunterdon. In sum, 98 of 99 original volunteers reported a residence within a 20-mile radius of Flemington at the time he enlisted, and the 99th resided only about 25 miles away (in Flanders, Morris County).

These spatial factors provide strong circumstantial evidence that many of the volunteers knew each other prior to service, that some must have gone to "common school" together, working together seasonally as farm hands or laborers, and that most counted one or more neighbors among his comrades.

Family relationships also contributed to the make-up of the company. Two volunteers, Lewis and Wilson Snyder, are known to have been brothers, and two others, John Butler, Jr. and Sr., were father and son. Several others may well have been related (they include, for example, the company's three Daytons; and its two Greens, Hendershots, Henrys, Higginses, Hockenbergs, Jacksons, Johnsons, Nevinses, Servises, and Starkers).[37]

Taken together, such data offer specific proof of the pervasive bonds of community, familiarity, and neighborly intimacy that scholars have long believed characterized locally-recruited units in the Civil War.

The nineteenth century's Civil War soldiers came overwhelmingly from occupational backgrounds involving heavy, usually outdoor, manual labor. In 1860, the nation remained

overwhelmingly rural and agricultural, and most men supported themselves and their families by the work of their hands - most women did as well (in the sense that their contributions to the household economy - wage-generating or not - were also manual-labor-intensive). RLACW gives an early and straightforward breakdown of soldier occupations that has not been much altered over the intervening years: 43% farmers, 24% mechanics (a category that included skilled workmen and tradesmen), 16% (unskilled) laborers, 5% "in commercial pursuits", 3% professional, and 4% "of miscellaneous vocations". McPherson provides a very similar breakdown, relying on the "U.S. Sanitary Commission" source (which is Gould, the apparent source of the RLACW figures), and an independent compilation by Wiley. His figures (first percentage from Gould/second from Wiley) are: 47.5/47.8% farmers and farm laborers; 25.1/25.2% skilled laborers (RLACW's "mechanics"); 15.9/15.1% unskilled laborers; 5.1/7.8 white-collar and commercial; 3.2/2.9% professional; and 3.2/1.2% miscellaneous and unknown. (McPherson also gives a useful breakdown of *all* American males occupied in the these categories, from the 1860 census. They are not much different from the soldier samples: 42.9% farmers and farm laborers, 24.9% skilled laborers, 16.7% unskilled laborers, 10.0% white-collar and commercial, 3.5% professional, and 2.0% miscellaneous and unknown. With respect to the biggest discrepancy [10.0 percent of the general population in white collar and commercial occupations, compared with only 5 to 8% of soldiers], he points out that most soldiers enlisted at a young age, and would not yet have had the opportunity to "rise" to a white collar or professional level.)[38]

The occupational data for Company A's volunteers reveal fairly similar patterns. (Reliable pre-war occupational data were discovered for 59 of the company's 100 volunteers.) Forty-six percent listed their pre-war occupations as "farmer", "farm hand" or "farm laborer," only a percentage point or two below the army-wide average. (One farmer also listed "blacksmith" as his pre-war occupation.) It is doubtful that any useful distinction can be drawn between farmers, on one hand, and farm hands or farm laborers, on the other. The terms may have used interchangeably by wage earners employed to work on farms owned by

others (including their parents), although it is probable that some using the term "farmer" intended to indicate their status as a farm *owner* . Nor does any clear difference in the these farm-related occupational terms emerge on the basis of either age ("farmer's" average age was 22; "farm hand/laborer's" was 21), marital status (three of ten "farmers" were married; two of ten "farm hands/laborers" were), or literacy (two illiterate "farmers"; one illiterate "farm hand/laborer"). In any case, following McPherson's reasoning, it is unlikely, because of the relatively young age of most volunteers at enlistment, that many already owned their own farm and, unless an older, married volunteer had children to operate a farm he did own, unlikely he would have left it behind for the purpose of volunteering.

Another twelve percent listed themselves simply as "laborer" (one laborer also listed his occupation as "farm hand".) This is about only three or four percentage points below the average for all Union soldiers. It is likely in this agricultural county that many self-described "laborers" were in actuality relatively unskilled seasonal farm hands (or did both kinds of work). There were a few factories and mines, and numerous mills, in the county, but there were many more farms. Moreover, many of the county's farms were too large to be tended solely by the families of their owners, and would had to have employed compensated help. (See Chapter 7.) Significantly, laborers on average were older than the average Company A volunteer (28); were more likely to be married (forty-three percent, compared with thirty-three percent for the company as a whole); and comprised an exceptionally illiterate category (four of the company's seven laborers were illiterate, one was literate, and the literacy of two could not be determined).

More than a third of the company's known occupations at enlistment (thirty-six percent) - a relatively high proportion - consisted of skilled or semi-skilled trades. This is more than ten percentage points higher than the approximately 25% of all Union soldiers who had been "mechanics" or skilled laborers before enlistment. Company A's men in this category included four masons (one of whom stated he was also a plasterer); three carpenters; two blacksmiths (not including the farmer who listed blacksmith as a second

occupation); two shoemakers (one of whom also listed "actor" as his occupation); two printers; two painters; one wheelwright; one carriage-maker; one tinsmith; one engineer/machinist; one sailor; and one miller.[39] Taken as a group, these men had the second highest average age (27), next to laborers; were more likely than any other category of Company A men to be married (just under fifty percent); and included only two illiterates (one of the painters and the engineer/machinist).

Three of the four remaining men whose occupations are known (five percent) were engaged in commercial or clerical work, consisting of one "trader" (probably here meaning "merchant"), one "clerk" (probably a store clerk), and one merchant/general store owner (the Company's Captain, Lambert Boeman). This is wholly consistent with the 5 to 7% figures for the Union Army in general. The fourth and last man (John Emery) was the only company man known to have been pursuing a professional occupation before the war. Having graduated from the College of New Jersey (Princeton University) in 1861, he was serving as a "law clerk" immediately prior to enlisting. Emery's professional status (he would go on to become a lawyer and judge in the post-war period) constituted 1.6% of the company's known occupations, comparable to the 3% for all Union soldiers. Among these four white collar and professional men, Boeman was oldest (about 30) and the only one married; the other three were typically young (nineteen or twenty) and single. All four, as expected, were literate.

In addition to having prior experience in civilian occupations, five of the company's volunteers, Isaac Danberry, William Dungan (or Duncan), Andrew Henry, Theodore Stryker, and George Van Camp, had prior military experience. Not surprisingly, the five shared certain connections. Danberry and Dungan were both residing in or near Flemington when war broke out in 1861, and surely knew each other; in the war's opening days, they both enlisted for three months' service with Company H, 3rd New Jersey Regiment, Militia. (The regiment saw no action and was soon disbanded; see reference above in this chapter.[40]) Stryker and Van Camp were both residing at the time in Lambertville, while Henry was living just across the county line in Hopewell Township (Mercer County). It is likely the

three of them were also acquainted with each other; Stryker and Van Camp soon volunteered for service with Company E of the 3rd New Jersey, and Henry joined Company I. All five served in the rank of Private. (Dungan, however, when he later joined Company A, was made a Corporal, probably as a result of his prior service in 1861. By the time he was mustered out with what was left of the company in 1865, he had become its senior enlisted man, First Sergeant. Henry rose to the rank of Sergeant while serving with Company A.) It is possible that some or all of the five had drilled together as part of one or more pre-war state militia units, based in Flemington, Lambertville, or even Trenton; it was from such units that New Jersey's first wartime regiments, including the 3rd, were put together.

Stryker had an even earlier period of military service, having for a brief time been a member of a regular (federal) Army regiment stationed at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1855. His five-year enlistment was cut short by an injury, and he was discharged after about six months. (What is known about Stryker's unusual and somewhat mysterious life is narrated in Chapter 15. He was the other husband - the first was Clawson - who falsely claimed to be a bachelor when enlisting with Company A in 1862.)

With regard to Union soldier education and literacy rates, the prevailing consensus seems to be that they were quite high, especially as compared with European levels. Wiley, while not offering a source or any precise statistics, concludes, "The average company in the Union Army had from one to a half-dozen illiterates. Many had none." (In a standard company, this would translate to a literacy rate of 94% or higher.) Another scholar states, also without citation, "A typical white regiment on either side of the contest probably had few illiterates, and many units had none at all." McPherson, drawing on New England's exceptionally high school enrollment and 95% adult literacy, as well as on the census-reported 90% overall white literacy rate for the United States, suggests that Union soldier literacy must have fallen somewhere between the two measures (90% to 95%). Thus, recognized sources all put the overall Union soldier literacy rate at well over 90%.[41]

The documented literacy rate for the men of Company A, however, appears to be significantly lower than the rate that would be expected from this prevailing scholarship: about 82%.[42] (Clear indications of either literacy or illiteracy were determined in the case of 49 company men.) Only about four out of five men in the company, in other words, could actually read or write (and this ratio may be overstated), rather than a projected nine or ten out of ten.

Although it is difficult to determine with precision the average educational level of Company A's men, it is clear that many received at least some elementary schooling, and a few may have obtained a small amount of post-elementary education at one of the county's private "academies" (though this is far from certain). Only one, Emery (the law clerk mentioned above), went on to get substantial university and professional training; he not only graduated from college in 1861, he later attended Harvard Law School. (See Chapter 7 for Emery's story. Chapter 2 examines Company A's pre-war educational and literacy levels in more detail, and offers a possible explanation for its lower-than-expected literacy level.)

Ethnically, the original men appear to have been entirely of northern European ancestry, primarily (perhaps exclusively) from Germany, the Netherlands, and the British Isle nations (the latter provenances referred to in this work collectively as "Anglo/Gael," unless otherwise specified).[43] A significant majority (probably about three quarters) was of Anglo/Gael origin; of these about a fifth were most likely of Irish or Scottish heritage, and the remainder of English heritage. The remaining quarter of the unit's men were of German or Dutch origin, excepting one individual, Abraham Lattarette (or Latourette), who was most likely of French ancestry.

The men of the company were overwhelmingly American "natives". Enlistment records showing place of birth were found for all but one of the original volunteers, and of these, only four reported overseas births (two, John Butler, Sr., and Thomas Gregory, in England; one, Garret Hogan, in Ireland; and one, John Burns, in England or Ireland). This picture was indirectly confirmed by the limited information found regarding the birthplace of

volunteers' *parents*. Of eighteen instances in which a parent's nativity was recorded, only three showed a foreign birth (both parents of John Collins were born in Ireland, and Andrew Henry's father was born in Scotland).

Much has been written about the general religious life of Civil War soldiers, including the role of chaplains, worship services, prayer meetings, and the like.[44] Yet almost nothing of a precise or statistical nature is apparently known about their religious views or denominational affiliations. (Unlike the practice of the twentieth-century American Army, no Civil War recruiter or mustering-in officer wrote down the "religious preference" of new enlistments, or recorded such information on what in the next century would become known as soldiers' "dog tags.) Nor of course is it known how many Union men had *no* formal religious affiliation at all, or counted themselves atheists or "scoffers". Wiley, for example, is only able to report, quite generally, that:

> The Union Army, like the mid-nineteenth-century America from which it was drawn, was overwhelmingly Protestant, with a strong leaning toward evangelical denominations, especially Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian.
> * * * In almost any regiment [however] there were individuals who laughed at the pious behavior of their comrades and some even made mockery of worship.[45]

Standard histories of religion on America do provide general data and conclusions regarding nineteenth century church trends and membership, however, which provide context for the religious life of the men of Company A. According to one, for example: [46]

> …[C]hurch life was at a low ebb during the Revolutionary period, and at the opening of the [nineteenth] century less than ten percent of the population were church members. * * *
> [However, b]eginning at the very end of the eighteenth century, a mighty reawakening of religious interest swept the land...sometimes called the "Second Great Awakening"….

Most denominations, even older, well-established ones (such as Congregationalists in New England and Presbyterians elsewhere), made free use of emotional "revivalist practices" during the period.

> …[T]hrough the revivals…an evangelistic, pietistic interpretation of Christian faith became widely disseminated in America in the nineteenth century. The denominations that employed the revival pattern most fully grew to be the giants in this period of national expansion. Methodists, a

> scant fifteen thousand strong at the time of their independent organization in 1784…were well past the million mark by 1850.

This rendered the Methodists (including so-called "Methodist-Episcopalians") the largest sect by mid-century, their total membership constituting more than 4% of the total U.S. population in 1850. Baptists grew from about 100,000 to 800,000 in the same period, while Congregationalists and Presbyterians, though their memberships continued to expand, fell behind Methodists and Baptists in total numbers, losing "the commanding place they had held" since Colonial times. (A more detailed discussion of nineteenth-century church life, and the possible influence of Methodism on the men of Company A, is included in Chapter 4.)

From available data, three general conclusions emerge about the religiosity of the company's men. First, it is clear that some portion of them – possibly a substantial number - lacked strong ties to *any* particular church or denomination, and did not regularly attend worship (at least not before entering service).[47] Second, of those who did have significant beliefs and/or denominational ties, they were almost certainly to be as members of Protestant Christian churches (only two Roman Catholics, John Collins and Joseph Sullivan, and no Jew, was identified among the company's original volunteers[48]). And third, a Company A volunteer's Protestant affiliation was most likely to have been with one of the following denominations (in order of probability): Methodist or Methodist-Episcopal; Presbyterian; Baptist; (Dutch) Reformed or Lutheran; and Church of England (Episcopal).[49] These proportions reveal a denominational ranking consistent with that of the nation as a whole, if adjusted for the particular early ethnic settlement patterns of the county (large Dutch and German contingents, accounting for relatively high numbers of Reformed and Lutheran congregants) and for the county's relatively scant and transient pool of recent immigrants (as, for example, its Irish laborers, whose numbers during the pre-war period were insufficient to support more than a couple of established Roman Catholic churches).

Given the relative religiosity of the era, it is not surprising that volunteers' surnames (often referred to as their "Christian" names) were more likely than today to have been

drawn from Bible sources and Hebraic language roots. In order of frequency of use (with Biblical names italicized), the men's surnames were: *John* (16); William (11); *James* (8); George (5); *David* (4); *Abraham* (or *Abram*), Andrew, *Isaac,* and *Peter* (3 each); *Benjamin,* Charles, *Daniel,* Henry, *Jacob, Joseph,* Lewis, *Samuel,* Theodore, and *Thomas* (2 each); and Albert, Cornelius, *Elijah*, Erin, Garret, Herman, *Isaiah,* Lambert, *Lemuel, Levi*, Lucien, *Manuel*, Martin, *Michael, Moses, Nahum, Paul*, Phillip, Robert, *Silas, Solomon*, Sutphen, Warren, and Wilson (one each).

There were obvious economic or class differences among the company's original hundred men, though none was wealthy. Did the factor of class translate in any clear-cut way into the men's *military* ranks and position in the command hierarchy? The answer appears to be that it did, though more obviously with respect to officers than to non-commissioned officers, and anomalies did occur. Looking at the company's entire initial cadre – both its commissioned and non-commissioned officers – as a discrete group, it is possible to discern occupational, educational, age, and other patterns that more often characterize these men than the "rank-and-file" Privates, and that may partly explain why they wound up in leadership roles. By the time of mustering in (August, 1862), Company A's cadre had taken shape as follows, in order of rank:

Captain: Lambert Boeman

1st Lieutenant: Thomas P. Stout

2nd Lieutenant: John R. Emery[50]

1st Sergeant: George C. Justice

Sergeants (4): Manuel Kline, David Hicks, Lucian Vorhees, and Charles Jackson

Corporals (8): Paul Kuhl, James Bullock, William B. Dungan, William Barber, Albert Reading, Warren Dunham, John Kutter, and Levi Runyon

In some respects, the group profile of these sixteen men is quite similar to that of the company as a whole. They were born & raised, for example, in the same general locations. 75% of the cadre was born in Hunterdon County, whereas 80% of the men of the company

were born there. 94% of the cadre (all but one) resided in the county by the time its members entered service in 1862, compared with 90% of the company as a whole.

But the cadre's residence at mustering in was much more *concentrated* in the county seat of Flemington and the immediately surrounding area of Raritan Township: 2/3rds of the cadre were living in that comparatively confined region in 1862, while only 1/4th of all the company's men did. This residential concentration, centered on one of the largest towns in the county, suggests that most of the cadre's sixteen men probably knew each other prior to the war, probably had regular interactions with one another, and even some sort of informal pre-war social and/or commercial network. (Paul Kuhl, one of the company's initial Corporals, for example, was the brother-in-law of the company's Captain, Lambert Boeman.)

The only non-county resident among the original cadre was the company's original 1st Lieutenant, Thomas P. Stout. This is probably explained by the fact that, as mentioned, the 15th Regiment's organizer, Colonel Fowler, reserved to himself the right to select all ten of the companies' original 1st Lieutenants, and Fowler, as a Sussex County resident, would have been less likely to know potential officer candidates from the Hunterdon area. For Company A's 1st Lieutenant (and second in command), he chose a Mercer County man, from Hopewell, New Jersey. (Mercer County, and Hopewell Township, nevertheless border Hunterdon, Hopewell lying only about 11 miles from Flemington. It is thus possible that Stout as well was acquainted with some of the new company's leaders before mustering in.)

One further speculation may be made on the basis of the cadre's pre-war residences. The widest diversity of residence (among cadre) occurred among the company's eight original Corporals. Only half of them were from the previously described confined area of Flemington and Raritan; the other four resided in Lambertville, and the Townships of Delaware, Franklin, and Tewksbury. Looking at a map of the county, it is evident that the home areas of these eight men, in marked contrast to those of the company's three officers, were distributed *roughly in proportion to the home areas of the men* in the company in general. (See Map ?) That is, half of the Corporals came from the central Flemington/Raritan

Township area, which also accounted for 24 of the company's original volunteers. A fifth Corporal resided in the north county township of Tewksbury, which contributed 14 men to the company's original roster. A sixth enlisted from Lambertville, the southernmost town in the county, from which 10 men had joined up.

The seventh Corporal was from Delaware, which lay between the Lambertville and Flemington/Raritan concentrations, and immediately to the west of the Amwells. 6 volunteers had been raised from this township (Delaware), and the adjoining Amwells together accounted for an additional 18. The last Corporal lived in Franklin Township, to the west of the Flemington/Raritan area. Although Franklin contributed only 2 men, it bordered two other townships, Kingwood and Clinton, that together sent 5 men to the company.

Although it cannot be documented from surviving records, it seems nonetheless likely that the smallest subunits of the company - its four sections of about 24 men - were made up of groups from the same townships or areas of the county. The men of these groups would likely have known one another growing up, and many had probably listened to the same recruiting speeches, read the same recruiting broadsides and posters, and conferred with one another on the decision to enlist. They would have been well-acquainted with each other's reputations in their small communities: whom they could trust, and who might need watching. Being allowed to form ranks, and to eat and bunk together, in the same section of the company, and also to choose their most immediate superiors - the Corporals - from among their own local comrades, would have made a great deal of sense. It appears from the residential evidence that this is exactly what happened.

There may even have been a similar though less precise effort made at regional distribution, among the company's five original sergeants. Three came from the Flemington/Raritan focal point of the company, as might be expected, but the other two came from points north (Clinton) and south (Lambertville).

The cadre's average age, and marital status, were very close to that of the men as a whole. Both the cadre's and the company's overall average age on mustering in was 24. The average age of the single men in both groups was also the same: 20. A smaller portion of the cadre was married, however (about 1/4, as compared to 1/3 of the company as a whole), and the cadre's married men were, on average, five years older than their company counterparts: 36 vs. 31.

Ethnicity, as determined by last name, was more Anglo/Teutonic among the cadre than the predominantly Anglo/Gael mix that characterized the company as a whole (no Irish or Scottish surnames, but at least five Germanic or Dutch names, existed among the sixteen cadre members).

As expected, in terms of a class-based analysis, one of the biggest discrepancies between the men and their leadership emerges along prewar *occupational and educational lines* (although information is not available for as representative a portion of the cadre). Of the eleven known prewar occupations of the company's cadre, there was one professional, a law clerk "reading" to become a lawyer (representing 9% of the cadre); two men pursuing commercial occupations, a merchant and a "trader" or retailer (18%); four tradesmen: a painter, a printer, a shoemaker (who also listed his occupations as "lecturer" and "actor"), and a carriage-maker (36%); three farmers (27%); and one farm laborer (9%). This occupational breakdown is quite different from the overall occupational breakdown of both the company and the Union army as a whole. In fact, it stands the latter on its head. In each both the army and the company as a whole, "white-collar" professionals and commercial workers together accounted for only about 7% of total strength, whereas among Company's A's *leaders* the two categories accounted for 27%. Farmers (about 45% of both the army and the company) were underrepresented among the cadre (only three farmers, or 27%); as were unskilled laborers (about 14% of the army and company, but only one - 9% - among the cadre). Only skilled tradesmen were comparable in all three groups: 24% of army, 36% of company, and 36% of cadre.

Although little is known about the specific educational backgrounds of the company's men (see Chapter 2), the only member known to have received private secondary schooling (and who then went on to law school) joined the cadre as its initial 2nd Lieutenant. Another leader, the company's initial 1st Sergeant, is known to have acquired enough knowledge and training before the war to become a public "lecturer" on subjects that included psychology, electricity, and botany, as well as to work as an actor. The company's initial organizer and Captain had built up a thriving retail dry goods business in Flemington before the war, valuable enough for him to be able to sell his interest and set his family up comfortably before leaving for the front. He may well have benefited from some private schooling, possibly at Flemington's Readington Academy, as a youth. One of the company's original Sergeants had been a printer, another lucrative and highly literate trade. Twelve of the thirteen cadremen for whom evidence is available were literate (92%), compared to an estimated literacy level for the entire company of only 82?%. When the regiment formed a "literary society" during its second winter encampment of the war (a sort of soldiers' topical discussion group and debating club; see Chapter 3), two of the Company A's original non-commissioned officers were founding members, and a third became known as the regiment's "great orator," often called upon to speak during ceremonial occasions.

Taken together, these occupational and educational data suggest a significant measure of class-based influence: strong correspondence between higher occupational status (and potential income generation) and higher educational achievement, on one hand, and higher rank and leadership responsibility at time of enlistment, on the other.

Finally, there is the matter of religion and denominational preference, when considering cadre as a discrete group. Although the sample is small, this axis of comparison reinforces that of class. Of the seven members of the cadre for whom there is at least some data relating to specific church affiliation or preference, only three were Methodist/Methodist-Episcopalian. The other four were Presbyterian, Episcopal, Baptist, and Reformed Lutheran; at least three of which were probably deemed more mainline or

"establishment," and were certainly less evangelical, than the Methodist-Episcopal Church (see Chapter 4). This pattern of affiliation *inverts* the pattern for the men of the company as a whole, among whom Methodist-Episcopal was clearly the prevailing Protestant denomination (as it was as well within the county as a whole, especially its most rural areas).

The perhaps unsurprising conclusion arising from the contrasting data for the company's cadre and its men is that relatively high prewar *status* - especially as measured by occupational and educational level, literacy (perhaps even degree of articulateness, or oratorical skill), town (rather than farm) residence, and "old" or mainline Protestant church affiliation - was likely to contribute to one's being chosen as one of the company's original commissioned or non-commissioned officers. The link was especially strong between leadership position and occupational category. Moreover, even *within* the cadre, higher occupational category generally translated into higher rank. (Thus, for example, 100% of commissioned officers held "white collar" positions, and 75% of the Sergeants were skilled tradesmen; whereas all of the cadre's farmers were Corporals.)

What did the North's Civil War soldiers look like, and how did they compare with the men of company A? By most accounts, the company's men began the war a hardy lot. Before being accepted for enrollment, each candidate was required to remove all clothing and was examined by one or more of the regimental surgeons, who, to the degree permitted by the medical techniques of the time, decided whether the man was fit for service.[51] (This pre-enlistment examination would figure prominently in some later pension claims, when the issue was whether a claimant's alleged wartime injury or illness had in fact been incurred before or after he joined up; see Chapters 5 and 8.) The physical examination, while probably not terribly effective at screening out many kinds of medical conditions that would today be considered disqualifying, at least provided baseline data as to physical size and appearance, and an overall impression as to "soundness".

At least two sources claim that the average height of Union soldiers was 5'8" or 5'8-1/4", with "slightly" taller men showing up from the states of Kentucky, Indiana, Iowa,

Maine, and Missouri, and with West Virginia's men averaging 5'9", about an inch taller than average. Only about four men out of a thousand were taller than 6'3", and a few were reportedly taller than seven feet (although the tallest Union man whose height could be "unimpeachabl[y]" verified, a captain in the 27th Indiana Infantry, measured only 6'10-1/2"). The shortest verified height was 3'4", given for a 24-year-old member of the 192nd Ohio Infantry. These two measurements provide a range of heights for all Northern soldiers that varied, at its extremes, by at least 3-1/2 feet, the tallest verified Union soldier being more than *twice* as tall as the shortest! Average weight is variously reported by the same two sources as 143.5 and 145 lbs.[52]

The average height of Company A men at enlistment (for whom data was found) was 5'7-3/4" [23][53], the men ranging from 5'3-1/2" to 6'. This is only very slightly shorter than the overall Union average, with a much narrower height range that varied by only 8-1/2". The men's weights were not recorded on enlistment or at discharge.[54] An *approximation* of their wartime weights is possible, however, from looking at the weights recorded during their first post-war medical examinations (for those who ultimately filed pension applications). Of the 53 men known to have survived the war, this information was found for 43 of them. This constitutes a significant sample, though somewhat out of date for assessing wartime weight; at the time of their first post-war examination, the 43 men had attained an average age of about 43 years (in other words, their weights were first recorded, on average, about two decades after enlistment). At this point, their weights averaged 153 lbs, ranging from a low of 128 lbs. (for the man who was 5'3-1/2" in height, the company's shortest) to a high of 220 lbs. (for a man 5'11" in height). (The average height, incidentally, for this later and slightly larger sample of Company A men, about 20 years after enlistment, was 5'7-1/2". This is as expected, and does not vary significantly from the wartime sample's average height of 5'7-3/4".) Using these averages, Company A's weight-to-height ratio bespeaks an overall level of fitness that would be enviable today.[55]

Determining the precise hues and colors of Union soldiers - color shades were routinely recorded at enlistment for complexion, eyes, and hair - becomes to some extent a matter of definition. Absent color photography and color samples, how does the historian usefully distinguish, for example, between eye and hair colors such as "brown" and "dark," or "dark" and "black", or between hair colors such as "light" and "sandy" (especially when the color "blonde" was not commonly used at the time)?[56] Color or shade categories were also notoriously inconsistent from one region (or regiment) to another; see analysis below. Nevertheless, grouping certain Civil War-era color categories together, gross generalizations regarding appearance can be made. (The hues and colors of 37 Company A men were determined.)

According to RLACW, the complexions of Union soldiers in general were 60% light, 33% dark, and 7% medium. The complexions of Company A's men, by contrast, were shaded much more toward "light." Most were recorded as having a “fair” complexion (sixty-two percent), and adding men who were listed as either “light” or "pale" (another eight) would account for 84% of the company's known descriptions (RLACW's categories included neither “fair” nor “pale,” and Company A’s inventory did not use “medium”). Even if all those in the RLACW's "medium" complexion category were added to those in “light,” the remaining "dark" category still accounts for a full third of all Union soldiers, whereas only *half* that many Company A soldiers (16%) were judged “dark” (combining 5 "dark" and 1 "brown," a complexion category also not used by RLACW).

With regard to eye color, RLCAW gives the following percentages: 45% “blue,” 24% “gray,” 13% “hazel,” 10% “dark,” and 8% “black”. (There was no category for "brown"). Combining lighter shades (“blue,” “gray,” and “hazel”) accounts for 82% of eye color descriptions; darker shades (“dark” and “black”) account for 18%. The eye coloring of the Company A's men was roughly similar, at least with respect to the relative proportion of light and dark hues: 37% “gray,” 32% “blue,” 5% “hazel” (these three lighter shades totaling 74%); 16% “brown,” 8% “dark,” and 3% “black” (darker shades totaling 27%; discrepancy due

to rounding). The combined categories of “blue” and “gray” eye coloring totaled 69%, or just over two-thirds, for both the Union Army sample and the Company A sample.

Finally, Northern soldiers' hair color is described by RLACW as 13% “black,” 25% “dark,” 30% “brown,” 24% “light,” 4% “sandy,” 3% “red,” and 1% “gray”. Combining “black,” “dark,” and “brown” produces a total of 68% for darker shades of hair; “light,” “sandy,” “red,” and “gray” shades together total 32%. The company's hair colors were 11% “black,” 14% “dark,” and 59% “brown” (a total of 84% for darker shades); and 14% “light,” and 3% “gray” (for a total of 17% in lighter shades). (The percentage for "brown" includes one man listed as "dark brown" and one as "light brown". No "red" hair at all was recorded among the Company's original volunteers, which is not surprising among this predominantly non-Hibernian, non-Scandinavian group.) Hair color, then, presented a different comparative picture than complexion; about twice the proportion of Union soldiers (than Company A men) had light shades of hair, but about twice the proportion of company men (than Union soldiers) had light skin coloring.

In general, the outward appearance of the men of Company A, at the time of enlistment, reflected their Northern European origins. The physical profiles sketched above are consistent with the images of the men preserved in approximately nine surviving, Civil War-era photographs of them (although it is difficult to discern precise shades of color in any of them.)[57] Overall, they were likely to have light or fair skin (8 out of 10), gray or blue eyes (7 out of 10), and dark or brown hair (7 out of 10).[58]

Company A Volunteer “Profile”

Taking all of the preceding demographic, cultural, and anthropological data into account at a glance, it is possible to construct a “profile” of the average company volunteer. In sum, it was more than likely, statistically, that such a man, on enlisting with Company A, 15th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry Regiment, in 1862:

-had been born and raised in Hunterdon County (of parents born in the United States);

-was of Anglo/Gael stock;

-was in his early 20s;

-knew, and resided near, several of the men who were signing up with him (and in some cases was related to one or more of them);

-had worked at farming or a manual trade before joining up;

-was only mildly schooled, but literate (though several of his comrades were not);

-had been attending a Protestant church (if he had any church affiliation at all), and was a Methodist-Episcopalian;

-had not yet married (but would after the war);

-was fit, and enjoyed a “stout” physical physique (specifically, was about 5'8" tall, and weighed about 150 lbs); and

-had fair skin, light eyes and brown hair.

On August 29, 1862, this “average” young Hunterdon resident - cheerful and enthusiastic according to contemporary accounts - embarked with his fellows by train for the war in the South, leaving youth and rural Hunterdon behind. The final, grimmest element of his profile was a statistic he could not yet know, and may not have wished to: he had only a barely better-than-average chance - about 53% - of returning alive.

CHAPTER 2

MINDSETS: THE MEN'S EDUCATION, LITERACY, AND POLITICS

Formal Schooling and Literacy

> [His parents] had the benefit of all his servasis as a farm hand[,] that is[,] when he was not at School[;] he went some to the district school.
>
> John Van Nest, neighbor, testifying about Company A Private, John H. Wyckoff, 1886

> …[M]any good hickory whips were cut to use on the backs of us boys.
>
> Theodore Bellis, Flemington resident and local historian, in 1924 article about his days at the Copper Hill School

Consideration of the "interior lives" (mentalités, mindsets) of Company A's volunteers begins with an attempt to assess the opportunities they had during the pre-war period to obtain some degree of formal schooling, and to achieve basic literacy. The historical record for these factors, in the Hunterdon County area where most of the men spent their youth, is frustratingly thin and unspecific, but a few facts and specific anecdotes do emerge, and some useful observations may be confidently made.

Broadly speaking, much has been made of America's leadership in the field of public elementary education during the nineteenth century, beginning most notably in New England. Commentators, noting Europe's early development of universal education and its connection with the Protestant Reformation, have traced the continuation and acceleration of universal learning in the predominantly Protestant New World territory of the United States. Especially in Puritan New England, this trend was presided over during the nineteenth century by such public education reformers and promoters as Horace Mann of Massachusetts. McPherson, for example, summarizing the scholarship in this field, states that "New England led the world in educational facilities and literacy at midcentury," and that, starting in Massachusetts in the 1830s, "a rapid expansion and rationalization of the public school had spread westward and southward."[59]

American emphasis on educational preeminence undoubtedly produced comparatively high rates of literacy in the mid-nineteenth-century United States. McPherson reports a 90% literacy rate for the (non-slave) nation as a whole, ranging from 95% in the New England region during the 1850s (with "the rest of the North...not far behind"), to an 80% rate in the (non-slave) South. (By comparison, a much lower 2/3rds overall rate prevailed during the same period in Great Britain and northwest Europe, and 25% in southern and eastern Europe.) This generally high American literacy was, according to McPherson and Wiley among others, reflected in high levels of schooling, literacy, and readership among the era's Civil War soldiers.[60]

But as mentioned in Chapter 1, the overall literacy rate for the men of Company A, *as determined from actual evidence contained in their pension files*, was only about 82%.[61] The rate for Company A is in fact comparable to the 80% literacy rate reported by McPherson for all *Confederate* soldiers, and raises a question as to whether the higher levels suggested by him and others for all Union soldiers should be revisited. Perhaps soldier literacy was lower than has been claimed *throughout* the Union Army, and lay closer to Company A's demonstrated rate.

But if that is *not* the case, and Company A's literacy rate is simply below the army average, what could account for the disparity? There are at least two potential explanations, both of which could have been at play. One is New Jersey's comparatively slow start on the public education front. And the other is the relatively isolated and rural nature of Hunterdon County, which could have given it a delayed start at uniform public education even by New Jersey's arguably diminished standards.

As noted by historians of New Jersey's education system, the state's development of a universal, "free" (tax-supported), and mandatory public education system lagged far behind that of other northern states, at least at the *beginning* of the nineteenth Century.[62]

In 1817, New Jersey was "far behind many of her sister states in the

> march toward popular education. Nothing whatever had been done by her, as a State, for the promotion of education. She had no system of common schools[63] - no fund for their support."[64]

Though reform movements in the state grew steadily throughout the century, they did not coalesce or bear much fruit until the 1870s. In 1876, for example, a state constitutional amendment was adopted requiring, for the first time, that the state legislature "...provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of free schools for the instruction of all children in this state between the ages of five and eighteen years". This, of course, came far too late to benefit the state's Civil War-era soldiers.

Two related reasons are generally given for New Jersey's slow progress: the more varied ethnic and religious make-up of the state's original settlers (with the result that political consensus on tax-supported schools was more difficult to achieve than in more homogenous regions, such as New England), and the related factor of the early proliferation of private, tuition-charging, predominantly church-affiliated "academies," whose supporters opposed secularizing and democratizing their children's parochial education.[65]

Prior to the 1876 universal public schools amendment, it appears that very few municipalities in rural Hunterdon County had established free elementary schools. However, tuition-charging "common schools," conducted at the elementary level, became fairly prevalent in the county during the first half of the nineteenth century. The common schools were often inadequate, open for only a limited school term (probably not more than the five or six months between growing seasons), and poorly attended.[66]

The earliest surviving detailed inventory of the county's common schools was completed in 1870 by County Superintendent of Schools, Cornelius S. Conkling.[67] It lists 108 school districts throughout the county, provides the earliest known date of the operation for each district's school, and provides anecdotal descriptions or historical information for several of the schools. The comprehensive Beers county map, published three years later in 1873, shows the boundaries of nearly all 108 districts, and the location of the common schoolhouse building in each. In nearly every instance, there is only one school per district.

(In a few of the more populated districts and large towns, there is a second school, sometimes associated with a nearby church, or labeled “private”. All common schools were for elementary grades only; there were no public high schools in the county in this period, although there were a few private "academies" that operated at the secondary school level.)

On average, during the mid-nineteenth-century period, each Hunterdon school district served a population of about 300 residents (of whom perhaps 50 were of school-age), and a geographical area of about four square miles. Accordingly, no child should have had to walk more than about 2-1/4 miles - an hour's travel - to reach a school in his or her district. (Actual plotting of home-to-school distances in the county, utilizing the Beers Atlas, shows walking distances that vary from one or two blocks in developed towns [Flemington, Lambertville, Frenchtown, Junction, etc.], to as much as 3.4 miles in the countryside [Mt. Airy, for example, in the county's flat, southern, farming region]. But most maximum travel distances did indeed fall within a 2 to 2-1/2 mile range.)

The majority of Company A’s men were born in the 6-year period from 1837 to 1843; the median year of their birth was 1841. A majority, then, reached school age (age 5) from 1842 to 1848, with a median beginning school year of 1846. *By 1846, approximately 92 of Hunterdon’s 108 common schools (85%) had reportedly been created*; no new one was added until 1849. Thus, nearly all of the company’s original volunteers appear at least to have grown up with a school close enough to attend, if their parents wished them to go and could come up with the tuition. These facts weaken the argument (above) that Hunterdon County provided uncharacteristically sparse primary educational opportunities (at least with respect to the time period in and after the mid-1840s), and that this weakness best explains a lower-than-expected literacy rate among the young men reaching school age in this era.

What was the common school experience like in Hunterdon County for the “boys” of Company A in the 1840s? A few surviving descriptions of school life give an idea. Superintendent Conkling’s 1870 inventory (see above) includes the recollections of one early, unidentified student who attended the county’s District 78 common school at “Van Fleet’s

Corner," in Three Bridges (near Flemington), in 1813. He described the schoolhouse as having a 16' by 16' square floor-plan, 8' in height from floor to ceiling, with windows that each held twelve 7" by 9" glass panes. A rough-hewn oak board ceiling was affixed to 8" ceiling beams, and at certain places a very tall teacher would have to "dodge or hit his head". The walls were lined with 4' blackboards on 3 sides, and a "ten-plate" stove supplied heat (locally manufactured, these iron stoves built from ten castings or plates[68]), and were used as well to roast potatoes and apples for eating. (Parents were responsible for bringing "fuel wood" to the school for heating, and students were expected to cut and split it for stove use.) Students sat on backless "slabs" of lumber planed flat on the top side, mounted on 2' long hickory legs. For desks they used planed "writing tables," which the narrator described as being inevitably carved up with pocket knives, depicting "horses, mules, dogs, panthers, lions, etc." All ages of sat in the same room, with "small scholars" seated on the middle benches with their "feet dangling 6-8 inches".

> The teachers of that time were generally English, Scotch or Irish, with a few stray Yankees. The English and Scotch were generally good pens-men and the Irish good arithmeticians. Grammar and Geography were not taught in those days except in very few instances and for extra pay. Oral Spelling, Reading, and Arithmetic received good attention….
>
> The teacher collected his own bills for tuition - $1 to $1.25 per student for a 13-week term (3 months).

Room and board costs for the teacher, who would normally be only a transient resident of the community, were covered by the parents sending their children to school, on a pro-rata basis. If the teacher "hired his board" (elected to make his own living arrangements), he was permitted to charge $2 per student in tuition. Room and board costs were expected to run about $1.50 per week, or about $19.50 for a 13-week term.[69]

Though terms were short, the teacher was expected to hold forth for seven hours per day in winter, and eight in summer. The Van Fleet's Corner school at this time, according to the narrator, usually attracted about 25-50 "scholars," a bit more in the winter months.

In 1924, Elias Vosseller, an elderly resident of Flemington, published in the local newspaper his "Recollections of a School," which concerned the common school he had

attended in 1843-44 in the village of Milltown, in neighboring Somerset County. He tells of a "modernization" project in 1843, which replaced the old slab seats and writing tables with new chair-desk arrangements.

> The desks had lids and so each [pupil] had a safe place for his books, slate, ink, etc. Also they furnished a support for a child's back which the slab seats could not supply. With this great change came a revolution in that school. Samuel Walker was the last school tyrant who taught at Milltown, representing the old time, peripatetic, "three R's" type of schoolmaster. * * * …[H]is application [to continue] was turned down. This meant deliverance for the children of the neighborhood from the hated oppression of those antiquated teachers.
>
> The first teacher [after Walker] was John Bodine Thompson a graduate of Rutgers College. He was a large shapely man with a pleasant face…. * * * His methods were so different from those we were accustomed to, and so interesting that we began to like the work. …[He once] asked us to spell the name of that flower the ladies called "sturshun." Only the large girl in our class knew it was "nasturtium." * * * Some of us had Smith's Grammar. These he threw out, saying, "Smith was a blockhead." He introduced physiology and a few of us even undertook Latin. * * *
>
> On my way home from school [one day]…a colored boy present seeing my school book under my arm asked me what I was studying. I told him "Cutter's Anatomy, Physiology and Hygiene." Said he, "good land boy! Is you gwine to larn all dem languages?" We had one colored boy in school, well behaved and a good student. He became a minister and did good work among his own people. * * *
>
> Cornerball was as popular in school then, as baseball is now. We had to make out own balls…. That ball was plenty hard enough to hit a player with, and in Cornerball, hitting the player was what counted. The teacher often played with us. He was very supple and had a smart way of evading the balls that were thrown at him.

As always, discipline was sternly enforced, even by well-liked teachers such as Thompson. Vosseller says that on his first day on the job, he "closed with something like this: 'Now children, to do our best work, we must have order in our school, by pleasant means if possible, but, we are going to have order.' Well, we had good order and it was mostly by pleasant means, but there were some exceptions."[70] Writing an article for the *Hunterdon County Democrat* in 1924, long-time Flemington resident Local historian, Theodore Bellis, reminisced about his attendance at the nearby Copper Hill School as a young boy, "where in the woods many good hickory whips were cut to use on the backs of us boys. Almost imagine I feel them at the present writing."

There is, disappointingly, almost no explicit evidence of actual "common school" attendance (or non-attendance) among the men of the company. In one rare instance, James Hoffman, while testifying before a pension official in 1895, made express mention of

attending school, along with two other Company A individuals. He stated, without further elaboration, that, "Comrades Geo[rge] S Beavers and John Bulmer were schoolmates with me before the war…." (This statement is corroborated by other information contained in the record: all three men resided in Tewksbury Township before the war, all listed their pre-war occupation as farmer or farm hand, and were all were born between 1841 and 1843.)

The only other known mention of school attendance was made in an 1886 affidavit by John Van Nest. Van Nest was a neighbor of the parents of a company man, John H. Wyckoff, who had died of "camp fever" in 1863. He was trying to help the parents establish a "dependency" pension claim stemming from the loss of their son. Van Nest stated he had known the soldier "as a boy," and that up till the time he enlisted, his parents "had the benefit of all his servasis [sic] as a farm hand[,] that is[,] when he was not at School[;] he went some to the district school". Other evidence in the record shows that Wyckoff was 18 when he enlisted (the minimum age, without parental consent), and gave his occupation as farmhand. Significantly, he attended school despite the fact that his parents were "very poor".

From the known examples of postwar literacy and illiteracy, it is reasonable to conclude that *most* of the men did obtain at least some elementary schooling in reading and writing, but that a significant minority - the approximately one in five who were illiterate - appear to have received little or none. Additionally, it can be deduced from the kind of post-war occupations that some of the company's survivors took up that most of the men were also "numerically" literate, and had at least received basic instruction in arithmetic. (The ability to do accurate and timely arithmetical calculations would have been a necessary job skill in such Company A job descriptions as store clerk, customs inspector, restaurateur, hotel keeper, army officer, "trader," salesman, peddler, federal government worker, as well as in virtually all of the skilled trades. It would have also been of great, possibly critical, importance to anyone managing a farm.)

There is also the evidence of the Adelphi Literary Society, the 15th Regiment's soldier discussion and debating organization formed during the war. The descriptions we have of this soldier organization indicate that Company A men figured prominently among its members and officers (Paul Kuhl, James Bullock, Lemuel Hockenberg, Lucien Vorhees), and that at least one of these (Vorhees) was renown for his "oratorical" skill. While not necessarily evidence of prior school experience, such skill, and interest in the kind of abstract debate apparently favored by the society, suggest that its members were likely to have had some pre-war experience in "rhetorics" or public speaking, probably in a school setting.

George Justice. The prewar background of George Justice, an older member of the company who was killed at Spotsylvania, also strongly suggests a significant educational component. Justice was about 36 years old at enlistment, and gave his prewar occupations as "shoemaker, actor, and lecturer". Apparently alone among the company's volunteers, he spent much of his prewar life in an urban environment (Philadelphia). He gave Philadelphia as his birthplace, and was married there in 1847, at about age 21. The opportunity for formal public schooling, as well as exposure to acting and the theater, would have been much greater in that setting than in Hunterdon.

According to a postwar article written by a staff officer of the 15th Regiment, Justice, "in his youth," had initially trained to become a shoemaker, but by 1856 (at about age 30), "he turned his attention to the study of Botany, electricity and psychology," and began supporting himself and family by lecturing.[71] The same year, he and his family moved across the Delaware River to Burlington, New Jersey. He must either have obtained a significant amount of free public education in Philadelphia (there is no indication he was a man of means, and was reportedly unemployed at the time of his enlistment), or became something of an accomplished autodidact, undoubtedly taking advantage of the many essentially free public institutions and sources of information available in that city. In the meantime, presumably during his 20s, he had pursued an acting career on the Philadelphia stage.[72]

Justice again relocated in 1860, this time to Lambertville, in Hunterdon County, and two years later he enlisted in the 15th NJ. His initial posting to the position of the company's *senior enlisted man* (First Sergeant), followed by his rapid rise to commissioned rank - 2nd Lieutenant (March, 1863) and 1st Lieutenant (July, 1863) - are strong indications of at least some prior formal schooling, and possibly professional training. (Sadly, Justice was killed in 1864. He left behind a widow, Sarah Ann Hinkley, to whom he had been married for 17 years [at the time of their wedding, she was only 16 and a month pregnant with the first of their seven children!]. Sarah's unhappy story, following George's death, is related in Chap 11.)

Relatively sparsely populated and overwhelmingly agricultural, conditions favorable to the creation of *private* primary or secondary schools (academies) existed only in a few, more densely populated areas of the county in the pre-war period. Most of those that did open appear to have met with limited success.[73] The most successful private secondary school was the Flemington Academy, or "Old Brick Academy," established by an elite group of local trustees about the year 1812. Beginning in 1818, it was used for a few years on Sundays as a "Sabbath School" for less privileged children, until local churches assumed that responsibility in their own church buildings; from 1826 onward, the academy adopted a "Classical School" curriculum, which was then popular. The school term in the academy's early years was decidedly seasonal and arranged to accommodate the busy agricultural season, the record for 1829, for example, indicating that school "opened" on November 25.

By the time of its last year of operation, tuition at "Flemington High School" (as it came to be called) had grown quite a bit higher than tuition in the common schools, especially for instruction in post-elementary grades. An advertisement in the August 20, 1862 edition of the *Democrat* shows that, while students in the private academy's "Primary Department" and "Common English Branches" would be charged $3 and $5 respectively, it cost $6 to enroll in "Higher English" and $8 in the "Classical Department". These prices are substantially higher than the $1-$2 tuition charged a few decades earlier for a term of 13

weeks in Three Bridges's common school. (The term at Flemington was 14 weeks, and school now opened in early September.) The academy closed its doors that year and was eventually sold, to be replaced by nearby Reading Academy, also in Flemington.

Regrettably, there is no clear evidence that any future Company A man attended such a private institution, with the single exception of John Emery. A late-century encyclopedia of prominent New Jersey men records that "[y]oung Emery attended first the private schools of his native Flemington [the Flemington Academy was undoubtedly one], and then prepared for college at Dr. Studdiford's private school at Lambertville". As mentioned, he went on to attend college before the war and law school afterward.

Lambert Boeman. Besides Emery, it is likely that the Company's original commanding officer, Captain Lambert Boeman, also obtained some private, prewar schooling. He was born in Milford about 1832. At the time, Milford was a developed town on the bank of the Delaware River, in the southwest corner of the county. It had both a public ("common") school founded in 1810, as well as a private school, one of which Boeman surely must have attended as a young man. He did not leave Milford and go to Flemington to apprentice as a store clerk until he was 14 years old, in about 1846. (He may of course have attended the Flemington Academy as well, once arriving in that town as an ambitious teenager seeking a commercial career.)

Boeman did well in the store business, and by the time the Civil War broke out fifteen years later, he was married with two daughters, was an active member of the local "establishment" church (The 1st Presbyterian Church of Flemington), and had risen to become a partner in a thriving "dry and fancy goods store" on Main Street, the enterprise being known as "Anderson, Nevius, & Boeman". He had become "active in promoting Flemington public improvements," and was known as an "ardent patriot". As prospects for a long war increased, Boeman's patriotism led him in 1862 to sell his considerable interest in the business, set up his wife and daughters to live as comfortably as possible during his planned absence, and devote full time and attention to raising a company for Fowler's new

regiment.[74] It is improbable that he accomplished all this, or that he would have been able to command the local respect necessary to organize and recruit a volunteer company in 1862 – or, for that matter, perform so competently the administrative duties his rank and position required - without having a better-than-average educational background. (Further evidence of the likelihood of such background is the fact that, by the time Boeman was tragically shot off his horse and killed in the fall of 1864. [See Chapters 3 and 4.] He had been promoted to the rank of Major and placed in charge of another regiment. He was clearly a man possessing innate competence and courage, but also one who most likely benefited from a well-schooled beginning.)

In summary, during the decades immediately preceding the Civil War, New Jersey's public elementary and secondary school systems appear to have lagged behind those of other northern states, especially the New England states. A "free" (tax-supported) public educational system was not put in place until after the war. Within New Jersey generally, and certainly within Hunterdon County, a tuition-based "common school" system *was* well in place by the time most of the men who would join Company A grew to school age, and school houses within reasonable walking distance existed throughout the recruitment area. But *actual* regular attendance at such schools, or attendance for periods long enough to be pedagogically productive, was quite another matter. Available evidence indicates poor attendance in places where actual student counts were made. Additionally, the predominantly agricultural character of the county meant that the "school year" was short, and the traditional means for funding common schools meant that poorer families often could not afford – or would be unlikely to choose to spend – to send their children. (But see the case of Wyckoff, mentioned above.) The opportunity and financial ability to attend *private* school, or to progress beyond the elementary grades, was confined to a very few.

It is highly probable, then, that a significant portion of the men of Company A, as well as their spouses (see Chapter 11), received little or no formal schooling prior to the war, resulting in nearly 20% of them entering the Union Army unable to read and write. In fact,

even this seemingly high percentage may be underestimated: some illiterate volunteers may have *become* literate during their wartime service, or after the war, factors impossible to track in the records available. (Save for the rare instance of a soldier who died in the war leaving some evidence of writing ability – such as a wartime letter or journal - literacy calculations for the company's men were based entirely on the literacy of claim-filing *veterans*, as exhibited in the *post-war period*. It is conceivable that some men who were literate by the time they filed had not been literate when they entered service.[75])

How reliable, then, are literacy statistics for the period, in general? McPherson, for example, cites several sources for his claimed 90% overall (white) literacy rate in mid-nineteenth-century Century America. Each cited source in turn appears to rely primarily or exclusively on nineteenth-century U.S. Census data. So far as is known, those data, like much else in the federal census, were *self-reported* and not independently confirmed: i.e., the person being interviewed by the census "enumerator" merely responding to the enumerator's question: "Can you [or a particular member of your family] read and write?" There would be at least some tendency to answer "Yes," and reluctance to answer "No," regardless of the truth of the matter. There was no known follow-up request to perform a reading or writing exercise to demonstrate literacy.

The literacy or illiteracy of each man in the Company A sample, on the other hand, was assessed more directly and, presumably, reliably. In some cases, assessment was made by virtue of an attorney's or other official's written notation in a volunteer's (or family member's) pension file that "Claimant does not write". More often, assessment was accomplished by noting whether a veteran or claimant signed or "subscribed" a document with a legible signature, or merely with his or her "sign" (invariably an "X"), witnessed by someone else who could write. Finally, assessment in some instances was possible by noting a letter or other document written in the claimant's own hand (although occasionally a letter was found that had been handwritten *for* a claimant by a literate friend). The company's 82% literacy rate may be overstated for another reason; in instances where literacy was in

question based on the file review, the veteran or family member was listed as presumptively literate. (Doubtful instances occurred, for example, where the only evidence of literacy was a "signature" penned in such an uncertain hand as to raise the possibility that the signer had learned to write only his or her own signature and nothing else, or where no signature or attributed writing sample was found at all.)

Whatever combination of factors explains the approximately 10% lower literacy of Company A soldiers as compared to that customarily reported for their northern comrades as a whole, the difference remains intriguing. It may well indicate that literacy rates for this period in American life have been consistently overstated.

Finally, it is interesting to ponder how the literate/illiterate distinction may have played out in the Civil War setting - the potential divide between members of the company who enjoyed the benefit of at least some education and those who had little or none; between those who could read the camp newspapers and posted orders and write letters home, and those who needed to be read to and to secure the assistance of a comrade amanuensis. Today, a minimal common education, confirmed by standardized testing and an ability to read and write with relative ease, are considered threshold qualifications for basic intellectual and social functioning - they are taken for granted, assumed. A modern soldier would be hard put entirely to avoid stigmatizing an unschooled, unlettered tentmate; he would be shocked, indeed, to come across even one such man, much less to find a fifth of his unit in this condition.

In both the wartime and post-war records of the men of Company A, absolutely nothing was discovered to suggest that illiterate men were stigmatized. But literacy was undoubtedly one of the factors that resulted in selection of some men, *and disqualification of others*, for positions of leadership within the company. *All* of the company's officers (lieutenants and captains) and all but one of its non-commissioned officers (corporals and sergeants) for whom there is clear evidence, were literate. Indeed, some of the duties of these men would have *required* them to read and write: announcing written orders and other

camp notices; reading drill instructions and soldier's manuals; completing muster rolls, casualty reports, and discharges; writing letters to next-of-kin, for example.[76]

On the other hand, with one exception, there is no hint that any of the men of Company A, including its officers, had any pre-war college or university training (and no *certain* evidence, again with the same exception, that any of them even had any high school or private "academy" education.)[77]

In summary then, with the exceptions noted above, the men of Company A were largely an only modestly and irregularly educated lot, at least in a formal sense, and a fair number of them had no education at all and never learned to read or write. This characterization, however, means only that they were probably much like the vast majority of their fellow Americans in this mid-century era.

Politics

> [A] man who will sacrifice principle through fear of rebellion cannot be made loyal to his own convictions of right by remonstrances. Cowards will always run when danger appears.
>
> Flemington resident, A. Van Fleet, in letter to Henry Race, concerning political compromise with South, February 11, 1860

On the eve of war, New Jersey was one of the most politically fractured and internally unsettled of the northern states, owing in some degree to its mid-Atlantic location. (See the state's characterization as a "crossroads" or "middle region" territory, in Chapter 1.) The Mason-Dixon line was generally regarded in the prewar period as the unofficial east-west boundary separating free from slave states (at least in the eastern United States). A look at the national map shows that the line, if extended eastward from the point where it marks the border between Pennsylvania and Maryland, would transect southern New Jersey, and that about one quarter of the state, including Atlantic City and all or portions of

eight of the state's twenty-one counties, lies south of the line. The state's southernmost point of land, Cape May, is situated at a more southerly latitude than Baltimore, Maryland, and Harper's Ferry, Virginia, and at about the same latitude as Washington, D.C. In fact, New Jersey has been described, during this tumultuous pre-war period, as the "northernmost of the border states," and this characterization was in some respects justified.[78]

National politics during the era encompassing the majority of the lives of Company A's men - the 70-year period from approximately 1840 to 1910 - were as complex and varied as the tumultuous events of American history that they sometimes reflected, and at other times propelled. It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate them closely, but a broad-brush political picture is worth painting, to give an idea of the larger political context into which the company's men were born, and in which they formed their earliest notions of such concepts as "Union," "political party," and "slavery".

Andrew Jackson's democratizing "revolution" in presidential politics, and new party alignments (Jackson was the new Democratic party's first president), lay in the recent past (1829-1837). The long-term effects of Jackson's impact on America's national political scene, and on its party system, were just beginning to take hold as the majority of the company's men were being born in the early 1840s.

After Jackson, however, American government at the national level underwent something of a dull period: an era of consolidation and stabilization after the tumultuous first half-century of the republic's life, in which it was mainly engaged in the business of inventing and expanding itself, and investing heavily in the beginnings of a needed transportation infrastructure (roads, canals, and finally railroads). This post-revolutionary, post-Jackson interim – which would be brought to a cataclysmic end by the outbreak of civil war – probably produced very little at the federal level that would have made lasting impression on the young sons of rural folk in west central New Jersey.

William Henry Harrison, who followed Jackson, served in the office of president for a mere month before expiring from pneumonia (1841), and his vice president, the "below

average" John Tyler, finished out his term (1841-1845). In fact, although Hunterdon's citizens had no way of knowing it and small chance of assessing the matter for themselves, the 20-year, pre-war period in which most of the men of the company grew to maturity would see a disappointing succession of lackluster American presidents, at least as rated by twentieth-century historians: Zachary Taylor, who died of illness in July, 1850, half way through his term (1849-1850); Millard Fillmore (1850-1853); Franklin Pierce (1853-1857); and James Buchanan (1857-1860). This forgettable series of chief executives was relieved only by the powerfully expansionist and politically adroit James Knox Polk (1845-1949), who fomented war with Mexico, and greatly increased the territory of the United States during his term of office. Most of the company's men were still young boys at the time, only beginning to become aware of such large events on the national scene. Still, many of them must have heard stories of the daring feats and dangerous battles of the American Army in Texas and Mexico, and some would have been of an age to play at soldiering, imagining themselves as part of the doomed Texas contingent at the Alamo (1836), or of Winfield Scott's dashing cavalrymen descending on Mexico City (1847).

In fact, Company A's "boys" were reaching adolescence and young adulthood at about the time the United States was evolving its third great political "party system," during the 1850s. (The first system, consisting of Federalists and Jeffersonian "Democratic-Republicans," had emerged toward the end of the eighteenth century, to be overtaken in the 1830s by the second system of Whigs and Democrats.) The emergence of a third system owed much to the stresses and continuing moral ambiguities presented by the republic's greatest unresolved issue: African-American enslavement and the importance of slavery to the South. Long before settling into the relatively stable two-party arrangement of Republicans and Democrats, the third system was convulsed for several years by a multiplicity of party names and positions. (The last two parties have of course survived to this day, *in name*, though the arrangement has undergone what political historians have identified as at least two further party system iterations. The fourth, taking over in the latter nineteenth century and

marked by Republican dominance, constituted the primary political environment in which the company's veterans and families would live into old age.)[79]

New Jersey broadly reflected these national and political party developments, though it leaned more heavily toward the Democratic party than did the nation as a whole. Democrats largely controlled state offices in the two decades immediately preceding the war, but they were energetically opposed first by Whigs and, as that party dissolved into oblivion, by newly organizing Republican and allied splinter parties. Much of the Democrats strength in the pre-war era was due to their support for and association with the state's burgeoning and monopolistic railroad industry. (This was an unlikely alliance. As inheritors of Jacksonian democracy, Democrats at the *national* level were typically anti-railroad and suspicious of big business combinations; Whigs, conversely, favored monopolies. Pragmatism won out at the state level, however, as wealthy railroad owners funneled money and favors to Democratic leaders, and Whigs concentrated on accusing Democrats – rather than railroads - of corruption, and on attempting to expand their minority hold on elective offices throughout the state.)

Rural Hunterdon County during this pre-period was considered a "safe" Democratic jurisdiction; it was even more solidly aligned with that party than was the state as a whole. Most of its local newspapers were openly aligned with the Democrats (nearly every newspaper in the state at the time was a political party organ of one stripe or another). Most Democratic sentiment, both in the county and throughout the state, strongly favored compromise toward the South (Whigs labeled it appeasement), arguing that the paramount issue was to avoid any serious threat to the integrity of the Union. Consistent with this Democratic tilt, there was in general less abolitionist fervor in New Jersey than further north, and many of the state's leading businessmen and merchants enjoyed strong and lucrative ties to the South.

But it would be wrong to conclude (as some historians of the state have done), that New Jersey was ever in the Southern camp, or that it could best be described during this

period as a non-slave "border state" (or even, as some labeled it when the prospect of war drew closer, a "Copperhead" jurisdiction). When war did break out, Democratic leaders at the state level firmly repudiated the "treasonous" actions of the South, and quickly and effectively responded to Lincoln's original call for state troops to protect the capital.

As might be expected, though, the general political climate in Hunterdon as war approached was more strongly anti-abolitionist, and more sympathetic to Copperhead sentiment, than the climate in the state generally. Within the county, opposition to growing "Radical" Republicanism at the national level was probably greatest in developing manufacturing centers like Lambertville, or railroad towns like Junction, where immigrant Irish laborers were concentrated and Democrats enjoyed overwhelming control. (New Hope, Pennsylvania, for example, lay immediately across the Delaware River from Lambertville, sharing not only a bridge that connected the two towns, but also much of Lambertville's manufacturing, demographic, and political character. New Hope was described in 1862 by one local newspaper editor as "a hot bed of secession." He posed the questions, "…[W]hy is it that New Hope is backward in the expression of her loyalty? And why do the citizens permit it to rest under the stigma of being the incubating nest of treason?"[80] The situation in Lambertville was much the same.)

What were the specific, slavery-related political issues and legislative proposals that dominated national politics in the decades prior to the war? Much federal government time and effort were expended during this pre-war period - by all three branches - in attempting to deal with the ultimate social, cultural, and administrative consequences of massive immigration from Europe, and frenetic *internal* migration from the settled east coast regions to the "far" west (which in pre-war times extended only as far as the trans-Appalachian states bordering the Mississippi River). A major component of this national effort was directed, unsuccessfully as it turned out, to addressing the vexing problems presented by slavery's potential extension into the new western territories that were being settled as a consequence. As early as 1820, the "Missouri Compromise" legislation had drawn an east-

west line through the territory of the Louisiana Purchase (at 36° 30' latitude, the location of the southern border of modern Missouri), and mandated that no slavery would be permitted in territory north of the line. (This would have prohibited slavery in what later became Kansas.) In 1848, legislation known as the "Wilmot Proviso" barred slavery in any territory acquired as a result of the War with Mexico in 1846-48; Texas was exempted since it had declared its independence before the war and was therefore not deemed to have been "acquired" from Mexico. (Texas had also already been admitted as a slave state, in 1845.)

Angered over the extensiveness of the Wilmot Proviso, southern legislators succeeded in passing legislation known as the "Compromise of 1850," which allowed California to join the Union immediately as a free state, but permitted New Mexico and Utah to decide on slavery for themselves. (All three were areas acquired from Mexico. As it turned out, neither latter state was admitted until well after the Civil War, in 1896 and 1912 respectively, so the matter as to them was largely mooted by events.) Whig President Taylor opposed the compromise bill, crafted by Kentucky Senator Henry Clay, a Democrat, and might have vetoed it had he lived. Millard Fillmore, his successor (and the last Whig President), also disliked the proposal, but reluctantly went along with it since both major parties were split over the issue and he hoped to achieve a permanent, politics-stabilizing settlement.

In 1854, only seven years before such matters would lead to war, the ongoing legislative bickering and compromising culminated in the last great Congressional "deal" on slavery in the territories: the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Kansas and Nebraska were each allowed to decide by popular vote whether to join the Union as free or slave states, and the conflicting provisions of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 were repealed. Democratic President Franklin Pierce signed the act into law. A rush to the territories was on, especially to Kansas, with people of both views hurrying to settle there and control the vote's outcome. Predictably, violent conflict erupted and led to a state of near civil war. ("Bleeding Kansas" was eventually admitted as a free state in January of 1861, mere weeks before the firing on

Fort Sumter; the Civil War there had already begun as a practical matter, and would continue. Nebraska waited until 1867 to join the Union.) The territorial controversy was much on the minds of New Jerseyans. (This included educators and teachers-in-training. In 1855, the state opened its first "normal school" in Trenton; these were colleges for the training of school teachers for the "common schools". One question on the entrance examination for applicants was, "Where is the Territory of Nebraska?"[81])

Against this ominous background, slavery became a key and much discussed issue in the next presidential election (the election of 1856). The Democrats nominated James Buchanan, who took a compromising position on the slave issue, hoping to avoid a dangerous confrontation with the south; the Republicans nominated the strongly anti-slavery but politically inept John C. Fremont, under the slogan, "Freedom, Freedmen, and Fremont!" Though close, Buchanan won the election and, predictably, a majority of New Jersey's voters supported him. But surprisingly, in the election that year for *state* government officials, the new, rapidly ascending Republican party engineered a startling break with past political tradition. Joining with other anti-Democrat factions and referring to themselves generically as the Opposition Party (in an effort to offset anti-Republican sentiment), Republicans succeeded in breaking the long Democratic hold on the state's governorship. The Opposition Party elected William A. Newell, a physician, to be the state's new chief executive, to serve from 1857 to 1860.

In the "safe" jurisdiction of Hunterdon County, however, Democrats continued more or less to dominate in the years immediately preceding the war. In the 1856 presidential race, for example, county Democrats cast 3,497 votes for Buchanan, while anti-Democrat factions (including Republicans) split their votes: 1,554 for Fremont, and 1,105 for Millard Fillmore (the former Whig, now endorsed by the "Know-Nothings"). Even combined, the non-Democrat votes remained a minority totaling only 2,659, or about 43% of the total vote. In Hunterdon's *municipal* elections held the following year (1857), "Opposition" Republicans improved on their poor record in past local elections, still managed to outpoll Democrats in

only three of the county's seventeen townships: Clinton, Lebanon, and Franklin. Even so, the incensed editor of the *Hunterdon Democrat* called the Opposition coalition a fusion of "moneyed powers" and "Black Republican Negro Worshippers."[82] Things were warming up politically.

At the time (1856-57), the average future Company A volunteer was about 16 or 17 years old. As an adolescent, he had undoubtedly begun to overhear more (and more heated) talk about politics, slavery, and the specter of southern secession, and may have begun to read more news of it in the local papers available throughout the county.[83] In fact, about the same time, a new paper was launched in Flemington, *The Hunterdon Republican*, under the editorship of a capable man named Thomas E. Bartow. The mere founding of a Republican paper in Hunterdon reflected the turmoil then taking place in national party politics, as the Whig party was dying out and being replaced. (The county's Whig newspaper, *The Hunterdon Gazette*, failed in 1858. Nevertheless, a new owner, Adam Suydam, declaring himself a "Douglas Democrat," resurrected the *Gazette* and managed to keep it going for another decade[84]). It also indicated the growing strength of the Republican party.

Bartow was a bright editor, more reasoned and moderate in tone than either of his Flemington competitors, Adam Bellis of the widely-read *Democrat* and Willard Nichols, a "Henry Clay Whig," of the dying *Gazette*. In his first editorial in 1857, he frankly acknowledged that Republicans were being commonly referred to in New Jersey as "Black Republicans, Woolly Heads, and Negro Worshippers," and were considered "enemies of the Constitution and the Union." He then staked out his own position (in the dense, run-on language typical of the era), and alluded to the profound political shifts the underway:

> The abrogation of the Missouri Compromise, a great and wise measure that had given peace and quietness to the whole country, both North and South for a period of more than a third of a century, with the consequences and circumstances that have naturally grown out of a violation of the public faith so wanton and unwarrantable, together with a reckless, corrupt, and imbecile administration of our public affairs, have caused the fountains of the great deep in politics to be broken up and already a large portion of the people are disregarding the old lines of party demarcation and abandoning their former leaders and favorites from a devotion to what they deem the paramount interests of the general welfare of the country.[85]

The men of Company A were now only a few years away from their departure for the front lines. A few older ones, like Boeman and Justice, were married and had children by this point, and were undoubtedly thinking seriously from time to time about the great questions facing the nation. Although it can only be a guess, it is probable that a majority of the men who would later join up were Republicans (or were at least sympathetic to Republican positions), and that a smaller number considered themselves "regular" Democrats (pro-war if war came). It is of course unlikely that any of the men entertained serious pro-Southern or Copperhead sentiments, or counted themselves among the "peace" Democrats.

As with religious affiliation, many of the men must also have been political "atheists" – neutral, indifferent, and/or disengaged from contemporary issues of slavery, states' rights, and party politics. For even in this age of unusually strong party affiliation and identification, and high voter turnout at elections, a sizeable minority of eligible Americans – from about a quarter to a third - remained somewhat aloof from national politics. (According to a leading political historian, "[f]rom 1840 to 1872, the average turnout for presidential contests reached 69 percent; from 1876 to 1900, a record 77 percent".[86]) These estimated proportions of the politically disaffected are roughly corroborated by the turnout levels recorded for pre-war elections in Hunterdon. In both the 1856 presidential election and the 1858 state election, for example, 30-40% of the estimated number of eligible male voters in the county stayed home. There is no reason to doubt that a comparably significant percentage of company men was also at least moderately estranged from the politics of the day. (This is consistent with the analysis of the men's motives for enlisting and fighting developed in Chapter 4.)

In any event, local turmoil continued to attend the next state election in 1859. For governor, the Opposition party nominated Charles S. Olden, a somewhat obscure but highly esteemed former state senator with traditional Whig leanings. Frustrated by Olden's

studied refusal to clarify his position on slavery issues, the *Flemington Democrat* urged voters to reject sectional "fanaticism" and to make "deadly war upon Negro worship".[87] In the event, a clear majority of Hunterdon County's voters remained Democratic, and in some areas there were even significant pro-south or "Copperhead" sympathies expressed. The Republican portion of the total county vote increased only slightly over 1857 (44% v. 43%). But Olden won the state by a slim margin, and two of the county's State Assembly districts sent Republicans to Trenton.[88]

Complicating the outcome of the 1859 election was John Brown's sensational raid on Harpers Ferry in mid-October. This was big news in Hunterdon, as it was elsewhere in the nation, and the *Hunterdon Republican's* reluctance to publicize the event is revealing. The editor, Bartow, must have sensed that the raid was overwhelmingly condemned by county residents, even by most antislavery Republicans, and at first said nothing. When taken to task by the *Democrat* for his silence, he responded by accusing the rival paper of "raising a hue and cry" for political purposes, and wrote that Brown's attack was "the most foolish thing in our recollection," and that Republicans had nothing to do with it.[89] Later, when Republicans at the national level argued that the raid was the direct result of the Democrat-inspired repeal of the Missouri Compromise, Bartow went along, claiming that it was indeed the Democrats who were responsible "for the blood spilled at Harper's Ferry, over which the [*Hunterdon*] *Democrat* is shedding so many 'crocodile' tears".[90]

As the watershed election of 1860 approached, Company A's volunteers had nearly all reached adulthood, many now were married, and several had children. The issue of slavery and Southern secession - and the prospect of civil war - dominated the presidential election campaign. The major parties, under the extraordinary stress of these issues, fractured yet again. Had they not done so, Lincoln would probably not have won the election.

"In New Jersey," as one historian of the state's politics put it, "these national developments caused political chaos."[91] In the event, New Jersey residents, like the rest of the country, had to chose among four candidates: Abraham Lincoln, the Republican nominee;

Steven Douglas, a relatively moderate, "northern" Democratic nominee, who tried to appeal to former Whigs; John C. Breckenridge, a Democrat nominated by Southern states dissatisfied with Douglas; and John Bell, supported by anti-Lincoln and anti-Douglas moderates, who ran as the Constitutional Union party candidate. Statewide, the electorate was deeply divided, and the presidential race was extremely close. In the end, Lincoln (who received about 40% of the popular vote nationwide) received four of New Jersey's seven electoral votes while Douglas (with about 30% of the popular vote) received the balance of three.

Running true to its "middle region" status, New Jersey was the only northern state that did not give all of its electoral votes to Lincoln. At the state level, Democrats made a much stronger showing than Republicans: the party won both houses of the state Assembly. Within Hunterdon County, Democrats retained their traditional predominance: Lincoln carried only two municipal jurisdictions, while between Douglas and Breckenridge, Democrats carried all eighteen of the others.

* * *

What exactly did the men of Company A think about these roiling political events during the pre-war period, and what were their political affiliations or leanings? Regrettably, we do not know for certain about any of them individually. But the historical record sketched above provides important clues and permits an overall impression and estimate of the group.

-The men who would join the company in the summer of 1862 were not, by and large, ideologically- or politically-driven super-patriots. (Of course there must have been a few, like company organizer Lambert Boeman, the "ardent patriot," who were exactly that.) They had been raised in a Democratically-controlled county whose leaders mostly had opposed the war, at least until it broke out, and they had been exposed as well to some local expression of "Copperhead" sentiment. There is no evidence that any of them was an abolitionist, or deviated from all-too-standard, mid-nineteenth century white opinions of "coloreds," and of

race relations in general. Their local newspapers, and county lore, were full of subtly (and sometimes not-so-subtly) demeaning accounts of black language, thinking, behavior, and life in general. (By the same token, there is no evidence of overt bigotry. See also the fascinating case of William Sloan, described in Chapter 4.)

-Politically, most of the men in the immediate pre-war period were probably *either* at least mildly sympathetic to Republican party positions and leaders, preeminently Lincoln, *or else* moderately estranged from party politics. A few undoubtedly considered themselves "loyal" Democrats, who would have been able safely to express opposition to Lincoln in the form of disenchantment over what they considered to be his inept handling of the war. (Some Republicans would have agreed.) It is hard to imagine, however, that *any* of the men harbored strong "peace Democrat" or Copperhead notions, or condoned the South's actions in seceding. Thus, as a group, the company was probably *not* wholly representative of the politics of the county's contemporary male population.

-Modern Political Science has stressed the importance of primary group loyalty and cohesion as important explanatory factors in the formation of political identity, and voting patterns. The very act of serving together in wartime probably did more to influence the men's ideologies and political party affiliations than any other single factor. The extremely lopsided soldier vote favoring Lincoln in the 1864 election provides strong evidence of this phenomenon. Across the entire north, Lincoln garnered 55% of the popular vote, outpolling McClellan, his Democratic challenger, 2.2 million to 1.8 million. But in the nine northern states that separately tabulated absentee soldier ballots, Lincoln beat McClellan by a vote of 119,754 to 34,291, *or 78% of the tabulated soldier vote*. (New Jersey, like a few other Democratically-controlled states, did not permit absentee voting by servicemen, since it was widely perceived soldiers had become strongly pro-Lincoln by the latter part of 1864.) Thus it is very probable that, from whatever portion of the company's men might have been inclined to participate in party politics by 1864, as much as *three-quarters* would have voted Republican. This would likely be true regardless of their party identification (or indifference)

going into the war. And it probably continued to be true throughout the balance of their lives, as the Republican party came to champion the pension issue and other veterans' interests in the post-war period.[92]

-The growing politicization of the company's men and their increasing identification with the Republican party (at least as hypothesized above) occurred *despite* their home county's persistent loyalty to Democratic and anti-war politics throughout the war. (In 1864, for example, McClellan carried the county by a 62% majority, 4335 to 2631, and gained a majority in every township. The *Hunterdon Democrat* continued vehemently to object to Lincoln and Grant's conduct of the war, right up to it final months around Petersburg: "If we are a traitor for not applauding the performance of the clown at the head of our nation, then we shall glory in the name."[93] Of four "Copperhead" Assemblymen left in the state legislature by war's end, one was elected from Hunterdon.[94]) This must have been extremely galling to the men of the company, but a tribute to the strength of the free-speech tradition that was then only seven decades old.

CHAPTER 3

COMPANY A AT WAR

> ...[I] was with him in the charge at Laurel Hill near Spotsylvania in Virginia on the Eighth of May A.D. 1864. It was Sunday - we were side by side on the advance towards the rebel breastworks when a minie ball struck Isaac Dayton over the eye & passed through his head. He fell instantly and the last words I heard him say was to ask for help. * * * It was about five o'clock in the afternoon....
>
> ...I shall never forget Sunday the Eighth of May.
>
> Private Garret Hogan, 1866

> How dreadful is this place!
>
> *Book of Genesis*, Chapter 28, Verse 17; quoted in Chaplain Haines's sermon of April 9, 1865)

The Civil War, fought over four years from April, 1861, to April, 1865, remains by far the single most traumatic and nation-altering event in U.S. history. It was cataclysmic in the original sense: a "washing away," on this occasion with the blood of its male population, of the order that preceded it.

Contemporaries were certainly aware of the exceptional magnitude of the conflagration, and the unique stakes involved for both sides, and struggled to understand and express the war's fundamental meaning. Lincoln, in the month before he was himself gunned down as a result of the passions unleashed by the conflict, famously sermonized that God himself had sent the "terrible war" as the punishment earned by both North and South for the "offense" of slavery, and warned that it might not end "until every drop of [African] blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword."[95]

Numbers alone only begin to tell the story. More than 600,000 men lost their lives in the conflict, *nearly two percent of the entire US population*, black and white, North and South. Of the pool of white males most likely to serve at some time over the war's course

(i.e., those ranging in age from about 13 to about 43), more than a third went to war, a high percentage as volunteers. From this one-third under arms (a total force of nearly 3 million), the Union lost one out of every six men and the Confederacy one of every *three*.[96] It is difficult, impossible in fact, to grasp the magnitude of these losses when expressed in such gross terms. An early statistical compiler recognized the fact.

> It is hard to realize the meaning of the figures…. It is easy to imagine one man killed; or ten men killed; or, perhaps, a score of men killed. With some effort one can picture a hundred men stretched, lifeless and bloody on the ground. …[B]ut even [the veteran] is unable to comprehend the dire meaning of…[a] hundred thousand, whose every unit represents a soldier's bloody grave.
>
> The figures are too large.[97]

Writing in 1888, the same grim compiler quoted above stated that "[i]t was the greatest war of the century," and listed Gettysburg, along with Waterloo, as "[t]he two great battles of the age." At Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, the opposing Union and Confederate armies totaled about 150,000 men, with a combined total of more than 600 artillery pieces, and *each* army suffered the loss of more than 20,000 men killed or wounded. The losses occurred over a mere three-day period of active fighting, culminating on the afternoon of the last day, July 3, 1863, in Confederate General George Pickett's disastrous charge against the Union's dug-in line, which alone left nearly 7,000 Southern soldiers dead, dying, or wounded on the field.[98]

How must such losses have been felt by the typical American villager? The inhabitants of a town of 850 people, in which 300 eligible men resided, would, on average, have sent 100 of them off to fight - enough for a standard infantry company - and of that company, on average, twenty one - one of every five - would not have come back. (As mentioned, Company A's loss rate was twice as high.) Those twenty-one would have been known, their faces familiar, to virtually every older inhabitant of the village. Throughout the country, a large portion of American families felt the cold hand of the battlefield, as did almost each neighborhood, and virtually every hamlet, village, and township. Within a few decades, monuments to the war's dead would appear in nearly every public square or green,

large and small, east of the Mississippi. On Lincoln's "consecrated" ground at Gettysburg alone, 1,320 of them were eventually erected: a serene and grassy precinct of the dead, the 522 acres of its original parkland tract more densely populated with granite slabs and figures than the neighboring town had been with live human beings.[99]

The *intensity* of the carnage was also unparalleled. This was due primarily to several, mutually-reinforcing technological innovations in small arms weaponry. First was the use of a copper percussion cap that could be fitted to any flintlock weapon then in use (the cap is a device struck by the musket's hammer, to ignite the gunpowder charge in the breech of the barrel, thereby "firing" the weapon); caps made the discharging of such weapons more rapid and much more reliable. Second, bullets themselves were greatly improved. In place of older musket "balls" (literally spheroid in shape), French and American inventors, Claude Etienne Minié and James Henry Burton, introduced at about the same time new "cylindroconoidal" rounds (the "Minié ball" and the "Burton bullet"); these rounds both expanded slightly on firing, creating a tighter seal with the inside of the barrel and conveying more "muzzle velocity" to the bullet, and remained more stable in flight than a simple, spheroid shape. And finally, both armies made widespread use of "rifled" muskets: guns with barrels that were spirally-grooved on the inside, thereby imparting a high rate of spin to the bullet fired out of them, greatly increasing the bullet's range, accuracy, and killing power. These small arms developments combined to render the Civil War battlefield an environment of almost unimagined lethality and horror.

> …[T]he sheer dominance of long-range small arms was startling…. Of a representative sample of 144,000 Civil War casualties, 108,000 [75%] were caused by cylindroconoidal bullets and only around 13,000 [9%] by cannon-fired ball and shell – a major shift, when it is considered that artillery had traditionally inflicted around one half of combat injuries. …[I]n the space of a very few years the long-stranding and balance relationship between the major battlefield component, infantry, artillery, and cavalry had undergone a major realignment because of the introduction of a single weapon.[100]

At Antietam on September 17, 1862, one of the costliest days in American military history, nearly 6,000 men died in the space of about ten hours. This was nearly twice as

many Americans as died storming the Normandy beaches on June 6, 1942, the single worst day of U.S. casualties in all of World War II (approximately 3,400 killed and missing), and roughly equivalent to the number of deaths suffered by the American Army throughout the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, *combined*. Had Antietam's dead all fallen along a continuous line marking the battle's approximately three-mile front, there would have been a corpse *every yard*; laying out the wounded bedside the dead would have produced a casualty every *foot*. A Union division commander, General "Fighting Joe" Hooker (who was himself wounded at the engagement), said later, "Every stalk of corn in the…greater part of the field was cut as closely as could have been done with a knife, and the slain lay in rows precisely as they had stood in their ranks a few moments before." Describing the dead and dying of his own regiment at a site that came to be known as "The Bloody Lane," one Confederate soldier put it terribly succinctly: "…[O]ne could have walked the length of six companies on their bodies."[101]

To feed this meat-grinder of men, Union states over the course of the war raised more than two thousand regiments, the Civil War Army's basic combat unit. (At standard strength, an infantry regiment consisted of about 1,000 men, organized in ten companies of about a hundred each; see Chapter 2.) Of these two thousand regiments, forty-five, or just over two percent of the total, lost at least a fifth of their men (200), either killed in action, or succumbing to wounds or disease. Only one New Jersey regiment ranked among this grim list: the 15th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry. (By way of comparison, Pennsylvania supplied *eleven* of the forty-five worst-hit regiments, almost twice as many as the next ranking states [Massachusetts, Michigan, and New York, with six each]; New Hampshire's single listing, the 5th New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, suffered the greatest total number of deaths: 295 officers and men; and one federal, or regular army, regiment made the list: the 18th U. S. Infantry, which ranked twenty-sixth. Vermont, which contributed four regiments to the list, earned the distinction of suffering the highest *per capita* death rate of any Union state

[approximately 8.6% of Vermont's eligible males died in the war, compared to an overall Union rate of about 6%; the South's overall rate was three times as high].)[102]

The 15th New Jersey, with an official soldier death count of 240, ranked twelfth in losses among the forty-five and, as the sole regiment from its state among that group, ranked *first* in losses among the fifty-two regiments New Jersey contributed to the war (forty-four infantry, three cavalry, and five artillery). There were two principal reasons for the 15th's unenviable record. First, its original volunteers signed up during the second year of the war for a three-year period, thus assuring them exposure to the war's risks for what turned out to be thirty more months of hard marching and regular fighting, interspersed with three grueling winter encampments. (Several of the state's regiments had only 3- or 9-month enlistments, and a majority of its 3-year regiments were not formed or sent forward until later in the war.)

And second, the regiment had the misfortune of being centrally engaged in the Union Army's extremely bloody campaigns in central Virginia during May and June of 1864 - campaigning that began with the costly, 8-day Battle of the Wilderness that culminated in the horrific fighting in and around Spotsylvania Courthouse. The latter climaxed in a hellish pitched battle on a rebel breastwork, later remembered by veterans as the "Bloody Angle". On the rainy mid-morning of that single Thursday, May 12, in the space of a mere half hour, the already much depleted 15th lost more than *half* its approximately 300 remaining men. Company A, probably down to about thirty before the fighting began, lost nine killed and another five wounded (two of whom died over the next few days), a one-engagement casualty rate of 47%. As the regiment's Chaplain later wrote, "No experience during the whole time the Fifteenth was in service was more destructive than [that] half hour, from ten o'clock to half-past ten, of the morning of May 12th." (178)*

---

*The frequent references in this chapter to Haines's unit history of the 15th New Jersey Regiment are given in the text, in parentheses.

The 15th New Jersey's Wartime Experience

At the strategic, or large-scale level, the 48-month Civil War proceeded in five annual phases, each phase occurring during the "campaign season" (usually April through October or November) of the years 1861 through 1865). It took place *primarily* in three theaters: the Atlantic coastal states between Pennsylvania and Georgia (the "Eastern" theater); the Mississippi River states between Illinois and Louisiana (the "Western" theater); and the sea, primarily the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. Fighting did occur elsewhere (for example, there were numerous sharp engagements in some of the unsettled states and territories lying west of the Mississippi, and even a skirmish in northern Vermont, near the border between the United States and Canada), but it was in no way determinative of the war's outcome.

The North fought a war of invasion, destruction, and blockade, seeking to attack and occupy vital Southern cities and transportation networks, reduce its economic capacity to sustain hostilities, and annihilate or capture its armed forces. Correspondingly, the South fought a largely defensive war, seeking to repel Northern incursions, strike at federal supply lines, maintain its much smaller industrial capability and vital European trade, and kill enough "Yankees" to dissuade the North from continuing. Except for Confederate General Robert E. Lee's audacious invasion of Pennsylvania in the summer of 1863 – the mid-point and possibly the turning point of the war – the overall course of the conflict was a story of inconclusive initial moves and countermoves, especially in the East, followed by the North's gradual but increasing constriction and destruction of the south's economic and military might in all three theaters during the final two years of fighting.

The 15th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry Regiment, including Company A, spent its entire 3-year period of wartime service (August, 1862, to June, 1865) as part of the Union's eastern theater army. Geographically, the unit spent the majority of its time in various areas of central and western Virginia, but it ranged widely, from Gettysburg in the north to North Carolina in the south, and from the Shenandoah Valley in the west to the national

capital in the east. In chronological sequence, its wartime experience is summarized in the pages that follow.

Late Summer and Fall, 1862. The 15th NJ Regiment mustered in on August 25, 1862, at the Fair Oaks Campground in Flemington, New Jersey. There they were issued uniforms and basic equipment, Sibley and Wall tents, and Enfield muskets (rather than, as the men had hoped, the coveted Springfields). Here they were introduced to basic military tradition and etiquette, and instructed in close-order marching (or "dismounted drill," as it was - and still is - referred to in the infantry). Family members visited, packages of home-cooked food were doled out, and photographers circulated offering to take posed pictures of the new soldiers at the exorbitant price of $5 (about $100 in today's currency[103]). Spirits were high, and health still good. The mostly young and unmarried men of Company A took advantage of their final days in home territory to visit with Flemington-area friends and relatives and, undoubtedly, to cavort.

On August 29, the company boarded a train at Flemington, bound for Washington and the front. It was the second year of the war, and its second campaign season was already drawing to a close. In the men's memory of recent events lay the North's initial humiliating defeat of July, 1861, at the Battle of Bull Run (Manassas)[104], as well as two inconclusive and costly efforts the following summer to take the Confederate (and state) capital of Richmond, Virginia. (These were the "The Peninsular Campaign," in April and May, and "The Seven Days' Battles," in June and July, 1862. Initially established at Montgomery, Alabama, the Confederate capital was moved to Richmond on May 30, 1861, a few weeks after Virginia seceded and joined the Confederacy.)

The 15th arrived at Washington's Union Station at dusk on Saturday, August 30. Haines painted a somber picture of the events of the day, as the regiment's train haltingly approached the capital:

A low, deep sound could often be heard from the southward, resembling

> distant reverberations of thunder. This was the echo of artillery from the second Battle of Manassas, where General Pope was suffering disastrous defeat before Lee and Jackson. It sobered out thoughts.... (13)

The following morning, in pouring rain, the 15th was marched about six miles northwest to Tenallytown (an area within the capital district). There it settled in at its first posting, an earthen fort dubbed Fort Kearny, then being constructed for the protection of the capital. En route, the soldiers observed two stark images that, had they realized it at the time, could have stood as apt metaphors for the incomplete work of nation-building they were now committed to attempt to complete, and the sad and terrible price that project was to exact. For on the march quarters that day, they passed "the huge, unfinished dome of the Capitol [that] stood out against the sky, looking like some great hill that towered above all the surrounding country," and a bit further on, with "the rain falling heavily," they noticed "the public buildings were draped in mourning, because of the death of the President's son; and, passing the White House, we remembered the sorrow that had stricken the household of our Chief Magistrate."[105] (13)

Despite the atmosphere of their arrival, the regiment's initial "break-in" period in Washington was relatively pleasant. The men worked at improving fortifications, "enjoy[ed] luxuries of which we were soon to be altogether deprived, got "a full issue of new clothing, and ample supplies of army rations," and "were in easy communication with friends at home, and received many boxes of delicacies by express." Haines also naturally saw to the men's spiritual needs.

> We had delightful prayer-meetings in the open air nightly, and much tenderness in religious matters was manifested by some of the younger men. After these meetings, the invitation was frequently given for any desirous of serious conversation to remain. * * * A regimental church was organized, composed of the confessing Christians. The Communion of the Lord's Supper was administered to them at intervals of every three months while we continued in the service. New converts were added to our church on these sacramental occasions. The first communion was administered on...September 21st. * * * Four young converts stood up in the presence of their comrades, and publicly took the vows of God upon them, one of whom was baptized. (15-16)

Very soon, however, in mid-September, a major engagement began to take shape only about 45 miles further to the northwest, near Sharpsburg, Maryland. The Battle of Antietam would be, until the second day of the Battle of Gettysburg, "the worst day of the war" in terms of mass casualties and desperate fighting. Too late, mercifully, to participate, the 15th was nonetheless transported by train from the capital to Frederick, Maryland, on September 30, and decamped in the vicinity of Sharpsburg. This was the volunteers' first opportunity to witness the aftermath of a major battle (which had concluded a week and a half earlier).

> We…crossed a portion of the battle-fields, and marked many new-made graves. At various point hospital tents were erected, filled with wounded men, who, from the nature of their wounds, could not bear the risk of removal. The churches generally, and many barns, were also used for hospitals. (18)

For the next four months, extending into winter and lasting well beyond the usual campaign season, the Union Army of the Potomac, having changed commanders, continued to move and spar along the Shenandoah Valley region of Virginia, threatening the rebel stronghold of Fredericksburg. The 15th NJ, now part of the main army's efforts and more or less permanently incorporated into the First New Jersey Brigade, crossed into Virginia in October and for the next several weeks engaged in sporadic skirmishing and minor battles in the Shenandoah.

Meanwhile, several men of the regiment had begun to fall ill with typhoid fever. (For descriptions of this and other common wartime illnesses suffered by the men, see Chapter 5.) The regiment's popular commander, Colonel Fowler, was so sick with the disease he had to be left behind on October 31st, as the rest of the unit was crossing the Potomac from Maryland into Virginia. He would never regain his health, and resigned his commission in March of the following year, much to the dismay of the men.[106] (19) Also sick with typhoid and remaining behind with Fowler was Company A's 2nd Lieutenant, John Emery. He failed as well to recover sufficiently to stay on active duty, and was honorably discharged, for medical reasons, three months later.

One Company A Private, Isaiah Hassel (or Harsel), had come down with typhoid fever in September, when the 15th was still encamped at Tenallytown, in Washington. He remained hospitalized when the 15th moved out for Antietam at the end of September, and on October 28, 1862, *he became the company's first mortal casualty of the war*, dying from his illness while separated from his comrades. He had served less than two months.

At this early stage of the regiment's wartime adventure, any death or burial was attended with almost melodramatic seriousness and ritual. On November 23, for example, at its field hospital that had been set up at Stafford Court House, Virginia, the regiment lost 25-year-old Andrew Courtright of Company I. Courtright had also been sick for some time with typhoid fever, and toward the end of November it was clear he was dying. Haines wrote:

> …Surgeon Sharpe asked me to go with him to the hospital to see a man [Courtright] who was in a dying condition. * * * A crowd of the man's more intimate acquaintances were around the entrance. Pushing in I knelt down beside him, asked him a few questions, and told him to look to Christ alone in this hour. He asked me to pray with him. Then his brother Solomon came in, and, stooping down, kissed him. A rattling in the throat followed, his eyes rolled, he raised his head, let it fall heavily, gave a few gasps, and all was over….
>
> The tent became solemnly still. * * * …I said [we should bury him] at sundown. * * * The body was placed in a hastily made box answering for a coffin, and brought outside the tent. The men of Co. I filed by, taking the last look at their dead comrade, and the lid was nailed down. The corporal's guard detailed, headed by the musicians, who played with fife and muffled drum, led the procession. Then came the dead man's brother, who walked with me before the coffin. The men of Co. I followed, then the officers, and the regiment indiscriminately. We buried him on the edge of a pine thicket near camp. Green pine boughs were scattered upon the coffin when it was lowered. There were brief religious exercises and the benediction. The guards loaded their pieces, and fired three volleys into the grave, which was soon filled up, and all turned away. …[T]he affecting event is deeply felt by us all. (21-22)

(Such death scenes and burial formalities continued to be observed throughout the war, but only of course if time and battle-field circumstances permitted. For example, a very different….[107] [H 21-22. compare this rather elaborate death and burial scene with the one described by Haines one and a half years later, at Cold Harbor [H 182, 205-6], *infra* at p. ?? Also in fn: the female historian who does work on burial & treatment of the dead???].

The fall campaign season concluded for the 15th with a failed effort to take Fredericksburg in mid-December. On December 13, the day of the main action, the regiment had been posted to picket duty[108] in front of a section of the Union line, and did not participate in the assault. The regiment nevertheless suffered its first men killed in action, mainly from enemy sniper fire, the very first being Michael Mulvey, of Company G. Mulvey, who had just shot a Confederate "sharpshooter," was himself shot through the head at almost the same moment, and died instantly. (34) Following the Fredericksburg action, the regiment was marched into its winter quarters at White Oak Church, a tiny hamlet lying about five miles east of Fredericksburg, between the Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers.

Winter, 1862-3**.** Several months of living in crowded and unsanitary camp conditions now began to take a heavy toll on the largely rurally-reared members of the 15th. Typhoid Fever was an especially potent killer, with a mortality rate of more than one in three of those contracting the disease. As Bilby states:

> Typhoid fever, with its 37% mortality rate, was endemic and sometimes epidemic in units occupying static positions. Spread by bacteria bred in the feces of unsuspecting "carriers" (two out of every thousand people in the general population), it was transmitted via food and water, primarily the latter. Although the specific cause of the disease was unknown to medical officers, they were all too familiar with its ravages, including the fatal side effect of peritonitis [infection of the abdomen]. * * * Treatment consisted largely of "nursing" and letting the disease take its course.[109]

Adding to the general discomfort, General Burnside, in mid-January, 1863, planned and ordered an ill-considered last attempt to take Fredericksburg. The effort was clumsily carried out by an army that thought it had already settled in for the winter, and soon bogged down in impassable roads, rebel taunts, and extreme incoordination. (The winter of 1862-3 was the last time eastern army commanders would attempt cold-season campaigning on this scale.) The venture, which began on January 20 with a feckless approach march that became known as "Burnsides' Mud-March," was described by Haines as follows:

> Drops began to fall about three o'clock in the afternoon [of the first day of the march], and before we were camped for the night rain had set in.
>
> January 21st: * * * The rain had fallen all night and still continued. The clothes of almost all were wringing wet. * * * The roads were a slippery mass of pasty mud, which was getting deeper every hour, and were almost impassable, as the rain had

> brought out all the frost. * * * …[T]he day had been selected for our crossing the river. * * * Then it was sought to make men do what animals could not. Long hawsers were put to the pontoon carriages, and half a regiment would endeavor to haul one of them. They would by panting exertion move them a little way. Then down in the next slough hole they would stick. With mud knee deep, the troops would extricate them, move them a boat's length or two, then down the wheels would sink in the miry clay once more. * * * Dead horses and mules lay by the hundreds where they had stalled or smothered in the mud. * * *
>
> January 22nd: The morning dawned upon as woe-begone a set of men as could be imagined. The rain was still falling, and our proud army, all drabbled with mud, still bore the peltings of the pitiless storm. An hundred and fifty thousand men were powerless, floundering in the slime. * * *
>
> On Saturday, January 24th,…[I]t was raining again. We began a march through the mud, [and…[a]fter toiling for more than two hours, making a distance of four miles, to our disgust we found we had been marching in a circle, and emerged from the woods a few hundred yards from where we started. * * *
>
> Sunday, January 25th, was a most wretched day for us. At 10 o'clock in the morning the order was received to march [back] to White Oak Church. * * * A cavalry brigade had occupied the ground in our absence, and had burned all the lumber…[and] trampled our company streets into mire…with mud and filth everywhere. Whiskey was served out, and profanity and wickedness seemed unchecked.
>
> The failure of the march caused much gloom and depression throughout the army. General disgust was expressed by all. We felt ourselves *miserable*.… Burnside's Mud-March will never be forgotten by those who participated in it. (38-40)

In fact, several of Company A's men would later complain of injuries incurred or illnesses contracted during this fateful, six-day expedition. It was the last straw for Burnside, who was sacked.

<u>Campaigns, 1863.</u> The Regiment was involved in two major eastern theater engagements during the 1863 campaign season, which, as usual, began in April with the warming spring weather. It took part in a series of battles in and around Chancellorsville (Virginia) in late April and early May, as well as the three-day clash at Gettysburg (Pennsylvania) at the beginning of July.

Directed by General Hooker, the Chancellorsville campaign was the Union effort in early 1863 to lure Lee's Confederate Army out of its entrenched positions around Fredericksburg and onto open ground, where Hooker's larger Union Army could supposedly destroy it. Situated less than ten miles west of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville - and Lee's army at the time - lay close to the 15th NJ's winter campground at White Oak Church. The 15th moved out of camp on the afternoon of April 28, crossing the Rappahannock and

preparing over the next few days of maneuver to give battle to the enemy just west of Fredericksburg. (In less than a year of war, the regiment had already been reduced by this time to about one-third of its initial strength, or around 350 “effectives”.) As several days of inconclusive skirmishes and battles gained momentum and approached a climax, the regiment was finally seriously engaged on May 3, in what became known as the Battle of Salem Church (or Salem Heights), an area of high ground along the road from Fredericksburg to Chancellorsville. Committed to action as part of the Union's VI Corps under General John Sedgewick, the 15th traded fire with the rebels early in the day, serving as cover for a Northern artillery battery, and then, toward late afternoon, was called upon to advance into an area of woods against a strong Confederate line. (52, 55, 63)

According to Bilby, the relatively inexperienced regiment held up well during the day's fighting, and never fell back, as did some other Union units. But its valor was extremely costly, the 15th NJ suffering a 47% casualty rate - its first such substantial losses.[110] Company A suffered proportionately, incurring eight casualties in the fighting. One of them was David Hicks, the 15th's Color Sergeant and a member of Company A. With the unit engulfed in a "hail of lead" laid down by the opposing Georgia regiment, he attempted to rally his comrades by "wav[ing] the flag high and dr[awing] a blizzard of bullets until his brains were spattered over his comrades…."[111] Haines eulogized Hicks as follows:

> …[H]e was chosen for his fine soldierly qualities to be the standard-bearer. He was a tall, noble-looking young man, and had endeared himself by his generosity and courage to all who knew him. When the order to advance was given, as we charged into the woods, he sprang forward at once, carrying his colors straight on until a bullet pierced his brain, and he fell clasping them in his hands. * * * When in after times Company A would gather around their camp-fires, the mention of the name of Hicks would awaken sorrowful emotions.

Private Warren Dunham, another Company A member killed that day, was similarly lauded by Haines:

> [He] was a lovely Christian youth and true soldier…. In him death chose a shining mark, and of the dead who that night peopled the woods, none were more dearly loved than he, in the little circle of his army friends. (57)

These two, Hicks and Dunham, *were the first of the company's men known for certain to have been killed in action in the war*; they died approximately nine months after leaving home. Private Peter Frey was listed as missing and "supposed dead" on the same date, and probably also expired on May 3. Five others were wounded (Corporal William Dungan, and Privates James Apgar, James Hoffman, John Kutter, and Abram Van Fleet). Apgar suffered a bad leg wound and had his leg amputated in the field; he lingered for 17 more days and died on May 20. Dungan survived a glancing gunshot wound to the left temple; Kutter a slight wound to the right hand; Hoffman a gunshot wound to the neck and jaw; and Van Fleet a "dangerous" wound to the right chest, the ball passing through him from front to back [he survived, but would be plagued throughout life with serious lung problems. (57, 63)

The afternoon's engagement at Salem Heights ended in a dearly-purchased stalemate. Both armies retired to lick their wounds, the 15th returning to White Oak Church where, according to Haines, a spirit of gloom descended over the men - and perhaps the nation in general.

> The war had occasioned great suffering, and the prospect seemed very slight for its speedy close after the battle of Chancellorsville. Death and sorrow had invaded almost every family circle, and mourning and desolation filled the land. There was for days more than the usual quiet along the banks of the Rappahannock River. (63)

In late June of 1863, after several weeks of desultory moves and countermoves, Lee put in motion his huge gamble to take the war to the north. He invaded Pennsylvania. Both great armies lurched northward from points south and southwest of Washington, warily attempting to gage each other's strengths and intentions. The federals had recently been placed under yet another new commander, General Meade.

The 15th, from its White Oak Church base-camp, made one more inconclusive foray into the Fredericksburg/Chancellorsville area in early June, and then began moving gradually north with the bulk of the Northern army. For a week in late June, the unit dallied in camp near Fairfax, just west of the capital. But at 3:00 am on the morning of June 26th, as Lee's aggressive intentions clarified, the entire VI Corps broke camp and moved out

rapidly in what would become an exhausting series of forced marches to reach Gettysburg in time for the impending clash. (Lee's objective did not become completely clear to Meade until June 30.)

The marches alone were a memorable moment in Company A's wartime saga. The first day, June 26, the men marched fifteen miles, reaching the Washington and Leesburg Pike, just south of the Potomac. The next day, June 27, they continued north, crossing the Potomac and into Maryland on a pontoon bridge near Edwards Ferry, before camping again a mile north of the river. On June 28, at sunrise, the 15th broke camp and continued marching north through Barnesville to a point a mile north of Hyattsville, Maryland, a distance of eighteen miles.

The following morning, June 29, at 4:00 am, the regiment broke camp again and marched another eighteen miles, passing through Mt. Airy and making camp near the small hamlet of "Jewsburg"[112]. At noon the next day, June 30, the 15th marched through Westminster to a point near Manchester, Maryland, about eight miles south of the Pennsylvania line.

From this last stepping off point, the regiment was first placed "in line" (men and companies side by side, in ranks facing ahead), in preparation for battle; it remained in this formation during the whole day of July 1, without moving further. As it became clear toward evening that the main encounter was shaping up further to the northwest, near Gettysburg, the 15th was rallied at 10:30 pm and undertook an amazing, *17-1/2-hour forced march of about 35 miles*, reaching the Pennsylvania town at about 3:00 pm the next day, July 2, the second day of the battle.

In all, in the six days since leaving the Fairfax, Virginia, area, Company A and the rest of the regiment had marched *more than 100 miles*, with only one day of rest, thus averaging more than twenty miles per marching day. The final 35-mile push was an especially notable accomplishment. As Haines described it:

We made no halt, excepting for a few minutes at a time, and were mostly

> without food. Only twenty-five men were reported absent from the entire brigade, and several of these came up a few hours later. This was one of the most severe marches of the campaign, and is memorable to all the men of the Sixth Corps. (80-81)

The load the men carried on the march could total as much as fifty pounds or more, almost a third of the men's average body weight.[113] With exhausting, weight-bearing treks such as these, it is small wonder that later in life - the "after time" in Haines's quaint phrase - many of the war's survivors would continue to suffer the effects of overstrained limbs and torso - especially in the prevalence of such conditions as severe leg and testicular varicosity, abdominal and inguinal hernias, and injuries from serious trip-and-fall accidents. (See Chapter 5.)

The men of the 15th arrived at Gettysburg thoroughly exhausted and sore, and soon arrayed themselves over flat ground a mile or so east of Little Round Top, a hill anchoring the Union Army's left flank. There "[s]ome began making coffee; others, divested of much of their clothing, were stretched upon the ground in almost sheer exhaustion." Very soon, however, the sound of intense musketry opened in front of them and to the left, signaling what had already begun as the day's most violent assault on the Union line: the Confederate Army's assault, under Longstreet, on Little Round Top. (84)

The wearied Sixth Corps, including the 15th NJ, was quickly formed up and "hurried forward at the double quick," with Southern artillery shells bursting overhead and "minié balls singing close to our heads." Whether because the tide of the desperate battle on the hill was already turning in the North's favor or, as Haines believed, it turned because "[o]ur forces on Little Round Top saw us coming, and it is probable the Confederates [did] also," the engagement ended before the Sixth Corps reached the front line. The 15th was then deployed in a defensive position just north of the hill, to await the next day's events.

Haines's description of the night is haunting:

> We slept on our arms in the position we had taken. In the bright moonlight…[t]he stillness seemed the more intense after the uproar and excitements of the afternoon. Hundreds of the slain lay all about us; especially were they thick on the plain, in our immediate front…. Only a few wakeful ones among us heard the moans and cries of the wounded who lay between the two lines in front. They were begging

> piteously for water, and some that they might be carried off. The sad wail broke on the night air, and every now and then it came up like the whine of a dog. A few venturesome spirits, moved by humanity, carried water in canteens, and relieved those who could be reached. (85)

The following day, the men of the 15th hugged the ground and watched as the main theater of action transferred to the center of the Union line, which lay to their right front. Shortly after 1:00 in the afternoon, Confederate General George E. Pickett, led his determined but doomed charge against Cemetery Ridge. Miraculously, despite all the Confederate shelling of the regiment's area, which "tore the trees" and "would strike the stones and make the pieces fly with great velocity," no member of the 15th NJ died that day. But sadly, one man, Company A's Isaac Cathrell (or Cathrall), received a bad shell fragment wound to the hip, and died ten days later in a Philadelphia army hospital.[114]

The aftermath of the battle was grim, and made a deep impression on the men of the company. Sergeant Paul Kuhl wrote home stating he could not find words to describe the battlefield (and may have wanted to spare his loved ones the attempt), but hoped he would "never witness another such sight". Lucien Vorhees, who worked on a burial detail, prayed that "such a stench as hovered over that battlefield may God never again give occasion for".[115]

After delaying in order to regroup and refit after the horrific fighting at Gettysburg, the Northern army gradually gave pursuit of Lee's retreating forces. The 15th NJ Regiment was part of the effort, departing the Gettysburg area on July 5, and spending the balance of the campaign year moving generally southward, but engaging in no significant battles. It crossed the Potomac River into Virginia on July 19, reaching the north central Virginia town of Warrenton by August 1. Here the regiment set up camp, remaining until September 15. Haines reported, "Our camp was kept in fine order; our rations were regularly issued; and, with general good health, the regiment recruited [recovered] after the fatigues of the early summer." Only one death occurred in the regiment during this encampment, a soldier from Company C, who died of chronic diarrhea. Overall, "We were well pleased with our location

at Warrenton, in the midst of a beautiful country, and our relations with the inhabitants were apparently of the most amicable kind."[116]

As of the end of October, the 15th NJ's "morning report" (a unit's daily listing of its members, including the fitness for duty of each) showed a total of only 386 "present for duty," or only 43% of the 896 who had originally mustered in with the regiment a little more than a year previously. The regiment had not yet received its first infusion of replacements (new recruits or draftees). A detailed breakdown of Company A's enlisted roster at the time, according to Haines (106), was as follows:

-48 present for duty

-5 sick but present

-5 detached [temporarily, for duty with a special detail or another unit]

-9 sick and absent

-4 killed or died of wounds received in action

-6 died in regimental [field] hospital

-2 died in general hospital

-1 missing in action

-6 discharged for disability

-1 promoted to officer rank

-4 transferred to "Invalid Corps" [reserve units filled with less seriously wounded or disabled men]

-1 "drummed out"

-2 deserted

After more marching to the south, and several crossings and recrossings of the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers in an area about 35 miles west of Fredericksburg, the regiment finally, on December 3, moved into winter quarters. This second winter encampment was located on the Rappahannock, about 2-1/2 miles east of Brandy Station, and was only about 30 miles west-northwest of its first winter camp at White Oak Church.

Strategically, the location was designed to allow the Union army to continue by its presence to threaten the major Confederate stronghold of Fredericksburg.

Winter, 1863-64. Bilby provides the following description of the regiment's life in camp at the start of the 1863-64 winter season:

> In winter the army became a city divided into brigade wards and regimental neighborhoods, with each company a two row block of two to four man huts. The huts were cozy affairs, with chimneys and pole frame bunks which doubled as sofas. Walls bedecked with muskets and accoutrements provided a suitably military décor. As long as he wasn't called out…winter was a good time for the Civil War soldier. Officers went on leave by order of seniority and a few lucky sergeants and corporals got to go home for a brief spell, although the privilege was not often extended to lowly privates. [The army's concern here was probably not so much the privilege of rank, but the practical concern over the temptation to desert while away from comrades and command supervision.] Food boxes from home…poured into...the Fifteenth's winter quarters. [Company A's] First Sergeant Paul Kuhl and Corporal William T. Butler feasted on boxes of hams, butter cakes, canned strawberries and other preserves sent by their families. When a box arrived for their buddy, [Company A's] Corporal James I. Bullock, who was on leave, Kuhl and Barber devoured its contents as well. Showing no hard feelings, Bullock returned with a turkey cooked by Kuhl's sister and the three soldiers feasted on it together. Clothing was also a favorite winter gift from the homefolks, and packages of warm scarves and mittens for use on the picket line, and sturdy, snowproof boots to replace government issue brogans were soon making their way southward from Jersey. * * * [On New Year's Eve], [t]he line officers of the Fifteenth held a "grand jubilee" in their tents to celebrate [and]…[t]he enlisted men received a whiskey ration so they could "with a hic wish a Happy New Year".[117]

The men's spiritual and intellectual lives also received greater attention during the long winter stand-down. The men quickly constructed a makeshift church (as they had the previous winter), and Chaplain Haines actively proselytized new Christian recruits; held regular "divine services" on Sunday, and prayer meetings three nights a week; and even arranged for the appearance of civilian and military guest ministers. (122-25) (A detailed description of the church, church services, and Haines's observations on the spiritual state of the men is provided in Chapter 4.)

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the men of the regiment also formed a debating club this winter, calling it the "Adelphi Literary Society of the Fifteenth New Jersey Volunteers," in which the men of Company A appear to have been unusually active. (Adelphi is the Greek word for "brothers".) According to Bilby, the society was greatly encouraged by "the scholarly Haines," and "drew the cream of the Fifteenth's noncommissioned officers". Records show

that three of the four NCOs most active in founding the society were Company A's Kuhl, Vorhees, and Bullock. Vorhees drafted the group's constitution and by-laws, and was described as one of the "literary lions of the regiment."

Another Company A NCO, Corporal Lemuel Hockenberg, must also have been an early member of the society. Hockenberg was killed during the following campaign season (in May of 1864), but kept a diary until he died, in which he listed the "Officers of the Adelphi Literary Society". The list shows Haines as "Pres[ident]," and lists four Company A men among the society's eight officers: Vorhees, as "Treas[urer]," Heimbolt (presumably Private Herman Heimbold, who was also killed the following summer), as "Doorkeeper," and Bullock and Barber, as members of the "Exec[utive] Com[mittee]".

As far as is known, the society steered clear of overtly political or ideological debates, which surely would have been discouraged by the regiment's commanding officer, in any event. (Fowler's replacement as regimental commander, Colonel William H. Penrose, also cautioned the men that "no discussions in praise or censure of any military man must be allowed".) The only topic known to have been formally debated was recorded by the 15th's Adjutant, Lieutenant William Halsey, who attended one of the group's meetings. It was: "Which exerts the most pernicious influence on society, the Slanderer or Flatterer."[118]

As with any army at rest, the business of prostitution soon flourished in the vicinity. Prohibited within the camp itself, some of the more enterprising sex-workers plied the outlying picket lines, where common soldiers were generally stationed alone, and beyond the direct observation of superiors. Bilby quotes from a letter written by a Company H private to a friend at home: "…[T]here is plenty of wimmin down hear [on the picket line] such as they are, mostly all black ones. It don't make eny difference to a soldier wat cinde they are."[119]

"Camp fever" once again became a problem after a few weeks of living in cramped and static conditions. Illness appeared to strike especially hard among new recruits, many of whom joined the regiment in late 1863 or early 1864. One veteran soldier noted, "[M]ost of them are on the sick list and now and then one of them gets planted [buried]." Diarrhea

returned as a serious problem, as it had been in the fall of the preceding year. In February, 1864, Colonel Penrose issued orders forbidding the use of "any water from the spring at the right of the regiment"; requiring the individual purchase, cleaning, and storage between meals of knives and forks; prohibiting the preparation of meals in soldiers' huts; and mandating the burial of all food refuse ("bones and slop"), and daily cleaning of huts and company streets. Despite these precautions, by the end of March, five members of the regiment had expired in camp. The last of these was the mysterious passing of a Company A man, Private John Slater. In Haines's account:

> John Slater, Company A, died very suddenly, Wednesday, March 30th. He seemed well, and made no complaint of being ill. He laid down on his bunk, and asked his tent-mate to wake him at drill-call. He apparently fell asleep, and when his tent-mate went to him he found him dead. (13)

But Slater's Company A comrades, in post-war affidavits made in support of his sister's pension claim, stated that the deceased had not been well "for some time," and that on the day of his death his "legs hurt" so much that he decided to go back to bed about 10:00 in the morning. The Surgeon General's report of the incident listed the cause of death as "apoplexy" (stroke, or cerebral hemorrhage), but a modern reading of Slater's reported symptoms points more toward cardiac arrest.[120]

Campaigns, 1864. After a few short and inconsequential expeditions in the early spring, the 15th NJ moved out of its winter quarters for serious campaigning on May 4. Although the men did not know it, they were heading for the worst and most deadly wartime encounters they would have, as participants in the gruesome Battles of the Wilderness and Spotsylvania Courthouse.

These battles, lasting just over a week (May 5-12), produced unprecedented suffering and death on both sides. They occurred over an area about ten miles in length, just south and west of Chancellorsville. As McPherson writes:

> From May 5 through May 12 the Army of the Potomac lost some 32,000 men killed, wounded, and missing - a total greater than for all Union armies *combined* in any previous week of the war. As anxious relatives scanned the casualty lists, a pall of gloom settled over hu8ndreds of northern communities.

> Lee's casualties had been proportionately as great - about 18,000 – and his loss of twenty of fifty-seven commanders of infantry corps, divisions, and brigades was devastating.[121]

Ulysses S. Grant had recently been appointed by Lincoln to overall command of the entire Union army (although not, strictly speaking, to direct command of its eastern element, the Army of the Potomac, which was still commanded by Meade.) The Wilderness and Spotsylvania fighting would be the first occasion on which Grant's tenacity as a military leader, and willingness to expend lives in a determined effort to break the Confederate army's will to fight, became evident. Perhaps Grant's persistence did ultimately shorten the war and bring victory to the north, but for soldiers required to carry through on Grant's ambitions – required, that is, to become expendable - this was small comfort.

The May battles pitted a main northern force of about 120,000 against Lee's Army of Virginia numbering only a little over half that number. As he often did, Lee relied on daring and rapid maneuver, exceptional subordinate officers, and, increasingly, quickly prepared and fortified defensive positions, to counter the northern advantage in manpower. After Grant and Meade initiated the contest by moving their army south across the Rapidan in the early morning hours of May 4, the battles proceeded through two main phases. The first, in which fighting erupted on May 5, took place in and around an area about five miles west of Chancellorsville, called the Wilderness, and lasted two days, ending inconclusively. On the night of May 7 and 8, both armies maneuvered quickly southeastward, to an area near the village of Spotsylvania Courthouse, about six or seven miles south of Chancellorsville. The Confederates arrived first and established a defensive line north of the village, and bloody fighting raged from May 8 through 13, as federal forces attempted repeatedly to breach and take the line, and drive the rebels from the field. (They did breach the line on several occasions, but were each time driven back by counterattacks.)

The 15th NJ was engaged more or less continually in both phases of the fighting, and was twice committed to particularly sharp and costly action, first on May 6 and 7, in the

Wilderness, and again on the campaign's pivotal - and most costly single day - May 12, at Spotsylvania's "Bloody Angle".

In the action on May 6 and 7, the 15th NJ was placed in a section of a long front line extending between the two opposing armies, centered more or less on a road called Orange Turnpike, which ran east-west through the Wilderness. Most of the worst fighting took place on either side of the regiment, and it was never directly assaulted. Sniper and picket fire, and artillery shelling, were more or less continual however, and on May 7, members of Company A were assigned the hazardous task of picket duty, inserting themselves between the Union and Confederate lines to keep track of enemy movements.[122]

The assignment took its toll that day, as pickets were constantly under fire, and at one point about noon had to flee to the rear and join up with the main body of the regiment as rebel forces made an advance.

> At that hour we saw the enemy coming. They were driving in our skirmishers, and feeling all along the line. John Brogan, Company A, was killed, and three others were wounded. The hill we held was too well strengthened to tempt them to carry it by assault, and a few shells from the battery behind us warned them off. (153)

According to Haines's list of casualties in the Wilderness campaign, eighteen Company A men were killed, wounded, or went missing during this phase of the fighting, all but one on May 7. Of these, twelve were original volunteers. (189)

On the night of May 7-8, the 15th withdrew from the line across Orange Turnpike and, along with the bulk of Meade's army, marched quickly toward Spotsylvania Courthouse by way of Chancellorsville, a distance of about ten miles.

> The heat was very great, and our men, who were much exhausted by the march and their previous exertions, kept up with difficulty. About noon we came to the front [about two miles northwest of the village of Spotsylvania Courthouse, astride Brock Road], before [in front of] the enemy and under their fire [where the regiment halted]....
>
> * * *
>
> At about 6 P.M. came the order for the Fifteenth to advance, and find out what was in the wood beyond the cleared field [in front of us]. Led by Colonel Penrose, the Fifteenth at once moved gallantly forward, charging at double quick, without firing a musket.... The enemy, too, reserved their fire. Reaching a point near their works, the formidable character of them was for the first time seen. There was a strip of marsh, and on gaining it, we were under enfilading fire [fire from the flanks rather than the front, thus able to sweep the entire advancing line] from two directions. With hideous

> yells the Confederates poured in a deadly shower of bullets. Yet, though our companies seemed to melt away, our gallant fellows plunged ahead through the soft mud. They forced their way over the fallen timbers of the abattis [wooden ramparts], until they mounted the crests of the works and fired on the foe in their own ditches. They fled before us on the immediate front, but on either side stretched their long lines. We had successfully carried the line before us - "going through it like a slug." …[But] the enemy rallied their troops by hundreds from all sides, to beat back the little remnant of a single regiment. With overpowering numbers opposed, we fell back, and all this dash, so costly to us, accomplished nothing. (158)

The unsuccessful assault had been extremely costly. In approximately twenty minutes fighting, the regiment had lost 101 killed, wounded, and missing. Company A alone lost a reported twelve, nine of whom were original volunteers. Haines describes the aftermath.

> With Dr. Hall, I was in the rear when our regiment charged, at the field hospital; we had established. We made our preparations, expecting, from what we saw, there would be many wounded to be cared for in a few minutes. We were still thus engaged…when our wounded began to come back to us. Those who could walk came in by themselves; and later, those borne in the arms of their comrades. It was a terrible thing to lay some of our best and bravest men in a long row on the blankets. Waiting their turn for the surgeon's care. Some came with body wounds, and others with arms shattered and hands dangling. * * * At 10 P.M.…I sought the regiment, that we might take off any of our stricken comrades who might yet be found. I met Orderly Sergeant Martin C. Van Gelder, of Hamburg, carried in a blanket, mortally wounded. With his hand all bloody, he seized mine, saying, " Chaplain, I am going. Tell my wife I am happy." Then we found young corporal Sandford Simmons, of Lafayette, and bore him back with a mortal wound in his breast. As I opened his blouse and shirt I said, "Dear boy, this is a very bad wound." "Yes," he replied, "I know it is; but I have made my peace with my Saviour, and it will all be well." * * * About 2 o'clock [a.m. May 9] I laid down in our field hospital, in the midst of a great thro9ng of poor, bleeding sufferers, whose moans and cries kept me awake. Van Gelder could not lie down…, his wound was bleeding, and he groaned in terrible pain all night. Sergeant Benjamin O. Scudder, Company E, lies senseless, a bullet in his brain. * * * I found a Pennsylvanian, who lay at my feet, almost touching me, dead. * * * …Sergeant Lucian A. Vorhees, Company A, was killed. He had become a subject of converting grace, and made profession of Christ while we were in camp at White Oak Church. He was a very attractive young man, of great nobleness of bearing, and esteemed as one of our best non-commissioned officers. (159-60)

The next day, May 10, the regiment was detached from the Sixth Corps and placed under the command of the Second Corps, accompanying them on a reconnaissance to the east (they were trying to locate Burnside's Ninth Corps). This costly expedition resulted in the reported loss of another twenty of the 15th's men. Later in the day, they were reunited with their own

corps, and moved to a place behind and near the center of the Union line, and held in readiness for the fighting that would come.

Both sides spent May 11 in preparation, the front line between the two armies having settled for the moment along a several-mile stretch just north and west of Spotsylvania Courthouse. Near the center of the Confederate line, a large, inverted, U-shaped salient extended north on rising ground into the area controlled by the federals. It was called the Muleshoe Salient, and its left front corner (from the rebel perspective) formed an angle. This site was to become known over the next thirty-six hours as "the Bloody Angle," and was to witness some of the most savage and horrible close-quarter fighting of the war. The Sixth Corps, including the 15th Regiment, was placed in position immediately to the northwest of the spot.

In the early morning of May 12, elements of Meade's army began assaulting the Confederate line. The Muleshoe Salient was at first taken and the rebel forces defending it driven back in rout. But as often occurred during the war, initial success was not followed by sufficient reserves of men, and soon determined rebel counterattacks drove the Union troops back to the forward edge of the salient. Here, along that edge, a terrible, slogging mêlée developed that would endure all through the long day and *until about 4 am the following morning* (May 13). Throughout, both sides made repeated, determined efforts to re-take the ground, and continued to commit additional units to the fighting, but in uncoordinated and piecemeal fashion. Haines described the 15th NJ's participation in the slaughter of May 12 as follows:

> It was approaching 10 o'clock [am] when the order was given to advance and charge. Colonel Penrose led his command with great steadiness, forbidding his men to fire a musket until they saw the enemy and every shot should tell. * * * As we emerged from the cover there was a piece of open ground to cross. Beyond this were fallen trees, making the abattis; and then the works. These were formed with a bank of earth and logs upon the top, with an opening three inches wide, through which our foes could fire with little exposure to themselves. As soon as we appeared, charging over the open plain, they poured upon us their deadly, concentrated fire. * * * For a long distance to our right the enemy's rifle-pits could be seen, and their occupants, having no attacking enemy on their front, poured an enfilading fire upon our ranks. In the short

space of time required to cross the flat, two hundred men were stretched lifeless, or helpless with wounds, upon the ground.

The Fifteenth did not falter, but dashed on through the abattis and over a portion of the breastwork, some of our number falling dead upon the other side. We captured about one hundred prisoners and a flag.... We drove out or bayoneted those who tenaciously clung to their work.

* * *

Captain Cornelius C. Shimer, Company A, was killed...being struck by a bullet in the head. A faithful officer, he was prompt in duty and never absent from his place in line.

Lieutenant George C. Justice, Company A, of whom Colonel Campbell said, "He was as brave as a lion," as he rose on the breastwork, waving his sword and shouting to his company, was shot by one of the skulking prisoners, who was in turn run through by the bayonet of a man from Company A.

* * *

The tenure of our part of the captured works was brief. An enfilading fire from each side poured into our thin ranks. The enemy from the second line of works sent a continuous shower of bullets. It was impossible to hold the captured bank so long as it was swept by works untaken. Accordingly, the men were ordered by Colonel Penrose to fall back, and when Colonel Campbell gathered his shattered [regiment] beneath the hill, scarce an hundred could be counted.

* * *

The intense musketry fire was maintained throughout the day and prolonged all night. So fierce was the incessant shower of bullets that the bodies of the dead were riddled. Great trees were cut away a few feet from the ground. The trunk of an oak - ...eighteen inches in diameter - was afterwards displayed at Washington, at the War Department Building, and at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Few localities, if any, on the broad theater of the war, witnessed greater carnage than this.[123]

Another commentator wrote:

...[A]t the "Bloody Angle" lines stood within 50 feet of each other and blazed away for hours. Bodies were shot to pieces - one was found with 80 bullets in it. So thick was the small-arms fire that an oak tree 23 inches in diameter was shredded to fiber six feet from the ground' it blew down that night.[124]

Surveying the scene after the battle, Horace Porter, one of Grant's aides, stated:

Our own killed were scattered over a large space near the "angle," while in front of the captured breastworks the enemy's dead, vastly more numerous than our own, were piled upon each other in some places four layers deep, exhibiting every ghastly phase of mutilation. ...[B]elow the mass of fast-decaying corpses, the convulsive twitching of limbs and writhing of bodies showed that there were wounded men still alive and struggling to extricate themselves from their horrid entombment.[125]

Haines concluded that, "No experience during the whole time the Fifteenth was in the service was more destructive than the half hour, from ten o'clock to half-past ten, of the morning of May 12th."

Forty bodies, or nearly one-fifth of the whole regiment, lay on the

> breastwork, in the ditch, or the open space in front. Others had crept away to expire in the woods, and others were carried to the hospital, there to have their sufferings prolonged for a few more days, and then to yield their breath.
>
> * * *
>
> Paul Kuhl, Orderly Sergeant Company A - a brother-in-law of Major Boeman - lay close by the works. He had been shot through the thigh, and had wound his handkerchief around the limb, and twisted it with his ramrod to stop the bleeding. …[I]n giving signs of life, he had made himself the mark for the enemy's bullets, with which his body was pierced again and again. He had, in his military life, given his heart to his Saviour, and was loved and respected, for his manly piety by all who knew him.[126]
>
> * * *
>
> Corporal Joseph G. Runkle, Company A, of the color guard, had his right arm pierced by bullets, and it fell paralyzed by his side. He continued to carry the colors with his other hand, until the contest ended. He died from his wounds, at the hospital in Washington, June 7th. He was a young man of more than ordinary promise, and had endeared himself to a large circle of friends. * * * While in winter quarters, he united with the army church, and took his stand with the followers of Jesus.
>
> * * *
>
> Happy are those who know war only from a distance and never tread the fields where human gore purples the soil. (180-81)

Haines put the losses of the 15th for May 12 at 151: 45 killed, 85 wounded, and 21 missing, or *more than half of the regiment* present for duty that morning. Of these 151 casualties, Company A reported a total of 25, a sixth of the regiment's total. Of the 25, 19 were original volunteers: 9 killed and 10 wounded (2 of whom, Runkle and Lemuel Hockenberg, would die from their wounds within a few days). It was by far the single worst moment in Company A's three years of war. (178-81, 189)

From May 13 to May 21, when the entire Union army withdrew from the field to maneuver southeastward toward Petersburg, the 15th was moved to various points in the line and ordered occasionally to prepare for another assault. Mercifully, the order never came. On the 13th, Chaplain Haines led a detail to bury as many of the regiment's dead as it could. "We carried eleven to a field of cleared ground and buried them, marking their graves with bits of board from cracker boxes, out of which rations were being distributed to the regiment." There was a rank-based protocol even in death, for Haines's list of the eleven buried consists entirely of officers and non-commissioned officers, and he comments that they had carried back the body of a twelfth man (also an officer), and "a few others," when "the detail was summoned to follow the regiment, and no more could be buried."[127] ([182]

Compare this burial scene to the elaborate ritual described above, in connection with the death of Andrew Courtright, and the poignant battle-field burial of Sergeant-Major Wyckoff, narrated below.)

On May 21, the 15th served as part of a rear guard covering the withdrawal of Meade's army, and after helping to repel a weak rebel advance in the afternoon, finally received orders to abandon the area for good, at 11 o'clock that evening. "We knew not what might await us in the near future, but it was a relief and joy to be moving away from the dark and bloody lines of Spotsylvania." (189)

After further maneuvering, Grant and Meade pushed southeast, beginning in mid-June. By July, they had established a 50-mile-long line, extending from a point above and to the east of Richmond to a point below and to the east of Petersburg. The war entered a new phase at this point, a morbid harbinger of wars to come: siege and trench warfare over an extended front line, accompanied by near continual artillery shelling of static positions.

Meanwhile, on the first day of June, the 15th participated with the main Union army in the sharply contested Battle of Cold Harbor, Virginia, losing an estimated 30 to 40 men killed and wounded in a late afternoon assault to take a hill occupied by rebel forces. (Cold Harbor was later regarded as one of Grant's most costly and least necessary blunders of the war.) The hasty circumstances of a particularly poignant battlefield burial were narrated by Haines shortly after this costly engagement.

> When I came again to our field hospital [on the night of June 1], I found there our young and gallant Sergeant-Major Wyckoff insensible, with a bullet in his brain. [Sergeant-Major was the senior-most enlisted position, and rank, in the entire regiment, a highly regarded role.] * * * The first look in his face and upon the wound, with the oozing brain, told me that all out endeavors were useless…. Oh, how sad my heart was as I sat on the ground beside that young fellow, and felt my helplessness to aid him. With my attendants I knelt on the ground and offered a prayer for my dying friend. * * * [Later] I…went back to the hospital. The Sergeant-Major had breathed his last. With Sergeant Kline [of Company A] and the drum corps I had a grave dug in a clear part of the woods. * * * Shells came crashing through the trees and somewhat disconcerted our work. It was again resumed and the grave completed. Summoning all our men, we carried the body to the grave. I cut some locks of hair from his head to send to friends, and a button or two from his vest as mementoes. We wrapped the corpse in a shelter tent and then in a blanket, and lowering it down covered it with cedar boughs. A few words of burial service were pronounced, and we filled the grave, putting up a

> marked headboard. Then with sad hearts we turned away from the resting-place of a soldier, whom in life we loved, and in death we honored.[128] ([205-06] This was a fairly deliberate and thoughtful burial ceremony, given the circumstances, and probably owed much to Wyckoff's extraordinary status among the regiment's enlisted ranks.)

The regiment remained engaged in the Cold Harbor area until the night of June 12-13, when it withdrew with the main Union force and headed south toward Petersburg. Reaching the north bank of the James River by June 16, the unit was loaded onto the steamer "Diamond State," and carried upriver, turning south to proceed up the Appomattox River where it joins the James, and disembarking at a town called Bermuda Hundred, only a few miles northeast of Petersburg and the Confederate lines. Here the 15th was assigned to occupy a section of the line lying south of the city. It remained there for nearly a month, making occasional forays to disrupt Confederate rail and road lines leading into Petersburg, and improving the entrenchments and breastworks. One soldier of the regiment wrote home with the following description of the latter:

> First a hundred or more of axes were at work felling the large pines, making a clatter and noise indescribable, the boys yelling to each other to look out for the trees, which came crashing down here and there, and on all sides, causing us to do some very spry dodging, it seeming almost impossible that some of us should not get crushed under the descending branches. As soon as a few logs were laid, the picks and spades were brought into play, the men working by the light of numerous little fires built along the line, altogether making a scene so picturesque that I wish Frank Leslie's artist could have transferred to his paper under the heading, "the Sixth Corps Building Breastworks at Night."[129]

During the balance of the 1864 campaign season, while the main elements of the two eastern theater armies continued to spar with one another along the Richmond-Petersburg line, the 15th NJ embarked on a somewhat different and more far-reaching adventure.

General Lee, seeking to relieve pressure on Petersburg, ordered Confederate General Jubal Early, with a force of about 10,000 men, to march north up the Shenandoah Valley, and then turn east to threaten the federal capital at Washington. Grant did not learn of the deployment until July 5, when Early's troops crossed the Potomac into Maryland. A hurried response was organized, and several units, including the 15th, were detached from the forces besieging Petersburg and rushed north to defend the capital. The 15th reached the 6th Street

wharf in Washington, by steamer, on July 12; it would not return to the Petersburg trenches for nearly five months, in early December.

From Washington, the 15th was almost immediately marched out to engage or discourage Early's force, and spent a week maneuvering in northern Virginia before returning. After a week of rest, encamped near the first Tenallytown base they had occupied in the fall of 1862, the unit in late July again departed the capital for western Maryland and the northern Shenandoah. Grant, sensing the seriousness of Early's diversionary threat and hoping to find an aggressive general able effectively to pursue and disrupt him, appointed, on August 2, famed cavalry commander Philip Sheridan, to lead what would become known as Army of the Shenandoah,

Attached to this army until December, the 15th was soon swept up in a fast-moving campaign of march and counter-march along the north-south axis of the Shenandoah Valley, punctuated by numerous skirmishes and several significant engagements. These included actions at Strasburg, Virginia, on August 15, in which Nahum Cregar, a Company A Private, was wounded by a gunshot wound to both legs, and other Company A men received less serious wounds (241); Winchester, on August 17, in which three Company A men were listed as missing, and one, James Johnson, was wounded in the arm; Opequan Creek (near Winchester), on September 19, in which three Company A man were mortally wounded (see below) and three went missing (Hardick, Welch, and White, according to Haines, none of whom was an original company volunteer); and Fisher's Hill (near Strasburg), on September 21, in which the regiment lost two killed and six wounded.

Mortally wounded on September 19th were Jacob Bryan (shot in the chest, he died later the same day in the 6th Corps Hospital); Daniel Woodruff (wounded in the upper leg); and Robert Sorter (wounded in the back). Woodruff lasted another day. According to the Company's new First Sergeant, Manuel Kline, who was "present [with him] on the Field of Battle,"

Woodruff…was wounded while in the performance of his duty near

> Winchester…, a shell striking his leg near his body and shattering it to pieces. He was taken to [the 6th Corps] Hospital at Winchester Va and died the following day September 20th 1865 [sic; the year was 1864].

Sorter lingered at the same corps hospital for nearly three weeks after being wounded, and died on October 9.

Sorter was the last of the company's original 100 men to expire during the war while still serving in the company, and was buried at a newly established "National Cemetery" in Winchester. When Company A had embarked on the Shenandoah campaign, it had already been thinned down, according to Haines, to a mere "19 Muskets". Among them, only 2 commissioned officers, no sergeants, and 3 corporals remained, and almost none of these were members of Company A's original cadre. The war was not over, but had by now taken a terrible toll. (241-266)

Fighting continued with an engagement at Cedar Creek (near Middletown, Virginia), on October 19, that was particularly bloody. The 15th lost thirteen killed, fifty-three wounded, and ten missing. Fortuitously, Company A lost no men serving with it that day, but it did suffer the loss of one its most highly respected original volunteers (word of the man's death would spread to the company almost immediately). The Company's initial organizer and Captain, Lambert Boeman, who had recently been transferred to command of the 10th New Jersey Infantry Regiment, was felled by a bullet to the "lower part of his breast". The wound, most likely to Boeman's heart, killed him instantly, according to Haines: "With a single exclamation he fell from his horse to the ground". (276) Tragically, but in a way somehow befitting a man of his evident stature and importance to the group, *Boeman thus became the very last of the company's original men to be killed on the field of battle* during the war.

Sheridan's fast-moving campaign enacted another feature that would soon become a commonplace of war, to be replicated the following spring on a larger scale by Union General Tecumseh Sherman's infamously destructive "March to the Sea" through Georgia. As Haines described it:

The Shenandoah Valley was becoming desolate by the destruction of all property that could benefit the enemy. Barns filled with grain, flour mills and hay stacks were fired, and in every direction might be seen the ascending smoke of these desolating fires. Sheridan reported, "I have destroyed 2,000 barns filled with wheat, hay and farming i9mplements; over 70 mills filled with flour and wheat, and killed not less than 3,000 sheep. (272)

The regiment was now down to only about 250 men despite the periodic infusion of recruits and transfers from disbanded units. Its level of "effectives" reporting for duty would remain at about this level, or slightly lower, through the end of the war.[130] (None of the company's 4 drafted replacements, or 36 substitutes, would reach the unit until 1865, the last year of the war.)

As the weather turned rainy and cold in November, the Army of the Shenandoah went into temporary camp near Kernstown, Virginia, five miles from Winchester. When Early's forces withdrew from the area, the 15th, along with most other elements of the army, was ordered to withdraw toward Petersburg. On December 1, it began to move, first by foot, then by train to Washington, and finally by riverboat along the Potomac and James Rivers. This was the second time the regiment had moved through the streets of the national capital (the first being the day after their arrival in August, 1862). This time, the 15th's transit through the city to the Sixth Street wharf (where its men were to board steamers) was depressingly indicative of the increasingly desperate challenge, faced by *both* sides at this late point in the war, of maintaining troop strength and checking desertions. An incredulous and clearly embittered Haines reported the experience:

> …[W]e reached Washington [by train] at mid-day, in the rain. [It had also been raining heavily on their original march through the capital.] [The train cars] were pushed through the city, no one being permitted to leave the trains until they stopped near the wharf. We were kept under guard until the steamboat *Thomas A. Morgan* was in readiness, when we embarked and went down the river, laying off opposite Alexandria until the next morning.
>
> Republics are said to be ungrateful. It is impossible not to contrast our reception when we [first] came to Washington with the treatment we now received. We were treated more as a band of convicts than as victorious troops who had saved the national capital…. No citizens cheered and hung out their flags. No President and cabinet were on the landing to bid us God-speed. Halleck's mounted provost guard [military police] – cavalrymen who never saw a battle – rode up and down, with new uniforms and drawn sabers, ordering us as though we were prisoners of war…. Any officer or man transgressing the limits assigned us was rushed upon by a horseman with naked sword or drawn pistol and ordered back. We had seen…prisoners…but never

> anticipated that we should suffer equal restraint under the shadow of the dome of the capitol. (289)

On December 6, the regiment reached its assigned place on the siege line ringing much of Petersburg, and relieved the 24th Michigan "Wolverines," taking possession of the latter's "nicely-built" quarters. Except for occasional feints, sniper fire, and shelling, the unit settled in for the winter. (292)

Winter and Spring, 1865. The 15th's winter encampment along the active siege line was not as peaceful or safe as in prior years, but the now-familiar routine of occupying semi-permanent log buildings, constructing a church for the ever-active Chaplain Haines, and catching up with mail and news from home, continued as always. In February, March, and April, 40 replacements - all privates – trickled into the company and were integrated into its ranks. (None of the 40 would be killed or wounded in action throughout the remaining few months of the war.)

On the night of March 24-25, Lee made a last effort to dislodge the encircling Union army, attacking at a point on the left of its line, in an attempt to break out and take the major federal supply depot at City Point, on the Appomattox River. The Confederate assault was repulsed after very sharp fighting in the area of "the crater" [background?] Although the 15th NJ was mobilized on the morning of March 25, and marched from its position to the point of the conflict, fighting was over by the time it arrived and it were not committed to the engagement. Lee lost 3,500 men from his already badly dispirited army, and would never again mount an offensive.

James Bullock. Meanwhile, far away at sea off Cape Hatteras on the North Carolina coast, a bizarre tragedy would take the life of the very last of Company A's original 100 volunteers to die during the war. (Unlike Boeman, this man was not to expire on the field of battle, but he nevertheless gave his life in the cause, and in "line of duty".) James J. Bullock had joined up in 1862 as a Corporal, and had risen steadily through the ranks. He was made company First Sergeant on May 29, 1864, shortly after the terrible fighting at

Spotsylvania, where his friend and the former First Sergeant, Paul Kuhl, had been killed. He was commissioned a Lieutenant on July 3 of the same year, and was transferred at that time to Company I. On February 9, 1865, he was promoted to Captain, and assigned to lead Company B.

Still suffering from wounds received at Cedar Creek the previous October, he was sent from Petersburg to convalesce at Hart's Island, New York, where he was subsequently assigned to escort new recruits being transported by coastal steamer to the front. (He unsuccessfully petitioned at this point to be returned to the 15th and the front. Ironically, his life would almost certainly have been spared had the request been granted.) On March 31, 1865, the huge "screw" (propeller-driven) passenger steamer, *General Lyon*, carrying Bullock, a contingent of 22 new recruits, and more than 550 other passengers, caught fire in a "hurricane" and heavy seas off Diamond Shoals (Cape Hatteras), en route from Wilmington, North Carolina, to Fort Monroe, Virginia. With the end of the war less than a month away, Bullock, just twenty years old - "a most worthy and excellent young man, of decided talent" - perished in the disaster, along with all but a reported 34 of the persons on board.[131]

Unaware of the loss (news of Bullock's death would not reach his comrades at the front for another week), the regiment left camp the following day, April 1, for what would be its last battle, an assault on the Confederate line southwest of the city of Petersburg. The assault was made against significant resistance on April 2, but the rebel line was carried, and its defenders fell back to a new line only a mile from the city itself. That night, Lee gave orders to abandon the city, and the withdrawal was largely accomplished by the morning of April 3, Lee's army streaming away to the west along the Appomattox River. The Union army, sensing victory at last, gave chase.

The 15th NJ, although part of the pursuing army, was detailed to serve as one of the units guarding its long supply train, and participated in no fighting or skirmishing during the pursuit. The chase ended at Appomattox Court House - about 80 miles west of Petersburg - on April 9, with Lee's formal surrender to Grant. As Haines remembered it,

"The men cheered, and all the bands of our [Sixth Corps] brigades began playing national airs in their highest strains." (309)

The war itself was not quite over, however, as further south Sherman continued to pursue Johnston's rebel forces in the Carolinas. Meantime, both sides, on April 15, received the shocking and potentially destabilizing news of President Lincoln's assassination.

> We were holding a prayer-meeting on the evening of the 15th, when, as we closed, Major Davis came in, bringing the announcement of the assassination of President Lincoln. We were horror-struck, and the deepest gloom filled our camp. Some counseled revenge upon the Confederate officers in our hands, and for a time all the kindly sentiment we were indulging toward our conquered foes was rudely swept away.
>
> * * *
>
> There were some in the Southern army who upheld the act of Booth, but the general feeling was that of its utter repudiation, and many [Confederate] officers told us that "they regretted it as deeply as ourselves". (310)

In the absence of a complete Confederate capitulation, elements of Grant's army, including the 15th, were ordered to march south from Appomattox. In North Carolina, Sherman's federal army continued to maneuver against Johnston's rebels, as no truce had been concluded between the two commanders. The regiment headed out from its camp near Burkesville, Virginia (a small railroad junction town about 50 miles southwest of Richmond), on April 23, and on April 27 crossed into North Carolina, at Danville, the southernmost point it would reach during the war. Here, news reached the men of Johnston's surrender. The war was over.

As the regiment remained in North Carolina for a few days, Haines had an opportunity to observe local conditions and inhabitants.

> …[We were in] a portion of the country hitherto untrodden by Union troops. There were squads of Confederate soldiers going to their homes, happy that the fighting was over. Many of the officers, however, carried themselves rather haughtily. The poorer classes were very friendly in their greetings, and often stood at their gates with pails and cups, to offer water to our thirsty men. The wealthy were very prompt in asking protection, and having their property guarded.
>
> The colored people were badly off. Confederate soldiers had stripped them of food to supply themselves. Their masters had little to give, and showed little pity for them, as our advance brought them freedom. Colored men and boys crowded our camps, asking for employment, and saying nothing of wages if they were only fed. Confederate money was abundant, but it would purchase little, and had almost ceased circulating. The people had felt the terrible evils of war, though the contests had not been upon their territory, and they denounced "Jeff Davis" as the author of all their

> troubles. Although they spoke min denunciation of the rebel President, they were always respectful in mentioning General Lee.
>
> The country was…hilly and broken, but not mountainous. The land seemed to be miserably cultivated, and only with the view to get the most from it for the present crop, regardless of the future.
>
> * * *
>
> The trains were crowded with officers and men of the Confederate army returning to their homes. They were generally very open in their expression of views, and our sentiments toward them were much modified by intercourse. (311)

On May 5, the 15th began its long trip home, traveling by train as far as Sutherland, Virginia (a small village just west of Petersburg), and marching the rest of the way to an encampment just outside Washington, D.C., in Hall's Hill, Virginia (four miles from Georgetown), which it reached on June 2. On the way to the capital, members of the regiment obtained passes to visit Richmond, where Haines noted, "The Richmond ladies were mostly wearing black; some, perhaps, as an expression of their sympathy for the 'lost cause'; and more, probably, mourning for relatives who had fallen in the struggle." (314)

On May 29, Haines and others also visited the scene of the calamitous fighting at the "Bloody Angle".

> All the scenes of conflict could be readily recalled on the ground where they had taken place. Nature was putting forth her most luxuriant vegetation as though she would cover the scars of war. * * * The trees were still torn with the marks of the many thousands of bullets scattered among them. The many heaps and the long, low mounds of the ditches covered over, marked the ground where Union and Confederate dead reposed. The quiet of the place was very impressive…. The graves of those whom we had buried were undisturbed, and where they had been marked the head-boards remained as we left them. (315)

On June 8, the 15th NJ joined other elements of the Army of the Potomac to participate in the Grand Review before President Andrew Johnson. According to Bilby, the regiment, which had been refurbished somewhat by supplies from the U.S. Sanitary Commission, and with new caps from the army, arose at 2 am, and by 4 am began marching from Hall's Hill "across the Long Bridge into the District of Columbia and [later] tramped up Maryland Avenue and down Pennsylvania in column of company." Once more, and for the last time, the VI Corps men were the darlings of a fickle public, who this time cheered their saviors and pelted them with flowers.[132]

Two weeks later, on June 22, 1865, all surviving original volunteers (and most other surviving members) of the 15th NJ Regiment were mustered out at Hall's Hill. A total of 341 passed out of federal service that day – a small portion the grand total of 1,871 who, by Haines's reckoning, had served with the regiment during some period of the war. Company A, according to Haines, mustered out a total of only twenty-nine men: three officers and twenty-six enlisted men (five of whom were mustered out individually from one of Washington's several hospitals, where they were then convalescing). From available records, only *fifteen* of the twenty-nine who marched in the review were among the hundred volunteers who had signed up to fight with the company nearly three years before. (316-17)

The following day, the men once again boarded trains at Union Depot, in Washington, and headed north for Trenton, New Jersey, and home. (Though discharged from federal service, the men remained under service to their home state, under the terms of their enlistment contracts.)

> …[W]e…reached Trenton at noon the next day. The ladies and citizens, upon our arrival, gave us a handsome repast and reception. The services rendered by the regiment for their country were gratefully acknowledged by several speakers. This reception was immediately followed by another given by State officials. We then had a review, and were marched to a camping place to the east of the city. The following week we were paid off, and disbanded. (316-17)

Most veterans' family members and sweethearts must have taken their own trains down from Hunterdon to the state capital, to greet their returning loved ones. Their intimate personal reunions with their men – husbands, sons, brothers, fathers, present or future fiancés, some of whom had been away for nearly three years without leave – must have been almost unbearably sweet. Now those moments can only be imagined. And when the men "disbanded," most of them probably after taking a train back to Lambertville or Flemington, there were additional "repasts and receptions," more speeches and thanks. And then, the farewells of the men themselves, to one other. The hand-clasps, the tears, the promises to stay in touch, the feelings that were – and would always remain – inarticulable.

Haines ended his 1883 account of the war and the experiences of the regiment on a hopeful, yet almost anticlimactic note. When he wrote it, he had had eighteen years to ponder the war's effects on him, and to recall that homecoming.

> The war ended. The survivors of the Fifteenth sought their homes, happy to return to citizen life. We rejoiced that the great rebellion had been crushed out, and looked forward to a glorious future for our country. With an unbroken Union was the assurance of peace and prosperity for coming generations. With such a result attained, none regretted the sacrifices we had made. The scars we carried were from honorable wounds received in behalf of a noble cause. We should share in the common blessings of our favored land, and would value them all the more because our sufferings and toil had contributed to secure them. (320)

* * *

Over the course of the company's 34 months of active duty (August, 1862 to June, 1865), attrition resulted from various causes, with some losses being made up by the periodic arrival of replacements. Causes of loss included those killed in action (KIA); those wounded in action who subsequently died (DOW, or "Died of Wounds"); those who died of disease (DOD), non-combat injury, or from "unknown" cause; those who were taken prisoner (POW),[133] those declared missing in action whose fate was never determined (MIA); deserters; those discharged for "unfitness" resulting from wound, injury or illness, or simple incompetence; and those transferred or detailed to other less actively engaged units ("reserve corps"), usually because of a disability that was not serious enough to warrant discharge but that rendered the soldier unfit for combat.[134]

The attrition of three hard years of war and winter encampment among Company A's volunteers was staggering. Of the original 100 volunteers, a total of 42 - more than two out of every five - died during the war. Twenty were killed in action (one of these, following a sharp engagement, was listed simply as missing in action and, as he was never again heard from, "supposed dead"). Fourteen succumbed to disease, primarily typhoid fever. Six died of wounds, lingering for an average of just under eleven days after being wounded (one man dying after only one day, and another, the longest lasting, after twenty-six). One man was lost in a spectacularly disastrous shipwreck off Cape Hatteras; and one died "suddenly in his

tent" of no known cause (probably stroke or heart attack). (The figure of 42 does not include the company's five deserters from its original roster, about whom virtually nothing is known. One or more of these may also have failed to survive the war.)[135]

Of the 53 Company A men who are known to have survived, 24, nearly half, were sufficiently injured in combat to be listed as wounded in action. Of these 24, only 9 eventually returned to duty; the remaining 15 were either subsequently discharged for unfitness (7), transferred to a rear area reserve corps unit and assigned other duties (3), or were still hospitalized when the war ended (4).

Of the 29 survivors who were not wounded in action, one man, who enlisted as a "drummer," was soon found to lack the requisite musical skills and was discharged for "incompetence" early in the war. 16, or more than half of the 29 non-wounded, suffered non-combat injuries or illnesses serious enough to render them unfit for front-line duty, and by war's end had either been discharged (9) or transferred to the reserve corps (7). One of these (Runyon) was reassigned to a rear unit to guard prisoners, in the course of which duty he was attacked by a prisoner trying to escape, and had several of his teeth knocked out. Another (Bulmer) fell ill while he was a prisoner in rebel hands, and was subsequently paroled and furloughed home.

Over the 34 months of their active service, the men who remained with the company from the beginning marched on foot, at an average speed of from 2 to 3 miles per hour, an estimated 2,000 miles – a sufficient speed and distance to carry them from Washington, DC, to Salt Lake City, Utah, in 100 days.[136] On one occasion, they were force-marched 35 miles in a single 17-1/2-hour period. They did all this carrying a pack, musket, ammunition, water, rations, and equipment that weighed about 50 pounds, a third or more of their average body weight. In the course of all this foot travel, sometimes at the "double-quick," their limbs, groins, and backs were all physically strained, and many of them collapsed or tripped and fell, suffering ruptures, strains, leg and testicle varicosity, and other injuries.

They marched, ate, and slept in all kinds of weather and terrain. In winter, they suffered from frostbite, and one or two in the regiment froze to death (though none, apparently, from Company A). In summer, they were beaten down by the sun, suffering heat exhaustion or much more dangerous sunstroke. When it was dry, dust rose up, filled mouths and eyes, and covered or obscured everything. It was sometimes so foggy or dark they could not make out the enemy in front of them, and occasionally opposing lines passed through each other without either knowing.

It often rained, sometimes heavily and for days, and if the men were on campaign they simply had to endure it, shivering away entire nights as they tried to sleep on cold, wet ground, their clothing soaked through. Enough rain, or a quick-thawing frost, turned dirt roads to mud deep enough to suck off a man's boot and strand a horse or mule, as demonstrated during Burnside's infamous "Mud March".

The men went three times into winter encampments, enduring the close living quarters, latrine stink, and unsanitary conditions that brought on a host of "camp diseases," including pneumonia, typhoid disease, and dysentery. They got drunk, had sex when they could, got into fist-fights, sang songs, wrote home, wept, laughed, debated, prayed, hugged each other, and sometimes went to church.

And of course, they all "saw the elephant" – the standard Civil War term for exposure to battlefield killing and death - enduring some of the worst combat American soldiers (or any soldiers) have ever experienced. They made innumerable charges against significant, defended enemy positions, sometimes repeatedly; never once did they seriously falter, although they were often forced by losses and rebel counterattacks to give up ground they had taken. During and immediately after active fighting, they saw sights, smelled smells, listened to sounds, and touched (or were touched by) things that would stay with them forever.[137]

If they were unlucky enough to be badly wounded, there was nothing immediately for the pain, and the fallen often remained on contested battlefields, without water or comfort,

for hours or even days. Treatment at the army's first line of medical defense, the regimental field hospital, was caring but primitive by modern standards. If available, laudanum (an opiate), chloroform, or alcohol were administered to relieve pain, especially if amputation, or probing for a deeply embedded minié ball or shell fragment, had to be attempted. (For more than one soldier, such wartime remedies were their introduction to a lifetime of substance abuse and addiction.) Often there was only the soldier's own fortitude against the pain - "biting the bullet" - or the merciful but dangerous serenity of shock-induced unconsciousness.

If the wound was serious enough, evacuation further to the rear, and a general hospital, awaited the soldier. The ambulance wagon ride was excruciatingly jolting, and sometimes even a layer of shock-absorbing straw was not available. The hospital itself was often merely a place to take a bit longer to die: septic, gangrenous, foul-smelling, fly-infested. (It was enough even to make healthy care-givers sick, and to traumatize the well-intentioned.[138])

When what was left of the company at last marched in review below the approving gaze of newly sworn-in President Andrew Johnson on that late spring day of 1865 - their joy no doubt tempered by the pall of Lincoln's murder six weeks earlier - the number of its “stout” volunteers still able to participate had been reduced to a mere handful, only one out of every five or six who had assembled so smartly on Flemington's parade ground so long ago, swearing to defend the Union.[139]

Writing almost two decades later, Haines insisted that "none" of these long-suffering men "regretted the sacrifices we had made," and that all now "should share in the common blessings of our favored land".

Should share, he wrote. But would they?

CHAPTER 4

WHY THEY FOUGHT

He died for the maintenance of the Union, the Constitution and the Laws.

Tombstone inscription, Sergeant-Major John F. Fowler, 15th NJ Regiment, killed December 13, 1862[140]

He was a Christian.

* * *

He is dead; yet his death was beautiful and attractive.

* * *

Sad are the desolations of war…but by such costly sacrifices as these is our country to be redeemed and saved.

Alanson Haines, eulogizing Major Lambert Boeman, October, 1864

[Bounty] money was paid to [the 15th New Jersey's] volunteers in the name of local government, and…state and federal authorities. …[T]here is little doubt that [the money] was a major determining factor in the decisions of many who joined the army in the summer of 1862.

Joseph Bilby, *Three Rousing Cheers*

In his accomplished little book, *What They Fought For, 1861-1865*, James McPherson sets out to challenge what he describes as the prevailing paradigm: the conventional wisdom that soldiers do not fight for "belief in a cause," but rather for "'primary group cohesion'…that is, solidarity with one's comrades in squad or platoon or company…."[141] With respect to the Civil War, he argues that, based on his reading of numerous soldiers' letters and diaries, ideology and political views were in fact a significant motivator for combatants on both sides. For Union soldiers, he claims, these consisted primarily in "patriotism" and "the idealism of 1861," both based on soldiers' "intense conviction…that *they* were upholding the legacy of the American Revolution." He notes as well that, although not a *primary* motivator for most northern soldiers, the issue of ending slavery was critical to some, and

grew in importance as the war continued and as Lincoln himself seemed to evolve in his thinking and proclamations on the subject.[142]

Other historians have tacked differently on the question, coming down on the side neither of ideology nor camaraderie. Gerald Linderman, for example, subsumes nearly all other possible motivations in the notion that Civil War-era soldiers, imbued with rigid Victorian ideals of character and masculinity, were motivated primarily by a desire to use the war as a test of individual *courage*.[143] Reid Mitchell finds that defending the Revolutionary War's legacy of *individual freedom* best explains soldiers' motives for fighting, whether northern or southern (the two sides simply defined "freedom," and the factors that threatened it, differently).[144] And Earl J. Hess, limiting his analysis to Civil War soldiers' motives for enduring battle and remaining on duty (as contrasted with their motives for deciding to enlist in the first place), explicitly challenges Linderman's monolithic "courage" thesis, and concludes that Civil War soldier motivation, at least at the front, resulted from a wide *range* of influences.[145]

Except with respect to Hess, there are at least three major difficulties with all such grand arguments - arguments that purport to explain the reasons members of any now-expired generation (or perhaps even members of a living one) decide to go to war, and then once there, decide to remain rather than flee in the face of the enemy, or desert. The first difficulty is that the evidence, statistically speaking, is inherently scant. McPherson states only that he reviewed an unstated number of soldiers' letters and diaries from "rich and multitudinous collections," and that "ideological motifs almost leaped from so many pages." (Wiley by contrast, speaking about his own research into soldier motives, stated that “One searches most letters and diaries in vain for soldiers’ comment on why they were in the war or for what they were fighting.”) While no doubt true in the sense meant by McPherson, how many individual soldiers' thoughts were actually represented in these pages? A hundred, a thousand, ten thousand? About *3 million* soldiers (north and south) saw some sort of military service during the war. How representative are the thoughts of those whose

writings survive and have been reviewed? Obviously, the men were never polled or interviewed about their reasons for joining up in a way that might be deemed statistically reliable today.

And what if they had been interviewed? A second difficulty with historical evidence of this sort is its inevitable subjectivity, and the possibility (probability?) that even the soldiers themselves may not have been conscious of their deepest or most compelling motivations for going to war, or would not have felt comfortable expressing them. (What if, for example, a soldier was driven largely by a desire to escape from an unhappy marital situation, or the heavy responsibilities of raising or supporting children, or tending dependent parents? What if he were in debt, or jobless, or unhappy with his life's economic prospects? What if he were simply [and somewhat naively, as it would turn out] looking for a grand adventure, anxious in fact – like Stephen Crane's fictional Henry Fleming - to "touch the great death"?[146]) Wiley appears to support the idea that, for most volunteers, motivation was complex and multifaceted, and that the deepest motivations may have laid beyond their own ken. "It seems clear…that the great bulk of volunteers responded to mixed motives, none of which was deeply felt."[147] Hess as well cautions against too monocausal an approach to the issue.

> What held these men to their work? There are as many answers to that question as there were soldiers…. The factors that kept men in line of battle were…complicated, multifaceted, and diverse…. It is impossible to demonstrate with "scientific" accuracy whether one factor was dominant. * * * All one can do is identify the recurrent themes…and construct a multilayered view…. [148]

And third, the arguments of all these scholars do not adequately distinguish between, on one hand, soldiers' motives at the home-front for volunteering to sign up, and, on the other hand, their motives on the frontline for actually engaging the enemy, volunteering as it were to "advance under fire" (or, in less dramatic circumstances, their motives at the front for merely sticking it out and not deserting). Though certainly related, these are two quite distinct decision points, actuated by different sets of motives (or perhaps by similar sets

but in very different mixes). Most scholarship conflates them, making little or no effort to distinguish between them.

The evidence generated by research for this work points strongly to three general conclusions regarding the wartime motivations of Company A's men. In some ways, the conclusions challenge the recent scholarship referred to above; in other ways, they merely tend to round out or confirm the motivational picture already painted by others, adding interpretations that can be readily harmonized with their work.

1. Consistent with the two-tiered motivational framework suggested above, two complementary but *different* sets of motives operated (a) to propel the men to enlist in the summer of 1862, and thereafter (b) to propel them into battle (and keep them at the front) over a grueling period of nearly three years. As Wiley and Hess point out, soldier's motives are at any moment multi-layered, complex, changeable, and even inconsistent. Factors that loom large in the initial decision to volunteer - a decision made far from the front lines - may recede into the background and become nearly inoperative when the same soldier finds himself and his comrades *in extremis*, frightened to near panic and struggling to survive, or finds himself back in camp, reflecting on the lethal horror of a recent engagement, and perhaps deciding whether to re-enlist, or to desert.

2. Material, or *economic,* factors weighed heavily in motivating many Company A men's first-tier decision: choosing to volunteer. These factors in turn reflected a significant degree of pre-war economic insecurity or marginality, and a high degree of both volunteer and family member willingness to take large risks to provide materially for the household. Such motivational factors have been largely omitted from recent scholarship.

A corollary of this claim is that, except in one instance, clear evidence of ideological or patriotic motivation for joining up was all but non-existent among the members of the company - though it surely operated to some extent, and some *indirect* evidence for it did emerge. (The single instance was that of Sergeant William F. Sloan, a young and unusually

competent man who was likely a strong abolitionist; what is known of his intriguing story is narrated below.)

3. With respect to motives for the men's second-tier decisions – choosing to expose themselves to lethal combat and to remain with the company till the end – the evidence of this project demonstrates that *Christian religious beliefs and practices* played a major role. Such beliefs and practices, the "revivalist" nature of which was especially well-adapted to the purpose, strongly reinforced the motivating and sustaining influence of "primary group cohesion" that has been well-documented by others. Religious factors also appear to have greatly strengthened individual soldiers' psychological adjustment to their wartime predicament. Nonetheless, such factors, like economic ones, have been almost entirely left out of contemporary scholarly analysis of soldier motivation (for reasons which are suggested below). Religious factors, of course, did not operate *universally* among the men of the company, and precise assessment of how strong or pervasive a factor religion may have been remains difficult.)

<u>The Decision to Enlist.</u> Difficulties of interpretation always confront the historian's effort to reconstitute an intellectual, emotional, or "interior" past. McPherson and others have done well in trying to recover what can be recovered, using the best evidence available, filtered as responsibly as possible through their own judgment and life experience. But applying such methods to the experience of Company A's volunteers points generally to reasons *other* than ideology, or anti-slavery sentiment, as their primary motive for joining up to fight.

Most of the literate men of Company A wrote letters during the war, and a few must have kept diaries. Unfortunately, only a handful of these documents are known to have survived. Letters of seven men are maintained in various public and private collections; portions of a letter from an eighth are quoted in Haines's regimental history.[149] Only one (partial) diary of a Company A man, Lemuel Hockenbury (or Hockenberg), is known to exist. It, and several of his letters, were found in the federal pension file opened in response to the

"dependency" claim of Hockenbery's allegedly destitute father, William, in 1880.[150] These writings are most often quotidian communications to family members or friends, often describing camp life, asking for certain scarce goods to be sent from home, or enclosing money (sent home for dependents; see discussion below). Sometimes they describe the details of marching or fighting, remarking on places traveled to and camped at, the weather, campaign conditions, etc. Occasionally, they recite the circumstances of a comrade's death or burial, intended as a comfort to his family.

But with respect to modern claims that these men felt themselves to be inheritors of an heroic, Revolutionary War legacy, or that they were fighting, at least in part, to preserve "the Union," or "freedom," there is simply no evidence in the men's writings to support such assertions. (In fact, the universal *absence* of these subjects in the men's writings creates a contrary inference: that such high-minded reasons for fighting did *not* generally motivate the men of the company, or at least the men did not feel that they did.) *None* of the surviving letters explicitly discusses either the writer's views on the war in general, or his particular motives for enlisting or soldiering on. *In not one instance* has any unambiguous statement of ideological or political motive, or position on current events, emerged from a wartime Company A writing.

The situation is the same with respect to abolitionist or anti-slavery sentiment as a motive to enlistment; evidence from the surviving letters and diary is non-existent. In fact, the slight evidence that does survive in written form may argue for quite a different conclusion: in one of his wartime letters home, written in mid-1863, Private Lemuel Hockenbury described "this soldier's life" as being "H--- [hell] for us and the horses and a Heaven for the Negroes." In context, he seems to be repeating a commonly used soldier's phrase of the time, though this is not absolutely clear. Nor is it clear how the phrase was meant by Hockenbury. It may merely have been a more or less accurate, racially-neutral, soldierly perspective (war *is* hell for soldiers and horses, and by the time he wrote the letter

the Emancipation Proclamation had been issued and northern incursions *had* succeeded, if only coincidentally, in liberating many slaves).[151]

Or, Hockenbery's phrase may have been something darker and more racially-freighted. Regular units of black troops only began to be formed in the north in mid- to late-1863, the year of his letter. New Jersey, for what seems like racist as well as political reasons, *resisted* the trend more than most other northern states, failing to supply a single black New Jersey regiment to the Union effort by war's end (most other northern states with a black population eventually did so).[152] Perhaps Hockenbery was complaining about what he saw as a "free ride" African-Americans were getting in the bloody conflict, which by 1863 had been officially declared to be at least partly for the purpose of freeing them from slavery. Or possibly he, like a fair number of his fellow white New Jerseyans, believed that racially "inferior" blacks had no business fighting alongside whites in the war, or even being freed from slavery in the first place.[153] In the end, it is impossible to tell.

William H. Sloan. But one Company A man surely was (or became) an abolition backer and active supporter of African-American rights. His wartime story merits attention at this point. William Sloan resided in the Flemington area before the war, giving his pre-war occupation as "trader" (which probably meant, in the usage of the era, salesman or merchant). At least by Hunterdon standards, he probably had a comparatively privileged and urbane upbringing, possibly including education at the town's private academy; his father, William H. Sloan, Sr., used the title "Honorable," most likely meaning that he was an attorney and judge (or possibly an elected official); his mother, Caroline Imlay, had been raised in Philadelphia. Literally fair-haired and blue-eyed (and about 5' 10" tall), Sloan must have been a highly respected young man among the company's original volunteers: only 19 years old at enlistment, he was immediately appointed (possibly elected), over many older men, to one of its four Sergeant positions.

Unfortunately Sloan, like several of his comrades, came down with numerous "camp diseases" during the unit's first winter in the field. In January of 1863, his promising army

career appeared to be over when he was found unfit for duty and discharged, according to the regimental surgeon's certificate, after suffering for more than sixty days with "Chronic Diarrhea resulting from Febris Typhoidis [typhoid fever], with evident symptoms of Phthisis Pulmonalis [tuberculosis or pneumonia)".

But the call of military life continued to beckon, and after recuperating for two years, Sloan felt ready to return to the fighting. Instead of returning to his old unit, however, Sloan now took a most unusual step. On February 18, 1865, he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the United States Army, *and volunteered to serve as one of the white officers in an African-American outfit*. The unit was Company K, 31st U.S. Colored Infantry, and Sloan served with it for nine months. The 31st USCT, as it was designated by the army ("CT" for "Colored Troops"), had been organized in April, 1864, and had been in action since the summer before, as part of a new black division in the recently-created "Army of the James". On July 30, it had even taken part in the notoriously bloody "Battle at the Crater" on the siege line encircling Richmond; one of the few major engagements of the war in which black soldiers were heavily committed. (The 31st saw fairly hard service in its 12 months of campaigning. Of the Union's total of 166 black regiments, the regiment ranked approximately twentieth in overall casualties: 51 combat deaths, and 124 deaths from disease, accident, or imprisonment. The dead included 4 of its white officers.[154])

Sloan of course did not join Company K until the final months of the war, but he did manage to see action with it. In late March of 1865 (Sloan had been with the company a little over a month), the 31st USCT was moved to the Petersburg siege line to support the general assault against that last rebel stronghold in Virginia. It was then part of the 25th Corps (which comprised one black and two white divisions) and, ironically, was initially positioned immediately to the rear of the 6th Corps (containing the 15th New Jersey), to serve as a reserve. When Lee abandoned the city on the night of April 2-3 (see Chapter 3), the 31st USCT, with Sloan accompanying it, was one of the first Union regiments to enter and raise

the flag. Later the same day, it was ordered by Grant to participate in the grand pursuit of Lee's army westward, to its final surrender at Appomattox Court House later that month.[155]

What would the men of Company A have thought, had they had any idea of the life turns their former Sergeant had taken? The significance of Sloan's experience with the 31st should not be underestimated. Black units were a novel arrangement at the time, and in many white quarters remained extremely controversial. Black Union soldiers captured by Confederates were sometimes paraded, humiliated, and/or summarily executed by their captors. Whites who volunteered for cadre duty in colored units (there were virtually no African-American officers commissioned during the war) took on more than usual risk as a result, often suffering ridicule themselves as "Nigger-lovers". In combat, blacks, as well as their white officers, were sometimes shown no quarter (this apparently occurred at the Crater, for example), and the worst documented atrocity of the war, the Confederate slaughter of surrendering Union soldiers at Fort Pillow, Tennessee, in April, 1864, was perpetrated largely against black soldiers.[156]

Sloan's active commitment to the cause of African-Americans did not end with his discharge following the war. Two years later, after rejoining the U.S. Army in June, 1867, he was posted to the Union's occupying forces at Richmond, serving there with the 11th US Infantry Regiment until October. He was then stationed with the federal Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands, in New Kent Court House (a Virginia town about 25 miles east of Richmond, on the Pamunkey River), remaining there for about a year, until September, 1868. The Freedmen's Bureau, established by act of Congress in March, 1865, was part of the War Department, and operated as a quasi-military organization commanded by a Union general (Oliver Howard). Its chief responsibilities were to protect newly-freed slaves, and facilitate their adjustment to non-slave status, Duties included the distribution of emergency clothing, medicine, and food; assistance with finding and contacting family members; and establishment of a public education system for African-Americans in the south.[157] (Sloan's career in military and government service continued

beyond this time, but not in any way known to have been connected with the cause of abolition or newly freed blacks. The balance of his story is narrated in Chapter 7.)

The evidence of Sloan's wartime and immediate post-war activities, even though not fleshed out by the historical record in as much detail as might be wished, nevertheless demonstrates a clear anti-slavery enlistment motivation for one of the company's men, at least by the last year of the war.

But as mentioned above, except for Sloan, there is virtually no evidence to support an argument that the men of Company A were otherwise strongly motivated by ideological, abolitionist, or "patriotic" sentiments in reaching their decision to join up in 1862. To the contrary, the evidence suggests that a significant impetus to the men's enlistment was the prospect of *material benefit*: bounties, regular wages, and certain other material considerations. Curiously, *none* of the four above-quoted historians of Civil War soldier motivation – McPherson, Mitchell, Linderman, and Hess – seriously or specifically addresses the possibility that economic incentives may have factored significantly into soldiers' enlistment decisions. (How far has historical scholarship come from the heyday of Marxist analysis and interpretation!) Only Wiley, in his classic work on the Civil War world of "Billy Yank," attributes general importance to economic factors (and even he acknowledges that they may at first seem "preposterous" as a motivational explanation):

> Why did the men in blue go to war? For what were they fighting? * * *
> *The economic motive influenced many*. At first thought it seems preposterous that thirteen dollars a month, the pay of infantry privates during most of the war, should be an attraction. But the first months of the war were marked by depression, and unemployment recurred periodically until 1863. Too, bounties early became part of the recruiting system and these were steadily increased…. * * *
> If soldier pay was low, so were [mid-nineteenth-century] wages in general, and army pay had a certainty and permanence rarely found in field or factory.[158] [Emphasis added.]

Of what, exactly, did the "economic motive" consist? For men signing up from New Jersey about the time the 15th was organized in 1862, it included a $100 federal bounty, a small local bounty, and a $2 signing "premium". Additionally, the state had enacted legislation under which the *wives* of married volunteers, and the *widowed mothers* of

unmarried volunteers, were paid $6 per month while the volunteer was in service (a single man with no widowed mother accrued an extra $2 per month, payable on discharge). Robert F. Stockton, New Jersey's Adjutant General at the time, calculated in 1862 that a married Private and his family would receive a total of $1,232.76 in money or other benefits (e.g., clothing and ration allowances) over the course of a three-year enlistment. This works out to just over $34 per month, 2-1/2 times the Private's base pay. (In contemporary dollars, this might amount to about $12,000 per year, which still seems low; see Part II for a discussion of the problem of converting nineteenth-century currency values into modern equivalents.)

William Gillette, preeminent historian of New Jersey's *political* life during the war period, also stressed the importance of material factors in this context.

> With wages low and jobs scarce at the start of the war, many [New Jersey] men were induced to enlist by the opportunity to receive a bounty and earn regular pay while securing other benefits. The average workingman's monthly wage came to about twelve dollars; in view of that, one soldier declared [in December, 1861], "I am fighting for neither the laws or the 'niggers,' but for 13.00 per month and board and clothes."[159]

Bilby, like Wiley and Gillette, felt that material incentives were often of controlling importance in motivating soldiers to enlist in the 15th New Jersey. In his modern unit history of the regiment, he concludes:

> While the money pledged was, by standards established later in the war, paltry, *there is little doubt that it was a major determining factor* in the decisions of many who joined the army in the summer of 1862.[160] [Emphasis added.]

Direct evidence of at least some measure of economic motivation is set forth later in the book, in Chapters 11-13. Among other topics, these chapters deal with the post-war economic hardships suffered by many of the widows and parents of Company A men who died in the war. To lay the groundwork for seeking a federal pension, these "dependent" family members (especially parents) were required to describe the financial or material benefits their deceased soldier had provided the family before and during the war until, he was killed, as well as the marginal economic circumstances in which they lived. It is clear from many of these stories that economic incentives had figured prominently in a husband's or son's enlistment decision, despite the risk of death or disability. (Wiley quotes from the

revealing 1861 letter of one Pennsylvania recruit to his wife, "It is no use for you to fret or cry about me for you know if I could have got work I wood not have left you or the children".[161])

Indirect evidence of the crucial importance of material incentives exists also in the form of the company's overall pre-war economic "profile," as developed in Chapter 7. Probably like younger men in most areas of the United States at mid-century, the bulk of the company's volunteers were farmhands, laborers, and tradesman who worked hard, were only irregularly (or seasonally) employed, and owned no property to speak of in the pre-war period. As indicated above, many of them as young adults continued to reside in the household of their parents, who usually were to some extent financially dependent on them. For some of the older men, married and with children, economic considerations could be even more pressing; if unemployed, or employed at only basic farmhand or laboring levels, it would have been increasingly difficult to make ends meet and support an often expanding brood of dependent children.

While the regiment's early historian, Alanson Haines, does *in general* attribute high-minded motives to the men who signed up as common soldiers in 1862, he is nowhere specific. The tone of his entire book is extremely respectful of the men's courage under fire, and their stoicism in the face of pain and loss. At places, he remarks on their "tenderness" and love for one another. But in virtually no passage does he attempt to distill the reasons they volunteered to fight, except in the most broad and abstract way, and he recites nothing in their own words on the subject. (On the very first pages of his history, for example, he states that, "Animated by ardent patriotism, thousands of the young men of New Jersey [were] desirous of entering the service of their country," and that "[p]atriotic citizens of the northern counties" were among them and "[n]ever was a regiment so quickly enlisted". But he offers nothing concrete to buttress these assertions.[162]) Perhaps this was simply a reflection of his own primary focus on matters spiritual – his concern for the men's earthly wellbeing and heavenly salvation. But Haines was an intelligent man, and an astute

observer and careful recorder of events. In the few places in his book where he does muse on his own understanding of the war and its objects, it seems unlikely he would have altogether omitted to mention the men's ideological perspectives if indeed they had customarily expressed any such thoughts.

It must be remembered in this context that all but five of the company's volunteers had waited out the first two campaign seasons of the war (1861 and 1862). They were not, in other words, the kind who dropped everything and rushed to enlist in the first weeks after the firing on Fort Sumter. Given the massive and increasing infusions of men that the war was requiring following its first round of inconclusive engagements, the men of Company A probably behaved like most other American men of the period, in terms of their eagerness to fight. They were neither the first to step forward: the gaily-uniformed Zouaves, carrying pocket editions of Sir Walter Scott, nor the last: the cringing conscripts, buying their way out when they could. (Although it must also be remembered that, when they *did* go, all but four of them stayed till the end, or until they were injured or sickened beyond the ability to fight, or simply killed.)

If Wiley, Gillette, and Bilby are indeed on to something important in this connection, why has most contemporary scholarship so badly missed it? At least two factors come to mind. First, most modern scholars are *personally* far removed from the kind of daily life experienced by the men who joined up from Hunterdon County in 1862. The majority of Company A's volunteers lived pre-war lives marked by hard labor and economic tenuousness. Most worked seasonally at farming or a trade, or performing unskilled labor; few enjoyed regular or reliable wage-generating employment. There was virtually no government-provided social or economic safety net. (And to jump ahead, the majority ended life in nearly the same condition, or a worse one; see Chapter 7.) These social and economic perspectives made life's calculations much different from those most make today.

Second, it remains even today more agreeable to think of soldier motivation in terms of such standard and timeless, *non-material* sentiments as duty, loyalty, courage, honor,

sacrifice, idealism. (Consider, by way of illustration, the very different notions of human motivation conjured up by such terms as "soldier of fortune," "mercenary," "substitute," or "private contractor".) Recruiters, as well as the men themselves, surely preferred to have enlistment motives commonly thought of in the prevailing language of duty and loyalty to home, community, state, and country. Few contemporaries would have dared cast the nation's “noble” and “self-sacrificing” volunteers as anything like mercenaries or soldiers of fortune - reminiscent of the infamous Hessians of their great-grandfathers' war, impelled by considerations of practicality and hard cash.

All this is not to say that patriotic or idealistic sentiments really did have little or nothing to do with the men's decisions to volunteer. In 1861, they certainly must all have felt that their dear young country had been run through the heart at Sumter, and wished this terrible southern inconstancy to be avenged. But for many, a year later, there was undoubtedly something more working on them as well: the perfectly pragmatic calculation that they would be of the greatest service to dependent family members – in other words, *to those they most loved and felt most responsible for* - by insuring a steady and predictable flow of money into household coffers, even though it required them to risk life and limb. In this sense, such acts may even be seen, and may have been seen at the time by some, as exemplars of courage and selflessness, rather than as mere "material" calculation. Whatever such acts may have been, economics was certainly an incentive to join up, and the men’s general economic circumstances certainly placed them in a condition where such incentives were more likely to achieve the intended result. These facts of life and of wartime “voluntarism” deserve to be much more credited and examined in the scholarship than they have been.

<u>The Decision to Advance Under Fire, and Stick Out the War.</u> At least one important motive for fighting the war, for continuing to brave the near-constant exposure to death that it presented, has also been largely ignored by modern scholars. That motive was the mobilizing, collectivizing, and sustaining force of religious faith: more specifically, the kind of

nineteenth-century American faith practice known as *Methodism*. The contemporary evidence that emerges from Company A's experience is *suffused* with Christian religiosity and purpose; in McPherson's words, it fairly "leap[s] from so many pages".

Of the four historians of motive mentioned above, only one, Hess, treats religion as a serious influence. To be fair, part of the problem may be that with few exceptions modern American historians of religion have themselves been reluctant to claim that their field can significantly inform historical understanding of large social, cultural, or political trends, or events such as the Civil War.[163] (A recent work by Harry A. Stout, a noted historian of religion, is an attempt to address and correct that omission; see below.[164])

McPherson does not mention religion at all in this context. Mitchell does not list it anywhere among his lengthy explication of the numerous elements motivating Union soldiers to fight for “freedom,” which runs for several pages. Indeed, in a few places in his book he does mention religious, even Christian evangelical, factors, but relegates them to a comparatively minor role, helping scattered individual soldiers deal, for example, with corpses, killing, or the threat of death.[165]

Linderman, curiously, does not mention Christian faith anywhere among the various factors he claims contributed to, or characterized, soldiers' "courage," a concept that he sees as the most useful intellectual or psychological framework for understanding the behavior of Civil War combatants. In fact, in one scarce and oblique reference to religion's influence on behavior, he seems to differentiate what he interprets as the Civil War soldier's struggle to find courage from his struggle to approach "godliness," and makes no explicit connection between the two except to state that both struggles were promoted by the profound "influence of home".[166]

Only Hess discusses religion as a major factor in motivating Civil War soldiers, especially, in his view, in sustaining them in combat. In a chapter aptly titled "Holding On," in which he focuses on various influences that he argues kept northern soldiers fighting, he ranks highly their pervasive Christian faith.

> Traditional religion…was a potent force in keeping soldiers to their work. When the war came, churches all over the North answered the call to support the cause and encourage men to join the army. * * * [Regimental] Chaplains struggled to ensure that their charges - often young and impressionable men away from home for the first time - remembered their religious upbringing and behaved accordingly. Their sermons were often filled with patriotic fervor, reminding soldiers of the righteousness of the Union cause and urging them to keep the faith until the final victory.
>
> * * *
>
> Dying in the nation's cause, which [some soldiers believed] was the Lord's cause as well, would make them martyrs.
>
> * * *
>
> Many soldiers clung desperately to thoughts of God while bullets flew over their heads and dimly seen lines of Confederates began to appear in their front. *This was the elemental role that religion played in the soldier's ability to hold on.*[167] (Emphasis added.)

While Hess seems on to something here - something he himself characterizes as "potent" and "elemental" - he neither emphasizes nor develops religion as a significant motivating factor.

It is not that religious and spiritual factors, and specifically Christian ones, have gone completely unrecognized in Civil War historiography. Two works, one by Harry S. Stout, a self-styled "moral historian" of the war, and the other by Stuart McConnell, an historian of the Grand Army of the Republic (the post-war Union veterans organization), often put such themes at the center of their arguments. Stout argues, for example, that the Civil War was *the* critical episode in American life that "transmogrified" Christian Protestantism into national patriotism, ever after our "civil religion," with its own sacred documents, icons, rituals, and messianic figure (Lincoln).[168] In a similar vein, McConnell claims that in the post-bellum period, the war became, for northern veterans, the story of a great "crusade," in which Union veterans became the "saviors" of the nation, and soldiers who had died were explicitly compared to "Christian martyrs".[169] (McConnell's claims for the post-war period are examined more fully, in the context of Company A's own GAR experiences, in Chapter 9.)

Stout's principal thesis is that both regions' intensely religious contemporary rationale for, and understanding of, the Civil War - and their consequent willingness to undergo enormous "blood sacrifice" in order to achieve victory - led inexorably to the twin

evils of "disproportionality" (capacity to accept wartime losses far out of proportion to possible gains), and "discrimination" (capacity to wage "total war" against civilians and their property, in addition to soldiers and military assets). In a word, the Civil War was not at all a "just war," by Stout's reckoning, when measured by traditional Christian moral standards and doctrine.

It is not necessary to accept Stout's thesis *in toto* in order to credit one of his central, supporting findings: war fever in the North (in the South as well) was greatly fueled by deeply-rooted Christian sentiment, and by religious leaders' use of explicitly biblical metaphors and grand narratives.

> Northern clergy…fell victim to the sheer power of patriotism following Sumter.
>
> * * *
>
> The most important moral authorities for fixing each section's redemptive mission and sacred claims were the ministers with local connections in every community.
>
> * * *
>
> In terms of national identity, the North had long adopted the rhetoric of the "New Israel" as its own. By 1861 it was deeply ingrained and as instinctual to elite opinion shapers as to ordinary men and women. The rituals of fast and thanksgiving days, begun in seventeenth-century New England…articulated what the intellectual historian Perry Miller dubbed an "American jeremiad" that spelled out America's sacred identity as a "redeemer nation" engaged in a special "covenant" with God to save the world.[170]

But Stout's work is not primarily concerned with what motivated rank and file soldiers to enlist or to fight, but with how religious motifs drove each sides' *elites* - intellectual, religious, political, military - to justify morally dubious military measures.

Picking up where historians like Hess, McConnell, and Stout leave off, it should come as no surprise that religious considerations, *and certain specifically Christian themes*, figured prominently in the mental and motivational worlds of common soldiers, north and south. The only wonder is that such considerations have not been given greater play in modern, Civil War historiography. It is worth describing a few of those religious considerations and themes in greater detail.

The Civil War, and many of the specific events that foreshadowed it, provide strong general evidence for the broad influence of Christian beliefs, symbols, and narratives on

soldiers' wartime behavior. The evidence is usually framed in terms of statements of the coming need for sacrifice and the spilling of Christian blood, always (for the North) in the cause of preserving or protecting the Union, and occasionally in the context of the great sin of slavery. Four examples illustrate the point: John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry, two (related) Civil War songs, Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, and one of Walt Whitman's wartime poems.

Less than three years before the men of Company A volunteered to enter the Union Army, the radical abolitionist, John Brown, carried out his lethal and doomed raid on the federal weapons arsenal at Harper's Ferry, Virginia. Brown naively hoped to spark a general uprising of slaves throughout the South and, not so naively, to bring national attention to the cause of abolition. The raid, capture, and subsequent trial and execution of Brown was probably the most spectacular and notorious public event of 1859, a year in which Company A's future volunteers were, on average, 21 years old (its single men averaged 17, and its married men, 25). It is therefore an event they would all have heard or read about, and probably discussed. (It is known from articles in Hunterdon's local newspapers that it was indeed a topic of public debate; see Chapter 2.)

Brown was an authentic, home-grown terrorist (or freedom fighter, depending on one's view of slavery), and a willing martyr – a religious activist who might today be labeled by some as a "Christianist" or "Christo-Fascist". Commonly perceived to be horribly misguided, Brown made no secret of what he regarded as the deep spiritual roots of his radicalism. In his address to the court on November 2, 1859, just prior to being sentenced to hang, he spoke of his motivating faith and quoted from scripture.

> This court acknowledges, as I suppose, the validity of the law of God. I see a book kissed here which I suppose to be the Bible.... * * * It teaches me...to "remember them that are in bonds as bound with them." [Hebrews 13:3[171]] I endeavored to act up to that instruction. * * * I believe that to have interfered as I have done - as I have always freely admitted I have done - in behalf of His despised poor was not wrong, but right. Now, if it is deemed necessary that I should forfeit my life for the furtherance of the ends of justice, and mingle my blood further with the blood of my children and with the blood of millions in this slave country whose rights are disregarded by wicked, cruel, and unjust enactments - I submit; so let it be done! [172]

Though possibly deranged, Brown was nevertheless perceived by some Union soldiers as an iconic figure who had attempted to right a wrong. At the start of the war, soldiers on the march created various new sets of lyrics to sing to the tune of a popular religious revival, or "camp meeting," hymn ("Glory! Glory! Hallelujah!"). One of the most widely-sung of the new lyrics was "John Brown," a combination of grim soldierly humor ("John Brown's body lies a-mould'ring in the grave,") and approving elegy ("His soul is marching on!" and "He's gone to be a soldier in the army of the Lord!"). The men of the 15th, like most northern soldiers, were quite aware of Brown's sensational act, and they more than once during the war marched through Harpers Ferry, or nearby Charleston where he had been tried and hanged. On at least one occasion, Haines reports, they even broke into singing "John Brown" as they did so.[173]

In late 1861, Boston worthy, Julia Ward Howe, composed another set of lyrics for the tune, in order, according to Wiley, "to provide a song of greater power and dignity" than the earthy "John Brown" version. She entitled the new version, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic". Howe's martial lyrics resonate with Christian images, warning that God has taken sides in the war and is "sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment seat," and that He will deal with northerners according to how they "deal with [His] contemners" (presumably southern slave-owners). The song urges the male listener to rise up swiftly, act "the hero," and "crush the [Confederate] serpent with his heel". In a final Christic and highly sentimental verse, the lyrics encourage Union soldiers to prepare to offer as great a blood sacrifice as that of Jesus: "As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free/While God is marching on".[174]

Biblical quotes and images, and warnings of God's wrath, were not of course confined to zealots, lyricists, and soldiers. President Lincoln also made frequent use of finely polished Christian motifs, especially on significant public occasions. On March 4, 1865, as the 15th NJ was temporarily standing down preparatory to its last active period in the war (the siege of

Petersburg and the resulting pursuit of Lee, in April), Lincoln gave his Second Inaugural Address at the capitol. It is widely regarded as one of Lincoln's best speeches, and he may have regarded it that way himself.[175] In its penultimate paragraph, the president assumed the tone of Old Testament prophet, frankly acknowledging in explicitly Biblical terms that "the Almighty" had given "to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense [of slavery] came." He went on to warn that even if "all the wealth piled up by the bondsman's…unrequited toil shall be sunk, and… every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword," God's judgment on Americans will be "true and righteous altogether".[176] Lincoln did not confine that terrible judgment, or the retributive loss of wealth and blood, to the South. He seemed, on behalf of all northerners, to be taking on a substantial portion of ultimate responsibility for the great American "offense," and to be calling upon his constituents, as well as their Confederate counterparts, willingly to bear God's punishment for having to abide it so long.

This would have been the most difficult message imaginable for a Union soldier (or his family) to hear. "You are fulfilling God's judgment on His people, by volunteering to shed your own blood (or by suffering the shedding of your loved one's blood), as penance for what you yourself have tolerated for so long." Most men of the 15th probably felt little or no responsibility for the institution of slavery; none of them owned a slave and, by the 1860s in Hunterdon County, probably few even knew anyone who did.[177] Mainly farmers and laborers themselves, some may have been more likely to identify to some degree with black laborers and white southern farmers, than with the elites of either region of the country whom they were much more apt to regard as directly responsible for, and as benefiting from, the "peculiar institution".[178] Lincoln's message then, had they understood it in the way suggested above, might have been interpreted as urging them to become Christ-like in their sacrifice: to be ready to shed blood, not primarily for their own sins, but for the sins of others, including their own more powerful countrymen.

Christic identification was sometimes made explicitly by cultural voices of the era. Walt Whitman, for instance, in his 1865 poem, "A Sight in Camp in the Daybreak Gray and Dim," describes a sad and silent scene outside a front line hospital tent, where three corpses are lying on stretchers, covered with blankets. The narrator gently lifts the blanket from each man's face and finds, in turn, an "elderly man so gaunt and grim," and a "sweet boy with cheeks yet blooming." He finally reaches the last corpse:

> Then to the third - a face nor child nor old, very calm, as of beautiful yellow-white ivory;
> Young man I think I know you - I think this face is the face of the Christ himself,
> Dead and divine and brother of all, and here again he lies.

Nor of course was it lost on the vast majority of the Christianized American population that Lincoln himself had been shot down on Good Friday, the traditionally observed day of Jesus's crucifixion. As Carl Sandburg noted, "Over and over again were the parallels drawn of Lincoln and Christ in blood of atonement dying for mankind, and of Lincoln having his Judas [the assassin, John Wilkes Booth] no less than Christ."[179]

It is clear as well that this old theme of Christian martyrdom was current among the men of the 15th New Jersey; Chaplain Haines sometimes employed it explicitly. On the occasion of his eulogy for the slain Major Lambert Boeman, for example, Haines stated:

> Sad are the desolations of war…but by such costly sacrifices as these is our country to be redeemed and saved. In former days the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church. God grant that the blood of our brethren who have fallen in this conflict, *holy martyrs to liberty and law*, may not be spilled in vain. (286; emphasis added.)

The war, in other words, was underlain with a deeply Christian plotline, one that would have been readily grasped by most of the men of the company, and fervently believed in by many as God's intended plan.

Operating within the general religious factors described above, the evidence also suggests that it was a particular *kind* of Christian practice and plotline that was primarily at work among the men of Company A – one that was confessional, evangelical, and, while intensely personal in one sense, was also highly public and social. It emphasized the soldier's intimate relationship with Jesus as his best hope for strength and courage in the

battlefield tests to come, and his best chance for salvation and a heavenly afterlife if things turned out badly.

What specifically is known about the religious convictions of the company's men, their actual denominational affiliations, and faith experiences? The historical record is far from complete and in many instances only suggestive, but it does provide several strong impressions. The evidence comes primarily from four discrete sources: (1) Haines's description of particular soldier's *wartime religious conduct or character* (often rendered in connection with a soldier's impending or recent demise)[180]; (2) two of the men's wartime *letters*[181]; (3) a *county church inventory* developed from a detailed 1873 county atlas (referred to above, in Chapter 1); and (4) the known religious character of the *marriage ceremony* of numerous company members, which in most cases includes (or suggests) the denomination of the presiding minister or host church.

Much of the evidence for the 15th New Jersey's religious practices and sentiments is supplied by its Regimental Chaplain, Alanson Haines, in his 1873 unit history. (This of course in itself raises the possibility of a religious-motive "bias" in attempting to evaluate the relative importance of various potential motives for the men's remaining in the fight..) In numerous references, he describes worship services and prayer meetings conducted in camp (and elsewhere); the piety and other Christian characteristics of various members of the regiment (sadly, this usually took place at the time of their deaths); burial services; and particular men's conversions or professions of faith.

Typical is an early Haines passage describing a Sunday worship service, on December 21, 1862:

> Much religious feeling prevailed among the men of the regiment. Religious meetings were held as regularly as the weather and military duties would allow. A communion service was appointed for Sabbath…but the cold was so severe we could not hold it until the afternoon, which we did around a fire in the open air. Six young men were received into the regimental church, on profession of faith in Christ.[182]

Camping in Warrenton, Virginia, late the following summer, Haines wrote:

> The church was occupied every Sabbath while we continued at Warrenton.

> On the 16th of August [1863] the 15th Regiment held a communion service in the afternoon, which was very solemn…. Twelve men were received, on profession of their faith, into the regimental church - seven of whom were baptized. * * * Evening meetings for prayer were frequently held in our camp, and were well attended…. (104)

Haines conducted a great deal of church activity during the regiment's long, 4-1/2-month second winter encampment in 1863-64, at Brandy Station, Virginia. The men had experienced much hardship and loss in their first 1-1/2 years of warfare (though worse was to come), and many seemed ready that season to focus on developing their faith. It was a culmination of sorts, and a period in the unit's life that obviously touched Haines and others deeply. The Chaplain's comments on the period are worth quoting at length:

> Divine service on the Sabbath day, and our prayer meetings had hitherto been held in the open air, as regularly as circumstances would allow. * * * We often had a fire built in cold weather, around which we gathered…. We always found this very uncomfortable. On the 17th of January, 1864, a chapel, twenty feet by thirty in size, was opened for religious services in the regiment. The timber was cut, and the logs brought, mostly by hand, for the walls. The roof was a large canvas fly…. A sheet-iron stove was…presented by the Christian Commission.[183] A goods-box furnished material for a pulpit desk. …[A] detail of volunteers…hewed out [wooden] slabs, and made seats enough to…seat one hundred and thirty worshippers. On the day of dedication three services were held, when the house was filled. Soon afterward it was resolved to floor it. * * * Trees were cut and split in the woods. …[A] detail of one hundred and fifty men brought the slabs (which had been hewn a third of a mile away) to camp upon their backs, and in two days the floor was completely laid. We lighted the house by wooden candlesticks, placed against the walls, with a tin plate behind as a reflector. One evening some of the men surprised us with a chandelier of their own construction, made of wood and tin, hanging in the centre. *This rude house of worship is associated with much of our highest enjoyment while we sojourned in this camp. It witnessed many a scene of devotion and the evident presence of the Holy Spirit, and was the spiritual birth-place of many souls*. After it was opened, services were held twice on the Sabbath, and on every evening of the week, excepting that of Wednesday, when the [Adelphi] Literary Society had the use of the building. * * * Services would be continued until tattoo [the bugle call signaling assembly of the soldiers and lowering of the flag at day's end]…the men…returning immediately afterward, for the prayer meeting. *Meetings for inquirers [those considering joining the church] were opened as the religious interest continued to spread. The spirit of prayer was poured out upon the regiment, and those who were unaffected…were greatly in the minority*. Three communion services were held here. At the first one (January 24th) two men…made public profession of their faith in Christ. At the second (March 27th), nineteen…were received…and eleven baptized.[184] At the third (May 1st), twenty more were received, six of whom were baptized. The services of May 1st, held while we were under marching orders, were largely attended. [Within a mere week, the slaughter of the Wilderness Campaign and Cold Harbor would commence.] *[One officer] said it was the most solemn administration of the sacrament [of communion] he had ever attended. Many officers and men were bathed in tears as they received the memorials of their dying Savior*.[185] * * * Out of the one hundred and thirty of the regiment, who professed Christ, many never again met at any religious service on earth.

> Before the month of May ended, two-thirds of them had been slain, or were disabled from wounds…. (123-24; emphasis added.)

If Haines's fervid narrative is to be believed, the picture is one almost of a minor "Great Awakening" among the members of the 15th New Jersey. The regiment had gone into winter quarters at the end of October with a roster (including the sick who had not been hospitalized) of about 446 men, according to Haines. One hundred and thirty "professed" members of the regiment's church thus amounts to nearly 3 men out of every 10, and there were undoubtedly many more who attended services or prayer meetings from time to time without publicly claiming "saved" status. This is a huge contingent, and Haines may be forgiven possible hyperbole in claiming that "those…unaffected [by the outpouring of prayer]…were greatly in the minority".

Indeed, it appears that worship services, prayer meetings, "inquiries," and religious discussion in general became something of a staple of camp life, particularly important after a sharp engagement. In mid-May, 1864, for example, after the worst of the Wilderness and Spotsylvania experiences, Haines recorded:

> At 1 o'clock (on May 16) we held a prayer meeting near the Gayle House, and soon after moved into the rifle pits, near the river. At night those off duty assembled and held another prayer meeting. When we raised our voices in singing, men from other regiments came in and we had quite a congregation. A number of strangers remained after the meeting for religious conversation. These services were very comforting to those who participated in them, in the midst of all our gloomy surroundings, and with hearts saddened by the many bereavements of the last few days. (184)

In the fall of 1864, following the bloody battle of Cedar Creek (Virginia), Haines conducted an impromptu evening service on the very site of the battle:

> On the Sabbath, October 23d, most of our men were on picket during the day, but at night a large fire was built, and we endeavored to hold a religious service around it. The theme of the service was, "Thoughts Suited to a Battle-field" and the text chosen was from *Gen[esis]*, xxviii, 17: "How dreadful is this place." The stretcher, which two or three used as a seat, was marked with the blood of those who had been carried on it. Within a few paces, on every side, were the new-made graves of the slain. All about, distinguishable by the light of day, were dark patches on the soil, showing where human blood had been poured out, and the fallen had breathed their last.[186]

Finally, on the very day Lee surrendered to Grant (April 9, 1865, a Sunday):

> At 7 o'clock [in the evening] the Fifteenth and Tenth Regiments were

> paraded, and…invited to attend [a ceremony], in front of brigade headquarters, to return thanks to almighty God for the happy ending of this campaign and for His goodness toward our army and country. The exercises consisted of singing the Hallelujah Chorus, reading the 96th Psalm, a short address and prayer. Then all stood up as we sang, with joyful voices, the long metre doxology, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow."[187]

As indicated in some of the above quotations, Haines considered the conversion and baptism of "unchurched" members of the regiment one of his prime tasks, and took great satisfaction in adding to his flock in the "army church". He also greatly appreciated men among the rank-and-file who encouraged religious activity, and exhibited a “pious” bearing. These themes regularly recur in his descriptions of dying or deceased soldiers. The 15th's first standard bearer, Company A Sergeant David Hicks, for example, was shot down and killed during the assault on Salem Heights, on May 9, 1863:

> When in the after times Company A would gather around their camp-fires, the mention of the name of Hicks would awaken sorrowful emotions. He was missed in our prayer meetings, and in our after endeavors to promote piety in the regiment. (57)

In praise of two other Company A men, Sergeant Paul Kuhl and Corporal Joseph Runkle (both killed at Spotsylvania Courthouse in May, 1864), Haines stated:

> [Kuhl] had, in his military life, given his young heart to his Saviour, and was loved and respected, for his manly piety, by all who knew him.
>
> * * *
>
> [Runkle] was a young man of more than ordinary promise, and had endeared himself to a large circle of friends. Feeling it his duty to enter the service of his country, no earthly consideration could dissuade him from it. While in winter quarters he united with the army church, and took his stand with the followers of Jesus. (179-80)

A few days earlier in the same summer's awful fighting, Haines had come across a mortally wounded Corporal from another of the regiment's companies (Sanford Simmons):

> As I opened his blouse and shirt I said, "Dear boy, this is a very bad wound." "Yes," he replied, "I know it is; but I have made my peace with my Saviour, and it will all be well." (159)

Later in the war, Haines cared for Joseph Moser, a young Swiss substitute who had joined Company H. Moser had been shot through the leg during the Battle of Fisher's Hill, in Winchester, Virginia. In October, 1864, he wrote Haines from the field hospital:

> Dear Chaplain: * * * I promised…to write to you.
>
> * * *
>
> [After being much neglected] I am under good treatment now, and well

> cared for, and for the remainder God will make all things well.
>
> Through all my sufferings and tribulations the Lord has comforted me. * * * He is my sole consolation now. To him I have dedicated my all. I have no will without his. His will be done, not mine. * * * My only trust is Jesus' blood. Millions have found salvation in it, and so will I. * * *
>
> I am your humble friend, Joseph Moser (265-66)

(Sadly, Moser developed severe gangrene from a secondary amputation of his leg, and soon expired.)

Aside from Haines's writings, there is little wartime evidence (either way) in Company A men's own hands, concerning their religious sentiments. Very few of their letters or diaries survive, and most simply do not directly address issues of faith. However, in one pair of extant letters that Private Martin Grassman wrote to his mother (Grassman was an unmarried man who had joined the company from Readington Township), he expressed strong religious desire. In one, dated September 16, 1862, Grassman wrote: "I don't want you to worry any about me in my absence[,] for if I live I want to live in God and if I die I want to die in God and meet you in Heaven."

That fall (the second letter is undated), Grassman wrote:

> Dear Mother - I thank you for your kind advice[.] I will try and profit by it[.] I hope that God may hear and answer prayer in my behalf[.] I live in hopes that this war will not last long but that we may all be home soon again. I would like to see you and the children and Aunt Caty and everybody else but you must trust in God in hope of a happier meeting in the eternal world when this short life shall close.

Sadly, Martin Grassman's short life closed on May 4, 1863, the result of a severe gastro-intestinal ailment. (The intriguing story of his mother, Sarah Grassman, is narrated in Chapter 12.)

About the same time, Sergeant Kuhl (the one later killed at Spotsylvania) wrote a letter to his sister in Flemington, in which he reported favorably on Haines's efforts to attract followers for the regiment's church. Commenting on the drinking and "merrymaking" that characterized the behavior of some of the recently arrived troops, he stated he hoped to return home "purified by the temptations" through which he would now have to pass.[188]

In sum, it is evident from Haines's passages and from the letters and utterances quoted above that the mental and spiritual worlds of *numerous* Company A men were suffused with Christian images and narratives, and with messages of hope and redemption. These beliefs were openly shared among the men in group religious settings, discussed (or "professed") by them to their spiritual leader, and described in their letters home. On point of death, often in breathtaking pain, these beliefs were among the most common – and often the last – thoughts uttered aloud by the dying, according to the evidence that survives.

But how many of the company's men were actually part of this intensely religious environment? Surely there were a fair number of "scoffers". And how many of the believers tended toward "Methodist" practices that emphasized the most public and confessional forms of worship and religious expression? There can be no precise answers to such questions, but some measures do exist, and it is possible to paint an overall picture that is probably quite accurate.

The detailed "Beers" county atlas published in 1873 shows one or more churches situated in nearly every village of any size. A total of 86 are depicted, over a third of which (30) are identified as Methodist Episcopal ("ME"). Although no precise, county-wide inventory of churches or church membership appears to exist for the war period a decade earlier, from Beers it can be confidently estimated that there were at least 80 or so churches spread throughout the county when the war began, and that the most numerous were Methodist Episcopal (about 35%), followed by Presbyterian (about 25%), and Baptist (about 15%). Lutheran and Dutch Reformed congregations, concentrated among the German and Dutch populations that had settled in Hunterdon's northwestern region, together accounted for only about 10% of the county's churches, by the time of the war.[189] From this gross inventory, it can be inferred that a member of the company who belonged to a church was more likely to be affiliated with a Methodist-Episcopal congregation (a 1-in-3 chance) than with any other denomination.

A useful comparative measure of both propensity for church affiliation, and of specific denominational affiliation, is the record of the men's marriage ceremony data. Of the 60 company men known to have gotten married at some point in their lives (36 before the war, 1 during it, and 23 after it; see discussion of men's marital experience in Chapter 6), data were located concerning the marriage ceremony of 48 of them. (As mentioned in Chapter 1, nearly all of the 63 original volunteers who joined the company as single men would have expected to marry at some point in their lives, but about half of them died before getting the chance.) Of the 48 cases with data, it is possible to tell the nature of the marriage proceeding – religious or civil – in 46 of them: *44 of the 46 (96%) were religious ceremonies* (determined from the fact that they were performed by a minister, and/or in a church); and only 2 were civil proceedings (determined from the fact that the officiant was identified as either a "Justice of the Peace," or simply as "Esquire"). Thus the overwhelming majority of weddings were conducted, at least nominally, as Christian rites. When the men of the company decided to marry, they (and their betrothed women) evidently placed significant value on the religious and sacramental aspects of the arrangement.

Of the 46 religious marriage ceremonies, it was possible to determine the denomination of the officiating minister, and/or church venue, in 32 cases. (In the other 14 cases, no particular church was identified, and the minister was referred to only as "Reverend" or "Minister of the Gospel".) The breakdown of the 32 identified denominations is as follows:

-Methodist/Methodist Episcopal: 11 (34.5%)

-Presbyterian: 6 (19%)

-Baptist: 5 (15.5%)

-Lutheran or Reformed (Dutch): 3 (9%)

-Church of England: 3 (9%)

-Catholic: 2 (6%)

-Protestant Episcopal: 1 (3%)

-"Protestant": 1 (3%)

The breakdown is consistent both with the county church inventory discussed above and, if adjusted for Hunterdon's particular settlement, immigration, and ethnic characteristics, with the national picture generally portrayed for this period by historians of nineteenth-century American religion. By this measure (as well as others), the faith-lives of the men and women of the company were skewed heavily toward the kind of confessional Christianity represented by the period's Methodism.

* * *

Taking the above evidence together, it can be confidently concluded that this rural group, consisting predominantly of farmers, laborers, and tradesmen, was highly "churched," and affiliated primarily with "confessing" or "witnessing" evangelical denominations: Methodist-Episcopalian and Baptist. A significant but smaller group adhered to more liturgically conservative and traditional denominations, primarily Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Reformed Dutch churches.

Combining all (probable) evangelical church members into one group (Methodist/Methodist Episcopal, Baptist, and Protestant/Protestant Episcopal), and all more traditional church members into another (Presbyterian, Lutheran/Reformed, Church of England/Episcopal, and Catholic) confirms this impression: 18 evangelicals and 14 traditionals. This evangelical bias is quite consistent with the portrait of army religious life painted by Haines, who seems clearly to have adopted "Methodist measures" in his own wartime ministry.

What were the characteristics of the peculiar form of Christianity most company A men appear to have practiced? The Methodist Episcopal (ME) Church was primarily a phenomenon of the nineteenth century. A short review of its development and tenets, and liturgical style, is important to an understanding of the prime spiritual and denominational influence at work in Company A. At mid-century, the ME Church probably most closely resembled what today would be considered an evangelical sect, described in such terms as

fundamentalist, Pentecostal, confessional, emotional, ecstatic, salvational.[190] It was also, in a perhaps typically American sense, anti-clerical and democratic.

"Methodism" appeared in the latter eighteenth century, not as a separate sect but, as its name implies, as a discipline or *method* developed by a group of Anglican church leaders (inspired particularly by England's John Wesley). Its purpose was to encourage Church of England followers to study and deepen their faith. Interested parishioners formed themselves into "Methodist Societies" that were more akin to church-affiliated Bible study groups than to a new branch of Protestantism. Brought across the Atlantic and planted in the Chesapeake Bay area before the War of Independence, a fast-growing network of these church societies split from the Britain-based Anglican Church in 1784, following the war, and formed themselves into an entirely new denomination, the Methodist Episcopal Church.[191]

Two key innovations of the ME Church in America were its encouragement of lay preaching and leadership - a practical necessity in the new, seminary-scarce republic - and itinerant preaching by ordained ministers - allowing the few available men with training to serve more congregations. Both these factors facilitated the church's rapid growth, especially in more sparsely populated, “frontier” areas. By 1820, about the time the generation of Company A men's *parents* was being born, the Methodist Episcopalians had overtaken Baptists to become the single largest denomination in America.

The ME Church was also *doctrinally* equipped for rapid expansion and broad appeal: it stressed an eclectic diversity, refused to emphasize differences in dogma or to emphasize "party names," and focused on direct personal and divine relationships and a vaguely-defined "Christian unity”. As Wesley had laid down:

> Methodists do not impose in order to their admission any opinions whatever.... [We] think and let think. One condition, and only one, is required - a real desire to save the soul. Where this is, it is enough.... ...[W]e only ask: "Is thy heart herein as my heart? If it be, give me thy hand."

Coincidentally, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, an intense spiritual movement commenced in various parts of the new nation that would, collectively, become known as the Second Great Awakening. The ME Church, already having begun to thrive and spread rapidly, adapted readily to the emotional, "revivalist" style of the movement. The denomination now extended northward along the Atlantic coast, through New Jersey and into New York and New England. Older, more staid denominations were taken by surprise, and sometimes offended. At their 1805 General Assembly, Presbyterians, for example, expressed formal disapproval of "camp-meeting" services, explaining that, "God is a God of order and not of confusion, and whatever tends to destroy the comely order of his worship is not from him." This did not deter the ME faithful, however. As one historian of religion described it:

> If Presbyterians had trouble handling the energies generated by camp meetings, Methodists did not. They were accustomed to noise and excitement and on-the-job training for their preachers. Furthermore, the theology of camp-meeting exhorters with its implicit rejection of predestination and its explicit emphasis on salvation as potentially available to all…posed no problem…. This was the gospel they had preached from the beginning.[192]

By the period leading up to the Civil War, the ME Church had done so well it was becoming mainstream, predominant, and even "bourgeois" (though that term was not yet available to describe it).

> The tide was running in…[the] direction [of evangelistic urgency], and the decades immediately preceding the Civil War witnessed the triumph of the distinctive emphases of Methodism in practically all the denominations. * * * With even Old School Presbyterians no longer untainted, it is apparent that "the Methodist age" of American Protestantism had reached maturity. * * *
>
> The "prayer meeting" or "businessman's" revival of 1857-59 [was] a symbol of how thoroughly the piety of the revivalists had become domesticated in the American scene. …[T]he revival itself was in the hands of the laity and revealed little theological sophistication. Its major feature was its thorough respectability. * * *
>
> * * *
>
> While there was much that was superficial in this…piety, its achievements were not inconsiderable. Philip Schaff, [a German visitor in 1854]…felt compelled to confess that…"the United States are by far the most religious and Christian country in the world." "Table prayer," he noted, is "almost universal," "daily family worship" is the rule "in religious circles," and church attendance is "inseparable from moral and social respectability."[193]

This was the prevailing spiritual milieu in which the young men of Company A grew up in the pre-war years. For those whose families attended Sunday service, or engaged in "table prayers" or "daily family worship" (probably a fair number), Methodism was clearly the prevailing *denominational* milieu in which they attempted to sort out their faith. The central story of Christianity's Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth, is, of course, a tale of physical suffering and painful, public death, willingly undergone for the purpose of "washing away" the sins of others, and winning eternal "salvation" for the sufferer as well as others. Few other major faith systems' master narratives are better-suited to promoting the quintessential martial value of sacrifice of self "for God and country," or to encouraging the soldier's greatest act of love, to "lay down his life for his friends".[194] [John 15:13]

Methodism was a form of Protestant religiosity that *accentuated* these aspects of Christianity, emphasizing not intellectual sophistication, but direct, personal "communion" – *human relationship* – with the divine sufferer. In compensation for death voluntarily risked for righteousness' sake, to the soldier was pledged the reward of a pleasing, lasting afterlife. Moreover, the spiritual settings that resulted in this holy contract were not, typically, solitary events; they were public, *group* rites often incorporating intense emotion, that were bound only to *strengthen* the bonds that already existed among many of the company's wartime comrades-at-arms.

All of these factors help to explain the impassioned, sentimental, and intimate nature of so many of Chaplain Haines's descriptions of worship service, conversion and baptism, and the men's dying professions of faith. Neither he, nor the soldiers, were laying it on. Their faith may have required "little theological sophistication," but it was a faith that gave the men an all-encompassing and supremely comforting means to confront death and dying. Especially in wartime, this was no small boon.

There were of course other strong motivators for wartime participation, as several of the Civil War historians mentioned above have pointed out. A sense of "duty" or "loyalty" to nation, state, or home community, combined with (or strengthened by) important self-images

of manly courage, was certainly among them. And there were instances among the company's men in which whatever motivation may have existed at the outset was finally overborne by the force of horrible events, or perhaps simply by exhaustion. A couple of the men's stories suffice as examples of these motivational experiences.

Lambert Boeman. Captain (later Major) Lambert Boeman was a substantial man, and a pillar of his home community before the war, described in one biographical sketch as "active in promoting Flemington public improvements".[195] Boeman was a local worthy in Flemington, a partner in a prominent retail business establishment, and the chief organizer of the company. He was clearly among the county's elite, and this status appears to have influenced - or at least to have been associated with – the way in which he bore himself in the war theater, especially in the presence of his men. His status also appears related to the manner in which he pursued his religious faith, and to the part his faith may have played in motivating him to go to war. Boeman was a Presbyterian, and he and his family belonged to what was probably widely regarded at the time as Flemington's "establishment" church. The congregation's large, stolid church building, which survives today, is prominently located at the north end of town at a major road intersection. It looks out on a small green which would later become the site of the Civil War monument dedicated in 18??; see Chapter 9. A peaceful cemetery, full of trees, lies behind it; Boeman and members of his family are buried there.

Before the war, Boeman had been a Mason (a member of Flemington's local chapter, the "Darcy Free and Accepted Masons"), and when he was killed a delegation from the chapter had traveled to Virginia to retrieve his body and return with it for burial. Friends of the family subscribed for a white marble monument, to mark the site at the Presbyterian cemetery where he was laid to rest.

When news of Boeman's death at the head of the 10th New Jersey reached the men of the 15th, they and Chaplain Haines quickly organized a ceremony to honor his memory and mourn his death. (As mentioned in Chapter 2, Boeman was killed on October 19, 1864, while

commanding another regiment at Cedar Creek; the ceremony took place five days later.) But in presenting the formal eulogy and choosing language to describe Boeman's "relationship with his Saviour" and his "Christian works," Haines was much more restrained and formal than he had been in so many of the death-scene descriptions he related concerning the regiment's rank-and-file (see above). It was as if he were respectfully describing a community booster among the disciples, rather than a fervent confessor on his knees in the pews:

> He was a Christian. During an intimacy of more than two years I have never seen in him anything inconsistent with his profession as a follower of Christ. Interested in every good work, he promoted it to the extent of his power. His influence and example were always exerted in opposition to those vices which are only too common in camp. (285)

Boosterism, however, even of a Christian tenor, is a thin propellant in wartime. What did motivate a man like Boeman? From the evidence provided by Haines, it was more akin to a profound sense of duty – even soldierly decorum – as well as an undoubted commitment to his men, and an understanding that wherever he went on the battlefield, he would be looked to as a model of right behavior under stress.

> A good and brave man has fallen…. * * * The soldiers in the ranks honored and loved him, and they mourn for him as for a near and dear relative….
> That he was a brave man we who have seen him in the thickest of the fight cannot doubt. When duty called, he shrank from no exposure; and while the battle raged, seemed, as a soldier said to me, "never to think of himself." He was a true patriot. * * * As you know, in the spring he was detailed on duty at Trenton, where he was relieved of the hardships of field service…yet he made application to be returned to his regiment, saying, "If there's danger to be incurred, I am ready to take my share of it."
> * * * When asked if he had any thought of resigning before his term of service expired, he replied, "Not if I am needed here." (285-86)

Here was a man for whom the mere fact of the example he knew he must set most likely served as a primary motivating factor. This in no way diminishes his personal bravery, since it could only have been from bravery that he was able to make good on his determination: to set the example that was his goal and chief desire. And somewhere in this mix of ingredients comprising courage, Boeman's men surely recognized his love for them and commitment to be with them, even if (especially when) it cost him his life. (A Mr.

Proudfit, Chaplain of the 10th New Jersey, added a story to Haines's eulogy, by way of demonstrating Boeman's readiness "to sacrifice his personal ease and comfort" on account of his men whenever circumstances required. "On the morning of the battle [in which he was killed] he left his breakfast untasted, hurrying out to see his men…, anticipating the call which everyone saw could not long be delayed." [286].)

In his ample discussion of the meaning of courage – and while asserting that tests of courage imposed a "far heavier" burden on officers than on enlisted men - Linderman nevertheless misses a crucial point. Men were not only alert to displays of manly courage on the part of their leaders, they were also highly sensitive to leaders' small acts of care and steadfastness in the face of *common* hardship, danger, or even mere inconvenience. Boeman was animated, at least in large measure, by one of the oldest and most powerful command motivations a human being can have: a leader's love for "his" men. The men of the company knew this. In losing Boeman, as Chaplain Proudfit put it, "the men…felt they had lost a…father".

John Emery. Though single and significantly younger when the war began (18 years old in April, 1861), John Emery's status in the community and company had many of the same earmarks as that of Boeman.[196] He too was an officer, and the men's regard for him is indicated by the fact that he entered service as a Private but was immediately promoted to leadership rank, possibly by election (or at least by the expressed preference) of the men themselves. Emery was already comparatively highly-educated, and "clerking" (apprenticing) in Flemington to become a lawyer when the war began. (He pursued specialized legal training and a successful legal career after the war, and was ultimately appointed a judge. This part of his story is narrated in Chapter 7.) But Emery's tour did not last long. He contracted dysentery and a disabling fever during the unit's first winter and, with a surgeon's certificate attesting his unfitness for further service, was discharged in February, 1863, less than six months from mustering in. He never returned to duty.

A biographical sketch of his later life discloses that he and his wife became "communicants of the Protestant Episcopal church, their membership being in the Church of the Redeemer, of Morristown [county seat of Morris County, New Jersey]". (It is not known where or by whom the couple was married.) It is clear that Emery's church operated in the "high" Episcopalian tradition (liturgically more formal, patterned after the Anglican Church/Church of England, from which it had evolved in the United States), and it appears that Emery became actively involved in the church's charity work and governance. Although it is ultimately impossible to assess the relationship between Emery's religious beliefs and practices, and his wartime motivation, he does not seem to have had the kind of "regimental church" experience described by Haines, that was common among the company's men.

So what did motivate Emery? It was certainly not financial inducement; his family was well-to-do by Flemington standards, and he was suitably employed at the time he enlisted. There is no evidence of any particularly faith-based reason for his actions, either in deciding to join up or in staying at the front (and, as mentioned, he did not stay long). Because of his later prominence in the legal field, several sketches of the man exist in various state and local biographical encyclopedias. All refer to his short period of service, yet none of them details his motives for serving (beyond the usual, formulaic statements, such as "[H]e decided it was his duty to march to the defense of his country's flag," and ""[A]ll personal considerations were put aside…that he might answer the call of duty and defend his country in her hour of peril"), and none comments on the nature of his service, other than to state that he was "honorably discharged" (and, in one entry, making it clear that "he was not in battle but in active service").

Emery returned to Flemington from the front and, according to one biographical essay, "resumed the study of law" under a mentoring attorney, and then entered Harvard Law School in the fall. Evidently within a few months, the attack of dysentery had been sufficiently dispelled to accommodate the continuation of Emery's law career and a move to another part of the country. Clearly, unlike Boeman (who actively sought return to the front

from his safe haven in a Trenton billet), and unlike Sloan (who became ill about the same time as Emery and was also discharged, but who later in the war sought re-commissioning in a black regiment), Emery's taste for war and the hardships of campaigning had come to an end.

This is not to demean Emery's original motives, or to question his general commitment to improving the nation and society in which he lived. (Indeed, there is every indication in his many capsule biographies that he became a man highly dedicated to public and charitable service, and active in progressive professional circles. He was a hard-working judge and prolific judicial thinker. On his death, he received encomiums from many of his colleagues.) But something there was that kept him from again putting on the uniform, and marching to war. Most likely, even in the short time that he was there, he had simply seen enough - his youthful desire to see the elephant, or touch the great death, had been satisfied. (In 5-1/2 months of active service, he had witnessed the drawn-out deaths from disease of dozens of the regiment's men; the wailings and ruined bodies of Antietam's wounded survivors and the after-stench of that "worst day of the war"; and the cold, wet folly of Burnside's Mud March. See Chapter 3). In a sense, perhaps the good that Emery accomplished later in life was his way of keeping faith with those with whom he had briefly served. Whatever the truth may be, Emery's case reminds the historian that it can also be important in this context to ask, Why did they *not* fight?

* * *

There is no way to evaluate confidently how various motivational and psychological adjustment influences *ranked* among the men of Company A, or even whether any of them *predominated* But there can be no doubt about two general conclusions. First, material incentives played a significant part in the men's initial decisions to leave home and family and go off to war (though this factor probably became less important, or disappeared altogether, as the war's length and lethality increased over the months and years that

followed). And Second, while no specific evidence was found among this group for there having been a specifically religious or faith-based incentive for joining up, it is clear that the men's religious beliefs and practices – and certain aspects of the peculiar Christian Protestantism that many of them were drawn to – did much to keep them together in the face of the war's horrors, and to reconcile them to death, even in some cases their own.

In the end, it is more useful to acknowledge that the human heart is finally unfathomable, and that, as with our sense of the divine, a good deal of the nature of men's motives for going to war will forever "pass understanding". Human art, however, can supply a *form* of understanding, one less literal and more literary. Why *do* men fight? What does, in the end, bring men to war? According to Viet Nam War novelist, Tim O'Brien, the answer to this question may be something all men "carry".

> They carried all the emotional baggage of men who might die. Grief, terror, love, longing…. They carried shameful memories. They carried the common secret of cowardice barely restrained, the instinct to run or freeze or hide…. They carried the soldier's greatest fear, which was the fear of blushing. Men killed, and died, because they were embarrassed not to. It was what had brought them to the war in the first place, nothing positive, no dreams of glory or honor, just to avoid the blush of dishonor. They died so as not to die of embarrassment. * * * It was not courage, exactly; the object was not valor. Rather, they were too frightened to be cowards.[197]

For writer, Antoine de St-Exupéry, a French combat pilot of WWII, the answer is finally a mystery, somehow bound up with love:

> You never really wondered about the imperious call that compelled you to join up. You accepted a truth which you could never translate into words, but whose self-evidence overpowered you. * * *
>
> When the wild ducks or the wild geese migrate in their season, a strange tide rises in the territories over which they sweep. As if magnetized by the great triangular flight, the barnyard fowl leap a foot or two into the air and try to fly. The call of the wild strikes them with the force of a harpoon…. All the ducks on the farm are transformed…and into those hard little heads, till now filled with humble images…there swims a sense of continental expanse, of the breadth of seas and the salt taste of the ocean wind. The duck totters…gripped by a sudden passion to perform the impossible and a sudden love whose object is a mystery.[198]

PART II

VETERANS

THE MEN WHO CAME HOME, AND THE POST-WAR LIVES THEY LED

> …[Europeans] were loud in their prophecies of the trouble which would arise on the attempt to disband the [Union] army. A million men, with arms in their hands, flushed with intoxicating victory, led by officers schooled in battle, loved and trusted, were they not ready for an adventure? Was it reasonable to believe that they would consent to disband and to go to work again at the bidding of a few men in Washington? Especially after Lincoln was dead, could the tailor from Tennessee [Andrew Johnson] direct these myriads of warriors to lay down their arms and melt away into the everyday life of citizens.
>
> Nicolay and Hay, *Life of Lincoln*, 1891

Part II describes the post-war lives of the company's surviving volunteers - who now assumed the special mantle of "veteran" - and of their immediate families. The part's six chapters are organized by topic, but their themes are intertwined and significant overlap occurs.

Chapter 5 begins Part II by telling the story of the men's post-war health and overall fitness, including especially the consequences of their war-related wounds and diseases, and their longevity and causes of death. Chapter 6 looks at veterans' family and marital experiences, and the lives of the wives who did not outlive them (the lives of Company A's many *widows* are treated in Part III). Chapter 7 deals with residence and migration patterns, and with economic issues: work, income, property accumulation, class and socio-economic mobility, and impoverishment.

Chapter 8 describes the elaborate federal pension system that grew out of the war, and the men's pervasive pension-claiming experiences. (The pension experiences of widows and other family members are taken up in Part III.) Chapter 9 narrates how some of the company's men later remembered and memorialized the war, particularly through affiliation with the era's principal post-war fraternal organization, the Grand Army of the Republic,

and the meanings they gradually came to give to their own lives as veterans. Finally, Chapter 10 details some of the serious post-war adjustment problems suffered by veterans, and their effects on the men's immediate families.

CHAPTER 5

HEALTH AND LONGEVITY

> ...I have always look upon it as a sin to be sick.
>
> Private Thomas R. Gregory

> His Physical condition from the date of his discharge to the time of his death was an emaciated, debilitated, weakened and utterly prostrated condition - his wife being compelled to labor for the support of his family, he being unable to do so….
>
> Neighbor describing Private John Butler, Sr.

American medical practice during the Civil War and the postwar period was primitive by today's standards. Even for the time, it was less developed than in Europe, where most of the era's important medical discoveries and training were taking place. With a few notable exceptions, there was little that most doctors could do in the latter half of the nineteenth century effectively to treat the horrific assaults on body and mind suffered by most Civil War combatants, and little they could do beyond alcohol and opiates even to ease their considerable chronic pain.

This chapter will first sketch the basic state of the medical arts during the period in which Company A's volunteers required doctoring. It will then describe in some detail the serious health problems the men encountered *during wartime* service, and narrate the stories of several representative soldiers: their wounds, diseases, accidental injuries, and other health mishaps. Finally, the chapter will follow the health-related experience of the company's survivors *after they returned* from war, and lived out the balance of their lives. It will describe their attempts to deal with the long-term consequences of their war conditions, and with the effects of new ailments and illnesses encountered later on. It will conclude with a discussion of the veteran's old age, longevity, and mortality, and speculate as to whether and how Company A's health conditions distinguished them from those of the Union Army as a whole, or from the contemporary American male population in general. (Medical and

health aspects of the men's probable *psychological* ailments and postwar adjustment problems are treated separately, in Chapter 10.)

There were extremely few formally trained doctors in the American colonies. Until 1765, there were no medical schools, and anyone wishing formal training was obliged to obtain it in Europe. It is estimated that at the time of Revolution, there were only about 400 physicians throughout the colonies with medical school degrees (about one for every 6,000 people). A much larger number, perhaps more than 3,500, had learned doctoring through the traditional apprentice system. Much medical service was provided by druggists or "apothecaries" who, while formally limited to compounding and selling medicines, in actuality did a great deal of diagnosing and prescribing on their own. The traditions of apprenticeship training and apothecary medical practice endured well into the nineteenth century, especially in rural areas such as Hunterdon County.[199]

The founding of the first American medical school is usually attributed to Dr. John Morgan, who, with one other faculty member, opened what would become the School of Medicine of the University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, in the fall of 1765. This was followed by establishment of similarly miniscule medical schools at New York's King's College (1767), Massachusetts' Harvard University (1783), and New Hampshire's Dartmouth College (1797). In the nineteenth century, medical schools proliferated - there were 62 more or less regularly established schools by 1876 - but they were modest ventures by contemporary standards. In 1810, a total of only about 100 students graduated from all US medical schools; in 1860, about 1,700 ; and in 1900, about 5,200.

The standardization and regulation of medical practice were also slow to progress in the newly formed republic. New Jersey, at least, was at the forefront of these efforts. The New Jersey Medical Society, one of the nation's earliest, had been founded in 1776, in New Brunswick; it adopted a standard fee schedule for doctors to charge patients, and quickly succeeded in getting the colonial legislature to enact a rather stringent law regulating the admission of apprentice doctors to practice.[200] A few years after the war, in 1792, New

Jersey passed one of the new United States' first laws requiring examination and licensing of doctors. A national medical society did not form until 1847, when the American Medical Association was founded in Philadelphia.

Generally, scholars have noted that the quality of both medical education and day-to-day medical practice remained comparatively low in the United States throughout most of the nineteenth century, despite efforts by a few to improve both. As Marks and Beatty point out, for example:

> While the [medical school] reform movement was gaining strength during the last half of the nineteenth century, it was as yet too feeble and disorganized to halt multiplication of [substandard] medical schools. There were disgraceful conditions in many schools, and unsatisfactory standards in all but a few.[201]

Another historian of medicine, John Duffy, writes:

> …[W]hile major advances were being made in chemistry, physiology, and the related medical sciences in Europe, with a few exceptions American physicians were content to concentrate upon their medical practice and, when new viewpoints were set forth, to defend traditional ideas. …[T]he caliber of medical schools was no better in the postwar years than in the early nineteenth century, and it may have been even worse. This fact, combined with the inability of physicians to deal with the major diseases, guaranteed that the medical profession would continue to be held in low esteem. * * *
>
> American medical schools contributed virtually nothing to medical research in the second half of the nineteenth century, and American medical graduates who wished to keep up with the latest in medicine were forced to study abroad. * * *
>
> [This period] witnessed a transformation in medicine and surgery. Of the changes taking place, the bacteriological revolution which made possible the conquest or control of major contagious diseases was the most significant. * * * American medicine remained relatively untouched by [this development]. Although a few physicians trained on the Continent brought back the new concept of disease, not until…the 1890s…did American medicine begin to move into the mainstream of Western medicine. * * * University, Federal, state, and municipal laboratories were [by then] springing into existence….
>
> [But] while medical discoveries were being piled one on top of another…the average American physician continued the even tenor of his ways, little concerned with what was happening in the laboratories. * * * Medical practice in the second half of the nineteenth century did not differ too greatly from that of earlier days….[202]

In broad outline, the picture of Company A veterans' health conditions emerges in two general stages: prior to 1890, and from 1890 forward. This is because pension law was significantly changed and liberalized in 1890, requiring an applicant merely to demonstrate a work-disabling condition of some kind, and no longer requiring the condition to be

connected to wartime service. The rapidly growing GAR had lobbied hard for this change in the law, and the change did, as opponents predicted, produce something of a "run" on the Pension Office.

Thus, the health picture before 1890 is based exclusively on conditions claimed either to have arisen during the war (wounds, diseases, and accidental injuries), and (usually), or to have developed into more serious problems in the postwar period, or both. A total of 48 of Company A's war survivors filed pension claims during or after the war (see Chapter 8), and 39 of them (81%) did so during this first period, as follows:

-During the war (following discharge for unfitness):	2
-Balance of 1860s (after war ended):	9
-1870s:	14
-1880s:	14

The health picture enlarges somewhat in and after 1890, as veterans were now able to submit claims for *any* work-disabling health condition, regardless of cause. (The single exception to this general rule was that the condition could not be the result of immoral behavior: "vice" or "vicious habits" in the euphemisms of the day. Such habits included the failure to remain "chaste," resulting in the veteran's contracting a "women's disease" [sexually transmitted disease], or "intemperance" [excessive alcohol consumption], resulting in alcohol-related disability. No Company A claims were rejected on these grounds.) A total of 9 additional Company veterans filed claims from 1890 forward, 6 of them in the key year of 1890 (the peak year for pension filings), and the last 3 in 1898, 1902, and 1907.

In both periods (pre- and post-1890), pensioners could at any time apply to the government for an *increase* in their award, based either on significant further deterioration of an existing pensioned condition, or the onset of a new disabling condition. Later on, veterans could obtain a pension simply on the basis of having attained age 65, subsequently lowered to age 62 (only one Company A man, William Briggs, appears to have sought a initial pension *solely* on this basis).

The pension filings of the men have provided a great deal of detailed information about their health and physical condition, both pre- and post-war. As detailed in Chapter 8 and elsewhere, the application process usually required them, or their widows or other dependents, to describe their pre-war health condition; the wound, injury, and/or disease they suffered during the war; and their post-war health and capacity for manual labor. These descriptions were almost always supported by the sworn statements of others (fellow veterans, neighbors, and employers, for example), particularly the soldiers' treating physicians. Veteran claimants were also usually required to submit periodically to government-appointed doctors' examinations, resulting in a continuing record of more-or-less comprehensive medical reports, which were accompanied in many cases by hand-made diagrams. All of these records made their way into the veteran's pension claim file.

From this source, then, it is possible to develop a fairly reliable and comprehensive picture of the general health and medical problems the veterans faced, and how the problems affected their ability to work and earn a living. They also make it possible in most cases to describe how, as wartime soldiers, they were wounded or killed in battle, accidentally injured by the stress of campaigning and camp life, or plagued by disease. Finally, it can often be determined from the records when and from what causes most of those who survived the war eventually died.

With respect to certain categories of the data, it is even possible to make general comparisons between the men of Company A and either the men of the Union Army as a whole, or the men's corresponding non-soldier cohort of nineteenth-century American males. Additionally, of course, the pension documents permit an intimate look at many individual cases among the company's men, some of whom were reduced by their wounds and diseases to exceedingly hard and poignant circumstances, and some of whom (not all) displayed remarkable resilience and courage in the face of them.

Pre-War Health and the Enlistment Examination

The health and fitness of the mostly young men who enlisted to serve with the company in August of 1862 cannot be directly ascertained in most cases, but overall is likely to have been fairly robust. As described elsewhere, the majority of them performed physically demanding labor before the war (farming, "manual labor," trades), and their weight-to-height ratios (body mass indices) as young men place almost all of them in categories that would today be considered physically quite fit. (Chapter 1)

Many subsequent pension claims contain descriptions of the veteran as "a sound and well man" before the war (e.g., Theodore Bellis); none portrays a claimant as debilitated in any significant way prior to entry into military service. This is to be expected, whether or not literally true in every case. The men were volunteering to serve, after all, and presumably wanted to be found physically qualified to do so. In at least some instances, service was most likely deemed by the enlistee and/or his family as the best strategy for economic survival. In the post-war setting, moreover, it was obviously in the claimant's interest to demonstrate a "healthy" pre-war condition, in order to contrast it with a disabled or "broken down" post-war status, so as to link the origination of any disabling condition with wartime service. This must in some instances have led to an overly confident portrayal of prewar robustness.

And although every volunteer had to submit to pre-enlistment physical examination by a doctor, these were notoriously uneven in thoroughness and lacked army-wide standardization. It is likely, however, that by time the men of Company A were examined in the second year of the war, the process had become at least a bit more rigorous. As Wiley notes, "the failure to sift out unfit men at induction…was especially true in the early part of the war". Investigations by the United States Sanitary Commission in late 1861 revealed widespread deficiencies in the enlistment examination process, with the result that "scores of weaklings," and "many men with hindering maladies, including hernia, varicose veins, tuberculosis, and syphilis," had been allowed to enter service.[203]

In the 15th New Jersey's case, the examining doctor was usually either the regiment's original Surgeon, Redford Sharp (who had previously served as Assistant Surgeon of the 6th New Jersey, in 1861), or its original Assistant Surgeon, George R. Sullivan (a highly respected physician from Flemington). There are grounds for believing that Sullivan and Sharp's examinations were particularly thorough for the time. In the case of one Company A volunteer (Theodore Bellis), for example, who later claimed to have incurred a serious testicular hernia in the course of his military service, Sullivan insisted that the man had no such condition on enlistment, since "he made special and searching digital examination with reference to Hernia" in each man's case. Another company man (Levi Runyon), claiming to have had no ailments prior to the war and to have incurred "piles" (hemorrhoids) while in the service, remembered that he was "stripped and examined by two surgeons when [he] enlisted," and that "the main surgeon of the regiment examined me, Dr. R. Sharp." A veteran later trying to prove he had had no hernia before the war (James Hoffman) testified that when he was examined for enlistment, "[o]ur clothing was entirely removed and we were pronounced sound". These descriptions of induction physicals are very different from some of those cited by Wiley, particularly in the context of female volunteers whose very sex had escaped detection during their pre-enlistment examination! One male veteran of the 95th Illinois Regiment, for example, who was later asked about such a case in his own company, stated, "When we were examined [at induction] we were not stripped. [The female enlistee and I] were examined on the same day. All that we showed was our hands and feet."[204]

However, no matter how competently performed, the state of the medical arts in the 1860s would not have enabled detection or recognition of many conditions that would otherwise have been disqualifying. Diagnostic implements such as the thermometer and stethoscope, though in existence, were not yet in common use by American doctors. The military itself may often have colluded with examining physicians in passing marginal cases, under increasingly severe wartime pressure to recruit more men for the carnage.

In Company A's case, there is only a single documented instance of pre-war disability that the volunteer evidently withheld or hid from the examining official when he entered service. Theodore Stryker, who was born about 1834, enlisted with the company at age 27. (In fact, Stryker's veracity was never very reliable; he alleged at the time that he was single when he was in fact married; see a fuller description of Stryker's fascinating and confusing life is set forth in Chapter 15.) He had served in the army before the war, from 1855 to 1856, when he was discharged for unfitness, and pensioned (he suffered a hernia while on duty). Stryker seems not to have mentioned this period of pre-war service, *or his preexisting hernia*, when he reenlisted in 1862. After serving through one season's campaign, in 1863, he was transferred early in 1864 to a non-combat unit and soon discharged again for hernia-related unfitness. The army surgeon who examined him at the time apparently took a dim view of Stryker's various and conflicting versions of past events, and noted on his discharge certificate that his medical situation was "not a case for pension". (He managed to obtain one later on, in any event.)

There is also the matter of the mysterious, mid-war death of John Slater, who simply lay down one morning in his tent and was later found "under the covers," dead. Slater had been feeling poorly for "some time," and said his "legs hurt" when he awoke on the morning of his death, March 30, 1864. The official cause of death was "apoplexy" (cerebral hemorrhage), but later affidavits of two comrades stated that Slater had not been feeling well for some time. One may speculate as to how healthy Slater had actually been on enlistment, and on whether the condition that
did cause his death could even have been diagnosed in 1862. He was only about 20
when he died.

Wartime Wounds, Diseases, and Accidental Injuries.

Generally speaking, the doctors who treated the Union Army's soldiers "represented a cross-section of American medicine, ranging from very able individuals to virtual quacks,"

and "sick soldiers received at least as good medical attention as they would have had in civilian life".[205] In the field, most soldiers were treated by their own regimental surgeons, who were appointed by their respective state governors and were considered part of the regiment's officer staff. (In practice, these surgeons were usually well-known doctors with practices in the region from which the regiment was raised, selected by the regimental colonel.) In the general army hospitals, soldiers would be seen primarily by "contract surgeons," civilians hired by the military for hospital duty. (The army's regular surgeons served in federal regiments, or performed staff work.)

Neither North nor South had entered the war with adequate medical personnel, supplies, or organization, and the treatment of wounded and ill soldiers during the war's first year, according to Duffy, was "atrocious". This situation had improved somewhat by the time the 15th New Jersey reached the front in the fall of 1862. Logistics were in place; a field, division, and general hospital system had been organized; ambulance wagons and recovery of the wounded enhanced chances of surviving battlefield wounds; and a nursing corps was slowly emerging.

The war had a profound impact on the health of Company A's volunteers. (See Chapter 2.) Of 99 reporting for duty at the front in 1862, 42 died during the next 34 months, and most who survived returned home suffering from wounds, various injuries or other disabling conditions, and/or diseases (approximately 46 of the 54 men known to have survived the war). A scant 5 of the company's original men are known to have come back from the war with no recorded illness, wound, or serious injury.

Projectile Wounds. A total of 49 men - *half of those who reached the front* - were struck or grazed by a projectile at some point during the war, some of them multiple times. The records contain at least some specific information regarding each of the 49, either the type of projectile involved (32 cases), or the part of the body struck (29 cases), or both items of data. With respect to type of projectile, the men's combat wounds were caused overwhelmingly by gunshot (30 of the 32 known cases), and to a much lower extent by canon

fire (2 cases). The ratio of gunshot to canon fire wounds was therefore 94%% for all known Company A cases, which is identical to the overall ratio of 94% reported for all Civil War wounds.[206]

Gunshot wounds were the result of being struck with a bullet or "ball" fired from a rifle or musket, the projectile composed of soft lead and measuring from about 9/16th to 11/16th inches in diameter. (Specifically, the most-commonly used Civil War rifles and muskets utilized rounds that measured from 0.58 to 0.69 caliber, or 58 to 69/100ths of an inch in diameter. Such rounds were thus heavier, slower, and larger than ammunition typically used by today's armies, and could cause horrendous wounds to flesh and bone. As one historian of medicine put it:

> Unlike the present-day steel-jacketed bullets…, [l]ow velocity and a tendency for the [Civil War] bullet to flatten on contact meant instead of neatly zipping though the body…it often lodged in the tissue, made a larger wound, and usually caused infection by carrying in with it bits of skin and clothing. On impact, the Minie bullet not infrequently shattered a large part of any bone it encountered.[207]

The men were most vulnerable to being wounded by gunshot when advancing in the open against an enemy line of soldiers in fortified or protected positions, a favored - but extremely costly - infantry tactic of the period.[208] They may also occasionally have been struck by enemy "sharpshooters" (snipers), often using larger-bore, longer-range weapons, firing without warning from concealed positions. Casualties from sharpshooters were often incurred while men served as "pickets" or scouts (deployed singly ahead of an army's main line, in order to keep track and warn of enemy movements).

Cannon (artillery) fire was also a lethal battlefield menace. These weapons could accurately hurl cannonballs weighing from 3 to 24 lbs. (and from 3 to 4.62" in diameter), for distances of up to 3,000 feet (nearly 6/10th of a mile). Canon-fired projectiles were of various types: solid shot; "shells" (hollow balls with an explosive charge inside); and "canister" rounds containing many smaller projectiles or musket balls. Fuses on the exploding shells would ignite the powder after the balls were fired, the subsequent explosion blowing the ball's shell into small, jagged pieces (shell fragments or "shrapnel"). These in turn, though not traveling

great distances, could decapitate, truncate, or otherwise maim any human being within their "killing radius". Solid shot (or an unexploded shell) acted as a huge musket ball, cutting a narrow but deadly swath through rank and file. At close-range against advancing infantry, artillerymen often fired "grape shot," a charge made up of small round projectiles (or nails, chain, or metal scraps), which had the effect of many, short-range muskets fired at once in a concentrated area.[209]

As is obvious from this description, the battlefield environment of the Civil War soldier was psychologically harrowing, and extremely lethal. Men wore no helmets, protective vests, or other body armor, and their chances of receiving battlefield medical support if wounded, or even timely evacuation, were slim.

In the case of Company A's 49 men who were struck by projectiles, 19 died on the battlefield more or less immediately (39%), and were listed on the company roster as killed in action ("KIA"). Another 7 (14%) died of wounds ("DOW") after being evacuated, all but one in less than a month's time. The lethality rate for the 49 men who were at some point struck by a projectile was therefore extremely high. Combining those killed outright with those who subsequently died of wounds produces a figure of 26 dead, or *more than half* of all those struck.

With respect to the wounded (who did not die outright), the 6 who survived for less than a month averaged only about 2 weeks (13.67 days), the shortest time being 1 day and the longest being 26. Most of these died of quickly spreading systemic infection, or gangrene - the much feared "hospital disease" - some after suffering through the ordeal of one or more amputations.[210] The seventh man hung on for the exceptionally long period of 130 days, or just over four months. Twenty-three other men who were wounded survived their wounds, and returned home after the war. (These were listed on the company roster as wounded in action - "WIA".) This results in a death-from-wounds rate of 23%, among the men who did not die outright from being struck (7 men died out of 30 wounded). This rate is almost 2/3rds higher than the 14% DOW rate reported by McPherson and others for all Union soldiers.[211]

How were the men wounded? For each of the 23 wounded men who survived the war, pension or other records indicate how they were wounded (gunshot or shell), and either the general or specific area of the body that was penetrated or grazed. In many cases medical boards have left drawings of the actual wound site or sites, and in some cases even marked the supposed trajectory of the ball or shrapnel involved. The record is less complete for the 26 men who were either killed on the battlefield (19) or later died of wounds (7), but some information remains as to some of them. Nine of the 26 are known to have died from single or multiple gunshot wounds, and none from canon fire. Of these nine, it is recorded that two died of leg wounds, two from head shots, and one each from a back, arm, or trunk wound. (The body area involved in the two remaining gunshot deaths is not known.)

The evidence that remains suggests that gunshot was not only the more prevalent mechanism of injury and/or death for the men of Company A (30 of the 32 men whose injuries are described in the record), but also the more lethal. Both of the 2 men struck by shell fragments survived their wounds. It is possible, however, that artillery shelling actually accounted for a slightly higher proportion of the company's 49 men who were struck, and a higher portion of those who died. Being hit at close-range with shell fragments from an exploding cannonball, or by an entire unexploded ball or solid shot, would very likely have killed and probably obliterated the victim, and may have accounted for some of the 13 KIAs (or MIAs) for whom no details of death survive.

The men were struck in every area of the body. The records permit more or less detailed tabulation in the cases of the 28 men whose wound areas are known (some of the 28 received multiple wounds, or a single projectile struck more than one part of the body):

-Head wounds, including "temple" (1), "brains," and "neck and jaw" (1):	3
-Trunk or torso wounds, including "chest" (1), "breast," (1), "lower chest" (1), "side of body," (1) and "back" (1):	5
-Upper extremities (arms), including shoulder (3), "forearm" (1), hand (3), and finger (1):	9

-Lower extremities (legs), including thigh (7)[212], calf (2), "groin" (2), buttocks (1), hip (2), foot 1), and ankle (1): 17

At first blush, this distribution of wound areas seems highly skewed toward the upper and lower extremities - 26 hits to arms and legs - as compared to only 5 hits to the torso and 3 to the head. It must be remembered, however, that head and trunk wounds were -and are - notoriously lethal, and certainly must have accounted for a major portion of the 17 *unknown* wound sites that resulted in company deaths. As McPherson states, "Stomach wounds were generally fatal because there was no known prevention of peritonitis."[213]

Although members of the company were engaged in some instances in close-quarter, hand-to-hand fighting, there are no known instances of any being wounded by a "sharp-edged weapon" (bayonet, sword, knife, etc.), or by a blunt non-projectile object (such as, for example, the barrel or butt of a musket). Such wounds likely occurred, however; some of the men's bodies were never recovered, and some stated causes of combat death probably only included the most apparent or lethal wounds. The record also suggests there were at least a few instances of the company's men wounding or killing enemy soldiers by such means.[214]

Many of the men who survived being wounded were plagued after the war with long-term consequences, including chronic pain, weakness, lameness, and reduced capacity - or complete incapacity - to perform manual labor. Most of the wounds figured prominently in veterans' post-war pension claims.

On the other hand, a few of the wounds were mercifully slight, and did not result in any significant long-term disability. This did not necessarily mean, however, that every man incurring such a wound sought to return to the fighting as soon as possible, or that he would later consider the wound an unworthy basis for a pension claim. A good example is the gunshot wound incurred by Private George Beavers.

George Beavers. About May 5, 1864, Beavers received a "slight" or "flesh" wound to the right foot during the early phase of the company's involvement in the Wilderness Campaign. The wound was nevertheless sufficient for Beavers to find his way to Judiciary

Square General Hospital in Washington, where War Department records indicate he showed up the same day (May 5). According to Haines's day-to-day narrative of this engagement, on May 5 the company for the most part lay in shallow entrenchments facing the rebel line near the main road through the area, with little movement by either side.

> It was impossible to see the enemy; and although we peered into the thick woods [in front of us], we were fighting invisible foemen. * * * All the time the enemy were sending a shower of bullets over and past us. * * * It was wonder4ful that our casualties were not greater in that leaden storm.

Haines goes on to describe the wounding by shelling of Company E's commander, Captain John H. Vanderveer, and then states that "two men were wounded by musket shots." (Beavers may well have been one of them.) Vanderveer was wounded seriously enough immediately to be evacuated, first to the regiment's field hospital and then to the division's, and finally to a general hospital in Washington. Conceivably, Vanderveer could have reached Washington by the evening of May 5, and Beavers must have gone along at the same time. Even allowing for transfers and delays, Washington was reachable from the Wilderness in half a day's time.[215]

Beavers had been holed up at the hospital for only two additional days when, on May 7, evidently believing that he was using the relatively mild wound to delay return to his unit, the regiment officially listed him as a "malingerer," a court-martial offense. This must have spurred him to rejoin the company, although not in any great haste; the roster shows him returning to duty about a week later, on May 13. If Beavers did in fact delay his return, which seems likely, it may well have spared him his life: by so doing he was away on May 12, 1864, and missed the fighting at the "Bloody Angle" - Company A's "worst day of the war."

More than 15 years later, in 1880, Beavers sought pension compensation for the wound. It was denied. The examining physician in 1883 found "no disability" from the injury, and the Pension Office made note of War Department records indicating that the wound had only been "slight," had caused the soldier no disability during the war, and that Beavers had been considered a "malingerer". (He was awarded a pension on other grounds,

however; see below in this chapter. And his onetime stigmatization for malingering seems to have had little affect on his postwar status among Company A peers. He became, for example, one of the company's 10 charter members of Flemington's GAR Post in 1880 - the same year he was prompted to apply for a pension, possibly prompted by his GAR activity.)

One more speculative observation regarding the nature of the men's wounds deserves mention. The Civil War was fought during an era in which a man's "character," measured in this case by courage on the battlefield, was a factor of overriding importance.[216] Marks of courage included a man's ability to "face the enemy", and "go forward under fire". In his letter to the Pension Office supporting the claim of one of his men, for example, Lieutenant George C. Justice described the man's actions under fire as follows:

> The 15th Regt NJ Vols was ordered in[to] St Marys Woods on the above date, and most Manfully did Corp John A Kutter advance with the Regt, and never left his possision untill Ordered, by myself, to the rear, after being wounded. If he had returned to his company I should have recommended him for a Sergt.

Persuasive evidence of this sort of battlefield valor would be a gunshot wound to the *front* portion of one's body, rather than to one's backside, as might be expected during flight or retreat. (In his 1887 pension application, for example, Lewis Snyder describes being shot in the ankle in 1864, at Strasburg, Virginia, "while being *ordered* to retreat from the battle there." [Author's italics.])

In fact, it can be speculated that in at least one case this eagerness to be seen as manly in the face of fire may explain an otherwise baffling inconsistency that emerges in the course of the medical examinations of one Company A veteran. Andrew Clawson was shot through the chest and grievously wounded on May 8, 1864, during the desperate fighting at Spotsylvania Courthouse. Surviving the wound and the war, he made his first pension application in 1874, in which he described being "wounded by a ball, entering under the right shoulder, passing through the right lung and coming out through the breast." The first doctor assigned to examine him for pension purposes filed a report, also in 1874, declaring that the "[b]all entered on line of fold of axilla (right side posteriorly) [right rear armpit] and

about 3/4 in above; and emerged over center of manubrium [top of sternum] about on level with third rib." In other words, Clawson was shot in the back.

As Clawson applied for increases in his pension over the next two decades, this general description of the wound, and path of travel of the bullet, was reiterated several times, both by him and by the doctors who examined him. A full, three-doctor board in 1889, for example, not only confirmed the ball's direction of travel as proceeding from rear to front, but added a significant supporting detail: "Scar of entrance 3/4 in diam., depressed nearly 3/4 in, dragging, not tender, Scar of exit 1-1/2 x 5/8, depressed, ragged, adherent, tender". (Exit wounds are almost always larger and more damaging than their corresponding entry wounds, because of the bone and tissue a projectile displaces and drives before it, after piercing the body.)

But three years later, in 1892, a different board, for the first time, declared just the opposite, describing the ball as having *entered* at the sternum and *exited* under the right rear shoulder. (This board described the scars in general terms only, without measurements or a size comparison). So far as his file reveals, Clawson - who could now state that the medical evidence showed he had been squarely facing the enemy when wounded, absorbing a gunshot full in the chest - never challenged this new version of the bullet's path of travel. All six of his future board examinations described the path in the same fashion, front to rear. (Only one of them, in 1902, described the two scars with the same precision as the 1889 board, and that board also found the sternum scar to be about twice the size of the rear shoulder scar).

In short, there is little doubt that Clawson's earliest description of the wound, as well as the first group of medical examiners, had it right. It is also very unlikely that Clawson himself was unaware of the discrepancy, when it first appeared in 1892. Yet he seems to have been content to allow the mistake to persist; he may even have begun suggesting the front-to-back scenario to later examiners, who would surely have thought that by that time he would be well aware of exactly how he had been shot. It is possible, of course, that Clawson did remain blithely unaware of the discrepancy, or that he harbored no concern

about his combat performance so many years in the past, and considered the discrepancy an insignificant detail - another example of how easily doctors could go astray.

But it is also quite possible that he was acutely aware of the divergent finding, and that he fixed upon it at once as a much more satisfying way to measure and recall that horrific moment when he had stood face to face - if not with the enemy - than at least with death itself. And who could blame him?

Disease. Besides being wounded or killed by enemy action, the other principal risks posed by wartime service consisted of illness or disease, and accidental injury. The records show that a total of at least 36 men suffered from one or more of these health risks: this total constitutes 37% of the men reaching the front.[217] Of these 36, 14 expired as a result of their condition, accounting for 43% of the company's volunteers who died during the war. Men who died of disease or illness were listed on the roster as died of disease ("DOD").

In general, disease was the predominant killer of Civil War soldiers. McPherson, for example, recites the usual grim statistic, that "twice as many Civil War soldiers died of disease as were killed and mortally wounded in combat," and reminds the modern reader that, "The Civil War fought at the end of the medical middle ages."[218] According to Duffy:

> …[B]oth sides suffered heavily from diseases, and the first year or so saw widespread outbreaks of disorders normally associated with childhood [particularly measles]. * * *
>
> Once the ill-disciplined troops were collected in camps. Major sanitary problems emerged – and with them came diarrhea, dysentery, typhoid fever, and a host of gastroenteric complaints. * * * Typhoid…rose to major proportions. * * *
>
> To complicate the picture further, scurvy in a mild form affected a high percentage of the sick. * * *
>
> …[R]ecruits housed in poorly built army camps or tents and constantly subject to exposure would experience a high percentage of respiratory ailments. * * * Pneumonia was *a* or *the* chief killer, with a case fatality rate of about 20 percent. In addition…a vast number of acute and chronic rheumatism and lumbago cases were also recorded.[219]

As with wounds, wartime records for the company's men permit fairly good tabulation of the nature of the diseases and injuries suffered during service, as follows:

-Typhoid fever, including undifferentiated cases of "fever": 13
-Fatal cases: 9 (69% of all cases)

-Diarrhea/dysentery: 6
-Fatal cases: 4 (67% of all cases; one while POW)

-Pneumonia: 1
-Fatal Cases: 0 (0% of all cases)

-"Scurvy" (while POW): 1
-Fatal cases: 1 (100% of all cases)

-Total fatal cases: 14

Typhoid fever was the biggest single killer disease among Civil War soldiers in general, and also among Company A men contracting disease. It is caused by an intestinal *Salmonella* bacterium (*Salmonella typhi*), and is spread in contaminated food and water. Symptoms include persistent fever, significant "physical and mental depression [fatigue and loss of energy]," eruption of rose-colored spots on chest and abdomen, and often severe diarrhea and intestinal hemorrhaging; it typically lasts about 4 weeks. (The disease was occasionally confused with other diseases, including Typhus, which is another fever- or stupor-generating illness, but caused by a different strain of bacteria and spread by lice.)[220]

The highly dangerous illness, like a grim but transient guest, visited the company's men very early in their wartime careers, remained with them only a few months, and then took its leave, afterwards returning only once. It struck down its first Company A victim, Isaiah Hassell, on October 28, 1862, a short 8 weeks after the unit's arrival in the capital area. On November 9, it took another, William Clark. Sparing the company during the Christmas season, it came back in January of 1863 to carry away three others (Daniel Dayton, James Hurley, and Peter Nevins), and force the discharge from service of two more (John Emery and William Sloan). It killed three more in February, James Dayton, Philip Hendershot, and James Everett, and another, John Wyckoff, the following month. It then seemed to disappear, returning a final time in November of the same year (1863), when Andrew Starker succumbed to it. Only one man, John Parrish, is known to have contracted the disease (he was hospitalized with it in February, 1863) but managed both to survive it and to remain in the service.

Probably all of the 99 men of the original company - almost all of whom remained with it during the early months of the war - were exposed to the typhoid bacteria. The unlucky 13 who were destined to die or become seriously ill from it, with only one exception, did so during the initial five months the disease ran its course: late October, 1862, to early March, 1863. All the others managed to fend it off with few or no symptoms.

The chronological course of the second most-fatal condition, chronic diarrhea or dysentery, was less concentrated. Dysentery is a more or less generic medical term for disease of the bowels, "marked by watery stools, often with blood and mucus, and characterized clinically by pain, tenesmus [sphincter muscle spasm], fever, and dehydration." A common form is spread by an amoeba, *Entamoeba hystolitica,* and in acute cases it can lead to collapse and death.[221] Like typhoid, it was often a product of the war's crowded and unhygienic camp conditions.

The first two reported cases (John Parrish and David Hendershot) emerged in January, 1863, during the company's first winter and about the same time its devastating encounter with typhoid fever was peaking. Hendershot died. No further cases were reported until two months later, when Charles Heath became so sick and weak he was discharged in March and sent home. (Tragically, he died at his family's residence the following month.) A month after that, Martin Grassman also died from the disease.

No one else succumbed to dysentery for another year when, while the company was suffering through what would be its worst campaigning of the war in 1864, Erin Green expired from the disease in May. During the same period, Sutphen Starker was captured in the Wilderness fighting, setting into motion a sad chain of events that would later result in his death from the condition while languishing in Andersonville Prison, in September. He was the last victim of this particular scourge among the unit's original volunteers.

A month earlier, in August, 1864, another Spotsylvania POW [9/8], George Henderson, succumbed to scurvy, while being held at the Winder Building Prison in Richmond. Familiar to ocean-going mariners of the period, scurvy is a condition brought

about by a diet lacking in vitamin C (particularly fresh vegetables and fruit), and resulting most apparently in swollen and hemorrhaging gums. In extreme cases, it can result in exhaustion and debility, and even death.[222] It was a frequent enough occurrence in the Civil War prison context to be referred to as "prison scurvy."

The only company man officially diagnosed with pneumonia during the period of his service was William Sloan (he also contracted typhoid fever, and was discharged in January of 1863). Pneumonia, usually referred to in this era as "phthisis pulmonalis" (literally, "wasting [or consumption] of the lungs"), usually took years to develop into a life-threatening condition, and did not often appear as a diagnosed cause of distress or premature discharge during the war itself. (Numerous instances of the disease figured in later pension applications made by the company's survivors, however, and their origin was usually claimed to have been associated with wartime service; see below. Eventually Sloan himself, about age 60, died of heart and lung conditions that were certainly consistent with chronic pneumonia.)

John Bulmer. An ambiguous case of wartime "spinal disease" or "rheumatism" is presented by the chilling experience of John Bulmer, who became a POW. (Bulmer's condition, whatever it may have been, was never clearly diagnosed in the postwar period, and is not included in the company's disease statistics.) During the early phase of the 1864 Wilderness Campaign, Company A, like many of the forward elements of both armies, was involved in confusing and fluid skirmishes and feints, and the frequent intermingling of opposing lines. Many prisoners were taken by both sides in these circumstances, and on or about May 8, Bulmer became one of them. After spending about a month in Libby Prison in Richmond, he was transferred to Andersonville Prison in Georgia, where he remained almost a year until the end of the war.

Living conditions and prisoner treatment were appalling. (Bulmer's story, including his description of prison conditions, is related in more detail in Chapter 10.) Among other deprivations, he was reduced to sleeping in the open, without shelter or adequate clothing,

on ground that was often cold and/or wet. After the war, Bulmer suffered from what he described generally as "spinal disease," which he claimed manifested itself in lameness or weakness of the back, and difficulty in rising or stooping. He understandably attributed these afflictions to his prison experience, and in 1888 sought a pension on that basis. Despite undoubted sympathy for Bulmer's wartime hardships, however, a succession of medical boards, while observing various degrees of back "tenderness," "lameness," or "lumbago" (lower back pain, from no specified cause), could find no particular evidence of "spinal disease," and that aspect of the claim was rejected.

However, as frequently occurred in the context of nineteenth-century diagnostic efforts, patients (and doctors) often resorted to the vague medical concept of "rheumatism" to describe and give substance to otherwise imperfectly understood, generalized conditions of pain, weakness, or soreness, especially those associated with the musculoskeletal system.[223] Claimants often included rheumatism in any extended litany of conditions put before pension officials, often probably on the advice of experienced pension claim attorneys and their treating physicians. Medical boards and official reviewers, if a case appeared particularly sympathetic yet offered no recognized or objective medical basis for approval (or clear service-connection), occasionally granted awards on the basis of "rheumatism" alone. Bulmer's initial application was indeed guided by an attorney who was a pension claim specialist, Joseph Turner, Esquire, of Washington, DC (see Chapter 8), and it did in fact incorporate a claim for rheumatism. It was approved.[224]

Overall, then, wartime records report a total of 21 cases of serious, specific disease or illness, 14 of which (2/3rds) proved fatal during the war. (Two men, Parrish and Sloan, incurred two illnesses each; thus, a total of only 19 men were afflicted with the described diseases. The case of Slater, who "died suddenly in his tent" of an apparent stroke, is not included in this compilation of "disease" cases.) The nature and lethality of the diseases reported by the company's men are consistent with those of diseases reported elsewhere for

the Union Army as a whole, as "the three principal killer diseases of the war: diarrhea/dysentery, typhoid, and pneumonia."[225]

Compared with total wartime casualties from battle wounds (26), deaths from disease amounted to somewhat over half the number of company deaths attributed to combat. If deaths from wounds following evacuation and hospitalization are removed from the "battlefield" deaths category and added to the death-by-disease category (the "disease" in many wound cases being sepsis or gangrene), the comparison is more telling: 19 men dying on the field to 21 dying in hospital, an almost even division. However, this Company A comparison does *not* bear out conventional figures for overall causes of death in the war, according to which "twice as many Civil War soldiers died of disease as were killed and mortally wounded in combat."[226] What could account for the discrepancy, and the much lower comparative incidence of death by disease among Company A's volunteers? Were the rugged rural farmers and laborers of Hunterdon County healthier, fitter, or more resilient than the rest of their northern comrades? Were they members of a population more likely to have already been exposed to the war's major killers (this seems especially improbable)? The probable explanation may be simply that the company's men were just as likely to die from disease as other Union soldiers, but much *more* likely, because of their regiment's particularly severe combat experience, to die from the fighting as well.

Accidental Injury**.** In addition to battlefield wounds and camp diseases, many of the company's men suffered serious or disabling injuries, or other non-disease conditions, in the course of their wartime service. Most of these were observed at the time by commanders or medical personnel; many required hospitalization; and some were serious enough to require assignment to lighter duty within the regiment or brigade, transfer to the "Invalid" (Veteran Reserve) Corps, or even discharge for unfitness. They thus became part of the affected man's official wartime record and, though none of the injuries or conditions proved fatal during the war, many if not most did become, like the men's wartime wounds and diseases, the basis for later pension claims.

This category of wartime event has been largely neglected in discussions of Civil War soldiers' exposure to risk, injury, and death. The conventional approach has been to focus on battlefield deaths and camp diseases, trotting out the old (and more-or-less accurate) chestnut that "twice as many died from sickness as from bullets or shells," and then to focus on specters of amputations and horrific, disfiguring wounds. An intriguing and otherwise highly useful essay in Gerber's recent anthology of works examining *Disabled Veterans in History*, is simply the latest evidence of this trend. In "From Individual Trauma to National Policy: Tracking the Uses of Civil War Veteran Medical Records," the authors make the point that "Civil War records, documentary photographs, and associated pension files" are a "relatively unknown" and vastly overlooked source of information about "the veteran experience," and may shed much light on "the emergence of the relationship between the [American] citizen and the nation-state" in the latter nineteenth century.

> The number of casualties and the scope of medical treatment…was never so great…. On the Union side alone, over 7 million cases of disease were treated and over 250,000 wounds were examined. * * * Most notable were the 30,000 amputations where quick resolution of a shattered limb was essential if the soldier was to survive….

The article goes on to examine contemporary medical treatment and documentation, research, veteran suffering in the post-war era, pensions, "rebuilding the wounded" (prostheses and employment), and "memorializing injuries" through photographs and specimen collection, yet in *none* of these sections is there any mention of accidental wartime injury or death, or the long-term consequences many of these injuries imposed on veterans and their families.[227]

This chapter, then, devotes proportionate space to listing and describing accidental injuries, in an effort to redress traditional omission of this class of potentially disabling (or even lethal) wartime occurrence. Individual cases are also summarized below. As the following tabulation suggests, the injuries and conditions referred to can be roughly broken down into two broad categories: in the first categories are weight-bearing, straining, and

falling injuries (resulting primarily in hemorrhoids, hernias and ruptures, and varicosity); and in the second, all other types of injuries and conditions.

Generally, the first category includes events resulting in breaches of the body's muscle walls, vessels, or other tissue, caused either by excessive strain (e.g., unusually heavy marching and/or weight-bearing), or by accidental "insult" (e.g., falling, being fallen upon, or running against a sharp object), or by a combination of the two. As detailed in Chapter 3, the company's wartime campaigning involved marching more than an estimated 2,000 miles, often under slippery, muddy, or other difficult conditions, bearing pack and weapon loads of up to a third or more of the men's body-weight. The stress of active combat - rushing forward (or rearward) full of adrenaline and under frightful conditions; jumping ditches; avoiding stumps, stakes, and earthworks; crashing to the ground; straining to maneuver or lift heavy objects such as caissons, bodies, tree trunks, horses - imposed serious additional risk. It is no wonder that the largest single category of injury resulted simply from overtaxation of the body's basic anatomical structure, at some of its weakest points (the lower abdomen and perianal musculature).

At least 6 men suffered serious ruptures or hernias during the war, from various more or less well-documented causes. Essentially, a hernia or rupture is "the protrusion of a body part or structure through the tissues normally containing it." Most common in the case of the company's men were abdominal hernias (or "laproceles"), in which a portion of the bowel at about stomach level protrudes through the abdominal muscle wall; and inguinal hernias, in which the lower bowel protrudes downward through the "inguinal ring" at the upper part of the testicles, sometimes reaching into the scrotal sac.[228] The following, in chronological order as they were incurred, are several instances of wartime events that brought about significant ruptures.

Samuel Case. The first known hernia incident occurred as soon as the company reached Washington, a few days after mustering in. On the night of August 31-September 1, 1862, it had begun to rain heavily, and continued the next day as the unit was ordered to

march to Tenallytown on the outskirts of the capital. Like his comrades, Private Samuel Case was "heavily loaded with his knap-sack, gun and other accoutrements". According to his comrade, Abram van Fleet:

> …[I]n marching he slipped and fell hard upon his testicles, injuring [them] severely…. * * * After reaching camp…we were ordered to build a fort and [Case] was relieved from duty on account of the injury. * * * [I] bunked in the same tent with [Case] and often saw his private parts…and his testicles were very much swollen. Before being mustered, [we] were examined at the same time, and [Case] had no such in jury….

After the war, Case was awarded a pension for "right inguinal hernia," involving the right scrotum.

John Yorks. Early the next month, October 1862, Private John Yorks herniated his right scrotum during a march from the company's encampment near Tenallytown. The difficult forced march had begun a few days earlier, as the 15th New Jersey was rushed toward Antietam in hopes of joining in the pursuit of the rebel army after the horrendous fighting there. Most of the unit traveled by train, one of the few times during the war it would do so, but Yorks and some others were detailed to a different duty. (Providentially for the men of Company A, the battle had peaked and passed by late September, and the regiment arrived too late to take part even in pursuit.) According to Yorks's comrade, Private Henry Johnson:

> …[A[bout September 28th, [the regiment] was ordered to join the Army of the Potomac at Bakersville (near Antietam). …[A] detachment from each Co. was ordered as a guard to accompany the [horse-drawn] wagon train after [the] Regt., [Yorks and I] being on said detail from Co. "A". On going up the mountain first beyond or near Frederick, Md.,…[Yorks] began to complain of a very severe pain in his right groin and the pain got worse until he could not march any more: [I] was left with him until the Ambulance came up and took him….

The approximate marching distance from Tenallytown to Frederick, where Yorks was finally forced to quit, is almost 40 miles. The Catoctin Mountain range, which rise about 1,000 feet above the capital district, lie immediately to the east of the city. The injury was sufficiently disabling for him to be discharged for it a few months later.

John Reading. About two months later, in mid-December, Company A found itself formed up "in line of battle," in preparation for an assault on Fredericksburg. However, according to the later recollection of Private John Reading:

> …[T]he enemy was shelling us so hotly that we received orders to fall back in the ravine [behind us] for protection. In attempting to do so, [I] caught [my] foot in some creeping vines and fell with great force upon [my] abdomen across a stump which injured [me] so severely as to produce a very bad hernia on the left side. [I] was very heavily loaded at the time with knapsack, cartridges, [and] rations.

Reading remained with the company for the next two years, but was finally transferred to the Veterans Reserve Corps, and was granted a pension after the war because of the hernia. Medical boards in 1885 and 1887 described it as a "complete left inguinal hernia descending within the scrotum, easily reduced and kept up by a proper truss," and described the actual protrusion as "about the size of a small hen's egg".

Levi Runyon. In January, 1863, during General Burnside's infamous "Mud March," Sergeant Levi Runyon suffered serious injury when he slipped and fell backward onto his back, along a road "about four or five miles from Fredericksburg". According to oral testimony he gave in 1898 at a Special Examination into his condition:

> The column was moving in four ranks [and] I was on the outside acting as file closer. There was a ditch about two and half feet deep and about three feet wide. I jumped over the ditch. I landed on the opposite bank and it gave way and threw me into the ditch. I did not think I was hurt much at the time. I got up and went on with my company. My back hurt me some and it hurt all night. The next morning I went to stool and my bowels came down.
>
> * * *
>
> [Afterward my back] pained me very much and it was weak. I found it difficult to keep up on the marches after that and carry my equipment. I never went to stool after that injury…without I had to put my bowels back.

Edward L. Campbell, formerly Lieutenant Colonel (second in command) of the 15th New Jersey Regiment, had previously provided an affidavit in support of Runyon's pension claim, when the government elected to dispute it. In it, Campbell stated he "well remember[ed] Levi Runyon…as a gallant soldier who became prominent in the Regt. as an efficient noncommissioned officer." He went on to describe Runyon's fall and subsequent injury during the "mud march," and then added:

> The men were heavily loaded with rations, ammunition, etc., in starting out in what was expected to be a long expedition and a hard fight. * * * The next few days [following Runyon's injury] involved hard duty and exposure for the men. After the [snow] storm was over and the troops ordered back to their former camps, the [15th NJ] Regt. was left behind to drag artillery and pontoons out of the mud. On arrival at old camp, the Regt. was immediately ordered out to re-establish the old picket line - in the midst of snow-slush and mud. [I] think Sergt. Runyon stuck to his company through it all.

William Clayton. Private William Clayton waited more than twenty-five years to complain of a hernia, which he insisted had "come on" in 1863. (The soldier's pension file contains no other details as to cause; by this date, 1890, pension law did not require an injury to be connected with wartime service.) The examining medical board described the condition at the time as "left complete inguinal hernia, 3 inches protrusion, reducible and easily retained". (Clayton's tardy claim that his hernia originated in the service was not corroborated by any fellow soldier, and had resulted in no known wartime treatment, hospitalization, reassignment, or War Department record. It has therefore not been included in the injury statistics provided above.)

Benjamin Wolverton. In the fall of 1864, as the company campaigned southward through the Shenandoah Valley as part of General Sheridan's raiding army, it became engaged in what would be known as the Battle Of Cedar Creek (Virginia). On October 1, Confederate forces suddenly approached the company as part of an attempted flanking movement. The movement spooked the brigade's herd of cattle, which began to stampede. Private Benjamin Wolverton, who had by then been detailed from Company A to serve with the Regimental Quartermaster as a butcher, quickly mounted a horse and rode in among the herd in an effort to head off the stampede. Wolverton was then ordered to "break the fences so that the herd could pass through" to safety. In the attempt, his horse stumbled while endeavoring to leap over a ditch and "fell backward…upon him…producing [a] rupture."

Wolverton was not treated for the injury during the half-year balance of the war, and its precise nature was not determined until he applied for a pension nearly twenty years later. (The injury developed into severely enlarged and painful testicles, although

consecutive medical boards disagreed on whether a hernia actually existed within them; the history of Wolverton's worsening post-war medical condition is detailed below.)

Thomas Gregory. The company's last recorded wartime hernia episode allegedly took place during the Union Army's siege of Petersburg in the war's final stages in 1865. Private Gregory claimed to have suffered an inguinal hernia to his right side, as a result of charging the enemy's position.

> About the break of day [on May 2, according to Gregory, though this date fell after Lee's surrender] we charged the rebel lines. In getting through the abbatis and other obstacles I ran against a pointed stick. Shortly after the excitement was over I examined myself and found a lump about as large as top of my finger but I thought nothing more of it, supposing it would pass away. But in that I was mistaken.

The Pension Office did grant an award under the more liberal provisions of the 1890 act, but not for a service-connected injury.

Theodore Bellis. Another case involving serious injury to testicles was that of Theodore Bellis; in his case instead of rupture, however, the episode caused a different kind of painful condition. In the summer of 1864, Company A participated in the Battle of Cold Harbor. On June 1, the unit assaulted a rebel line, crossing a corn field "at the double quick," when Private Bellis stumbled in a "ditch or "washout" and fell down hard "upon his gun". According to Bellis's later affidavit (in which he uses the third person, as many formal documents did at the time):

> …[The fall] so injured his left groin and one of testicles that he was unable to continue longer with his company doing heavy duty, and…was detailed to perform light duty at Brigade Head-quarters…[where] he took care of horses and did other light work….
>
> While there he was treated once for said injury by…the Regimental Surgeon…[but received no other treatment] except the treatment he gave it himself, such as bathing, bandaging, etc. * * *
>
> …[He was] not able to perform the heavy duty of a soldier in marching or upon the battlefield. …[W]hen upon a march he would ride a horse.[229]

Other testimony in Bellis's case indicated that his fall had been so severe that he lost consciousness, and that later, when riding a horse, he was forced to ride "sideways" to be comfortable. His injury, called a "varicocele," worsened over the years; the course of Bellis's

post-war health is described in detail below. (A varicocele is a condition of enlarged, or varicose, blood vessels of the spermatic cord, or testicles generally.[230])

Michael Welsh. Next to ruptures, rectal hemorrhoids or "piles" incurred during wartime were a frequent basis of later pension claims, although the connection was sometimes difficult to prove to the government's satisfaction. The late pension claim of Private Michael Welsh for service-connected "piles" and "founder" of both legs, was finally rejected for lack of any corroborating evidence. Welsh did not initiate the claim until 1890, and offered no specifics as to how or when the alleged hemorrhoid problem had arisen during his wartime service (but he claimed it had). His service record shows he was transferred to brigade headquarters sometime during the unit's first winter in the field (1862-3), and that he was "never intimate" with his Company A comrades. This factor could have cut either way with respect to his claim: the transfer to light (headquarters) duty may suggest a physical problem, *or* may indicate Welsh was considered unreliable, or an outsider, by his fellow volunteers.[231] (Welsh filed an alternative pension claim later the same year, based generally on *non-service-connected* "disease of the heart and rectum," which was ultimately approved.)

George Beavers. Another disputed claim of service-connected hemorrhoids was that of Private George Beavers. In 1880, he filed a pension claim based both on this alleged condition, and on a superficial gunshot wound he had received while in service. He offered no details as to the origin or suspected cause of the former, and although subsequent examinations did confirm the existence of hemorrhoids, the physicians were of the opinion that they were "moderate" and not disabling, and also not caused by any service-related circumstances.[232] Surprisingly, his claim for the condition was nevertheless approved.

Benjamin Wean. An example of a wartime injury in the second category mentioned above ("all other injuries") is presented by the case of Benjamin Wean. Private Wean was one of the oldest of the company's original volunteers, about 32 on enlistment. Whether for reasons of age and basic constitution, or perhaps from having been afflicted quite early in the

war, he appears to have suffered from at least five distinct ailments or injuries while in service. They included a rupture from "hard marching," a probable dose of typhoid fever, hospitalization for lumbago, and chronic diarrhea (possibly dysentery). But records indicate that in the postwar period, Wean suffered predominantly from the serious and long-term consequences of a severe encounter with frostbite.

On the night of December 9-10, 1862, as the regiment encountered its first winter in the field, the men of Company A huddled together around small fires, or tried to stay warm in their small tents. They were camped near King George's Courthouse, "a place so miserable," according to Bilby, "that the men dubbed it 'the Devil's Hole'".[233] They had in fact been experiencing a good deal of the misery offered by nineteenth-century campaigning: typhoid fever had recently begun to ravage the regiment, and two weeks earlier its first man had died (Private Andrew Courtright); they were preparing to participate in their first major action (an attack on Fredericksburg); and the weather had turned cold, snowy, and windy. According to the recollection of Wean's fellow volunteer, Isaac Danberry:

> An unusually violent snowstorm came up and for a short time it was excessively cold. Several inches of snow fell. …[I]t was so cold [I] and a Private named David Ellgard slept with [Wean] in a small shelter tent made of the pieces belonging to each of [us]. Only one end of the tent was closed and the snow blew in upon [us], almost the same as if there had been no tent. * * * In the morning [Wean] complained of his right leg and…Ellgard complained of both of his feet. …[I]t was plain that Wean's thigh and Ellgard's feet were frozen. * * * Ellgard was sent away to the Hospital where his feet was amputated and he died. Wean limped badly but remained with the Company…. In a short time he was detailed for duty at the Regimental Head Quarters, and remained there until his discharge. He always limped more or less afterwards and sometimes rode in an ambulance on the march.

Private Benjamin Wolverton later remembered that at some point during the night, Wean awoke and made his way to a small fire Wolverton and others were keeping, and "complained of being almost frozen". Wean himself stated that his right leg became stiff and lame after the frostbite, and "red and swollen near the middle behind." The frostbitten area developed into "an open sore of about double the size of a dollar by the middle of January [1863]," but "was all healed by the first of April". In 1880, Wean successfully applied for a

pension, based on "disease of the right hip" resulting from the frostbite and the ensuing infection.

William Clark. Another non-combat injury was suffered by Private William Clark, who, as stated above, was one of the company's men who came down with typhoid fever during the winter of 1862-3. His disease was debilitating enough for him to be transferred to the Veterans Reserve Corps. He ended up being assigned to Company D, 16th Regiment VRC, which was posted to a Union prison at Elmira, New York, to guard rebel POWs. On March 12, 1865, only about a month prior to the end of the war, a group of prisoners in Barracks No. 3 attempted a break-out and escape. Clark was serving at the time as Sergeant of the Guard of the barracks, and began rallying his men to prevent the break-out. At this point, according to Clark's commanding officer, Lieutenant Hiram Jackson, who witnessed the event, Clark "was struck across the mouth with a club by one of the prisoners, which knocked out several of his upper teeth and broke off some others, causing very painful and permanent injury".

Clark was discharged four months later, and immediately pensioned for the injury to his mouth. He later stated that he had lost a total of five teeth from his upper jaw in the assault, and that the attacker was not even a Confederate soldier but a northern "bounty-jumper" who had been caught and imprisoned.

James Bullock. Finally, the war exposed the men to one other grave prospect: the risk of accidental *death*. In this case, Company A's one known instance of such a calamity, the soldier's end was a dramatic example of causation by "act of nature" or "God." James Bullock was a promising young individual who was born in Hunterdon County, and resided in Raritan Township when he enlisted at about age 18. His prewar occupation is not known, but he had not yet married when he went to war. His rise through the ranks, especially in view of his young age, is astonishing. He was immediately made a corporal, and became a tentmate of Sergeant Paul Kuhl, brother-in-law of the company's captain. In May, 1864, after serving with Company A for nearly two years, he was made its First Sergeant, the

company's highest enlisted rank and a considerable honor. (He replaced Kuhl, who had been killed.) Within a few weeks, he received a commission as 1st Lieutenant, and was transferred to Company I. He was "slightly wounded" with that unit at Cedar Creek, Virginia, on October 19, 1864 (no details given), and sent to convalesce at Hart's Island, New York.

In four more months, he was again promoted, this time to Captain, and assigned to command of Company B. He was still stationed in the rear, however, assigned to recruiting duty in New Jersey as his superiors probably sensed the war was winding down and may have hoped to keep him out of harm's way; he petitioned to return to the 15th, no action had been taken on the matter. It was February 1865; Bullock had survived much, and served well.

Finally, in March, Bullock was detailed to escort 22 new recruits back to the front, where they could augment the 15th's diminished muster roll. (It is unclear where Bullock went to pick up and take charge of the men, but presumably it was to the New Jersey's recruitment depot at Trenton.) The return trip was aboard ship, and he and the recruits were first diverted south to the City of Wilmington, North Carolina.

There, on March 29, they boarded an old "screw" (propeller-driven) steamer, the *General Lyon*, and set out for Fortress Monroe. (Fortress Monroe was a fortified point in Virginia at the mouth of the James River, occupied throughout the war by Union forces. From there Bullock and his men would have had an easy sail up the James River, to join the 15th NJ where it was participating in the siege of Petersburg.) The vessel also took on at Wilmington several hundred wounded and discharged soldiers, and numerous paroled or escaped prisoners of war, as well as a few refugees fleeing to the North (including women, children, and "two Negroes); together the passengers and crew totaled about 600 souls.

Early on March 31, a strong gale arose. By 10:00 am, the sluggish vessel was foundering about 60 miles off Cape Hatteras in hurricane-strength winds, making virtually no progress. According to one crew-member, the ship's severe wallowing threw kerosene and

oil barrels in the engine room against the vessel's huge boiler, igniting a fierce fire amidships that quickly spread and engulfed the pilot house.

Despite the efforts of crew and passengers, the *General Lyon* could not be saved. (Eyewitness reports described soldiers assisting the crew in their desperate attempt to contain the fire. It is quite plausible to imagine Bullock spending his last few minutes on earth pitching in, and trying to direct the new men in his custody to do what they could. He had certainly proven himself that sort of man.) The engines soon lost power, however, and the ship drifted broadside to the building sea. It was now driven toward the shore, while at the same time it steadily burned to the waterline. No one really had a chance.

A contemporary newspaper report, based on survivors' accounts, is heartrending.

> …[T]hose below, alarmed by the smoke which was spreading through the cabins, rushed on deck only to be driven back by the flames. The frightful shrieks of the women and children, and their piteous supplications for help, were drowned by the roaring of the storm. Several of the paroled soldiers were sick and confined to their berths. Some of them managed to crawl on deck, and clung there until washed overboard by the waves. * * *
>
> The first officer acted with great courage, and only abandoned the vessel when all hopes of saving her were gone. The fire-pumps wee still kept at work, and the flames were fought back with great determination. Many of those below were doubtless already suffocated. The shrieks and moans of the dying came up to those on deck, but they could do nothing to help them.

Unlike the first officer, the vessel's captain became "crazed with fear," and attempted to escape in one of the few lifeboats. The boat was struck by the ship's huge propeller and sank at once, taking the poor captain with it. In the end, only 34 survived, miraculously rescued by a passing steamer despite the hurricane. Bullock and all 22 of his new recruits perished.[234]

In an era of calamitous loss and death, the shipwreck must have seemed to some the vengeful act of a truly wrathful God. But as Lincoln had put it only a month before in his Second Inaugural Address,"…[I]f God wills that…all the wealth piled up by [slavery] shall be sunk, and…every drop of blood drawn with the [master's] lash shall be paid by another…still it must be said 'the judgements of the Lord are true and righteous altogether'." So the

General Lyon was sunk, and Captain Bullock, with many others, paid his share of the blood money. He was the last Company A casualty of the war.

O Captain! My Captain! Our fearful trip is done,
The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won,
The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting,
While follow eyes the steady keel, the vessel grim and daring;
But O heart! heart! heart!
O the bleeding drops of red,
Where on the deck my Captain lies
Fallen cold and dead.[235]

Post-war Health

By late 1865, the surviving soldiers of Company A's original 100 volunteers had been freed from the hardships and exposed living conditions of the war, and found themselves back home. Of that 100, 42 are known to have perished before the war ended, leaving 58 possible survivors. Four of the 100 deserted, and nothing is known of their life outcomes after that. Of the remaining 54, there is significant data for the 48 who filed federal pension claims at some point in the postwar period, substantial data for one additional veteran who did not file (John Emery), and some scant postwar data for two others (Garret Hogan and Elijah Horn). Thus, because of the high incidence of wounds, disease, and wartime injuries among the original men of the company - and the correspondingly high rate of pension claims submitted for service-connected health conditions - there is fairly good postwar health data for 91% of the war's known survivors (49 of 54).

Almost all of the men's 47 health-based pension claims were ultimately approved for *some* significant and disabling health problem. (As mentioned, only one claim of the 48 was based solely on age: that of William Briggs, who filed in 1907.) The great majority of these claims involved affidavits from treating physicians and/or standardized examinations by medical boards, and all data from these survive in the pension files. It is thus possible both to characterize the overall state of health of Company A's survivors (including the health

conditions that figured most prominently in their postwar lives), and also to narrate in some detail several representative cases of common conditions (as well as a few unique ones).

As expected, the general health of the company's war survivors was greatly impacted by their wartime service: wounds received in battle, diseases contracted in unhealthy encampments, accidental injuries sustained in wartime circumstances. Many if not most of these followed the men throughout the balance of their days, contributing directly - or more subtly - to their deteriorating health, gradually increasing their inability to perform hard manual labor (or even lighter work), and ultimately factoring into the causes of their deaths.

Of Company A's 48 first-time pension claims, almost half (23, or 48%) were based solely or primarily on the post-war consequences of the veteran's wartime projectile wound(s). Of these 23, more than half (13) involved disabling conditions of the legs and lower, weight-bearing and ambulating portions of the body (including wounds to hip, buttock, foot, and ankle). It is not surprising that such injuries should have generated efforts to obtain financial assistance from the government; this was a world where it was critical to have the capacity for "manual" labor (a misnomer of sorts): the ability, often for long periods, to stand, walk distances, carry or shoulder heavy loads, balance, mount and dismount horses and wagons, and wield heavy, hand-held implements in a standing position. By contrast, finger, hand, and arm wounds figured in only 4 initial pension claims; and chest, trunk, and back wounds {including shoulders) in 5. Neck, jaw or head wounds resulted in only 1 claim. (Part of the reason for the low number of claims in the two latter categories, however, is the fact that chest and head wounds, as mentioned, were generally fatal, and did not leave many veterans to submit postwar claims.)

20 of the 48 initial claims (42%) were based solely or primarily on wartime illness or disease. Interestingly, the single largest postwar disease category prompting claims was one or another form of heart disease (5 claims), even though such ailments were very rarely diagnosed during the war. What accounts for this is unclear. Objective diagnosis of heart ailments in the latter nineteenth century, as with many other conditions, was limited to

"external" assessment, such as palpitation (tapping on the outside of a body cavity, and listening for tell-tale sounds produced within), auscultation (listening, especially with the aid of a stethoscope[236]), evaluation of pulse and (later on) blood pressure, and observation of such symptoms as skin color and shortness of breath. Added to this would be subjective complaints made by patients (e.g., "chest pain" or "palpitations").

Medical theory at the time embraced the notion of a combat- or stress-induced cardiac condition sometimes known as "irritable heart" or "soldier's heart". Lacking development of psychological theory, and the vocabulary that accompanied it, such terms often stood in as vague and generalized explanations for any sort of postwar adjustment difficulty.

The Civil War's "big three" diseases – typhoid fever, dysentery/chronic diarrhea, and tuberculosis - were implicated in a total of about 8 of the men's first-time pension claims. Of these 8, tuberculosis, or other pulmonary ailments (variously diagnosed as "pleurisy," "phthisis pulmonalis," or simply "lung disease"), constituted the single largest category of postwar disease problem for the company's veterans, and were identified in 4 initial claims. Chronic diarrhea was the central factor in 3 claims. (If the company's three serious cases of "rectal disease" are included, that figure would increase to 6, and chronic diarrhea would become the largest disease subcategory.) Other initial disease-based claims were founded on "chronic headache," "spinal disease," and "rheumatism". Additionally, one veteran is known to have been treated after the war for syphilis (Van Camp; see narrative of this and his other conditions, below).

Finally, wartime injuries and conditions other than wounds and disease were involved in approximately 12 initial pension claims (25%).[237] By far the largest subcategory for these claims were hernias or ruptures, and "varices" or blood vessel injuries, including varicoceles and hydroceles (total of 8). (A "hydrocele" is swelling of the scrotum, caused by accumulation of watery fluid in the testicular sac.[238]) These conditions generally resulted from falling with heavy packs and/or against hard objects, or in one case running against a

stake, and in another being crushed by a falling horse. The other significant injury subcategory was piles or hemorrhoids (3 claims), usually alleged to have resulted from hard marching, lifting, or other straining work during military service. Other wartime injuries giving rise to first-time claims included loss of upper teeth (1) and frostbite (1). *Postwar* injuries prompting first-time claims included partial loss of vision (1) and fractures (1).

The pace and timing of veterans' initial claims bear mention. Looked at by decade, the rate of new filings remained fairly constant for a long period: 14 initial claims during the 1860s; 12 during the -70s, and 13 during the -80s. (The men were aging during this period from an average of about 22 when they entered service in 1862, to late-40s by 1889.) In the 1890s, however, the rate of first-time claims dropped by half, to 6, and only three new claims were filed after 1900. There were two basic reasons for the decline after the 1880s: veterans began to expire, and most (39 of 48) had already made an initial claim and gotten a pension. (Those with approvals could of course file subsequent claims for increased awards, based on worsening disability and/or on new and more generous pension legislation, and most did. Subsequent flings are treated below.)

Reviewing first-time pension claims by decade also indicates the health factors most immediately troublesome to veterans in the postwar period, as compared with those that took longer to develop into disabling conditions, or that resulted simply from the aging process. Thus, claims for wartime wounds predominated in the first two decades, but dropped off rapidly thereafter: 17 in the 1860s and -70s, but only 6 in the 1980s and -90s (and none after 1899). Conversely, though not as distinct a trend, claims based primarily on wartime illness and disease totaled 5 in the 1860s and -70s, but rose to 9 in the next three decades. Similarly, initial claims based on accidents and other wartime injuries amounted to only 2 each in the 1860s and -70s, but rose to 6 in the -80s and 4 in the -90s. Only one company man filed a first-time claim based solely on age (William Briggs, in 1907), a statutory "disability" allowed after 1889.

As mentioned, most pensioners filed subsequent claims in an effort to obtain higher awards. In Company A's case, 43 of the 48 men who submitted initial claims made one or more later claims for a larger pension (90%). Later filings were almost always accompanied by updated supporting affidavits from local doctors, neighbors, or others, and the filings usually prompted new examinations by the government's appointed medical boards. (In many instances, periodic examination by boards, usually every two years, was a condition of the veteran's continued eligibility for a pension, whether or not he filed later on for an increase.) Together these sources provide a continuing look at the general states of health of most of the company's veterans over a multi-year period, often over the rest of their lives.

Subsequent pension filings asserted two general categories of condition: a pensioner's original medical condition - and corresponding disability - that had significantly *worsened*, or a *new* disabling condition. (Prior to 1890, any newly claimed condition still had to have been incurred during wartime service.) Often a single application claimed both. Overall, the conditions claimed by the 43 veterans filing subsequent applications were fairly evenly distributed between the two categories: 53 instances of worsening original conditions, and 59 instances of new conditions.

In the first category - worsening conditions - wartime wounds again predominated (30 claims), followed by wartime accidents and non-combat injuries (14 claims), and wartime diseases (9 claims). With respect to wound problems, the most frequent veteran complaint concerned diminished use of a previously-pensioned wounded limb (including increased "weakness," "loss of rotation," or "lameness"); these formed the basis of 11 claims. This condition was followed in frequency by “cicatrix” or scar-related problems (including "adherence" and "tenderness"[239]), which were the basis of 5 claims; increased pain or soreness, mentioned in 4; and worsening skin or vessel conditions (including "eczema," "edema," and varicosity), mentioned in 3. Regarding worsening accidental injuries, by far the most frequently mentioned complaint (11 claims) concerned deteriorating rupture or

hernia conditions. In connection with wartime diseases, worsening heart conditions were asserted in 4 cases, and worsening chronic diarrhea or rectal disease in 3.

In the second general category - new (or newly raised) conditions - the rankings were virtually reversed: 40 claims were based on a new disease or illness not mentioned in the pensioner's original claim; 19 claims were based on a new accidental injury or other (non-disease) condition; and no claims were based on a previously unmentioned wound. In the disease subcategory, newly-diagnosed heart disease predominated (14 claims, including two for "irritable heart")[240], followed by rheumatism (8 claims); and nervous disorders and headache (5 claims, including "chronic" or "severe" headache, "neuralgia" or "catarrh" of the head, and "nervous _____" [illegible, probably "affection," or "affliction"]). Stroke (including "apoplexy"), and rectal disease/chronic diarrhea each formed the basis of 3 new claims; and prostate problems (including cancer), 2. In the subcategory of new accidental injuries and other conditions, fractures predominated (6 claims, most from postwar mishaps in the workplace); followed by vision loss and ruptures/hernias (3 claims each), and hearing loss and hemorrhoids/piles (2 claims each).

To flesh out the health overview described above, the individual health histories of several representative veterans are detailed below. The histories are grouped first by principal medical "complaint": i.e., by the condition the veteran appears to have experienced as most painful, persistent, and/or disabling (e.g., "chronic diarrhea," "lameness," etc.). In each of the cases described, however, a complete picture including all of the veteran's complaints or symptoms is drawn, insofar as the archival or other records permit. Within each "principal complaint" grouping, individual cases are listed in chronological order, according to the date the veteran filed his first pension claim (called "Original Declaration"). The month of the application follows the veteran's name below, in parentheses.

Cases involving long-term effects of wartime wounds

Isaac Danberry (December, 1865). At about 35 years of age, Danberry was one of the oldest men enlisting with the company. He married Mary Suydam in 1853. The veteran

was born, raised, and spent his entire life in or near Flemington, and made his living - or tried to - as a cobbler, both before and after the war.

On September 19, 1864, at Winchester, Virginia, he was struck in the knee by a shell fragment. The 15th NJ participated that day in a large assault by the Union army under Sheridan against a sizeable Confederate force; about mid-day, according to Haines, while maneuvering through a wood, "[w]e were…exposed to a terrific shell firing," and it was likely at this moment that Danberry was wounded. He was hospitalized in Wilmington, Delaware, and discharged in April, 1865. Wartime records noted that he suffered significant "loss of muscular tissue from Hospital Gangrene".

In December of the same year, having resettled in Flemington, Danberry applied for a pension, and the supporting affidavit of his Company A comrade, Manuel Kline, stated the veteran had incurred "a very serious wound by the bursting of a shell which struck him above the left knee severing the tendons, and causing him to be laid up in the hospital for six months." Danberry testified in an affidavit "that [I] cannot at times follow [my] trade of shoemaker because of pain." He was granted a pension the following year.

The veteran's remaining postwar life - he lived another 30 years, until age 68 - was a sad combination of demonstrable physical decline, and more or less continual obsession with trying to obtain more money from the government, on grounds that seem questionable in some cases (although his persistence did pay off). There is no question that his knee wound deteriorated, and his leg below the wound became swollen and developed ugly and painful "varices" (dilated, or varicose, veins). Meantime, Danberry applied no fewer than *seven times* for an increase in his initial award of $8 per month, utilizing four different attorneys in the process.[241] Four of the seven applications were rejected, but three were approved, leaving him ultimately with a monthly pension of $14.

During his lifetime, Danberry himself complained exclusively about his leg and its effect on his trade, and seems not to have mentioned any other significant ailments to pension officials and medical board examiners. It was only after he died that other serious

conditions began to be alleged, now in the context of his *widow's* own pension claim. This of course renders them somewhat suspect, and they were not credited (see below).

With respect to his leg wound, successive medical boards examining Danberry described conditions such as the following:

In 1873, the veteran "show[s] great incapacitation in muscular action" at the left knee.

In 1879, "the leg is somewhat varicose and the foot swollen".

In 1880, in the wound site there is a "large, deep and adherent cicatrix five inches long, three deep and two wide - in center - leg below the wound much swollen".

In 1887, "he is not apparently lame".

In 1889, gangrene "must have destroyed" muscles, scarring interferes with the knee joint, there is "puffy swelling" below the scar.

Danberry's penultimate examination was in 1890, in Somerville, New Jersey; he was 62 years old. The board reported he complained, "[t]hat his leg is becoming weaker, and that the veins become very much distended if he stands on it - can be on it very little." Its examination disclosed:

> Cicatrix on inner aspect of thigh at junction of middle with lower third, measured 5 inches long & 2 inches wide, is depressed below skin level 1-1/2 inches, is adherent, puckered, and tender.
>
> Varices - left leg around calf measures 1 inch more than right owing to varices. All the external veins are involved, they are tortuous and just below the knee form a girdle two inches wide nearly encircling leg at various points. The veins project 1/2 inch beyond skin level, they are extremely tender.
>
> Heart, lungs & all other organs normal.

The veteran's last board examination, the following year, made no significantly different findings. From age 48 to age 64, Danberry's weight changed only moderately, from 170 to 180; he was about 5'6" tall.

Hiram Hart, a farmer living in Raritan Township, was a longtime friend of the veteran, who often employed him to make or mend shoes for him and his family and who "would be in his [Flemington] shop every two or three weeks and sometimes oftener". Hart

submitted an affidavit in 1901 that provides what is probably a truthful and accurate summary of Danberry's life and troubles.

> [I] remember…that at the time [Danberry] enlisted, he was a strong able bodied man. He would come to [my] house and men harness & shoes sometimes - and has worked some form [me] on [my] farm.
>
> When [I] first saw Danberry after his return from the war [I] found him looking badly and heard him complain of his back and rheumatism. He seemed to be stiff. I noticed from this time until he died he seemed to grow more stiff - and his complaints increased. He was not a well man after his return, and [I] noticed he…had more difficulty in getting up from his bench & walking around as time went by. In time he walked with a cane.
>
> Danberry was in the habit of buying provisions of me and working to pay for them. This he did until he was unable to work any longer. He was to make a pair of shoes for my wife, but finally had to give it up - and I guess he never worked after that. This [I] think was about a year before he died.

Danberry died on May 26, 1895, at age 68. His death certificate gives heart disease "for two years," and "Dropsy" (an obsolete term for edema, or swelling) as the causes.

His widow, Mary, subsequently claimed that her husband had also been suffering from "Bright's Disease (an obsolete term for unspecified kidney disease) and rheumatism" when he died; that his heart disease had begun in the service; and that the immediate cause of death had actually been "Hemorrhage caused by the wound". (These claims were by way of an effort to link her husband's death with his wartime service, which may have entitled her to a larger widow's pension.)

To bolster her claims, in 1900 Mary filed the affidavit of Susan Hoagland, a friend residing in Neshanic Station (Somerset County), "seven or eight miles" from the Danberry residence. Hoagland stated she had known the veteran from the time of his discharge, and knew "he was suffering from heart trouble as Dr. J. Ewing was attending [illegible]…[and he] was suffering from shortness of breath, [and was] very excitable." Despite the 7-8 mile distance separating their homes (a 3-hour walk each way), Hoagland swore she was "a near neighbor and almost daily visited [Danberry] during his illness and assisted his wife in nursing him, and heard the Doctors who attended him say that he was suffering from heart trouble." All this is possibly true, but the fact that Danberry never himself raised "heart

trouble" during his 26 years of active pension activity, and that none of the many examining boards found evidence of heart disease, fatally weakened Mary's claim.

Whatever may have been the truth of the heart matter, Danberry's life was unquestionably impacted by the progressive, long-term effects of his wartime shell wound. His suffering, and growing incapacity to make a living at his lifelong trade, were real.

James Hoffman (January, 1868). Hoffman's story presents a case of postwar suffering from the effects of both a serious wound *and* a significant wartime injury. In the first two decades following the war, the veteran's health issues seem to have revolved primarily around the wound, but the other injury assumed relatively greater importance as he aged.

Hoffman was born in Hunterdon County in 1841, probably in Tewksbury Township, where he "worked on a farm from the time I was 9 years old up to I was 19 years." He worked first for his surrogate father, Philip Auble ("he raised me, I suppose"), and then for Philip Eick, a farmer in New Germantown (present day Oldwick), until he enlisted. He joined the company as a 21-year-old single man, of average height at 5'7".

Long after the war, Hoffman for the first time would officially claim he was ruptured in mid-January 1863, while working in a road-building detail near the company's first winter encampment at White Oak Church. His failure to mention the injury at the time would later become a problem.

A few months later, in early May, 1863, main elements of the Union and Confederate armies were slugging it out in very heavy fighting in and around Fredericksburg, Virginia. On May 3, Union forces managed to sweep through the city and the heights above it, and then drive westward toward the strongly-defended ground around the little town of Salem Church. The 15th New Jersey was part of the left flank of the Union line, and was engaged throughout the day. According to Haines:

> As soon as we came up [to Salem Church] the Fifteenth formed a line in a hollow, and there unslung knapsacks, some forty paces from the woods. The order "Forward, Guide Center," was given, and we charged into the woods for three hundred

> feet.... A tremendous roar of musketry met us from the unseen enemy, one hundred feet away, posted behind a fence and ditch. Men tumbled from our ranks dead, and others fell helpless with wounds.

One of the wounded was James Hoffman, of Company A. During the hour-long engagement - probably the initial charge - he received a grievous wound to the right shoulder, neck, and mouth, most likely from being struck with a single musket ball. The wound probably should have been fatal, or at least paralyzing - the ball just missed striking his spinal column at the neck - and he was not expected to survive.

Many men were left on the field when the regiment was eventually ordered to withdraw. (David Frey, for example, was listed as MIA after the battle, and later as "supposed dead".) Hoffman was lucky to be taken off. The suffering that night, as the regimental medical team set up a temporary field hospital in a local house, beggars description.

> The house was crowded with the wounded and dying.... Those who could not be taken into the house were laid in the out-buildings and the surrounding gardens. * * * It was most distressing to see the amount of suffering crowded into that small dwelling. * * * The floors were stained and the carpets of the house soaked with human blood. Cries and moans...filled the rooms. * * *
>
> We had gone into battle that morning with three hundred and fifty men. Our total casualties were estimated at one hundred and fifty-four [44%].... The killed were twenty-eight.

The fact that the regiment, which numbered nearly 1,000 men when it had left New Jersey only eight months before, was already diminished by about two-thirds in combat-ready strength, attests to the dire effects of disease and injury during the unit's first winter at the front. Next to the regiment's experience at Spotsylvania Courthouse, which lay a year in the future, this action would rate its worst of the war. Company A, which was probably down to about 35 or so men of its original 100, suffered badly (but not as badly as the regiment as a whole): eight casualties (about 23%), three of whom were KIA (Warren Dunham, Peter Frey, and David Hicks), and five WIA (James Apgar, William Dungan, James Hoffman, John Kutter, and Abram Van Fleet; Apgar died 2-1/2 weeks later, after his leg had been amputated).

Hoffman was transported to a field hospital at Aquia Creek, and later hospitalized in Washington. Remarkably, within about four months he was sufficiently recovered to be transferred to an "Invalid Corps" unit stationed in the capital (Company E, 9th VRC Regiment). He remained there until being discharged on June 26, 1865. The army surgeon who examined him on discharge wrote:

> [B]all entered a little to the right of 7th cervical vertebrae [lower neck], passing leftward, upward and forward, underneath floor of mouth, making exit at lower border inferior maxillary bone [lower left cheekbone, just above teeth], one inch to the left of Symphasis [line above center of mouth, where cheek bones join]. Rotary motion of head somewhat impaired. Complains of weakness of right arm and inability to perform labor requiring swinging motion of head, such as using a cradle [a farming tool attached to a scythe]. Disability 1/2 and not positively permanent.

Like many others in his circumstances, he had opportunity while being so posted to meet and court a woman, in this case a very young Hannah Ryan. Two days after being discharged, the two were married by a local pastor at the "GE Church" (German Episcopal?), in Washington; Hannah was about 15, and James was 24. (The couple was prolific, and wasted no time. They produced 12 children over the next 24 years, their first born 9-1/2 months following the wedding.)

The Hoffmans then returned to New Jersey, but settled in Georgetown, a small village in Burlington County about 40 miles south of James's Hunterdon hometown. There, despite his wound and resulting disability, the veteran returned to farming - an occupation he pursued the rest of his life - working first as a farmhand for a man named George Wilson. Two and a half years after his discharge and marriage, Hoffman filed his initial pension claim, based on disability stemming from his gunshot wound. It was approved, and rated at 1/2 ($4 per month).

Hoffman was at first required to submit to the usual biennial medical examinations, but this was waived after an examination by the Trenton board in September, 1873, the implication being that his condition was not expected to improve in future. The board report noted:

> [The ball] carried off a portion of the lateral process of the dentate

> [illegible, but probably referring to upper teeth], cut through esophagus, and injured the tissue generally so that speech was lost for months, swallowing for a time almost impossible and his recovery not expected. Bone was discharged from an opening made [by surgeon?] in front of the sternomastoid muscle [neck muscle on either side of throat]. Neck stiff and carried to one side.

Based on this review and the board's recommendation, the veteran promptly filed an application for an increase in his pension award (the first of ten!), which was subsequently approved at the new rate of 3/4ths ($6 per month). By this time (1873), Hoffman was 32 years old and he and his wife, who was only about 23, had already produced 5 children. The board recorded his height in 1873 at 5'9", two inches taller than his height as measured at the time of enlistment! (All subsequent height measurements by medical boards put his height between 5'8-1/2" and 5'9", making that range the more reliable measurement. Hoffman was always trim and in some years must have appeared emaciated; his recorded weight varied randomly over the period of 36 years in which it was recorded, oscillating between 130 and 145 pounds.)

Hoffman filed his second increase request 6 years after the first, in late 1879. He continued to base his claim on the direct results of the gunshot wound, but now - apparently on the strength of comments a treating doctor had made to him - asserted for the first time that he believed the ball that had struck him was still lodged in his neck or back. The examining board did not confirm this. It nevertheless recommended Hoffman for an increased award, which was made in January of the following year (to 10/18ths, under a new rating system which entitled him to a monthly amount of $10).

The veteran's health continued to deteriorate, and over a subsequent period of 23 years - 1883 through 1906 - he filed four more claims seeking increases in his award. All were rejected. Of note was his claim of June, 1886, in which he raised two new medical complaints: rheumatism, attributed to the musket ball he still insisted remained in his body; and a rupture, which he asserted had been incurred during wartime service. (Hoffman was 45 years old at this time, and now had 10 children.) Specifically, he claimed the rupture had been caused in January, 1863, by the strain of building a "corduroy road" along the muddy

way between White Oak Church and Belle Plain Landing, in Virginia. ("Corduroy," literally, "King's road," was a form of road made by laying sections of log side-by-side, perpendicular to the route of travel.) Hoffman asserted that he "was provided with a truss" at the time, and that it continued to bother him. He was supported in this claim by George Webb, a former comrade in the VRC, who backed up Hoffman's version of events. (Webb had gone to war about the same time Hoffman had, with Company G of the 11th New Jersey Volunteer Regiment, which had mustered in Trenton. He was also wounded during the 11th's first summer of campaigning in 1863, hospitalized [where he met Hoffman], and transferred to the same VRC company the same month as Hoffman [where they became "bunkmates"].)

The Pension Office, however, was not persuaded on any count. The Trenton board that examined him following the application found no evidence of a lodged ball and thus could not find that the claimed rheumatism, if it existed, resulted from any wartime circumstance. The government reviewer noted that the Surgeon General's records made no mention of Hoffman's wartime treatment or hospitalization for an alleged rupture. No one found an increase in disability.

Undaunted, the soldier waited another six years and applied again, in 1892, this time adding a claim of "general debility" for good measure, and retaining a new attorney to represent him (the Trenton-based pension specialist, James Rusling). He fortified the lodged ball/rheumatism claim with an affidavit by Dr. A.H. Patterson, who had been treating him during the last several years. Patterson, with an air of assurance, wrote:

> The ball entered the shoulder just above the Collar Bone passing downward along the spinal column and now lays embedded in the muscles of the back thereby causing the Rheumatism of the shoulder and neck producing the usual symptoms of this disease.[242]

Later that year, the Trenton board examined Hoffman and, though finding him "a well nourished man and muscular," and declining once again to credit the lodged ball assertion, did note that he suffered from a "testicle three times normal size" (the rupture). The board recommended adding another 4/18ths ($4) to his existing disability rating, for this

"varicocele." The Pension Office took more than two more years to decide how to respond to this more generous assessment of Hoffman's ills. Finally, in March 1895, it rejected his latest application for a higher rate.

Either because his attorney sought review of the decision, or the government itself decided to revisit it (the record does not disclose which), 9 months later, in November, the Pension Office ordered a Special Examination (formal inquiry; see Chapter 8) into the rupture claim. The stated focus of the proceeding was "investigation relative to origin [of varicocele of left side], there being no record and no medical evidence of its existence in service or at discharge". A drawn-out affair followed. Over a period of 9-1/2 additional months, four different examiners convened proceedings in six locations (Georgetown, Camden, and Trenton, New Jersey; Philadelphia and Bristol, Pennsylvania; and Springfield, Illinois), and took formal, transcribed testimony, or received written responses to its questions, from a total of more than 13 witnesses, including Hoffman's wife and at least 12 of his wartime comrades (all but one from Company A). (By this date, applicants no longer had to show that a disabling condition was service-connected, but there was still an incentive for doing so because service-connected conditions were rated differently and could result in higher awards. Thus the origin of the hernia was an important issue for both Hoffman and the government.)

The government investigation sheds light on Hoffman's worsening health condition over the years, and its effect on his ability to earn a living and take care of his large family by performing the physically difficult work of farming. It also, however, provides insight into the ways a claim could be "tailored" and supported by an applicant endeavoring to win a bigger share of federal largesse. It is worth reviewing in detail.

The Special Examination proceeded through four phases. First, in November 1895, Special Examiner R. McMorris questioned Hoffman himself, and his wife, in their hometown of Georgetown, New Jersey (possibly at their home). The veteran testified that he had

encountered no hernia problems in his prewar work as a farmer, and that he was naked during his pre-enlistment physical examination and "pronounced sound".

He then stated:

> When working on the corduroy roads near White Oak Church along in January or February 1863, I noticed a pain in the left groin, and I knew there was something wrong. I noticed an enlargement in the left testicle, as if some entrails had gone down in the bag.[243] It was caused by carrying heavy timbers out of the woods on hand porters or sticks. It come on me with a sharp pain, suddenly from a strain.

Hoffman explained that he did not report this to the surgeon "as I should have done…because I did not think it was going to amount to anything". The veteran did not make the problem "very public," or even tell his Company A tentmates about it, "because it was a private affair and I did not think it necessary." Finally, he explained that he had not previously raised a claim for the hernia "for I had no idea that a claim could be made for that." He treated himself with a "bandage, a wide piece of canvas or muslin…[that] I would put…around the lower part of the stomach," as well as with a money belt that he wore and that he "would buckle…up tight". These "would support my stomach and…relieve the pressure below."

Webb knew about the hernia, however, because Hoffman told him of it after they were both assigned to the same VRC company, 8 months after the injury. Webb, according to Hoffman, "saw it when we went in bathing," but "[h]e don't know what caused it except what I told him".

Unfortunately, this testimony differed significantly from the impression Webb himself had left in an affidavit filed with the Pension Office several months before Hoffman's examination. (The examiner included Webb's affidavit as an exhibit in his subsequent report to the Pension Office.) Webb at the time had stated:

> …[I]n regards to James Hoffman's rupture I know *from personal knowledge* that he was ruptured while in the Army marching and working on the CordaRoy roads between Bell plain landing and White Oak Church - about the middle of January 1863, having seen the rupture myself while in the service…. [Italics added.]

Finally, the veteran acknowledged that he had been accidentally hurt a second time "about four or five years ago [1890-91]," when he was struck by a horse-drawn wagon:

> I was run into accidentally by a double team [of horses] and a heavy farm wagon, and I was run over by the horses, they trampled me and bruised me in the left side above the hip near the lower rib. It happened at night, it was simply an accident, the wheels did not strike me. …[T]he horse did not trample on my groin. I did not call a doctor. I used plasters and liniments.
>
> I made my claim for the rupture before I met with that accident.

None of this testimony bode well for Hoffman, although he was probably telling the truth on all counts. (His examiner reported that Hoffman's general reputation in the community "is said to be good".) His explanations for failing to have sought timely help for the injury in 1863 (he had not, as he later admitted, been "provided with a truss"); for neglecting to mention it to his Company A tentmates (some of whom were childhood schoolmates); and for not including it in an earlier pension claim (when he had recourse to competent legal counsel), all seem thin. And Webb's zealous testimony, in an obvious effort to assist a fellow veteran, probably did more harm than good. (Hoffman was forced to acknowledge he was also serving as a supporting witness in Webb's own pending pension claim.) It does not appear that Hoffman had volunteered the information about the horse-and-wagon accident, but only described it in response to questioning. (Worse, his wife's recollection under oath about the *timing* of the incident was quite different; see below.)

McMorris next examined Hannah Hoffman. In testimony that today sounds a bit Victorian or quaint, she described her growing awareness of her young husband's ruptured condition:

> I knew that he had an enlargement of the left side of the testicles. I cannot tell when I first knew of it but within one or two years of our marriage he told me about it. I had noticed it soon after our marriage but did not know what the trouble was [and did not ask!].
>
> After I knew he had a rupture he told me that he got it in the service. …[H]e did not wear a bandage or anything about his private parts after our marriage [and] he don't wear any now. He did some years ago wear a cloth or bandage.

As to the horse team incident, she stated:

> Yes, I knew about the team of horses injuring him *about 8 years ago*. * * * It

> was an accident. He went on errand to the store at night and a neighbor drove into him. [Italics added.]

This date (about 1887) places the injury a year or two *before* Hoffman's 1889 affidavit in which he first described the wartime rupture to the government. (Hannah's memory seems at least as reliable as her husband's; she recalled their wedding date with precision while James could not.)

Hannah also was prompted by the formal proceeding to amend some of the sworn statements *she* had earlier made, in an affidavit supporting her husband's pension increase claim. Most were inconsequential details but one was not: she conceded to the examiner that her prior statement that James was "totally incapacitated for labor" was "wrong".

Unsurprisingly, the examiner concluded in his report to the Commissioner of Pensions that "it is doubtful if [Hoffman] will be able to satisfactorily prove that the disability was due to his service". He nevertheless recommended that the investigation continue, and that additional witnesses be examined.

The second phase of the Special Examination took place in December 1863, when George Webb was interrogated in his town of residence, Bristol (Bucks County), Pennsylvania. Webb was now pressed on his "personal knowledge" of the claimant's rupture, and had to modify his earlier affidavit:

> I do not remember which side the rupture was on…but I saw it then [in "Convalescent Camp" after Hoffman was shot] and saw it many times afterwards for we afterward served in the same company in the VRC and bunked together…. I do not know the origin of the rupture - how he incurred it - but I do know positively that he was ruptured…. He wore some sort of a support. * * * It was a very crude arrangement invented by himself.

Webb's examiner, D.H. Alexander, chose to focus on the *consistent* portions of his testimony, and in January 1866 wrote the Commissioner that "the witness sustains his former testimony as to existence of hernia in service". (Tellingly, he referred to Webb as "comrade," signaling that he too was a veteran and probably inclined to be as helpful as possible.) More charitably than Special Examiner McMorris, Alexander concluded that Hoffman's claim "appears to have merit," and also recommended further examinations.

The next phase of the investigation - its most time-consuming - occurred in March 1896. It involved contacts or attempted contacts with 12 Company A veterans: John Parrish, Theodore Stryker, Peter ten Broek, Manuel Kline, John Reading, Theodore Bellis, Henry Johnson, Lewis Snyder, George Beavers, John Bulmer, George Van Camp, and John Burns. The conscientious examiner, C.E. Hayward, deposed Burns, Parrish, ten Broek, Stryker, and Kline; and corresponded with Reading, Bellis, Johnson, and Snyder. He was unable to locate only Bulmer and Van Camp.

After all this work, though, only one of the ten contacted veterans was actually able to shed any light on the claim one way or the other. All of the remaining 9 gave similar versions of the same unhelpful information: they could not remember, or only barely remembered, Hoffman, and had not seen him since the war); and while they recalled members of the company doing some road-building work during the period in question, they knew nothing of Hoffman's claimed rupture.

John Burns, however, *did* remember something useful. Burns at the time resided in Ringoes (Hunterdon County), was 50 years old and working as a hotel keeper. (This was one of *many* occupations he would pursue during his postwar career; see Chapter 7.) Contacted by Hayward, he wrote back excitedly that he did indeed know and “well remember” Hoffman, who had been a tentmate and a "Gallant soldier". However, Burns continued, since the fight at Salem Church, "I have never met him [again]," and he asked Hayward, "Can you give me his post office address"?

The examiner now had the perfect witness: a Company A comrade and tentmate who remembered Hoffman well, but who had not spoken to him since the war, and did not know how to contact him now. Before responding to Burns's request for an address, Hayward wrote him again, asking if he "recollect[ed] any injury that Hoffman incurred before he was wounded”? Burns replied, “I think if my memry serves me right that James Hoffman was treated while we layed at White Oak Church VA[,] previous to his wounds[,] with Rupture or Hernia.”

Hayward immediately summoned Burns to be deposed at Ringoes, and the latter appeared for this purpose a couple of days later. His testimony was substantially identical to what he had written, adding that the applicant "had good health at first and did duty right along". Burns also related that he had visited Hoffman in the hospital at Aquia Creek after he had been wounded, but never saw or heard from him again and "supposed he was dead until you [Hayward] wrote to me".

Hayward's report to Washington detailed his pivotal exchanges with Burns, concluding, “He could have had no communication with the claimant, and I am satisfied that his deposition may be implicitly relied upon. He [also] stands well in his community.” On this basis, Hayward as well felt Hoffman's claim to have merit, and recommended following up with even further efforts to contact members of Company A.

The fourth and last phase of the proceeding was conducted by Charles A. Hughes, in Springfield, Illinois, in September of the same year. He managed after difficulty to trace down one more company man, William Barber. On corresponding with him, however, he determined that Barber, like almost all of Hoffman's other former comrades, "remembers nothing about the alleged rupture". He nonetheless recommended further action: in this case an attempt to track down and question William Collins, in Port Angeles, Washington!

But the Pension Office had had enough, and had surely spent a considerable amount of money. The Special Examination was brought to a close at this point and, unhappily for Hoffman, the government did not see fit to revise its earlier rejection of his increase application.

Another decade passed before Hoffman made his next (sixth) application for a pension increase. In 1906, he returned to the Washington attorney he had used (unsuccessfully) twenty years before, and again based his claim on the aggravating factors of rheumatism and rupture. The filing prompted a medical board examination, which took place in December, in Camden. Hoffman was now 64 years old, and remained a farmer. He gave his address as Columbus, New Jersey. (This may simply have been a different post

office address for the same residence; Columbus and Georgetown are only about 3 miles apart and are both a part of Mansfield Township.)

The Camden board found the veteran's "[g]eneral appearance and muscular development good," with "no evidence of heart disease" or "vicious habits". It did rate him for three conditions, however: the original gunshot wound, a "direct inguinal hernia of the right side" (all previous hernia and testicle references had been to the *left* side), and rheumatism (stiffness and tenderness) in the left shoulder joint. The hernia observations are especially mysterious; the board found that the "[l]eft side is normal," but that on the right side he had a "tumor 1 x 1 inch, the mass pass[ing] through the external ring…[and] admit[ing] one finger tip," requiring Hoffman to wear a truss "habitually". Although the board did not comment on it explicitly, it presumably found no evidence of the former left side varicocele - the left testicle that both Hannah and another board (in 1892) had testified was three times the size of his right. Had this condition spontaneously resolved itself? Did the board simply miss it (implausible)? Whatever the case, the Pension Office, for the fourth time, rejected the claim early the following year.

One month later, Hoffman's luck changed. Congress passed new legislation (the "Act of February 6, 1907"), awarding a pension to any Union veteran attaining age 65, at a uniform rate of $12 per month. Hoffman, having turned 65 the previous year, promptly filed, and received, the higher amount. In subsequent years, he would file 4 more times for age-based increases, following legislation that continually liberalized award amounts ($15 in 1911 for attaining age 70; $24 in 1912, when Congress adjusted all rates upward; $30 in 1916, for attaining age 75; and $40 in 1918, after another general rate adjustment).

Probably about the year 1915, Hannah died (the exact year and cause of death are unknown). She was in her 60s, and the physically demanding life she had undoubtedly led as a farmer's wife and mother of 12 children may finally have worn her out. By 1916, the veteran had left New Jersey and moved in with one of his sons, Charles T. Hoffman, in a Washington, DC, apartment building. He was obviously no longer farming, and must now

have eased fully into the life of the "Old Veteran," rocking away the hours; reliving the vivid memories of his youth and the war; and being comforted by the ministrations of his large family, which by now surely included many grandchildren. On April 18 of that year, his son Charles "called at the Bureau [Pension Office]" to advise the staff that his father had recently turned 75, and to inquire about his receiving the higher pension amount now due him. Charles's note of inquiry, in small, precise, and perfectly-punctuated handwriting, remains in Hoffman's pension file; James could write too, but barely, and Hannah had only been able to sign her name.

Remarkably, Hoffman lived another ten years, at some point moving back to New Jersey and taking up residence at Bordentown. (Bordentown is about 6 miles north of Columbus and Georgetown, near the Delaware River.) It is likely that he relocated there to live with another of his children in his waning years. Fittingly, he died on July 4, Independence Day, 1926, at age 85.

George Bartow (March, 1870). Bartow, a prewar resident of Hillsboro (a western township in Somerset County that borders the village of Clover Hill, in Hunterdon County), was 19 years old and single when he went off to war. He worked as a printer before enlisting. On the morning of June 20, 1864, during the 15th NJ's participation in the opening phase of the siege of Petersburg, he was wounded in the left "thigh," according to military records, with a shell fragment. (The wound was actually to his left buttocks). Bartow had the distinction of being the regiment's sole casualty that day.[244] He was hospitalized for about half a year, and then transferred in January, 1865, to the VRC, and discharged in July after six months' service in Buffalo, New York.

He returned to reside in Clover Hill, Hunterdon County, just across the county line from where he had grown up, and went to work "clerking in his father's store and reading Medicine". (The Beers 1873 Atlas shows a "store" at the Clover Hill crossroads, just over the line in Hillsboro, Somerset County. It is likely that his father was a druggist, and among

other goods dispensed "medicines" from the store.) Sometime afterward (the date is not known), he married Elizabeth Van Cleve Merrill.

Despite the less physically demanding work entailed in store clerking and studying to become a doctor, Bartow found himself disabled "to a serious degree from labor by said wound," and in 1870 applied for a pension. Later that year, the examining board determined that the veteran was indeed disabled from a wound "over the origin of the Gluteus [buttocks] Muscles[,] which is mostly destroyed leaving large cicatrix and showing considerable loss of tissue". The board recommended a finding of 3/4ths disability, and Bartow was subsequently approved for a pension.

At his "biennial examination" two years later, Bartow reported that the wound produced lameness in his left leg, which was "aggravated by performing manual labor," and that changes in the weather resulted in "rheumatism" in the affected area. In 1875, the examiners noted that the condition had shortened the distance of Bartow's left step, and that he experienced pain and fatigue on walking. In 1876, Elizabeth died, and three years later, in 1879, he married again, this time to Matilda Bigelow, a widow with a son. Matilda had known Bartow since childhood, stating, "[I] remember him as long as I remember anyone". The same year, the medical board excused further appearances as a condition of keeping his pension, concluding that no improvement in his disability was likely.

A decade later, Bartow's condition has worsened, and he claimed also to have "had heart trouble about ten years". In 1889, at age 46, he accordingly applied for an increase in his pension. The examining board now described the wound scar as about 2 to 3" wide and 1-1/4" deep, "adherent [attaching to underlying bone or tissue] and very tender". It observed that the left gluteus muscle was "divided," and that the veteran could not flex his leg "more than 1/3rd". Examining his heart, the board found a "severe degree of mitral regurgitation" [blood flowing backward through a damaged mitral valve], as well as enlargement, which it speculated might be due to "overexertion" stemming from Bartow's disability.

Bartow was also now showing signs of a more sedentary lifestyle, or at least one in which his ambulatory ability was increasingly compromised. Between age 30 and 46, he gained 47 lbs., going from a very slim 135 to a stout 182, a 35% gain in body mass (his height was about 5'9"). The Pension Office approved an increase in award.

Bartow died in 1907, a month short of turning 64, from "cerebral apoplexy" (stroke). Evidence from his estate indicates that he did in fact pursue the practice of medicine after the war, though never managing to become much of a financial success. His death certificate lists his occupation as "M.D.," and at his death, he was a member of the Society for Widows and Orphans of Medical Men, which paid his widow $230.25 in proceeds from an insurance policy on his life. He owned personal property valued at about $500, including "two horses, some wagons…, books and miscellaneous medical instruments". He also owned both his residence in Three Bridges (although it was mortgaged for about twice its value), and a half interest in a "small lot" in Clover Hill, rented out for farming at about $50 per year.

Bartow's wartime wound clearly remained a painful and physically limiting condition throughout his lifetime, and although he arguably became one of the few Company A veterans to rise on the social or occupational ladder (from prewar tradesman to postwar white collar or "professional" status), his upward mobility did not translate into any significant gain in economic standing. (See generally, Chapter 7)

William Barber (February, 1883). Barber was a 21-year old bachelor living in Raritan Township and working as a farmer when he enlisted. On October 19, 1864, he was hit in the left calf by a musket ball at the Battle of Cedar Creek (Virginia). The wound was a bad one, serious enough for him to be transferred from the field hospital to the general army hospital in Newark, New Jersey, where he remained recuperating for nearly nine months before being discharged in July, 1865. He then returned to Hunterdon, married Arietta Arwine, and produced at least one child, a daughter, Maggie.

He apparently tried to go back to farming, but could not make it with his badly injured leg, and finally in 1883, at age 41, sought a pension for his disability. The Medical

Board that convened to examine Barber in 1886 reported that "[the] ball struck the lower part of the gastrocnemius [rear calf] muscle of the left leg[,] passed forward and outward carrying away muscles and tendons and leaving leg weak[;] it also swells - and is painful." (Although Barber had probably not been aware of it, the board also diagnosed him with an enlarged heart, specifically, "heart hypertrophy," a thickening of the walls of the heart in response to vascular, valvular, or other heart disease."[245] As this condition was not attributed to his wartime service, his pension award did not include it.)

Arietta died in 1886, and in 1889 Barber moved to Illinois, to live with or near Maggie and her husband in Nokomis, a small village near the center of the state. He tried to do light outdoor work as a nurseryman, but found even this too much for him. In 1890, with the pension law liberalized, he applied for an increased award, now claiming both the direct effects of the wound as well as "sciatica" and generalized "rheumatism". The examining board in 1892 did recommend an increase, and in describing Barber's condition wrote:

> …[C]icatrix of entry [wound] as large as a ten cent piece - the exit cicatrix is as large as a dollar…effect of wound is to greatly impair limb for walking of prolonged use - weakness limb. He has pain at left hip at exit of sciatica [nerve,] tender on pressure rendering limb stiff to knee with occasional pain in left hip.

This board made no mention of any heart condition, however, and discounted the claim of rheumatism (or considered it a part of the sciatica complaint).

Barber stayed with his daughter's family in Illinois for the rest of his days, residing in their home in Nokomis during his final years. He did not succumb from heart disease but, sadly, was afflicted instead toward the end with stomach cancer. He died in 1910, 11 days short of his 69th birthday (the death certificate reads: "Carconoma [sic] of stomach resulting in haemorrhage"). Barber's son-in-law, Milo Sperry, made application under a 1907 federal act for reimbursement of "the expenses of his last sickness and burial." (He was later partly reimbursed, according to the confusing provisions of the act.[246]) The bills Sperry submitted with the application provide some insight into the veteran's last days, and the contemporary

state of basic medical treatment (which appears to have relied heavily on alcohol and tobacco).

Doctors were engaged by the family to treat Barber in the last six weeks of his life. Dr. W.C. Hovey, of Nokomis, began with a home visit on March 9, and made five more visits through the end of the month ($3.50 per visit); he also administered unspecified "medicine" on March 12 and April 2 ($0.75 each time). On the latter date, Sperry purchased a list of items for his father-in-law from Dr. C.H. Kempton, apparently the local druggist (among other things; Kempton's printed bill form advertised "Drugs, Stationery, Paints, Oils, Wall Paper, Etc."). The list, costing a total of $11.25, included: 2 bottles of grape juice; 1 pint of alcohol and 1 of whiskey; a quart of "sherry wine"; 1 box of "Dyspepsin"; a bottle of "[Illegible] Aqua Cure" and 2 of "Pluto Water"; 1 box of chewing tobacco; 2 rolls of absorbent cotton; 3 "All [illegible] Plasters"; and 1 hot water bottle.

At about the same time, Barber's treatment was turned over to Dr. Charles H. Lockhart, of Witt, Illinois, who made five further home visits from April 6 through 17 ($4 per visit), and also sold the family a bedpan for $1. (Witt is located about 5 miles southwest of Nokomis; it is not known why the family changed doctors in the midst of Barber's final health crisis.)

Barber's daughter, Maggie Sperry, also submitted a bill for government reimbursement, charging "for nursing W.T. Barber in last illness - 37 days @ $2.00 - $74.00," as did a Mrs. Bertha B. Kissinger, in the sum of $6.00. Maggie's bill suggests that her father's stomach condition must have become seriously disabling, and probably increasingly painful by March 12 or 13 (when her active care-taking started), and that he suffered with it for over 5 weeks before essentially bleeding to death. (One wonders if he were able in the final 2-1/2 weeks even to keep down the spirits obtained for him on April 2, and clearly intended to ease his discomfort.) Barber's assets at death were listed at "$0," but his family did receive the proceeds of a $150 "industrial" life insurance policy he had purchased from Prudential Insurance Company of America.

William Barber was embalmed the day he died by the local morticians, "Shannon & Best, Dr." (The title "Dr." appears to have been in wide usage at the time). The procedure itself only cost $10, but the Sperrys spent an additional $118.15 providing the old deceased veteran with a $100 casket, a new suit to be buried in ($16), and even new shoes ($2) and "hose" ($0.15). Another $5 was spent hiring a horse-drawn ambulance to drive Barber's body to the train station, where it was carried to Flemington, New Jersey, for burial, reaching the town on April 21, only two days after Barber's demise.

Once reaching the Flemington train station (no bill was submitted for train fare), Barber's body was picked up by "Davis Hanson, Dr. - General Furnishing Undertaker," and for $6.50 was transported by "hearse, team, and driver" to the Prospect Hill Cemetery. Finally, upon paying Judiah Higgins, Treasurer of the cemetery association, the sum of $10 for "grave for body," Barber was at last put to rest in the town where he had spent most of his life, gone off to war and come back, been married and widowed, and raised his daughter.

Cases involving long-term effects of wartime diseases or camp conditions

John Butler, Sr. (July, 1866). John Butler, Sr. was born in England about 1812, reportedly in "Dovington," Shropeshire County.[247] In 1840, he married Charlotte Hughes, and the couple had three daughters, all born in England.[248] Butler, who was illiterate, worked in his native country as a laborer for the local "Parish Church." At some point between 1845 and 1862, the family moved to the United States, and settled in Raritan Township. (Neither John nor his wife made subsequent reference to their daughters in their pension files, and it seems likely they stayed behind in England when the couple migrated. This suggests they did not immigrate until their last daughter had reached marrying age, which would not have been until about 1862.)

At 50 years of age, Butler was by far the oldest man to enlist with the company. He almost certainly did so for economic reasons, but the decision turned out to be a grave misjudgment. About November 25, 1862, as typhoid fever and other camp diseases began to take their toll among members of the regiment, Butler "took sick at Bakersville, Maryland,"

according to Manuel Kline, Company A's new 2nd Lieutenant, and "was left behind…when the Army crossed into Va." Kline went on to explain:

> The Regiment was a new one and was much of the time drilling…[and] also doing considerable Camp & Picket Guard duty with the exposure usually incident thereto, the men were comparatively fresh from civil life and had not become accustomed to the habits and mode of life in the field. * * * [I am] not certain as to the disease which [Butler] was taken with but think it was chronic Diarrhea. * * * [He] rejoined his company at Stafford C. H. Va about December 1st, 1862 and was immediately detailed to the [1st Division] Ambulance Corps.

Cornelius Waldron, an army friend from another company, went looking for Butler at division headquarters in May of 1863, but was informed he was "very sick with fever and diarrhea" and had been hospitalized. (From this description, he may have contracted both typhoid and dysentery.) When Waldron found him, "I saw him laying very sick in the Army Hospital [and] he was so bad that I never expected to see him again". War Department records show he recovered but did not return to the company. He was transferred instead to the VRC in September, 1863, and remained in that service until being discharged in June, 1865.

Butler, who according to Waldron had entered military service "a sound, healthy and well man," was never the same after coming home. He did not return to Hunterdon County, but resettled with Charlotte in Trenton, the state capital. In July, 1866, he filed for a pension based on his service-connected illnesses; like many in this early period of pension claiming, he submitted his application informally, by way of a letter to the Pension Office, and his file lacks any of the usual printed "declaration" and affidavit forms that soon became standard. He did not use an attorney. Sadly, the government appears never to have taken action on the application, and Butler himself failed to pursue it. He died six years later, chronically ill, unable to work, and wholly dependent on whatever his wife could earn.

In 1879, Charlotte Butler filed her own application for a widow's pension. In an effort to demonstrate her husband's death had been caused by diseases incurred while in service, she submitted affidavits from 4 neighbors, 2 of whom (John Jackson and Joseph Weber) had resided on either side of the boarding house the Butlers had lived in at 158 Fair

Street, and one of whom (Peter Saundt) had boarded at the same house. Together they drew a sad picture of Butler's life during the seven years he survived the war. According to his 2 next-door neighbors:

> …Butler suffered during all of said period with Chronic Diarrhea and to such an extent as to almost totally incapacitate him from labor - being only able to work for a day occasionally; his wife being compelled to work for their support…. They were intimate personal friends and constantly visited and were visited by him, and were his daily associates. * * * They were with him when he died.
>
> They frequently talked with said Butler who always complained of said disease, and knew of and saw his many daily visits to the Privy to attend to the calls of nature by said disease. There was no time…[up to] the time of his death when he was free from said disease and…not so prostrated thereby as to be unable to do any physical labor except an occasional day at light work, and was sometimes compelled even to relinquish [that] in the middle of a day by reason thereof.

His fellow boarder, Saundt, added:

> …[I]n 1865 immediately after [Butler's] discharge [I] worked with [him] and [he] was suffering from Chronic Diarrhea…and could do scarcely any work at all… For three years he did not do a stroke of work on account of debility…. [I] lived in the same house with [him] for five years about this time. Sat up with him at night while sick with said disease. [I] frequently saw the evacuations from [his] bowells…& they were clear slime & water and sometimes blood with it. He would go very frequently during the day to have an evacuation. * * * His Physical condition from the date of his discharge to the time of his death was an emaciated, debilitated, weakened and utterly prostrated condition - his wife being compelled to labor for the support of his family, he being unable to do so….

Elsewhere Saundt stated:

> …Butler was constantly running to the Water Closet from said disease and…was given up by Doctors some time before his death…. [They] would not come any more as they said they could not do anything for him…[and] Butler suffered very much….

His death was probably a blessing. The death certificate in 1872 gave "disease of the heart and kidneys" as the cause; he was about 60 years old. In an 1879 affidavit, a Dr. Elmer, one of his former treating physicians, elaborated, stating that Butler suffered from "valvular disease of heart of long standing & extensive edema of the feet; Dyspnea [difficulty in breathing associated with heart or lung disease] and hypostatic congestion [pooling of blood] of the lungs," and that his death had been "preceded by coma," brought about by overwork and "exposure".

Charlotte outlived her husband by sixteen years, dying in 1888, at about age 68. She, at least, received the small comfort of a widow's pension during that period, which was bringing her $12 a month by the time she passed away.

James Mattison (July, 1871}. Mattison (sometimes listed as "Madison" on the company's muster roll) was born on June 6, 1842, in Flemington. Before joining the army, he worked in town as a clerk in a hardware store owned by Jesse Bodine (see below). At age 20, he enlisted with Company A; he was single. He was also literate, and wrote and spoke well by company standards; he may have received a better-than-average early education at the town's private academy (see Chapter 2).

As the company approached its first grueling winter encampment, with typhus and dysentery beginning to ravage so many of his comrades, Mattison was brought low with a serious case of what was termed at the time, "Pleuro-Pneumonia". According to one of his Lieutenants, Manuel Kline, "[D]uring the months of November and December, 1862, [he] was taken sick with the disease…which seemed to be greatly aggravated from the crowded condition of the Hospitals, and from his exposure to cold and dampness". George R. Sullivan had been the Mattisons' family physician in Flemington since 1860 when he began his practice, and thus knew the soldier from before the war. Sullivan had in fact given Mattison his pre-enlistment examination, before going on to become the 15th New Jersey's Chief Surgeon. He stated later in an affidavit:

> …[I] know [Mattison] to have been of sound bodily health prior to his enlistment and entirely free from the disease…. Some time during the winter of 1862, while in camp near White Oak Church in the State of Virginia, he was attacked with the said disease, and placed in the camp Hospital for treatment. …[H]e partially recovered and was placed upon light duty at the office of the Adjutant of said Regiment where he remained until his discharge. * * * …[T]he camp at this time was exceedingly unhealthy, and…said disease was induced by exposure and cold.

He was discharged a half year later, in July, 1863, never having regained his health. At discharge, he was examined by the regiment's Assistant Surgeon, Redford Sharp, who described him as suffering from "[a]dhesions of the pulmonary and costal pleurae, resulting from pleurisy contracted Jan'y 63, rendering him entirely unfit for service." (Essentially, this

describes an infection, inflammation, and sticking together of the membranes lining the chest cavity and surrounding the lungs.[249])

Mattison returned to Flemington, and resumed working as a hardware store clerk. In April, 1869, he wedded Mary Eliza Swayze, of Chester (Morris County), New Jersey. Before long, his lung disease prompted him to apply for a pension, which he did in July, 1871, five years following the end of the war. Dr. Sullivan, who had returned to private practice and continued to treat Mattison after returning from the war, averred "that since [Mattison's] discharge he has suffered at various times severely from said disease, and at various times has been entirely disabled for work," adding that his condition was at no time "aggravated or prolonged by intemperate or other bad habits". The government rated him 1/2 disabled, and awarded him a $4-per-month pension starting in November, 1871.

From this time forward, Mattison became one of those pensioners who seemed never to be satisfied with the amount of his award. While it was common for pension recipients to file one or two "Increase Applications" over the course of their lives - especially when new laws liberalized criteria and potential award amounts, allowed payment of "arrears" from an earlier date, or their health condition deteriorated dramatically - some turned the pursuit of federal money into a single-minded and lifelong career. Mattison was one of these: from his initial award in 1871 to his death in 1918, he formally sought higher awards (or arrears) a total of 10 times or, on average, about once every 4-3/4 years. This is the highest number of such applications for any Company A veteran. Of the 10, 6 were approved and 4 rejected, his initial award of $4 per month growing to $22.50 by 1917. In 1878, he also received a lump sum payment of $398.27 in prorated "arrears," calculated from his discharge date in 1863. (This particular application involved Mattison and his brother-in-law, a doctor, in an embarrassing minor investigation by the Pension Office; see Chapter 8.)

Mattison's first pension-related medical examination at the hands of a government-appointed doctor came in April, 1878, when the Pension Office directed T. H. Studdiford, a Lambertville physician, to examine him. (At this relatively early stage in the long life of the

Civil War pension system, examination by a three-doctor medical board had not yet become standard.) Mattison was 35 years old. According to Studdiford's report, he was 5'7" tall (about average for the time), but weighed only 134 lbs.

> On inspection of the thorax [chest] I find there is some degree of emaciation. On percussion, dullness over the lower lobes of both sides, especially the left. On auscultation [listening with stethoscope], feeble inspiration, considerable bronchial respiration, and bronchophony [exaggerated bronchial noise]. He complains of having occasional paroxysms of dyspnea [attacks of shortness of breath], of distress in the lower portion of both sides of the chest, and debility as to interfere in a measure in the performance of manual labor. There is evidently some induration [hardening] of the lower lobes of both lungs.

Between 1881 and 1885, Mattison got a position as a clerk in the federal Treasury Department, and moved to Washington, DC. From this point until the end of his life, he appears to have moved back and forth between Washington and New Jersey, probably depending on his ability to get or keep this work with the federal employment. By 1887, for example, he was residing once again in Flemington, but by 1890, he had returned to Washington. (This may have had something to do with party politics; see Chapter 2 generally, and Chapter 9. Grover Cleveland, a Democrat widely seen as unfriendly to veterans' causes, held office from 1885 through 1888; but Benjamin Harrison, a Republican and Civil War veteran himself, occupied the White House from 1889 through 1892.)

In January, 1889, Mattison and his wife experienced the tragedy of losing their first-born, Mary Bell, at age 12; on August 30 of the same year, their second (and only other child), Samuel Swayze, was born. (The cause of Mary Bell's death is not known. Like so many other children of the time, she probably died of an infectious "childhood" disease. It is tempting to speculate that her parents conceived Samuel as a conscious rebuke to so cruel an act of the Grim Reaper; having had no children in the twelve years since their daughter's birth in 1876, Samuel was born just short of nine months following her death, to a mother who was probably at least 40 years old, and likely older.[250])

Back in Washington, Mattison filed 2 of his 10 applications in the years 1890 and 1891. For the first of these he continued to use local, New Jersey counsel (in this case, John

Connet, his longtime Flemington attorney); the application was rejected. For the second, he switched to Butts & Phillips, a large, Washington-based law firm. Mattison and his new attorneys this time arranged for the submission of three important supporting affidavits: those of Jesse Bodine, a Flemington businessman and Mattison's former employer; Alanson Haines, the 15th New Jersey's wartime chaplain; and Edmund Halsey, the regiment's adjutant. (This also constitutes a rare instance of a low-ranking Company A veteran using regimental level personnel as witnesses.)

Bodine had employed Mattison at his hardware store for two years before he enlisted.

> I saw him again soon after his return from the army - think in 1863 – and have known him intimately ever since. His employment since his discharge has been in the hardware business, Traveling Salesman and at times doing clerical work - much of the time for many years past he has, to my knowledge, been unable properly to attend to his duties. * * * In my opinion [he] is unable to perform manual lab or to scarcely any extent - is now and always has been temperate….

Haines, who was now 60 years old, stated that as Regimental Chaplain he knew Mattison during the war, and recalled his illness and hospitalization, attributing it to "the fatigue and hardship of the service and exposure to wet and cold and change of weather".

Halsey, now 50 years old, had more specific information.

> …Mattison was detailed for duty in the Adjutant's office in 1863 and…was much about the headquarters of the Regiment where his appearance attracted the attention both of [myself] (the Sergeant Major of the Regiment shortly after Adjutant) and of the Surgeon…. …[H]is appearance indicated that he was suffering under lung or liver trouble or both, and in the opinion of both [me] and said surgeon he could not remain in the service and live. He was accordingly discharged….
>
> …Mattison was at the time of his enlistment apparently perfectly well…. [I have] seen Mattison occasionally since the war and [have] always found him more or less of an invalid, suffering with lung trouble….

The Washington medical board that examined him at this time observed "coarse bronchial rales [rasping sounds] over both lungs," and that Mattison "coughs frequently and appears anemic," and "says he is losing flesh [weight]". (The veteran weighed 135 at the time, but had not at that time undergone a significant weight loss. His recorded weight, which remained consistently low throughout his postwar life, never varied by more than about 8 lbs., from a low of 132 [1881] to a high of 140 [1885, 1890, and 1900].) Disability

ratings had by now become more complicated and variable, and the board recommended a rate of "12/18ths". The Pension Office obliged by increasing his award from $8 per month to $12.

Mattison's last board examination took place nearly ten years later, in 1900, in connection with his seventh increase application. (The country was currently at War with Spain.) He was now 58 years old, and variously gave his residence as Washington, DC, and Chester, New Jersey, the town where he had been married twenty-nine years earlier. (This and other evidence suggests that at times Mattison and his wife lived separately: he in the capital and she in New Jersey. If true, it does not necessarily indicate marital discord, but may instead have been the product of the veteran's irregular federal employment and serial relocations, and/or an unrecorded health condition of his wife, compelling her return to her parents' home in Chester to be cared for, while her husband concentrated on making a living.) The board made detailed findings, and painted a much less deteriorated picture of Mattison's lung disease than had prior boards, implying that he could do with a bit of exercise!

> …[T]emperature normal; auscultation and percussion sounds at posterior aspect of the chest normal; on the anterior surface of the chest right side percussion sounds normal, left side slight modification of normal resonances; auscultation sounds on right side somewhat harsh on inspiration, auscultation sounds on left side show on inspiration roughness, expiration prolonged and harsh; no rales or friction murmurs detected…modifications of normal physical signs probably due to old pleurisy which claimant states he has had twice, as well as pneumonia; claimant denies hemorrhages and night sweats & fever; no evidence of cough or expectoration during examination; fairly well nourished, tongue clean, skin clear, somewhat pale and anaemic, muscles somewhat soft and flabby, probably as a result of lack of exercise.

The board did note (and rate) the onset of mild heart disease ("action slightly more rapid than normal…slight mitral systolic murmur…slight dyspnaea"), but in the end actually recommended a lower overall rating (8/18ths) than had the 1890 board. Mattison's application was rejected.

Nevertheless, all 3 of his last applications (in May and July of 1912, and in 1917) resulted in increased awards. Each stemmed from liberalized award levels legislated by

Congress, mainly for age, and Mattison successfully processed all three without the services of an attorney. He remained living in the capital throughout this period. His wife may have died by or during this time. Although the date of her death is unknown, it is certain that she predeceased him; there is no record of her filing for a widow's pension, and on the veteran's death the couple's son informed the Pension Office that he was the only surviving heir. Mattison finally expired on October 5, 1918, survived by his son, Samuel; the cause of death is not known. (The country was once again embroiled in conflict: WWI.) He was 76 years old, outliving the majority of his fellow Company A veterans.

Mattison's is an intriguing case. He had been a bright and articulate man, gregarious and, at least at his socio-economic level, evidently well-connected. His wedding was reportedly attended by sixty "witnesses," an extremely large number by Company A standards. He was a founding member and elected officer of his local GAR Post in Flemington, and stayed in touch with post comrades after moving to Washington to work for the federal government. He continued all his life in a clerical, "white collar" occupation of some sort, first in the private sector and later in government service. When he needed supporting testimony for his numerous applications, he was able to reach beyond the company itself (where he had enjoyed "intimate acquaintance" with one of its officers), and enlist some of the most respected members of the regiment: its Surgeon (Sullivan), Adjutant and Sergeant Major (Halsey), and Chaplain (Haines). These engaging traits help offset what otherwise emerge as highly manipulative, acquisitive, and even devious elements of his personality (his 40-year obsession with higher entitlements; his run-in with pension authorities in an apparent attempt to avoid paying attorney's fees by dissembling [Chapter 8]; his continuing claims in the face of evident, late-in-life improvement of his lung condition). What could account for this mixed picture?

Mattison was not personally exposed to much battlefield risk during the 10 or 11 months he remained on active duty with the company, and although he must, like most of his comrades, have seen first-hand some of the more grisly aspects of the wounding and dying

that took place during that period (including, as prime example, the end and aftermath of the Battle of Gettysburg), he did not himself do any fighting after contracting lung disease in the late fall of 1862. He was probably not a candidate for wartime combat fatigue, or, inn the postwar years, for what today would pass for PTSD. Compared to his fellows, he got off easy and he knew it. Not to indulge too heavily in historical psychoanalysis, it is possible that Mattison suffered after discharge with a strong case of "survivor guilt". If he did, the constant raising of his service-originating disease, which he accomplished through the pension-claiming process, and the affirmation of that disability, as demonstrated by the nation's award of an ever-growing pension, may have helped assuage his feelings. He *too* considered that he had suffered greatly from the war, as did his family, and his pension, as well as the central status awarded him by his comrades in the local GAR, proved it. (Consciously or otherwise, he may even have associated his daughter's premature death with his wartime service and disease. Had she died from some infectious ailment related to, or even "caught" from, his own?[251] The record does show that, whatever the reason, Mattison's efforts to obtain more money from the government accelerated, and became particularly aggressive, in the two years immediately following her loss.)

Such conjecture does not necessarily excuse the apparent greed and self-interest of veterans like Mattison, especially when contrasted with those with more dire physical conditions, and those reluctant to seek any pension, or pension increase, at all. It does serve, however, as cautionary reminder that wartime experience works on the human soul in many ways, and it is dangerous to jump to simplistic judgments of another's behavior even when they appear justified.

Solomon Kise (May, 1881). Kise was born in Hunterdon County on May 11, 1827. (There is some discrepancy in the record regarding his actual year of birth; by some accounts of Kise's age, he would have been born in 1824. 1827 seems the most likely year, however.) He spent his early years farming, and learning to be a blacksmith. In 1847, at age 20, he married Mary Morgan, a Frenchtown woman eight years his senior (then, as now, a

relatively unusual occurrence; see Chapter 6). Five years later, the couple produced their only child, David.

Kise enlisted from Ringoes (East Amwell Township), giving his occupation as "blacksmith." At 35, he was one of the "old men" of the company. He did not last long at the front; on December 12, 1862, according to the veteran, "While on the march to Fredericksburg, my foot was caught in a Branch or Root & [I] fell with my Breast striking a Stump, producing…injury accompanied by a severe cold."

Kise claimed the injury and cold "produc[ed] difficulty of Breathing, hoarseness, cough & spitting of Blood". Within two weeks, he had been evacuated to a field hospital, where he remained for several months, until summer of the following year. He now began to develop serious symptoms of lung disease. The Surgeon General's records show he was treated during this period for pneumonia, aphonia [laryngitis or loss of voice], bronchitis, and influenza. As his condition worsened, he was transferred in June to Lincoln and then McClellan General Hospitals in the capital. Finally, on December 19, 1863, a little more than a year after his fateful fall, he was discharged from the service, at McClellan Hospital, for unfitness.

The discharge certificate states that Kise "had had a hemorrhage from the lungs [before his fall] but had not gone off duty [as a result]." Apparently, the soldier had already developed some sort of severe lung condition before the march to Fredericksburg, and possibly even before entering the army. Lewis Taylor, the army doctor who signed the certificate, stated:

> …I find [Kise] incapable of performing the duties of a soldier because of Phthisis [tuberculosis], the development of the disease being due to exposure while on duty. There appears to be a cavity in the right lung. He is unfit for Invalid Corps [VRC]. Disability total.

Before leaving the capital, Kise must have been in touch with the local Washington law firm of Gilmore & Co. For as a result of the firm's efforts, he was soon receiving a

disability pension, starting from the date of discharge. The award, however, was for a modest $2 per month, based on a disability rating of only one quarter.

Kise returned to Hunterdon, and settled with his family in a small hamlet in southern Kingwood Township, called Idell. (The hamlet lies about seven miles southeast of Frenchtown, close to the probable location of Mary's family. The Beers 1873 Atlas identifies Kise's home, about 6/10ths of a mile west of Milltown.) Having been discharged for serious lung disease and judged totally disabled by the discharging physician, it seems strange that Kise did soon submit application for an increase in his award, or at least seek out less physically demanding work upon his return. Perhaps, like his fellow veteran, Thomas Gregory, he believed it "a sin to be sick" and determined to return to the physically demanding labor he had once performed. In any event, he resumed working as a blacksmith, despite the physical demands.

By 1881, however, eighteen years after being discharged, Kise's lung and other health conditions had progressed to the point of near-incapacity, and he finally filed for a higher pension award. He was now 54 years old. His application claimed:

> …[H]e has great pain and distress in his lungs; he seems to be choked nearly all the time; he is hoarse and has much trouble breathing; he has not slept in a bed since his discharge; he is braced up in an erected position and of course gets little rest; if he should lie down in bed he would suffocate in a very short time; and that because [of this] he is totally disabled for all regular manual labor.

In support of the claim, his attorney submitted the affidavit of G.N. Best, M.D., a Rosemont doctor who had been treating the veteran for five years. (Rosemont lies about 3-1/2 miles west of Kise's home. The Beers Atlas shows a blacksmith shop on its main thoroughfare, which may have been where Kise worked.) According to Best:

> …Kise during this [five-year period] suffered with Emphysema of right lung, preventing him from following his trade (Blacksmith), at least from horse shoeing, or, in fact, from doing any straining work in a stooped position. This condition was constant except as it was aggravated by cold or by attempts at straining work, etc., and consequently disabled to the extent of three fourths of complete disability. …[His disabled condition] is increased by advancing age (shortness of breathing), pain and tenderness in right chest, bloody expectoration, etc.

Best had also picked up and diagnosed important factors contributing to Kise's chest ailments that nearly a year of examination and "treatment" during the war seem to have missed:

> …Mr. Kise's injury [from the wartime fall]…appears to have been a diastasis [separation] of the 1st & 2nd bones of the Sternum and a fracture or dislocation of the 2nd & 3rd ribs, one or both, with more or less damage to the underlying pulmonary structures, giving rise, as appears, to Emphysema of the right lung. [Underlining in original]

Clearly, Kise's fall against a stump, while carrying full equipment, had been more damaging than initially thought. The increase application prompted two medical board reviews, in 1882 and 1883, with interesting and quite conflicting outcomes. The first board, in Trenton, essentially agreed with the findings of Kise's doctor, and recommended his rating be increased from one fourth to one half. However the second board, in Easton, Pennsylvania, felt Kise was exaggerating his complaints, and recommended a *reduction* of his rating to one-eighth! The latter board's report states:

> [Applicant] complains of violent pain in right chest with shortness of breath.
> * * *
> He winces unnaturally on examining the lungs. He flinches on the least touch - jumps on the least touch. We think he exaggerates this.
> * * * States that he never has any troubles with the heart - that he has no disability save weakness of lung. Man looks well - color good. Body very well developed. [Kise was about 5'5" tall and weighed 158 lbs. at the time of this examination.] External appearance of chest perfectly natural.
> This man may have some disability but he exaggerates so much that it becomes difficult to rate him. We think most likely he has had pneumonia in some past time and this has left the right lung a little weak.

Doctor Hood, one of the Pension Office's "Medical Referees" in Washington, was displeased with the Easton board's findings. Just before it convened in February, he had sent a note about Kise, giving detailed guidance on how to examine his chest, lungs, and heart, and admonishing it to attend to detail. "You cannot be too careful or minute in either ex[amination] or description." That such a note was deemed necessary (and the fact that the board had not followed it) at least suggests that inattention to detail and failure to perform adequate examinations was a problem, either in general or with certain boards. In any case, Hood duly forwarded the Easton board report to his superior for final action on the

application, but added his own note: "This man is entitled to a higher rating". And, after a third board examination in May (which also recommended one half, noting that Kise showed up "with an anxious appearance, indicating difficulty in breathing"), that is what he got; it came to $4 per month, starting in 1883.

Kise's health deteriorated markedly over the next ten years, and he made 3 more increase applications during this time. His first, in 1884, resulted in a board examination in Trenton the same year; the board observed that the veteran's "face is blue and congested" and recommended a total disability rating. This was approved, increasing his pension to $8 per month.

The second, in 1889, probably resulted from the impending change in the pension law that would permit a significantly higher award for total disability. The Trenton board examined him in early 1990:

> A man of florid complexion and fairly nourished - has great orthopnoea [breathing difficulty] – great heaving of chest - chest is however well developed and symetrical - Tympanitis [term here is probably misapplied, but meant to indicate abnormal sound] on percussion over both lungs showing a great deal of emphysema - Has dilatation of air vessicles * * * Has tumultuous heart action, so much so cannot detect sounds - Hepatic [liver] enlargement marked… - There is [heart] hypertrophy and dilatation, cannot work any more - Disability is of permanent character and of a degree incapacitating him for the performance of any manual labor.

Kise's increase application was approved, and he began receiving the more generous amount of $24 per month, triple the amount he had previously been receiving.

Nonetheless, Kise made a third (and final) increase application at the close of the same year (1890). Apparently, he hoped to qualify for an even higher award, as allowed under recent legislation on a showing not only of complete inability to do manual labor, but also of dependence on another person for assistance in performing routine daily tasks, such as dressing and bathing. The application languished for three years without action by the Pension Office. In an effort to prompt a decision, in January 1894, Kise's attorney sent the Pension Office the affidavit of William Vanhorn and Isaac Keyser, two Idell neighbors who

"have both known him for thirty years" (that is, since he returned from the war). Both attested to Kise's lung and heart disease, and then stated:

> We are neighbors of his and have lived within two miles of him for the last twenty years, and we both have nursed him during the night for his disabilities. * * * We say his disabilities are total. In our opinion he can perform no labor either manual, professional, or skill[ed] to earn a livelihood, and…his present condition has existed…we say for the last two years.

It is curious that Vanhorn and Keyser added "professional" and "skilled" to the list of labor the veteran could not perform. It is the only known instance of such an expanded qualification among all the company's pensioners. One reason was surely that most of the men of this era earned a living, if able to do so, by manual labor. Even "skilled" labor - trades - often required a large component of physically demanding work, performed with the hands (e.g., masonry, blacksmithing, carpentry). Another reason peculiar to Kise's case may have been his apparent, late-career work as a veterinary doctor (see below), which would have been considered either professional or skilled labor. Perhaps Kise's neighbors were making the point that by 1894 he had become so sick and disabled that he could not perform even this presumably less physical "manual" labor.

The neighbors' affidavit came too late. Less than two weeks after providing it, Kise died "suddenly" at his home, on January 18, 1894, at the reported age of 67 (probably 66). The death certificate gives "Vetinary Surgeon" [sic] as his occupation, which in the nineteenth century would have been a natural career progression for a man who had spent much of his life working with horses and other large animals (as a blacksmith would have done). The cause of death was given as valvular heart disease, brought on by "structural lesions of the heart" from long-term emphysema.

Despite his lifelong struggle with serious lung and other ailments, Kise and his wife had managed to build up a modest estate by the time of his death, a relatively unusual circumstance among the company's veterans. (See Chapter 7.) According to a statement submitted later that year in support of Mary Kise's application for a widow's pension (which she eventually obtained), the couple had "about 22 acres [of real estate] in Kingwood

Township [Idell]…[worth] about $700," and "household and kitchen furniture and two horses,,,[worth] about $500". The acreage was rented out to others to farm, and brought in net income of "about fifty dollars a year". With Kise's higher pension in his last years, this provided the couple with annual income of about $338, a relatively comfortable sum for a rural family of two. Sadly, Kise's health had probably prevented him for many years from enjoying it.

George Van Camp (September, 1888). Van Camp's health history offers an illustration of suffering from both wartime disease *and* serious postwar injuries, one of which was incurred in the workplace. The soldier was born in 1832, and was brought up in the manufacturing town of Lambertville, working as a "machinist." In 1855, he married Mary Jane Niece, of the same town. The couple produced 3children, 2 before the war and one afterward.

Van Camp was 29 years old when he mustered in with the 15th New Jersey; he had already served an uneventful three months in 1861 with the 3rd New Jersey Militia. A short man in stature at about 5'4" in height, Van Camp stated he weighed a robust 140 pounds when he enlisted. After serving without recorded injury or disease for most of the war, he was afflicted in its final month with a severe case of chronic diarrhea (possibly dysentery). According to fellow volunteer and tentmate, Corporal Abraham Trauger, writing in 1891:

> I…personally knew him to be sick with the Chronic Diarraia…[but] in Regard to these Dates it is a very difficult thing to Remember being 26 years, but will say on march to Danville Va about April 14 or 15-16 [1865] or thereabouts do know of him being hard with the Diarrahia. Also returning from Danville all the way to Washington and [he] did not go on the [Grand] Review on account of same.

Van Camp returned to Lambertville after the war, and resumed his trade as a machinist or "engineer," initially operating an engine at Lambertville's rubber mill. In 1868, he slipped and fell on ice in a street near his home, and fractured his right radius (wrist bone). Six years later, in 1874, Van Camp incurred a much more debilitating set of fractures, when he slipped and fell against an iron rod at the mill, breaking both bones in his right lower leg (fibula and tibia).

In the meantime, his chronic diarrhea returned and worsened, and he was forced to give up his strenuous work at the mill. Finally, in September of 1888, he filed for a pension, alleging service-originating diarrhea, and resulting "general debility." It was approved.

As soon as the 1890 act was passed eliminating the service-connection requirement for pensionable disability, the veteran applied for an increase in his award, now raising his leg and wrist fractures. He stated that he had worked as both a mill machinist and railroad engineer, but had had to give up such work for the lighter work of a "huckster" ("hawker" or peddler), but had trouble even doing the latter. His doctor, Larison, stated in an affidavit that he treated the veteran "almost every week" for diarrhea and other ailments, and that he was "a broken down man premature." He was examined in 1891 by a medical board in Trenton, which found epigastric and abdominal tenderness, evidence of the three fractures mentioned above (healed but with "deformities," his right wrist "weak"), and noted that his "Rectum is inflamed and oozing of mucous". The board also recorded his weight at 128 lbs., which constituted a 12 lb. (9%) weight loss over the 26 years since the war. (He would never again achieve a recorded weight higher than 130 lbs.)

A telling and graphic statement was offered the same year in a letter from Company A veteran, John Green, addressed to the "Gents" at the Pension Office:

> You request me to state about [Van Camp's] Cronic Diarrhea. Breaf as posibel, the symptoms is as follows, The Evacuations are semi-fluid[,] sometimes numerous, and again there may [be] but one or to in 1 Day. The color varies from a Light clay color to a Dark Brown. The passages are often mixed with mucus, Pus, Blood, and shreds of Lymph resembling membrane. The passages may seem almost normal for a few Dayes, and then take on the unhealthy character. Sornes [soreness] across the Bowls, Loss of apetite, makes the person nervous and Restless. Pains in the Head[,] and flesh sore, in fact leaves man all broken up so to speak, and almost imposibel to stop it. Some times it turns to Dysinterry. * * * Hoping this is all the Light you want on this application From me I remain yours truly….

George Naylor, a "near neighbor" and veteran of another New Jersey regiment, stated in support of the application that Van Camp had not worked for "at least six months," and he did "not think according to the Government standard of manual labor, he [Van Camp] has at any time been able to perform such labor. His principle occupation has been that of a

huckster which he has followed as best he could for the purpose of earning a livelihood, which has not been of a very successful nature."

The Pension Office took no action on the application for an increased award, so in 1895 Van Camp's attorney enlisted the assistance of Stacy Bray and Torbert Coryell, respectively the current and immediate past mayors of Lambertville, to try to move things along. According to Bray:

> I kept track of Van Camp during his whole term of enlistment. …[H]e was a sound man when he enlisted [but] upon his return he was in a weak and delicate condition, and I employed him along with others to work in the wood department of the Belvidere Rail Road Co., he was not able to do a full man's work and I favored him for that reason knowing that he was a poor man; he was in my employ for two months and since that time I have never considered him an able bodied man, and would not consider him now or for several years past….

In an age predating workers compensation insurance for on-the-job injuries, or government welfare or unemployment insurance, Bray's charitable "employment" of Van Camp is evidence of one of the informal social safety nets that sometimes operated at the local community level.

Mayor Coryell stated he had known Van Camp "for twenty years" and "see him every few days". He added:

> …[M]y business is Superintendent of the Lambertville Waterworks…[and] was Mayor…for the past eight years…. I have employed [Van Camp] at different times to work for me as engineer, and I found that he was not able to perform his duties…on account of his ill health…. I can safely say that he is not able to perform manual labor 1/2 of the time.

Despite such consistent statements from neighbors, employers, and fellow veterans, medical boards examining Van Camp between 1896 and 1901 reached conflicting conclusions concerning the state of his health, especially his claimed chronic diarrhea and such later claimed conditions as "heart trouble" and "memory loss".[252] For example, the Somerville board in 1898 reported that Van Camp "looks fairly well," and found no evidence of chronic diarrhea or memory loss; the Doylestown, Pennsylvania, board in 1900 found him "very feeble and debilitated," and specifically noted symptoms of chronic diarrhea, including a "red…and inflamed" anal membrane and "2 external piles each size of hazelnut," and

symptoms of heart disease; and the Trenton board in 1901, while finding loss of all teeth and "substantial disability from all causes," observed no evidence of either chronic diarrhea or piles! As a result, the Pension Office in 1896 took the extremely unusual step of *reducing* Van Camp's original award from $12 to $8.

On January 30, 1902, Van Camp died at home in Lambertville, as a result of "heart trouble". He was 70 years old. The following month, his widow received word from the Pension Office that his award had been restored to its original $12 per month, effective as of June of the prior year. A bittersweet outcome, but at least she was entitled to the accrued arrears.

Effects of postwar injury

Abraham Trauger (June, 1871). Abraham Trauger was a young man, 17 or 18 years old, when he enlisted from Lambertville with Company A. He was unmarried. On May 12, 1864, the company's hardest day of the war (at Spotsylvania Courthouse), he was relatively lucky to sustain no more than a gunshot wound to the hand. In his own words:

> …[I] was wounded in the left hand, & had [my] forefinger amputated in the field hospital at Spotsylvania. I was sent to Mount Pleasant Hospital, Washington D.C., & from there to Satterlee Hospital, Philadelphia, and remained there about a month, when all the Invalids who were able to go were sent [back] to Washington. On arriving at Washington [we] were all examined, & [I] with others unable to do duty were sent to Hospital in Newark, New Jersey, about the 24th of July, 1864, where [I] remained till fit for duty. …[I] was returned to [my] Regiment about January 1865, where [I] remained till expiration of service. …[My] hand was healed at that time. * * * …[T]he wound was dressed in a great press of business immediately after the Battle [and I] doubt [the treating doctor] could have any positive recollection [of it]….

Trauger was promoted to Corporal after he rejoined the unit in 1865, and was discharged with the rest of Company A in June. He returned to Lambertville, and sometime shortly afterward married his first wife, Mary Parsons. (Between 1868 and 1884, Mary would bear 7 or 8 children, which number is uncertain) He took a job in the same local rubber mill where Van Camp worked. Five years after being discharged, Trauger filed his initial claim for a pension, based on his wartime wound, and the loss of the middle and distal "phalanges" (two outer bones) of his left index finger. A short man at 5'4", he was at the time

relatively trim at 130 lbs. He reported his occupation as "rubber maker," but stated he "was disabled from earning a livelihood" from such work "in consequence of said injury". Although this seems somewhat unlikely, the disability was nevertheless rated at one quarter, and he was granted a modest pension of $2 per month, commencing June, 1871.

Mary died in January of 1888, leaving her husband, at age 47, with a houseful of young children - the youngest, John, being then only four years old. He soon met a younger woman, Alberta Marion Welsh, 27 years his junior. She lived across the Delaware River, in Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, and four years later, in 1992, they were married there. Alberta and Abraham would have 3 more children between 1893 and 1904, bringing his total to 10 or 11.

Trauger evidently considered the amount of his initial 1871 pension award to be too low. Over the next twenty-five years - until he sustained a *bona fide* workplace injury in 1896 - he filed a total of 4 applications for a pension increase (6, if his multiple applications in July, 1990, are counted separately). Only the second increase application, in May, 1888, was successful, raising his award to $4 per month. None of them asserted significantly different - or worsening - conditions, or at least Trauger was unable to demonstrate any such conditions to the satisfaction of the numerous medical boards that examined him during the period. In fact, it appears Trauger became increasingly belligerent over the years, as his applications were routinely rejected. The Trenton board that examined him in 1895 stated. For example, that "Claimant refused to wait for examination of eyes, became impudent to the members, [and] was under the influence of alcohol slightly".

All this changed the following year. On July 7 or 8, 1896, according to Trauger's later affidavit:

> I…[sustained] injury of my left ankle…at Lambertville, New Jersey, while assisting in removing a boiler at the Lambertville Rubber Works, where I am employed. The said boiler came in contact with my left foot and ankle, while shifting the boiler, injuring the ankle so that it has bothered me ever since that time. The accident was in no wise caused by vicious habits.

Apparently, Trauger was no longer "disabled from earning a livelihood" as a rubber maker, as he had claimed twenty-five years earlier. In 1898, at Doylestown, he was examined for the first time since sustaining the workplace injury. He was now 52 years old and weighed 158 lbs, a hefty 22% weight gain over a 24 year period. Although he did not expressly complain of it, the board itself noted the ankle injury, questioned him about it, and ultimately "rated" him for it as part of his overall disability.[253]

> Left ankle is enlarged, the internal malleolus [ankle prominence] being more prominent than the right, give[s] history of roller running over foot in July 1896, looks as though he has had Pott's Fracture [fracture of lower fibula, with outward displacement of foot] but was treated as sprain. Left ankle measures 14 in., right measures 13 in., heel-instep measurement, complains of pain and walks with slight limp. Rating 5/18.

The sympathetic Doylestown board also diagnosed and separately rated "Rheumatism [of the lower back] and intercostal neuralgia," failing eyesight, loss of his left index finger, and slight deafness. (Although not rating the conditions, the board also credited Trauger's complaints of "sleeplessness," which it attributed to "working in rubber mill in a temperature of 110 degrees F.," and of generalized chest pain, which it attributed to "[irritable] heart…due we think to indigestion." These and other potential symptoms of postwar psychological problems, or PTSD, are addressed in Chapter 10) The Doylestown board (composed of the same three doctors) examined Trauger again in 1900, with similar findings.

In 1902, undoubtedly encouraged by the two Doylestown reports, he once again filed for a pension increase. Follow-up examinations by boards at Trenton (1902) and Somerville (1903) found even greater deterioration in Trauger's overall health, including decreased circulation and weakness in his right foot, inability to walk without a cane, numbness in both legs, general neuritis in lower extremities, spinal problems, and heart disease. His weight had gone up to 160 lbs. Taking no chances, and surely mindful of his client's 1895 run-in with the Trenton board, his attorney submitted supporting affidavits from Lambertville's current mayor, L.H. Sergeant, and one of its police officers, Samuel Price. Each stated he had been "intimately acquainted" with Trauger for many years, and throughout that time

knew him "to be a man of sober, peaceable, good habits". In July of 1903, the Pension Office approved an increase in Trauger's award to $12 per month.

The veteran enjoyed this income for another seven years. He died of stomach cancer on January 6, 1910, still residing in Lambertville. He was 65 years old.

Longevity and Causes of Death

The *first* Company A veteran to die was John Butler, Sr., who expired on October 4, 1872, only 7-1/2 years after the close of the war. This is not surprising; born in 1812, he had been about 50 years of age when he enlisted, by far the oldest volunteer to do so (next oldest were David Hendershot and John Servis, both about 42). Butler Sr. was about 60 when he died, and the manifold causes of his death were listed as heart disease, lung congestion, coma, and "exposure." The *youngest* veteran to die was Moses Housel, who passed away on September 21, 1883, at age 47 (cause of death unknown). He was the only veteran known to have left an orphan child; see Chapter 14.

The *oldest* veteran to slip away was John Servis, who died on May 11, 1907, at age 87 or 88. He died a resident of the New Jersey Soldiers and Sailors Home at Kearny, New Jersey, from acute pneumonia and heart disease. Nahum Cregar was the *last* Company A veteran to die; he expired on September 25, 1929, a month before the stock market crash that would mark the beginning of the Great Depression, at age 86 (cause also unknown). The Civil War had been over for 64 years, and the Spanish-American War and World War One had come and gone. American involvement in World War Two lay a mere 13 years in the future.

To recapitulate Company A's postwar record:

1872 – First veteran to die (Butler, Sr.)

1883 – Youngest veteran at death (Housel)

1907 – Oldest veteran at death (John Servis)

1929 – Last veteran to die (Cregar)

The passing of the company's war survivors thus took place over a long, 57-year period. One or more of them died at nearly every age between 47 and 87. Only three of them died throughout the 1860s, -70s, and -80s, but after that they averaged 11-1/2 deaths per decade over the next four decades. The highest mortality decade was the 1890s - the "Gay 90s" - when most of the men were in their 60s (15 deaths).

In the end, the veterans of Company A's original 100 volunteers lived remarkably long lives for their day - on average, about *2/3rds of a decade longer than their white male peers in general*. Of the 54 original volunteers known to have survived the war (see Chapter 3), the exact or approximate date of death (usually at least the year) is known for 46 of them (85%). These 46 surviving veterans lived, *on average*, until age 66-1/2. This datum permits a tentative comparison with the average life expectancy of all nineteenth-century American males born about the same time.

Life expectancy comparisons of this sort are difficult, and must remain tentative to some extent. Part of the problem lies in the fact that there are no complete life expectancy figures available for nineteenth-century America as a whole (nationwide birth-and-death statistics were not collected by the census until then1930s.) There are at least 3 sources, however, that shed useful light on the subject. First, the U.S. Census *did* compile life expectancy data for males in nineteenth-century Massachusetts, for various years. The data show that males residing in that state, who were born in 1830 or 1835 (the closest years to the average Company A men's birth year of 1840), and who survived to age 20, had a *total* life expectancy of 60.1 and 59.8 years, respectively. (Life expectancies for Massachusetts males reaching age 20 at 4 later intervals up to "1900-02" vary only slightly, from 60.7 to 62.2.)[254]

Second, in an innovative study of nineteenth-century American life expectancy published by Michael R. Haines in 1979 (which is widely credited in the field), the author calculated that white males who reached age 20 during the decade 1850-60 had an average life expectancy of 58.7.[255] Finally, Robert William Fogel, utilizing a large "genealogical

sample" to generate life expectancy figures for the same period covered by Haines's work, has produced a very comparable life expectancy for *native-born* white American males (surviving to age 20) of 57.9 years.[256]

Taking the 3 sources together results in an average life expectancy for the *entire* white male population of the United States at mid-century (provided only the men survived to age 20) of about 59 to 60 years. By contrast, Company A's survivors, who were born on average about the year 1840, could look forward, at age 20, to about 46-1/2 more years of life; that is, a total life expectancy of about *66-1/2*.[257] This is about *7 years longer* than their white male peers as a whole. Especially in view of the widespread incidence of chronic, disabling illness and other debilitating conditions among these longer-living veterans, the substantial difference in longevity seems remarkable and counter-intuitive.

When this aging veteran cohort finally did slip away, the causes of death were reported with varying degrees of medical specificity. Of the 54 original volunteers known to have survived the war, a reported cause of death is known for 31 (57%). Overall, a total of 40 causes are listed, since death certificates reported multiple causes for 7 of the 31 men for whom death records were found. (In cases where two or more conditions are listed, it is impossible to assign one of them as the primary cause of death. Accordingly, in the following breakdown, all numbers and percentages refer to the *total* number of causes of death reported [40], rather than to the total number of veterans for whom death information is available [31]; all percentages are rounded to nearest whole number).

Among the causes of death listed for Company A men, by far the greatest number (18, or 45%) involved cardiovascular diseases, including heart disease (12 instances, including "Myocarditis," "Pericarditis," and "Heart Attack") and stroke, or "apoplexy" as it was termed at the time (6 cases, including "Cerebral Hemorrhage," "Cerebral Paralysis," or simply "Paralysis"). One additional cause of death was reported as "Locomotor Ataxia" (essentially, inability to walk due to loss of muscular coordination), which may also have been a stroke-related, cardiovascular death. Another was reported simply as "Dropsy"

(edema or swelling), which may have indicated a cardiovascular cause of death. Adding these two cases would increase the total number of such cases to 20, or 50% of all causes of death.

The next most common cause of death involved lung-related diseases or conditions, and totaled 7 cases, or 17.5%, including "Bronchitis," "Lung Congestion," or "Acute Lung Congestion," "Chronic Emphysema," and "Lung Hemorrhage." Three causes of death (7.5%) were attributed to stomach cancer or carcinoma. An additional death was attributed to "Suppurative Cystitis" (pus-producing inflammation of the bladder) accompanied by "Hypertrophic [enlarged] Prostate", and another to "septic Prostatitis," both of which may have been instances of prostate cancer, potentially raising total cancer deaths to 5, or 12.5%.

Kidney disease accounted for another 3 deaths (7.5%), including 1 diagnosis of "Bright's Disease" (a general nineteenth-century term for kidney disease), 1 of "Chronic Nephritis", and 1 of "Chronic Parenchymatous Nephritis" *and* Bright's Disease. (Parenchymatous means simply that the disease was confined, in the examiner's opinion, to kidney tissue cells, and did not involve supportive or connective tissue.)

Three deaths (7.5%) were attributed to accident: 1 to the veteran's fall, fracturing his hip, fourteen months prior to his demise; 1 to "accidental drowning"; and 1 to the veteran's fall down a stairwell, breaking his neck.

Finally, 1 death (2.5%) was reported as the result dysentery, an infectious disease. Another was attributed to "Chronic Malarial Poisoning" (possibly fever induced by infectious disease); adding this would raise this category to 5% of causes of death.

While not precisely comparable, the above distribution of causes of death among Company A men is similar to distributions reported in two other studies, the first a sample of American white males dying in 1910, at ages 70 to 74, and the second a sample of Union veterans, dying "circa" 1910.[258] (As mentioned, the average age at death of Company A men was about 66-1/2, which they would have attained – again, on average - in about 1908.) The distribution of causes of death in the two studies, compared where possible with the

distribution described above for Company A men, is as follows (the categories are those adopted by the two studies; all percentages are rounded, and are given first for the all-males sample, then the all-veterans sample, and lastly the Company A sample):

Cardiovascular conditions: 59%, 57%, 45-50%.

Lung diseases: 15%, 21%, 17.5%.

Neoplasms (cancers): 11%, 7%, 7.5-12.5%.

Infectious diseases: 7%, 8%, 5% (including "malarial poisoning").

"Violence" (accidental death): 6%, 6%, 7.5% (including the fall/hip fracture).

Diarrheal conditions: 3%, 1%, 0%.

(Company A's three cases of kidney disease do not fall explicitly within any of the cause of death categories adopted by the other two studies.)

In general, then, the distribution of causes of death among Company A's veterans is quite consistent with those of the two much larger samples. The company's veterans died mainly from the same causes that killed their non-soldier male peers, and their fellow Union veterans in general. From this it may be speculated that the rigors of Civil War service, while certainly exposing combatants to an exceptionally high level of physical wounds, illness, and injury, does *not* appear to have shortened the lives of those who fought - provided of course they managed to survive the war – and does *not* appear to have significantly altered the usual mix of health conditions that terminated men's lives in their generation. This may say less about the effects of war in the nineteenth century (which were horrendous by any account), than about the universally poor and dangerous health environment produced by a rapidly expanding urban and industrial society in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America - an environment to which growing numbers of immigrant and native poor were being continually exposed.

Two additional conjectures may be made with respect to the "long-lived" men of Company A. First, the energy and effort the men had to put in as soldiers during the war probably mark them as a group *particularly determined* to survive in the first place. As

volunteers, there may have been an element of self-selection in this process; that is, men who "voluntarily" submitted to the rigors of war probably considered themselves unusually tough and resilient, physically and mentally. This self-view, in and of itself, may have improved their chances of coming back and, more significantly in the context of post-war longevity, may have manifested itself in a long-term will to live, almost by "habit," that endured for several decades.

The second speculation relates to the *quality* of the veterans' post-war lives. Though a highly subjective assertion, it is nevertheless a near certainty that, despite their remarkable longevity, Company A's volunteers suffered much more than their non-combat peers, and experienced much higher levels of health-related disability of various kinds. It is likely, then, that as a direct result of this suffering and disability they were much less successful at improving their economic circumstances in the post-war era. (This is born out, and amplified, by the findings made in Chapter 7.) If so, it is precisely such small, individual "failures" and family tragedies – and the human stories attending them – that remain among the "uncounted" costs of war.

CHAPTER 6

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY

> I lived next door to him for seven years in the [eighteen-]eightys and…if his wife had not helped him to make a living by making dresses for the last twenty five years I believe he would have starved to death.
>
> Neighbor, regarding Private Alfred Collins and his wife, Anna Collins

> …[My husband's piles and] asthma have existed during our entire married life to such a degree…that I was compelled to earn our living by my own labor and he requiring much of my care and attendance….
>
> Anna Runyon, wife of Sergeant Levi Runyon

> Hurry up the case Please I am a poor woman with two children by a former husband aged 10 & 12 to maintain.
>
> Louisa Peer, widow of Private William Peer, to Pension Office

This chapter takes a broad look at what is known of the general marriage and child-producing patterns of the company's men and their wives, the families and homes these couples made together, and the kind of lives led by some of the women of Company A. It includes both pre-war family life (for volunteers who married in the pre-war period) and, if the soldier survived the war, his and his wife's post-war lives. The wives whose lives are examined in this chapter are in most cases limited to women *who died before their veteran husband*. Wives, including second wives, who became *widows* - either because their soldier husband died in the war or because she outlived him after he returned from duty - are treated separately in Chapter 11.

The reason for this division of spousal categories is that widows, unlike wives who predeceased their soldier husbands, were eligible to claim their own "widow's pension," and most of them did. This in turn means that more detailed spousal information is usually available from pension records for widows than for non-widowed wives, and the information for widows typically continues for longer time periods. A final factor is that the

circumstances facing widows after the death of their soldier husband were naturally quite different from those confronting married women.

Numerous historians, most of them women, have attempted in recent decades to focus on the nineteenth-century American home and family, and particularly on the lives of women situated in those settings (including women's roles within the family, women's separate cultures or "spheres," and women's work and contributions to the household economy). Among the most interesting and provocative theses to come out of this scholarly attention have been the following:

-Men's and women's lives and daily activities became increasingly separate and divergent during the period (separate spheres). One consequence (or concomitant) of this trend was the development of unusually intense homosocial (female-with-female) arrangements and relationships.[259]

-With nineteenth-century economic and material progress came an emerging bourgeoisie, or middle class, which ultimately dominated American cultural and social life. The basic characteristics of this newly emerging middle class were, in turn, determined largely by "domestic values and family practices."[260]

-The era's new bourgeois, or middle-class, ideology strictly bound women to home and hearth; prescribed female behavior that was chaste, pious, and subordinate; and penalized female forays into the wage-earning workforce.[261]

Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, the leading scholar of women's separate spheres, for example, has described what she terms a unique "female world of love and ritual." But she has based her analysis of this eighteenth- and nineteenth-century female culture almost exclusively on literate, middle-class sources. This of course skews her findings, which do not generally seem to fit most of the Company A women studied here. (There are certainly exceptions, however, especially among the wives and widows of the company's few well-educated and/or better-off members.) In somewhat unqualified terms, Smith-Rosenberg describes the female world as follows:

> Most eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women lived within a world bounded by home, church, and the institution of visiting – that endless trooping of women to one another's homes for social purposes. It was a world inhabited by children and other women. Women helped one another with domestic chores and in times of sickness, sorrow, or trouble. Entire days, even weeks, might be spent almost exclusively with other women. Urban and town women could devote virtually every day to [such activities]. Rural women developed a pattern of more extended visits that lasted weeks and sometimes months, at times even dislodging husbands from their beds…so that dear friends might spend every hour of every day together.[262]

Mary P. Ryan, in her intensive "community study" of late-eighteenth- and (pre-war) nineteenth-century Utica, and Oneida County, New York, has described a hegemonic middle class that she says emerged during this period. She argues that this class was powerfully influenced by evangelical religion and reform movements, and profoundly shaped by the values and dynamics of the *family* – a social institution she has termed "the cradle of the middle class." "…[My] final hypothesis: Early in the nineteenth century the American middle class molded its distinctive identity around domestic values and family practices." And Ryan feels so strongly about the representative and more or less universal nature of her particular historical example (at least within the United States), that she claims it can be used as a template for explaining change within the country as a whole.

> Beneath the detailed account [of Oneida County] that follows…lurk larger patterned relations between family, gender, and social change.
>
> * * * Recent community studies…have proven that a single extraordinary town can, like biography writ large, illuminate, enliven, and give a human dimension to our understanding of general social conditions and developments. In addition, a carefully chosen town is like one of Hegel's world historical individuals: It can initiate as well as represent historical change. It is not too farfetched to grant Oneida County, New York, such a grandiose role.[263]

The new middle-class pattern for proper behavior, at least for women, was suffocating and highly moralistic, and severely limited women's ability to contribute financially to family well-being, according to Ryan.

> Within the bourgeois world, a confining ideology reinforced…pervasive patterns of economic discrimination. Erecting the nonproductive woman into a symbol of bourgeois class hegemony, the new bourgeois men of the 1820s, 1830s, and 1840s formulated the Cult of True Womanhood, which prescribed a female role bounded by kitchen and nursery, overlaid with piety and purity, and crowned with subservience. The woman who rejected these constraints, or who, pushed by poverty, entered the labor force, were viewed as unnatural.[264]

None of these claims rings particularly true in the context of Company A's rural, Hunterdon County women (or men, for that matter). Most of the women clearly did not number among the emerging middle class, *at least as that class is defined by these scholars*, and very few would have regarded themselves as "subservient," "nonproductive," or bound strictly to the "kitchen and nursery" at home, and to "church, and the institution of visiting" outside the home.

A more helpful (and modest) analytical frame has been suggested by Jeanne Boydston, an historian of women's work. She has argued that nineteenth-century working women continued to make very substantial contributions to household economies (and to families in general) as the century progressed, even as the more independent and isolated, subsistence farming economy of the colonial era slowly gave way to the urbanized, industrial economy of the late-nineteenth century. She has challenged what she regards as an over-reliance on the notion of separate spheres (a "metaphor," not a "description," according to Boydston, most useful as a "rhetorical construction"). Citing the work of another scholar, she has offered a very different way to view nineteenth-century changes in women's work and production.

> …[H]istorians have tended to simply concur with the nineteenth-century conclusion that industrial capitalism removes economic production from the household and relocates it in large-scale, profit-directed factories. * * *
>
> [One recent study] of the history of housework, however…propose[s] a fundamental revision of the traditional view…. Specifically, [its author, Ruth Schwartz Cowan] contend[s] that "industrialization occurred just as rapidly within our homes as outside them." * * * Viewed from this perspective…housework is more precisely understood, not as nonindustrialized labor, but as labor that has been "incompletely industrialized or…industrialized in a somewhat different manner" than market work.[265]

Boydston has also recognized that the concept of housework as labor "industrialized in a somewhat different manner" applied most obviously to the work of laboring-class women and, *quintessentially*, to the work of rural farm women.

> The cash-earning responsibilities that often remained periodic and unseen among middle-class wives were frequently the most visible aspect of working-class women's labor…. Any woman might be called on in an emergency to set aside her other household duties in favor of…wage-earning…. *For many…working-class women,*

> *however,…cash-earning was the domestic work around which all other tasks constantly had to be organized.*
>
> * * *
>
> Rural women performed virtually all of the core labor of housework undertaken by women in more urban areas…. *But country women, far more often than women in urban areas, also produced the raw materials necessary to their household labors.*
>
> Farm life had not remained unchanged in …the antebellum period. * * * Nevertheless, particularly for wives, day-to-day life on the farm continued to look much as it had in the colonial period.[266] [Emphasis added.]

This is a more apt description of the realities and life experiences of most Company A women and their families.

* * *

To reiterate, this initial chapter on domestic life describes what can be determined from primary sources about the essential marital and home lives of Company A veterans in general, and in particular about some of the wives who failed to outlive them. It first sets forth basic statistical data and typical marital "profiles" of the soldiers and their wives. It then discusses, primarily but not exclusively from *wives'* perspective, domestic experiences in various topical areas: getting married; giving birth; raising and caring for children; working and attempting to accumulate and/or control wealth (a discussion of women's pension filing experiences as *widows* of deceased Company A soldiers is contained in Chapter 12); and wives' community or "civic" lives. In each area, a description of one or more wives' (or couple's) lives will be offered to illustrate the matter under discussion. (Certain marital data that are more usefully presented in one place for *both* non-surviving wives and for widows, is given in this chapter rather than being allocated between this and later chapters.)

Instances of marital discord or family dysfunction that are revealed in the historical record are examined later in Chapter 15, as a discrete topic. They include instances arising within Company A veterans' own marriages, as well as a few arising within subsequent marriages of Company A widows, and include such issues as non-support, "intemperance," desertion, abuse, and infidelity (virtually all acts committed by or alleged against the husband). The troubled marriages of some soldiers' *parents*, usually disclosed in the course

of a *mother's* claim for a "dependency" pension after having lost a son in the war, are included in Chapter 12.

Marriage was an extremely strong normative arrangement in nineteenth-century America, and a social practice almost universally adhered to by the men of the company who survived until marrying age. (The sole known exception is Private James Palmer, who survived the war as a single man and remained single for the rest of his life. What is known of Palmer's post-war life is sketched in Chapter 10, where his non-married status is considered, if only circumstantially, as a possible symptom of post-war maladjustment.)

During the middle decades of the nineteenth century, the period when virtually all of the company's soldiers and their wives became married, American marriage and domestic relations laws were undergoing a fascinating evolution.[267] In colonial times, the law had been largely shaped by British common law and ecclesiastical law traditions. It was marked by a feudal and patriarchal emphasis on land ownership, developed over long years within a comparatively small island nation, fully-settled, in which land was at a premium and the conserving institutions of entailment and primogeniture were common (land legally bound to descend indefinitely to the first male heir of each succeeding generation). Male heads of household reigned supreme, at least in the law, and during "coverture" (marriage), wives and children, and all of their property and income if any, were deemed his property; even their persons were considered to be merged into his and to be a unitary legal entity. (Wives, for example, could not sue, be sued, or enter into contracts, except by way of their husbands.) England's established church governed may aspects of the marriage institution, including overseeing the formal, 5-step process necessary to enter into the marital relationship (espousal [engagement], publication of banns [advance notice to the community, whose members were entitled to object], execution of espousal contract, formal religious ceremony, and sexual consummation). Much more than a mere private arrangement between two individuals, marriage was a "sacred" institution and public status strongly regulated by both church and state. While altered considerably under the quite different life conditions of the

colonies (relatively sparse settlements and "frontier" living, scarcity of trained ministers, lack of an established church in many places, abundance of land), this was nevertheless the legal framework most American colonists brought with them to the New World and out of which they fashioned early efforts to produce their own.

The culture and institutional dislocations of the republican revolution that followed in the latter eighteenth century, however, combined with the new conditions mentioned above, worked dramatically to change many of these legal precepts and practices. By the early decades of the nineteenth century, marriage had become much more purely a matter of private contract and individual choice, relatively unregulated by the state. (There was, for example, no provision at all in the new national constitution for federal intrusion into this arena, and state marriage laws were typically vague, incomplete, and even inconsistent.) Banns quickly fell out of common use, formal requirements for the wedding ceremony itself varied considerably (or were non-existent, as a matter of law), and virtually all states soon came to permit civil as well as religious officials to preside over them. Significantly, so-called "common-law" marriages rapidly came to be a permitted alternative to formal marriage ceremonies in a majority of jurisdictions (including New Jersey). (Essentially, this was a form of marriage requiring only that the partners consent to reside together, engage in sexual relations, and "hold themselves out as" [publicly declare themselves to be] husband and wife. It was an arrangement that was well-suited both to living conditions in many areas of the new land, as well as to the fervently antistatist, individualistic ethos of the early days of the republic.) As with many other areas of nineteenth-century life in the new nation, American judges and lawyers stepped into the legislative and religious vacuum, and gradually defined, on a case-by-case, a novel and uniquely American code of matrimonial law.

Although this phase of American matrimonial law would again be substantially altered by reform movements toward the end of the nineteenth century, it prevailed throughout the middle period of the nineteenth century, and was the legal and institutional

environment in which virtually all of the company's men and women (as well as their parents) entered marriage. [268]

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the immediate pre-war marital status of all but one of the company's original 100 volunteers is known, since it was one of the few items of data recorded for every man when he mustered in during the summer of 1862. Of the 99 recorded, 34 were listed as married, and 65 as single. Two cases of almost certain misreporting of marital status were determined (John Clawson and Theodore Stryker, who both signed up as "Single"), and correcting for this results in a figure of 36 men - more than a third - who were married at mustering in, and 63 - just under two thirds - who were single.

Of this initial group of 63 men who went off to war *unmarried*, 29 - nearly half - are known to have died in the war and 30 are known to have survived. (The 4 unknowns each deserted and it is therefore not known if they survived the war and/or married.) Of the 36 *married* men who left for the war, 13 are known to have died, and all 23 others are known to have survived. (The lives of the 13 widows the married soldiers left behind are treated primarily in Chapter 12.) Overall then, a total of 54 Company A volunteers are known to have survived the fighting (30 as bachelors and 24 as husbands - one man, Van Fleet, who started the war single, got married during it).

There were thus a total of 24 Company A wives who still had husbands at war's end.[269] Military and pension records provide at least some data for 22 of these 24 women (92%), and the families they reconstituted with their veteran husbands returning from war.

Of the 30 single men who came back, historical records reveal post-war marriage data for 24 of them (80%). 23 of the 24 married at some point following the war, usually within a few years after returning, and only one is known never to have married (Palmer). These records thus provide some data on another 23 Company A wives.

Setting aside the company's 4 deserters, there are only 8 known war-surviving veterans - 6 who were single when they went to war, and 2 who were married - concerning whom the historical record regarding post-war marriages and/or domestic life is silent. Five

of the 8, including the 2 men who were married when they joined up, never filed pension claims: Garret Hogan, Elijah Horn, Abraham Latourette, Samuel Servis, and Thomas Stout. The other 3 veterans did file claims, but their files make no mention of post-war wives or children: John Bulmer, John Butler, Jr., and David Hendershot. (All 3 were older claimants – 2 close to 50 and the third nearly 70 when they filed - and they may have been widowers at this point, or may never have married.)

Putting all the above information together, then, the historical record discloses at least *some* biographical data for 59 of the known wives and widows of the company's volunteers (13 widows of married men lost in the war, 19 wives of married men who returned from the war, and 27 wives of returning single men who married after the war). The maximum possible number of wives and widows of Company A men (discounting the 4 deserters for whom there is no war-survival or marriage information) is 66, and the 59 sets of data thus represent a large portion of the entire field of company spouses (89%). (66 is the sum of the 37 wives and widows of men known to have married before or during the war, and the 29 wives of single men who returned from the war and are either *known* to have married [23] or are *assumed to have* married [6]). The "maximum" number of 66 is for first wives only. Several veterans who outlived their first wives married a second time, and at least one veteran married a third time; data is preserved regarding several of these subsequent wives as well, and enlarges the pool of women whose lives are examined.

Getting Married and Having Children

As stated above, among the company's men, marriage, whether before, during, or after the war, was the overwhelming norm. More than a third of the company's volunteers were married when they signed up to go to war. One single man got married during the war. Of the 24 single men who survived the war *and* whose post-war marital status is known, all but one got married afterwards. Stated another way, of the company's 61 men who had opportunity to marry either before, during, or after the war, *and whose marriage decisions*

are known (i.e., who either *did* marry before or during the war, or who are known to have survived the war and thus got the opportunity to marry later on), 60 (98%) chose to be married and only 1 chose to remain single.

What were the weddings and marriage ceremonies of these Company A couples like, where did they take place, and who attended them? The pension files shed little light on these question, though interesting hints emerge. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 4, the ceremonies were overwhelmingly religious rather than civil in nature. (Forty-four out of the company's forty-six first marriages – 96% - for which the category of ceremony can be fairly reliably determined.)

Of the 44 religious celebrations, the *place* of the ceremony was indicated in 26: 19 of the 26 (73%) were held in church; 3 (12%) in the home of the bride's parents (in 2 of these 3 cases, the home was actually listed as "the father's," an interesting suggestion of the survival of traditional notions of patriarchy in marriage); 2 (8%) in the minister's home or parsonage; and 2 (8%) at the bride's home. (If the bride's home was also her parents' home, which is likely, then a total of 5 weddings [19%] were performed in the bride's parents' home.) In the 7 additional cases of company men's *second* marriages where it was possible to determine the place of the wedding, church was the venue for 6 of them, and the 7th was the *groom's* parents' home (the sole instance of this choice of location). It is clear from these statistics that "church weddings," though certainly not the expensive, high-fashion affairs they were to become by the mid-twentieth century, were nonetheless the desired norm among this largely working-class group of nineteenth-century couples. The clear tilt toward wife's or wife's parents' residences for non-church weddings (which in every case were nevertheless conducted by a minister) also reveals the traditional status of the wedding ceremony as an essentially "female" rite.

Finally, there is the question of who (and how many) attended the wedding. In most Company A cases, the impression usually left by mention of the wedding in the pension file is that it was a very small, private affair, most often involving (besides the marrying couple

and officiating minister) only close family members and perhaps a few friends, or persons called in to serve as witnesses. In 2 cases, however, a much larger ceremony occurred.

Thomas Gregory/Eliza Clark. Thomas Gregory was born in Devonshire, England, and had immigrated and settled in Flemington at some point prior to 1860, where he worked as a mason. There he met Eliza Clark, also a Flemington resident. The two were apparently both members of Flemington's "establishment" Presbyterian Church, and may have met there. They were married by its pastor, Dr. John Janeway, on October 21, 1860. Thomas was then about 22 years old (he later reported birth dates in both 1837 and 1839), and Eliza was only 15.

Almira R. Runkle, a neighbor and childhood contemporary who knew and was fond of them both, was asked many years later to provide testimony regarding the couple's marriage. (Janeway, who was now long dead, had never registered the marriage with the county clerk or even inserted it into church records, and the ceremony had taken place well before the era of state-mandated vital statistics registration.) Runkle, who had been a young woman of 19 at the time of the wedding, stated she had known both Thomas and Eliza for "more than 60 years":

> …I did not attend the wedding…as I was ill at my home in Flemington, N.J., but…I know that they were married by the Rev. Dr. John G. Janeway, of the Presbyterian Church, on the 21st day of October, 1860. …[T]here were present at said weding in the neighborhood of fifty people and…I well remember having been told by witnesses to the wedding of the uniting of the said soldier and [Eliza] as husband and wife.

Hiram Deats, Secretary of the Hunterdon County Historical Society, was also asked to shed light on the marriage date. He answered officiously that he could find nothing and that the parties should have recorded their marriage in the county clerks office "under the law of 1795," and then added, "Dr. Janeway was notoriously lax in such matters." (The balance of the Gregorys' fascinating and peripatetic life story is narrated above, in Chapter 5.)

James Mattison/Mary Eliza Swayze. James Mattison was born in Hunterdon on June 6, 1842, and enlisted at age 20 from the town of Flemington. Suffering from various

lung ailments, he was discharged early in 1863, and returned to Flemington where he took up once again his prewar occupation as a hardware store clerk. He was a bright, literate, and socially well-connected young man. (The details of his story are related in Chapters 5, 7, and 8.) Within the next few years, he met Mary Eliza Swayze, who appears to have been from the village of Chester, in Morris County. (Chester is about 20 miles northeast of Flemington.) On April 22, 1869, the couple was married at Chester (the precise location is not known), by Rev. James Bruster. The wedding was quite an event. In a subsequent reply to an inquiry of the Pension Office, Mattison reported that (as in Gregory's case), Bruster had left no record of the marriage ceremony, but added that there were "about 60 witnesses."

Moving beyond the marriage ceremony itself, it is interesting to look at the statistical profile of the company men and women who getting married. The average age of Company A's men at their first marriage (whether marriage took place before, during, or after the war) was 24.8, and that of the women who became their wives, 21.1. Husbands were thus, on average, about 3.7 years older than their wives.

The median *year* of marriage for all Company A men and their first wives was 1862. This year falls during the war, but in actuality there was only *one* Company A marriage that took place during it, that of Abram van Fleet and Cordelia Akins (or Ayers), in 1863 or 1864 (see below). The median is skewed in this respect because about a third of the company married over an extended, 22-year period *before* the war, while everyone else (except van Fleet) married *afterward*, their marriages tending to cluster during the five-year period immediately following war's end, 1865 to 1870. The median year of marriage for all veterans marrying before the war was 1854, eight years before the men enlisted. For those marrying afterward, the median year was 1868, only three years after the men came home.

John Kutter/Elizabeth Sanders (or Saunders). The *earliest known Company A marriage* was performed on Christmas Eve, 1839, between John Kutter and Elizabeth Sanders (or Saunders). Kutter was about 19 - he also appears to have been the *youngest* of the company's men at the time of his marriage; Elizabeth's age is not known. They were

married in southern Hampton Township (Hunterdon County), by a Baptist minister named James Bowen. Kutter had been born about 1820, and by the time he enlisted he was, at age 42, one of the oldest men in the company.

He was assigned the rank of Corporal probably because of his age and significantly longer life experience. On May 3, 1863, during the company's first full year of campaigning, he received a gunshot wound to the right hand at Salem Church. (According to Lieutenant George Justice, one of his officers, Kutter "most manfully Did advance w/ the Reg[imen]t" on that fateful day, and Justice declared he would have "recommended him for Sergeant" had he returned to the company after recovering from the wound..) Luckily for his wife, Elizabeth, he was medically discharged for the wound four months later, probably because he could no longer handle a rifle with his injured hand, and returned to New Jersey.

He died on April 3, 1877, at age 57, and Elizabeth subsequently applied for and received a widow's pension later the same year. (A description of her unsuccessful effort to demonstrate that her deceased husband also suffered from a service-connected illness, and thus qualify herself for a higher pension award, is provided in Chapter 12.)

Benjamin Wean/ Mary Elizabeth Perry. The *youngest Company A bride* was Mary Elizabeth Perry who, on May 31, 1851, at age 14, wed Benjamin Wean, who was 21. Mary and Benjamin were joined in marriage at the Presbyterian Church in Pleasant Grove, by Reverend H. Whitfield Hunt. The couple produced at least two and probably more children, the two known - both daughters - being born in 1875 and 1879, when Mary was, respectively, about 38 and 42 years old. (The latter children are recorded because of their mother's claim for a widow's pension after Benjamin died on January 26, 1893, at about 62 years of age. Their last child, Lida, was only about 14 years old at the time, and was thus eligible for a $2/month pension supplement, payable to her mother or guardian, until her 16th birthday, in 1895.) The records disclose that Mary outlived the older of these two daughters (name unknown), and spent her final years living with Lida at the latter's residence in Newark, New Jersey; Mary died on January 10, 1820, at about 83 years of age.

Samuel Case/ Frances A. Lake. The *last* known Company A first *marriage* was performed in 1885, in Flemington, between Samuel Case and Frances A. ("Addie") Lake, by an officiating party named Robinson Hyde (title and church affiliation, if any, unknown). Case also appears to have been the *oldest* company veteran to have entered into a first-time marriage; he was about 43 at the time (Addie's age is not known). No children were produced by this later-in-life union, and Samuel, in 1898 (age about 61), could recall only the year, and not the date, of the ceremony! (In fact, Case was described by a person assisting with his pension application as "quite illiterate," and although he later in life claimed to have been born on Independence Day, 1842, this was questioned by the Pension Office.) The veteran outlived his wife, and died on April 1, 1927 ("Fool's Day," about which there is no question), age about 85 years.

William Peer/ Louisa Schuyler. The *oldest known woman* to marry a Company A man (*his* first marriage; her second) was Louisa Schuyler, who married William Peer (age unknown) on July 31, 1858. She was 32, still relatively young, when they were married at the Presbyterian Church in German Valley (now Long Valley, in Morris County), by Rev. William R. Glen. Louisa had been previously married, and had already born two children, in 1853 and 1855. (There is no record of how her first marriage terminated, but she was almost certainly widowed.) Peer was one of several men gunned down at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 12, 1864, the company's single worst day of the war, which, sadly, rendered Louisa once again without a husband or provider for herself and her two children (who were about 9 and 11 years old when Peer died).

In December, 1864, seven months following her husband's death, Louisa, who was illiterate, submitted an application for a widow's pension. She did not engage the services of a lawyer (hiring a lawyer was a rare practice at this very early stage of the federal pension program; see Chapter 8), and was instead assisted by friends who wrote letters on her behalf. Frustrated by the government's delay, and probably desperate financially, in June, 1865 - more than a year after Peer had been killed - she had a friend write for her to Pension

Commissioner Barrett. The letter reminded him that all her documents had been submitted, and pleaded, "Hurry up the case Please I am a poor woman with two children by a former husband aged 10 & 12 to maintain." After another four months, the application was finally approved for the standard award of $8 per month, with accrued payments due from the veteran's 1864 date of death. While undoubtedly a huge help, her children were nevertheless ineligible to receive the usual $2/month supplemental payments, because they were not children of the veteran!

Peter Ten Broek/ Jeanette Ford. The *oldest woman* for whom marriage to a Company A man was also *her* first marriage appears to have been 31 years old at the time. On November 4, 1866, Jeanette Ford betrothed Peter ten Broek, in Perth Amboy, New Jersey. They were married in the city's First Presbyterian Church, by Rev. James A. Little; ten Broek was about 29, a couple of years younger than his bride. The couple had one child, born in 1868 when Jeanette was about 33 years old. She survived her husband, who died on October 25, 1902, at about age 65, and became one of several Company A widows who lived their final years in a state Soldiers and Sailors Home - in her case the home in Vineland, New Jersey. She died on April 16, 1928, at age 92.

The largest known age difference between a Company A husband and wife at *first* marriage was 12-13 years (William Clark was about 32 when, in 1868, he married his first wife, Annie Ewing, who was 19 or 20). The biggest known age difference at the husband's *second* marriage was more than twice that, approximately 27 years (Abraham Trauger was about 47 years old when he married for the second time on October 22, 1892; his new wife, Alberta Welsh, who was getting married for the first time, was only 20). (One veteran, Michael Welsh [or Welch], married three times, and was about 63 when he married his third wife. Her age is not known, however, nor is the marriage known to have resulted in any children, which would have been at least a general upward indicator of the woman's age. What is known of Welsh's domestic history is described below.)

Of the 31 company marriages for which the ages of both parties are known, wives were older than husbands in only five cases (16%), the age difference ranging from one to eight years, a much smaller age range than for marriages between older men and younger women (? to ?). The eight-year difference was between Mary Morgan, who on October 23, 1847, at age 28, married Solomon Kise, aged 20, in Frenchtown. They were married by Rev. T. T. Campfield, a "Minister of the Gospel".[270] They are known to have had one child, born in 1855, when Mary was about 35 years old. Solomon died on January 18, 1894, at age 66 and, despite being eight years older, Mary outlived him by more than a decade, expiring on April 15, 1904, at age 85.

Spouses who outlived their first marriage partner in the post-war period were almost evenly divided between husbands and wives: 19 veterans became widowers and 20 veterans' wives became widows (as mentioned above, an additional 13 wives were widowed by the war; these are not included in the 20). This contrasts dramatically with modern life expectancies for married partners, which favor wives by about seven years.[271] Thus, even though Company A men were on average more than three years older than their wives, they had about the same chance as their wives of outlasting their spouse if they survived the war. This may have had something to do with the risks and rigors of nineteenth-century childbearing, although even that is not clearly established by the record of Company A families.

Remarriage was common among surviving widowers, but much less so among surviving widows; additionally, quite distinct remarriage patterns emerged for widows and widowers. Eleven surviving husbands - more than 50% of the total - are known to have married a second time (as mentioned, one man outlived his second wife and married a third time), whereas only five - about 13% - of surviving wives did so, *and all 5 were among the 19 mostly younger widows who had lost husbands in the war.* Men remarried over a comparatively long period of nearly four decades, from 1867 to 1904 (their median year of remarriage being 1887, at which point the veterans of Company A were, on average, about 46

years old), *while all of the women remarried in the space of a single decade, from 1868 to 1878* (their median year of remarriage being 1873, only 8 years after the war, at which point they were, on average, about 29 years old). Widowers, then, remarried at significantly higher ages than widows and, unlike widows, they often married spouses who were significantly younger than themselves - women who could and often did continue to bear children. (Comparable information on second marriages of Company A's widows is sparse. Once remarried, they became ineligible to continue receiving a widow's pension, and the trail of documents containing details of their lives usually disappears.)

Naum Cregur/Larien Young. Despite these patterns, one piece of evidence suggests that *significant* age differences could in some instances produce a degree of social discomfort, or a reason for dissembling. Naum Cregur married his first wife, Anna Mary Moore, in 1867; he was 24, Mary's age is unknown. Mary died in 1881. Five years later, in 1886, Naum remarried; he was now 42 and his new wife, Larien Young, was 32. The wedding ceremony took place in the St. James Methodist-Episcopal Church in Elizabeth, New Jersey, on February 9. When asked by the presiding minister, Reverend J. E. Price, for his age, Naum replied that he was "40." He knew his bride would be asked for her age too, and probably felt certain she would truthfully answer "32," thereby reducing their age difference from an authentic 10 years to a possibly more acceptable 8. But in this case, doing some quick thinking of her own, Larien sought to turn her husband's small mendacity into at least a partial truth; she answered "30"!

More than four decades later, in 1929, the little episode returned to haunt Larien. Nahum had recently passed away, and Larien was seeking reimbursement of his funeral expenses from the Pension Office. The reviewing agent noticed the discrepancy in the decedent's reported age: "40" when he was married in 1886, but "86" (instead of 83) when he died in 1929. Larien felt she had to come clean and, on November 21, wrote the following to her pension attorneys:

Dear Sirs:

I will endevor to straighten that mistake[.] when we were married, I was between 32 & 33 years [Larien was born on May 7, 1853] and my husband was between 42 & 43 years [he was born on June 1, 1843]. when the Minister asked him how old he was he answered 40 years[,] then [the minister] asked me and I said 30[.] when we came out I said why didn't you tell it right. he said I am 40 but he don't have to know how much more. there was nearly 10 years difference between us. in all the business with you, I have given correct, the possitive truth, and nothing but the truth, and God knows it.

now I have told you all. so you will understand that mistake. and I do hope the pension beauro will be satisfied.

Very Truly
/s/ Larien Y. Cregur
Glen Gardner
N.J.

Michael Welsh. The only company veteran known to have married three times was Private Michael Welsh (or Welch). A somewhat mysterious character about whom not a lot is known, Welsh was one of only a handful of original volunteers who was born and grew up outside of New Jersey, who moved out of New Jersey permanently shortly after returning from the war, and who seems to have had few (or no) close comrades among the Hunterdon County men. He was born in New York City, probably in 1844 (some evidence indicated 1841), but was orphaned when his parents "died young" and was taken to Pennsylvania and raised by others. He worked as a farmer before enlisting as a bachelor, and had moved across the Delaware River to the small Hunterdon County village of Rosemont (in Delaware Township) by the time he joined up. He was a small man, 5' 4" tall, probably of Irish descent, with fair hair and skin and dark eyes; he was literate.

He led something of a charmed life; his service record involved no illness, wound, or serious accident. One reason was undoubtedly his year-long assignment to serve at Brigade headquarters (February, 1863, to February, 1864), though this did not spare him exposure to the horrific Wilderness and Spotsylvania Courthouse fighting during the summer of 1864. (The 15th New Jersey was one of three New Jersey regiments assigned to the 1st "Jersey" Brigade during much of the war; see Appendix C.) Welsh later explained that this brigade posting meant that he "never got intimate" with the men of the company, but this seems only a partial reason (or rationale) as he served with them for more than a year afterward.

Following the war, he moved in 1867 to the small village of Widgeon (Somerset County), Maryland, on the "Eastern Shore." (Somerset is the southernmost county in the state, comprising the southwest portion of the Maryland Peninsula, and lying least of Chesapeake Bay. It was a sleepy, flat, agricultural region in the nineteenth century, with a large population of blacks.) Sometime later, probably in the mid-1870s, he married a local resident, Ann Elizabeth Ross; the couple produced 2 children: a daughter, "Eliner" E. (the spelling as later rendered by Welsh), born in 1877, and a son, Ulysses S. Grant (Welsh), born in 1879. Ann died, as best Welsh could later remember, in 1884 or 1885, probably still relatively young.

Within two or three years, on October 18, 1887, Welsh married his second wife, Victoria Paul, in a religious ceremony performed by "Rev. Harding." A year later, they had a son, Denwood. A year and a half later, in 1890,Welsh filed his first application for a pension: he claimed piles and "founder" and swelling in both legs (and made the mistake of alleging the conditions originated in the service, a quarter century previously!). (Founder, technically, is a generic term for inflammation of any lamina, or layer tissue, and is most commonly applied to swelling of the tissue to which a horse's hoof is attached. Its nineteenth-century meaning as here used was general lameness and difficulty walking.[272]) Predictably, the Pension Office did nothing, so Welsh and his pension-specializing DC Attorney, J.B. Cralle, filed a second "original" claim later the same year, this time omitting any allegation of service-connection. Welch now added heart disease to his list of ailments, stating he suffered from "fluttering and palpitation at the heart when I take violent exercise" and could not do any manual labor.

To buttress his application, Welsh utilized the testimony of two members of the larger Ross family (very likely relatives of his first wife). In 1890, Charles R. Ross, a 62-year-old farmer and resident of Mt. Vernon (a small village about 2 miles west of Widgeon), stated he had known Welsh since 1867, and "had employed him and worked for him at different

times." Ross had often attended his friend Welsh over the years, "seeing his piles, nursing him, seeing him suffer…visiting him, hearing him complain…."

> [From] the date of [my] first acquaintance with [Welsh, he] was suffering from piles and founder in both legs, and swelling and contraction of muscles. [H]is piles were protruding, he had pain when at stool, passed blood. [H]is legs were painful, swollen and stiff and he was unable to lift heavy weights, and he has continuously suffered from the said disabilities each and every year since 1867….

The next year, Henry J. Ross, a 43-year-old "mechanick" living in Crisfield (a coastal town about 20 miles south of Widgeon), also provided an affidavit stating he had known Welsh since 1867: "…[Since 1867, I] herd him complain of pain he sufered from piles and pain in his legs[.] * * * [H]e said that he was just home one year or so from the war[.] [A]t that time I stayed with him most every night…."

The new application was approved the following year, in 1892, for $8 per month. (The first application languished, but was finally rejected "for lack of evidence" of a service connection, seven-and-a half years after it had been filed!) But Welsh was not satisfied. Within three months of receiving the award, he applied for an increase. The request was not helped by the fact that two reviewing medical boards found him to enjoy "good physical development" (1891) and "good physical condition" (1896), but that over the five years' time separating the two Welsh had allowed himself to deteriorate from a "muscular" to a "flabby" physique, choking and coughing with exercise (he was the about 55 years old). He had evidently quit trying to farm. Nevertheless, an increase to $12 a month was approved in early 1897.

Seven and a half years later, on November 29, 1904, Welsh's second wife died; their marriage had lasted 17 years. Before another year was out, Welsh had married his third wife, Ann Eliza Ross. This Ann Ross, Welsh's second wife by that name, had never been married. She was probably considerably younger than her new husband (Welsh was now 63, give or take a year or two), and she was almost certainly related to his first wife. And both

wives were undoubtedly related, in turn, to the two Ross men who had supported Welsh in his initial pension application.

In 1911, he applied for a pension increase based on a claimed age of 70. The couple now lived in Princess Anne, the county seat of Somerset, about 5 or 6 miles southeast of Widgeon. They may have moved in with one of Welsh's 3 children, who were all now in their 20s and 30s. The government questioned his reported date of birth (1840), prompting him to write a letter in February of that year:

> As to my age I can't furnish any baptismal record…as my father and mother died when I was very young. In fact I can't remember them. I was taken to New Jersey from New York [earlier he had claimed to have been brought first to Pennsylvania] a very small boy and never returned again. I have no relation in New York to my knowledge.
>
> All I know in reference to my age is what I was told by the parties I was living with. [Curiously, there is no indication in the pension file that Welsh ever identified the "parties" who had raised him.] I was always told that I was bornd [the word is unclear, and could be "found"] in March 1840.

Welsh even enlisted the help of his Congressman in the matter. On March 1, 1912, Representative J. Harry Covington wrote the Commissioner of Pensions:

> I am informed that this man who is a very reputable citizen of Princess Anne is, like many other persons, unable to supply some substantial proof of the date of his birth. At the same time his age was accepted by the Government at the time of his enlistment and I would like to know what steps can be taken by him to establish his age at the present time.

Covington's letter shows the difficulty encountered by many men of the Civil War generation in attempting to prove vital dates to regulators' satisfaction (see Chapter 8). Nevertheless, while obviously seeking only to be of help to an old veteran, he was wrong on "the Government's" position. Welsh had joined up in 1862, claiming, according to War Department records, to be 18 years old. This gave him a birth year of late 1843 or 1844, in which case he would not have turned 70 until 1913 at the earliest. In any case, the commissioner never replied. Welsh finally succumbed in 1915, by that time almost certainly in his early-70s. His third marriage had lasted the last decade of his life.

<u>Bearing and Raising Children</u>

Among the 46 first marriages of company men for which *some* birth data exists, the couples involved produced a total of *at least* 128 biological children, an average of 2.78 children per couple. (This is undoubtedly a low estimate. In some cases, no data regarding children was found in the pension file, or the only data found concerned children that were still minors – 16 or under – when the file was activated.) Counting only the 42 couples for whom the *total* number of biological offspring is relatively certain produces a slightly higher child-per-couple average of 2.98. This is still 25% fewer children-per-couple than the contemporary national average of 4.[273] Six couples produced no known children, and eight couples produced only one child. Only one couple is known to have produced twins, and only one (one of the childless couples) is known to have formally adopted a child (Levi Runyon and Anna Hall).

James Hoffman/Hannah Ryan. The largest known number of offspring born to a single couple was twelve, produced by James Hoffman and Hannah Ryan, who married on June 28, 1865, in Washington, DC, two days after Hoffman was discharged from the Army. (As mentioned elsewhere, Hannah was also one of the youngest known company brides: 15 years old at marriage.)

Hoffman had received a nasty gunshot wound to the neck and face two years earlier, on May 3, 1863, at the Battle of Salem Church, and never returned to the company. He spent about four months convalescing in a Washington military hospital, and the balance of his enlistment performing local, light duty as a member of the Veterans Reserve Corps, into which he was transferred in September of 1863. This was "garrison duty" in the national capital and Hoffman would have had time on his hands.[274] Like many soldiers, he undoubtedly met his future bride during this period of his military career. Wartime Washington was awash with young women, who came to work at paying jobs - including sex work - or to volunteer their services in the war effort, particularly in nursing and Sanitary Commission duties, but also in wartime manufacturing jobs.[275]

The couple wasted no time beginning their conjugal project, Hannah giving birth to their first child ten months after the wedding, when she was only about 16 years old. Their last child was born in 1890, when Hannah was about 40 years old. She did not survive her husband, and died sometime during the period between 1895 and 1915.[276] The 12 Hoffman children were a hardy lot by nineteenth-century standards; as of 1915, 11 of them were still alive.[277]

In fact, it was common for newly married couples to begin having children as soon as possible. Several had their first child within nine, ten, or eleven months of the wedding, and it was also not unusual for couples to conceive their first child before marriage. In at least 5 instances (John Butler, Sr., James Dayton, Andrew Clawson, Erin Green, and George Justice), first-borns were delivered between five weeks and eight months following the wedding. In a sixth instance (John Burns and his future wife, Elizabeth Carkhuff), the couple had their first child, Annie, more than two years *before* they were formally married (see Chapter 7).[278]

Women's Work

What sort of work did nineteenth-century rural women do? They often did a *double portion* of work, according to Boydston (see above). Describing the daily routine of rural farming women "in the early industrial world of the antebellum Northeast," she states:

> Rural women performed virtually all of the core labor of housework:…they swept and washed floors, did laundry, hung clothes to dry, ironed, cooked, baked, bound up cuts and scrapes, made and mended clothing, and took responsibility for virtually all of the child care - at least until sons were old enough to be helpful to their fathers in the barn and the fields. [They]…also produced the raw materials necessary to their household labors.[279]

Such domestic, non-wage-generating work would have been particularly common among Company A wives. Their husbands, after all, consisted overwhelmingly of rural, working class men - farmers, laborers, and tradesmen. Moreover, they were men who generally could not afford domestic help, had less time than wealthier individuals to perform

domestic chores, and were often dependent on offspring for unpaid assistance with their own income- or sustenance-producing work. On top of it all, they were often sick or injured, and many were significantly disabled. Their wives were predominantly undereducated and often illiterate, with few skills to offer in the commercial workplace beyond the domestic skills they had learned from their own home-bound mothers. While contributing directly to the family's economic well-being and very survival, their work often did not result in the production of wages.

But many Company A women did earn wages or other income. Some of them were veterans' wives obliged to find such work after their husbands became unable to support them (or, in a few cases, after their husbands simply refused to do so; see Chapter 15). Some were widows, required to support themselves after their soldier husbands had died (see Chapter 11). And several of these women were the mothers of deceased Company A soldiers, whose husbands for one reason or another did not support them after their sons had been killed (Chapter 12). Virtually all such women had a few things in common: they were poor, laboring women, residing in rural, farm communities, without men able or willing materially to support them, who needed to generate at least some income to survive. They were the women whom Boydston earlier described as the "working-class women [for whom] cash-earning was the domestic work around which all other tasks constantly had to be organized." (A small minority of the company's women were better-off, and managed to generate more adequate income from property they owned or had invested in; these are treated separately below, or in Chapter 11.)

They found numerous ways to do this. A few (mother of David Hicks; wives of John Parrish and Charles Banks [substitute]) took boarders into their own homes (none was sufficiently well-off to own a boarding house distinct from their residence), or (mother of Jacob Apgar; wife of Banks) generated small amounts of rent from modest properties a few of them owned; one (wife of Levi Runyan) did "hotel work"; several (mother of Henry Smith; wife of Alfred Collins [draftee]) did "piece work" or "made clothes" or "dresses" for cash; some

(mothers of Cornelius Nevins and Henry Smith; wife of Naum Cregar[280]) "washed" (laundry), "did washing, ironing and other work," or performed other "housekeeping" jobs for pay; at least one (mother of Smith) was paid for "nursing" (which may have meant either "wet-nursing" a suckling infant, or simply caring for young children, as in a "nursery" setting); many (mothers of Philip Hendershot, George Henderson, David Anthony, Jacob Apgar, and Cornelius Nevins; wives of Levi Runyan, Theodore Stryker, and Peter ten Broek) performed unspecified sorts of paid work, including "labor," "manual labor," "daily labor," "going out to work," "working out [of the home]," or working "wherever [I] could get work"; one (wife of William Blackwood [transferee into Co. A]) worked "in the fields" (farmed); and one (mother of David Smith) raised and sold "garden" vegetables and eggs from "chickens and duck." One woman even gave piano lessons for a fee (the second wife of Joseph Runkle's father; see Chapter 12).

The details and background stories of many of these working women, especially widows and mothers of Company A soldiers, are narrated elsewhere in this work (see especially Chapters 11 and 12). The remainder are set forth below. (Women's work stories are more rare and generally less developed in the pension sources than men's. For that reason, this section has been expanded to incorporate the experiences of 3 wives married to men who were *not* among the company's original 100 volunteers: 1 substitute, 1 drafted man, and 1 man transferred into the unit late in the war.)

Mary Shaw Banks/Rent and Board. Mary Shaw became the wife of a Company A substitute, Private Charles Banks, in 1871. (Charles, a 20-year old farmer from Salem, New Jersey, was a member of the company for only three months in the final weeks of the war: March 21 to June 20, 1865. Even with so brief a posting, he managed to contract "Chronic Diarrhea" and apparently spent most of his army days in Slough Hospital, at Alexandria, Virginia, from which he was mustered out. He lied to his wife, apparently feeling obliged to improve on his thin service record, and claimed to have served another three-month stint at the beginning of the war with Company H, 3rd NJ Militia. [Neither the federal AG nor

ROMNJ showed Banks as a member of that unit.] He died of tuberculosis in February, 1902, at age 57.)

Mary, who was illiterate, filed the following month for a widow's pension, from her South Jersey home at Bridgeton. In her papers, she disclosed that she supported herself (and probably Charles as well when he was alive) from two meager sources. From renting out a house she owned in Lawrence Township, Cumberland County, she received $5 per month. (The house was worth only $700, and was encumbered with a $500 mortgage.) She also received payment for board she provided to her two unmarried adult sons, who lived with her in Bridgeton (the amount was not disclosed). The Pension Office evidently felt this modest income was not sufficient to render her self-supporting, and awarded her the standard pension of $8 per month. (The amount had risen to $40 per month by the time she died, sometime after 1928, probably in her late 80s or 90s.)

Anna Alicia Mansfield Collins/Dressmaking. Anna Mansfield was the wife of Alfred Collins, one of Company A's few "Drafted Men" (there were only 4). The couple resided all their lives in Newark, and during his long work life (Collins lived to age 67, about the average for Company A's surviving original volunteers), he variously listed his occupations as "musician," "ornament maker," "locksmith," and at the end, "saddlery hardware." He enlisted for a short term as a musician, with Company B, 37th New Jersey Infantry, and served from May to October, 1864. (According to RLACW, members of the 37th were known as "hundred-days' men," and saw limited action; the regiment suffered a total of 19 deaths, only 5 of which were on the battlefield.)

But Collins was not finished with the war; he was drafted the following year, and entered service on February 24, this time with Company A. The tour was relatively uneventful, aside from participating in Lee's surrender, and he was discharged in July. He married Anna three months later.

Collins had no service-connected ailments, but did eventually obtain a pension in 1890 ($12 per month, for "rheumatism"), after new legislation obviated the need for wartime

origination of the condition. For the rest of his life, he persistently sought an increased award (even claiming, in 1903, that the rheumatism *had* originated in the service), but to no avail. He died in 1911.

In April of 1904, as part of his many efforts to get more money from the Pension Office, Collins asked a friend and former neighbor, John Connolly, to write a supporting letter to the government. In the letter, Connolly stated he had known Collins "for thirty years or more" and added, perhaps dramatically:

> I lived next door to him for seven years in the eightys and knew him to be laid up with rheumatism frequently and if his wife had not helped him to make a living by making dresses for the last twenty five years [i.e., since about 1879] I believe he would have starved to death.

Anna E. Hull Runyan/Hotel Work. Anna Hull was 18 years old when she married a recently-discharged Company A man, Sergeant Levi Runyan. They had met in Trenton, where he had been sent to do recruiting duty in the last months of the war; he was 25 years old. In the spirit of the times, they wedded on the Fourth of July. After discharge, the couple moved first to Illinois, where Runyan became a carriage maker and painter, and later settled in Iowa.

Runyan had taken a bad fall on his back during the infamous "mud march" of January, 1863, and developed painful piles and a chronically lame back as a result. At times, pain from the piles was so severe that he had to lie down while at work, or even to "take down his pants and sit" in a pail of cold water, as one co-worker remembered it. By 1899 (at age 59), after undergoing years of suffering, friends described him as "a man out of Kelter," increasingly subject to "flashes" and "nervous attacks."

Anna stuck with him throughout (he lived until 1915, dying a month short of his 75th birthday; she lived another ten months, dying at age 69). They were impoverished when they passed away, both of them residing at the Iowa Soldiers and Sailors Home.

Runyan first filed for a pension in 1877, but the government took no action on it and his attorney (who appears generally to have done a poor job representing him in the matter)

failed to press it. With new counsel, he filed a new application in 1890, and this time was successful, though he was rated only 8/18ths disabled ($8 per month). Nearly ten years later, as a result of several medical boards having strongly recommended a higher award, the Pension Office conducted a lengthy Special Examination (see Chapter 8). In the course of testimony before the examiners, Runyan's dire financial circumstances and periodic inability to work were forcefully depicted. Also described were Anna's efforts to contribute her own work and wages. An Illinois hotel owner, a woman named Eva Crist, had the following to say:

> I knew Levi Runyan upwards of 20 years ago. He and his wife boarded with me at my hotel – National Hotel – and his wife worked for me a part of the time for her board and part of the time for wages and her wages went toward paying her husband's board as he was not able to work all the time. * * * He was very much emaciated when here, and he was very pale. When his back was hurting him he would not be able to do anything at all.

A few years later, in 1907, Anna herself testified along the same lines in an affidavit requested by the Pension Office:

> …[My husband's piles and] asthma have existed during our entire married life to such a degree that a great deal of the time he was entirely disabled from earning our support so that I was compelled to earn our living by my own labor and he requiring much of my care and attendance….

Mary C. Henson Blackwood/Field and Farm Work. Private William F. Blackwood was not an original Company A volunteer, and had a complicated Civil War service career. At about age 24, he enlisted during the first weeks of the war in Company C, 3rd NJ Militia, for a three-year stint. He was from Camden, New Jersey, near Philadelphia, and gave his occupation as farmer and laborer. While serving with the 3rd in late June, 1862, he was detailed "as a nurse for our sick and wounded soldiers." (This was during the notorious Seven Days' Battles just outside of Richmond, which lasted from June 25 to July 1. As usual, McClellan's actions in the campaign were tentative, and his forces were finally obliged to retreat. When they did so, about 2,500 wounded and sick Union men, and several surgeons who volunteered to remain with them, were left behind and soon captured by rebel

forces. Blackwood was among this group.[281]) Following capture, he was confined at Libby Prison in Richmond, and then at the Confederate prison on Belle Island.

> …[W]hile there I had the Diarhea [probably dysentery] and could get nothing to check it[.] It come on me by drinking the water (we used to have to dig holes in the ground and drink the water that come in them) and sleeping out at night without any covering with nothing to eat but a half loaf of Bakers Bread and some days nothing[.] Ever since then as I do my business part of my Bowels come down and do still. I had no treatment there and in Sep. or the 1st of October I arrived at camp of parole prisoners and there I had it again very bad. With a soreness in the upper part of my stomach and my bowels coming down with sharp stinging pains.

Blackwood was released to the Union lines, hospitalized, and then furloughed for a spell; finally, perhaps understandably after such an ordeal, he deserted in early 1864. He was subsequently apprehended (or voluntarily returned; the record is not clear), and this time was assigned to Company A for the latter part of 1864. (He was later transferred again, to an artillery battery, where he remained till the end of the war.)

In 1869, having returned to farming and now residing at Chews Landing, Camden County, Blackwood married Mary C. Henson, of Philadelphia. (That city lay just across the Delaware River from Camden County; Chews Landing, part of Gloucester Township, was a small farming village on a westward-flowing tributary of the Delaware). It took the couple a long time to produce their two offspring: William H., Jr., was born in 1881, eleven years after the marriage; and Helen Pearl in 1888, nineteen years after (at this point Mary was 39 years old). William Sr.'s health, never good following his imprisonment, grew worse. One neighbor testified that "he had an awful bad sickly look when [he] first came home and seemed to be badly broken down & remained that way…." Another remembered that when he came back from the war "he complained of pains acrost his lines [loins] and Kidneys[,] and after sitting down & would go to rise up he would place his hands acrost his lines as though to assist himself in rising from his sitting posture." A third stated Blackwood had not been able to do a full day's work since returning, and "was so helpless with Rheumatism that he could not carry the child [his daughter, Helen] across the house."

In 1882, Blackwood swore out a long affidavit in support of the pension application he had recently filed. In it he described Mary's efforts to relieve the family's plight. "I think I am entitled to some recompense as now I cannot work one third of my time *and my Wife has to work in the field and any thing she can get to do*…." (Emphasis added.)

Incredibly, Blackwood's application was rejected after a delay of 4 years. He died in 1890 without ever receiving an award. But at Mary's insistence, the matter was re-opened, and a small pension of $2 per month was allowed retroactively to the date of her husband's original filing. Mary collected was owed her deceased husband, and also began receiving her own $12 per month widow's pension (plus $2 per month for Helen, who was still quite young).

Mary remarried four-and-a-half years after her husband's death, and moved with her new husband, Robert Shepherd, to nearby Moorestown, in Burlington County, New Jersey. In accordance with the legal requirements of the day, she petitioned the Burlington County Orphans Court in 1903 for formal appointment as Helen's guardian. (Even though she was mother and sole surviving biological parent, the law required women, especially upon remarriage, to be formally appointed guardians of their own children. This requirement was probably often honored in the breach except where, as here, money payable for the child's benefit was at stake.[282] Mary was entitled to receive, and surely needed, the extra $2 per month in pension money payable on Helen's account, but the government could make certain she got herself properly appointed as Helen's legal guardian before continuing to pay it.)

Death and Burial.

Notwithstanding the refreshing progress made by women in recent decades, American culture remains largely patrilineal and patrilocal. It was certainly so during the nineteenth century. One consequence was that wives were more often required to move as their husband's search for work, or mere desire to migrate, dictated, than husbands were required to move as their wives determined. This is especially evident, for example, from the

analysis of post-war (and post-marriage) residence and migration patterns detailed in Chapters 7 and 11. Women may have been able to choose the place of their wedding (usually, according to tradition, their home, or home church, or home town), but then they "moved in" with their husband, typically residing and raising children (who would inevitably take the husband's surname) in or near the husband's home community, or else following him as he decided to "light out for the territories" in search of a place to call "his" own.

But this did not mean that wives easily (or ever) gave up attachment to their own childhood homes and birth families. (It also does not mean that this patrilineal/patrilocal practice was uniform or uncontested. Numerous wives, then as now, must have exerted considerable influence in selecting the family's residential community, or even the husband's choice of work, if choice presented itself.) And sometimes a wife far from home decided on returning, even if only after death.

Bridget Ann Fay (Collins). Born Bridget Ann Fay (probably about 1840), this future wife of a Company A survivor was residing in Newark, New Jersey, when the war ended (she had probably lived there a good deal- perhaps all - of her life, but the record on this is unclear). Bridget most likely met her husband, John P. Collins, in 1864 or 1865, while he was convalescing at the Army's general hospital in Newark, having received a gunshot wound to the left forearm on June 7, 1864, during Company A's engagement at Cold Harbor. (John Collins's story is told in detail in Chapter 7.) Within a year of his wounding, the couple was married in Newark, at St. Johns (Catholic) Church, on May 29, 1865; John was somewhere between 21 and 24 years old (the evidence in his file varies as to his year of birth), and Bridget was about 25. The day following the ceremony, Collins's discharge was signed. (This actually makes him the second man in the company to be married while yet in service, but in his case the war had ended.)

The couple then removed to Pottersville, a small village at the northeast corner of Hunterdon County from which Collins had enlisted three years before (for Bridget, quite a change from urban, industrializing, Catholic-immigrant-filled Newark). Despite the

disability Collins suffered as a result of his wound, he again took up his pre-war trade of blacksmithing. Sometime during the mid-1880s, after living in rural Pottersville for about 15 years, the couple, who remained childless, apparently became restless and moved back to Newark. (Perhaps Bridget did not take to country life, or missed her family, friends, and the comparatively urbane surroundings of her home city. Their childless status may have aggravated whatever sadness she was feeling.)

But removal to Newark did not have the desired effect, at least not for John. Within a few years, in July, 1889, they moved again, this time approximately *3,000 miles west* to the inland city of Tacoma, Washington Territory, and then, four months later, even further westward to the Pacific coast, finally settling in Port Angeles, Clallam County, Washington. There Collins resumed his trade. Bridget was probably about 49 or 50 years old at this point.

The couple were not to find lasting peace out west. Within a little more than five years, on February 17, 1895, Bridget died, most likely from a ravaging case of tuberculosis, but exacerbated perhaps, as such things can be, by a broken heart. (In 1898, Collins would report his wife's death as having occurred in 1896, but other evidence confirms it was in 1895.) Her obituary in a Port Angeles newspaper described her final months, using the sentimental Victorian language and templates of the period:

> The immediate cause of her death was hemorrhage of the lungs. For months past the estimable woman had been a patient from weak lungs, and would only rally to again be seized with a severe cough which threatened premature decline. For the last few months she had been gradually sinking to a point where the physician pronounced the case incurable, and the end only a question of a short time. Last Sunday she was seized with a severe spell of coughing, which produced hemorrhage of the lungs from the results of which the patient soon expired. Deceased was highly respected in this city, and her death will be sincerely mourned.

"Gradually sinking" over a period of several months, Bridget had ample opportunity to make her memorial service and burial wishes clear to her husband. Remarkably, two days after her death, Collins embarked with her body on a train bound for Newark, New Jersey, to return her for interment there. A Newark newspaper notice indicates that four days after her death, a Mass of Requiem was "celebrated for the repose of her soul," at the very church

where she and John had been married nearly 30 years before. It is most likely that her body was also buried in Newark, probably at the St. John's Church cemetery. Bridget, who had evidently left a large part of her heart in Newark, had at last come home to stay. (Bridget's sad end-of-life itinerary is also evidence of the amazingly rapid transcontinental transit that railroad travel had made possible, and reasonably affordable, by the close of the nineteenth century.)

John then returned to Port Angeles and, following a decent interval of nine years, remarried; he died in 1908 in his late 60s and, unlike Bridget, remained to be buried in Port Angeles.

* * *

Returning to the place this chapter began, a final comment is in order concerning the work of such scholars as Carroll Smith-Rosenberg and Mary Ryan. While elements of their claims must surely have been true for "bourgeois" men and women, there is little in the documents reviewed for this study that suggests any of the Company A women living in the early nineteenth century - primarily soldiers' mothers (see Chapter 12) or, in a few cases, their young wives, who were virtually all rural-dwelling, and mostly poor, farming, or working-class - felt themselves bounded by the cult and female role Smith-Rosenberg describes. Many were indeed compelled by poverty into performing various kinds of wage labor, in and outside the home, and while many may have preferred otherwise, none seems to have considered such work "unnatural." This also appears to be the case for most of the next generation of Company A women - soldiers' wives and widows - who lived out their lives in the mid- to late-period of the century, and continued into the twentieth.

Neither Ryan nor Smith-Rosenberg are necessarily off the mark in outlining the nineteenth-century changes they describe, so long as they are clear about situating those changes *within the limited class of women, and particular time and place*, on which they focus. The point here is simply a cautionary one of claiming too universal a sweep for one's findings. The very "discovery" of a separate female world, and of women's voices in general,

is often attributed to the work of Smith-Rosenberg, based largely on her early examination of numerous collections of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women's manuscripts, mainly letters and diaries.[283] In a sense, the insight seems less a modern historical discovery than a timeless and universal human truism, appreciated by virtually all self-conscious men and women living in traditional communities, and manifest in their daily conversation, activities, and lore. (Smith-Rosenberg's achievement was to advance scholarly understanding of *the particular shape and intensity* of certain aspects of this separate culture in American life, at least as it existed for middle-class women, and to render it for a while a central focus of women's history). Part of the reason she was led to this field of inquiry was undoubtedly her concentration on exclusively women-to-women and women-for-women writing. *There are virtually no examples of such writing in the Civil War pension archives* (although there are examples of literate females writing to male lawyers or government officials on behalf of themselves or illiterate female friends, and of women networking with and assisting women in other significant ways, e.g., midwifery).[284]

Every historian is affected not only by his/her own character and life experience (no matter the claim made to "objectivity"), but also by the very nature of the historical documents placed in his/her path. As Smith-Rosenberg explicitly recognizes, the documents are always limited and limiting, more or less accidental "gifts from the Fates" and, particularly if voluminous, "impossible for any single scholar to exhaust." Her own principal set of primary documents, as she concedes, does not constitute a group of "well-rounded samples" in a modern, statistical sense. Her materials are, necessarily, the writings of only those women who were literate enough to write, who chose to express themselves to other women in writing, and whose writings have somehow survived *and* been collected. And even after running that winnowing gauntlet, they are in the end only that small portion of the available documents selected to see the light of day - documents judged sufficiently illustrative of the historical truth the historian wishes to offer as compelling.

It is not surprising that there is little direct evidence of separate spheres in the documents examined for this study. Such spheres surely existed; they always have. But in the pension and other materials forming the foundation of the present work, women emerge primarily in roles that seem for the most part to *transcend* their separateness and that typically place them in contact with males or with their communities in general: women as (heterosexual) lovers, wives, mothers (of sons), sisters (of brothers), widows, householders, laborers, entrepreneurs, property owners, and public actors (primarily as pension claimants, but as actors in other public capacities as well).

In these roles, Company A women do not come across as puritanical, pietistic, or subservient; in fact, as a group they often appear the opposite. Pursuing, for example, sources of government assistance - widows' and mothers' pensions – or working for the very survival of their families and mates, they display both remarkable assertiveness and persistence, and also (as with their men folk) occasional touches of self-serving manipulation or even untruthfulness. They certainly display none of the diffidence that might be predicted by too literal a reliance on modern notions of Victorian-era women's studied helplessness and modesty. These are good things to remember.

CHAPTER 7

RESIDENCE, MIGRATION, WORK, AND WEALTH

> As you will see I am allmost out of the U.S. but hope to get back among my old Camrads & civilization again sometime.
>
> Private John Collins, in the (new) State of Washington

The second half of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth have been consistently described as a period of intense and rapid change in American society. Subjected to increasing rates of industrialization, urbanization, immigration, and population growth, the familiar lineaments of America's social fabric - patterns that had remained more or less intact for more than a century - were stressed, warped, and in some cases, severed altogether and cast aside.[285]

During this period, for example, the United States underwent far-reaching transportation, communication, and production "revolutions" (steam and later gasoline powered engines; railroads, the early automobile and airplane, and the shift from wind- to engine-powered vessels; the telegraph, telephone, and typewriter; the rapid growth of mechanized manufacturing and agriculture, the beginnings of factory mass-production, and the growth of large corporations and "trusts" dominating certain industries).

As Burton Bledstein has pointed out, many of these factors combined to produce for the first time in United States history both an *actual* American "middle class," and a prevailing, subjective sense among Americans of *belonging* to such a class, regardless of objective economic, social, and other considerations. The proportion of Americans engaged in manual labor declined, as did, apparently, Americans' desire to be identified as members of the "laboring classes."[286] Traditional attachment to geographical place and local community ebbed, while traditional practices of hand craftsmanship and face-to-face economic relations foundered. For many, predominant goals became individual "self-improvement" and upward social and economic mobility, and American males in particular (who constituted the

overwhelming majority of the non-domestic workforce) were encouraged to do whatever might be necessary to reach them, including the pursuit of new job opportunities in "higher" occupational categories, and relocating to new communities or regions of the country where these goals were thought to be more attainable.

How did all these post-bellum trends in American life affect the survivors and families of Company A? Were their work lives fulfilling and successful? Did they too "move up" the social and economic ladders of their day, achieving (or maintaining) respectable, middle class status, and accumulating creditable estates to pass on to their progeny? Did they join in the general post-war restlessness, moving their residences about with some frequency in order to pursue these goals, now and then even "lighting out for the territories"?

This chapter begins by describing Company A's post-war residence and migration patterns, and by narrating the detailed movements of 5 representative veterans and their families. The chapter then assesses the overall work and economic picture that emerges from the post-war life histories of the company's survivors (job changing, occupational and economic mobility, wealth, impoverishment), and traces in detail the particular work and wealth circumstances of several veterans' families whose differing experiences shed light on the general conclusions reached.

Migration, geographical mobility, and changes of residence

Of the company's 54 original volunteers known to have returned from the war, initial residential data were obtained for 49 (91%), and more or less complete post-war residential data, including place of death, for 48 (89%). (One additional "returning" veteran, Charles Heath, was discharged with chronic diarrhea in March of 1863, returned to his family's Hunterdon County home, and died from his illness [probably dysentery] five weeks later; his residential information is not included in the sample.) In some cases, the data covered only a portion of the veteran's post-war life (although usually a long one), but in most cases the

residential data covered all or nearly all of it, including the place first returned to after discharge or mustering out, and continuing through the veteran's domicile at time of death.

A total of 23, almost half of the sample, initially returned to reside after the war in the same Hunterdon town or township from which they had enlisted. Twelve additional men, moreover, returned to reside in a neighboring Hunterdon town or township (places bordering or very near their places of enlistment), and if these twelve are added, *a total of 35 (71%) of the war's survivors may be deemed to have re-settled in or very near their pre-war "home towns" immediately after the war.* (Two of the 35 had enlisted from Hillsboro, a Somerset County township bordering Hunterdon, but initially resettled after the war in Hunterdon County, in a township near Hillsboro. This is evidence that the company's predominantly Hunterdon provenance influenced even its few non-Hunterdon volunteers in establishing a residence on their return.)

Four additional men resettled in parts of Hunterdon, or in Hunterdon's bordering counties in New Jersey and Pennsylvania[287], that were *not* in or close to their enlistment towns. But all 4 chose places that were no more than a few miles from their home towns (towns of enlistment). If these are added to the 35, a total of 39, or about 80% of the sample, may be said to have initially resettled in their "home territory" after the war.

Of the remaining 10 men who did *not* immediately return to their home territory (about a fifth of the sample), 6 initially resettled in northern or central New Jersey *cities* (4 in Trenton, a few miles south of Hunterdon, and 2 in more distant cities, Newark and Perth Amboy); 2 resettled in *southern* New Jersey; and 2 relocated beyond the state's borders (Wisconsin and Texas).

Moreover, once resettled after the war, most veterans and their families *resided continuously* in or near their home town or home territory for the balance of their lives, despite subsequent moves. These men moved mainly within a fairly small geographic area, centered on their "home" county of Hunterdon. Of those who initially returned to Hunterdon County, more than a third (13) resided continuously in the county until their deaths (14, if

William Dungan is included, who at one point left the county to live for three months in Chicago, but who then returned). Another third (13) continuously resided until their deaths within a larger area encompassing Hunterdon and its five adjoining counties, an area with a radius of approximately 30 miles from the geographic center of Hunterdon. Three additional veterans, while residing and/or dying outside Hunterdon and its bordering New Jersey counties, remained residents of the State of New Jersey their entire lives. (These three sets of figures include 8 veterans who died while residing in one of the state's two Soldiers and Sailors Homes - 7 in Kearny, in North Jersey, and one in Vineland, in South Jersey - all of whom had spent all of their previous, post-war lives residing in New Jersey.[288] Three of the 7 Kearny residents had lived continuously in Hunterdon County before being admitted to the home, which occurred during the last years of their lives.)

Overall, then, the data reveal a pattern of broad and persistent veteran attachment to home town and home region, a pattern that continued throughout the veterans' lives. *More than half (26 of the 48 for whom data are known) resided continuously in Hunterdon or its five bordering counties for the remainder of their lives.* And a total of three-fifths (29) remained all their post-war lives either within the State of New Jersey or within a Pennsylvania county bordering Hunterdon (Bucks).[289]

This preference for home territory persisted despite the facts that most returning veterans moved their place of residence at least once over the course of their post-war lives, and that many moved numerous times. The data show that only 15, or fewer than one-third, continued for the rest of their lives to reside in the same town or township they settled in after the war - though some of these moved one or more times *within* the same municipality. (The figure of 15 includes a few veterans who moved into a Soldiers and Sailors Home near the end of their lives, but who had otherwise remained living in the same place in their post-war years.)

The other 33 veterans for whom post-war residence data through date of death are known (more than two-thirds of the sample of 48) moved to a new residence in a *different*

town or township at least once during their post-war lives, 8 of them relocating only one time, and the remaining 25, or over half the sample, relocating two or more times. In fact, it was not uncommon among the company's survivors for men and their families to move to a new residence four or five times over their post-war lives, in some cases traveling substantial distances to do so. John Burns (whose story is narrated in detail below) moved at least eighteen times, including two separate moves to Kansas and one to Iowa, two "across the river" to Pennsylvania, and one to another New Jersey county (Monmouth)!

While a large majority of the company's returning men resettled in their home state of New Jersey, most of them to remain in that region, a smaller but significant number moved much further afield, some temporarily and others permanently.

Two of the company's returning men, Thomas Gregory and Joseph Sullivan (4% of the sample), appear to have moved away from New Jersey in the immediate post-war period. Gregory moved to Wisconsin (although, by the time he died, he had returned to reside in Plainfield [Somerset County], New Jersey), and Sullivan moved to Texas (where he remained for the rest of his life; his story is narrated in detail below).

Ten men (20%), while initially resettling in New Jersey, later moved away temporarily and established one or more residences in other states before, like Gregory, returning to New Jersey to live out their final years. Among them, the 10 established a total of seventeen different out-of-state residences, which included addresses in the States of New York (three, including two in New York City); Pennsylvania (three); Illinois (three, including two in Chicago); and one each in California, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, South Dakota, and the District of Columbia.

Finally, a total of 7 men (14%), after initially resettling in New Jersey after the war, moved away permanently, like Sullivan, establishing new homes in the District of Columbia, and the States of Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, and the new (and very distant) State of Washington.[290]

Taken together, these figures reveal that a significant minority of Company A's survivors - *nearly 2 out of 5* - spent at least some of their post-war years living outside the state from which they all had enlisted and where the majority of them had grown up. And 8 members of this migratory group - *1 out of 6 of the company's returning men* - moved away *permanently*. Although many of these New Jersey "emigrants" moved to mid-Atlantic jurisdictions relatively close to New Jersey (New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Virginia), a larger number moved to mid-western states (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Kansas, Texas) or "far" west states (California, Washington, South Dakota). Perhaps not surprisingly, no veteran spent any time living in a "Deep South" state after the war, and only 2, William Sloan and Joseph Sullivan, lived in any of the other former Confederate States. (Sloan lived in Virginia for about a year shortly after the war, but was there only as a member of the federal army of occupation; see Chapter 4; Sullivan's immediate and permanent post-war migration to Texas is described later in this chapter.) Only one veteran, Theodore Stryker, migrated *eastward* to a New England state, moving for a short time to Connecticut (the move apparently prompted as much by conjugal difficulties as by economic concerns; see Stryker's story in Chapter 15).

The post-war life courses of the families of 5 veterans illustrate the variety of migratory and residence-changing patterns that existed among the company's survivors. At one end of the migration spectrum, John Burns changed residences eighteen times over the course of his post-war life, living in eight different counties in four states. At the other end of the spectrum, three veterans, Isaac Danberry, John Reading, and Abraham Trauger, returned after the war to their Hunterdon County hometowns, and never moved again. Finally, the appeal of the "far" west is represented by the experience of John Collins, who in 1889 moved permanently to the State of Washington, a place so distant that he was prompted to write to a New Jersey official a couple of years later: "As you will see I am allmost out of the U.S. but hope to get back among my old Camrads & civilization again sometime." (Except for a brief trip back east with the body of his first wife, he never did.)

John Burns. The post war life of John Burns and his family constitutes an extreme example of post-war migration and residence changing. It also illustrates how the factor of a serious wound or health condition (or the war's trauma in general) was often interwoven with frequent job changes (or joblessness), multiple moves and residences, and precarious economic survival.

Burns was an immigrant born in Roscommon County, in central Ireland, who had immigrated to the United States and was living in Hunterdon County (Tewksbury Township) when he enlisted with the company in 1862, at the age of about 19 years.[291] Like so many of his comrades who managed to survive the unit's first two years of fighting and wintering, he was grievously wounded on May 12, 1864, at the Battle of Spotsylvania Courthouse, where he suffered multiple gunshot wounds to the right leg, hip, and shoulder. Hospitalized and then furloughed for a couple of months toward the end of 1864, he returned to duty, surprisingly, in 1865, but never thrived. He was discharged "for wounds" about a week before the rest of the company was mustered out *en masse* in June of that year.

At some point following his discharge in 1865, most likely as he made his way back to New Jersey from the war zone, Burns was examined by a government-designated doctor in Newark, who noted his three wounds and recommended a disability rating of one-half to two-thirds. (The discharge examination itself did not constitute an evaluation for pension purposes, but did serve typically to establish a more or less official assessment of the wounded veteran's eligibility for a pension, in the event he elected to apply in future.)

Returning to Hunterdon, he settled first in Frenchtown, a Delaware River community on the western edge of the county, about 18 miles from Tewksbury. Burns had been a "laborer" before the war (probably a farm hand), but in Frenchtown he apprenticed to a harness maker, apparently intending to learn a trade and improve his position. He remained in the town for about 18 months, during which time he did make formal application for a disability pension, in January, 1866, using one of the popular Washington, D.C., attorneys, George Lemon, to process the paperwork (see Chapter 8). The application

was approved in the relatively short period of three months, and an award of $8 per month was made retroactive to his date of discharge in June of the previous year. This meant that Burns, along with his first quarterly pension payment of $24 in mid-1865, would also have received a lump sum arrears payment totaling about $100, a significant stake for a young apprentice trying to re-start life.

At some point during his 18-month residence in Frenchtown, Burns met his future wife, Elizabeth A. Carkhuff, daughter of Dennis and Amanda Carkhuff, who was then about 18 years old (Burns was then about 24). Toward the middle of 1866, John and Elizabeth conceived a child. As Elizabeth's pregnancy developed (and her condition became obvious), Burns moved across the Delaware to Hellertown, Pennsylvania, where he stayed about two weeks, and then, during the winter of 1866-67, moved back to Reaville, New Jersey, a hamlet on the eastern border of Hunterdon County. (Burns later stated that throughout these moves he was continuing to pursue his apprenticeship, but did not indicate whether Elizabeth accompanied him.)

In any case, in March of 1867, as winter drew to a close and with Elizabeth now in her third trimester, she and John both pulled up stakes and made a long, 1,200-mile trip west, to a place near the small, recently-settled town of LeRoy (Coffee County), Kansas. (The early Union Pacific Railroad had just been run through LeRoy, and John and Elizabeth must have traveled there by rail.) They probably used part of John's pension arrears payment to finance the trip. It is likely that John chose rapidly-growing Kansas as a likely place to look for work in his new trade, and the couple may well have arrived claiming to be married. (In fact, so-called "common law marriages" - marriages that under certain circumstances became legally recognized, and that carried the same rights and obligations as formally performed marriages - were lawful in most jurisdictions of the period.[292] See generally, Chapter 6.) Their first venture west met with job disappointment and domestic tragedy, however; after arriving in Kansas, their first child, Annie, was born, but died within a few weeks. After a

mere three months, in June, 1867, the couple made their way back to Hunterdon County, this time settling in Lambertville.

Once reestablished, John got work with the railroad, but had to quit within a month because he "was unable to stand the heavy labor." He became an apprentice once again, this time "to learn the barber's trade." After spending about five months under the supervision of a Lambertville barber named G. A. Slack, Burns and his wife moved to the town of Oxford, in Warren County, about 30 miles north of Lambertville, where, beginning in the winter of 1867-68, he "worked at my trade as a barber nine months."

Again, things did not work out, and by the end of 1868, the couple had moved back to Hunterdon again, this time to West Amwell, a township on the outskirts of Lambertville. Here, John worked for a businessman named William T. Bainbridge, driving a milk delivery wagon in Lambertville.

At this point, he and Elizabeth, who had now been together for at least three years, decided to get married formally. The wedding was performed on June 9, 1969, at the Lambertville Methodist-Episcopal Church, by the Rev. H. M. Brown. (It is entirely possible that up to this time, the couple's West Amwell and Lambertville friends and neighbors believed - or had been told - that they were married already, and none may have known about the birth or death of their first child, more than two years before.) Burns, an immigrant from a central Irish county, was almost certainly Catholic, or descended from Catholic ancestors; it is interesting to speculate whether the mixed-faith nature of their relationship was any sort of issue for the young couple, or whether Burns's attachment to his native religion was so tenuous that it was readily consigned to the past, perhaps even during his years in the service and the soul-saving ministrations of the evangelical Regimental Chaplain, Alanson Haines (see Chapters 3 and 4).

After about seven months of milk wagon driving, John got work in one of Lambertville's several "manufactories," a rubber mill, where he continued for another five months, presumably as a common laborer, until the winter of 1869-70. Apparently

dissatisfied with his prospects, and perhaps wishing to make another effort to start a new life out west, John at this point traveled to Cedar Falls, Iowa, in search of work. (Cedar Falls lies on the banks of the Cedar River, a significant southeast-flowing tributary of the Mississippi; it is a bit upstream of Waterloo, near the center of the northeastern quadrant of the state.) He probably went by himself, traveling by train (the first transcontinental railway had just been completed), intending to send for his new wife if a situation could be found. But after about two months "in search of employment" in Iowa, John returned to Lambertville, where he obtained work in the railroad company's repair shop. He stayed there for two years - until then the longest period of continuous employment he had had in one job.

At the end of the two-year period, John having now reached the age of about 29, he and Elizabeth gave up town living and once again settled on a farm in West Amwell. It was late 1871 or early 1872, and John, having spent the previous six years trying his hand at various trades and laboring positions, perhaps wanted to resume the kind of work he had most likely been performing when he joined the army: farming. In any event, farm work occupied the next decade of his life.

While residing on the West Amwell farm (John undoubtedly working as a tenant farmer, or hired hand and boarder, rather than farming his own spread), the couple had their second and third children: Ella, born April 26, 1874, and Sarah, born July 2, 1876. John was also examined twice during this period by government-appointed medical boards, the first in Trenton, in 1873, and the second in Lambertville, in 1875.

In 1877, after working the West Amwell farm for about six years, John and Elizabeth decided to make one more effort – their third - to settle out west. This time, they relocated to Sumner County, Kansas, where they remained for about 18 months. (Sumner County lies on the state's southern border, south of Wichita.) Again things did not go well, and this time the couple was burdened with the care of two young daughters, aged one and three years. John later stated that he "farmed part of the time and was sick the rest of the time." He was

examined twice in Kansas during 1877 by government-appointed doctors, the first one in Wichita and the second in Oxford.

W. M. Hendrickson, the doctor completing the September 8, 1877, "Surgeon's Certificate" (report) of the Wichita examination, reached the highly improbable conclusion that all of Burns's gunshot wounds had been caused by a single "ball" (bullet), which had entered his upper right shoulder from above, "passed backward and downward" and exited his right upper arm below the shoulder, then continued downward, "entering the right buttock" and re-emerged from the buttock about six inches below the second entry wound. (It would only have been possible for the ball to travel this path, entering and exiting Burns's body twice, if he had been lying in a prone position, facing the enemy, at the moment he was shot.) The doctor rated Burns as totally disabled, thus supporting his continued eligibility for the current maximum, $8-per-month award.

In 1878 or 1879, with John in deteriorating health, the family gave up on Kansas and returned once again to Lambertville. In the Spring of 1880, they moved onto another farm, this one in Lebanon, in central Hunterdon County. Tragedy struck the family a second time the following winter when, on December 7, Elizabeth died of "Phthisis Pulmonalis" (almost certainly tuberculosis). Left with the care of two young children, in poor health, and suffering increasing disability from his war wounds, John was prompted the following year to apply for an increase in his pension award. (Since 1877 and the time of his Wichita evaluation, pension legislation had increased maximum awards.) He was examined by a medical board in Lambertville and, the board finding no new condition to support a higher award, the application was rejected.

In 1883, Burns "quit farming on account of ill health and moved to East White House," a village in the eastern part of the county. The move permanently ended his days as a farmer, and for the next two years he "sold books for a living." On December 15, 1883. while residing at East White House, John married a second time. The wedding took place at the Mechanicsville Methodist-Episcopalian Church (Mechanicsville was near East White

House), and was performed by the Rev. David Walters. The bride was Mary A. (Cole) Henry, daughter of Matthias Cole and Mary Beers; she was 22 years old (Burns was now about 40). Mary was a widow, and had been married to Burns's regimental comrade, John R. Henry, formerly of Company E. Henry had been a railroad worker after the war, and had been killed in a railroad accident in December of the previous year. Burns may have known Cole from their days together in the Regiment, and had probably met Cole's wife, Mary, when both men had worked for the railroad (in 1867, and again in the early 1870s).

In 1884, the year following his second marriage, John was examined by a three-doctor board in Trenton. For the first time, in addition to his war wounds and resulting disability, the board diagnosed Burns with "liver disease." This raises the possibility that Burns had been drinking alcohol excessively for some time, and that the "vice" was beginning to take a significant toll on his health.

In 1885, perhaps encouraged by the findings of the Trenton board, Burns again applied for an increase in his pension, now aggressively pursuing the additional claimed ailments of liver and kidney disease, and attempting to link them to his wartime service. In a February 9, 1886, letter to the Hon. J. C. Black, Commissioner of Pensions, for example, he expressed frustration at being unable to provide documentary evidence to support this aspect of his renewed claim, as had been requested by the Pension Office:

> Dear sir it is interley impossible fore me to gett the desired evidence as I never was treated while in the army fore Liver and Kidney deasease but I commenced treatment all most immeadeatley after my discharge and continued with but littl entermision up to the Present time.

Later the same month, Burns submitted the affidavit of Harmon Beavers, a Lebanon resident for whom Burns had worked and in whose home Burns had lived "for about nine months" (the year was not specified, but this probably occurred during Burns's farming years in that town). Beavers testified:

> …I know that [Burns] was & is not capable of doing more than 1/4 of full manual labor[,] was taking medicine & doctoring continually & seemed to be physically uncapable of manual labor but doing what he could[.] I believe him to [be] thoroughly honest & a good citizen[.]

Perhaps significantly, Beavers did *not* include in his affidavit one of the standard phrases that had become almost formulaic in pension application documents, to the effect that Burns was a "sober" man, or a man "with no vicious habits," i.e., that he did not drink to excess.

With his application still pending, Burns was examined by two boards in 1887, the first in Somerville, in neighboring Somerset County and the second in Easton, Pennsylvania, a city just northwest of Hunterdon on the Delaware River. Curiously, Burns did not press his complaints of liver or kidney disease on either occasion, and neither board made any diagnosis related to those claims. The board's physical descriptions did indicate one aspect of John's gradual deterioration at this point: always a slight man of relatively short stature (about 5'4" tall and weighing about 135 lbs. in the immediate post-war period), he had now dropped to a weight of only 125 lbs.

Although of little practical help to Burns, the Easton board also undertook a detailed reassessment of the number of gunshot wounds he had suffered at Spotsylvania Courthouse, finding evidence for a total of *two* wounds, rather than three (the army's discharge version) or one (the first post-war doctor's version). After methodically describing the entry and exit wounds and resulting cicatrices (scars), the doctors concluded that the first ball to strike Burns traveled laterally through his right shoulder from front to back (entering through the deltoid muscle and exiting through the latissimus), while the second ball traveled downward, entering at the top of Burns's right rear buttocks (the glutii muscle), where it apparently lodged about halfway through the buttocks. The doctors found two additional scars on Burns's right buttocks below the entry wound, and theorized they were caused by subsequent probing and surgical removal of the ball. (The number of Burns's gunshot wounds, and the precise path of the balls striking him, continued to confound examining doctors for the rest of the veteran's life, and no consensus appears ever to have been reached on the issue.[293])

Finally, in August of 1888, the Pension Office rejected the application, again leaving Burns at his $8-per-month award level.

In the meantime, Burns had made another change of residence and embarked on a new line of work, this time moving, in 1885 or 1886, to the central Hunterdon village of Pittstown, to learn the "hotel business" (probably at the Pittstown Inn, the town's centrally located restaurant and hotel). He remained only about a year, however, before moving again across the Delaware River to Point Pleasant, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, to continue in the same business.

About this time (1888), he and Mary had their first child. They would have two more, in 1890 and 1892. The couple's three children were born while Mary was in her late 20s and early 30s, and John in his late 40s and early 50s. John's two surviving children from his first marriage, who would have been in their early to late teens during this period, most likely continued to reside as well in the couple's household.

In 1889, perhaps prompted by these increasing family responsibilities, John again applied for an increase in his pension award, again utilizing the services of his first attorney, George Lemon. Like the two previous increase applications, this one was also rejected, in April of the following year.

Nor was John experiencing much luck in his new line of work. Impeded by failing health (and likely alcohol problems), the hotel business suited John no better than any of his numerous prior efforts to develop a stable calling or employment situation. In 1891, the family returned to Hunterdon to reside in Ringoes, a village in West Amwell Township. Burns was about 48 years old. At this point, his condition may have been so debilitating that he did not work at all, or worked very little; the record reveals no further employment or occupation for him whatever prior to his death many years later. (It is possible, of course, that he did continue to work occasionally at some business or trade such as sales or clerking, but it could not have earned the family much income. As the couple's children grew older, or

as the older children among them grew old enough to look after the younger, it is probable that Mary as well worked at whatever jobs she could find.)

The same year, Burns made a fourth application for a pension increase, this time adding a claim of "heart disease" to his expanding list of ailments, and specifically requesting that he be examined by "the Board of Surgeons that meets at Somerville, Somerset Co. New Jersey as this place is easy of access to the claimant." (In fact, Lambertville, where a board also met, was much closer to Ringoes than Somerville. This raises the possibility, at least, that claimants were by this time engaging in "forum shopping", attempting to have their examinations performed by boards considered most sympathetic to veterans.) Burns's persistence paid off, and he was finally granted that year a 50% increase in his pension award, to $12 per month. It must have been very welcome news.

The record of Burns's moves and job changes thins at this point. He was examined by a Somerville Medical Board in 1897, while still a resident of Ringoes; he pressed his alleged liver aliment at this time but the board found his liver to be normal. (This prompted Dr. Raub, a medical referee who had formerly been a member of the Easton Medical Board, to request further information and another formal examination. This was accomplished the next year by the Trenton Board, who diagnosed Burns with "Hypertrophy of liver".)

By 1908, Burns had moved to the Blairstown (Warren County) area, about 35 miles north of Flemington, to try his hand again at hotel work, taking a job as "proprietor" of the local inn, thej "Blairstown House." (He wrote to the Flemington GAR Post that summer, extending his membership and paying the annual dues; see Chapter 9.) Proprietor in this case almost certainly referred only to a managerial position, rather than to ownership. The printed letter-head used by Burns advertised the inn's "electric lights, hot and cold water, and all modern improvements"!

About a decade later, in 1912, he successfully applied for another increase in his pension, this time under new legislation that awarded increases merely on the basis of a claimant's having attained the "disability" of old age. Burns now resided in Freehold,

Monmouth County, about 27 miles southeast of the Hunterdon County line, and was at least 65 years old (the latest birth date he had ever given was 1845). As provided by the new act, his award was increased to $24. Burns was still living in Freehold in 1915, when he filled out a marital information form for the Pension Office.

By 1923, Burns and his wife had returned to Flemington, in Hunterdon, most likely to move in with their unmarried adult daughter, Cora S. Burns, at 20 Spring Street. (Cora was 30 years old.) He died there on February 22, 1923 (Washington's birthday), of "cerebral paralysis," most likely a stroke. He was somewhere between 78 and 82 years old.

Taking all the above residential information together, it is certain that during the 58 years Burns lived after returning from the war, he changed his place of residence (usually with his wife and children in tow) a total of *at least* 19 times, averaging a relocation every 3 years. In the process, he and his family resided in a total of four different states and eight counties, remaining in one place for as little as a few weeks, and never longer than five or six years (at least not until Burns reached his 50s, when the record of his relocations becomes less exact; he may then have enjoyed what would have been for him and his wife a period of relative residential stasis until his death in 1923).

During the twenty-six post-war years that he is known to have worked (until, that is, approximately age 48), Burns tried his hand at at least 9 different kinds of work, taking a job in at least 15 different employment "situations" or business ventures, comprising every major category of work except "professional" (farming, laboring, skilled trade or "mechanic," and sales or commercial). The work ranged from the heavy and relatively low-skilled manual labor of farm and railroad work; through the skilled trades of harness-making and barbering, and commercial work as manager of an inn; to the relatively light, low-skilled pursuits of milk wagon driving, book-selling, and railroad repair shop and rubber mill work. It appears he attempted at least 2 and possibly 4 entrepreneurial ventures, a barber shop and a hotel business (and possibly a second hotel or "inn" venture, and a harness-making business), and failed at each, no venture lasting more than two years. He remained at some of these jobs for

only a few weeks or months; his longest stretch in any single kind of employment being his five or six years' of apparently continuous work and residence as a hired farm hand in West Amwell, during his early 30s. Overall, during his post-war work life, Burns changed jobs an average of once every 2.9 years, which was even more frequently he changed residences.

Burns's 19 documented changes of residence constitutes the highest number of known relocations undertaken by any Company A veteran, although several others certainly underwent frequent changes as well (see, for example, the detailed narrative of Runyan's post-war experience, described later in this chapter.) Moreover, this combination of factors - chronic inability to remain long in any one job (or even in one occupational category), the severe nature of his wartime experience and multiple gunshot wounds, apparently chronic liver disease and probable alcohol abuse, the ultimate dropping out of the work force altogether in his late 40s, and near-permanent state of migration – certainly raises the specter of serious post-war dysfunction, and what would most likely today be diagnosed as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. (See Chapter 10 for a look at Burns's life from this perspective.)

At the other end of the residential and migratory spectrum are Isaac Danberry, John Reading, and Abraham Trauger, each of whom returned after the war to the locale from which they had enlisted and remained there for the rest of their lives.

Isaac Danberry. Isaac Danberry was born in Flemington in 1828, and died there in 1895, at the age of 68. One of the older men of the company - he was married and about 34 years old when he enlisted, having already performed an uneventful 3-month stint in the 3rd New Jersey Militia Regiment in 1861 - he was severely wounded in September of 1864, at the Battle of Winchester (Virginia). An artillery shell exploded near him, and shrapnel from it carried away a large chunk of his inner left thigh, severing some of the leg tendons; he suffered further muscle tissue loss from the gangrenous infection that subsequently set in during his six-month hospitalization.

Before the war, Danberry had been a shoemaker and, according to the 1901 affidavit of Hiram Hart, a farmer and customer, had been "a strong able bodied man". His health deteriorated substantially, however, on his return. "From this time until he died he seemed to grow more stiff - and his complaining increased.... ...[H]e...had more difficulty in getting up from his bench & walking around as time went by - in time he walked with a cane."

Nevertheless, Danberry continued after the war doggedly to pursue his work at "shoe making and shoe mending," and occasional harness mending as well. He "was in the habit of buying provisions from [Hart], and working to pay for them." He managed to carry on in this way for nearly thirty years, until about a year before his death when, according to Hart, he became unable even to finish making a pair of shoes he had begun for Hart's wife, and "finally had to give [the trade] up." His meager income was supplemented somewhat by his pension, which began at $6 a month in 1865, and increased to $14 a month by the time he died.

Throughout the period - indeed, throughout his entire life except for three years away during the war - Danberry resided in Raritan Township, most of the time in the town of Flemington (which was then part of the township rather than a separate municipality), and elsewhere within the township for perhaps a couple of years. (Hart's affidavit indicates Danberry lived "a year or two" near his farm in Raritan Township, which Hart described as being "in the country," as contrasted with the "town" of Flemington. Flemington did not become a separate municipal entity until 1910.[294])

Danberry's widow, Mary E. Suydam, apparently remained in Flemington after his death, but little is known about her or her circumstances; there is no record of children. She reported that the couple had no income other than the pension, and no assets except for "a few Hogs, and I don't suppose they are worth more than 30 or 40 dollars". (The local tax assessor corroborated this, stating the couple had no assessable property as of 1895.) She applied for and received a widow's pension ($12 per month), and died eleven years after her husband, in 1906, about 76 years of age. (Her residence at death was not recorded.)

John Reading. John Reading was born about 1838 in Raritan Township, and was married with one child at the time of his enlistment from the same locale. At the time, a second child was on the way (he and his wife, Elizabeth, would have a total of five). He worked as a laborer before joining the army, and returned to reside in Flemington and to work at manual labor after his discharge. When he died from falling down stairs and breaking his neck in 1904, at age 67, his death certificate still listed his residence as Flemington and his occupation as laborer.

Reading incurred a significant injury in the line of duty during his wartime service, but one that did not result in formal treatment or immediate hospitalization. According to his 1895 pension application, during the siege of Fredericksburg in December, 1862, Company A was at one point "drawn up in line of battle" and ordered forward to an assault position. The men were "heavily loaded at the time with knapsack, cartridges, rations." As they reached the assault line, "the enemy was shelling us so hotly that we received orders to fall back." As Reading turned to do so, he "caught his foot in some creeping vines and fell with great force upon his abdomen across a stump," producing an inguinal hernia. (An inguinal hernia is a rupture allowing painful downward intrusion of bowel into the testicular sac; see Chapter 5.) He nonetheless remained on duty with the company for another year, until being transferred to the Veterans Reserve Corps and, ultimately, mustered out in 1865.

Increasingly troubled by the hernia after returning to civilian life, he finally applied for a pension in 1885, more than 20 years after his discharge, and was granted an award of $8 per month (which further applications increased to $10 by the time of his death in 1904). The supporting affidavit of Reading's employer, Robert Thatcher, who states that he had known Reading for 25 years, gives the following details:

> …[A]t and prior to his enlistment, said Reading was a strong well man, free from bodily disease, especially from Hernia of left side. If he had been so afflicted, [I] would have been likely to know of it, having lived a neighbor [sic] and having frequently seen him. When Reading came home from the army he was troubled badly with Hernia of the left side and has been ever since that time. [I have] seen the Hernia or rupture, and [have] often seen him putting it in proper position so as to make him more comfortable and able to work. [H]e has worked for [me] off and on for some time past, and has

> suffered much with this trouble. The work is on the farm and the Hernia interferes much with his work. He often would have to stop work on account of it. Nor is he able to earn as much wages as he would if he were a sound man, and is paid less than if that were the case. In [my] opinion…[he] has been in each year and is now disabled to the extent of fully one-half for the performance of full manual labor. [I] state the above from personal knowledge having…employed him and frequently seen him.
>
> .

Reading's widow, Elizabeth E. (Williamson), remained in Flemington for a time after her husband's death. In her own pension application the following year (1905), she stated that the couple owned no real estate and only about $25 worth of personal property, that she was unable to work (she was then 62 years old and illiterate), and that the $250 in life insurance proceeds she had received on her husband's death had all been spent on his funeral and burial expenses.

But by the time she died in 1921, at age 78, she had moved in with her son, John W. Reading, in Pittstown, about 7 miles northwest of Flemington. She had been confined to bed for about two years, the result of debilitating illness following a fall that broke her hip and one of her femurs. She owned no property, and the $80 of life insurance proceeds her son received at her death all went toward her own death expenses.

Abraham Trauger. Abraham Trauger was born in 1844, probably in Lambertville (his place of birth is not recorded), and was 17 or 18 years old and unmarried when he enlisted from that town. He died in Lambertville from stomach cancer in 1910, at age 65.

There is no record of Trauger's pre-war employment, if any, but it could not have been of long duration in any case. He was wounded at Spotsylvania Courthouse in May, 1864, sustaining a gunshot wound to the left hand (his index finger was later amputated), but returned to the company in February of the following year to serve out the remainder of the war.

He resettled in Lambertville after the war and, like a few other veterans of Company A, was soon working in the Lambertville Rubber Works as a "rubber maker."

Although he claimed in his initial pension application in 1871 that "in consequence of [his wartime] injury [I am] considerably disabled from earning a livelihood at [this]

occupation," the pension office rated him at only 1/4 disabled, awarding him a pension of $2 per month. (Over the ensuing years, this rating would be increased, and his award raised to $10 per month by the time he died.)

In 1896, Trauger suffered a workplace injury while helping others to move a heavy boiler by means of rollers: while "shifting" the boiler, one of the rollers struck or ran over his left foot and ankle. The 1903 board of physicians speculated that Danberry had sustained a "potts [sic] fracture but was treated as [a] sprain," resulting in an enlarged and painful left ankle joint, and slight limp. (A Pott's fracture involves the lower portion of both calf bones, the tibia and fibula, and outward displacement of the ankle; to heal properly, it must be "reduced," the bones reset to their normal alignment, and immobilized until healed. This was apparently not done in Trauger's case. See also Chapter 5.)

Despite the accident and numerous applications for pension increases, each describing deteriorating health conditions, he appears to have remained employed at the mill until sometime shortly after the turn of the century, when he would have been in his late 50s. (At his medical board examination in 1900, the subscribing physician still listed "works in rubber factory" as his occupation; at his 1903 examination, however, the form recites he "cannot presently do any manual labor.") He died in 1910.

Trauger's widow, his second wife, Alberta Marion Welsh, remained in Lambertville for some period following his death. (Trauger's first wife, Mary Parsons, had died in 1888, leaving him with 7 and possibly 8 children. He remarried four years later, in 1892, and had 3 more children with his second wife.) Alberta was living in Lambertville the following year, 1911, when she applied for benefits for herself and two minor daughters. At some point prior to her death twenty-four years later (she died in 1935 at age 62), she returned to her home town, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, to take up residence with her unmarried daughter, Mildred. (Lock Haven is a town situated on the banks of the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, about 135 miles west of Lambertville.) Applying for reimbursement of her mother's funeral and burial expenses, Mildred reported that Alberta had died with no

assets, and no income other than her pension (which had increased from $12 to $30 per month by the time she died).

All 3 of these men, Danberry, Reading, and Trauger, remained in Hunterdon County their entire lives, from birth to death. Each consistently pursued the same occupation - shoemaker, farm laborer, rubber mill "mechanic" - his entire work life, 2 having started to work in their occupation prior to the war, and all 3 continuing to work until a few years prior to their death, ceasing only when war-related wounds or injury kept them from working longer. Each married (one of them twice), and at least 2 produced and raised children; all remained with their wives, and all were survived by them.

It is difficult to speculate as to why these 3 (and many others) remained so bound to their place of birth; in most ways that can be determined from the data, they were typical of the original men of the company as a group. For Danberry and Reading, it might have been partly that they were a bit older than the average Company A volunteer, and were already married fathers when they enlisted, with several years' work experience in the Flemington area behind them (this would have been especially important for Danberry, a skilled tradesman whose prospects would be improved by having established relations with a local "customer base"). Also for both, the notion of relocating self and family while suffering from a debilitating physical condition (a painful leg wound and lower leg varicosity for Danberry, and a painful inguinal hernia for Reading) might have seemed particularly daunting. For the illiterate and unskilled Reading, it may have been more a lack of options, at least perceived ones, and the security and peace of mind gained by staying put in a familiar neighborhood. For the more enterprising Danberry, the ability to participate in Flemington's village life, and especially, in and after 1880, to become a charter and active member of the GAR Post formed in the town that year, may have been added incentives to remain in the area. (The central role of GAR membership in the post-war civic and fraternal lives of several Company A men is treated at length in Chapter 9.)

For Trauger, reasons for staying probably included the prospect of steady "manufactory" work within walking distance of his home, and the relative stimulus of town life in Lambertville and neighboring New Hope, Pennsylvania directly across the Delaware River and accessible by a bridge). Family and community networks also may have played a part. The 1900 federal census indicates numerous Traugers with addresses in town, and the veteran's application for a pension increase in 1902 was supported by affidavits from Lambertville's mayor and "policeman," each attesting to "intimate acquaintance" with Trauger for many years, and to his "be[ing] a man of sober, peaceable, good habits." Trauger may also have become active in Lambertville's GAR Post 20 established in 1878 (unfortunately, the records of this post have been lost; see Chapter 9).

But in the end, whatever influenced these men to stay where they had grown up, and others to "light out for the territories," must remain only guesses. Much of it must have had to do with the mysteries of impulse, personality, and chance occurrence: all things that remain stubbornly beyond the reach of such tantalizing clues as these men and their families left behind.

John Collins. One man who did eventually light out was John P. Collins, although he did not do so right away. Collins was born on the auspicious date of July 4, 1840 and, unlike most of his fellow company volunteers, he was not born in Hunterdon County but in Morristown, the seat of adjoining Morris County. His parents, Cornelius and Ann (Caughlin) were both born in Ireland.

He was single and had moved to Hunterdon (probably Pottersville) and become a blacksmith by the time he enlisted at age 22 in 1862. (After returning from the war, he would pursue this trade for the remainder of his life.) At the battle of Cold Harbor on June 7, 1864, Collins was badly wounded by a minié ball that passed through his left forearm a few inches below the elbow, taking with it a considerable amount of tissue and 2" to 3" of the ulna. (The ulna is the larger and longer of the two forearm bones, and lies between the outside base of the hand and the elbow; the radius lies closer to the torso, and articulates

with the base of the thumb.) The Army eventually transferred him to a general hospital in Newark, New Jersey. During his stay there, he almost certainly fell in with elements of a local Irish Catholic community, and met his first wife, Bridget Ann Fay, They were married in Newark at St. Johns (Catholic) Church, on May 29, 1865, the day before Collins's discharge was signed.

The couple then removed to Pottersville, where despite the disability Collins suffered as a result of his wound, he again took up blacksmithing. (In addition to the loss of bone and tissue itself, the wound resulted in large and sensitive entry and exit wound scars, eczema around the wound site, and partial loss of left arm extension, and flexion of some fingers. An 1887 medical board described the ball's entry scar as the "size of a silver dollar" and the exit scar as "[measuring] 5" by 2" retracted, tender and adherent".) Most blacksmithing tasks involve repetitive use of both arms and hands, the smith typically gripping and manipulating heavy tools such as hammers and iron-laden tongs. To have sustained a lifetime of such work with a weakened, stiff, and chronically sore left forearm reveals Collins as a man of unusual grit. He was stocky and undoubtedly powerful, about 5 feet, 9 or 10 inches tall, with a post-war weight that varied between 190 and 209 pounds.

Sometime during the mid-1880s (Collins would have been in his mid-40s), the couple, who remained childless, moved back to Bridget's home city, Newark. Then, in July, 1889, they picked up and moved approximately 3,000 miles west, settling temporarily in the inland city of Tacoma, in the Territory of Washington. Four months later, they continued westward to the coastal town of Port Angeles (Clallam County), Washington, where they settled for good and Collins resumed his trade. Perhaps they were stimulated to move by the publicity and local boosterism that undoubtedly accompanied the territory's admission to the Union in November of that year, only a few months after their arrival.

As with several other of Company A's westward-migrating men and women, the railroad played a part – probably in Collins's case, a decisive one – in the decision to move where they did. The nation's first transcontinental railroad laid out over a *northern* route

across the country had only recently been completed. The great Northern Pacific, chartered in 1864 as the war raged through one its costliest campaign seasons, took until 1883 – nearly twenty years – before its own golden spike was driven into the ground at Gold Creek, in central Montana. (Dignitaries attending included Ulysses S. Grant, brought from the East aboard one of four special trains arranged for the occasion.) The railroad's slow western progress had been accompanied by waves of settler migration from the East, and by persistent and in many instances ruthless displacement of the indigenous Native American population. The U.S. Army, its greatest war only a decade in the past, was called in to keep the peace, with irregular success. (The annihilation of General George A. Custer and his cavalry troops at Little Big Horn, in South Dakota, had occurred in 1876, only seven years before the celebration at Gold Creek.)

But in 1883, the newly completed route from western Montana to the Pacific coast wound south and then west along the Columbia River to Portland, Oregon; passengers wishing to reach Washington then had to entrain for travel northward along the coast.

The engineering feats required to push the railroad through the western Montana mountains and directly into Washington Territory would take another five years. Crews had to dig a long tunnel through the mountainous peaks at Stampede Pass, and erect temporary trestles and elaborate "switchbacks" on grades reaching a much as 6% (a 6' rise in track elevation every 100') and requiring engines to get up them what included, at the time, the 2 largest steam locomotives in the world. The first train negotiated the completed tunnel and proceeded on to Puget Sound on May 27, 1888, *only a year* before the Collinses took their own incredible journey over the same trackage.[295]

Sadly, less than six years after settling in Port Angeles, on February 17, 1895, Collins' wife Bridget died, almost certainly from tuberculosis. Her body was returned for burial to her home city of Newark, New Jersey, accompanied by John and born along the same spectacular route the couple had taken west only a short time before. (For the saga of Bridget's death and burial, see Chapter 6.)

Collins returned to Port Angeles, and remained there. The 1900 federal census lists him that year as a widowed head of household, and owning a mortgage-free home on Georgiana Street. By this time, at age 60, Collins may have slowed down somewhat: the census also reports that the veteran was not employed all 12 months of the year (this might have been the case for some time). But owning his own debt-free home is evidence of at least modest occupational and financial success. His circumstances were no doubt aided by his pension, which he had been drawing since being discharged in 1865, and which, as a result of changes in the law and subsequent increase applications, would grew from $6 to $12 per month by the time of his death.

On September 18, 1904, Collins (now age 64) married Emma Loyal Ritchie, a previously unmarried woman who was 44 years old. Collins lived only another four years, however, dying on October 22, 1908, at age 68, of "Bright's Disease [and] Chronic Parenchymatous nephritis" (liver and kidney disease) according to the death certificate.

No certain evidence has yet been uncovered regarding Collins's date-of-death wealth, but it is likely he still owned his home at that point, and perhaps other assets. His second wife, Emma, promptly applied for a widow's pension, and got remarried herself less than two years later, in 1910. She outlived her second husband but was later declared insane and ended her days in a state asylum.

Work and Wealth

How did the returning original volunteers of Company A support themselves and their families in the post-war period? What sort of work did they do, how much did they earn, and how much wealth, if any, were they able to accumulate over the remainder of their lives? Did the trajectory of their adult careers reflect economic improvement or decline? How many died impoverished?

While the data provide fairly reliable answers to many of these questions, especially in the case of veterans whose occupational and financial details are amply described in their

pension files, the answers to some of the questions must remain tentative. Overall, however, the picture that emerges for most of the company's war survivors is one of economic stagnation or decline, and this pattern persists despite the men's (and their widows') near universal resort to an increasingly generous Civil War pension system (see Chapters 8 and 11).

For purposes of this study, economic progress and wellbeing were assessed by looking at various, complementary pieces of information (not all of which were available, of course, for each veteran). The pieces included (1) descriptions of a veteran's occupations, and career mobility (changes from one occupational category, e.g., "laborer", to another, e.g., "trade"), which descriptions occasionally included specific wage or income information, hours or seasons of work, and other details, as reported by the veteran himself, his widow, employer, or neighbor; (2) descriptions of a veteran's property, often listed as of date of death, as reported by his widow or other heir, a local tax assessor, estate representative, or other party;[296] (3) residential factors such as institutionalization (which in the case of this group ordinarily meant residence in one of New Jersey's two Soldiers and Sailors Homes), or late-in-life residence with an adult child or other caretaking relative or friend; (4) descriptions of health and disability, as reported by treating or examining doctors, the veteran, or others, rendering the veteran unable to do the same amount of work (usually defined as manual labor) as a "fit" man, or unable to work at all; (5) instances of extremely frequent job and/or residence changes (e.g., the case of John Burns, above); and (6) subjective declarations of a veteran's poverty or other economic circumstance, as made by the veteran, his widow, neighbor, or other party.

First post-war jobs held by the company's 48 survivors for whom occupational information is available break down as follows: 12 farmers (25%); 13 farm hands/laborers (27%); 20 tradesmen/mechanics (42%); 2 clerks/businessmen/salesmen (4%); and one professional (2%).[297] (There was a high degree of continuity between jobs held before and

immediately after the war. In 43 of the 48 cases, initial postwar jobs were the same [or in the same category] as the jobs the veterans reported they had held just before enlisting.)

Overall, lifetime career patterns showed a remarkable persistence of general occupational category: with one exception (the category of farmer), veterans in the sample most often remained for the balance of their work lives in the same job category in which they had started. In other words, there appears to have been very little upward (or downward) occupational mobility among the company's survivors, and this fact probably translated into a very low degree of upward social and economic mobility as well.

Specifically (leaving the exceptional category of farmer to last), of the 13 men who began their career lives as relatively low-skilled (or unskilled) "farm hands" and "laborers" (more or less at the bottom rung of the occupational ladder), 11 ended their career lives in the same category. Only one of the 13 succeeded unequivocally in transitioning to the status of farmer - becoming an enterprising and modestly prosperous Texas rancher - and improving his and his family's economic condition. (The story of this laborer-turned-rancher, Joseph Sullivan, is narrated below.) The other member of the 13, Albert Reading, moved from laborer to a succession of "light work" clerical or commercial jobs. In Reading's case, however, this apparent "upward" occupational mobility seems to have been less a matter of choice or ambition than of options forced upon him by deteriorating health, or occasioned by the charitable impulses of others, and probably did not translate into a significant advance in income or status.

Company A's sample of 20 men within the skilled category of "tradesman" or "mechanic" covered a wide range of specific jobs, including barber, blacksmith, boilerman (factory steam boiler operator), butcher, carpenter or "framer," carriage maker or painter, "gas maker," harness maker, house painter, locksmith, lumberman, machinist/engineer (at factory), miner, mason, miller, plasterer, printer, railroad brakeman, rubber maker (at factory), sailor, shoemaker, slater (slate roofer), teamster (horse team driver), tinsmith, and wheelwright. It is interesting to note how the skills represented by this list cluster around

three major commercial fields: building trades (carpenter, mason, slater, framer, painter, lumberman); the primary transportation systems of the era: railroads, waterways, horses, and horse-drawn vehicles (blacksmith, harness maker, wheelwright, carriage maker/painter, brakeman, teamster, sailor); and the incipient manufacturing industries engendered by industrialization (gas maker, rubber maker, boilerman, and possibly tinsmith).

Fifteen of the 20 men in this skilled-work category remained in it throughout their working careers, while the remaining 5 changed categories at some point following the war. Three of the 5 made ostensibly "upward" moves into the "commercial" or "white collar" category (Theodore Stryker, Moses Housel, and Peter ten Broek). One man (Lewis Snyder) changed from his pre-war trade of harness making to post-war work at farming: a change probably best categorized as a *lateral* occupational move. (In fact, Snyder's post war occupational move was to work as a hired "farm hand," which might better be categorized as a "downward" shift; see below.) The fifth man moved into the professional category of "physician" (George Bartow).

On close examination, however, *none* of the 5 managed to achieve any long-term economic improvement in their or their families' lives, and with the exception of Bartow, all seem to have experienced an overall *decline* in fortune. Their stories are worth briefly summarizing; they illustrate how a facially upward change in occupational category, *by itself*, is seldom a sure guide to material progress or advance in social standing.

Theodore Stryker. Theodore Stryker had worked as a merchant sailor (and before that as a peacetime soldier) prior to the war, and afterward became a railroad conductor and finally a salesman for a Trenton pottery manufacturing firm. (He claimed also to have been an "engineer" before the war – a vague job description at the time - but this was never borne out in his later work). Neither job enabled him to support himself or his family successfully, even with extra income he received in rents (from real estate inherited from his father), and his Civil War pension. He essentially died impoverished, spending at least some of his last

years in a Soldiers and Sailors Home. (Stryker's post-war life seemed indeed troubled; his complete story is related in Chapter 15.)

Moses Housel. Moses Housel was a harness maker when he enlisted, and turned to "gas making" and then sales work ("canvassing for books") after he was discharged. He had been a prisoner of war at Andersonville for about half a year, and returned home in very poor health. Increasing war-related lameness eventually reduced him to a succession of part-time, "light work" jobs, and he died at the relatively young age of 47 with no known estate. (His widow, Margaret Hockenbury Housel, died three years later, leaving their son, Charles, as the only known company child to be orphaned; see Chapter 14 for this story.)

Peter ten Broek. Peter ten Broek plied the house painting trade before the war. He incurred a gunshot wound to the right hip during the conflict, and was unable initially to return to painting when he was discharged. He first tried opening a "vegetable business" in the city of Perth Amboy, but was unsuccessful. By 1870 he had gotten employment as a railroad brakeman, but this proved too physically demanding. In later years, as he made his way back to Hunterdon County, there is evidence he made an effort to return to house painting, but had to give it up again, finally resorting to work as a "salesman," or claiming no work at all. He died impoverished, along with his wife, in a state soldiers and sailors home.

Lewis Snyder. Lewis Snyder went from the carpentry trade before the war to farming afterwards, but had little success at the latter. He had been shot in the right foot during the war and, like ten Broek, was plagued by lameness for the rest of his life. The injury relegated him to what he termed "light farm work," including "watching stock." He stated, in connection with his pension claim, the somewhat obvious fact that "in farming there is a great deal of walking," and that he could never do more than "a day or so" of sustained plowing. Unsurprisingly, he never accumulated sufficient earnings from the work to acquire his own farm (and would in any case have had to hire others to help him work it), and left his widow no estate other than "a few household goods" when he died in 1894.

George Bartow. The story of the *fifth* tradesman to change category after the war sheds light on the nineteenth century's varied paths to "professional" standing (as well as to the fact that such standing did not guarantee any better economic outcome than work at farming or a trade). George Bartow reported his occupation as printer before he enlisted, but claimed to have risen to the profession of "physician" in the post-war period.

Bartow was badly wounded on June 20, 1864, during the company's participation in the siege of Petersburg. He was apparently struck both by a minié ball and a shell fragment, the latter penetrating his left buttocks and destroying much of the underlying muscle. This left him with a painful limp, and unsuited him for any sort of sustained manual labor (possibly even printing work, which at the time involved long periods of standing while manipulating hand-operated printing presses). His 1870 pension application stated that since the war he had been "clerking in his father's store and reading Medicine." Throughout the years until his death in 1907, he continued to claim "physician" as his occupation when appearing before pension medical boards, and his death certificate lists his occupation as "M.D." He left an estate of marginal value that appears to have been insolvent[298], but that included "books and miscellaneous medical instruments". His widow received a life insurance payment on his death in the sum of $230.25, paid by the Society for Widows and Orphans of Medical Men.

But what did it mean to be a medical doctor in rural Hunterdon in the post-war period? As with law (see the description of John Emery's career path, below) and other professions, the Civil War era was a turning point for the "professionalization" of many careers. There were only 12 medical schools in the nation by 1825, and most doctors were self-trained or learned from fellow members of a gentlemen's "medical society". There was little or no specialization, and no state regulation. The American Medical Association formed in 1847, and increasingly asserted itself in the areas of standardization, formal medical training, state licensing and regulation, and the recognition of specialties. A growing rift developed between university-trained "physicians" and more informally or self-taught

"homeopaths"[299]. By the end of the century, there were 86 medical schools, and the now standard 4-year course of post-college study had been widely adopted. Twenty-one states had established an examination system for licensing doctors, and fourteen others only permitted accredited medical school graduates to practice.[300]

Bartow's years of "reading" and practicing medicine fell somewhere between the two above descriptions. There is no evidence of his having attended any regular course of medical school instruction, although as part of his "reading" he may have apprenticed to an already established local doctor. In any case, while certainly not becoming a man of means or status in the county (he is not mentioned in an 1881 county history that provided biographical sketches of numerous doctors in the area, including Drs. Studdiford, Larison, and Sullivan, the regimental Surgeon of the 15th). He nonetheless appears to have made enough of a living by "doctoring" to support himself and his wife, and to acquire a modest amount of (heavily mortgaged) real estate. In his case at least, the post-war change of occupational category appears to have worked a rise in Bartow's social status, if not in actual economic wellbeing.

Finally, all 3 of the company's men who began before the war in "commercial" or "professional" categories remained there. Each of them - James Mattison, William Sloan, and John Emery – also constitutes something of an exceptional case among the company's survivors.

James Mattison. James Mattison worked as a hardware store clerk in Flemington before the war, and returned there afterwards to perform the same work until sometime in the late 1880s. (The store was most likely "T.C. Bodine, Dealer in Builders Hardware, Stoves, Ranges, Agricultural Implements, etc.," located on Main Street, the sole hardware store listed for Flemington in the 1873 Beers Atlas.) At that point Mattison, who was in his late 40s, succeeded in getting a clerical job in the U.S. Treasury Department in Washington, where he remained living off-and-on for the rest of his life. (Mattison had been an active

member of the Flemington-based post of the Grand Army of the Republic, and continued after the move to stay in touch with his old comrades there; see Chapter 9.)

Although evidently financially secure during his lifetime (in addition to his clerk salary, he drew a pension which ranged from an initial award of $4 per month in 1871, for "lung disease," to $22.50 in 1917, for having attained age 75), Mattison, who died in 1918, left no appreciable estate according to his son, Samuel.

William Sloan. Like Mattison, William Sloan also resided in the Flemington area before the war, giving his pre-war occupation as "trader" (probably, in nineteenth-century usage, signifying salesman or merchant). He served at least 3 separate periods in the military: a few months with the 15th NJ in 1862-63 (he fell ill and was discharged for unfitness); about nine months with a federal "Colored" regiment during the war's last year; and then about two-and-a-half years between 1867 and 1869, in various postings, the last being with a federal unit in Yuma, California. (Sloan's unusual military experience, which seemed to reflect strong abolitionist sympathies, is discussed in Chapter 4.)

At some point after his final discharge in 1869 (the record falls silent until much later), Sloan obtained a clerical position in New York City with the federal customs house, where he continued to work as of 1900. (The Brooklyn medical board that examined him that year in connection with a pension application, as if passing judgment on Sloan's relatively sedentary and non-manual form of labor, noted on its report: "customs house; palms soft".)

Exactly how long he worked at customs is unknown, but at some point prior to his death on August 30, 1928 (he was 85), he was admitted to Ann May Hospital, probably a tuberculosis sanitarium, in the New Jersey shore community of Brielle. The cause of death was listed as pulmonary edema (this is consistent with a tubercular condition) and chronic endocarditis. (Sloan's wife, Fannie, had died in 1908, and after that he lived with his unmarried daughter, Caroline Imlay, in Brooklyn. The fact that his daughter, who was 53 at the time the veteran died, reported both a Brooklyn and a Brielle address, suggests she had

established the latter in order to be near her aging and rapidly deteriorating father, now hospitalized, in his last months.)

Like Mattison, Sloan must also have felt relatively secure financially on a day-to-day basis throughout his adult life. Besides his income from government employment, he drew a veteran's pension that increased from $6 per month in 1998, for a hernia and impaired hearing (surprisingly, claims based on the lung-related ailments that ultimately killed him were initially rejected), to a high of $65 per month in 1926, the new rate provided in legislation that year for veterans at least 75 years of age. Despite this income, Sloan's daughter wrote the Pension Bureau after his death that her father had "been in government service all his life, both military and federal, *and was therefore unable to accumulate any assets*" (italics added). It was apparently recognized at the time that long-term government employment was not an avenue to wealth, or even to a modest estate.

John Emery John Runkle Emery, the third Company A volunteer who enjoyed a pre-war "commercial/professional" status, remained in that status for the rest of his life as a member of the legal profession, rising quite remarkably within that category. Emery was born on July 6, 1842, the son of William and Anne (Runkle) Emery. He spent his entire pre-war life in Flemington, where his father was a highly successful lumber merchant and his family belonged to the local Presbyterian church, where William was an elder. He is the only company member known to have attended private primary and secondary schools, and college, all of which he did prior to the war. Specifically, his parents sent him first to the private academy operated by the Rev. Dr. Studdiford, in Lambertville (which he could have reached daily from Flemington by train), and then to the Edge Hill School, at Princeton, to "prepar[e] for collegiate work" (young Emery undoubtedly boarded at this school). He entered the College of New Jersey (Princeton University) in 1858, at age 16, and graduated three years later, in 1861; he was president of his class in his last year. For about a year, he clerked (apprenticed) for Bennet Van Syckle, a prosperous lawyer in Flemington who later became a judge. Within a year, however, as one description put it, "all personal

considerations were put aside…that he might answer the call of duty and defend his country in her hour of peril."[301]

Although his military career was short and he saw no combat - he was discharged on February 23, 1863, after a long bout with dysentery - his rise through the ranks in the brief period (less than half a year) was spectacular. Although there is no specific record of his promotions, he enlisted as a Private and was discharged in the rank of 2nd Lieutenant, still only 20 years of age, a rise of at least three grades (Corporal, Sergeant, 2nd Lieutenant). This was the fastest advance in rank of any company member, and was undoubtedly due to a combination of unusual intelligence, educational background, devotion to cause, and popularity among the men. (Emery's enlistment was certainly not based on financial need. In fact, his service only delayed his plans to become a lawyer.)

Returning from the war, Emery entered Harvard Law School in the fall of 1863, and completed a year of studies. He was there during a transitional time both in legal education generally and in Harvard Law School's development in particular.

> Through the first half of the nineteenth century legal education had been casual, providing training…through the apprenticeship system. A few law schools had existed before the Civil War, but there was little uniformity in either the method or the substance of the teaching of law. Some judges and lawyers…operated private schools, and a few colleges created law departments [Harvard appointed its first professor of law in 1815] By about 1850, however, the emphasis in legal training shifted decisively away from then office and apprentice system and toward professional education. Between then and 1900 the number of law schools increased from 125 to 101, with an enrollment of over ten thousand.[302]

Still, by the Civil War era when Emery attended, a fairly loose and unregulated system of legal instruction remained at Harvard. Until 1870, the school was operated by only 3 full-time faculty, no particular course or length of study was mandated, and no examinations were required before students were awarded the LL.B. degree (bachelor of laws). This state of affairs even drew substantial criticism that year in a new journal, the *American Law Review*:

> For a long time the condition of the Harvard Law School has been almost a disgrace to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. * * * …[A] school which undertook to confer degrees without any preliminary examination whatever, was doing something

> every year to injure the profession throughout the country, and to discourage real students. * * * We were glad to learn, therefore, that the old system has [this year] been abandoned.[303]

At the time of Emery's attendance, the student body fluctuated widely, from about 78 (during the Civil War) to 154. One of its more industrious and successful students who had graduated in 1849 (Frisbie Hoar, who later went on to become a U.S. Senator from the state) described student life in a memoir:

> The youth breathed a legal atmosphere from morning till night all the year round. He had the advantage of most admirable instruction, and the resources of a complete library. He listened to the lectures, he studied the textbooks, he was drilled in the recitations, he had practice in the moot courts and in the law clubs. He discussed points of law in the boarding-house and on his walks with his companions.[304]

Given what is known of Emery's gifts, he was likely was of the more serious and hard-working students at Harvard, and the time spent there evidently set the course for his later career. After his return to New Jersey, Emery began clerking for another Flemington attorney and judge, Abraham Van Fleet, and in 1865 was admitted to the state bar. He also that year found time to earn a Master's Degree at Princeton. He soon relocated his practice to the state capital, Trenton, where he formed a partnership with another attorney and within a few years "enjoyed a large and lucrative clientage."

The disease(s) which had driven him out of the military continued to plague him, however. In 1874, less than a decade after moving to Trenton, "on account of failing health, he withdrew from active practice and spent the following year in Europe. Travel greatly benefited his health, and in the fall of 1875 he returned to his native land and located in Newark, New Jersey…." There he resumed practice and again prospered. He was described as a lawyer who "prepared his cases with the greatest care and provided for every possible emergency, so that he was ever ready to meet the argument of his opponent."

> He is a close reasoner, logical in his deductions and a fluent, forcible and convincing speaker. His knowledge of the law in its various departments is comprehensive and accurate and his devotion to his clients' interests was proverbial.

His professional reputation spread, although not much is known about the details of his practice. It can be inferred, however, from his subsequent appointment to the equity

bench, and from his documented interest in divorce law, that he did a fair amount of work in the fields of matrimonial law and other equity areas. (It can also be guessed that he did not get into the field of pension application representation. He was not listed as attorney of record for any of the company's applicants, despite the fact that the men frequently turned to at least one other lawyer, E.L. Campbell, who had ties to the outfit.)

On October 6, 1885, he married Alla Mackie or MacKie), the daughter of a prominent Newark family. John was by then 43 years old (Alla's age is not known, but she was considerably younger); the couple had 4 children, Alla, John, Steuart, and Theodore. They moved to Morristown in 1891, from which city Emery could easily commute by train to Newark (about 18 miles distant), and became active in local affairs. They both became members of Morristown's "establishment" church, the Protestant Episcopal "Church of the Redeemer," John serving as a "vestryman." The couple was described as having a "household [that] is the center of a cultured society circle…he and his wife enjoy[ing] the hospitality of the best homes of the city." Befitting a man of his growing status and accomplishments, Emery was active in numerous civic and fraternal organizations, including his local GAR post in Morristown, the 15th Regiment Association, the elite Essex Club of Newark, the Morris County Golf Club, and the American Bible Society. As might be expected, he was described as "a Republican in politics."

In 1895, after twenty years of arguing cases, Emery's professional efforts were capped by appointment as a judge of the prestigious chancery court. As a "vice-chancellor" (equity judge), he had made a substantial impact on development of the law of equity in New Jersey, producing 34 bound volumes of judicial opinions. He was active in one of the era's many law reform and standardization movements, joining the Uniform Divorce Law Congress. Emery was highly regarded as a lawyer, judge, and human being, as numerous testimonials at the time of his retirement, and when he died a very short time afterward, all reveal. "In 1901 Princeton recognized the learning and ability of her son and conferred upon him the honorary degree of LL. D." His health problems never fully disappeared, however;

his health "failed again" in 1912 and he was required to take "a short rest…but was never again in good health." He held the judicial position for a total of twenty years, but in 1915 suffered "a severe [but unspecified] attack from which he did not fully recover," and was obliged to retire on December 31, 1915.

In his last year as judge (1915), Emery earned $12,000 per year, an extremely generous salary for the time (about $180,000 today). His state pension, which he was only able to collect for a few weeks, was half that amount, or $6,000 per year. (For evident reasons, he never filed a veteran pension claim.) As far as can be determined, he was *by far* the highest-earning, and most likely the wealthiest, of the company's men. By contrast, Emery's fellow Company A pensioners were receiving a maximum annual amount at that time of only about $360 per year (a comparatively paltry $5,400 or so per year, in current value). Moreover, he had managed to acquire a substantial estate before he died. With the possible exception of Lambert Boeman, the company's original organizer and Captain, he is the sole company man known for certain to have done so.

Emery died within a month of retiring, on January 30, 1916, at age 73. It is most likely that he was in the end brought down by the long-term and near-constant consequences of his war-time dysentery and other exposure to serious infectious disease, which his system was never able completely to throw off. But his ability to take needed breaks from a demanding work schedule, to afford the best medical care available at the time, and to travel to Europe (where health care was more advanced) may well have extended his life beyond the average of 66-1/2 years that his fellow company men experienced. He lived six years longer than most of them.

At a meeting of the Essex County Lawyers Club convened in 1916 to eulogize their departed colleague, Emery was paid high tribute by many. One fellow lawyer stated that "his equity knowledge was so complete and he possessed such skill in applying it that he became conspicuous throughout the country as an exceptionally able equity judge," and "has made one of the largest and most important contributions to the equity jurisprudence of this

State." But "his fidelity to his work" came at a high cost, and "beyond all question shortened his life."

Finally, of the 12 company survivors who reported their pre-war occupation as "farmer," half, a total of 6, moved on during their post-war careers to a skilled or semi-skilled trade, while only a quarter, or 4, remained at farming for the balance of their work lives. Three of the rest "descended" into common laboring occupations after the war, while one "moved up" into a commercial pursuit. This, as mentioned above, characterizes farmers the only occupational category in which a wide range of post-war mobility was experienced by the company's men, and the only one in which most (or all) of those who began in the category did not remain there. Even so, just as with tradesmen who "moved up" to the commercial category, the mobility that farmers did experience did not necessarily result in significantly greater job status or economic prospects. Of the half who could be said to have "improved" their job category (5 to trades and one to commerce), assessment of their individual career experiences reveals a more mixed picture.

In several instances, the transition from farming to a trade or business was clearly motivated by health or physical conditions that made a continuation of farming impossible, and in some cases the veteran found it difficult or impossible to continue in the new job category as well. William Dungan, for example, tried to return to farming after the war, but wartime wounds and the onset of a somewhat mysterious aversion to sunlight eventually rendered him completely unable to stand the work, and he reportedly turned to harness making. (Dungan's complex of wounds, ailments, and subjective complaints suggests that he, as well as a few other company survivors, may have suffered from what would today be diagnosed as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder; see Chapter 10.) John Green reported carpentry as his new post-war career, but ended life with no income (other than his pension) or estate, residing in a soldiers and sailors home. John Yorks turned from farming to the trade of butchering, and to various other "kinds of labor" in the post-war period, but the

move was necessitated by a severe thigh wound, and a disabling hernia that "unfits him to perform manual labor."

Class (Socio-Economic) Mobility, and Wealth Accumulated at Death

Putting these pieces together reveals what is believed to be a fairly accurate portrait of the economic circumstances of numerous individual veterans in the sample, and a generally reliable synopsis of the economic life outcomes of the company's veterans as a whole. Of the company's 54 known war-surviving volunteers (see Chapter 2), significant economic data was found for 48 (91%). The data were sufficient to assess the general career and economic experience of all 48 men, and sufficient generally to characterize the date-of-death *assets* of 39 (74%) of the sample.

With respect to lifetime economic progress, or career trend, 34 of the 48 men (71%) were judged to have experienced an overall *decline* in their economic and/or job situation; 9 (19%) to have remained relatively constant; and only 5 (10%) to have enjoyed an *improvement* in economic circumstances.

At death, a total of 32 - *two-thirds* of the 48-man sample - were found to have had no or only a nominal net estate, whereas only 7 (15%) were found to have died in possession of a solvent estate. (By "net estate" is meant the total value of the veteran's date-of-death holdings - real estate, personal property, the rare investment - less any debts he may have owed; an estate is "solvent" if value exceeded debts. In two of the cases included among the 34 no-net-estate veterans, George Bartow and William Clark, the veteran had significant assets, but died owing more money than his estate was worth. In Clark's case, his widow paid off the net indebtedness of her husband's "insolvent" estate out of her own assets.) No reliable date-of-death data was found for the remaining 9 [19%] of the sample.

In other words, at least *two out of three* of Company A's surviving volunteers suffered a lifetime slide into worsening economic conditions and/or class or occupational status, *and* ended life in control of no significant assets or savings, no property to pass on to widow,

child, or other heir. (The latter circumstance could have grave consequences for surviving widows, whose pension rates were lower, and whose wage-earning and remarriage prospects were generally dim; see Chapters 6 and 11.)

Lifetime economic outcomes, moreover, bore little relationship to initial job category. Two, or 15%, of the 13 veterans whose pre-war (or first post-war) employment was as laborer or farm hand ended up in improved economic circumstances, and died leaving an estate - a record as good as or better than the company averages as a whole. On the other hand, *not one* of the 20 veterans who started in trade occupations managed to improve his lifetime career situation, and all but two suffered some degree of decline; and only 3 (15%, the same as the company's overall average) left solvent estates.

The one instance in which starting background obviously enhanced life chances was the case of John Emery. He came from an established and prosperous Flemington family. At enlistment (and having only just turned 20 years of age), he had already graduated from Princeton University (then known as the College of New Jersey), the only Company A volunteer known for certain to have obtained any education beyond elementary school. Immediately after the war, he entered into a law clerkship with a Flemington attorney, attended Harvard Law School, and was soon admitted to the bar of the state. Capping his career, he was appointed to a judgeship in 1895, at age 53, and went on to become a prolific, well-paid, and widely-respected member of the state judiciary.

Much more representative of the general economic outcome of the company's men and their families, however, are the stories of three other Company A veterans:

-Levi Runyon, a Hunterdon tradesman plagued by severely debilitating physical conditions, whose efforts to start new businesses first in New Jersey and later "out west" both ended in failure;

-George C. Van Camp, a Lambertville "mechanic" (machinist) who returned and remained in that town after the war and attempted to continue in his pre-war line of work,

only to suffer gradual physical and medical decline, despite the efforts of local officials to assist him; and

-Joseph Sullivan, the laborer son of Irish Catholic immigrants, who immediately went west following the war in search of bride and fortune, and succeeded, at least modestly, on both accounts.

Levi Runyon. Levi S. Runyon (spelled Runyan on his wartime muster roll) was born on April 17, 1840, in Milford, a small, central Hunterdon County town, and was 22 years old and single when he enlisted with Company A. He had moved by then to nearby Quakertown, in Bethlehem Township, and had already learned a trade, which he alternatively reported as wheelwright or "carridge maker". He was promptly made a corporal in the new outfit. During the company's first winter, he was badly injured when he fell on his back during the infamous "Mud March," in January, 1863. (See Chapters 2 and 5.)

By April, however, he had recovered sufficiently to be promoted to Sergeant, but later that year was detached from the company and sent back to Trenton, New Jersey, to perform lighter "recruiting" duty, evidently as a result of his injured condition. He remained there for the balance of the war, and was discharged at Trenton in June, 1865. During his one-and-a-half year stint at Trenton, he met his future bride, Anna E. Hall, and four days following his discharge, on Independence Day, 1865, the two were married at her parents' Trenton home by E. H. Stokes, a Methodist-Episcopal pastor. He was now 25, outwardly a fit man, 5'10" tall and weighing about 148 lbs, with light skin and hair, and blue eyes. Anna was 18. The war was just over; the world beckoned.

Full of hope and enterprise, and funded perhaps by army wages saved during the war, the couple soon moved to Clinton, in Hunterdon, where Levi tried his hand at establishing his own carriage business.

The venture lasted only about three years, from the fall of 1865 to the fall of 1869, at which point, according to his much later deposition, it "failed," and the couple decided to go west. They were undoubtedly spurred in this decision by the fact that the failure appears to

have left Runyon in debt to some of the Clinton locals (as he put it, the failure caused "some prejudice against him" in that town). After removing from the state, they never returned. They may also have been discouraged by their inability, during the first 4 years of the marriage. to conceive a child, and have thought about trying again in a new place. (There is no record of a biological child being born to the couple, but an 1898 affidavit of the veteran mentions their having an "adopted daughter," the only such instance that has come to light among Company A's family data.)

For approximately the next 16 years (from the winter of 1869-70 to about 1886), the couple resided in Illinois: first in Prairie City (a village in McDonough County, in west central Illinois, about 45 miles west of Peoria), and then, from about 1875, in or near Kingsbury (in Whiteside County, an area of northwestern Illinois on the Mississippi River). By all accounts, it was an increasingly disappointing period in the young couple's life. Levi worked for a few years as a carriage maker and painter in Prairie City, most likely in someone else's employ, but by 1873 or -74 was forced to give up the work because of his worsening piles. For the next four or five years, during which the couple moved to Kingsbury, he did "nothing". (His wife did "hotel work" to provide some cash to the family; see Chapter 6.) In 1877, with the aid of a local attorney named Charles Cadwallader, he filed his first pension application, claiming only injury to his back but making no mention of his chronically debilitating piles. (Runyon later testified that Cadwallader, for reasons unknown, advised against including the hemorrhoid condition.) The application languished, and in fact appears never to have acted upon, or much pressed by Runyon's attorney.

Perhaps desperate for income, Runyon at this point determined to try his hand at farming "with hired help" (it is unlikely he could have performed much farm labor himself), but by 1880, this enterprise had also failed. To add to his troubles, Levi reported that he had been injured the same year by falling on his "rump" from a farm wagon being driven by a "boy". By this time, Levi was 40 years old, and Anna, 33. Prompted by the new injury, Runyon or his attorney succeeded in obtaining an examination by a medical board the

following year, in 1881 (his 1877 application was still pending); although the board recommended a disability rating of 3/4ths, for injury to the "lumber" muscles, the pension office took no action on the report.

About this time, Levi and his wife moved to Albany (also in Whiteside County, on the eastern bank of the Mississippi River). After a few more desultory years in that town, the Runyons decided in 1886 to move again, this time to the state of Iowa, where they would both remain until their deaths. Runyon must have requested a new medical examination shortly after arriving, for an Iowa board conducted one in 1886. This time, the veteran brought up the longstanding issue of his hemorrhoids, and the board recommended an even higher rating than the previous one, for both back and hemorrhoid problems. Again, however, the pension office declined to act.

For at least 12 years, until 1898, the Runyons lived in Clinton, Iowa (a large town in Clinton County, immediately across the Mississippi River from Albany), k during which time Levi worked at a variety of "light jobs" (including night watchman, book seller, teamster, and furniture seller). While there, Runyon must have cast about for a new attorney and been referred to the popular Washington, D.C., pension attorney, George Lemon, since a new application was filed for him by Lemon in July of 1890, this one expressly including both "spine" and pile conditions. Following another medical board appearance in 1891, and a 12/18ths disability recommendation, the pension office, in March of 1891, at last approved an award to Runyon of $8 per month, for "rectal disease" and lumbago.

In 1897, toward the end of the couple's stay in Clinton, Levi applied through Lemon's office for an increase in his award, now adding rheumatism and asthma to his list of ailments. This resulted in a new medical examination the same year, which rated Levi's combination of afflictions at "greater than 100%" disability. (The board also noted, without criticism, the veteran's use of morphine to help him deal with the effects of pain and discomfort.) The application was granted, and Runyon's award increased to $12 per month.

The following year, in 1898, the couple moved to Marshalltown (about 130 miles west of Clinton, in Marshall County, Iowa). The same year, the pension office, on its own initiative, elected to conducted a Special Examination on the issue of the connection between Levi's wartime service and the back and hemorrhoid conditions for which he had been pensioned. (Although by this date veterans were eligible to receive pensions for non-service-connected disabilities, award levels remained higher for service-connected conditions and most veterans sought to establish the connection if they could; see Chapters 5 and 8.) The proceeding dragged on for two years, eventually involving four Special Examiners (the original examiner in Iowa and his replacement, and two additional examiners commissioned to interview witnesses at the veteran's former places of residence in Illinois and New Jersey). The testimony was largely supportive of the veteran's claim of service connection, and the various reports submitted by the examiners essentially recommended that the connection be deemed established. Nonetheless, the Pension Office rejected the connection, leaving Runyon, now 60 years old and probably increasingly disconsolate, to be pensioned at a lower rate. (Louis Cavalier, an attorney working for Lemon's firm, went as far as to file a thoroughgoing appeal of the pension office's decision, but the rejection was ultimately affirmed; for a general description of the Special Examination process, and related proceedings and appeals, see Chapter 8.)

Runyon and his lawyers nevertheless kept up the pressure. In 1904, he filed a "renewal" of his claim for service connected disability, and in 1907, a entirely new application; both were rejected. There is only one further indication of his holding a job during this period: Levi's report that as of 1904 he was once again working occasionally as a "carriage painter" (he would have been 64 years old that year). By 1907, Runyon had become sufficiently destitute or infirm to take up residence in the Iowa Soldiers Home, accompanied by his wife. (The home was situated in Marshalltown, and it is possible the couple had this fact in mind when they had chosen to relocate there a few years before.)

In 1910, his pension was increased by law to $15 per month, because of his age (70). About this time, possibly due to the marginal improvement in his financial circumstances resulting from the pension increase, Levi and his wife left the soldiers home and returned to Clinton, his final place of residence. In 1912, under new legislation, his pension was increased a last time, to $24 per month. Three years later, on March 12, 1915, Levi Runyon passed away, the cause of death listed as "angina pectoris" and "chronic cardiac asthma." He was one month short of his 75th birthday.

Anna arranged for her husband to be buried in Newton, Illinois. (The reason is unclear. Newton is a town in southeastern Illinois, and is not near any of the Midwestern towns they had lived in. It is possible that Newton was at that time the residence of their adopted daughter, who would have come of age during the couple's years in Illinois, and who may have met a husband and settled there. The daughter would probably have been in her 40s or 50s by this time, and Anna had probably made arrangements to be buried in Newton as well). Anna herself survived her husband by less than ten months. Although the widow's pension she promptly applied for was approved, she died on January 6, 1916, before receiving her first payment. She was about 68 years old.

George Van Camp. From the time he was a "small boy" until the end of his life, George C. Van Camp lived in Lambertville, Hunterdon County's primary manufacturing and transportation hub along the Delaware River. Six years before the war broke out, at age 23, he married Mary Jane Niece, three years his senior, and the couple produced 3 children, 2 prior to the war and one born nine months after Van Camp's return from it. (Neither George nor his wife could write, although Mary Jane did learn to scrawl her own name; he signed with an "X".) He listed his pre-war occupation as engineer/machinist, and he had probably worked as a boiler operator in one of Lambertville's several steam-powered factories before signing up.

Van Camp's first military experience was as a "three-month" man, from April through July, 1861, with Company E, 3rd New Jersey Militia, during which he saw no action.

He re-enlisted in 1862 with Company A as one of its older volunteers (he was then 29), and managed to get through the war unwounded. But at some point he incurred a severe case of chronic diarrhea (possibly dysentery, and so debilitating that he was excused at war's end from participating in the regiment's Grand Review on June 8, 1865).

Returning to civilian life, Van Camp, after recuperating for half a year, tried took to take up again his prior occupation ("running engine at [Lambertville's] rubber mill), but was only able to pursue it briefly on account of his worsening gastro-intestinal disease and two serious accidents. In 1868, he suffered a fractured right forearm [radius], falling on ice near his home, and in 1874, he slipped and fell at work against an iron rod, fracturing both bones of his right calf [tibia and fibula]; both sets of breaks were either inadequately set or allowed insufficient time to heal, and both knitted back together in deformed positions. The veteran then appears to have fallen into a long succession of marginal or part-time work, often obtained through the intercession of friends or local politicians.

In 1890, for example, Van Camp reported working as a railroad engineer, but a year later, he and others listed his primary occupation as "huckster" (peddler or salesman), an effort that was "not of a very successful nature." One neighbor described him at this time as a man who was at no time able to perform work "in accordance with the government standard of manuel [sic] labor." Two years earlier, Van Camp had obtained at least a small measure of financial relief by making his first pension application, which was approved for service-related chronic diarrhea and resulting "general debility" at the rate of $4 per month. He applied for an increase in 1890, under the new pension legislation that permitted claims for non-service-related conditions, adding both of the post-war fractures to his list of disabling ailments. This was also approved, and tripled his award to $12 per month.

Five years later, in 1895, two Lambertville officials, former mayor Coryell and current mayor Bray, both attested that the veteran had been a "poor" and "delicate" man since coming home from the war. They each stated they had tried unsuccessfully to place him in jobs available at work sites they supervised: Coryell got him work as an "engineer" at

the Lambertville Water Works, where Van Camp turned out "not [to] be able to perform manual labor 1/2 of the time," and Bray placed him in the "wood department" of the Belvidere Railroad Company, where he could not work "half a hand" and had to quit after two months.

By 1900, Van Camp was back to huckstering, attempting to "eke out an existence trying to sell," but experienced "little truck." Throughout the 1890s, he had filed four further applications for a pension increase, each time adding additional ailments (loss of teeth and memory, weak back and chest, rheumatism, "old age"). Each was rejected and, even worse, Van Camp's second such application, in 1895, resulted in a Pension Office review of his prior award and a *reduction* to $8 per month. (Reductions were extremely rare; see Chapter 8.)

Finally, a further application in 1899 (adding "dizziness" to the now long list of medical complaints) produced an approval, and an increase to $10 per month. (This was still not the $12 he had been awarded earlier.) The Doylestown, Pennsylvania, medical board that examined him in connection with the application found him in "very feeble" condition. A man of short stature (5'3-1/2"), his weight had fallen by this time from a relatively robust wartime level of 140 lbs., to a low of 128 lbs., and his brown hair had turned grey. Van Camp's last application for increase, submitted in January of 1901, was also approved, and although this resulted in restoring his award level to its highest previous level ($12), the veteran died of "heart trouble" in January of the following year, before receiving his first quarterly check at the new rate. He was 70; funeral services were conducted at his and his wife's home. (At least his wife, now 73, was paid the accrued benefit to which George was entitled, and she soon obtained her own widow's pension, at the lower rate of $8 per month. Mary Jane remained in Lambertville until her death approximately 6 years later, at age 79 or 80.)

At his death, Van Camp owned no real estate - he and his wife must have been boarders or tenants, or else resided with one of their children's families – and he had only modest personal property, was valued by local officials at a total of $75-$100.

Joseph Sullivan. Joseph E. Sullivan was born about the year 1845, in Hunterdon County according to his wife. In 1854, his parents and siblings all moved away to the south Texas county of San Patricio, a county situated on the Gulf of Mexico, centered on the port of Corpus Christi, and bisected by the Nueces River. The river marked the upper boundary of a large area of what at the time constituted mostly uninhabited territory in the southern part of the state that had previously been claimed by both Mexico and the United States.

Seeking to buttress its dominion over the contested area, the Mexican government had been encouraging settlement there by Irish Catholics who had migrated the United States. In 1828, a group of about 200 such families living in New York had been persuaded by two local impresarios, James McGloin and John McMullen, to move to an area near Corpus Christi; Mexico authorized the settlement, and the families arrived by boat the following year. In 1830, the group established a town on the Nueces River at the junction of two main Mexican roads: one leading west to Laredo and the other north along the coast to Louisiana. In honor of Ireland's patron saint, the Mexican commissioner in charge of overseeing the settlement named the town Villa de San Patricio de Hibernia (Town of Saint Patrick of Ireland), and at least initially a tone of bicultural harmony appeared to prevail (the first "alcalde," or mayor, appointed by the Mexican commissioner was an Irishman, and 2 of the first 4 elected aldermen were also Irish).

Although the new Irish-American settlers were reluctant to become embroiled in Texas's "revolution" against Mexico that developed soon thereafter in 1835, they were gradually drawn in on the side of the Texans, and a sharp fight occurred near the town in 1836, in which the Texans were defeated and a number of them (including several San Patricio men) were killed. The action effectively rendered the villa a ghost town for nearly a decade until, in 1845, General Zachary Taylor stationed a unit of American troops there in the course of the War with Mexico, and a sense of security returned. A few years later, in 1853, the Texas legislature incorporated the town (Texas had become a state in 1845), and the Sullivan family moved there the next year.[305]

It is probable that the family at the time was among the burgeoning community of new Irish-American immigrants populating the American northeast, and it may have had ties or contact with the New York group that had supplied San Patricio's first settlers a few years earlier. It is also likely that some male members of the family had moved temporarily from New York City out to Hunterdon County to take jobs as laborers. Joseph, who was only about nine in 1846 and probably the youngest son in his immediate family, was left behind in Hunterdon when the family moved to Texas, to be raised by his maternal grandfather, Henry Schamp.

He appears to have enlisted, from Pleasant Run (Franklin Township), as soon as he could, at about age 16 or 17, probably lying about his age (18 was then the minimum age for enlistment). He was badly wounded on May 12, 1864, in the costly battle of Spotsylvania Courthouse, suffering a gunshot wound to his right groin that shattered the thigh bone and rendered his leg permanently disabled. (In an 1889 affidavit, the veteran wrote the place of the battle as "Spotcialvaney," providing a clue as to his and his comrades' actual pronunciation of the word.) Following the battle, he was hospitalized for nearly nine months and was eventually transferred back to Newark. He nevertheless returned to his company in the closing weeks of the war "by [his] own request," where he was promoted to the rank of corporal and later mustered out with his remaining fellows.

Soon after returning from the war, at about age 21, Sullivan decided to move to Texas to rejoin his family. There he met his future wife, Teresa Barbra Holy. She was about 6 years younger than Sullivan, and the two most likely met while she was employed as a live-in companion or domestic servant by a "Mrs. Buckley," in Corpus Christi. They were married in Galveston, by a priest at the Ursuline Catholic Convent, on December 1, 1871, and eventually raised 6 children, born between 1873 and 1884. (Teresa Sullivan's unusual story - she outlived her husband by 17-1/2 years, taking over management of their varied holdings - is recounted in Chapter 11.)

Sullivan, who had listed his occupation as laborer when he joined the army, turned now to a life of ranching in his new home state. By the time he arrived in Texas, San Patricio had begun to grow and thrive as the county seat, and constituted an important river-crossing point on Texas's "Cotton Road," with wagon crews stopping in the town to purchase supplies and patronize the local saloon. By the 1880s, the town had several churches and cotton gins, as well as a grist mill. Two Catholic schools, one for boys and one for girls, were established in 1876, and it is likely that some or all of Joseph and Teresa's 6 children, who were born between 1873 and 1884, attended them. By 1890 the population reached a peak of about 400.

But the town's fortunes began to decline in the 1890s. A new railroad line was established closer to the coast, and in 1894 Sinton, a larger and faster-growing town to the northeast, was designated the county seat. San Patricio's population began to diminish; it was "disincorporated" by the Texas legislature in 1901 and, according to one local history, "for the [next] seventy years was all but forgotten".

Joseph Sullivan lived nearly his entire adult life in the small town. By the time he died there on September 3, 1903, at about 58 years of age, he and his wife had worked at ranching for nearly four decades, and had managed, despite the town's waning prospects, to build up a modest but creditable estate. It included, according to later declarations of his wife and others, real estate consisting of a 60-acre homestead that had been purchased for $440 (but on which the couple owed a $300 mortgage, leaving them with equity of only about $140). (Teresa, in her own name, also owned a total of about 57 acres in two other tracts of land.) Sullivan paid interest on the mortgage (probably about $9 a year), and annual taxes on the land (the taxes were $19.46 in 1905); against these land expenses, he raised cotton and corn on a portion of the tract, which generated, according to his wife, about $100 a year, which would have net them a bit over $70 in profits. (There is some indication that he employed 2 or 3 farm hands from time to hand to help in this operation, an expense which, if paid in cash rather than in the form of room, board, or goods, would have further reduced the

couple's farm income.) In a town that eventually began to lose population, however, demand for land was slight by the time of Sullivan's death. Teresa pointed out that the veteran's homestead actually had little value except for whatever income could be generated by farming it. It was also comparatively meager in size by Texas landholding standards ("only" 60 acres, as one pension examiner described it).

Personal property owned by Sullivan when he died included "about" 4 mules, 6 or 7 horses, and 8 or 9 head of cattle, all together worth approximately $350; a small interest in a cotton gin mill, his share in the profits of which amounted to about $5 per year; and another small interest in a ferry operation across the Nueces River (an enterprise which unfortunately collapsed when the nearby railroad was built, crossing the river).

Additionally, like nearly all of his surviving Company A comrades, Sullivan, though somewhat belatedly, applied for a pension to augment his income. In 1882, he attempted to file a claim informally by submitting a letter describing his wound and resulting disability to a Fort Worth law firm (Ball & McCart), who apparently forwarded it on to the Pension Office but did little else. (The firm's letterhead announced "Special Attention to Collections," but nothing in the veteran's pension file indicates its partners had any familiarity with even routine pension claim practice or forms, which by that time - 17 years after the war - had become quite formal and rule-bound; see Chapter 8.) Although this initial effort did result in the veteran's being examined by a government-designated physician in Austin (a destination 300 miles away from Sullivan's home in San Patricio!), and a request by the government for corroborating information from his fellow veterans (most of whom of course remained in New Jersey), nothing else came of it.

Four years later, however, after Sullivan had been steered to the law firm of Allan Rutherford - one of the many Washington, D.C., firms now specializing in the lucrative pension practice - he fared better. This time his application was ultimately approved, retroactive to June, 1886, but only for the minimum amount of $2 per month (which was increased in 1890 to $4).[306]

By the time of his death, then, at the relatively young age (for his Company A cohort) of about 58 years, Sullivan, despite considerable physical disability, was receiving approximate yearly income from all sources of at least $150. (His wife received a small amount of additional income - probably not more than $25 per year - from stock and real estate she owned separately.) He had also accumulated a net estate worth about $500 (and his wife owned separate property worth about $300). By some measurements, these financial circumstances placed the Sullivans within America's emerging, late-nineteenth-century middle class. It is certainly true that Joseph had managed, even if only barely, to improve his socio-economic position from a pre-war status of common laborer to an end-of-life position as small but independent rancher and modest investor.[307]

CHAPTER 8

PENSIONS

> ...[H]e did some pretty hard screaming to get a pension for himself.
>
> M. Robinson, Mendham Post Master, regarding veteran, William Reynolds

> This man may have some disability but he exaggerates so much that it becomes difficult to rate him.
>
> Medical Board, examining Private Solomon Kise

As several scholars have observed, the Civil War produced the nation's first substantial social welfare program sponsored by the federal government: federal pension benefits for Union veterans and their dependents.[308] Begun during the second year of the war, and initially limited to soldiers discharged for wounds or disease incurred during service (or to dependent widows and minor children of soldiers killed in combat or dying from wounds or disease), the pension program evolved, by the turn of the century, "into an open-ended system of disability, old-age, and survivors' benefits for anyone who could claim minimal service time on the northern side of the Civil War."[309]

Amounts awarded, though never extravagant, became increasingly generous, rising from a maximum payment in 1862 of $8 per month for a totally disabled enlisted man - the equivalent of only about 30% of the average income of an unskilled laborer, and worth about $145 in 2002 currency[310] - to payments in 1883 of $30 ($72 for a disabled veteran requiring the "regular aid and attendance" of another person). In 1883, $30 was approximately equivalent to the prevailing monthly wage for unskilled labor, and worth about $557 in 2002 currency.

After 1912, pensions based merely on age and length of wartime service (without regard to actual disability), ranged as high as $40 per month, and were automatically increased thereafter, without necessity of a new claim being filed by the pensioner.[311]

At its peak, during the period from about 1890 to 1905, approximately one million veterans or dependents were receiving pension awards, or about one pension for every 2 men who had served in the Union military. Pensioners comprised more than 1% of the total U.S. population of the period (including the South). Federal expenditures for the program constituted as much as *43%* of the total federal budget (in the early 1890s), and reached a peak level of about $175 million per year in 1913 and 1914 (about $3 billion per year, in today's currency).[312] By 1920, the number of pensioners had dwindled to about 600,000, rapidly declining thereafter, and federal expenditures had fallen by that year to about $3.5 million, or less than 5% of the federal budget.

The pension program involved considerable controversy, from beginning to end. At the outset, despite Abraham Lincoln's apparent endorsement of pension legislation in his second inaugural address ("...let us strive on...to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan"), some citizens questioned the propriety of granting war-related pensions at all, no matter what circumstances had befallen the soldier or his family. This attitude was shared by some veterans. As one Company A volunteer, Thomas R. Gregory, put it (after reluctantly being encouraged by a number of "old soldiers" to claim a pension in 1890), "...I have always look upon it as a sin to be sick."

Later, as powerful lobbying efforts by the organized veteran community (principally in the form of the Grand Army of the Republic), pension lawyers, and tariff interests overcame initial social and political opposition to the program, criticism focused on federal Pension Office waste and corruption, and on the system's fiscal consequences for those poorer groups of American residents who were ineligible for its benefits (such as the non-veteran poor, the young, recent immigrants, and a large proportion of Southerners).[313]

Although turn-of-the-century reformers hoped and expected the Civil War pension system to prepare the way for a more universal approach to old age and disability relief, especially as the fiscal burden imposed by the veteran population and its dependents declined with their gradual demise in the early twentieth century, this did not occur. As

pointed out by Theda Skocpol, among others, veterans' pensions were a special case: a program that "righteously privileged...those among the citizenry who had participated victoriously in a moment of national preservation." It was "not really a 'welfare state' [program]...[but] rather, an unabashed system of national public care...for the deserving core of a special generation," who "...had *earned aid* - for themselves and their dependents...."[314]

Under continuing pressure from lobbyists and supporters, the system went through 2 major phases (and many minor ones), with eligibility criteria and awards becoming gradually more generous during *both* phases. The first phase began on July 14, 1862, with Congress' passage of the first pension legislation of the war, and lasted until the summer of 1890. During this period, eligibility for claiming pensions was limited to veterans rendered unfit for manual labor as a result of war-related illness or injury (or to those immediate family members able to show financial dependence on a soldier or veteran who had died from war-related causes?). The 1862 Act, along with liberalizing enactments that followed during this first phase, were later referred to collectively as the "General Law," or "Old Law," to distinguish it from the significantly different pension legislation that came later.

In the second phase, beginning with Congress' Act of June 27, 1890, eligibility was expanded to encompass veterans who were disabled from *any* cause (not necessarily war-related), so long as the claimant had served in the Union Army or Navy a minimum of 90 days, and suffered from a disability that was not the product of "vicious habits." ("Vicious habits," in this era of Victorian and prohibitionist sentiment, referred primarily to noticeable abuse of alcohol or drugs, or to "unchaste" sexual behavior.) Moreover, the term "disabled" was now expanded significantly, so as to include anyone who had simply survived to age 65 (later, to age 62), whether or not an actual inability to perform manual labor (or any other kind of work) existed.[315] Similarly, wives and other dependents of deceased veterans became eligible for pensions merely on a showing that the veteran had died, regardless of cause, and that the widow remained unmarried, regardless of her financial circumstances or actual state of "dependence." This act, and the subsequent acts which generally liberalized its

terms, were generally referred to either individually, by date of enactment (e.g., "Act of June 27, 1890," "Act of May 11, 1912," etc.) or, collectively, as the "New Law".

Thus, overall, the Civil War pension system evolved over a fifty-year period (1862-1912) from a relatively low-award program limited to soldiers and families directly and demonstrably impacted by wartime mishap, to a relatively high-award program distributing funds to virtually every soldier unable to work, or living until age sixty-two, or to his un-remarried widow.

Company A Men: Overview of Claim Patterns and Awards

The general patterns and experiences of Company A's original 100 volunteers, and their families, were similar to those of the Union veteran population in general, except that a slightly higher portion of company men and women made claims, and a greater number of those claims were approved. This Chapter focuses primarily on claims made by the veterans themselves. "Dependency" claims - those submitted by spouses, parents, siblings, or guardians of children - are discussed in Chapters 11 through 14.

Of the war's known 54 survivors, a total of 48 (89%) are known to have filed pension claims at some point in their lives. This rate of filing is comparable to Costa's estimated 85% rate for *all* war-surviving Union soldiers, based on her sampling study.[316] As mentioned, pensions before 1890 (the first phase) had to be based *exclusively* on conditions claimed to have arisen during the war (wounds, diseases, and accidental injuries). A total of 39 of Company A's veteran claimants (81% of all 48 veteran claimants) filed during this first period, as follows:

-During the war (following discharge for unfitness):	2
-Balance of 1860s (after war ended):	9
-1870s:	14
-1880s:	14

In and after 1890 (the second pension phase), with veterans now able to submit claims for *any* work-disabling health condition, regardless of cause or date of origin, a total of 9 additional company men filed claims, 6 of them in the key year of 1890 (the company's peak year for pension filings), and the last 3 in 1898, 1902, and 1907. (The single exception to the general rule in this second phase was that the condition could not be the result of immoral behavior: "vice" or "vicious habits" in the euphemisms of the day. Such habits included the failure to remain "chaste," resulting in the veteran's contracting a "women's disease" [sexually transmitted disease], or "intemperance" [excessive alcohol consumption], resulting in alcohol-related disability. No Company A claims were rejected on these grounds.)

In both periods (pre- and post-1890), pensioners could at any time apply to the government for an *increase* in their award, based either on significant further deterioration of an existing pensioned condition, or the onset of a new disabling condition. Many did so, some more or less continually under their deaths (see Chapter 5). And finally, beginning in 1907??, veterans could obtain a pension simply on the basis of having attained age 65, subsequently lowered to age 62. (Only one Company A man, William Briggs, appears to have sought an initial pension *solely* on this basis; he is included in the figure of 9 "second-phase" claimants, given above).

Despite considerable processing delays and initial rejections in one or two cases, the claims of all 48 men were eventually allowed, in whole or in part. Some claims initially made and rejected under the provisions of the first phase of pension legislation, were resubmitted and allowed under the significantly more liberal terms of the second phase. (One man, Michael Welsh, made nearly contemporaneous claims in 1890 under *both* sets of laws, probably at the suggestion of his attorney. This presumably would reduce his waiting time, in the event the service-connected claim under the "Old Law" was ultimately rejected. The tactic paid off: it took the Pension Office *7 years* to reject the first application; meanwhile, the second application, under the "New Law," was approved, albeit at a lower rate, in a relatively short 18 months.) Company A's slightly higher than average application rate, and 100%

approval rate, are no doubt due to the fact that the unit served longer than many Union companies, and accordingly saw more action and sustained significantly more casualties than the great majority of them.

The overall picture of health conditions for which the company's veterans sought pensions, or pension increases, is detailed in Chapter 5. This chapter will examine their experiences in filing and processing those applications, and in dealing with the many actors involved (lawyers, government bureaucrats, doctors, and witnesses). Summarizing the pension data detailed in Chapter 5:

-All of the men's 48 pension claims were ultimately approved. most for *some* significant and disabling health problem.

-Almost half of the claims (23, or 48%) were based solely or primarily on the post-war consequences of the veteran's wartime projectile wound(s).

-20 of the 48 initial claims (42%) were based solely or primarily on wartime illness or disease. The single largest postwar disease category prompting claims was one or another form of heart disease (5 claims), even though such ailments were very rarely diagnosed during the war. The Civil War's "big three" diseases – typhoid fever, dysentery/chronic diarrhea, and tuberculosis - were implicated in a total of about 8 of the men's first-time pension claims. Of these 8, tuberculosis or other pulmonary ailments were identified in 4 initial claims. Chronic diarrhea was the central factor in 3 claims.

-Finally, wartime injuries and conditions other than wounds and disease were involved in approximately 12 initial pension claims (25%).[317] By far the largest subcategory for these claims were hernias or ruptures, and "varices" or blood vessel injuries, including varicoceles and hydroceles (total of 8).

-The pace of new filings remained fairly constant for a long period: 14 initial claims during the 1860s; 12 during the -70s, and 13 during the -80s. In the 1890s, the rate of first-time claims dropped to 6, and only three new claims were filed after 1900. Claims for wartime wounds predominated in the first two decades, but dropped off rapidly thereafter.

Claims based primarily on wartime illness and disease totaled 5 in the 1860s and -70s, but rose to 9 in the next three decades. Initial claims based on accidents and other wartime injuries amounted to only 2 each in the 1860s and -70s, but rose to 6 in the -80s and 4 in the -90s. Only one company man filed a first-time claim based solely on age (William Briggs, in 1907).

-43 of the 48 company men who submitted initial claims made one or more later claims for a larger pension (90%). Overall, the conditions claimed by the 43 (usually multiple conditions in one claim) were fairly evenly distributed among two categories: 53 instances of *worsening* original conditions, and 59 instances of *new* conditions. In the first category wartime wounds predominated (30 claims), followed by wartime accidents and non-combat injuries (14 claims), and wartime diseases (9 claims). In the second general category, the rankings were reversed: 40 claims were based on a new disease or illness; 19 claims were based on a new accidental injury or other (non-disease) condition; and no claims were based on a previously unmentioned wound.

Initial awards in first-phase (war-related) claims averaged $5.09 per month (in 1870, the approximate mid-point of all first-phase awards, this was worth about $100 in today's currency); they ranged from $2 to $8. More than half the awards were in the amount of $4, resulting from a disability rating of one-half; a third were in the amount of either $6 (3/4ths disability) or $8 (total disability); and one was for $2 (1/4th disability). The average amount of first-time awards approved for all second-phase veteran applications was $13.33 per month (in 1900, the approximate mid-point of phase-two awards, this was worth about $300 in today's currency); they ranged from $6 to $30.

<u>The Claims Process and the Experiences of Company A Veterans</u>

The federal pension claim process of the latter nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries was usually long, and often arduous, for both claimant and pension official. At the outset of the program, neither party had any significant prior experience with large-scale

citizen-bureaucracy relations (other than in the military), and the program was novel and grew rapidly. Each side struggled to keep up with the demands of the other: for the veteran, the government's sometimes baffling demands for documentary proof or witness corroboration (which often did not exist or was practically unavailable), in a context of ever-shifting regulatory requirements and award criteria; for the pension official, the daily clamor of an increasing volume of claims, amid a rising tide of fraud, powerful GAR criticism, and pressure from attorneys, agents and elected officials. The claims experiences of Company A men reflected all of these cross-currents.

Attorneys. Generally, before any application document was prepared or forwarded to the federal Pension Office, the claimant made a preliminary decision whether or not to "appoint" (hire) an attorney to represent him in the process. Most veterans ultimately decided to use attorneys, and this trend increased during the middle decades of the program.

In the program's earliest years, when claims were more limited and straightforward, and the process more informal than it would later become, the assistance of legal counsel was less crucial - or at least deemed by applicants to be less crucial - and the "pension claim bar," the small army of pension lawyers that would subsequently emerge in the nation's capital and in other urban centers, had not yet taken shape. Thus, for example, the initial applications of Isaac N. Danberry, William B. Dungan, James Hoffman, and John A. Kutter, all filed during the 1860s, were made without legal counsel (or at least without the attorney's active participation, even when asked to "handle" the matter).

In the program's last decades, the vast majority of claims filed were simply for having attained pensionable age, the preparation and submission of which did not usually require professional help. William Brigg's first claim, for example, filed in 1907 and based solely on his having attained age 62, was made without an attorney. (All other Company A claims based on age were made by veterans who had previously filed and been awarded a pension for "disability," and were now seeking a higher level of compensation. They therefore already had an open file and claim number in the Pension Office, making it simpler

to apply for an increase. Though virtually all of these claimants had used attorneys in their previous disability applications, most ceased doing so for their subsequent "Age" applications.) Moreover, once an initial age claim had been approved, subsequent increases in age awards were made more or less automatically by the Pension Office, as the veteran attained the next qualifying age; this of course completely obviated the need for legal assistance.

During the middle years of the program, however, from roughly the 1870s through the first decade of the 1900s, lawyers who focused on the prosecution of pension claims became a large and vocal element of the program and, as mentioned above, joined with the GAR and tariff supporters to form a powerful lobby for liberalized pension benefits. Several of them, especially those located in Washington, D.C., where they enjoyed ready access to the newly dedicated Federal Pension Building and its burgeoning staff, built entire law practices around the pension claims enterprise, in some cases generating national reputations and a huge clientele.

The largest and best known firm was that of George E. Lemon who, together with his associates, eventually handled "tens of thousands" of pension cases, became a powerful advocate for funding the expanding federal pension program by printing more "Greenbacks" to expand the money supply, and by keeping tariffs at high levels. (In a pre-income-tax era, tariffs – taxes paid on imported or exported goods – were the primary source of national revenue.) In 1877, Lemon began publishing the *National Tribune*, a nation-wide news sheet for Union veterans, agitating for pension legislation and advertising his services. The *Tribune* was fully endorsed by the national GAR, and in 1888 would take much of the credit for defeating Grover Cleveland, the "great vetoer" of pension legislation, by getting out the veteran vote against him.[318] Indeed, except for James Rusling, a New Jersey based lawyer with offices in both Trenton and Washington, Company A claimants used Lemon's firm more than any other in pursuit of their pensions (see below).

Given the trend toward the "lawyering" of claims, instances of incompetence, overcharging, the use of "agents" to locate and solicit potential claimants, and other abuses by attorneys became an increasing problem. Legislation designed to address the fee issue was adopted as early as 1862, limiting fees in pension cases to $5, with potential additional fees of $1.50 per affidavit. An 1864 amendment raised the permitted standard fee to $10, with no additional fees allowed, and prohibited payment until a successful outcome was achieved.[319] Later legislation limited fees for subsequent, or "increase", applications, to $2, and required attorneys to put their fee arrangement (retainer agreement) in writing, and to have it signed by their client.

Despite these statutory limits, the "unofficial" standard fee that actually appears to have prevailed during the first twenty years or so after the war, at least among many Company A applicants, was $25, and $10 for a subsequent application. (In 1880, twenty-five dollars would have equaled about $500 dollars in today's currency.) Lawyers charging a $25 fee included George E. Lemon (to James Donnelly, in 1879), D. P. Dunwoody, of Washington (to Moses G. Housel, in 1880), J. Connet, of Flemington (to Samuel Case, in 1886; he also charged Case a $10 fee for each of two increase applications), and E. S. Weeden (to Samuel R. Connet, in 1886). In the 1870 application of Nahum Cregur, Attorney W. S. Johnson, of Trenton, charged a fee of only $15. On the other hand, when Attorney James Rusling attempted to charge Danberry a $10 fee for a subsequent application in 1891, the government reviewer lined out the figure with a red pen in Danberry's file, and reduced it to $2.

There appears to be no explanation for the divergence in some cases from the fee authorized by Congress. In the case of higher fees charged in the 1870s and 1880s, government reviewers may have looked the other way or been instructed that this was a matter between the claimant and his attorney. In later years, the $10/$2 fee limitation appears to have been uniformly adhered to by Company A lawyers. This later practice would

have been enhanced by a requirement that attorneys file a copy of their retainer agreement along with the application.

As an additional precaution to aid claimants, the government appears to have begun compiling lists of attorneys disbarred by their supervising state authority, or disqualified by the pension office itself because of past impropriety. Case's first choice of attorney in 1879, for example, the Washington, D.C. firm of Gilmore & Co., was by 1882 "barred" from prosecuting further pension claims, and Case replaced the firm with a lawyer much closer to home, Attorney Edward Conking, of Flemington. (John Wyckoff's mother, Letitia Conover Wyckoff, who filed a "dependency" pension application after losing her son in the war, also had to replace her original lawyer, Jenkins A. Fitzgerald, of Washington, D.C. In 1883, the Pension Office suspended him from practice "in this office," for having "removed from city." Wyckoff's mother's story is related in detail in Chapter 12.) Moses Housel's first lawyer, E. B. Jackson, of Philadelphia, was subsequently listed in his 1874 claim file as "Suspended," and was replaced by Mr. Dunwoody (who, as mentioned, went on to charge Housel an unauthorized fee!). Housel should perhaps have been alerted to his first lawyer's incompetence when his *gunshot*-based claim in 1874 was initially rejected, on the ground that the original application failed to establish a connection between Housel's wound and his wartime service!

On occasion, claimants themselves attempted to practice law themselves, without benefit of an attorney, or to find some other way to get around the problem of having to pay an attorney for services. When James Mattison filed a claim in 1878, he appointed J. E. Evans, of Philadelphia, as "his true and lawful attorney to prosecute his claim." The pension office had doubts about Mr. Evans's status, since an attorney by the name of Evans apparently appeared on a list of suspended Philadelphia lawyers. This prompted the office to request its "Special Agent" in Philadelphia, F. N. Sprague, to conduct a "casual inquiry" (informal investigation) into the matter. Sprague discovered that J. E. Evans was in fact a druggist, who had been persuaded by Mattison's brother-in-law, a physician who knew

Evans, to permit the use of his name as attorney on the application. Both Evans and the brother-in-law, Dr. Eugene Wiley, soon filed affidavits attempting to extricate themselves from this awkward revelation.

In his affidavit, Wiley explained that Mattison lived in Flemington, and during a visit to Philadelphia in which they discussed Mattison's entitlement to a pension, Wiley decided to take charge of the matter on behalf of his brother-in-law, and assist him in filing a claim. "Being ignorant in claim matters," Wiley deposed, he asked a friend who was visiting Washington to "obtain the blanks [forms] from the Pension Office," and prevailed on another friend, an attorney named "Major Nevins," to provide "information in the matter of the manner of presenting claims." Wiley "gathered" from Nevins that "an attorney was necessary" in the process (this was not actually true), but only "as mere matter of form," and persuaded yet a third friend, the druggist Evans, to "sign the oath" as Mattison's attorney. He (Wiley) otherwise had "no interest in the claim," "no intention of prosecuting other claims," and "no connection with...any of the suspended attorneys of Phila." The whole matter, Wiley explained, "was one of a moment's consideration and simply to fulfill a requirement of the rules as deponent supposed [them to be]."

Evans swore to the same facts, explaining to the Special Agent that "he knows nothing of the claim business and has no intention of entering upon it." He became Mattison's attorney of record only "to oblige the doctor...[and] upon being assured that personally he would be put to no trouble as deponent is confined closely to business [preoccupied with being a druggist]." Evans stated further that he "had no arrangement for fees and...prepared none of the papers."

Sprague forwarded both men's affidavits to the Pension Office the next day, stating in his transmittal letter that "[b]oth appear to be persons of character and standing." This apparently satisfied the Commissioner of Pensions, for despite the fact that the scheme surely constituted one or more criminal offenses ("false swearing," "unauthorized practice of law," and "criminal conspiracy," for example) and had undoubtedly been thought up as a

means to avoid payment of what the "conspirators" mistakenly believed to be an unavoidable attorney fee, Mattison's claim - for service-connected lung disease - was ultimately allowed. The episode indicates, however, that the government even at this early stage was maintaining lists of attorneys admitted to, and suspended from, practice in jurisdictions from which claims emanated, to make sure veterans were at least being represented by real lawyers, whose licenses to practice remained intact. (The episode also demonstrates the wisdom of an old proverb: "He who represents himself – or in this case, lets his brother-in-law doctor represent him – has a fool for a client.")

Edmund Halsey also appears to have helped himself to some "free" legal advice. (Halsey was not a member of Company A, but became one of the 15th New Jersey's best known veterans on account of his wartime service as Regimental Adjutant and unofficial diarist, and probably as well because of his notable but sad post-war life in the Morristown, New Jersey, area.[320]) When Halsey filed his own pension claim in 1890, he used a set of forms produced by the well-known pension attorney, James Rusling. (Once application procedures became fairly standardized, many large pension firms began producing their own forms, as well as other written material announcing their services and summarizing award criteria for potential clients.) A line printed in large type on the margin of Rusling's forms stated:

☞ This Blank for use in Cases of JAMES F. RUSLING Only.

Halsey merely penned this line through, and submitted the claim without designating an attorney. Since Halsey himself had become an attorney after the war, however, and since the penned deletion was obvious, it is possible that Rusling had authorized Halsey's use of the forms and that this was merely an instance of "professional courtesy." The Pension Office, in any case, made no recorded comment on the matter, and approved Halsey's claim, for non-service-related lung disease (most likely tuberculosis), the following year. (Halsey died from his ailment five years later, at age 56.).

At one time or another, almost all of Company A's veteran claimants employed the services of an attorney. (Those who filed initial applications early on, without using attorneys, almost invariably employed them later to assist with increase applications.) In all, the men were represented by at least 33 different lawyers (or firms), many veterans using more than one. (Most often, attorneys mentioned in pension applications are identified by individual name, and town or city of practice; occasionally, however, identification is by firm only, such as "Gilmore & Co." or "McNeil & Birch," and in those instances it is impossible to know whether one of the "named" attorneys or some other member of the firm actually represented the claimant.)

By far the largest number of Company A lawyers, a total of at least 16 different firms, was based in Washington (usually referred to on applications simply as "the City", itself a reflection of the national capital's leading position in this early instance of "administrative" or "regulatory" law practice). Of the Washington-based attorneys or firms identified, George E. Lemon (or his firm) was the most frequently used by Company A applicants (4 claims), followed by Phillips (3].

The single attorney to whom Company A claimants turned more than any other, however, was James Rusling, who maintained an office in the state capital at Trenton. Rusling was well-situated to build a thriving pension claim practice. He had served and risen to the rank of Brigadier General in the war, and had also been appointed for a period after the war as the U. S. Pension Agent for New Jersey; his later pension claim forms prominently advertised these facts, and offered as references no less than the state's Governor, Adjutant General, both U.S. Senators, and a U.S. Representative; Civil War generals residing in several Union states; and, of course, numerous satisfied clients ("Pensioners and Claimants...everywhere nearly"). Sensitive to the competition from Washington firms, some of Rusling's forms also included the following paragraph:

> ☞ Attention invited to this Trenton, N.J., Pension Claim Agency, with Army and Pension experience since 1861. Business with U.S Gov't being *by letter*, and Trenton, N.J., being only short distance from Washington, D.C., with *many mails here and return*

> daily., this N.J. Agency, of course, *not exceeded* by Washington, D.C., or other Agencies. *Experienced, prompt, successful*. None surer or quicker.
>
> Many everywhere still entitled to Pension, or to Increase of Pension, under Old or New Law. Now is *good* time to apply. As a rule, increased age brings increased disability, and hence Increase of Pension now in order, if applied for properly, if worse or pensioned less than $12 a month.
>
> ☞ Remember this N.J. Agency not confined to New Jersey, but Pension Cases here from all United States, Canada, Europe, &c., and prosecuted same as N. J. cases. Others in your *vicinity or knowledge* solicited. No charge, unless successful, and then fee as fixed by U.S. Law. [Italics in original.]

Rusling was involved in the claims of at least 9 Company A men's applications. Setting up practice in New Jersey's capital assured ready access to the state Adjutant General's office, as well as to the GAR's state headquarters, both of which agencies played an increasingly active role in helping New Jersey's veterans to process claims. Trenton was also a relatively short 25-mile train ride from Flemington (about an hour's travel time), and was even closer to Lambertville and other southern areas of Hunterdon County.

Another Trenton attorney, Edward L. Campbell, represented at least 2 Company A men. He was an actor before the war (like deceased Company A Sergeant, George Justice, about whom Campbell later wrote an article), as well as an attorney. In the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, he served during much of the hostilities as Vice Commander, and then Acting Commander, of the 15th New Jersey. This undoubtedly helped his post-war pension practice among the men of the regiment, as well among New Jersey veterans in general; Campbell was "much beloved" by the regiment, according to Haines. (It is known from an affidavit he contributed to the pension claim of Levi Runyon that, by 1891, Campbell had retired and removed to the town of Trinidad, Colorado. A life-long bachelor, perhaps Campbell by this date had become bored with the relatively tame, money-grubbing post-war culture of the industrializing East, and set out to find an authentic Western adventure. At the time, Trinidad was still something of a wild town. Originally settled by a small group of Mexican families in 1862 [the same year the 15th NJ was being organized for war], coal deposits were discovered a decade later, and a wave of rowdy and ethnically diverse European miners was enticed to immigrate to the area to work them. The railroad went

through in 1878. Trinidad soon gained a reputation as "one of the roughest towns in the old west," full of drinkers, gamblers, cattlemen, and prostitutes. In 1882, the town hired the famous lawman, Bartholomew ["Bat"] Masterson, to clean things up. With the help of a notorious group of deputies, who at one time included the Earp Brothers and "Doc" Holliday [the latter himself fleeing arrest for murder in the aftermath of the OK Corral shoot-out in neighboring Texas], Masterson managed to do so in only a year's time. It was shortly after this period that Colonel Campbell arrived from New Jersey![321])

Other Trenton-based attorneys hired by Company A men included Henry D. Phillips - who may also have joined with a Washington, D.C., attorney named Butts to open a second office in that city, under the firm name of Butts & Phillips; and W. S. Johnson. Members of the Trenton "pension bar," like local groups of attorney specialists operating today, were probably intimate and clubby, assisting one another when possible. Attorney Rusling's oath, for example, appearing in the retainer agreement he prepared for George S. Beavers in 1884, was witnessed by Rusling's colleague, Attorney Henry D. Phillips, whose office was undoubtedly located close by.

A small number of attorneys serving Company A claimants maintained offices in Flemington itself, and included J. Connet (mentioned in 2 applications;
Attorney Connet is not to be confused with Company A transferee, Samuel Connet), Edward Conkling (1 case), and Richard Kuhl (1 case). Their relatively small number of pension cases is an indication of the degree to which the pension practice soon became specialized and concentrated among politically-connected firms in the national and state capitals. The Flemington attorneys, despite being situated nearest the pool of potential Company A clients and surely being known to many of them, were engaged in general practice, and lacked any particular expertise in pension law - much less any political clout with the growing pension bureaucracy - and most veterans seemed quickly to appreciate and act on these considerations. (Glasson estimated that by 1880, about six-sevenths of all pension claims

were being handled by fewer than 100 lawyers.[322]) The balance of the 33 lawyers was variously situated, usually in an area near the client's place of residence.

Surprisingly, the company's pension records also disclose the rare work of two female attorneys, Lavinia Smith and Louise Campbell, both of Newark, New Jersey, although neither represented any of the company's original volunteers or their families. Smith, in 1890, represented Benjamin Middaugh, a member of another regiment who was transferred to Company A for the last 7 months of the war; and Campbell, in 1911, represented the widow of Alfred Collins, a Company A draftee. As with racial and ethnic minorities and the foreign-born, women were virtually excluded from the practice of law until the 1870s, when the country's major law schools slowly began admitting them to study. Even by 1900, fewer than one in a hundred lawyers were women, and the gentlemanly Commonwealth of Virginia refused to admit any females to practice law until 1920.[323]

Most of the attorneys hired by Company A men, judging by the files themselves, appear to have performed adequate work for their clients. Those who were not specialists would, at a minimum, have had to familiarize themselves with the rudiments of applicable pension legislation, the bureaucratic protocol to be followed in submitting a claim, and, as the process became more standardized, the requisite "blanks" (forms) and "circulars" (printed rules and guidelines) . They would then have had to counsel their clients with regard to completing the essential form, called an Original Invalid Declaration, and gathering corroborating evidence and contacting witnesses and arranging for their affidavits. In several cases, beyond forwarding these completed forms to the Pension Office, they probably had little else to do for their modest $10 to $25 fee.

In other instances, however, when the process was complicated, or delayed by government demands for additional evidence (or simply bogged down for reasons unknown), the time investment by legal counsel must have been substantial - and probably, as a purely commercial proposition, not worth the effort.[324]

Some claimants became so exasperated by what they viewed as their attorney's lack of effort in a case, that they fired and replaced him while the application was pending. Many others who were less than satisfied simply hired a different attorney when it came time to file a subsequent application. No clear consensus on the relative merits of any particular attorney emerges from these hiring and firing decisions, however, and often they reflect very different judgments concerning the same individual. George S. Beavers, for example, used Rusling for his first filing in 1880, but in 1915 replaced him with Willard W. Cutler, of Morristown. Rusling, on the other hand, was chosen by Andrew C. Clawson, in 1896, to *replace* his first attorney (William Connard & Co., of Washington, D.C.), whereas Cutler, who was chosen by William Gulick (a recruit who joined the company in February, 1864) as his *first* attorney, was himself finally replaced (by the Washington, D.C. firm of McNeil & Birch) after failing for eight years to prompt action on Gulick's application.

Perhaps the greatest degree of attorney dissatisfaction was registered by two Company A men who each hired *4* different attorneys over the course of their many applications, an apparent record for Company A claimants. The two were Samuel Case, who hired Attorneys Gilmore & Co., in 1879, Edward Conkling, in 1882, John Soule & Co., in 1885, and J. Connet, in 1886; and Isaac N. Danberry, who hired Attorneys Richard S. Kuhl, in 1876, James Rusling, in 1879 [and again, in 1889, following Morris], Joseph E. Hunter, in 1887, and J.W. Morris, in 1888).

Sometimes, the wisdom of the claimant's decision to change attorneys was quickly borne out. In 1895, David D. Hendershot turned over his claim to his first lawyer, Connet, in whose hands it languished for the next five years. Frustrated, Hendershot replaced Connet with Joseph E. Hunter, a Washington-based lawyer, and obtained relatively quick approval of what the medical examiners described as a "borderline" case. John S. Green's initial attorney, Henry D. Phillips, of Trenton, succeeded only in getting his client's 1889 claim rejected, following which Green substituted John D. Kinney, of Washington, for Phillips, and obtained approval of the same claim.

One company transferee, Samuel R. Connet, did record his frank sentiments about the zealousness of his attorney's efforts on his behalf. (While not one of the company's original 100 volunteers, the case is recited here for illustrative purposes.) While not replacing his attorney, Connet was clearly unhappy with his efforts. Having relocated after the war from New Jersey to Chicago, Illinois, he had applied for a pension in October, 1886, using E.S. Weeden, a Chicago attorney, to represent him. He was examined by a Chicago medical board the following month, whose members described him as a "'broken down' man" suffering from "chronic diarrhea," and recommend a 5/8ths disability rating. Despite this, Connet received no determination from the Pension Office for more than half a year afterward and, in July, 1887, he finally wrote to the New Jersey Adjutant General asking him to inquire at the Pension Office concerning the status of the claim. In his letter, Connet commented:

> ...I do not think my Lawyer is pushing the matter. I know it is slow work but it seems to me he has left something back. Now if you will do this for me you will confer me a great favor. * * * If you find out anything will you kindly drop me a line.

(Even this request did not speed things up much; Connet's award - for $8 a month - was not approved until nearly another year had passed.)

At the other end of the spectrum, however, lie examples of extraordinarily persistent efforts by some lawyers on behalf of claimants, despite the fact that such extra attention could not earn them any additional fee, at least not lawfully. For example, after Williams L. Higgins's August, 1870, application for a pension bogged down for no apparent reason (he had filed based on a serious gunshot wound to the thigh, and had been examined by a medical board more than a year later, in September, 1871, but had heard nothing), his attorney, E. L. Campbell, wrote the Pension Office in January, 1872, to try to spur a decision. Campbell complained that, four months after the examination, the board had apparently not yet even reported its findings to the Pension Office, and went on to state that the pension "is especially important to this claimant. He is a young farmer and is to go to the Extreme West in March next - where land is cheap. If there is anything due him, he seriously needs it."

The government soon awarded Higgins the 1/2 disability rating ($4 per month) that the board had in fact recommended the previous September. (Higgins, however, remained in New Jersey for the rest of his life, passing away at Trenton in 1890, at age 54). Campbell also went to extra trouble to try to persuade the Pension Office to make the award retroactive to Higgins's date of discharge from the army, though he was not successful in this. (At the time, retroactive payments on an approved claim were made only as of the date of the *claim*, resulting in significant disparities in retroactive amounts received by pensioners with the same degree of disability, depending on the date the pensioner happened to file his claim; this would later be rectified under the "arrears" provisions of the Act of 1879, which permitted all claimants to apply for retroactive payments that would be calculated as of the date of their discharge.)

Initiating the Claim. Once a preliminary decision regarding legal representation had been made, the first step in the application process was completion of a document asserting the right to a pension award, and describing the disability. (In the first phase of the program, as mentioned, all claims were limited to those arising from wartime service.) In the earliest days of pension claim filing - the years during and immediately following the war - there were few readily available forms or "circulars" (advisory memoranda or copies of pertinent portions of pension legislation promulgated by the newly formed federal Pension Office) to guide claimants, and little standardization or uniformity in processing applications. As a result, many applications during this initial period were handwritten, and included everything from informal letters from applicants seeking a pension award, to highly formalized manuscript affidavits, or "depositions," drafted by attorneys, notaries public, or other civil authorities.

The 1863 application of John A. Kutter, for example, was submitted informally by letter, supported only by his own Certificate of Discharge for Disability, and another letter from his company commander, Lieutenant George C. Justice. (Kutter, a pre-war resident of Lambertville, was the first Company A man to apply for, and the first to receive, a Civil War

pension.) The certificate described Kutter's injury as a gunshot wound to the right index finger, incurred on May 3, 1863, at the Battle of Salem Church, causing "Anchylosis [stiffening] of joint and [loss of] use of the hand," and pronounced, with some degree of hyperbole, Kutter's "[t]otal disability for military service and civil occupation." Justice's letter added nothing to the description of Kutter's wound or resulting disability, but rather "certif[ied] on Honor...that he received his wound...[on] May 3rd 1863, while in the discharge of his duty as a good soldier." Nevertheless, with no medical examination other than the one done by the army doctor who discharged him, Kutter's application was promptly approved, for a "total" disability rating and an $8 per month award. (This 100% rating for the loss of two bones of one finger, the relative lack of supporting evidence, and the speed with which the award was processed, seem *astonishing* in comparison with what would later become fairly routine, and often onerous, requirements and delays.)

The early lack of protocol and uniformity in processing claims frequently resulted in extended exchanges of correspondence between claimants and pension officials, as each attempted to sort out exactly what was or should be required to pass judgment on the merits of a claim, or to determine the degree of disability to be compensated.

Within a decade or of the war however, procedures and printed forms had become standardized. At this point, a veteran's claim was typically initiated by the filing of a so-called "Original Invalid Declaration," a one-page printed form, with spaces to be filled in, and the entire document to be formally attested, by the claimant. Information usually included the claimant's current residence, Civil War unit, the circumstances of the war-related wound or other disabling condition and, if he had one, the claimant's designated attorney. The truth of the declaration was sworn to in the presence of a civil official authorized to administer oaths (such as a court clerk, Notary Public, or magistrate).

Often, the declaration was accompanied by one or more additional forms - supporting affidavits - prepared at the request of the claimant. They might include, for example, a "General Affidavit," "Neighbor's Affidavit," or "Physician's Affidavit."

The veteran's Declaration and any accompanying documents were aimed at fulfilling three essential requirements for approval of an award: (1) verifying the identity of the person making the claim; (2) establishing his military service during the Civil War; and (3) proving some degree of disability, defined as inability to perform "manual labor sufficient to earn a support" (and which, in the first phase, had to be related to wartime service). In later years, when age alone came to be defined as a qualifying "disability," proof of age supplanted proof of disability as the third essential element of the application.

In general, the claimant's statements had to be corroborated by the sworn statements of at least 2 witnesses who knew him personally, and who had "no interest in the matter" or "no interest in the prosecution of a claim for pension by said [claimant]." The stock phrases were meant to exclude a witness who might be paid a fee for making his or her statement, or who otherwise stood to gain in any way if the claim were ultimately approved. This more or less standard legal convention eliminated self-serving corroborative statements by, for example, the claimant's attorney, spouse, close relative, or anyone else who might be materially benefited by approval of the application (such as a creditor), and whose veracity, even under oath, might be influenced accordingly. Suspicion could even extend in this regard to a fellow veteran who, while perhaps having no *direct* interest in the claim of another veteran, might nevertheless be deemed to be biased in favor of *any* veteran's claim.

In Benjamin Wean's 1880 pension claim, for example, fellow Company A veteran, Isaac Danberry, then residing in Flemington, contributed a lengthy corroborating affidavit in 1883. The Pension Office evidently considered Danberry's detailed account, which backed up Wean's claim in every respect, to be dispositive of the case, but wanted first to ascertain Danberry's reputation for truthfulness in the local community. By letter, it asked the Flemington Post Master, William Hill, for an opinion on Danberry's "veracity." (Post masters were often sought out for this kind of evidence; besides being strategically situated at a hub of local community activity and gossip, they also owed their positions to federal appointment, and were probably thus regarded as owing at least some allegiance to the national

government.) Hill wrote back that Danberry's reputation "stands reasonably well in this community and I do not know any reason why his word should not be taken *except that he is an ex Soldier and they are sometimes prejudiced*." (Emphasis added. Wean's application was eventually approved in 1886, 6-1/2 after it had been filed!))

The case of Samuel L. Connett also illustrates this point. (Again, Connet was one of the 15th Regiment's original volunteers, though not one of Company A's. He started out as an officer in Company C and in April, 1863, was *transferred* to Company A to replace the departing Lieutenant Stout [who took over command of Company F]; he resigned from the army two months later, in June.) Connett applied for a service-connected disability pension in 1886, but had difficulty locating comrades who could corroborate the circumstances of his wartime illness and wound (he had moved to Chicago, which made things complicated). After considerable delay, in December, 1887, he obtained and forwarded to the Pension Office a crucial piece of evidence: the affidavit of a former New Jersey "neighbor" and long-time acquaintance, William Reynolds, detailing Reynolds's knowledge of Connet's health status both prior to the war ("in good health, never knew him to be sick") and after he returned ("in very feeble health...suffering from Chronic Diarrhoea and piles...[and] often confined to his bed"). Reynolds did not mention, however, that he was also a pensioned veteran (of another New Jersey regiment).

As with Danberry's corroborating affidavit in Wean's case, the Pension Office considered Reynolds's evidence to be dispositive, but before acting took the final precaution of requesting an opinion from the local post master on his reputation in the community (Mendham, New Jersey). The post master in this case, M. Robinson, wrote back to the government in February, 1888, stating, "Mr. Reynolds character for truth &c. is generally considered good - Altho' it is generally thought, here, that *he did some pretty hard screaming to get a pension for himself*." (Italics added. The innuendo of comradely partiality notwithstanding, Connet, whose medical board had already described him as a "'broken down' man," had his pension approved four months later.)

The first claim requirement, identity, was easily met by all Company A claimants. In only one instance was the identity of an alleged Company A claimant actually questioned by the Pension Office. In July, 1900, a "Frank Keller," age 65, who gave his address as "c/o King, 902 Broadway, Oakland, California," applied for a pension under the "New Law." Keller claimed wartime service with Company A, 15th New Jersey Regiment, and initially complained of disability due to "paralysis right hand and arm." Two years then passed with no action being taken on the application, and Keller finally submitted a more detailed list of woes in September, 1902 (he now claimed to be 66 years of age, although almost *2 years* had passed since he had claimed to be 65). New ailments now included chronic rheumatism, diarrhea, rectal disease, weak eyes, "catarrh," "senile debility", and "irritable heart." (Irritable heart, or "soldier's heart," was an term sometimes used in this to describe what today would be labeled as combat-related psychiatric illness, or PTSD; see Chapter 10). The Pension Office was apparently bestirred at this point to look into the claim, and was advised by the War Department that it had no record of anyone named Keller on the company's rolls.[325] Two months later, it issued a rejection on this basis, and the file was thereafter marked "abandoned." The claim had clearly been a complete fraud, the only known instance of such an occurrence among the company's numerous claims.

Proof of wartime service, the second crucial item of the initial claim process, was supplied in the first instance by the claimant's own statement, which typically mentioned the unit (or units) with which he had served, dates of service, and highest rank achieved (for most, "Private"). A minimum length of service of 90 days was required (unless death or a service-related disability discharge intervened); this requirement was easily met by all of the company's original 3-year men: none of them was discharged during the unit's first 90 days under arms (August 25 to November 23, 1862), and only one, Isaiah Harsel, expired during that period. (Harsel died of typhoid fever on October 28, 1862, while the unit was still in its first encampment at Tenallytown, Maryland, and was the 15th New Jersey's first fatality.[326]) No claims of original volunteers were rejected for insufficiently long service.

A claimant's service also had to have terminated in an honorable discharge. If the veteran deserted *and never returned to service*, he was ineligible to assert a claim. If he returned to duty after desertion, the lapse did not necessarily disqualify him but the period lost from duty was deducted from his "pensionable service" time (this only became important for 3-year Company A men during the latter phase of the pension program, when length of service was one of the criteria used to determine the amount of an award). An illustrative case is presented by the experience of Andrew C. Clawson with regard to this issue.

Clawson "enrolled" (contracted to join up) with the company in July, 1862, along with all of the other original, 3-year volunteers. Although surviving records contain no explanation for the matter, Clawson failed to muster in with them the following month at the appointed time, and did not depart for the fighting in 1862. (Clawson's story is related in detail in Chapter 1.) Instead, the records indicate that he did not join the company until more than a year later, in November, 1863. Clawson was badly wounded in May, 1864, during the Battle of Spotsylvania Courthouse and, after being taken prisoner, paroled, and hospitalized at a series of Union facilities, was eventually "furloughed" (given a leave of absence) for a month, in January of 1865. He was discharged later that year.

When Clawson first applied for a pension in 1874, the Surgeon General's records requested by the Pension Office for corroboration of the claim showed that Clawson had "deserted from furlough, February 7, 1865," and did not show up again until he "[w]as admitted to 6th A.C. Depot Field Hosp., City Point, Va, May 15, 1865, from field, with Chronic Diarrhea." This officially reported 3-month period of desertion, however, did not defeat his application (and no mention was made at this time of his previous period of desertion, at the beginning of his enlistment); he had returned to military jurisdiction, apparently of his own account, and had clearly served a total of more than 90 days. An award of $8 per month was approved in February, 1875.

Over the next two decades, Clawson, applied several times for an increased disability rating and award, and at some point in the early 1890s, the "desertion" issue once again

emerged. This time, his initial failure to muster in with the rest of his company in 1862 was deemed an additional period of "desertion," which must have raised the prospect of a reduced increase award (or outright ineligibility). Clawson engaged Attorney P.J. Lockwood, of Washington, D.C., to rectify the matter, and the latter filed an "Application for Removal of the Charge of Desertion" with the War Department. Clawson's pension file does not reflect the content of Lockwood's filing, but it was successful; by letter dated October 2, 1891 (in which the veteran's name was misspelled as "Clauson"), Lockwood was notified:

> ...[I]t has been determined by this Department that the charges of desertion of August 1862, against this man, and all records tending to show that he was in the military service of the United States and therefore amenable to the military rules and orders, prior to November 18, 1863, the date of his muster into service, are erroneous, and that a notation to that effect has been placed upon the official records.

This finally resolved (though it did not explain) the matter of Clawson's apparently authorized decision to defer joining the company for nearly fifteen months in 1862 and 1863.

It did not, however, resolve the recorded 1865 desertion "from furlough." Four years later in 1895, for reasons unknown, the Pension Office asked the War Department for another review of its records in the Clawson case. (By this date, record review and reporting functions in the War Department were no longer being performed by the Adjutant and Surgeon Generals' offices, but had been consolidated and transferred to a new Record and Pension Office.) In February, the War Department replied, reiterating the notation concerning Clawson's first period of alleged desertion, and now also noting that, with respect to Clawson's having been "reported deserted from furlough Feb 7/65...[t]his charge of desertion is removed." Apparently, on checking its records more carefully, the government had discovered a small, previously overlooked entry that had the effect of exonerating the soldier. Clawson, it seems, after departing on furlough on February 7, had actually reported back for duty at Alexandria, Virginia, on February 18, and then rejoined his unit at Petersburg on February 28. This was conclusively established for government purposes (at least for the moment), by the fact that on the last date "[h]e drew the following articles of clothing: Socks 1, Drawers 1."

But even this detailed confirmation of Clawson's reappearance did not lay the matter to rest. In 1913, more than a decade later, when Clawson applied for a higher pension rate under the Act of May 11, 1912 (he was now 75 years old), the government reviewer reduced the length of his pensionable service by 11 days (the period between his leaving on furlough and his return to duty at Alexandria), "on account of absence in desertion." And in 1918, when he turned 80 and applied for yet another increase (at new rates allowed by the Act of March 4, 1913), the reviewer deducted *21* days (the period between his leaving on furlough and his actual arrival at Company A!).

Thus was each federal functionary in turn able to justify the public charge entrusted to him (or her), and the government salary that accompanied it. Ultimately, however, no Company A men's claims were entirely rejected for having deserted, or for failure to satisfy the length-of-service requirement.

By far the greatest number of disputes, and government requests for further evidence, were prompted by the third claim requirement: proof of disabling condition (and during the first phase of the pension program, of its wartime origin). The first offer of proof was usually the claimant's own narrative, in his Original Declaration, of the circumstances of his wartime wound, disease, or other condition, and a general description of his resulting incapacity to perform manual labor. Often, this evidence was supported by additional documents submitted at or about the same time as the Declaration. These generally consisted of affidavits by Company A comrades who had witnessed the pertinent wartime events (if the claimant's condition had to be linked to a wartime occurrence), local physicians who had examined or treated the claimant after the war for the ailments described (or who could state that the claimant was in good health before the war), and/or neighbors familiar with the claimant's post-war condition and its effect on his ability to work.

Even wounds (or diseases) that seemed *clearly* to have originated during the war could present problems of proof. When Moses Housel applied for a pension in 1874, he claimed to have been shot in the thigh on May 8, 1864, at the Battle of Spotsylvania

Courthouse, and then to have been captured and confined to Andersonville Prison, where he contracted rheumatism. Paroled in December and immediately hospitalized at the Union General Hospital in Annapolis, Maryland, Housel was soon furloughed home, according to the Surgeon General's report, for "debilitas" (literally, "weakness," or a general state of exhaustion), where he was put under his family doctor's care for typhoid fever.

The government-appointed doctor who examined Housel in August, 1875, while not mentioning any evidence of chronic disease, did find that he suffered from considerable "lameness" as a result of the thigh wound, "which often interferes in the performance of manual labor," and recommended a 1/2 disability rating ($4).

The problem for Housel was that, because he had been left behind on the field and taken prisoner the day he was wounded, there were no Union witnesses and no military record of the event. Nor could he produce any corroboration, in the form of *military* medical records, for the ailments he claimed to have incurred at Andersonville or for his outbreak of typhoid fever while home on furlough. The Pension Office relied primarily in these matters on the minimal report of the Adjutant General's Office, which in Housel's case noted only that an "M.G. Hursell" of Company A, 15th New Jersey Regiment, had been captured on May 8, 1864, and paroled in November; the report found "[n]o evidence of confinement at Andersonville Ga. or treatment in any Rebel Hospital." As a result, after three years of waiting, the Pension Office took them astonishing step of formally *rejecting* Housel's entire claim, marking the file: "No record showing that claimant was wounded in the service. Inability to furnish necessary testimony."

Over the next three years, Housel scrambled to come up with corroborating witnesses, and finally produced 4 of them. Fellow Company A men, Benjamin Wean and Nahum Cregar, each swore out affidavits, Wean confirming that Housel had been wounded in the left thigh by a minié ball "while charging the rebel lines," and Cregar stating that he "was standing near by and saw him wounded," after which "[w]e fell back and he was captured."

Dr. John H. Smith, Housel's local physician, signed an affidavit describing his treatment of Housel during a particularly bad episode in 1875. By March of that year, according to Smith, Housel was "in an extremely sick condition," suffering from "Phthisis Pulmonalis [tuberculosis]." He was "greatly emaciated" and in "critical condition" before he began to improve after about a month of treatment. But Smith could not offer any opinion as to the origin of his patient's ailments. A second local physician, Edgar Hunt, while also unable to shed light on the service-origin of Housel's health conditions, nevertheless emphasized that the thigh wound "prevent[s] him from performing manual labor sufficient to provide adequate support for himself and family," that his injury "has never been treated," and "has not been aggravated or prolonged by intemperate or other bad habits, as he is a strictly temperate man."

In addition to these affidavits, there was now added to the file an original, 1865 letter written by Dr. Henry Field, the doctor who had treated Housel when he first returned home on furlough during the war. Dated February 13 of that year, Field's letter notified the military authorities that Housel was "at this time very ill of Typhoid Fever and is under my care," and requested "an extension of his furlough." (It is unclear how the Pension Office obtained the letter, or if Housel or his attorney even knew it existed, since it had been written years prior to Housel's application and sent directly by the doctor to Housel's commander. Perhaps the War Department came across it while reviewing Housel's service records, and passed it on to the Pension Office.)

In any case, the combination of new information was enough to convince the government to reverse its earlier rejection and approve Housel's application, which it finally did in June, 1880. He was awarded $4 a month. Though it had taken him 6 years, the delay in this case was not without a redeeming element. In the years Housel was struggling to gather convincing proof, Congress (in 1879) had enacted a new "arrears" provision in the pension law, making it possible for successful claimants to receive awards calculated from the date of their discharge from service, rather than the date of their application (as had

been the case for many years). Thus Housel was awarded his pension amount retroactive to his date of discharge in 1865, which would have come to about $720, a considerable sum (about $14,000 in today's currency).

After 1907, when age alone became a qualifying "disability" for pension purposes, some corroborating evidence of date of birth, to supplement the veteran's own sworn statement, became a requirement. Official government recording of births (as well as other "vital statistics" such as marriages and deaths), and the issuance of birth certificates, was not legally or uniformly required until a later period, and in no Company A case was a state document supplied to the Pension Office as evidence of birth date. While enlistment papers, and certain other military documents (such as pay vouchers and discharge certificates), did often list the soldier's *claimed age* at enlistment (not date of birth), such evidence was uncorroborated. It was not considered sufficiently reliable to establish age for pension application purposes, and in any event was only accurate to within a year. (A soldier truthfully reporting his age to be 22 on day of enlistment, for example, might have reached his 22nd birthday on the same day, or been one day short of his 23rd birthday.)

Accordingly, evidence of age was normally supplied by the affidavit of a parent (usually mother); a neighbor who could remember the birth, or a midwife or doctor who had attended it; a pastor or other church official with access to a baptismal record; or a person, usually a local official, who had examined a family bible in which the birth was recorded. (Problems establishing date of birth were often even more onerous in the case of veterans' widows seeking pension allowances on behalf of their minor children, since a child's eligibility normally expired at age sixteen; see Chapter 9. The fact that the widowed mother of the child was herself in the best position to recall precisely the date of birth made little difference. Corroboration by one more additional parties was routinely required.)

When John S. Green applied for an increased pension in 1914 (based on the age provisions of the Act of May 11, 1913), he supplied the Pension Office with the affidavit of "R.W. Dilts, JP" (Justice of the Peace), confirming that Dilts had personally inspected the

Green "family Bible," observed a handwritten entry showing the veteran's birth to be February 27, 1844 (making Green 70 in 1914), and that the entry "appeared to be genuine."

Former Lieutenant Lowe Emerson had moved to Florida by the time he applied, in 1912, for an age-based pension. Stating he did "not know what has become of the family bible," Lowe offered instead the following evidence, in an affidavit dated May, 1913 (the "affiant" is Lowe, speaking in the conventional third person):

> He says that in the 'Memoir and Genealogy of John Poor' by Alfred Poor, Genealogist, and printed...in 1881, a record is given of the Poor family, and that on Page 77 of this record the birth of affiant is registered as follows:
>
> "Emerson, Lowe, - B. August 14, 1837. * * * In the time of the Rebellion he was one of the foremost in organizing the Eleventh and Fifteenth Volunteer Regiments from the State of New Jersey, and went into the field in the capacity of Quartermaster."
>
> * * *
>
> Affiant further says he knows from family tradition, and from the fact that he is the youngest son in the family, that he is now of the age stated [75].

In 1917, Samuel Case, then residing at the Soldiers and Sailors Home at Kearny, New Jersey, applied for an age-based pension. He claimed to be 75 years old, and to have been born on July 1, 1842, but swore in an affidavit that there was no church or family record of his birth, that his father died when he was a child, and that he had not heard from his only sibling, a brother living "somewhere in Montana," for many years, After more than year of inaction, an apparently sympathetic pension official made an effort to help. He wrote to the federal Bureau of the Census, in February, 1919, describing what little he had been able to find out about Case's early family circumstances, and requested "a report from the records of your office." In less than a week, the bureau responded with a complete summary taken from its 1850 and 1860 census records. It had located Case's family, and the 1850 census had recorded Samuel's age at "8" as of August 1, 1850, bearing out Case's claimed birth date in the first 7 months of 1842. (The Census official had even located 15-year old Samuel, a decade later, living in the same Hunterdon County township [misspelled "Rariton"], but now in a different household headed by Henry and Rebecca Boss. Case's father's early death had probably occasioned the resettlement.)

Three other requirements were mandated by pension legislation, but seldom received anything other than *pro forma* attention. The first, mentioned routinely in earlier applications but gradually disappearing in later years, required evidence of a claimant's loyalty to the Union. It is hard to understand what greater proof of loyalty might be offered than the claimant's exposure, on his own government's behalf, to the risk of mortal combat, although a tortured case could perhaps be made that some claimants might nevertheless have done so only because conscripted, or did so with mental reservations about their fealty to the nation, and should therefore be disqualified from further assistance. Particularly in the case of the 15th New Jersey, an early, all-volunteer, three-year regiment with a remarkable combat record and comparatively low desertion rate, it would indeed be surprising to have come across any indication of "disloyal" sentiment among its survivors.[327] No questions appear to have been raised in connection with the loyalty requirement, in any Company A claim.

The second *pro forma* requirement, enduring at least as a matter of form well into late nineteenth century, required medical or other witnesses to affirm that the claimant's disability was "not due to vicious habits," by which was meant primarily a debilitating use of alcohol or drugs, or sexual promiscuity (at least if this "vice" led to a debilitating venereal disease). (Indications of alcohol and drug abuse among Company A men, and among Civil War veterans in general, are discussed in Chapter 10.) Although Company A records do make occasional reference to issues of drinking and, less frequently, to drug use, no claim appears to have been rejected on this ground. Express references to a claimant's sexual history are virtually non-existent, although occasionally the report of a medical examination includes a *pro forma* reference to the fact that no evidence of Syphilis was found.

The third requirement, emerging late in the Civil War pension period, simply required the claimant to affirm that he was not still serving in the military, or had not performed any post-war military service that would qualify him for benefits under subsequent legislation. Although one Company A volunteer (William Sloan) was

commissioned in the regular federal army after the war, he had retired from that service by the time his application was submitted and it was thus not a factor. (The Spanish-American War, which was the next United States military action to result in a federal pension program, did not begin until thirty-three years after the end of the Civil War, when the average Company A survivor would have been nearly 60 years old.[328] Needless to say, though many Company A survivors lived well into the twentieth century, further pensionable military service was not a factor in their claims experience.)

Government Response to the Filing of a Claim. When a claim was received by the Pension Office, it was assigned a claim number (preceded by the letter "I" - for "Invalid" - in the case of a veteran's claim). At this point, the office would request corroborating information from the War Department: the claimant's record of wartime service and discharge, from the office of the Adjutant General; and (if the claim required proof of wartime origin) the claimant's hospitalization and medical treatment record, from the office of the Surgeon General. The information was supplied in the form of printed "slips" returned to the Pension Office, filled in by hand with a summary of the individual's pertinent history, taken from regimental records on file in Washington, D.C. There were instances, however, of delays or confusion when War Department information sent to the Pension Office contained a different spelling of his name (or when information turned out to have been taken from the record of another veteran of similar or even identical name).

The veteran's submission of his Original Declaration, along with supporting documents, and the Pension Office's creation of a file, review of submitted materials, and comparison of those materials with information supplied by the War Department, concluded the initial phases of the application process. Once the veteran's submission satisfied all essential pension requirements *and* was born out by War Department records (or any inconsistencies were resolved), the reviewing pension official went on to the final phase: establishing the *degree* of disability, which in turn determined the *amount* of the award.

Determining Disability – the Medical Examination. Over many years of evolving pension legislation, criteria for determining degree of disability underwent several, and sometimes confusing, changes.

In some cases, determination of degree of disability was accomplished with no further action on the claimant's part. Particularly with respect to "Age" applications, where the award amount was based solely on age attained, no further information was needed.

In the vast majority of cases, however, the last phase of the pension application process entailed first an assessment of the claimant's current health and medical condition, and then conversion of that assessment into a numerical evaluation of his disability (total or fractional). To assess a claimant's medical condition, and to recommend degree of disability, the Pension Office utilized examinations by local physicians, whom it appointed and paid a fee for the purpose. In the early days of the program (or in less-densely-populated areas of the country,) the examinations were performed by individual doctors. Thereafter, examinations were conducted by regional boards of 3 doctors, who met regularly for the purpose. Claimants were advised by the Pension Office where and when to appear for examination, and were usually assigned to the nearest doctor or board available. No medical boards appear ever to have convened in Flemington, and most Company A veterans residing in the Flemington area were directed to boards meeting in Somerville, the county seat of neighboring Somerset County, about 14 miles from Flemington. Veterans residing in the southern portion of Hunterdon County were assigned to boards meeting in Lambertville or Trenton (in Mercer County); residents of central or western portions of the county, to boards in Easton, Pennsylvania; and those in the northern portions of Hunterdon, to boards in Washington (Warren County). Veterans relocating after the war to areas outside Hunterdon were assigned to medical boards in their respective regions.

Occasionally, a claimant failed to make a scheduled appointment, in which case he was inevitably issued a new one, usually after submitting a letter of excuse. If a claimant were too disabled or infirm to attend a board (which occurred more frequently as advanced

age took its toll), boards were authorized to conduct bedside examinations at the claimant's place of residence.

The examination itself was fairly complete, by the standards of the day, and resulted in the preparation and signing by the examining physicians of a one- or two-page report, usually referred to as a "Physician's [or "Surgeon's"] Certificate".[329] If additional space for text were required, a supplemental sheet would be added and, where appropriate, the printed, 4-view diagram of a male torso that accompanied the certificate would also marked up by the examiners. (The initial diagram showed the full male body from 4 perspectives: front and back view; and, with lower arms omitted, left and right side view.)

Over time, the printed examination form, including the diagram, was modified. For example, while the early form contained only one space for recording "pulse," later forms included 3 spaces, for recording the claimant's pulse while "sitting, standing, and after exercising." Later forms also contained an increasing amount of explanatory and advisory text printed in the margins. Such marginalia admonished examining doctors, for example, not to recommend an increased disability rating "...unless the present rating is unjustly low, or...the disability has really increased," and warned that their statutory fee ($2 as of July, 1882) would not be paid unless their "...examinations shall be thorough and searching, and the certificate contain a full description of the physical condition of the claimant at the time, which shall include all the physical and rational signs and a statement of all structural changes." The 4-view torso diagram underwent significant revision about 1878, the earlier Victorian-style male image (youthful, bushy-haired, slightly smiling, genitals covered by a single, large leaf) was replaced with a more clinical one (2 of the views become front and back skeleton diagrams; the 2 remaining views, also now front and back, depict a male of less determinate age, hairless, slightly scowling, genitals repositioned higher on the abdomen and covered by a sprig of small leaves).

By the 1920s, a third and more concise medical examination form began to appear. A fourth pulse rate entry is now suggested ("after two minutes' rest"), and spaces are provided

for recording Systolic and Diastolic blood pressure readings. Printed questions appear on the form, under various body "system" categories (e.g., "cardio-vascular system," "respiratory system,"' etc.), and the body diagram's 4 views have been reduced to 2: front and back view skeletons.

A comparison of the written reports of early and late examinations reveals a gradually increasing level of medical knowledge and diagnostic ability and specificity, in keeping with the significant advances in medical science, training, and professionalization achieved during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. (See Chapter 5.) A decade or so into the twentieth century, many reports were completed by typewriter, rather than by hand.

Once the medical board completed its examination, it forwarded its "Certificate" (report), with any recommended disability rating, to the pension office. At that point, a staff member would review the entire file and, in most cases, make a determination either to reject the claim (noting the reason on the review sheet), or to approve or "allow" it, setting forth on the review sheet the amount awarded, the date from which the award would be paid, and the basic condition for which the award had been granted. The claimant or his attorney would then be notified of the decision by letter, and a notation to that effect made on the pensioner's file jacket.

Changing the Initial Award. Initial approval of an application by the Pension Office did not usually mean the claimant's file would thereafter be closed or remain dormant. The overwhelming majority of pensioners, for as long as they continued to live, filed additional applications subsequent to their "Original Declaration," in an effort to obtain a higher award. The two most common grounds for filing a so-called "Increase Application" were: (1) significantly worsening, or new, health conditions that might result in a higher disability rating; and (2) new federal legislation, or Pension Office rules, permitting higher ratings or awards on previously determined claims, or creating new pensionable conditions.

The most dramatic example of the latter was, of course, the 1890 legislation permitting pension claims based on *any* disabling injury or illness, irrespective of wartime origin. In some cases, increase applications appear to have been made without any real change in the veteran's circumstances or in federal legislation, but simply in the hope - fostered perhaps by a new attorney or the encouragement of comrades - that a different government reviewer, or a different medical board, would look more sympathetically on the same facts.

An example of a Company A man who filed multiple increase applications over an extended period was Nahum Cregar, a Private from Glen Gardner. Cregar was shot through both legs on August 15, 1864, at Strasburg, Virginia, and made his initial application in 1870; it was approved three years later at a disability rating of 1/2 ($4). Over the next fifty-six years (Cregar died in 1929, at age 86), he made a total of 9 further increase applications. In 1875, his first subsequent filing, prepared by a new attorney, was approved with an increased rating of 3/4ths ($6). In 1879, under new legislation, he was granted arrears retroactively to his 1865 discharge date. In 1886, he asked for a further increase in his disability rating, using yet another attorney (Cralle), but was rejected. Employing Cralle again for 2 more applications in 1889 (filed in January and November), Cregar was this time successful, and his awards were raised, under a new rating schedule, first to $8 (8/18ths disability) and then to $10 (10/18ths).

In 1907, under the new provisions of the Act of February 6, 1907, Cregar filed his first "age" application, without using an attorney. He was soon approved for $12 per month, the rate for veterans who had attained age 62. Five years later, he submitted a another application under the terms of new age legislation (the Act of May 11, 1912), and his award was increased to $18 a month. (Over the next six years, Cregar's age award was automatically increased 3 more times, on the basis of his advancing age, and more generous pension legislation in 1914 and 1918; the monthly amounts grew to $24, $30 and, finally, $40).

Cregar made his last age application in January, 1926, at age 82, under the new terms of the Act of May 20. His application was approved the following month, and his award raised to $72 a month. His final application, made in August of the same year, sought an award of $90 a month, not for an increase in age but under the terms of yet another new piece of pension legislation, applicable to the most seriously disabled veterans. The Pension Office rejected the claim, stating simply that "Claimant is not totally helpless or blind," at least one of which conditions Cregar was required to show under the new law (the Act of July 23, 1926).

An approval, however, did not guarantee that a particular rating or award level would not be subsequently reconsidered and *lowered* by the government. John A. Kutter's total disability award of $8 per month was quickly granted in 1863, during the earliest and least formal days of the pension program (see above). His rating was unilaterally reviewed, however, less than two years later and, based on further medical examinations by government-appointed doctors, reduced to a 3/4ths rating, or $6 per month. Instances of unilateral pension reductions appear rare, however; only a few were discovered among the hundreds of initial and increased awards made to Company A men and their families.

Of course, outright fraud on the part of a claimant, if discovered, would lead not only to termination of the pension, but might well result in criminal prosecution as well. Although no instances of alleged fraud were discovered in connection with the claims of any Company A men, at least one women, Matilda Dayton, widow of James Dayton, did wind up as a criminal defendant in a pension fraud case (see Chapter 15).

<u>Unresolved Issues – the Special Examination.</u> Occasionally, an application presented one or more crucial questions of fact that the government believed should be addressed by more formal investigation, and the deposition of witnesses. (A deposition is a formal inquiry, in which witnesses are placed under oath and asked questions, and a record made of the testimony.) In this process, referred to as a "Special Examination," the Pension Office sent a formal written request to one or more of its regional "Examiners," setting forth the questions

to be investigated and asking that an inquiry commence. The Examiner, who had the power to subpoena witnesses (including the claimant), would then notify those whom he wished to depose of the time and place of examination, advising the claimant that he had a right to be present if he desired. (Claimant's attorneys were not invited, and there is no record of a lawyer attending any Special Examination involving Company A men or their dependents. Most attorneys would not have consented to attend in any case, under the limited fee structure allowed by statute. Most veterans could not have afforded to pay their attorney to attend, had the law permitted them to do so.)

At deposition, the Examiner posed oral questions to the witness, and wrote down the witness's answers (sometimes including the questions), more or less verbatim. When all pertinent witnesses had been interviewed, the Examiner wrote up a report for the Pension Office summarizing the testimony, giving his opinion as to the credibility of the witnesses and, in most cases, offering recommendations. Sometimes, two or more Examiners would interview witnesses in various parts of the country, in connection with one case. All of this information (examination requests, deposition transcripts, and reports) would become part of the applicant's file, and would be relied on by the government in reaching a final decision on the claim.

James Hoffman. One such Special Examination was conducted in connection with the pension claim of James Hoffman. Hoffman, a farmer from Oldwick, New Jersey, had been horribly wounded on May 3, 1863, at the Battle of Salem Church, Virginia. He was shot in the right, rear side of his neck by a ball that passed forward through his mouth, and emerged from his left cheek, carrying away a good deal of facial bone and teeth. (Hoffman never rejoined the company, and was transferred to a Veteran Reserve Corps unit for the balance of the war. These were holding units for men wounded badly enough to be deemed unfit for frontline duty, but not badly enough to be discharged outright, and were theoretically available for service in extreme emergency.) The findings of the army surgeon who examined Hoffman on discharge in 1865 reveal the tough-mindedness toward the

wounded that still prevailed at this early period. After matter-of-factly describing Hoffman's ghastly injuries, the surgeon concluded his report as follows:

> Rotary motion of head somewhat impaired. Complains of weakness of right arm and inability to perform labor requiring swinging motion of head, such as using a cradle [scythe with wooden frame to collect cut grain]. Disability 1/2 *and not positively permanent.*[330] (Italics added.)

Hoffman had no trouble qualifying for a disability pension when he first applied, in 1868 (he was rated at 1/2, in line with the Army's assessment, and awarded $4 per month). Over the next fifteen years, employing Attorney Rusling and, later, the Washington, D.C. firm of M.B. Stevens & Co., his applications for increased disability ratings and awards, based entirely on the neck and jaw wound, proceeded more or less routinely. In 1874, his rating was increased to 3/4ths ($6 per month); in 1880, it was raised to 10/18ths under a new rating system (resulting in an award of $10 per month); and in 1883, his increase application was rejected.

In 1886, however, using a third attorney (P.J. Lockwood, also of Washington, D.C.), Hoffman again applied for an increase, but now added service-based rheumatism as an additional disabling factor. This application was rejected, for Hoffman's failure to show a connection between the rheumatism and the gunshot wound, or any other aspect of wartime service. He applied again, in February, 1892, not only reiterating the rheumatism claim, but now adding a disabling hernia and "varicocele" (varicose testicle), alleged to have originated during wartime service (but not mentioned in any earlier application).

At Hoffman's next medical board, conducted in Trenton in November of the same year, the doctors indeed noted a right inguinal hernia, and a right testicle that was "3 x normal size". Without venturing an opinion as to the wartime origin of these conditions, they repeated previous recommendations of a rating of 10/18ths for the gunshot wound, but now added an additional rating of 4/18ths for "varicocele". Following this recommendation would have obliged the Pension Office not only to award Hoffman another $4 per month but also (since this would constitute a new, service-related condition) to award him approximately

twenty-six years of arrears, a lump sum of about $1,248 (about $25,000 in toady's currency). This was a great deal of money, and the government lingered over Hoffman's 1892 application. Finally, in November, 1895, it ordered a Special Examination, "for investigation relative to origin [of hernia and varicocele], there being no record and no medical evidence showing existence in service or at discharge."

The investigation was thorough, ranging over 4 jurisdictions in 3 states, ultimately involving the deposition of 6 veterans (in addition to Hoffman and his wife), and taking 10 months to complete. Special Examiner R. McMorris, stationed in Camden, New Jersey, opened the proceedings in claimant's home town on November 29, 1895, deposing Hoffman and his wife.

After some preliminary responses, the 59-year old Hoffman, gave the following testimony concerning his ailments:

> When working on the corduroy [log] roads near White Oak Church along in January or February 1863, I noticed a pain in the left groin, and I knew there was something wrong. I noticed an enlargement in the left testicle, as if some entrails had gone down in the bag. It was caused by carrying heavy timbers out of the woods on hand porters or sticks. It came on me with ma sharp pain, suddenly from a strain.
>
> No, I did not go to the Surgeon as I should have done,...because I did not think it was going to amount to anything. * * * I made a bandage, a wide piece of canvass or muslin and I would put that around the lower part of the stomach. I had a money belt too that I wore, and I would buckle that up tight...and it would support my stomach and that would relive the pressure below.
>
> I did not make it very public, it was a private affair and I did not think it necessary to tell everybody about it. ...I told [my tent mate, George D. Webb] about it, and he saw it when we went bathing. I don't know if any other comrades saw it....
>
> * * * ...[W]e were examined at Flemington at our enlistment. Our clothing was entirely removed and we were pronounced sound. I never had any trouble in the groin...prior to my enlistment. I worked on a farm from the time I was 9 years old up to I was 19 years....
>
> * * *
>
> [After the war] I never let on to anyone except my wife about the rupture. * * * When I made a claim for the wound, I did not claim for the rupture for I had no idea that a claim could be had for that. * * *
>
> Yes, I am a witness in George Webb's case.
>
> The rheumatism is the result of the wound. I did not have that in the army.
>
> * * *
>
> I did receive an injury about four or five years ago near here in Georgetown, N.J. I was run into accidentally by a double team and heavy farm wagon, and I was run over by the horses, they trampled me and bruised me in the left side above the hip near the lower rib. It happened at night.... I did not call a doctor. I used plasters and linaments.

I made my claim for the rupture before I met with that accident.

Hoffman's wife, Hannah, age 46, added during her own testimony that she "had noticed [the enlarged testicle] soon after our marriage but did not know what the trouble was," and that when, "within one or two years of our marriage," her husband finally spoke of it, "he told me that he got it in the service."

The tone of McMorris's follow-up report to the Pension Office was sympathetic, and he stated that Hoffman's local reputation "is said to be good." But he concluded that the claimant's ability to prove that the hernia had originated in the service was "doubtful," and recommended Webb be examined.

On December 31, this was accomplished. Webb was deposed in his hometown of Bristol, Pennsylvania, by D.H. Alexander, an examiner stationed in Philadelphia. Webb's testimony backed up that of Hoffman: he swore that, although he did "not know the origin of the rupture - how he incurred it - [he did] know positively that he was ruptured" in early 1863, while performing road work. "He wore some sort of a support. It was not a truss but a kind of band. It was a very crude arrangement and invented by himself."

The examiner at that point confronted Webb with an affidavit he had previously provided in the case, in 1889, in which Webb, who had been Hoffman's "Bunknest Companion... in the Convalescent Camp," had claimed:

> ...[I]n regards to James Hoffmans rupture I know *from personall knowledg* that he was ruptured while in the Army marching and working on CordaRoy roads...about the middle of January 1863, having seen the rupture myself.... (Italics added.)

Webb, of course, according to his (and Hoffman's) later testimony did not meet Hoffman until both "became acquainted in Convalescent Camp at Alexandria," and therefore could not have had personal knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the onset of the rupture. Webb recovered nicely, however, stating to the examiner, "Having heard read my former affidavit I desire to say that I worked on the Cordaroy roads and know the hardships

we underwint there and *have every reason to believe* that [Hoffman] was ruptured while so engaged...." (Italics added.)

Alexander believed Webb. In his January 2, 1896 report, he concluded that Hoffman's "claim appears to have merit," and recommended that a few of the claimant's original comrades from Company A be interviewed.

Over the next two months, a third examiner, C.E. Hayward, whose area of jurisdiction was headquartered at Trenton, tried diligently to contact at least 12 Company A men. He obtained depositions from 5 (John Parrish, Peter ten Broek, Theodore Stryker, Manuel Kline, and John Burns, all but one of whom - Burns - "add[ed] nothing to the case"); informally questioned 2 more (John Reading and Theodore Bellis, who "could give no information as to whether the claimant suffered from any disability in service"); and wrote unproductive letters to another 5, even though 3 of them resided "beyond the limits of my district" (Henry Johnson, Lewis Snyder, George Beavers, John Bulmer, and George Van Camp).

The testimony, however, of John Burns, then a 50-year old hotel keeper residing in Ringoes, New Jersey, was quite helpful to Hoffman's case. Explaining to the examiner that he had "never seen [Hoffman] since [the war], and supposed he was dead until you wrote to me about him," he added:

> He had good health at first, and did duty right along, until in the winter of 1862 & 1863. * * * ...I recollect that...prior to the Battle of Salem Heights, he was complaining of a rupture. I cannot recall exactly the time, or how he got it, but I remember the fact of his complaining about it perfectly.

This was enough for Hayward. He advised the Pension Office in his report of March 12, 1896, that Burns "stands well in his community," and that in any event he "could have had no communication with the claimant" regarding the matter. Like Alexander before him, he concluded that Hoffman's claim had merit, but recommended a few more depositions.

After some delay, the government authorized one additional examiner, Charles A. Hughes, based in Springfield, Illinois, to attempt to locate and question another Company A

man, William Barber, believed to be residing in Taylorville. After some digging, Hughes managed to find Barber (who "has removed from my territory"), but after having him answer and return a set of written questions, reported that Barber's reply "does not benefit the case, as he remembers nothing about the alleged rupture." Hughes also states that "[t]he claim appears meritorious," and recommended one further examination - of comrade John Collins, who was by then residing in Port Angeles, Washington!

At this point, the Pension Office drew the line on further examinations (and expense), and closed the investigation. Despite the new testimony generated in support of Hoffman's claim, and the favorable opinion of 3 of the 4 Special Examiners, the government, two months after receiving the last report, rejected Hoffman's increase application. (Hoffman tried again in 1906, and was again rejected. Finally, in 1907, he applied for an age pension based on the new Act of February 6, 1907, and was awarded an increase, to $12 per month.)

Other instances of Special Examinations involving Company A men included that of Samuel Case, in 1887, regarding a question, similar to Hoffman's, of the service origin of a large scrotal hernia allegedly suffered in a fall. (Special Examinations involving Company A widows or other family members are described in Part III.) Case claimed that on August 31, 1862 (Company A had only just reached Washington on this date), he was marching on a muddy road to their Tenallytown campsite in heavy rain, "heavily loaded with his Knap-Sack, gun and other accoutrements…[when he] slipped and fell hard upon his testicles. injuring [them] severely."

Backed up by the examiner's deposition of fellow veteran, John Reading (whom his local postmaster described as having a good reputation for truthfulness, although "quite <u>illiterate</u>"), Case's claim was allowed by the Pension Office later that year, raising his award from $12 to $16 per month.

<u>Delays and Decisions.</u> Delays in determining pension claims could be lengthy. While the Company A claim processed in the shortest time was determined in a mere two months

from the date of filing, the 2 longest each took about *six years*, and the average time to initial disposition (approval or rejection) was about twenty-seven months: a frustratingly long waiting period of more than two years. The glacial pace of pension processing must have taken a toll on needy, or on clearly eligible, applicants.

The maddening story of the delay experienced by Moses Housel, lasting six years, is related above. (Housel would only enjoy the pension he was finally awarded for another three years, at which point he died from undisclosed causes at the comparatively young age of 43.)

Equally poignant was the case of Andrew F. Henry, who was shot through the thigh and buttocks at Strasburg, Virginia, in August of 1864. He applied for a pension in 1882, which was relatively quickly approved (about 16 months later), with a 1/2 disability rating ($4 a month). In the 1890s, however, Henry's already fragile health began to deteriorate, and in 1895 his rating was increased to 3/4ths ($6). By the beginning of 1898, he was suffering from incontinence, paralysis from a stroke, and "dropsy" (swelling), and had become bed-ridden and virtually helpless. Taking advantage of new legislation designed to aid veterans like Henry who were "totally disabled" and in need of "regular" care, his attorney filed an application in August of that year, seeking the $72 statutory award permitted in such cases. Despite the evidence already on file with the Pennons Office in Henry's case, a medical examination at his home in Branchburg, New Jersey, was not arranged until July, 1899, nearly a year later. The physician quickly corroborated the 61-year-old veteran's condition and filed his certificate, describing Henry as "inclined to obesity - flesh loose and muscles flabby...his face dull & expressionless - temper irritable," and remarking that he had "never examined a more helpless case." The doctor concluded that "[i]t's not a question of recovery - it's impossible - but how soon he will die," and recommended the $72 rate.

Again, despite this uncontroverted evidence and Henry's evident need, the Pension Office did not determine the application until April, 1890, a delay of another nine months. But Henry never benefited from the award; he died the following month from a second

stroke. (His widow, at least, did eventually receive the 20 months of accrued benefits which Henry would have gotten had he survived: a comparatively princely sum of about $1,440, equivalent today to about $30,000)

Close of the Pension Era

The last Company A veteran to file a first-time claim for a pension was William W. Briggs, who filed an age application in March, 1907. Briggs was a farmer who had born in Albany, New York, and later moved to the Barley Sheaf area (near Flemington), where he joined up. Only a few months into his original term of enlistment in the late fall of 1862, he began to fall prey to a childhood condition (probably epilepsy). In January, 1863, he was given a disability discharge, the certificate stating that he had been rendered unfit for duty for 35 out of the previous 60 days, due to "Fits - having been subject to them from early life."

Briggs went on to marry Adeline Hammond in 1866, produce two daughters, and to continue to work much of his adult life as a farmer. He never claimed a service-connected (or any other) disability prior to his age application in 1907, which was made possible by the pension legislation enacted that year. By then, he was 62 years old, lived in the town of Highwood, New Jersey, and had "no present work".

His wife, Ida, died in 1914, while Briggs lived on until January, 1929, spending most of the last seven years of his life at a soldier's home in Bath, New York ("The State Camp for Veterans"). He was 84 years old at death, one of the oldest of the company's original volunteers and, except for one other man, the last to draw a Civil War pension.

That distinction went to a man who, by the early fall of the same year (1929), had suffered 3 debilitating strokes over the last five years, and been described by the last pension doctor to examine him as agitated, partially paralyzed, and extremely deteriorated ("muscular development flaccid; carriage poor; gait staggering; posture bent...[r]ight arm and right leg do not move as readily as left"). On September 25, 1929, aged 86 years, 3 months, and 24 days, Nahum Cregar passed away at his Glen Gardner home, in the company of his

76-year old wife, Larien. So far as the available records show, he was the last surviving member of Company A's original one hundred, the oldest of them when he died, and the last of them to benefit from his nation's promise "to care for him who shall have borne the battle."

* * *

Thus the men of Company A, having served the nation in wartime for three hard years, continued to engage it for quite different reasons for another three score. Three broad conclusions emerge from this aspect of their post-war lives and experience.

First, the detailed record of their claim-making illustrates how varied were the men's motives and probity in their pursuit of financial support – probably as varied as their motives for joining up in the first place, and for staying in the fight till the end.

Second, pension claimants' increasingly common use of lawyers to prosecute their applications, and the corresponding growth of a "pension claim bar" among contemporary legal specialties, constituted the first instance in American life of widespread resort to law and personal legal representation *by members of the laboring class*.

And third, the mere existence of a more or less universal pension system (for Union soldiers and their wives, and certain other "dependent" family members) profoundly affected the attitudes of many Americans toward their own national government, and their relationship to it. The long period of persistent claim-making, by upwards of a million Union men or their families, was a novel experience in the life of the relatively young republic. As Garry Wills has pointed out (with respect to the import of Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address"), the Civil War marked a fundamental turning point in the way Americans thought about the national polity they had created a mere ninety or so years earlier: in post-bellum life, the "United States" did indeed fulfill the promise of its motto: becoming one out of many - no longer a collection of sovereign entities taking the plural verb "are," but a new, collective unity commanding the singular "is".[331]

Many factors contributed to this sea-change in national consciousness, including, for Northerners, the very act of participating in a war "for perpetual Union." But at least part of

the reason for the change can be attributed to the post-war pension experience itself. The availability to so many veterans and their families of increasingly generous federal support, their increasing reliance – in many cases, outright dependence – on these "entitlements," and the long and often arduous efforts required to obtain and keep them, surely had the effect of binding citizens to their national government in ways that had simply not happened before. For the first time in the nation's short history, many Americans looked *primarily* to their nation, rather than to their state, community, church, or even family, for critical welfare assistance.

Skocpol is quite right to point to the Civil War pension program, and the strenuous pro-pension efforts of lobbyists, politicians, and others, as constituting some of the most significant "political" origins of American social policy. What has not been equally remarked, however, is the significance of the veterans' pervasive claim experience itself, as figuring among the *popular* or *cultural* origins of that policy. In a popular culture unfavorably disposed to government welfare or "redistributive" social policy in general, it is likely that Civil War pension awards became as liberal as they did *only* because they were allowed to soldiers or their families rather than to the "poor."[332]

But even more significant, the fact that such a large portion of U.S. citizens eventually *received* such awards, and became necessarily enmeshed in a *continuing dialog* with the federal government – often in the person of actual pension agents, or the Commissioner of Pensions himself - meant that citizens' attention was continually redirected in the post-war period to the *national* government, as steward of the common weal. (As mentioned above, at its peak the line item for federal pension awards exceeded any other federal budget item. Awards were eventually made to or on behalf of more than a million Union men or their immediate family members.) And this redirection of attention extended to a much larger portion of the population than veterans themselves: virtually everyone living in the North knew one or more Civil War pensioners. Not incidentally, this "federalization" of government welfare and political dialog must also have had the effect of

weakening affiliation and political identification with a citizen's home *state*. The Civil War would be the last major American conflict, after all, in which military units were raised and forwarded to federal command primarily by state authorities, identified by the marshalling state's name (e.g., the 15th *New Jersey* Volunteer Infantry Regiment), and replenished principally from the same state's own manpower resources. More than 2,000 infantry regiments were organized by the North during the war; only about 51 of these (2.5%) were federal (U.S.) regiments, each one composed of men from various states. (And only 19 of the 51 federal regiments, less than half, were composed of white men; the balance were so-called "colored' regiments.)[333]

In sum, the long, shared, pension claim-making experience of the men of Company A, like that of veterans of the Union Army in general, probably did more than any other single post-war factor to bind this cohort together and blur its sectional differences, cause its members to conceive of themselves as potent citizens who could – with the aid of attorneys - make the new national system conform to its will, and fasten its primary loyalty to the national government in Washington. To the rising walls of the house that had been built initially with only a roof, there was now added another sturdy course of brick.

CHAPTER 9

VETERANS AT LEISURE: THE GAR

> …[T]his is our day, to do honor to our dead, to perpetuate their memory and history; [you] are urged to discountenance and discourage all efforts on the part of ex-soldiers and the public, which tend towards making this a day for mere pleasure. The observance of the day should be invested with every circumstance that can impress upon our people the sacredness of the cause for which our comrades died, and teach the lesson anew to the rising generation.
>
> The Commander…hopes that every comrade who marched under the Old Banner will properly observe, and do nothing to mar, the solemnity of the day. Let us remember, as we on this occasion mingle our sympathies with the bereaved who have been left behind by those who have dropped out on the march, that on the next Memorial Day, one of the little flags that now marks our comrades' graves, may be placed on ours.
>
> Flemington GAR Post Commander Connet, to veteran members

As must appear from the kind of laboring and farming lives most Company A men and their families led (Chapters 6 and 7), precious little time was generally available for what today would be called leisure pursuits, and even less spare cash. As Costa has put it:

> Most social scientists define leisure as the time spent in activities unrelated to employment, housework, or maintenance of self. Leisure is thus defined purely in terms of free time…. When the activity is pleasurable, it is considered recreation. * * * Some activities…may require considerable outlays. The ability to engage in recreational activities depends, therefore, on the availability of both time and money.[334]

But despite shortages of both time and money, the survivors of Company A certainly did manage to indulge in some leisure activity, especially if the term "leisure" is given a broad construction. For purposes of this chapter, the term is deemed to include participation in a range of GAR events, most of which could well be construed as activities performed for "maintenance of self."

Such leisure pursuits are linked in this chapter to broader issues of the men's social, political, and cultural views - what might be termed their "interior landscape." The assumption is that it was largely and perhaps primarily through participation in such "elective" activities that these veterans developed and expressed their most deeply held beliefs about the *meaning* of the war they had fought, both for themselves personally and for

their community (and, by extension, their country), and that they worked out the ways in which they would *remember* and even relive the experience. As Roy Rosenzweig, an historian of working class leisure, has put it (responding to the question, "Why should labor historians - or indeed, any historians - concern themselves with the history of leisure?):

> The study of recreation helps to explain some of the distinctive features of American working class development.... * * * Only...when workers "are studied in a totality that includes their cultural backgrounds and social relations, as well as their institutional memberships and economic and political behavior" can we begin to address these issues adequately. Thus, this study of working-class recreational patterns in [one discrete community and period] attempts to contribute to a more comprehensive history of the American working class in its broadest social, economic, and political context. ...[I]t seeks not simply to describe...pastimes and amusements...but to shed light on...central questions [one of which is] what have been the central values, beliefs, and traditions of the American working class, and how have they shaped workers' views of themselves and the society at large?[335]

One must be careful, of course, not to claim too much for such a connection: while these veterans' "pastimes and amusements" may indeed shed light on much of their interior landscape, that landscape may or may not be representative of the much larger, post-war American cultural landscape as a whole. As Rosenzweig points out (quoting anthropologist Clifford Geertz), it would be "palpably foolish" to conclude that "the essence of national societies, civilizations, great religions, or whatever [can] be summed up and simplified on [a model of] so-called 'typical' small towns and villages.... What one finds in small towns and villages is (alas) small-town or village life."[336] But something useful can surely be discerned, even if it is only a poignant snapshot of the culture of a particular group, time, and place, to add to a larger historical album that may someday be built up through the work of others.

And once again, as with other aspects of this work, attempting to delve into the minds and private doings of Company A's veterans and their families presents daunting challenges. It is difficult enough to try to penetrate the specific, individual interior lives - the beliefs, prejudices, dreams - of *any* long-dead group of human beings. The difficulty is compounded when the group comprises men and women who, of necessity, must have devoted huge portions of their waking hours to manual labor and, in the words of the pension application "culture" of the day (see Chapter 8), simply "providing a support" for themselves

and their dependents. Neither the veterans of Company A nor their wives left any known *post-war* diaries or memoirs; many were illiterate, and most probably lacked any significant amount of formal schooling. Those of their post-war writings that do survive consist almost entirely of pension-related documents (application forms, supporting affidavits, letters) and these, for the most part, are understandably quite particular in scope.[337]

But there is *some* evidence available, some basis for attempting to recover a sense of the more prevalent post-war thoughts and attitudes of members of the group, and of the intellectual climate they lived in. The returning survivors of Company A were largely an uneducated or only modestly educated lot, at least in a formal sense, and a number of them never even learned to read or write. For the ones who remained (or remained for any significant period of time) in their home county of Hunterdon, what sort of leisure time activities were available, and which ones did they pursue?[338]

In general, there was much less "free" time available to nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century working-class Americans, less "disposable" income to spend on leisure pursuits, and a significantly different array of leisure activities, than is the case today. As Costa has noted, describing general trends in leisure since the late nineteenth century:

> The time available for recreational activities has increased dramatically. Not only have labor force participation rates for older men been decreasing since 1880, but, since the end of the nineteenth century, the average workweek has fallen [from about 65 or 70 to about 40 hours per week], and paid vacation, holidays, sick days, and personal leave have increased. * * * In the 1910s fewer than 30% of male wage-earners reported having a vacation, and that was not paid. * * *
>
> Around 1910, fifty-five hour workweeks were the norm for manufacturing workers, their wives worked even longer in nonmarket activities, and only the rich had both the time and the money to pursue pleasure[339]

As developed more fully in Chapter 7, as of 1890, nearly all Company A men and their families stood either among the estimated “poorer” American families (44% of the total family population), with annual income under $500 and average wealth of about $150, or among the families of the "middle classes," with annual income of $500 to $1,500 and average wealth of about $1,500. It was a period in which layoffs and unemployment were frequent, and a quarter or more of the work force was out of work some portion of the year. In 1900,

unskilled industrial workers in the North made about $360 per year, and unskilled farm workers about $260. For landowning farmers, a crisis in farm indebtedness resulted in many owners losing their farms; in 1880, a quarter of farm workers did not own the land they farmed.[340]

The scant evidence of early "recreational" expenditures suggests, as might be expected, that this household budget item accounted for less than 2% of industrial workers' family expenditures in 1888-90 (the earliest date for which any such information is available). (The figure has gradually risen to about 6% today.) It is likely, however, that nineteenth-century families of average means, including Company A veterans and their families, occupied much of their free time in no- or very low-cost pursuits, such as "visiting," church services, and prayer meetings, a factor recognized by researchers.[341]

Costa's evidence suggests that the largest single *category* of recreational spending among average Americans in the late nineteenth century was for "reading materials" (65.5% of the recreational budgets of surveyed industrial worker families in 1888-90). (That category has steadily fallen to about 20% today, when the largest category of recreational expense - about 37% - is for "home entertainment," primarily television, stereo systems, video games, cassette recorders, and other electronic devices.) She and others have also noted the preeminent place of music in nineteenth-century domestic and recreational life, including the purchase and playing of musical instruments, especially the piano; singing; and the purchase of sheet music.[342] (In fact, Wiley describes the central place of group singing in Civil War camp life[343], and it is clear that the Company A men who joined the Flemington-based chapter of the GAR also enjoyed group singing as a regular part of their frequent meetings; see below).

What emerges, then, from more general research on nineteenth-century recreation is an impression of Hunterdon County's war survivors having relatively limited amounts of time and money (and probably energy) to devote to leisure activities, especially as compared with today's population. The exceptions, at least with respect to the question of having

available free time, were probably farmers, farm hands, and other seasonally occupied workers, during non-productive periods of the year.

The Grand Army of the Republic

Beside church and perhaps (for farm families) the grange, the massive fraternal organization of Union veterans known as the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR) eventually became, for several Company A survivors as for many Union soldiers in general, the chief vehicle for post-war social, political, and intellectual expression. This played out in at least two critical ways for veterans. First, in countless GAR and related activities and functions, veterans *recreated* what for most had been the best and most affirming aspects of their military days. And second, veterans insisted, in a sense, that the memory and meaning of their wartime efforts be *shared by their larger communities*, and honored in the same way they themselves honored them. The first was a more private and fraternal project, the second a more public and communal one.

As its numbers grew, the organization's leadership structure and bureaucracy also expanded, both in size and complexity, in many ways coming to replicate the clearly delineated command structure of the Union Army all of its members had known. This of course was no accident. At the post level as well, the familiar language, traditions, and routines of service life were intentionally mimicked.

Over the years, as scholars of the GAR have remarked, the organization took on two primary functions. Particularly at the state and national levels, it became an articulate and powerful lobby group for veterans' causes. Primary among these were matters of obvious economic self-interest, such as pension liberalization and mandatory public sector hiring preferences. But other issues, such as those associated with notions of patriotism and loyalty, and with preservation of the nation's very memory of the war, emerged as well.

The GAR's other primary function, operating principally at the post or rank-and-file level, was related to the first, but is more difficult to describe. It was, in general, the great

project of providing veterans with a time and place to gather regularly, and to talk about and *endlessly recreate* some of the circumstances of their wartime experience. In the process, GAR members were able, in modern terms, both to contribute to the making of postwar culture in the United States, and to work on making their own postwar adjustment to wartime experiences, and to facilitate return to "normal" life - to heal, adapt, and give meaning to what they had done.

The GAR and Company A. Within the New Jersey "Department" of the national GAR alone, a total of 119 posts were eventually organized.[344] The first, in Newark, was established in October of 1866 and, following a ten-year lull (only 15 additional posts were added over the next decade), 57 new posts were "mustered in" during the following five-year period, from March, 1878 through December, 1882. By this time (1883), the state headquarters was located in the political stronghold of Jersey City, superintended by Department Commander George B. Fielder. The state organization "Roster" listed a total of 15 officers and staff – their titles including Senior and Junior Vice Commander, Chief Mustering Officer, Medical Director, Judge Advocate, Chaplain, Provost Marshall, and Ordinance Officer - as well as 12 official "Aides de Camp."

By 1900, New Jersey's GAR headquarters had moved to permanent offices in Camden, and the roster of state-level officers and staff had expanded to 17 (2 Color Bearers had been added), and the number of Aides de Camp had more than doubled to 27. 113 active posts were listed. (Some time between 1883 and 1900, the state's total number of posts - and probably membership as well - had peaked at 119.) New Jersey was active at this time in national GAR affairs. The roster shows several Jerseymen serving as national officers, including R.S. Dana, M.D., a member of Post 23 in Trenton, who had been appointed "Special Aide on Military and Patriotic Instruction in Public Schools."

The 1909-10 New Jersey Roster shows a further decline in active posts, from 113 to 107. (Half of the 6 newly-defunct posts, Nos. 98, 104, and 115, had been among the last to be established.) Headquarters was now situated at the "State House" (capitol building) in

Trenton. There were once again only 15 state-level officers and staff (which now included an official "Patriotic Instructor"), and the position of Aide de Camp had been eliminated. Formal committee work had been enlarged, however: there were now a Committee on Legislation, a Detail on Soldier's Home, Kearny, and a Detail on the Vineland [soldiers and sailors] Home, each with five appointed members. ("Detail" is a military term for a small group detached from a main body of soldiers, and assigned to a specific task; as used here it signified an *ad hoc* committee or task force.)

Four GAR posts were eventually instituted in Hunterdon County. The first 3 were all chartered within a three-year period during New Jersey's five-year stretch of rapid expansion, beginning in the late 1870s. Post 9 (the G.W. Taylor Post) was established at Junction (present-day Hampton), in October 1878; Post 20 (Major C.A. Angel Post), at Lambertville, in November 1878; and Post 48 (Lambert Boeman Post), at Flemington, in August 1880. (The fourth, Post 99 [General G.B. McClellan], was established at Frenchtown sometime after 1883 and before 1900.)

Little information has been located regarding the Junction and Frenchtown posts, and it is not known if any Company A veterans became members. (It is certainly possible, but very few of them are known to have settled after the war in the vicinity of these towns.[345]) The state roster for 1883 shows Junction with 46 members. Almost as little is known of the Lambertville post, except that the 1883 state roster shows it with 31 members (relatively low for that year, compared with other posts), and an 1879 post roster - the only one found - shows Abraham Trauger as a member. (Trauger was a lifelong resident of Lambertville. His story is narrated in Chapter 7.)

Flemington, as mentioned, had been the center of recruiting efforts for Company A, and many of its original volunteers returned to reside in or near the town after the war. Not surprisingly, Company A veterans were well-represented among the organizers of the post when it was established in 1880. On the night of August 25, 19 Flemington-area men gathered in town for formal institution of the post. The occasion was solemnly supervised by

officers from two existing posts: Charles A. Slack[346], Commander of Lamington's Post 20 ("Major C.A. Angel" Post), and George Winter, Commander, and George W. Drake, Adjutant, of Newark's Post 11 ("Lincoln" Post). (Winter and Drake had traveled more than 40 miles, almost certainly by train, to take part.) The 3 Company A men who showed up were all made officers that evening: Theodore Bellis became Officer of the Day; William Barber, Quartermaster; and James Mattison, Adjutant. The new post adopted the name "Post Lambert Boeman," and became Post 48 of the New Jersey Department. (Boeman, of course, had been Company A's original organizer and first captain, later killed while commanding the 10th New Jersey Regiment. Besides honoring Boeman's memory, the post's adoption of the name is another indication of the revered status of the company and regiment among the several units Hunterdon contributed to the war.) All but 2 of the charter members paid their initial dues for the year. (Dues were $2, a not insignificant sum; one of the other 2 charter members managed a partial payment of $1.) On average, the men were about 40 years old when they established the post.

By the end of the year, when a printed post roster was published, total membership had increased from 19 to 24, including one additional Company A man, John Yorks. The post grew rapidly. The state roster for 1883 shows membership doubling in three years, to 48, and meeting twice a month, on "every 1st and 3rd Wednesday". Within a few years (probably by the end of the decade), its roster had nearly quadrupled and stood at 85 members.[347] New members at this time included 3 additional Company A men: Samuel Case, John Green, and Benjamin Wolverton. Officers at the time included William Barber, who had risen to the position of Senior Vice Commander (indicating he was slated to become the post's leader the following year), and Theodore Bellis, who remained Officer of the Day. (The other 2 founding members, Mattison and Yorks, remained on the roster as well.)

In 1893, the post received a letter from William P. Haines, the New Jersey Department's Inspector, stating he was "very much pleased with the good report of your Post!" and congratulating it on "getting very close to the Century [100-member] mark."

Nevertheless, Post 48 membership most likely began to decline in the 1890s, as did GAR membership in general. (State rosters for 1900 and 1909-10 did not include chapter membership figures, and no post rosters have been located for this period.) The last known activity of the post - the annual Memorial Day observance - took place in May, 1918. By this time, the survivors of Company A were on average nearly 80 years old, although a remarkable number of them - at least 12 - were still living. (See Chapter 5.)

Based on the above, during a period that began in 1880, Company A had a maximum of at least 8 veterans who participated in the Flemington post (including Burns). Cross-checking these men against what is known of their reported residences in the same period indicates that 5 of them definitely lived in Flemington or in adjoining areas that were near enough to make regular meeting attendance feasible (Stanton, Raritan Township). One (Burns) appears to have lived further away, in Lebanon, an unhurried, 2-hour ride by horse (about 10 miles); and one (Green) in Lambertville, less than an hour's ride by train (about 11-1/2 miles). The 1880 residence of the eighth man (Wolverton) is not known, although by 1883, he was reportedly residing in Cokesbury, which, at about 14 or 15 miles from Flemington, would probably have been too far to travel to meetings regularly.

Adding Trauger (of the Lambertville post), a Hunterdon County GAR membership of at least 9 Company A veterans is thus relatively certain. Absent the rosters of the 2 other county posts, or any information as to posts beyond the county or state that other members of the company's far-flung veteran contingent may have joined, it is very probable there were more than 9.[348] Even that number, however, constitutes 39% - nearly two in five - of all 23 company men who returned to live in Hunterdon County after the war. (See Chapter 7.) This proportion is consistent with GAR membership among Union veterans in general, which Dearing and McConnell each put at "less than half of the eligible Union veterans," at its *highest*. (In 1890, its peak year, the GAR claimed about 428,000 members, drawn from an eligible Union veteran population of about 1 million.)[349]

McConnell also argues that, nationally, GAR enrollment became "increasingly unrepresentative of the American population at large," and that "the order [was] overwhelmingly white, predominantly native-born, and…largely middle class or lower middle class." All 9 of Company A's known GAR men were white, and 8 of them were native-born (Burns was born in Ireland). But while distinctions between middle and lower-middle class would be difficult to draw among the veterans of Company A, only one of the 9, Mattison, can be confidently assigned *any* version of middle-class status. (Mattison worked both before and after the war in clerical or commercial occupations, and was probably unusually well-educated for a member of the group.) The 8 others were primarily farmers or laborers, several becoming extremely unfit in old age - at least 2 of them rendered destitute - and none managing to accumulate any wealth to speak of. With respect to class, at least, the company's GAR members were atypical of their fraternal fellows in general, according to McConnell.[350]

For a "country post" in rural New Jersey, however, the Flemington post took an unusually active part in state-level GAR affairs. In both 1894 and 1908, for example, members of Post 48 were elected to the highest office in the GAR's state-level organization, Commander of the New Jersey Department. They were, respectively, John Shields and John Foran. (Little is known about Shields, other than that he had been active in the GAR since about 1868, long before the Flemington post was instituted, and had served as his previous post's commander in 1869.) Foran was born in Ireland and immigrated as a child to Massachusetts. He had served in the war as a member of the 1st Massachusetts Heavy Artillery, and was held prisoner at Andersonville. He had moved to Hunterdon County in 1893, at age 50, where he became extremely successful in the foundry business, and a highly respected member of the community.

This state-level representation was extraordinary; almost every other New Jersey Commander between 1868 and 1909 was elected from posts in large or midsized cities, such as Newark (7 commanders), Camden (6), Jersey City (4), Red Bank (3), Trenton (2), Orange

(2), Paterson (2), Plainfield (2), Hoboken (1), and Atlantic City (1). Larger cities predominated in all state-level appointments, committee work, delegates to the annual "National Encampment," and, undoubtedly, in GAR policy-setting in general. (By 1900, a total of 7 posts were based in Newark; 4 each in Camden and Jersey City; and 3 each in Trenton, Paterson, and Hoboken.) *None* of the other three Hunterdon posts contributed a state-level officer or committee member during this 41-year period of GAR life.

Flemington's post was busy internally as well. By 1900, it was meeting once a week (on Wednesday evenings) rather than only twice a month, and this schedule continued as of 1909-10. Only the Lambertville post maintained a similarly ambitious weekly meeting schedule during this decade; Frenchtown met twice a month, and Junction was down to only once a month.

To summarize, Company A's participation in GAR life was at least on a par with that of Union veterans as a whole, and in some respects it was exceptional. For the company men who joined in this "leisure time" activity, the affiliation was probably their single most significant social, political, intellectual, and even psychological (or therapeutic) postwar experience. For Company A members of the Flemington post, the experience was probably especially meaningful, both because the post was extraordinarily active compared with New Jersey's numerous other "country" posts, and because the men, at least by McConnell's analysis, were atypically poor or working-class, and thus their wearing of the GAR "badge" - and having the organization's support in difficulty - even more important.

Life in Post 48. What was local chapter experience - life in the Lambert Boeman Post - like? Over its 3 most active decades of operation (1880 to 1910), members conducted 4 primary kinds of activities: (1) holding elaborately scripted meetings at their post hall "Headquarters" in Flemington; (2) organizing the annual celebration of Memorial, or Decoration, Day, in Flemington and elsewhere in the county; (3) spearheading a local drive to erect a Civil War monument in the center of Flemington; and (4) participating in various

other memorializing and reunioning activities, over a larger region. Each of these activities contributed to the projects of memory and meaning mentioned above.

Post Meetings. The central feature of the Flemington GAR post was its regular membership meetings, called "encampments" or "muster nights," initially held twice a month on the 1st and 3rd Wednesday of the month, and later increased to every Wednesday. A strict and even somber protocol and sense of military formality appear to have characterized the conduct of these gatherings. The handwritten minutes of the post's organizational meeting on August 25, 1880, for example, records the following:

> Chief Mustering Officer [from another post,] after taking the names of recruits, proceeded to obligate the applicants [and] after the obligation was taken[,] the charge was delivered…, the secret work was then given [and, after the election of officers,] Chaplain Fisher [was] conducted to alter [sic], instructed[,] and conducted to his sta[tion]. P[ost] C[ommander] A. J. Connet presented himself for installation, was obligated and announced…. Charge given to officers. Charge given to members of the Post. [Connet] then took charge of the Post. *Resolved:* [that post to be] called Post Lambert Boeman #48.[351]

A myriad of official forms was made available to post officers for record-keeping and reporting. Elaborately detailed written instructions were circulated for conducting special sessions; for example, the carefully choreographed script for a meeting to induct new members required 6-1/2 pages, including such paragraphs as:

> O[fficer] of D[ay]. Advances to rear of Altar. Salutes C[ommander] and reports names of Candidates etc.
>
> Q[uarter] M[aster]. Rises and salutes, when C calls QM. After which questions and answers as to fees are given. C directs O. of D. to return to out-post, etc. O. of D. salutes and retires. * * *
>
> O[fficer of G[uard]. Meantime places two guards in front - two in rear - and guides [at] the right of recruits. C directs their admission [to hall].
>
> O. of D. Proceeds near enough to door to allow column to pass him in column left. Draws sword. Directs Sent[ry] (who stands at 'carry [arms]') to <u>open the door</u>. Orders the O. of G. to enter, etc.

At other meetings, speakers or exhibitors would sometimes be invited to make war-related presentations to the group. In April, 1884, for example, Joseph Karger, a college professor from Princeton (then known as the College of New Jersey), accepted the post's invitation to "meet for a few hours the comrades" of the post, and to deliver a lecture concerning actions in "the war regions of the South-West." He asked no "compensation for

[his] time and trouble…except the actual expenses of going and coming [by hired horse and driver]," and requested for the evening that the post obtain the loan of a certain 12' map of the region, "now in keeping of Mr. W. Hasbrouck, principal of the Normal and Model State School at Trenton" (now known, after Princeton's threat of litigation was rebuffed, as the College of New Jersey).

In all, these regular meetings served to replicate many of the most affirming and fondly remembered elements of the men's former army days. Conducted as they were, the gatherings permitted the men to experience themselves once again as a cohesive, noble, and disciplined band of brothers, forever set apart in some ways from their fellows, sharing a bond that was difficult to express to anyone who had not been there. The reliance on ritual and form, and on quasi-military rank and language, as stilted and even silly as they now may seem when stripped of context, reinforced these elements: they recreated the somehow satisfying experience of marching, drilling, and parading; the comforting recollections of their mutual support for one another; and their ennobling feelings of pride and self-worth. Today, in the treatment of troubled combat veterans, the intentional recreation of certain wartime patterns, and the encouragement of wartime memories, are standard components of post-war therapy. (See Chapter 10.) To some extent at least, the conduct of local GAR meetings may have prefigured this kind of treatment, employing memory and meaning to help bind the considerable emotional and psychic wounds many of these veterans must have suffered.

Memorial Day. General observance of Memorial - or Decoration - Day, traditionally May 30, was primarily a creature of the fledging national GAR. In 1868, its Commander in Chief, John A. Logan, instructed his membership to decorate the graves of fallen comrades each year on that date, and to arrange "such testimonial of respect as circumstances may permit." Logan conceived the idea from reports of southern women, as early as the spring of 1865, decorating the graves of Confederate soldiers with flowers; in fact, Logan's own wife had observed such activity while visiting battlefields in Virginia, and urged the project on

her husband. It caught on almost immediately, and rapidly spread through every region of the nation.

Accordingly, when Flemington's GAR post was organized in 1880, the local celebration of Memorial Day was already well established, but the post soon took over the leading role in its planning and execution. In May of the very next year, the post commander, Connet, issued the following "General Order," which was published in the local papers:

> This Post will observe Monday, the 30th of May, as Memorial Day.
>
> Comrades will assemble at the Post Room [at the time, the Flemington firehouse] at half past 10 a.m. The regulation GAR Badge, Cap & Buttons, will be worn. * * *
>
> All honorably discharged Soldiers & Sailors in this vicinity are cordially invited to join in these memorial ceremonies. The line will be formed at the Post Rooms…at half past one p.m. * * *
>
> The citizens generally are requested to display the National Ensign on that day and are invited to cooperate with the Committee of Arrangements in locating the graves and in furnishing flowers and garlands that we may suitably commemorate the services and perpetuate the memories of our late comrades in arms, who in the hour of our country's dire necessity, not only offered, but sacrificed their health and lives in order that a "Government of, by, & for the People" should not be destroyed.
>
> The memorial services will be held at 2 p.m. on the grounds in front of the Presbyterian Church, where appropriate addresses will be made. * * *
>
> Immediately after the services are over the graves will be decorated in the following order. First, those in the Presbyterian Yard. The procession will then move to the Baptist Cemetery, after which a detail will be made to visit the graves in the Prospect Hill & Catholic Cemeteries, and if time permits, a detail will be made to decorate the graves of comrades in the vicinity of Ringoes and Reaville.
>
> The Dept Commander…desires to impress upon the comrades the fact that this is our day, to do honor to our dead, to perpetuate their memory and history; whilst it has been made by legal enactment a holiday in this state, they are urged to discountenance and discourage all efforts on the part of ex-soldiers and the public, which tend towards making this a day for mere pleasure. The observance of the day should be invested with every circumstance that can impress upon our people the sacredness of the cause for which our comrades died, and teach the lesson anew to the rising generation.
>
> The Commander…hopes that every comrade who marched under the Old Banner will properly observe, and do nothing to mar, the solemnity of the day. Let us remember, as we on this occasion mingle our sympathies with the bereaved who have been left behind by those who have dropped out on the march, that on the next Memorial Day, one of the little flags that now marks our comrades' graves, may be placed on ours.

In subsequent years, the post promulgated very similar "orders" in mid-May, and continued, it seems, to be centrally responsible for the day's observances. After its initial experience in 1881, details of veterans to decorate graves in other towns were dispatched

early in the day, it apparently having proven too cumbersome to try to reach these outlying locations after concluding services in Flemington itself. By 1887, such details were being sent to at least 7 other sites throughout the eastern portion of the county.

Also beginning about that year, all post members were ordered to appear in full uniform at 7 p.m. on Memorial Day Eve (May 29) for church services. (One local church was selected each year, on a rotating basis). This additional observance requirement was apparently not met with universal approval among the members. The following year, the post "unanimously resolved" to dispense with attending an extra church service on the eve of Memorial Day, but rather to show up at a regularly scheduled church service on the preceding Sunday, which many of them would be doing anyway, except that they would now appear in one body at a selected church, and in uniform.

But even this did not work well indefinitely. By 1898, the post commander was publicly noting "with regret…the neglect of many members of the Post…to perform this essential part of our Memorial Day services," admonishing them to attend church service "in sufficient numbers to reflect credit upon themselves and show due respect to the Pastor and congregation who have honored them with an invitation…." The same message was still being conveyed more than a decade later, in 1911, in the form of an admonishment that year from GAR's national headquarters that "especially enjoined" members to attend "this appropriate and essential feature of our Memorial services." Among the rank-and-file, the leadership's efforts to "Christianize" GAR activities clearly met with some resistance.

1918 is the last year for which a record exists indicating that Post 48 continued to supervise Memorial Day observances. Surviving Company A men would have attained an average age of about 76 (there is no record of any being involved at this late date). Significantly, that year's notice shows that GAR responsibilities were being handed off to the next generation, in the form of various Sons of Veterans posts or "camps" that had begun to spring up in Hunterdon as elsewhere, beginning in the late nineteenth century. (The

Flemington-based Sons of Veterans chapter, called the "John Foran Camp, No. 9," was chartered in 1914.) Post 48's somewhat melancholy notice in 1918, for example, stated:

> The Sons of Veterans [organizations] should receive every encouragement from the members of the Grand Army of the Republic. The work we are set to do will not be finished when our order ceases to exist. Our sons are our natural successors. The time will soon come to all, as it has here to many, when we will need the aid of our sons for the proper observance of Memorial Day.... * * * The shifting of the burden from the older to the younger shoulders should come so naturally and gradually as hardly to be noticed by either and yet the work be no less efficiently cared for.

In contrast to the private and fraternal functions served by the post meeting, these elaborate annual ceremonies served much more public and communal ends for participating veterans. On one hand, it was their opportunity to share their memories, and the meaning that the war had for them, with a much wider audience, the community that lay outside their small band. On the other hand, it was an effort to make sure that that wider community continued to *have* a memory of what the small band had done, and even to suggest to the community's members what the war should mean to them as well.

It is fascinating to note that not everyone - not all "Soldiers and Sailors," not even all comrades of Post 48 - were always on board with the official dogma, and we hear echoes of disengagement in the Memorial Day announcements. One senses that many showed up to experience that supposedly solemn day as a day of "mere pleasure," that a few old soldiers were not above "marring" the occasion with bouts of revelry and drunkenness, that a fair proportion of the post membership itself had a hard time getting up enough steam to suit up, don the caps and buttons and badges, and go to yet another church service. Memory - official memory at least - and certainly historical meaning, are always contested things, and even when not contested, may be just too hard to keep constantly in the foreground.

The Monument. In 1888, nearly eight years after its founding, the Lambert Boeman Post decided to embark on an ambitious project: generating sufficient community interest and money to erect a substantial Civil War monument in downtown Flemington. The members of the post adopted a resolution at one of their May meetings that year, committing themselves to "solicit subscriptions, take charge of raising funds, [select] a suitable site, and

erect a suitable monument on or near Main Street." They soon formed a committee of 7 members (including Theodore Bellis, a Company A veteran) to oversee the work.

The project was actively promoted during that year's Memorial Day festivities, in particular by the Rev. Dr. Mott, pastor of a local church who mentioned it in his keynote address that day. Community interest in the project grew rapidly. The following year, the post devised a plan for obtaining "subscriptions" for the proposal (pledges of money that did not have to be immediately paid), and began consideration of potential sites and monument designs. Within two more years, their efforts were rewarded with sufficient subscriptions to see the project through: about $3,600 (approximately $70,000 in today's currency). A site on Main Street at the north end of town had also been selected, and a design for the monument approved. Significantly, the post's female "auxiliary" (the local post of the Women's Relief Corps) had managed to raise a full third of the total funds required, and their efforts were widely acknowledged by post members and others.

The monument was formally dedicated on Memorial Day (May 30), 1892, four years after the post had embarked on the project. Like so many other monuments of the era, it featured a lone, standing Union soldier atop a granite block. Beneath him, the main inscription read: "Flemington's grateful tribute to the self sacrificing valor of her loyal sons who went to defend our country's flag. 1861-1865."

For veterans, the day was a heyday of sorts - a high-water mark. Company A's men, on average, were just short of 50 years old; graying and slowing down perhaps, but not yet decrepit or "broken down." At the national level, the GAR and other pro-soldier lobbies had recently prevailed upon the federal government to award pensions to *any* disabled veteran, whether or not his condition had arisen during military service. GAR membership was nearing its all-time peak.

By contemporary accounts, the dedication was a moving and even spiritually charged occasion. Rev. Dr. Mott, a promoter from the start, had been asked again to address the crowd, as were several other local pastors. According to one contemporary observer:

> …[Mott] beautifully alluded to the position of the sculptured figure which crowns the monument; it is a life-sized figure of a Union soldier at the position of rest; significant, as he said, of the rest which the veteran soldier, in common with the rest of the country, is now having, after the struggle is over; also in that he is facing South toward the point where the terrible strife stilled the pulse of so many loyal hearts, and with a quiet dignified mien surveying the scene, as though to make sure that no further outbreak should take place to re-enact those scenes of blood and death. Further the roads coming from the Northwest and Northeast in the rear of the figure converge until immediately in front of it they united, forming Main Street, running directly South, significant of the North East, West and South, now forming one peaceful happy country.

As the main orator of the day, a retired Union major, delivered his speech, the temporary bleachers that had been set up for the audience suddenly collapsed under the weight of the unexpectedly "immense throng [that] had gathered," but providentially, no one was injured. At the same time, a sudden "thunder storm began to gather black in the West, and threatened," but then, as if on cue, it "parted and passed around on each side of us, and the ceremony proceeded undisturbed." The entire scene seemed to proclaim, as one participant remarked, that "though storms and dangers may threaten, yet He who guides the thunder-bolts, will protect and preserve us, if we truly put our trust in him."

Another local pastor, J.C. Sunderlin, composed a poem for the occasion and read it to the audience, probably to conclude the dedication ceremony. The poem began with a Whitmanesque reference to the long-buried Union dead scattered throughout the nation, often in unmarked, unknown graves. It then reassured the living that "It matters not - their work is done; they gave/The best they had - *themselves*, so let them rest."[352] But lest the younger members of the audience forget - and by this time there would have been entire young families among the listeners who had no personal recollection of the war - Sunderlin, with the gleaming new monument directly behind him, ended his poem with a stirring admonition:

> But write in flaming words each gallant deed,
> And give them, although late, their well-earned meed.
> * * *
> Go search the record, too, old, Hunterdon,
> And have thy noble son's memorial framed.
> …'Tis done;
> In age enduring granite wrought
> The memory stands incarnate.

Bow thy head
Child of younger days, and hear the dead
Speak, though in silent voices, through the stone;
"The freedom thou dost boast is dearly bought;
Guard thou the priceless boon for which we bled,
And claim the blood-writ title deed thine own."

In a sense, Post 48's monument campaign was a culmination of the annual Memorial Day observances that the veterans had been leading for some time, and that a dwindling number would continue to lead for at least another quarter century. It must have been a supremely gratifying marker for the veterans who attended the dedication, or who would now so often pass by it on their way in or out of town. As Sunderlin had written it: "In age enduring granite…The memory stands incarnate." What more could a veteran ask?

But one also senses - again from Sunderlin's poem - that by 1892, more than a generation removed from the war, the memories of many members of the "immense throng" were in danger of focusing on other things, that the meaning of the war, at least as it was experienced by veterans, was fading, or changing. It is well established that in this post-reconstruction period of American life, the worsening plight of southern blacks had all but disappeared from the national discourse, and a huge effort was underway – by itself a quite understandable one - to dwell on the reconciliation of northern and southern white populations, on healing the nation's great regional wound. (This was echoed in the remarks attributed to Rev. Mott, about a nation now "at rest," its four regional corners "now forming one peaceful happy country.").

But more significant for the veterans was the degree to which Sunderlin felt it necessary to *admonish* the members of the newer generation present, the "child[ren] of younger days," to "bow thy head…and hear the dead." The message was that the next generation must now take up the "title deed" to their freedom, a deed that veterans so "dearly bought" for them with their own blood.[353]

How ironic that the great war, at least for the North, was not fought primarily for any white northerner's personal freedom: “the freedom thou dost boast.” That war goal could

only have been applied to southern blacks. But such a concept would not comfortably have resonated with the majority of veterans or others in attendance that day, and was certainly not contemplated by Sunderlin when he included the word in his poem.

Indeed, what the dedication ceremony illustrates, beyond the colossal effort at memorialization and meaning-making that it surely did represent, is how transitory human memory can be, and what large cultural and individual investments are needed to keep memory both alive and truthful.

Wider Memorializing and Reunioning. As members of the post grew older, they turned more frequently to the increasingly organized business of memorializing and reunioning. In addition to their own Flemington monument project, they participated through their *regimental* organization, the "15th New Jersey Volunteer Veterans Association," in supporting the appropriation of state funds for 2 other major monuments. The first was a 40-foot tall, granite "watchtower" monument, commemorating the entire 1st New Jersey Brigade (which comprised the 15th and 4 other New Jersey volunteer regiments; see Appendix C). It was dedicated on June 30, 1888, on the Gettysburg Battlefield, and small, individual markers were placed at the same time to denote the approximate location of the brigade's regiments on July 3, 1863. Chaplain Haines pronounced the invocation at the beginning of the formal dedication ceremony.[354]

The second, undoubtedly a more poignant and meaningful memorial for the men of Company A, was the state-funded monument erected in Virginia at the site of the "Bloody Angle" fighting at Spotsylvania Courthouse. This monument was commissioned exclusively for the 15th Regiment. Carved from a large upright block of granite in high-relief, the monument's figure represents a solitary Union soldier in uniform and forage cap, standing at ease and holding a musket resting on the ground while he looks away into the distance.

In addition to monuments and dedication ceremonies, the national and state GAR offices, as well as other local posts and the men's regimental association, organized occasional trips to battlefields, campgrounds, reunion-hosting towns and resorts, and other

destinations. (The trips were inevitably referred to as "encampments.") On September 21. 1905, Flemington, for example, hosted the 26th annual reunion of the 15th New Jersey's regimental organization (it is thus apparent that these annual events had been taking place since 1879). Frenchtown, the headquarters of GAR Post 99, hosted the regimental reunion on October 19, 1894.

The State GAR, working though local posts, organized annual state "encampments" (veteran reunions) for many years. Typical was the 1882 encampment at Sea Girt, a popular New Jersey shoreline resort town. It ran for 5 days in early September. (Company A's men would have been about 40 years old, on average.) A printed circular, sent to all New Jersey post commanders to advertise the event, stated:

> Entertainment will be provided, gratis, for yourself and three delegates. It is expected that every post in the Department of N.J. will be represented. Tent room will be provided for all of the G.A.R. Encampment to be conducted after the "Old Army" style, Reveille, Guard Mounting, Drill, Dress Parade, Tattoo, Music and Dancing, Refreshments and Amusements.

In 1907, the regimental association organized what may have been the group's last battlefield trip, in May. Surviving veterans who could make it (Company A men were now about 67 years old, on average, and the majority had died) rendezvoused with Confederate counterparts at the site of their sharp engagement at Fisher's Hill, Virginia. A photograph of the reunioning members survives, showing a total of 41 (unidentified) men from both armies, their blue GAR and gray Confederate Veterans uniforms mingled together in the 4 rows. (It is not known if any Company A men attended).

As mentioned, by 1910, 12 of the state's 119 posts had ceased to exist, and the number of posts and members declined rapidly thereafter. One of the last recorded actions of the Lambert Boeman Post dates from 1912, when its longtime commander, John Foran, passed away. The post addressed an emotional letter of condolence to his family. Post members by this time were in their early 70s, on average, and it is not improbable that the blow of losing their popular and highly successful commander marked the beginning of the post's decline as well.[355]

But even so, on the front of memory and meaning, the men had done extraordinarily well - perhaps as well as they had done in the war itself. For 30 or 40 years, they stayed together, at least many of them did, keeping their own memories alive. They disciplined and supported and loved one another and made a success of their small organization. Moreover, they kept the community's memory of their war vibrant as well - sometimes ponderously, even pompously - but alive, nevertheless. They left behind their mark, in "age enduring granite wrought." The monuments are all still there, and from time to time some modern student of history fans the flame of local memory or pride and gets the Flemington monument cleaned up, re-dedicated, re-considered; it is always viewed as a worthy project. The men of Company A would be well satisfied.

CHAPTER 10

DYSFUNCTION

> …I am unable to learn that there has been one single commitment for crime of a returned soldier who went into the U.S. service from this town.
>
> There have been a few arrests for drunkenness but the number has been surprisingly small, less I think than one percent, no more certainly and less I think than would have been the case had they remained at home.
>
> In regards to the general habits of the returned Soldiers it gives me pleasure to say, which I can with truth and candor, that they are certainly no worse than before the war, and, in many cases, an improvement is manifest, and in my opinion out of the same number of men, yes, of these same men themselves, there would have been as many or more dissipated, idle, and dissolute had there been no war.
>
> Colonel John W, Kimball, Commander
> 15th and 53rd Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry,
> December 25, 1865

> Your mission as medical officers of the GAR…is to utilize to the uttermost your knowledge and skill in the defense of the rights of your comrades living, and of the dependents of those who are dead.
>
> You should endeavor to familiarize yourselves with the pathological residua of war… - the silence of yourselves in this matter, and that of your professional brethren…is the most remarkable thing in the history of medicine.
>
> * * *
>
> [You should encourage] the enactment of…pension laws that will…make it possible to successfully prosecute claims for nervous disability (i.e. neurokinesis and resulting neuratrophy [nerve agitation and resulting atrophy])…and above all other things, for the heart disease which is now so alarmingly prevalent among the surviving soldiers of the late war. …[T[he law making power [must] remember that these disabilities are as a rule the outcome of the totality of hardships endured by their victims while in the service of the United States and in the line of duty….
>
> Dr, Horace P. Porter, Surgeon General, GAR
> December 28, 1889

The chapter will look first at what the contemporary post-war world thought and understood about Civil War veterans' "dysfunctional" behavior, and at how it may have related - or failed to relate - that behavior to veterans' wartime experiences. The chapter will then narrate specific instances of evident - or possible - dysfunction among surviving members of Company A, laying out the available evidence for treating them as psychological casualties. The chapter will conclude with thoughts about how such instances of dysfunction

may be explained or understood in the context of the war, based on modern psychiatric theory (and its challengers).

The chapter's working assumption is that at least one of the principal *causes* of the pervasive dysfunction suffered by Company A survivors was their wartime experience, and that this dysfunction was not a "construct," as the term is used by contemporary "culturalists." In particular, this study asserts that dysfunction was caused or precipitated, to use the language of modern, mainline psychiatry, by "traumatic event[s]…outside the range of usual human experience…[that would be] markedly distressful to almost anyone who experience[d] [them]," the "events" in this case being of course the men's participation in the trauma of Civil War combat.[356]

This is a significant assumption, and one that cannot, given the limitations of historical evidence, be proved or disproved. (In fact, such assumptions, even the *existence* of significant post-war psychological illness attributable to war's trauma, are contested today; see discussion below.)

The term "dysfunction" is not new, although its application to psychological or interpersonal processes is.[357] It has now passed into common usage. But none of Company A's veterans would likely have used or recognized the word. And indeed, that is part of the problem facing anyone attempting to look back into nineteenth-century American life and locate signs or symptoms of its presence.

This work adopts a broad definition of the term, as applied to the company's men returning from war: one that is neither precise nor clinical, but that conveys, hopefully, a general sense of significant breakdown - or complete failure - in the conduct of a veteran's usual daily activities, or in the maintenance of his primary relationships. The working definition includes circumstances or behavior (usually present in some combination) that substantially impeded customary social, domestic, and/or personal functioning, such as:

-assaultive behavior;

-inability to form or maintain intimate relationships (including neglect or abuse of spouse or child), and other significant domestic problems (separation, divorce, failure to support dependents);

-joblessness, or frequent job-changing;

-homelessness, or frequent change of residence;

-alcohol or drug abuse;

-impoverishment;

-theft or other criminal behavior;

-suicide or suspicious accidental death;

or, in general:

-any behavior characterized by peers as unusually strange, offensive,

or eccentric, or

-a medical condition described in such terms as "nervousness,"

"general debility," "sleeplessness," or "excitability," or a condition that simply seems to have no satisfactory medical explanation (e.g., “allergy” to sunlight coupled with fainting spells, or complete numbness of limbs and temporary inability to use them).

Many if not most of the above circumstances are today routinely understood, at least in part, in terms of social or psychological dysfunction, stemming from mental or emotional illness. This was not generally the case during the nineteenth century, when most would have understood the same actions as the product of serious defects of will, character, faith, or morality (see discussion of "Romantic Psychiatry," below), or of some physical or “organic” disturbance of the body. In 1838, one noted physician even suggested that causality proceeded in the opposite direction - behavioral outrages *caused* mental illness - at least in the case of domestic or family dysfunction:

> Domestic disturbances and quarrels have made more husbands, wives, and daughters nervous [mentally ill], than the sword has slain; and ought, on this ground, to be religiously guarded against.[358] [Sons were apparently immune!]

Similarly, excessive use of alcohol was commonly understood, not as product or symptom of mental or psychological distress, or as a complicated disease itself, but rather as one of the principal *causes* of mental illness.

> That the liquids which have an immediate influence on the organ of the brain, should produce disease in it, can create no surprise. * * * In fact, these liquids are the destructive agents which have caused mutinies in our navy, disobedience to orders in our army, have filled our prisons with all kinds of victims; our hospitals and mad-houses with every description of mental and bodily disease; our domestic circles with strife; our cellars and garrets with want and misery; and our streets with blasphemy and obscenity.
>
> Inebriation is temporary madness. If often repeated it may become permanent madness.[359]

What *were* the words and categories available to nineteenth-century medical practitioners, and the theories and explanations of mental illness that prevailed? The earliest theories of the period held that the "aetiology," or origin and cause, of mental illness took two principal forms: "moral" failure or deviance (sometimes claimed, in turn, to cause disease of the brain), and "morbid conditions of the blood."[360] (As with other areas of medicine in the early nineteenth century, virtually all significant work and writing on these theories was being done in Europe and not in the United States; see Chapter 5.)

The first theory explained "disease of the mind" primarily as a result of "intense emotions or passions, often repeated or long continued," which were not only thought to lead to actual "lesions of the brain," but could also, in severe cases, cause "many structural and functional diseases" of other body organs as well. The theory has been characterized as "Psychiatric Romanticism," which stressed "the idea of the individual as possessed of powers and the will to combat insanity". According to Vieda Skultans, an English historian of nineteenth-century psychology:

> We can translate the term "moral" [in this context] as a rough nineteenth-century equivalent of the term "psychological" which at the same time retains certain ethical implications. * * * Foremost among moral causes [of insanity] are lack of moderation and excesses of all kinds. * * * Habit, perseverance, the will, and character each constitute…a counteracting force.[361]

Interestingly, for purposes of recovering a nineteenth-century understanding of "traumatically induced" mental illness, is a case reported by William Willis Mosely, a noted

English physician. Surveying the contemporary literature on insanity, he wrote in 1838 of an instance described by a French asylum administrator:

> Two respectable brothers, out of three, were torn away as conscripts for the army during the French Revolution, and one being shot by the side of the other, the survivor instantly went mad; and when he was conducted home to the third brother, the excitement occasioned in his brain by this sight, and the tale of shooting, caused him to go mad also.

In the same vein, Mosely listed among "exciting" (precipitating) causes of insanity: "extreme hunger, continued for some days," "great fear," "blows on the head," "sudden death of persons in our presence," "horrors of a storm at sea," and "sight of a public execution." (*All* of these experiences were suffered by one or more company men.) Underlying all of them, according to this theory, was the victim's "moral" incapacity to withstand the event's assault upon his will or character, or its challenge to his faith.

The other principal explanatory theme, which achieved ascendancy over "moral" theory in the latter nineteenth century, was an offshoot of the classical notion that explained sickness in terms of disruption in the natural balance of the body's 4 primary fluids, or "humors" (blood, phlegm, black bile, and yellow bile). A disproportionate amount of any of these fluids in the body caused a corresponding malady: a state of mind and body that was, respectively, overly sanguine (passionate, overconfident, aggressive), phlegmatic (lazy or listless), melancholy (depressed or despondent), or choleric (bilious, irritable, angry). Insanity, under this theory, was attributed to a disproportion of the "circulating fluid" or humor: blood - or to defects of the "sanguiferous [circulatory] system" in general.

> …[I]nsanity does not *depend* on disease of the brain…[or] from morbid conditions of the nervous system.
>
> …[I]nsanity…results *manifestly*, at times, from a morbid condition of the blood, and…there is…*presumptive evidence* that insanity may *always depend* on a morbid condition of the circulating fluid.[362] [Emphasis in original.]

This theory underlay the common nineteenth-century medical practice of bleeding patients, it being thought that blood caused mental (and other health problems) either by "congestion" (too much blood collecting in a particular area of the body, in this case the head), or by the blood's being corrupted, by means that were not understood, thereby taking on a

"morbid quality" that affected health. "Congestion" of the head or brain was indeed a symptom sometimes mentioned in connection with postwar medical assessment of Civil War (and Company A) veterans' psychological conditions, such as chronic headache, head "catarrh," predisposition to faintness or "spells," and sleeplessness.

Passing from the theoretical framework of nineteenth-century notions of mental illness in general, to the era's specific ideas of the relationship between mental illness and the experience of *trauma*, 2 quite different and separately flowing analytical streams emerged. The first was based on medical observation and treatment of patients involved in serious railway accidents (a growing phenomenon at mid-nineteenth century). It advanced an organic or "somatic" explanation: the actual *physical impact* or shock of the traumatic accident produced supposed (but unobservable) physical injury to the nervous system. (This specific explanation for mental illness was consistent with the general "diseased brain" theory, mentioned above.) The theory, first elaborated by British Professor of Surgery, John Erichsen, in 1866, posited that certain troubling post-accident symptoms of railway accident victims were literally caused by the jarring physical shock of the accident, which resulted in "the nervous force [being] to a certain extent shaken out of the man," which in turn produced a general derangement of "the harmony of the great organs."

> On the receipt of a severe injury the sufferer becomes cold, faint, and trembling; the pulse is small and fluttering; there is a great mental depression and disquietude; the disturbed state of mind revealing itself in the countenance, and in the incoherence of speech and thought; the surface becomes covered by a cold sweat; there is nausea, perhaps vomiting, and relaxation of the sphincters….

In railway accidents, the trauma was thought to be experienced primarily in the spinal column, which was then subject to "softening and disorganization" of the nerve tissue of the cord, rupture of its membranes, and inflammation. As this occurred, “A revulsion of feeling takes place. [The victim] bursts into tears, becomes unusually talkative, and is excited. He cannot sleep, or if he does, he wakes up suddenly with a vague sense of alarm.”

Other symptoms included hypothesized (but never actually observed) spinal lesions, and observable pallor and anxiety, loss of memory and confusion, irritability, headache,

numbness; impaired vision, hearing, or sense of touch; and paralysis. The syndrome was commonly referred to as "railway spine" or "railway shock."[363]

The other dominant analytical explanation for trauma-induced symptoms was primarily psychological, and was most clearly articulated in the nineteenth century by the French asylum administrator, Jean-Martin Charcot, in 1889. He advanced the theory that cases of railway spine and similar conditions were brought about by purely *mental* processes. Specifically, a victim's sensation of intense fear or hysteria, such as would be experienced in a serious accident, effectively "hypnotized" him, suppressing or clouding his judgment and will, and rendering him highly susceptible to physical paralysis on being subsequently struck or injured, even if only slightly.[364] The idea of a trauma-induced mesmeric state, which in turn induced a condition of mental illness, sounds farfetched to modern ears, but the insightful germ of the theory was that such illness was caused by mental or psychological processes, rather than physical or mechanical ones. As such, the theory continued the nineteenth-century tradition of "moral" (or psychological) explanations of mental disease, and prefigured aspects of Freud's transformative work a few years later.[365]

There have been at least two explicit modern efforts to look back at Civil War veterans and discover evidence of post-traumatic illness and behavior: Historian Eric T. Dean's 1997 work, *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War*[366], and the National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation's more recent government project aimed at Civil War veterans, entitled "Early Indicators of Later Work Levels, Disease, and Death."[367]

Dean's primary source was asylum and other records of 291 Civil War veterans institutionalized in the Indiana Hospital for the Insane.

> Although retrospective clinical analysis of men long dead is not possible…[t]hese records reveal a range of behaviors and symptoms typical of the twentieth-century victim of PTSD, including elements of depression, anxiety, social numbing, reexperiencing, fear, dread of calamity, and cognitive disorders.
>
> * * *
>
> In many cases…the connection between military service and later mental

> problems is quite clear and undeniable, especially in three classes: cases with their origin in mental breakdown in the service itself, cases involving gunshot or shell wounds, and cases of disease incurred in the service that subsequently had psychological repercussions.[368]

Comparing the trauma and hardships suffered by Civil War combatants with those suffered by participants in the Viet Nam War, Dean devotes much of his book to documenting what he believes were instances of Civil War soldiers' experiencing what today would be diagnosed as serious, psychological, postwar adjustment problems, or "PTSD."[369] His analysis draws directly on medical and other records that describe the troubling behavior, and in many case statements, of his veteran population. He is thus able both to characterize these manifestations as psychiatrically problematic, and to make fairly clear connections between them and the veteran's wartime experience. In his concluding chapter, Dean states:

> …[T]his book has attempted to demonstrate…[that] although the absence of modern diagnostic categories and the presence of a different set of cultural ideas in the nineteenth century concerning disease and suffering make it difficult to quantify the exact incidence of post-traumatic stress disorders in the Civil War veteran population, such problems - frequently severe in magnitude - existed and do not appear to have been isolated.[370]

The recently-completed NIH/NSF study, which was summarized in the April 21, 2006, edition of the American Psychiatric Association's *Psychiatric News*, created a detailed health and medical database for about 15,000 veterans from 303 randomly selected Union companies (of a total of more than 20,000 companies), in order to assess the relationship between wartime trauma and postwar health problems. The 15,000 veterans were all members of the selected companies who survived until at least 1890 (when their average age was probably in the late 40s), and whose archived medical records were "complete." (As in the present work, medical records were taken from NARA's pension claim files.) The study determined *degree* of wartime trauma by using 3 variables: the soldier's age at enlistment; the percentage of his company that died, whether through combat or disease; and his POW experience. Soldiers 17 or under at enlistment, or from companies suffering a high number

of casualties, or who were at some point captured, were deemed most at risk for being "traumatized."

The study sought to determine whether a correlation could be shown between a soldier's exposure to wartime "traumatic events" (as defined above), and his subsequent suffering with cardiac, gastrointestinal, and/or “nervous” diseases during the postwar period. In other words, did a higher degree of trauma in Civil War service render a soldier more likely to be sick later in life, either physically or psychologically?

With some qualifications, the government study answered these questions with a clear "yes" - there *is* a correlation, and degree of trauma is a significant factor. Generally speaking, youthful soldiers, veterans from high-casualty units, and former POWs *all* had greater risk of suffering later on from some combination of ailments in the 3 disease categories, and youthful soldiers and former POWs both had greater risk for early death. But the study produced a significant anomaly: there seemed to be no correlation between any of the 3 high-risk-for-trauma statuses and later nervous disease *alone* (i.e., a nervous condition that was not combined with a cardiac or gastrointestinal ailment). (The study did find a correlation between postwar nervous disease alone, and being physically *wounded* in the war.) Some study commentators speculate this may be due to the blurred line that existed between neurological and psychological instances of "nervous disease" in the Civil War era; the fact that in both cases there was "no agreed-upon nomenclature and no precision in diagnosis"; and imprecision regarding the very terms used by nineteenth-century physicians' to diagnose ailments that would today be considered psychiatric in nature (such as "homesickness," "nostalgia," and "headache").

Discerning signs or symptoms of war-generated nervous disease among the survivors of Company A is a challenging task. Unlike Dean's subjects, none of the company's men was institutionalized until relatively old age (when several took up residence in one of the state's 2 soldiers and sailors homes), none was pronounced "insane," and with rare exception none was even examined or treated for any *explicit* psychological disorder (as mentioned, the

medical categories and vocabulary for doing so hardly existed). To the contrary, they continued for the most part to live and work in the communities to which they returned or later moved after the war, residing in their homes with their families and children. The evidence for their dysfunctional behavior or psychiatric conditions is thus, at best, circumstantial. But circumstantial evidence is sometimes persuasive, and the conclusions reached in the present work are entirely consistent with Dean's.

Surveying Company A's men according to the criteria used by the NIH/NSF study is less conclusive. But the specific experiences of several company men, as detailed below, are certainly *consistent* with the study's main conclusions. Of the company's 46 war survivors (out of 54) fro whom year of death is known, about 43 are known both to have lived at least until 1890, and to have left behind relatively complete medical records (virtually all in the form of pension-related health descriptions, as in the government study). These 43, then, comprise the subgroup of the company's veterans that is comparable to the 15,000 men of the larger study.

In summary, the 3 studies - Dean's, the NIH/NSF's, and the present work - attempt to answer related but different questions, at 3 vastly different scales or levels of observation, using somewhat different primary source material. One is macrocosmic and highly statistical (NIH/NSF); one is microcosmic and primarily narrative (present study); and the third is situated somewhere in between (Dean). The conclusions of each are thus not precisely comparable.

Dean attempted to answer the threshold question of whether Civil War veterans can be deemed to have suffered war-generated ailments that modern medicine (and popular perception) would understand as primarily psychiatric, such as PTSD. He looked at a limited veteran population (about 291 men), *all* members of which were already considered at the time to be mentally disturbed ("insane"), and concluded that many of the men's ailments were war-related, and would be diagnosed today as post-traumatic mental disease. (In his conclusion, Dean speculated that the Civil War - perhaps all wars - can also have an

invigorating or strengthening effect on combatants, although his study does not offer much evidence for this proposition.[371] It seems a curious thing to say, but should not be dismissed out of hand.[372] Veterans typically speak of their wartime experience as the "best" of their lives, though perhaps without attributing conventional meanings to the word "best." And the men of Company A, for all their manifest trauma, did manage, it seems, to outlive their non-combat peers.)

The NIH/NSF investigators more or less *assumed* the Civil War's traumatizing influence on combatants, and set out to answer the questions of whether and how the *degree* of trauma experienced by combatants may have *worsened* their postwar health outlook. The researchers purported, statistically at least, to survey by sample the entire 2-million-man field of Union soldiers (although its subject veteran population was limited to those who survived into middle age, and who filed pension claims, factors which actually reduce the field by more than half). The study concluded, as might be expected, that the worse the wartime trauma (as somewhat simplistically defined, for purposes of the study), the worse the postwar health picture, physically and psychologically.

The present study also assumes a degree of adverse influence stemming from wartime experience, but the assumption is based on considerable evidence of adverse life outcomes in various areas (health and wealth, for example). In this chapter, it attempts to answer the question of *whether* and *how*, for certain veterans, the experience may have caused or contributed to postwar episodes of "dysfunction," an intentionally broader (and vaguer) category than psychiatric illness or PTSD. The study's sample is limited to 50 or so veteran volunteers of one very-high-casualty company, but looks at them (and, where possible, their families) as closely and in as much detail as the historical record makes possible. It concludes that many - probably most - of this miniscule veteran population experienced some form of significant postwar dysfunction, as broadly defined, and that several suffered the kind of specifically *psychiatric* dysfunction that comprised a main focus of the other two works. (The latter class of dysfunction is the principal topic of the present

chapter. Other chapters focus on other sorts of dysfunction, such as domestic, workplace, physical health, and material problems.)

It should be noted at this point that all 3 studies either assume *ab initio*, or conclude, that PTSD is a useful diagnostic category and a "real" illness, or more accurately a *complex* of illnesses and behaviors (syndrome), with a somewhat timeless and universal pedigree in human society. This understanding is strongly challenged by some. Anthropologist Allan Young, for example, while not dealing directly with Civil War veterans, has advanced a thoughtful and quite different perspective on the generality and timelessness of PTSD, and its serviceability as a modern diagnostic tool. In 1995, Young published a thoroughgoing critique of the large, self-serving, and collaborative PTSD "industry" he believes has emerged since the Viet Nam War. (The collaborating parties, in Young's view, consist of "traumatized" Viet Nam Veterans, the psychiatrists who treat them, and the federal Bureau of Veterans Affairs functionaries who have built a therapeutic empire in the cause of administering to them. The mutually reinforcing and, according to Young, wrongheaded *mentalités* of these 3 groups form the "harmony of illusions" that provides his work with its provocative title.

Striking a blow for "culturalist" forces engaged in the culture wars, he states:

> I…argue that [the] generally accepted picture of PTSD, and the traumatic memory that underlies it, is mistaken. The disorder is not timeless, nor does it possess an intrinsic unity. Rather, it is glued together by the practices, technologies, and narratives with which it is diagnosed, studied, treated, and represented by the various interests, institutions, and moral arguments that mobilized these efforts and resources. …PTSD is a historical product.[373]

In deference to veterans, Young is careful not to discount "the reality" of this "glued together" historical construct, insofar as he concedes real veterans suffer real pain that happens to be "diagnosed or diagnosable as PTSD." Nor does he deny, in claiming there is nothing "timeless" about the malady, that veterans of past wars suffered real "unhappiness, despair, and disturbing recollections." His complaint, rather, is with what he describes as the nineteenth-century construct of hidden or suppressed "traumatic memory," which he says

underlies the idea of PTSD. The sense of his extended argument is that humans do not *have* such memories, but have been encouraged by modern physicians of the mind to believe they do, and to "recover" them in therapy. Such doctors claim that failure to do so causes debilitating problems (such as PTSD), which can only be addressed by expert treatment.

Young, unsurprisingly, has taken issue with the recent NIH/NSF study, observing that it is merely the latest chapter in "140 years" of "arguments" that began with the nation's "first laws covering military pensions in 1863."[374] He believes that the study's findings are not necessarily accurate, but are to be expected since, as in the post-Viet Nam period, they result "not just [from] the language of the [pension] applicant, but the expectations of the clinician and the kinds of questions being asked."

According to Young, "You find the doctor asking very precise questions and the patient silenced. One can assume that the diagnostic process was highly directed by the doctors, so both idioms of distress and the doctors guided the process."[375]

Young's work is a valuable summary of the history (he terms it "genealogy") of efforts to understand, explain, and treat the psychological effects of war, and a timely admonition to healthcare workers and policymakers that soldiers' claims of psychological trauma and "victimhood" can indeed be manipulated. (As remarked elsewhere, there is evidence in this study that some of the company's men did exactly that, attempting to manipulate physicians and pension officials in an effort to procure unmerited pensions or increased awards.) But Young's fundamental thesis is unclear as to the precise place where the "illusion" of "traumatic memory" (that is, with what he believes are its suspect psychiatric consequences) leaves off, and the "reality" of mere "disturbing recollection," as he puts it (with its admittedly *authentic* pain, unhappiness, and despair), begins. He offers no guideposts.

In any case, the veterans of Company A were never systematically exposed to the temptation of rationalizing their postwar misfortunes by reference to handy theories of war-generated mental trauma. So, while virtually all of them at one time or another probably blamed various debilitating ailments or unfortunate personal circumstances on the war, they

did not use words or psychological concepts that would be used today. Added, then, to the challenge of relying on circumstantial evidence to determine dysfunction is the challenge of attempting to recognize PTSD-like complaints in language, or in "idioms of distress," that are unfamiliar.

As Dean and others have pointed out (and as briefly summarized above), theories of mental illness in general, and of traumatically-induced mental problems in particular, were slow to develop in the nineteenth century. With regard to Civil War veterans, however, certain vague health conditions or descriptions appearing to stand in for war-induced mental problems did seep into the medical terminology of the day. Examples include heart conditions diagnosed as "irritable heart" or "soldier's heart"; neurological disorders such as "nervous affection," "nervousness," "neurokinesis," "neuratrophy," "neuralgia"; and serious anxiety, exhaustion, or depression described as "nostalgia," "melancholy," "debility (or "debilitas")," or "being a "broken" or "broken down" man. Among Company A veterans, there were also descriptions of ailments that could not be attributed to any physical cause, such as chronic or severe headache or "catarrh," sleeplessness, and heat prostration or severe allergy to sunlight, that may have served as the functional equivalent of mental illness.

Quite aside from such more or less traditionally-classified health conditions, Company A's survivors also suffered from a range of social, personal, or interpersonal problems that were not at the time deemed "medical" or medically treatable (or war-related), but that are commonly recognized in *today's* therapeutic community as indicators of postwar adjustment problems, or PTSD. One modern expert, for example, lists the following conditions or behaviors as potential symptoms of PTSD, many of which must have factored into the postwar lives of Company A veterans: depression, isolation, continual movement or residential relocation, inability to form or maintain intimate relationships, rage, alienation, avoidance of feelings, survival guilt, hypervigilance, anxiety or "startle" reaction, sleep disturbance, nightmares, and intrusive thoughts or flashbacks.[376] Other experts stress

partner- and family-related dysfunction as among the most common and important consequences of veterans' PTSD.[377]

Many modern writers have also noted the common association of PTSD with "self-medicating" or "self-anesthetizing" problems; i.e., alcohol and drug abuse or addiction.[378] Others have described PTSD's connection with such antisocial or problematic behavior as criminality, joblessness (or continual job changing), homelessness, suicide, and difficulty with authority.[379] Dean found elements of most of these among his institutionalized war veterans, and examples or traces of virtually all of them turn up among Company A's survivors.

What is the evidence for likely or possible instances of serious postwar dysfunction among the members of the company sample? How clear is it that whatever dysfunction did occur was significantly related to wartime trauma? These are difficult questions, and definitive answers are simply not possible. But a close look at the evidence is warranted, and a few tentative conclusions can be drawn. The following section narrates or refers to the stories of several veterans whose postwar lives suggest serious adjustment problems of one sort or another.

Company A's Troubled Veterans

Several Company A men exhibited one or more of the vaguely medical symptoms used by nineteenth-century doctors to describe what might today be labeled PTSD, or some less serious form of postwar adjustment problem.

William Dungan. William Dungan was ultimately judged to be suffering from "heat prostration," "sunstroke" (or increased susceptibility to same), "nasal catarrh," and general "nervous affection," all as a consequence of his wartime experiences and physical wounds. Dungan, a farm laborer, joined up with the company when he was 20 years old (he was one of the volunteers who had done a brief, 3-month stint earlier in the war with another New Jersey unit). At the Battle of Mary's Heights, near Fredericksburg, on May 3, 1863, he received a glancing gunshot wound to the left temple. The wound "caused the blood to flow

freely," according to the testimony of two comrades, and required dressing in the regimental field hospital, but was otherwise a minor wound as such things went. But Dungan's good fortune in dodging a much worse strike must have registered deeply with the young corporal: a half-inch to the right and his cranium would have been cleaved through.

Just over a year later, during the company's fateful assault on the "Bloody Angle" at Spotsylvania Courthouse, Dungan was struck again. This time the ball hit him hard on the left shoulder, knocking him to the ground, shearing off the top of his humerus (upper arm bone), and then traveling downward to lodge in his upper back, at the base of the scapula (shoulder blade). At the hospital, the surgeon probed for the bullet, and removed it from a point about 5" below the level of the entry wound. He was hospitalized for some time, but finally returned to duty with the company and was discharged with it in 1865.

Dungan was immediately pensioned following the war, for inability to use his left arm and shoulder. (It is remarkable that he was able to finish out his wartime enlistment.) The government's examining doctor, in December, 1866, found that the veteran's shoulder was "stiff and painful," the broken pieces of the humerus "not united," and that he "cannot do any work that requires him to raise the arm at right angles to his body or that subjects him to being jerked ab[ou]t, such as ploughing among stones, etc." (Nothing was said at the time about his head wound, nor was it mentioned during follow-up examinations in 1873, 1875, and 1877. Although Dungan had mentioned it in his original 1866 pension application, he did not press it at the time, and appears not to have brought it up during these early examinations.) As a result, he was never able to return fully to farming or other heavy work.

But something else bothered him after the war as well; starting about a decade after the war's close, he began to press the complaint that his head bothered him, and that he could not work for any length of time "in the hot sun" without suffering from faintness or heat prostration. Over that first postwar decade, either the head-wound-related problems grew worse, or Dungan and his medical and legal representatives grew more sophisticated in presenting them to the Pension Office as a basis for additional compensation. Probably both

things occurred, and the problems themselves most likely included a fair dose of "delayed" postwar psychological distress.

In applications beginning in 1878, Dungan's memory of pertinent wartime events concerning the head wound became much more specific. He recalled, for instance, that the ball "cut his head badly, causing it to bleed profusely, and injuring the bone," that it necessitated treatment by the field hospital steward "for 2 or 3 days," and that although the wound eventually healed and Dungan at first "thought little of it…, subsequently when on the march in the sun, [I] found it greatly affected [me], and [I] had to be excused from duty." The government medical examiner that year noted: "…[Dungan] was wounded on the left Parietal bone [forehead]. I find no scar. He says that when he is in the sun that he feels fainty [sic], and has to work indoors. I believe what he says, yet I do not rate it [as a disability]."

The postwar consequences of the head wound took on much greater importance in later applications and medical board appearances. In 1878, for example, Dungan swore in an affidavit (speaking in the conventional third person):

> …[A]fter his discharge it continued to hurt him when in the sun, and does so now very greatly in hot weather, and this disability has now much increased on him. …[I]n making application initially for pension, he did not allege this because he then hoped it would pass away with his years.

His treating physician, Dr. L.D. Tomkins, supported these assertions, stating Dungan "is unable to work in the sun [and] and has been prostrated by heat on account of [the head] wound."

A 3-doctor medical board in 1885 noted that Dungan now complained of chronic headache. By 1892, he had added new ailments to his general malaise, claiming now to have been suffering from rheumatism for five years, and from "nervous affection" (though he attributed both to the shoulder wound). In keeping with the "railway spine" psychological theory of the day, the board duly searched for actual "nerve lesions" to substantiate the latter

affliction, but found "no evidence of any." Dungan was now 50 years old, and had been out of the army for nearly 3 decades.

By 1897, Dungan was again focusing on his shoulder wound, and made no head-related complaint to the board that year. He had now taken up the less physically stressful occupation of harness-maker, but was still substantially disabled by arm and shoulder limitations. (In fact, it seems he never again raised any head-wound-related issue. There is no mention of any, nor even any reference to the wound itself, either in the pensioner's complaints or the formal doctors' examinations of 1897 and 1905.) In 1905, he turned 63 and was focusing on diseases of old age, such as "senile debility."

This raises the question of whether Dungan ever actually had authentic PTSD-like problems to begin with. The evidence is suggestive, but certainly not conclusive on this point. In Dean's list of "mental problems" asserted by Indiana Asylum inmates in their efforts to procure pensions, there are several that are similar or identical to those alleged by Dungan: "disease of the head," "affection of the head," "head trouble," "nervous prostration," "nervous affection" and "headache". (Many other inmates alleged "sunstroke," although Dean does not put this in the "mental disease" category.)[380]

If Dungan did suffer from postwar dysfunction, did it resolve itself, possibly as a result of his finding reliable indoor work and obtaining a more generous pension award? By all accounts, Dungan had been a robust, competent, and literate young man. He was a favorite (and prewar friend) of Company A Lieutenant, Manuel Kline; he immediately assumed a leadership role in the unit, earned promotion to Sergeant, and was deemed a "gallant and faithful soldier" by his fellows. After the war, he married, and married again after his first wife died (the record is silent as to whether he had any children). He did not change residences or jobs often, and except for a 3-month adventure in Chicago remained throughout his life in the Hunterdon/Somerset County region where he grew up. He lived a long life, and died at age 71 of prostate-related problems, probably cancer. In other words,

history reveals him as a man better equipped than most to weather the psychic storms of postwar life, and the details of his record suggest that over the long haul he did just that.

Indeed, Dungan's story raises the intriguing question of why some human beings seem more susceptible than others to PTSD or, posed differently, the question of which factors best explain - or predict - the onset of PTSD or other dysfunction in a particular individual. How likely is it that a person who does suffer with these conditions will recover? In a study of Viet Nam veterans published in 1985, two leading clinical observers of PTSD proposed a common-sense approach to these questions, most elements of which are applicable to virtually any deeply traumatic experience.[381] Essentially, the approach identifies 3 general explanatory or predictive factors: the psychological health of the soldier *before* the traumatic wartime experience; the character of the wartime experience itself; and the homecoming and social reintegration experience following combat. To understand the onset of PTSD in a particular individual, then, it is necessary to understand which of that individual's "premorbid [pre-PTSD] attributes are associated with pathological consequences [and which with] healthy growth and restabilization." How *predisposed* was the soldier, in other words, to come through a wartime experience psychologically intact, or psychologically damaged?

Next it is necessary to assess the severity of the particular "stressors" of the war in question, and the individual's particular reaction to them. For example, did the soldier's role involve him in direct combat? How long and how gruesome was the combat experience? How unpredictable or random were combat events (e.g., were they primarily planned assaults, or surprise ambushes)? What sort of mentality did the soldier develop in response to combat (e.g., resignation, bravado, anxiety, immobility)? According to the writers, the single-most significant combat stressor is "exposure to *injury and death*" (emphasis in original), including especially active killing and witnessing others being killed.

Finally, the circumstances of the soldier's return to home and community need to be understood. "…[W]hat is important [in this setting] in terms of predicting PTSD is the

relative degree of support from significant others and a meaningful community, the opportunity to talk freely about the traumatic experiences of the war, and the social and institutional mechanisms that facilitate a rapid return to normal psychosocial functioning."

In Dungan's case, indications are that he was a psychologically healthy young man before the war, befriended and trusted by his comrades. (He was physically imposing too, for the time, at just under 6' in height, and weighing about 175 pounds.) During the war he served well by all accounts, and did not come down with any of the usual camp diseases. He did participate, however, in virtually all of the company's worst episodes of combat killing and dying, lost numerous comrades, and was wounded and nearly killed himself on at least two occasions. The war itself was one of awful and grinding attrition, many combatants by the end adopting attitudes of resignation and fatalism, if not despair. But when Dungan at last came home, he landed in familiar territory, and stayed there. He created homes with two wives, and seems to have managed to get by with the income from his sporadic work, his pension and, most likely, the financial contributions of his spouses. He lived to become a grand Old Veteran in the community of his youth.

The predictive factors, in other words, cut both ways when applied to Dungan. Taken together with what is known of his health complaints over the postwar years, they argue for at least some degree of postwar psychological dysfunction. But they also point to a man determined and proud enough to survive the war, and very possibly by the end of his days to have recovered from its disturbing psychic consequences - or at least to have put them away, in a secure place.

William Clayton. Less is known about the postwar life of Company A "drummer boy" William Clayton. But he did share with Dungan an unexplained propensity to suffer from severe headaches and other head-related ailments.

Clayton may not have been an enviable character, even before developing his mysterious condition. He joined the company at about age 20, but instead of wielding a rifle fulltime he held himself out as a drum player, and was officially carried on the roster in the

enlisted rank of "Musician." He may have been seriously overweight; he was quite short, at about 5' 4-1/2", and by middle-age weighed 175 lbs. Almost nothing is known of his military career, except that by "Special Order No. 20," on January 14, 1864, he was summarily discharged with several other of the regiment's musicians, as of a result of his being found "incompetent" to perform his musical duties. He had served out less than half of his 3-year obligation, and the (very rare) on-the-spot discharge indicates he was also considered by the authorities to be of little use in the company's basic infantry role.

Clayton returned to his native Hunterdon County, married Lavina Rittenhouse in 1866, and then disappears from the historical record for the next 24 years. In 1890, at age 49, he filed his first pension application. It was based on 2 conditions: a badly protruding left inguinal hernia (which he claimed he had suffered initially in the service, in 1863), and "severe headaches" and "spells." The government found no record of the dubiously claimed service connection for the hernia, but granted a pension in any case because by then such connection was no longer required; Clayton was not rated for the head ailment.

He persisted, however, following up the next year with more details and supporting affidavits. His doctor, who had known him for 20 years, stated that Clayton "complains of headache which is more or less constant [and] is subject to attacks of cerebral congestion when he becomes unconscious." ("Congestion" here means the presence of an abnormal amount of fluid, usually blood.) Reverend Stephen Jones, a local minister stated:

> Said soldier has been suffering from almost constant head trouble. I was intimately acquainted with him for two years and six months, 1884 to 87, and much of that time, from his appearance, I should judge he was not fitted for work of any kind. I have known of his being unconscious, which I supposed was caused by what the Doctors term Cerebral Congestion of the brain.

Two neighbors added:

> …[He] complain[s] of rush of blood to the head. * * * [W]e have saw the soldier when he fell to the ground from these attacks and we was called as neighbors to assist in carrying him to his home and for several days after these attacks he was not able to attend to any business or do any manual labor - at times he was unconscious.

It is possible of course that these "attacks" were simply a series of mild strokes or "temporary ischemic accidents" (brief interruptions in blood flow), some of which were potent enough to render him unconscious, but which were not otherwise disabling. He died in 1902 at about age 60, of "locomotor ataxia" (inability to coordinate his walking movements), which seems an insufficient condition to bring about death, but which may also indicate a history of strokes and brain damage.

It is also quite possible, however, that these recurring episodes, which appear to have begun in Clayton's middle years, were a sign of delayed psychological reaction to wartime stress. Notwithstanding his musician status, he would have witnessed at close hand, and perhaps participated in, at least some of the company's bloody engagements that occurred during its first full year of campaigning (1863), including witnessing the aftermath of Antietam and the carnage at Gettysburg. He may well have been detailed as a battlefield litter-bearer, assigned to deliver water and retrieve the mangled bodies of the dead and wounded; or posted at one of the regiment's field dressing stations, where he would have seen and listened to some of the post-combat horrors associated with treatment of the wounded and dying. And too, of course, Clayton may have harbored significant but deep-seated "survivor guilt" over his weak-hearted contribution to the company's wartime business. He got out, physically unscathed, when the job was only half done, and the worst lay ahead.

Isaac Danberry. Isaac Danberry, one of the older men to join the company in 1862 (he was about 34), incurred a painful and disabling shell fragment wound to the knee at the Battle of Winchester, Virginia, in the fall of 1864. Contracting gangrene while hospitalized, he lost additional tissue from infection, and developed a large scar that would become increasingly painful over the years. Though he survived the war, he was never afterward able fully to resume his prewar occupation of cobbler, and suffered increasingly with pain and stiffness. (Danberry's postwar work and wealth history is related in Chapter 7; and the story of his health in Chapter 5.) He seems, perhaps understandably, to have become angry over his fate, and frustrated by what he regarded as the Pension Office's insufficient rating of

his disability. (He applied for an increased award a total of 7 times, and was rejected in 4 of them.) Neighbors described his discomfort and deteriorating condition, one of them recalling after he died that he had suffered a long time from heart disease (which was in fact reported as his cause of death), and experienced "shortness of breath [and was] very excitable". ("Excitable" was here used in its earlier, nineteenth-century sense - the sense in which it continues to be used today in medicine - meaning quick to respond to stimulus, and to be "irritable."[382])

While not much to go on in trying to demonstrate that Danberry was a victim of PTSD, he certainly experienced a degree of combat trauma, and exhibited the sort of postwar symptoms, that are consistent with such a diagnosis.

Albert Reading. Albert Reading suffered real and debilitating ailments during the war and, like Clayton, was discharged early. He also suffered serious physical and psychological adjustment problems afterward but, with respect to the latter, he may have managed, like Dungan, to surmount them and "recover," or at least to hold them at bay. Reading's story also poses the possibility that he was one of the seldom described cases of wartime "combat fatigue" or "combat neurosis," a combination of war-induced physical and psychological exhaustion severe enough to disable the soldier from continuing in a combat role.

Reading joined the company at the age of about 19, a single man and a farm worker. He was a robust 5' 9" or 5' 10" tall, and weighed about 165 pounds. He was immediately made a Corporal despite his relative youth, and must at first have been respected and trusted by the unit's cadre. His good health and leadership role did not last long, however.

In September, 1862, his first month at the front, he was hospitalized for five days with "Indigestion." In October, less than a month after his first sickness, he was hospitalized again with "Intermittent Fever" (probably typhoid), and had to be left behind at Harpers Ferry in November, as the rest of the company pursued the Rebel army southward into the Shenandoah Valley. The fever developed into a bout of "Pleuritis" before he was well enough

to rejoin the unit. A few weeks later, in mid-January, 1863, he was hospitalized a third time for general "Debility," a common Civil War term that seems to describe what might today be labeled exhaustion, or even "combat fatigue".

Reading's "Debility" now developed into "Rheumatism," and 2 months later, in late March, Reading was considered sick enough to be transferred out of the war theater. He ended up in Citizens Volunteer Hospital, in Philadelphia, where he remained for the next half year. Finally returning to duty with the company on October 21, 1863, he was sick again within 2 weeks, and was this time hospitalized in Alexandria, Virginia, with a diagnosis of "Neuralgia." (Neuralgia is a term for nerve pain, or more precisely, a kind of stabbing or throbbing pain distributed along the course of a nerve or nerve system.[383]) After a week, he was again returned to duty, on November 15. By this date, Reading had been hospitalized on 4 separate occasions and treated for 5 different ailments, most of them nonspecific or with no clear cause. During his first 15 months of wartime service, he had been in the hospital for about 10-1/2. The 4-1/2 months he did serve on duty with the company were spent mostly in winter quarters, with the notable exception of General Burnsides' abortive maneuvering against Fredericksburg, in December and January, 1862-3, for some of which Reading was present.

By the time he was discharged from hospital for the fourth time, active campaigning for 1863 was over and the company was going into winter quarters. Reading had by now become a liability, either through the ill fortune of having contracted a series of serious infectious diseases, or through a growing reluctance to face an enemy that had already taken the lives of many of his comrades. Most likely it was some combination of these factors, his depleted constitution taking an increasingly heavy toll on his will to go on.

In any case, Reading was again admitted to an army general hospital for "Debility," this time in Washington, in March, 1864. The medical staff there now assessed him as being permanently unfit for front line duty, and transferred him to the VRC on March 17. The reason given for the transfer, according to the Surgeon General's records, was "irritability of

heart and debility." (All of this occurred before the beginning of the year's fighting season and, fortunately for Reading, before the deadly Wilderness campaign that would engulf the company less than 2 months later.) When Reading subsequently reported for duty with the VRC at Cliffburn Barracks, in Washington, medical personnel there judged him incapable of performing even in that much reduced capacity, and sought an order from the War Department discharging him from service altogether. This was accomplished in late May or early June, 1864.

Reading lost no time applying for a pension. It appears he did so the day after his discharge, while still in Washington, using the VRC physician's discharge examination as the basis: that officer found that Reading was suffering from "Valvular disease of heart - developed since enlistment," and rated his disability at one-half. The diagnosis itself raises interesting questions. Why, for instance, had such significant heart disease not been mentioned or diagnosed during any of the soldier's 4 hospitalizations while he was with Company A (or at his original enlistment examination)? What exactly did the discharging doctor observe that led him in this direction? Was he using the phrase to describe what may have looked to him like a case of trauma-generated "nerves," which in this era was sometimes diagnosed as "irritable heart" or "soldier's heart" (or simply as undifferentiated "disease of heart")? (Reading had received a diagnosis of irritable heart a couple of months earlier; see above.) It is impossible of course to know the answers, but Reading's wartime medical record is certainly consistent with a primarily psychological explanation for his "unfitness." "Irritability of heart and debility" may well have been his era's diagnosis of "combat fatigue and general exhaustion."

After the war, Reading never resumed the hard work of farming. He returned to Stockton (southern Hunterdon County), a village on the Delaware River a few miles from the Raven Rock area where he had resided at enlistment. "Unable to do any labor," he "helped a little in a dry goods and groceries store kept by one Wesley Johnson," remaining there about there years. Reading also lived in the Johnson household during this period. He probably

met his future wife, Emeline S. Johnson, at this time, she most likely being the daughter or other close relative of his employer and landlord. (Emeline first married a man named Thompson [marriage date unknown], and she and Reading did not wed for another ten years, after she had become widowed or divorced. Emeline appears not to have had any children with Reading, at least none who survived into adulthood.)

He then moved to Rosemont, an area adjoining Raven Rock and Stockton, and worked for a while at another store before giving up trying to work at all for a 5-year stretch. "…[F]rom 1870 to 1875, [I] had no regular occupation…not being able to engage as a man that was able to perform steady duty to attend a store or otherwise." Then, in 1876, he moved across the Delaware to Doylestown, Pennsylvania, about 10 miles away, and somehow recovered his capacity for steady work, at least for a while. He was employed there for about five years "carr[ying] the U.S. Mail." He married Emeline during this period, in Doylestown; he was 32 years old, while her age is not known.

Curiously, throughout these first 15 or so postwar years (1865-1880), Reading made no apparent effort to follow through on the pension application he had "informally" submitted at discharge in 1864. (On the informal style of early applications, see Chapter 8.) He may have thought he had delayed too long in pressing the matter and was no longer eligible. Or he may have been suffering from survivor guilt, and have felt undeserving of a pension, especially if his wartime history of "debility" had in fact been due in appreciable measure to psychological factors and a reluctance to return to the fighting. In any case, he took up the pension matter anew in 1880, this time with the aid of a local attorney, a Mr. Murphy. (By this time, he and his wife had moved to Hatboro, another Pennsylvania town about 10 miles south of Doylestown, and he had again stopped working.) Supported by the affidavits of friends and relatives, Reading and his lawyer asserted that he continued to suffer from heart disease, manifested primarily by pain in the left side, overall weakness, and inability to do any work at all. His former employer, Wesley Johnson, for example,

described him as "a mere wreck of his former self," and a relation, Richard B. Reading, "considered him a physical wreck - not able to perform any kind of manual labor whatever."

But other sources tell a different story. In preparation for reactivating his pension claim, Reading arranged to be examined by a local surgeon, Dr. William Corson, of Norristown, Pennsylvania. At the conclusion of the examination, Corson made out an affidavit stating that in his opinion Reading was *not* "incapacitated for obtaining his subsistence by manual labor."

Corson continued: "The history of claimant's case by claimant would seem to indicate an abnormal condition of cardiac function, and yet his statement is not in my opinion sustained by a careful physical examination."

But it was even more troubling than that, from the government's perspective. Later on the day of the examination, and probably aware of the doctor's opinion, Reading wrote Corson a letter from Doylestown. He first answered a question Corson had evidently put to him at the time of the examination regarding the onset of the claimed heart disease. Then he penned this surprising closing:

> Do what you can for me and if I succeed in getting my pension which should be a full pension for at least 2 years after my discharge, I will give you a reasonable present.
>
> Very best - Albert J. Reading

To his credit, Corson was flummoxed by the attempted bribe, and enclosed Reading's letter with his medical report to the Commissioner of Pensions, sending his own (finely worded) letter as well:

> Sir
>
> You will perceive that this note was sent the day after the examination of claimant Reading. I execrate his weakness, with reference to the offer he makes, but will be well satisfied, if the Dept. should consider it necessary, to have him referred, to the end that full Justice may be done him, to another & it may be more reliable Tribunal.
>
> I am most respectfully,
> Wm Corson
> Ex[amining] Surg[eon]

The Pension Office, after delaying almost a year, did refer Reading to another tribunal, a full medical board, which convened in September, 1881. The board was clearly

guarded in its assessment of the veteran's claimed heart disease, but did find "hypertrophic irritable heart with feint bruit at apex". (This highly medicalized description is not nearly as definitive as it sounds. Essentially it meant that the doctors detected an enlarged "irritable" heart, and heard a feint abnormal sound at the top of the left ventricle, where it pulsates or "beats" against the chest wall.) The board's lukewarm recommendation was that it would rate the condition at 1/2, *if* the "disability originated as claimed [in the service]," leaving the truth of that matter to be determined by the government.

Perhaps unexpectedly in view of these events, the application was approved, at the recommended one-half disability rate ($4 per month). Moreover, thanks to new legislation, Reading also received "arrears" at the same rate, calculated from his discharge date in 1864. This brought him a lump sum payment of about $864 (about $17,000 today), a very substantial boon in the circumstances. It is not known whether Reading ever tried to make good on his promise of a "present" to Dr. Corson, but it seems unlikely.

Like some others, the veteran devoted much time in later years attempting to demonstrate worsening health circumstances, and to garner a larger pension award. (He was successful about half the time.) In this self-serving cause, he later alleged that his heart disease was brought about by contracting measles in the service (the Surgeon General had no record of it); and that he increasingly suffered from asthma and other bronchial ailments. It is interesting to note, however, that in most of the later medical board examinations that were prompted by his continuing attempts, the doctors remarked on how *good* he looked. In 1889, the Philadelphia board, for example, stated "the applicant [age 46, weight 175] appears in good health"; the Camden (New Jersey) board in 1892 found his "general appearance and muscular development good" [though by this time, at age 49, he weight had increased to 200 lbs.]"; and a Norristown board stated, in 1896, "We find a well nourished man in apparent fair health [age 53, weight still 200]."

Emeline died on November 12, 1889, and 19 months later to the day Reading married a second time, to a woman named Emma Mauer. He died in March, 1906, at about age 63,

from undisclosed causes. It is not known if Emma outlived him, but she did not file for a widow's pension.

What can be concluded from this about the likely state of Albert Reading's emotional and mental health, both during and after the war? Taking into consideration everything disclosed by the historical record, it is probable that he suffered from a severe case of aversion to combat, and that the psychological consequences of this condition contributed after the war to a long period of self-fulfilling deterioration and inability to work, and an exaggerated sense of entitlement.[384] If he could convince himself that he really was "sick," in ways acceptable to the culture and in terms recognizable by the medical practitioners of the time, then he could also convince himself that he had acted as manfully during the war as his physical health had allowed. The "wreck" of his body, and not of his character, had let him down; the testimony of friends and the award of a pension proved it.

This is not to say that Reading suffered from no actual physical diseases; he surely did, both before and after the war. But as in many such cases, his physiological ailments most likely served to exacerbate, and even to justify or rationalize, his psychological ones. In the end, no one can discern the inner workings of the human heart – especially, perhaps, an "irritable" one.

John Parrish. The company's other musician, John Parrish, had a much different wartime and postwar record than that of his fellow, William Clayton. Parrish had been a carpenter before the war, and was married and had 2 children by the time he enlisted, the second being born about 6 weeks after he had left New Jersey for the war. He played the flute, a musical skill that, unlike Clayton's drumming, could not have been faked or picked up quickly, had he wanted merely to guarantee himself a comparatively safe wartime career with the regimental band. And unlike Clayton, he was not later summarily discharged from the service for musical "incompetence."

In fact, Parrish stuck it out despite severe wartime illness, and was one of the few original Company A volunteers to be mustered out with the company at war's end in 1865. But he suffered dearly. According to his initial pension application in 1879:

> On the expedition called "Burnsides Mud March" in (or about) February (or January) of 1863, [I] was first taken sick with a diarrhea. On the return of the Regt. to camp…[I] was confined to [my] tent and the surgeon…said I had typhoid fever; grew worse and worse and was removed to Regimental, Division, and General Field Hospital; had a very severe case of said disease, which left [my] system shattered & debilitated….

This wartime disease and hospitalization history was corroborated by the Surgeon General's records. Manuel Kline, a Company A Sergeant, recalled the hardships of that early period in the unit's service, and Parrish's particular suffering:

> …[I] well remember John W. Parrish, who was a sound and well man, doing regular duty…until he became disabled….
>
> …[In 1863], at White Oak Church Va. he was taken with Typhoid Fever…. [T]he army…had gone into their old camp whilst the ground was covered with snow: it had been constant exposure in rain and snow and mud for some ten days, during which they scarcely saw a shot of dry ground: an unprecedented period of sickness followed, sometimes several men of the regiment being buried in a day: he…was treated in the Regimental Hosp for a time, and the removed away from the Regt. – When the Regt passed the Hosp. at "Potomac Creek" Va in the way to Gettysburg the latter part of June 1863, he was there & rejoined his company and remained with the Regt always afterward: but he was always complaining after he rejoined on account of his disability [and] was attached to the Drum Corps as a fifer & so served until discharge.

After discharge, Parrish initially returned to Hunterdon County, living with his young family first in Lambertville and then Rocktown, a small West Amwell village about 5 miles north of Lambertville. (He had married his wife, Mary Ellen Dayton, in 1858, when she was only about 16 years old; when Parrish came home from the war, she was about 23, and the couple's 2 sons were 5 and 2.) During this time, Frances Everitt, a neighbor and close friend of Parrish's wife, had occasion to observe the progress of the recently returned veteran and his family:

> …Parrish came home from the Army about the first of July, 1865…and [I] was at his house nearly every evening whilst they remained [in Lambertville]…. Parrish was sick all said period: part of the time he was confined to his room, and part of the time he was up and around, but not able to work…[and] was under treatment of a doctor; every time [I] went there the neighbors inquired of [me] "how is Mr. Parrish": everybody who lived near knew he was sick: he looked pale, weak, and feeble: the disease he complained of was Chronic Diarrhea and general prostration….
>
> …[H]e [then] moved to [Rocktown] in the country; a man was cutting down a

> woods and getting out "spokes" and "ties": he gave…Parrish some kind of supervision over the hands employed and the work done: he…sharpened saws, counted the "stuff" & such other work: being a carpenter he was a kind of "boss" over the hands: [but] sometimes he would not go to the woods at all, sometimes would not go until late of the day, or in the forenoon: his wife took some of the hands at work to board to help get along: and [I] went with her to help do her work. * * * …[S]he would often tell [me] that she had been "up and down with him all night" and then he could not get up to breakfast, and likely take a late breakfast and go to the woods sometime after: sometimes he would be very bad, and then he would get over it: [I] should judge that he did not work at anything more than one third of the time [and] when he did work it was light….
>
> …[I]t was the opinion of [myself] and others around him…that he had the Consumption:…sometimes they thought he would not live long: then he would get up and out again: this state of affairs continued for about two years until his father-in-law [with whom the family lived] died and the work in the woods was done: then he moved to Trenton….

Parrish and his family lived in Trenton for the next nine years. In the last four years (1872-1876), they resided in the Chambersburg district of the city, and befriended a neighbor named James Grinage (or Grenage). He later stated:

> …[I am[well acquainted with John W. Parrish…[who] lived about a hundred yards from [me]…[and I] met [him] socially nearly every day, being intimately associated in church matters; met at his house or [mine] nearly every night, socially or for prayer meetings or class meetings….
>
> …Parrish was disabled from work two thirds of the time during said four years - without any doubt; for the first two years or more…he was employed (when he worked) as a Carpenter on the R.R. - he staid home from his work a good deal on account of sickness…[I] often saw him when he came home from work, so weak and debilitated that he could scarcely walk home; he looked badly always and had a considerable cough; he raised blood sometimes; from these and his complexion and his complaining of his breast (frequently) [I] believed at the time that he had lung disease; he stopped work on the R.R. because he could not stand it; he than undertook to keep a small grocery store; it was a very small affair; he could attend to that better in his weak condition, but he did not succeed well at it….

Toward the end of this period of residence in the state capital, he and his wife had their third child, a daughter, born in August of 1875; Mary Ellen was now about 33 years old, and their 2 sons were already adolescents. Perhaps prompted by the new family responsibility, Parrish, the following year, decide on another move, and "managed some way to get to his friends out West," according to Everitt. He was now about 44 years old.

The family relocated to the small village of Vermontville, in the south central part of lower Michigan, about 25 miles southwest of Lansing. (An early example of a "planned" colony, Vermontville had been settled 40 years earlier, in 1836, by a group of

Congregationalists from the Poultney, Vermont, area. It thrived, and soon became a maple sugar and maple syrup producing community. By the time the Parrishes arrived in 1876, it had a school, 2 churches [one being a Methodist Episcopal church], a hotel, post office, and newspaper.[385] It is not known how John Parrish decided on this destination, which lies nearly 600 miles west of New Jersey, or what "friends" he may have had there.)

Sadly, the western adventure failed. Within three years, Parrish and his family returned to Trenton where, according to Everitt (who had by now moved to Trenton as well):

> …[He] did not work any for a month or so, then went to work in the Lock Factory; he does "fitting up" locks and hinges; it is very light work which a small boy could do so far as strength is concerned; [I] have often found him down sick since he has worked there and found that he had not been to his work during the day; some weeks not at all; some weeks several days; & an average of a day or two in a week….

As soon as he returned from Michigan, Parrish finally began work on submitting a pension application. He filed in September, 1879, with the aid of the well-known Trenton pension attorney, E.L. Campbell, and two years later he was awarded a pension of $4 per month, plus arrears from his 1865 discharge date. (The award was later increased to $6 per month on the basis of further documentation.) The pensionable illness approved by the government was limited to Chronic Diarrhea and "resulting irritable heart," although several examining doctors had also noted a condition of "incipient consumption."

Although changing residences at least 3 more times after returning to Trenton, Parrish lived out all remaining 20 years of his life in the city. He successfully applied for pension increases in 1891 and 1892, claiming rectal disease, hemorrhoids, and worsening heart and lung disease as aggravating health factors. He died in 1899 at the age of 67 (about the average age for Company A veterans), the cause of death being recorded as "Heart Disease and Dysentery" for the prior two years. The death certificate lists his occupation as "grocer," so he must have returned in some capacity to this work during his last years.

There is little question that during substantial periods of his postwar life, John Parrish was either seriously ill or psychologically depressed, or both. He had certainly experienced sufficient wartime disease and combat trauma to account for both conditions.

His postwar dysfunction, in these senses at least, is fairly clear. Yet he did not resort to the "coping" mechanisms employed by some of his comrades: he did not turn to alcohol or opiates (or even tobacco), did not endlessly apply for more federal assistance, and did not attempt to bribe or deceive a government doctor. In fact, the picture that emerges from the historical record is of a man who never gave up completely, and who struggled persistently to do what work he could, and support his family in whatever fashion he was able. At least 3 factors help explain why Parrish was able to soldier on in these circumstances with a modicum of grace, when others did not.

First, it appears he was blessed with a devoted and able wife. She was comparatively young - about 10 years his junior - and healthy, surviving him by nearly a quarter century. She cared for their 2 very young children while he was away at war for nearly three years. She made lifelong friendships: the record is explicit about one, her relationship with Frances Everitt, a constant visitor who "helped her with her work" when her ailing husband came home from the war. She took in boarders, and surely must have helped the family in other ways to "get along" financially. She agreed to go with him to Michigan, leaving all she knew behind (including, most likely, one or both of their two maturing sons), and taking with her the couple's one-year old daughter. And, it is clear, she tended him lovingly, even when that meant getting "up and down with him all night," and serving him breakfast whenever he was able to arise the next day.

Second, Parrish attracted - or earned - the support of numerous friends. It is evident that several persons gave him the dignifying opportunity to "work," when his capacity to do so was limited or nonexistent. When he needed corroborating testimony to support his pension claim, an unusual number of old comrades, co-workers, neighbors, and employers stepped forward, and the detailed statements they gave seemed unusually sincere. Unlike John Burns (see below), he did not run desperately from place to place, or isolate himself from peers. He sought to become a part of the 3 communities he lived in throughout his postwar life - south Hunterdon, Trenton, and Vermontville - and all 3 seemed to lift him up

as best they could. People regularly inquired about his health, and noted his comings and goings.

And finally, the evidence indicates that Parrish's faith was a crucial and sustaining part of his life. In his early 40s, he was attending (and possibly conducting) prayer meetings on a regular basis at his and his devout neighbor, Grindage's, homes. It is likely that the "friends" who urged him to try his hand out west were fellow church-goers; Vermontville was a Christian plantation, conceived at the height of the Second Great Awakening, and there is at least a statistical probability that he and his wife joined the Methodist Episcopal Church that had been founded there in 1844.[386] He abstained from alcohol, in keeping with the Christian-oriented temperance movement of the era, and declined even to use tobacco.

All 3 of these factors are listed in modern PTSD literature as being of paramount importance to victims' successful recovery. Supportive and understanding partner and family, effective reintegration into home community, and access to meaningful faith group and resort to spiritual reassurance. Without benefit of modern therapeutic theory, Parrish seems to have been drawn to the things such theory recommends, or was simply fortunate enough to have them bestowed on him by wife, friends, and church. They undoubtedly made his difficult and often painful postwar life more tolerable. They probably made it worth living.

John Burns. John Burns had the dubious distinction among the company's veterans of having changed his and his family's residence, as well as his job (and even his line of work) more frequently than any of his Company A fellows. (His story is narrated in detail in Chapter 7.) Following the war, Burns moved his residence at least 18 times, averaging a move about every three years. Relocations included short-lived removes to 2 New Jersey counties besides Hunterdon, and to 3 other states: Pennsylvania (twice), Iowa, and Kansas (twice). He tried his hand at at least 9 different categories of work, in at least 14 different employment situations or business or farming ventures (several of which are known to have been financial failures). Often, according to his statements, he simply could not find

work, or had to quit a job for health reasons. His domestic life was hard: his first child and first wife died prematurely, and he had to act as sole parent of young children until he remarried. (He did not formally wed his first wife until several years after she had first given birth.)

His health was poor, and deteriorated rapidly as he grew older. At the still relatively young age of 48, he already suffered, according to examining physicians, from liver, kidney, and heart disease, and substantial weight loss. He was "doctored" and medicated "continually."

Taken together, these facts could be reasonably interpreted as describing a case of significant postwar dysfunction, possibly full-blown PTSD. Could Burns's wartime experience account for such an outcome? He was one of the company's small minority of men who served throughout the war, participating in all but its final campaign. Significantly, he was among those who made the catastrophic assault at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 12, 1864; witnessed the horrific sights, sounds, and smells of that ghastly encounter; and was himself critically wounded in the engagement, receiving multiple gunshot wounds and barely managing to survive.

Immediately after the war, Burns became one of the company's first pensioners, rated at 100% disability ($8 per month at the time). He also received a lump sum payment of arrears in 1866. He had, in other words, sufficient means to provide himself with spirits, and probably sufficient pain and suppressed emotional trauma to prompt him to do so. By 1884, about eighteen years after he was discharged (and probably in his early 40s), Burns was diagnosed with liver disease (specifically, "Hypertrophy [enlargement] of the Liver") a common symptom of excessive alcohol ingestion. There is a good chance that by then he had become an alcoholic. (His pension award continually increased over the years, and may have kept pace with his need to purchase alcohol despite his workplace shortcomings.) He may well have been encouraged in this regimen of self-medication by his treating doctors, whom it

is clear he saw regularly and who continually prescribed unspecified "medicine" for his ailments.

The death of his wife and child could only have exacerbated the feelings of grief and despair he must have retained from the war. His long record of failure as a wage-earner and provider would have made things even worse, perhaps challenging his very sense of himself as father, husband, and man. As one historian of American masculinity has put it:

> In the nineteenth century, middle-class men's work was vital to their sense of who they were. "Man is made for action, and the bustling scenes of moving life…" This self-perception was constantly reinforced by those who made up a man's social world. As [one woman] told her suitor…in 1868: "I often think it is so different for men from what it is with us women. Love is our life, our reality, business yours."
>
> If a man was without "business," he was less than a man.[387]

All in all, Burns seems never to have stopped moving - running perhaps, trying to escape his demons. As one modern therapist recounts, in reference to Viet Nam veterans:

> Once home, some veterans found that the only defense was to search for a safe place; they found themselves crisscrossing the continent always searching for that place where they might feel accepted. To this day, many veterans cling to the hope that they can move away from their problems. It is not unusual to interview a veteran who, either alone or with his family, has effectively isolated himself from others by repeatedly moving from one geographical location to another. The stress on his family is immense.[388]

It would be comforting to imagine that John Burns, the boy from Ireland, did in the end find that place of safety and acceptance. And perhaps he did, apparently dying at the home of one his adult children, in Flemington, in 1923. But it is unlikely.

Abraham Trauger. Possible alcohol or drug abuse, or a combination of the two, appears to have figured in the postwar lives - and possibly deaths - of several Company A men besides Burns. Abraham Trauger, for example, showed up for an official medical board examination in 1895 "slightly" under the influence of alcohol. The board also noted in its report to the Pension Office that "Claimant refused to wait for examination of eyes, [and] became impudent to the members." Were Trauger's acts the result of a generalized mistrust or resentment of authority, or simply an expression of frustration over the claims process (Trauger never felt adequately compensated by the Pension Office)?

Like Burns, Trauger had soldiered through the entire war with Company A, and had participated in the horrific action at Spotsylvania Courthouse. He had also been wounded there, but much less seriously than had Burns: a gunshot wound to his left hand, requiring partial amputation of the index finger.

His general health worsened significantly in the postwar years, undoubtedly aggravated by the suffocating and toxic atmosphere of the Lambertville rubber mill where he worked. He gained a great deal of weight and began complaining of sleeplessness. (A receptive medical board attributed the latter condition to "working in rubber mill in a temperature of 110 degrees," and also diagnosed the veteran with "irritable heart," from "indigestion".)

But it is also quite possible that Trauger suffered from the traumatizing effects of his wartime experience and used alcohol as a means of coping with them, and that at least one medical board dimly understood these things, calling the condition a case of "irritable heart" because there was simply no better term - or medical understanding - available to them.

John Bulmer John Bulmer was one of the few Company A soldiers taken prisoner in the war who lived to tell about it. But the experience, which entailed nearly a year of living and sleeping on cold, wet, and extraordinarily unhealthy ground at Andersonville Prison, left indelible marks. He complained after returning from the ordeal that he had contracted a debilitating and painful case of "spinal disease," but the condition was never subsequently confirmed or credited by government doctors, despite Bulmer's evident growing disability. This undoubtedly led to anger and frustration, on top of having to live with chronic pain and his memories of war and imprisonment. Laid up in bed most of the time, unable to pursue his usual livelihood as a coach driver, and barely able to rise or stoop, Bulmer took to drink. (Like Burns, he was also seen regularly by local physicians, who prescribed unidentified "medicines" for his woes, most likely adding to the amount of alcohol and other pain-reducing substances he may have put into his body.)

Bulmer's use of alcohol did not go unobserved. The Newark medical board examining him in 1894, after once more finding "no evidence of disease of the spine," did report: "Claimant is a steady and freq[uent] indulgent in Alcoholics." (This was a highly unusual entry; no other board report in a Company A case was found to contain such an observation.) Bulmer was 53 years old, and living in the Kearny Soldiers and Sailors Home. About four years later, another Newark board made similar findings: no spinal disease but "[t]here is evidence of free use of alcoholics." (The "evidence" was not specified, but likely consisted of aspects of his appearance, signs of liver disease, and possibly odor.)

The veteran did not last much longer; he died about 1900, from undisclosed causes. He was only about 60, almost seven years younger than the age-at-death average for company veterans. Even if not a factor contributing to his demise, it is clear that alcohol - almost certainly taken in immoderate amounts - played a large part in his final years, and possibly throughout his postwar life.

Bulmer's case is interesting for 3 additional reasons that relate to postwar dysfunction. First, modern therapeutic literature has noted numerous special health problems attendant on former POW status. (The American POW populations studied have virtually all come out of WWII or later wars, if the recent NIH/NSF study is excluded, but many of the observations seem applicable to earlier POW situations.) POWs, for example, often suffer from *physical* ailments related to captivity, such as peripheral neuropathy (damage to nerves in the extremities, caused by vitamin deficiencies), and musculoskeletal problems (especially degenerative osteoarthritis *of the back*).[389] These conditions are reminiscent of the effects of the “prison scurvy” that plagued many Civil War POWs (and was thought to have been the cause of death of Company A POW, George Henderson). And they are certainly consistent with Bulmer's claim of "spinal disease.”

Second, he is one of the few company veterans whose postwar marital status is unknown (see Chapter 6), and it is thus quite possible he never married. (Only one company man, James Palmer, is *known* never to have married after the war.) If true, it may suggest

he was unable to form the kind of intimate bond with a woman that would sustain a marriage or family, which in turn may have been a sign of wartime trauma's aftershocks. (The chain of inferences here is indeed an unsafely long one, but it may just describe what occurred.) Bachelorhood would also have rendered Bulmer companionless, childless, and probably lonely - making retreat to the state home more likely - and this alone may have worsened his emotional health outlook.

And finally, Bulmer spent at least some of his waning years in a government home for soldiers. In a recent study, Civil War Historian, James Marten, argues that alcohol abuse and addiction became "perhaps [the] most serious problem" that existed among soldiers and sailors home residents in the postwar period, at least according to the nineteenth-century administrators who ran them.[390] (Marten deals mainly with residents of federal "National Homes," rather than residents of state homes, but points out that alcohol abuse was a problem there as well. "…[O]fficials of northern state veterans' homes who convened…in 1894 believed that 'habitual drunkards' were the biggest challenge they faced.")

Marten offers three reasons for the high level of alcohol abuse among institutionalized veterans. Two are causes mentioned by many others (and mentioned above in the present work), and apply as well to non-institutionalized soldiers: the painful and debilitating "injuries veterans received in the line of duty," and the prevalence of "what twentieth-century psychologists have termed post-traumatic stress disorder."

But Marten's third suggested cause is novel, and unique to institutional residents like Bulmer. As he put it:

> …[T]hey may well have suffered from a different kind of pain. Disabled or chronically ill people, suffering from depression over their isolation, frustrating helplessness, and simple boredom, often turn to alcohol or narcotics to speed their long, empty hours.
>
> * * *
>
> [In soldiers and sailors homes] one is left with images of men with little to do, with no families to support, with no purpose to their daily lives.
>
> Veterans resigned to living at one of the branches of the National Home could not have escaped the prevailing turn-of-the-century notion…that aged males who had failed to put up money for their old age deserved whatever degraded and hopeless situation in which they found themselves. Alarming similarities link the residents of

> late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century poorhouses and soldiers' homes: the populations of both were rapidly growing older, many had never married, three-fourths had one or no children, and very few had any way of supporting themselves.[391]

This last explanation for excessive alcohol use is especially pertinent to Bulmer's circumstances (although it is likely he suffered as well from PTSD, and he surely suffered from painful, war-related injury and disability, Marten's other two suggested causes). When he died at the turn of the century, one would have been hard-pressed to say which had been the worst experience of his life: the relatively short-lived horror of war and captivity, or the 35-year-long ordeal of growing helplessness, indignity, pain, and solitary despair that followed.

Andrew Clawson Clawson's story not only serves as another illustration of likely postwar dysfunction, but also reveals how drug use in the nineteenth century was treated differently than it is today, at least when the use was for arguably "medicinal" purposes. (Other aspects of this intriguing veteran's life are narrated in Chapters 1, 5, and 6.)

On May 8. 1864, during the Wilderness Campaign, Clawson received a chest wound that should have been fatal. A minié ball struck him in the side, under his right arm, traveled through his right lung, and exited from the center of his chest, next to the sternum. Unable to maintain air pressure because of the bullet hole through it, the right lung quickly collapsed (Clawson later claimed that both lungs flattened), producing a painful and dangerous condition that modern battlefield medics refer to as a "sucking chest wound." Making matters worse, Clawson was left on the field and taken prisoner, and later transported to a Rebel hospital at Richmond. It is a wonder he did not asphyxiate on the spot, or die subsequently of sepsis. As it happened, he was well enough treated by Confederate medical officers to survive, and was paroled after about 3 months and returned to Union lines. He was then hospitalized in Baltimore for the balance of the war, and discharged in June, 1865.

But Clawson never *fully* recovered from the painful and debilitating effects of his lung and chest wound. He also suffered other ailments along the way, including piles,

testicular disease, and painful varicose veins in his right leg. He lost weight, going from a high of 136 lbs. in 1893 to an emaciated-looking low of 116 lbs. in 1907, a 15% weight loss (he was about 5' 6" tall). His wife, Catherine, whom he married the year before he enlisted (see Chapter 6), died in 1898, in her late 50s. Two of the couple's three children died before their father. Clawson was often bedridden, and never able to work steadily, lacking the strength and wind to perform the sort of physically demanding farmhand work that he knew. Illiterate, he had little chance to advance to anything better suited to his condition.

Together these things took an almost predictable toll. By 1889, in one of his numerous unsuccessful efforts to increase the modest pension he had begun to receive in 1874, he attested to his many health problems, including a chronic cough and the tendency to "raise [spit up] blood" if he attempted "heavy work." Significantly, he claimed that "on account of pain" in his right lung and shoulder, he could not "sleep well - scarcely at all *without opiates*." (Emphasis added.) He was 54 years old. A few years later, a local physician, Eliphulet Willet, who lived near Clawson and had known him "since birth," reiterated the veteran's maladies in an affidavit for the Pension Office. Willet ended by stating, "[H]is habits are fair except occasionally he gets a little intoxicated."

Chronic pain, wartime trauma, the indignities of long-term dependence, frustration with the government, grief over loss of comrades, wife, and children - it is no surprise that by middle age Clawson had turned to drugs and alcohol, and very likely did so more than "a little."

James Palmer. The ultimate symptom of war-generated dysfunction is, of course, pathological killing, whether the victim of the killing is another person (homicide) or the dysfunctional person himself (suicide). Sometimes, both occur as part of the same tragic event.[392] And sometimes, what appears to be an accidental death can be more properly understood as a self-inflicted one, especially if intoxication is involved. As Marten has written (with reference to older institutionalized veterans):

The disabling mixture of social isolation, uselessness, psychiatric

> maladjustment, physical infirmity, and alcoholism surfaces in the records…where the desperation in the lives of some of the veterans emerges from the slivers of evidence that have survived. * * * The desperation can be seen [for example] in the decision of [one resident], who had twice in a two-week period in 1891 requested to be confined in the guardhouse so he could sober up…[to] end his torment by committing suicide.
>
> Another resident, who was a "constant drinker," jumped out of a two-story building, broke his leg and had to undergo an amputation, and died a short time later from infection. A third, after spending the evening drinking, fell while staggering back to the home, hitting his head on a porch with such force that it killed him.

There is no known instance of a homicide being committed by a Company A survivor. But 2 of the company's instances of "accidental death" may indeed have been the final consequence of downward psychological momentum, aggravated by alcohol intoxication.

James Palmer appears to have been a dubious - or perhaps troubled - fellow from the start. He was born and probably grew up in Morris County, but enlisted from Clinton, in central Hunterdon. He was literate, and wrote and expressed himself well, and was eventually promoted to one of the company's Corporal positions in the last month of the war. He reported his age inconsistently over the years, so it is only possible to state with certainty that he was between 25 and 29 years of age, and single, when he enlisted.

In April, 1863, he was hospitalized briefly for "chronic rheumatism." At Gettysburg 3 months later, he complained of a "bruised back," for which he was hospitalized on July 4, the midpoint of the battle. The Adjutant General's records indicate that he then deserted the company, returning 3 months later, in October. The circumstances of the desertion were never officially resolved, but the charge on his record was removed when he returned to duty.

At the terrifying Battle of Spotsylvania Courthouse, Palmer suffered the indignity of being shot through the outer, fleshy portion of his left "nates" (buttock). It was deemed far preferable, in the manly calculus of the era, to be shot or shelled "with one's face to the enemy," and not in the rear end. Adding insult, an examining physician later described the injury as "a slight flesh wound…the inconvenience from which could have been but of short duration." Nevertheless, Palmer contrived to be laid up with it at Satterlee General Hospital, in Philadelphia, for more than five months!

After the war, the veteran never returned to Hunterdon, but moved around frequently within several northern New Jersey counties and adjoining portions of New York, eventually settling in Morris County by about 1891 (in his mid- to late-50s).

Meanwhile, over the years following the war, he had been aggressively seeking a pension, and then pension increases. He began in 1870, five years after his discharge, alleging that he had been shot in the left *hip* (better sounding than nates), that the "cords of leg" had grown stiff as a result, and that had not been able to resume his prewar occupation of farmer or laborer because he could not walk any distance or lift anything heavy. (This claim was made despite his having served another half year in the army after being treated for the wound and released, and participated in the company's rapid maneuvering around Petersburg, and dash southward on foot all the way to North Carolina, in the closing weeks of the conflict.) The pension reviewer made short work of the application, concluding, "Disability does not exist," and adding, "His appears to be one of those cases <u>hunted up</u> for a pension" (meaning actively solicited by his attorney, who was Whitfield Johnson, Esquire, of Trenton; underlining in original).

Undeterred, Palmer submitted five more applications over the next 2 decades, 4 of which were rejected or remained unapproved at his death. Only one was granted, for a minimal award of $2 per month, in 1885. Following each rejection, Palmer added novel medical complaints to his next filing, including over the years: scarring and loss of muscle tissue; “kidney disease” from laying on cold, wet ground during the fighting at Stafford Courthouse; neuralgia of the head; and rheumatism. There is no record of his *ever* working, or attempting to work, after leaving the service. As mentioned, he moved incessantly. He never married, and never made mention of parents, siblings, or other relatives. He deems not to have maintained contact with his former comrades, with the sole exception of Naum Cregar whom he asked to submit an affidavit supporting his pension claim

How exactly did Palmer support himself for nearly 3 decades? The pension arrears payment he got in 1885 came along well into his postwar years (approximately $480, or

about $9,500 today); the $24 per year in ongoing government payments could not have sustained him. He almost certainly suffered from serious psychological distress, very possibly including low self-esteem or even self-hatred. It is tempting to speculate that he became one of those men who depend on and take advantage of his friends, and in particular, women. It is likely he drank alcohol or used opiates, or both.

On a mid-summer day in July, 1893, Palmer went swimming in "Denmark Pond," a 1-1/2 mile long body of water situated in the center of Morris County, among the low mountains of northern New Jersey. (The pond is today known as Lake Denmark, and remains a recreational area, now located within the boundaries of the U.S. Army's Picatinny Arsenal, a weapons development facility.) It was a Friday. He was probably accompanied on the occasion by his friend, Sara Blakely, who lived in the village of Hibernia, an hour or so walk from the lake. The 2 may have been off on a lovers' summer picnic. He had probably had too much to drink. Palmer's most recent pension increase application, which had added head pain and rheumatism to his old list of ailments, had been languishing for two years with little prospect, he must now have realized, of approval. (Palmer was clever enough to know that his credibility with the government - and most likely with old comrades as well, with whom he had lost touch - was painfully low, and had been since his temporary "desertion" and other dubious behavior during the war.) He was nearing 60, with no apparent future, no posterity, and probably little or no self-regard. On that mild summer day, Palmer "drowned". It was Sara who reported his death to the pension authorities.

Frederick Strassburger. Frederick Strassburger was not one of the company's original volunteers (and is not otherwise a part of this study), but the circumstances of his life and death are suggestive enough to warrant mention in connection with the current discussion of postwar dysfunction. In March, 1846, Strassburger was born in Bavaria, which at the time remained a large and more-or-less independent duchy within a gradually consolidating German Empire. His family may have part of the wave of German (and other

European) immigration to the United States prompted by the continental turmoil and revolutionary agitation of 1848.

Although the date and details of his family's immigration to the United States are not known, he was living in the New Jersey's largest city, Newark, when he signed on as a substitute and entered service with Company A on March 23, 1865, having just turned 19. He was single, apparently fit (5' 7" or 8" tall, weighing about 165 lbs.), and gave his occupation as "locksmith." He was literate, at least in German, writing the double "s" in his surname with the German "ß" and placing an *umlaut* over the ü. The war ended within a few weeks of his arrival at the front, and the only combat Strassburger saw was the sporadic fighting around Petersburg, in which the company made no sustained assaults or stands, and suffered no casualties. He did get to march with the company in the Grand Review, but when the original members of the company were sent home in late June, he was transferred to a "Veteran Volunteer" unit, and held in service for another couple of weeks. There is no evidence that he ever again saw or had contact with any of the company's surviving volunteers.

His brief and relatively uneventful wartime experience was, nevertheless, enough to attract him to a second tour of duty. Three years after discharge, in 1868, he re-enlisted at New York City, this time with the federal army for a five-year hitch, and was assigned to Troop H, 2nd U.S. Cavalry (Strassburger the urban-dwelling immigrant apparently knew how to ride a horse). The unit was sent, with one other 2nd Cavalry troop, to far away Bozeman, in the Montana Territory, where a new fort - Fort Ellis - had been built the year before. (Montana did not become a state for another twenty-one years.)

Strassburger had either been lucky, or able to impress army enlistment officials with the strength of his qualifications; at the time he was accepted for service the army was drastically downsizing. Going from about more than a million men at the end of the war in 1865, it had fallen to about 54,000 in 1866, and would fall again by half, to about 25,000, by 1876. In the meantime, a flood of young Civil War veterans, immigrants, and others hungry

for land, was making its way to the far west in the immediate postwar period, often traveling through or settling in areas that had been guaranteed by treaty to Native Americans. The combination of a much reduced army, and the growing need for a large military "peacekeeping" buffer between angry Indians and covetous settlers, produced, in the end, what some observers have described as a tragic and terrible era of genocide against the indigenous population: the western "Indian Wars" between 1866 and 1890.[393] As one military historian of the period described the army's predicament:

> The post Civil War army assigned to fight the Indians and police the frontier was comprised entirely of volunteers. * * * Many of the men who enlisted sought either adventure, security, social mobility, or just survival in a strange country. Most of the enlisted men were illiterate…. The average age of an enlisted recruit was twenty-three at first enlistment [Strassburger was 25, but had already served a short tour during the Civil War]. Recent immigrants made up a large portion of these men. * * * At $13 per month, an enlistee's pay was low, but often higher than he could earn in civilian life. * * * There was nothing resembling basic training…[and] the army issued recruits equipment left over from the war….
>
> …[T]he army used a fixed-post system…sparsely scattered in the West…[with] never enough posts or soldiers to make the system effective. At such a post, the new recruit learned…discipline and frequently subsisted on a poor diet of salt pork, dried beans, brown sugar, green coffee, and weevil-infested flour. …[T]he recruit was assigned space in a large barracks in which he had only a bunk and a footlocker. He had no privacy…[and o]ccasionally contracted venereal disease, cholera, diphtheria, and typhoid. Dysentery…also plagued the men.[394]

Federal Indian policy during the years Strassburger was in Montana was comparatively benign, and although tensions and incidents mounted, no active or large-scale campaigning against local tribes was conducted during his tour. (Things changed drastically beginning the year after he went back east. Lieutenant Colonel George Custer led a cavalry expedition in 1874 that confirmed reports of gold in the Black Hills of the Dakotas, and two years later an all-out offensive was mounted against the Sioux tribes residing there. White settlers wanted the land and the gold. In 1877, the brewing tragedy would take the lives of both the arrogant and impulsive Custer, and his main adversary, the Sioux Chief, Crazy Horse; it would not finally end until the slaughter at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, in 1890.)

Typical of the early Indian Wars period, the Fort Ellis garrison was established in 1867 to guard the area against the supposed threat of Native American depredations in the

region. This was a much overblown concern at the time, manufactured or exaggerated by locals in order to obtain government facilities that would serve as major purchasers of local agricultural goods and produce, and that would employ local civilians in their construction. Bozeman is a mountain gateway town that sits on the upper reaches of the Yellowstone River, about 1,500 feet above the elevation of the high plains that stretch eastward from the base of the Rocky Mountains. The Lewis and Clark expedition had passed through the area on its way west, nearly 70 years earlier.

Strassburger's Montana tour lasted from September 1868 to August, 1873, and during it he was promoted to the rank of Corporal. The fort's population at the time was probably about 300, garrisoned on extensive government lands that covered 32,000 acres; the Town of Bozeman numbered less than 100. As so often occurs at such isolated postings, idleness and boredom became a significant disciplinary and behavioral problem. Besides periodic and uneventful patrolling, officers tried to keep the troops busy with routine daily drilling and other duties.

A recovered daily schedule for August 17, 1871, about the midpoint of Strassburger's tour, shows the following Monday-through-Saturday routine: "1st call for Reveille" (wake up) at 5:15 am, followed by "Stable Call" and then breakfast at 6:00 am, and "Fatigue call" at 7:30 am (fatigue, essentially, was a daily period of inactivity or unassigned time for soldiers not detailed to the day's mounted guard, "Water call," or other duty). After "Dinner call" at noon, an afternoon fatigue period ran from 1:00 pm to 4:45 pm, following which the day wound down with a second "Stable call" at 5:00 pm, "Retreat" (stand down) at sunset, "Tatoo" (lowering the flag) at 8:30 pm, and "Taps" (bed), at 9:00 pm. (There was no time stated for an evening, or supper, meal.) Most of these daily events would have been signaled by a bugler, sounding a short and distinct tune at the appropriate time. Sunday began with an 8:00 am inspection and "Guard mount" of the entire fort complement (mounted formation and drill, probably a simple parade), with the rest of the day devoted to chapel and time off for the bulk of the men.[395]

Officers attempted to head off trouble by encouraging "cultural events" such as a post theater and formal military balls, and by fostering an active baseball rivalry between town and fort. In June, 1873, for example, the *Bozeman Avant Courier* featured a story about the cavalry team's recent drubbing of Bozeman's civilians, 64-18, the troopers sporting new uniforms for the occasion: red stockings, and white caps, knee breeches, and jerseys emblazoned with the initials, "F.E." (Strassburger was almost certainly in attendance at the event, and may possibly have played.)

Unsurprisingly, alcohol abuse was a recurring problem, despite the local commander's placing Bozeman's drinking establishments off limits and prohibiting soldiers from purchasing spirits. According to an historian of Fort Ellis life:

> Merchants…made money by soldiers buying illegal alcohol. * * * [The fort's] officers and civilian leaders…worked together to stem alcohol use that threatened civic peace and military order. Some soldiers became so inebriated on visits to town that civilians robbed them of military equipment, clothing and horses. Temperance groups were one way the Army used to deal with the problem, but sometimes it took stronger action.
>
> On Dec. 11, 1867, not many months after the fort was built, soldiers tore down a log cabin near Bozeman where troopers had bought liquor. Three days later, the fort commander sent soldiers into Bozeman to destroy "intoxicating liquor" at two businesses known to sell alcohol to military personnel.[396]

Modern excavation of the nearly obliterated site of the fort has uncovered, among a few other period artifacts, a Budweiser beer bottle that dates to 1876, the year the brew was first introduced by the Newark-based Anheuser-Busch brewery!

Other "vicious" habits developed as well during this lonely northwest posting. The Surgeon General's records disclose that Strassburger was treated at some point during his period of service for venereal disease, probably syphilis (although it is of course possible he had contracted the disease while living in New York between 1865 and 1868).

By the time Strassburger was discharged a second time in 1873, he had undoubtedly learned to drink and carouse. But he was now a young adult of 27 years and, again returning to his home city of Newark, was this time looking to settle down. By the end of the following year, he was married to "Fan" Collins, the wedding taking place at Newark's St.

Mary's Catholic Church. (The couple would have three children, in 1879, 1884, and 1886.) He took up a new trade, "saddlery hardware," undoubtedly benefiting from his five years' experience in the cavalry. For a long stretch, he and his family seem to have managed to get by.

But nearly 20 years later, in 1892, at the age of 46, the veteran reemerges on the historical horizon, making at this time his first pension application. Proceeding without an attorney, he claimed now to be suffering from "chronic rheumatism, malarial fever and general debility." The Newark medical board found him to have rheumatism in the right ankle and knee, the joints of which were "stiff and tender," and recommended him for a pension at the rate of 1/3rd (6/18ths). After dithering for a year, however, the Pension Office finally rejected the claim in 1893, concluding that the condition described by the board did not demonstrate the applicant's incapacity to work at his trade, and thus presented "no ratable degree of disability." After waiting nearly a decade, Strassburger applied again in 1901, this time using the services of a Washington attorney, James Tanner, and alleging his medical complaints much more specifically: "Chr. rheumatism past 10 yrs., malarial fever 12 yrs. ago [and] from time to time since, gen'l debility past 15 yrs, lumbago past 3 yrs., poor eyesight past 4 yrs."

In April, 1902, a different Newark board made more detailed findings than the first board had, and concluded that the applicant's rheumatism now involved his right shoulder and lower back, had worsened in his knee, and that he was, in "the aggregate," permanently disabled to the extent of 10/18ths. (The board noted that the veteran no longer had any upper teeth, no prosthetic denture "plate," and only 7 of his lower teeth, "all poor." Perhaps significantly, it also found "liver dullness from 5th rib to free border," possibly a symptom of long and heavy alcohol use.)

But the Pension Office was still not ready to grant him an award, sending the report back to the board with specific instructions to reexamine the applicant's genital organs to determine whether the previous venereal disease was a possible cause of his deteriorated

condition. "It is not deemed sufficient," thundered the reviewing official, "merely to state 'No evidence of Syphilis or vicious habits' in a case of this character." (That is, no pension was going to be so readily approved for an old German immigrant, a Civil War substitute who had seen almost no action, and whose health may have been damaged by his own drinking and womanizing.)

The Newark board recalled Strassburger in August, and carefully examined him for telltale signs of syphilis and its long-term effects:

> No scars on penis. Two small depressed scars each 1/4 in. long upper part and surface left thigh 3/4 in. below Poupart's [groin] Ligament: probable result of abscess following local injury. No loss of hair, nodes on lung or flat [illegible], substernal [deep chest] tenderness, enlarged glands, eschars [scars] or mucous patches in throat, or other evidence of constitutional Syphilis.

A month later the Pension Office, one senses reluctantly, approved Strassburger for a pension, although it rated his disability below that recommended by the board (6/18ths disability, or $6 per month, rather than the board's 10/18ths). The government took pains to note that it felt it could now do so because the doctors had "eliminat[ed] effects of venereal disease" as a cause.

Two years later, in 1904, the veteran's wife died, and within the next three years, Strassburger had taken up residence in the nearby state soldiers and sailors home in Kearny. (The mid-sized town of Kearny is located 5 miles north of Newark, bordering to the east the narrow body of water known as Newark Bay.) He remarried (date unknown), to a woman named Eliza Maier, but she passed away in 1909; it is likely the veteran never moved out of the state home during these years.

Two years later, at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon on April 11, 1911, Strassburger had a "talk" with Aaron Van Felt and Isaac Riker, two fellow residents of the Kearny facility. Both of them remembered the exchange several months later, but did not mention or remember what it was about. It was the last occasion the old veteran, who had recently turned 65, would be seen alive by any known party. Nineteen days later, on May 1, his partly decomposed body was fished out of the Hudson River. (The river separates New

Jersey from New York, and its Jersey bank lies about 1-1/2 miles east of Kearny, a relatively short walk. Moreover, a body entering the water of Newark Bay at Kearny is easily carried by the current to the Hudson, where the bay flows into it about 2 miles below Kearny.) There was no evidence of foul play, or at least none reported or intimated. Strassburger's 2 daughters, Dora (unmarried) and Fannie (Mrs. Eugen Sieb), who both continued to reside in Newark, promptly reported their father's death to the Pension Office, noting his body "was supposed to have been in the river for 3 months [they probably meant 3 weeks]". They also sought whatever final accrued pension benefit was due his estate, which otherwise consisted of no assets and "a few old clothes," and they were eventually paid the small sum of $24.80. The veteran was buried on May 3, 1911, at Fairmount Cemetery in Newark.

Companionless, institutionalized, bored, his body increasingly racked and hunched over with the bending long-term effects of painful arthritis, with even his eyesight giving way, Strassburger had very likely become a despairing soul. Did he go out drinking the evening of April 11 after a last talk with two old fellow inmates? Did he walk down to the nearby bay, or over to the dark river? With his melancholia encouraged and his inhibitions depressed by the persuasive powers of liquor, did he finally conjure that night, in the words of the old song, "a great notion/to jump into the river and drown"?[397] No one living will ever know, but this or some similar scenario seems highly plausible.

(Note: A 3rd case of accidental death, John Reading's unexplained fall down a stairway in 1904, breaking his neck, leaves no hint of intoxication or other "dysfunction" as a contributing cause. Reading was 67 years old and married at the time, had 5 adult children, and continued to live in Flemington and receive a moderately generous pension [$10 a month] when he suffered the accident. There is evidence that he stayed in touch with old comrades, and with his children. Although he had lived for some time with an uncomfortable testicular hernia, that was the only significant health condition that seemed to affect him, and he wore a truss for it. He was a simple, and apparently happy man: an illiterate,

church-going, laborer throughout his life. There was simply no reason to include him in the above list of potentially emotionally distraught veterans.)

* * *

It is difficult to draw confident conclusions about war-generated dysfunction from the historical tracings left of the lives of Company A veterans. Perhaps the tracings are too faint, and simply will not divulge what lies beneath them. Or perhaps, despite great advances in modern psychiatric medicine and theory, Melville is still right. [The human heart is a mystery.] Unlike Dean's subjects, no soldier from the company was ever declared insane, or ended his days in an asylum (though several lived out their final years in a soldiers home - impoverished, enfeebled, and sometimes "de-mented"). And unlike the NIH/NSF's army-wide sample, it is safe to assume that at least by comparison *all* Company A men had been soundly traumatized - shook over Hell - but it is impossible to know how much better they would have fared, how less prone to dysfunction they may have turned out to be, had their wartime experiences been played out in a less-battered or shorter-serving unit, or had they not gone to war at all.

But at a minimum the men's stories do describe, often vividly, what happened to *them*. And what happened to them was hard. Though ultimately unprovable by any satisfactory social-scientific measure, their stories do in fact suggest that the war changed them forever, melding their souls and psyches into their memories of its horror, creating an amalgam that would never be dissolved. Looked at as a whole group, a few sad trends emerge.

54 men are known to have survived the war. There is historical evidence covering some part of the wartime and postwar lives of 49 of them (91%). 44 of the 49 came back having suffered a significant projectile wound (22), a serious accidental injury or illness (21), or both (1). Two of the 22 wounded also underwent a severe period of captivity as POWs in rebel hands; a third POW contracted a serious illness while a prisoner. Only 5 of the 49 are known to have returned physically "unhurt"; that is, 5 who subsequently claimed a pension

but whose claim did not mention any service-connected ailment (wound, disease, or injury). In other words, 90% of the company's 49 returning veterans whose post-war health circumstances are known lived the rest of their lives burdened to some extent - many of them heavily - with at least the *physical* consequences of hard wartime service.

Most of the 49 also endured the severe psychological trauma of the company's worst encounters with killing and/or dying. The experience of killing another human being, especially at close quarters; of witnessing the death of a beloved comrade, or an entire battlefield of dead and dying; or of being personally and immediately exposed to the risk of dying - all exerted an awful pressure on character and mind. There were at least 3 distinct periods in the company's wartime career when one or more of these dire conditions coalesced in particularly virulent form:

1. The epidemic die-off from disease that plagued the regiment for several weeks during its first winter in the war theater (1862-3);

2. The killing fields in and around Chancellorsville in April and May, 1863, and the unparalled horror of the sights, smells, and sounds of the Gettysburg battlefield, in July; and

3. The gruesome attrition of the Wilderness Campaign and Cold Harbor, in May and June, 1864, culminating in the shock of Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 12.

34 veterans - more than 2/3rds of the 49 for whom both wartime and postwar data are available - suffered through all or a significant portion of *all three periods*, and *none* of the 49 escaped all of them. (Of the 15 men who did *not* experience all 3 periods, 9 were discharged or transferred from frontline service during or following the first period of disease-related deaths, in most cases because they themselves had contracted a serious and disabling illness; 5 more were wounded during the second period, the sharp campaigning of 1863, and never returned to frontline duty; and one was wounded during the second period but recovered sufficiently to return for the third, the horrors of the 1864 Wilderness campaigning.) Thus, superimposed upon the physical wounds and accidental injuries that *44*

of the 49 men suffered, were the gruesome psychological experiences of *all 3* traumatic periods that *34 of the 49* suffered as well.

Did the combination of stress on body and mind produce an unusually high degree of dysfunction in the men's postwar lives? Did the 9 men who escaped from frontline service after the company's first, disease-ridden winter fare any better in later life than their war-surviving comrades (who would later be exposed to one or two summers of horrific combat)? Did the 3 men who both endured this initial period as well as later combat, *and also spent time as POWs*, do worse (2 of the 3 having also suffered serious wounds, and the third incurring a disabling disease while in captivity)? The evidence indeed suggests a correlation among the men of these two subsets of Company A survivors, between severity of wartime trauma, and various aspects of postwar health and functioning.

PART III

LOVED ONES: FAMILIES OF LOST SOLDIERS, AND THE PRICES THEY PAID

Part III describes the lives of immediate family members - soldiers' loved ones – who suffered the soldier's loss through death, disappearance, or one or another form of estrangement.

Most stories of loss stem from the soldier's death in the war. These have been put together from information contained in subsequent pension claims filed by the soldier's "dependent" family member, usually a spouse or parent. The experiences of surviving spouses - the widows of Company A men - are treated in Chapter 11. Those of mothers who lost sons in the war are described in Chapter 12; fathers in this category are described in Chapter 13. (Chapter 12, "Mothers," also narrates the stories of 3 families in which *both* the mother and father of a deceased soldier claimed a pension - the mother first and then, after her death, the father. Pension regulations did not permit payment of more than one claim at a time.) Finally, Chapter 14 contains 3 cases of soldiers' siblings who claimed benefits (in only one case were they *pension* benefits), as well as the one known case of a Company A orphan, whose guardian filed a dependent pension claim on his behalf.

Part III concludes, in Chapter 15, with a description of known or suspected instances of a different category of soldier "loss" - marital abuse, separation or abandonment. (No case of formal divorce among the company's original volunteers has been discovered.)

CHAPTER 11

WIDOWS

> …[I am] the widow [of] Erin J. Green…. * * * I applied for [an] "Increase" on account of three children through an attorney…[but] said claim for Increase is not settled yet…and [I] believe he has entirely neglected or abandoned [my] claim.
>
> Susan Green, widow of Private Erin Green

> I am sorry to say that my son is disipated [sic] and [has] already squandered one half of the estate [he received from his grandfather]….
>
> Helen Stryker, widow of Theodore Stryker

> Things are so tangled up that it is difficult for me to give any clearer idea [of my finances].
>
> Teresa Sullivan, widow of Corporal Joseph Sullivan

How many of the wives married to Company A volunteers became widows, and how much can be known about them? As mentioned in previous chapters, the immediate pre-war marital status of all but one of the company's original 100 volunteers is known. 36 of them had married before the war; of them, 13 failed to return, leaving 13 mostly young widows behind them, and a number of relatively young children. (See Chapter 1.) Of these 13 widows, *12* filed for pensions during or soon after the war, and thus some pension-related data survive regarding all 12. All were the first wives of the deceased soldier, and several of them later remarried.

What of the wives of soldiers who survived the war? Overall, a total of 53 Company A volunteers are known to have survived the fighting. 21 of the survivors were among those married before the conflict, and one survivor, Van Fleet, married during it, for a total of 22 "pre-war" or wartime wives who had not been widowed by the conflict.[398] (All of these were also first wives.)

Of the 31 *single* men who came back, post-war marriage data survive for 27 of them. All but one of the 27 married at some point following the war, usually within a few years after returning, and only one is believed never to have married. Thus, combining the 22 known pre-war and wartime wives with the 26 known post-war wives results in a field of 48 *first* wives of company veterans who, at least hypothetically, had a chance of becoming a widow and filing for a widow's pension in the post-war period. In the end, however, only 28 additional widows of Company A volunteers are known to have filed for pensions during the decades following the war. The reduced figure of 28 resulted of course from the fact that about half the 48 died before their veteran husbands; the figure was not as small as it might have been, however, since a few widower veterans remarried and were outlived by their *second* wives, who then filed for widows pensions.

Finally, there were only two *known* widows of veterans who did not file for a pension. Almost no data have been found regarding one of them, Ann Eliza Welsh, the third wife of Michael Welsh (see Chapter 6). Some data have been located regarding the third: ? Emery, widow of lawyer and judge, John Emery.[399]

Taking all the above information together, the record discloses at least some biographical data for 41 widows of the company's original volunteers: 12 widows of married men lost in the war, and 29 widows of men who returned from the war and subsequently married, or remarried after losing their first wives. While precise numbers and percentages are lost to history, this figure at least constitutes a substantial majority of wives who ultimately outlived their Company A husbands.

Widows Pensions

A total of 40 pension applications are known to have been filed by widows of Company A volunteers. First-time applications were filed over a long period of sixty-seven and a half years– much longer than the period encompassing veterans' "Invalid" pension claims – the first new widow's claim being submitted in July, 1863, and the last in December,

1930. The timing of the applications reflects the harsh demographic and wartime forces at work. There were two distinct waves: the first 12 widow applications (30% of the total) were all filed during a five-year portion of the 1860s, by young widows whose husbands had been killed in the fighting or died from camp diseases. That terrible stretch was followed by a long, relatively calm interlude: only 2 further applications were filed throughout the 1870s, and none in the -80s.

Then, as the company's surviving veterans began slowly to succumb to the longer-term effects of age, wounds, and sickness, the second wave came. Filing by company widows picked up again toward the end of the nineteenth century: 6 in the "gay" '90s, 10 in the first decade of the new century, and 5 in the 1910s. This group of 21 applications – just over half the overall total – included, in 1908, the first widow's claim of a *second* wife: Emma Loyal Ritchie of Port Angeles, Washington, who at age 43 had married John Collins, age 64, after the death in 1896 of his first wife, Bridget Ann. Widow applications then gradually slowed to a trickle – 4 throughout the 1920s - and finally ended with a last application in 1930, by Mary Martha Henry, widow and second wife of Andrew Henry. (Both Mary and Andrew's marital histories were somewhat convoluted – he was married twice and she *three* times before finally claiming a pension; see Chapter 15.)

Over the nearly 7 decades of widows' pension awards, amounts paid were gradually but significantly increased. The monthly benefit began at $8 - where it remained until the end of the nineteenth century – and was then regularly raised by Congress to $10, $12, $20, $30, and finally to $40 by the late 1920s. Widows of higher-ranking enlisted men, and of officers, did significantly better: First Sergeant George Justice's widow was paid $17 a month beginning in 1864 (until an unfortunate remarriage cut off her eligibility; see Chapter 15), and Major Boeman's widow got $25 a month starting later the same year. Additional monthly allotments for children under 16 years of age, first allowed in 1866, were pegged at $2 per child until the 1900s, when they were raised to $6 per child; by then of course very few Civil War-era widows still had such young children in their care.

As with veterans (Chapter 8) and parents (Chapters 12 and 13), widows generally retained the services of attorneys to help them in preparing application papers and in shepherding application through the new government bureaucracy. Local lawyers in Flemington and Lambertville, including Kuhl, Skillman, Connet, and Sergeant got much of the work (12 cases), while Trenton lawyers who specialized in pension practice, especially Rusling, Phillips, and Campbell, were also frequently chosen (6 cases). Widows appear to have been less inclined than veterans themselves to resort to "big city" attorneys: Washington, D.C. and Philadelphia firms were mentioned in only 3 instances.

However, one local attorney, Theodore Abbott of Flemington, managed to distinguish himself in an unfortunate way by producing a rare level of dissatisfaction and anger among his widowed Company A clientele. In 3 early cases during the 1860s, Abbott – who seems to have practiced in partnership with Charles Skillman – was terminated at some point and replaced by another attorney.

Mary Servis Nevins. Mary Ann Servis was the widow of Company A Private Peter Nevins; the couple had been married in January of 1858 in East Amwell, or in November of 1857, according to a later report). Mary's family resided in the rural township; she was 23 and he was 25. She subsequently gave birth to 2 children: John in April of 1860 and William in July of 1862 – the same month their father left for the war. Peter did not last long; he died of typhoid fever at the regimental hospital on the 2nd day of the New Year, 1863. Using Charles Skillmam, a Lambertville attorney, Mary applied for a widow's pension about 9 months later and it was promptly approved. Three years later, Congress adopted legislation that entitled Civil War widows of minor children – or the children's guardian – to receive $2 per month till age 16, the so-called Act of July 25, 1866. For reasons unknown, Mary apparently did not become aware of the legislation for well more than a year. Perhaps Skillman neglected to advise her, or perhaps he did and Mary simply delayed doing anything about it.

In any case, now retaining the services of Theodore Abbott of Lambertville, she applied in January, 1868, to add the 2 children to her allotment. Two weeks later Mary remarried. She was still young at about 33, and had sons aged 5 and 7 to take care of. This presented complications, however; Mary's entitlement to a widow's pension ended with remarriage, and she did not – under the bizarre legal doctrine of the day (see Chapter 6) – have an automatic right either to be their custodian or to receive their pension moneys. Abbott of course knew about such things, and presumably set about to protect his clients' interests. The standard arrangement of the time for resolving these legal and bureaucratic issues was for a remarried mother to prevail on a trusted male family member to seek court appointment as guardian and legal representative of her children; once appointed, the guardian could continue to receive the children's monthly supplement and apply it for their benefit, *and could also obtain the $8-per-month widow's pension*, and presumably apply that as well for their and the mother's benefit. Abbott started this process in motion, filing papers with the local "Orphans Court" to have Mary's father, John Servis, appointed guardian; within a few months, John was appointed. But then Abbott seems to have bogged down. Nothing happened for the next *16 months*, while the flow of *all* pensions moneys payable on account of Peter Nevins's sacrifice had stopped.

John Servis evidently lost patience. In January, 1870, he fired Abbott, hired Richard Kuhl of Flemington, and with his help filed immediately for resumption of the $2-per-month child allotment as well as payment to him, as guardian, of the $8-per-month allowance. By the end of the year, both payments had been awarded, retroactive to the date of his daughter's remarriage.

Emma Wells Cathrall. Emma Wells, originally of New Hope, Pennsylvania, was married to Isaac Cathrall (or Cathrell) on New Year's Day, 1851. They were wed in New Hope's Methodist Episcopal Church, by Rev. John Edwards; she was about 21, and Isaac's age is unknown. The couple produced 3 children: Samuel, born in October of 1851; Isaac Newton Cathrall, born in November of 1855; and James, born after a seven-year hiatus, in

October of 1862 – 2 months after Isaac had left for the war. Cathrall was unlucky. The 15th Regiment had made spectacular forced march to reach Gettysburg at the end of June, 1863, in time for the fighting. When they got there, however, they were held in reserve and did not experience any direct action. 1st Lt. George Justice, in a letter written from "Camp" several months later, described what happened next:

> On the 3rd day of July about 1 o'clock p.m. Isaac Catheral [sic] got permission to procure some water from a spring about a ¼ of a mile from our position inside of our lines. While there [he] was wounded[,] a ball entering somewhere near the groin [and] passing through the bladder. On the 17th day of July I received official, information of his death, caused from said wound, from the surgeon in charge of the hospital.

Evidently a "sharpshooter," or sniper, had caught the unsuspecting Cathrall at an unguarded moment, exposed and in the open. Emma's own later testimony indicated that the exact cause of death had been a tetanus infection following the wound, the ball "striking him in the back and passing almost through his body."[400] Isaac died at the South Street Hospital in Philadelphia on July 13, according to Emma; it is possible she managed to visit him there before he expired, as Philadelphia was only about 45 miles south of Lambertville, easily reachable by a 2-hour train ride. She seems to have had more accurate information on her husband's death than did Justice, who may not have seen him after he had been wounded and taken off.

Within a couple of months, Emma, who prior to the war had moved with her husband and children across the Delaware River to Lambertville, hired Abbott to represent her in submitting a widow's pension application. That seemed to proceed normally. But once again, when she tried sometime after the new 1866 act to get him to obtain the additional allotment for her children, nothing happened. Exasperated, she "revoked her appointment" of Abbott as her attorney, he having "neglected to collect the claim," and replaced him with the Trenton pension lawyer, and former Vice Commander of the 15th, E.L. Campbell.

A sad footnote to Emma's story was her involuntary commitment, in 1899, to the Morris Plains Asylum for the Insane, in Hanover Township, Morris County. She was then about 69 years old. A guardian, or "committee," named Levi Brown was appointed by the

Hunterdon court to receive her widow's pension, which had by then risen to $12 per month, and apply it for her benefit. Brown's 2 annual reports to the court, accounting for his pension receipts and expenditures in 1898 and 1899, show that at the time Emma was committed she owned total accumulated funds of $155.31, and that $144 in pension moneys were added in each of the 2 years. From these funds, which totaled 443.31, the guardian had paid $130 "in part payment for board," and $5 in notary public fees in connection with witness depositions. Brown would presumably have continued to serve in this capacity, for which he apparently charged no fee himself, but he died in 1901. Emma lasted another seven years, expiring at the asylum in 1908.

Susan Anderson Green. Susan H. Anderson married Erin (variously spelled Erwin, Evin, and Evan) Green in July of 1858, at the Methodist Episcopal parsonage in Clinton Township, by Rev. I. (or J.) A. Crane. Susan was about 20; Erin's age is unknown. The couple produced 3 children: Watson, born in February of 1856 – about 6 months after the wedding; Edward, born in May of 1858; and Albert, born in July of 1860, two years before his father enlisted.

Green survived the company's first two winter encampments, and first full season of campaigning in 1863, but came down with a serious case of "chronic diarrhoea," probably dysentery, sometime in 1864. He was transferred that spring to the army's Portsmouth Grove Hospital, in Rhode Island, and never got well. He died on May 14, as his comrades were slogging their way toward the end of the frightful Wilderness Campaign, many miles to the south.

Susan, now a widow about 29 years old, with 3 sons aged 8, 5, and 3, contacted Theodore Abbott and with his assistance applied for a widow's pension sometime in 1865. The lawyer's performance in Susan's case was the same as in the 2 previous cases: the basic widow's allowance was approved in due course, but when the children's allowance was subsequently sought in 1866, nothing seemed to happen. According to her affidavit in 1869:

> …[I am] the widow [of] Erin J. Green…and [am] in receipt of a pension as such… I

> applied for [my] "Increase" on account of three children through an attorney by the name of Abbott at Lambertville N.J. about three years ago – [but] said claim for Increase is not settled yet – [and I have] frequently applied to said Abbott to know the reason, but can get no information whatever, and [I] believe he has entirely neglected or abandoned [my] claim.
>
> [I] hereby revoke [my] Power of Attorney to said Abbott and appoint E.L. Campbell at Trenton N.J. [my] attorney to collect said claim.

Campbell undoubtedly got Susan her increase, which enhanced her monthly payment by $6, to a total of $14. She lived without remarrying until 1909, and was about 79 when she passed away.

Two Widows' Lives

As with the Company A veterans themselves, the life of no single veteran's widow can stand in for all the rest. But enough is known about the lives of the two following women – lives that included a fair sampling of frequently repeated themes in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America – that relating their stories in some detail gives a good account of the post-war worlds they faced, at both the family and public levels. In some ways, the two lie at very different places on the spectrum of Civil War widows – by simple geographic measure, for example, the two women started out, and ended, their lives about as far removed from one another as any two of the company's women. One actually saw the war firsthand as a girl; the other, like the vast majority of Northerners, never did. The marriage of one was fitful and even dark, producing a single child who seems to have been plagued with his parents' shortcomings; the other marriage was steady and faithful, resulting in the final satisfaction of hardworking children settling close to the family homestead.

In other ways, the "costs" the two widows paid for their husbands' participation in the war were remarkably similar. Both veterans came home sick or wounded; both struggled – in their own very different fashions and with quite different characters – to eke out a living an perhaps even rise a step on the ladder of social and economic class. Both wives suffered with them because of these things, and both also suffered *because* of them. Neither ended up life where they had hoped to, at least not in a material sense.

Helen Stryker. Helen Elliot and Theodore Stryker were married in Sag Harbor, a coastal New York town near the eastern end of Long Island, on October 29, 1861. They had their only child, Francis, sometime during the 1860s, possibly conceiving him before the wedding. They were most likely living apart when Stryker signed up, and their marriage would undergo a great deal of strain and periodic separations over the next thirty-six years until his death in 1897. (The details of Theodore Stryker's unusual and somewhat strange life, and the domestic problems the couple encountered, are narrated min Chapter 15.)

When Stryker died, Francis, now in his mid- to late-30s, inherited a very substantial estate from his grandfather (the veteran's father), totaling nearly $10,000, more than $200,000 dollars in today's currency. About half the estate was in the form of rental real estate in Lambertville (see below), and the remainder must have been fairly liquid - e.g., cash or bank accounts. Stryker himself possessed little or nothing to pass on directly to his son, and had left nothing to Helen, who was about 59 at the time.

Helen and Theodore's son proved to be a remarkably profligate heir. Within only a month or two month of his gaining access to his grandfather's estate, he had reportedly squandered half of it, a total of about $5,000! This was an amazing feat in itself, probably accomplished through gambling or other vice, or luckless venture. His mother Helen must have been heart-broken, and probably angry. She was also desperate, having been rendered almost destitute by her husband's death and, according to a neighbor, suddenly "without [any] means of support other than her daily labor." The veteran's pension income at the time he died was only $144 per year, and he was not working. Although, during his lifetime, he had enjoyed the right to receive the net income from his father's large estate, the record suggests that he probably did little to earn or enhance it, and that he had been a very uncertain provider at best (see Chapter 15).

Helen reacted quickly, responding in two ways. Within a month of her husband's death, she applied through a Trenton attorney, William Mills, for a widow's pension. She gave her age as 59, and reported a new Trenton address, 216 Butler Street. At the time, if

approved, the pension would have provided her $8 per month in income, or $96 per year - a meager subsistence, but at least something. Secondly, within 5 weeks of her husband's death, using the good offices of the Stryker family attorney, Charles Skillman of Lambertville – *the very same lawyer who had been associated with the inadequate Abbott during the war* - she had prevailed on Francis to deed over to her unrestricted title to the rental properties he had inherited from his grandfather. The redistribution of the remaining portion of Stryker's wealth at least stopped the despoliation of his estate, and began providing his widow with a small amount of immediate income. But this transfer of wealth, whatever its true intent, would create problems of its own.

Later that fall, either the Pension Office became curious about Helen Stryker's new propertied status, or her pension attorney, Mills, prevailed on her to report it on her own - her application had not yet been acted upon and her financial circumstances had clearly altered from what she had originally declared to the government. In November, Mills submitted affidavits by her and others on her behalf. The first, by Helen herself, claimed that she owned only "a very small quantity of household furniture" worth less than $100, and that since filing her original pension application:

> …[S]he has had conveyed to her by her son…a small property at Lambertville, NJ, worth about three thousand dollars…for the purpose of preserving the said property to himself and with the express understanding that [she] should hold the same in trust for him and that the net income from the property should be used for their mutual benefit.

The property itself was described as being "very old, and badly out of repair," and generating net rents that "will probably not exceed two hundred or two hundred and fifty dollars per year." (This is further evidence of Theodore's lack of attention to the care and maintenance of this real estate during his lifetime, even though he was then deriving income from it.) Francis was described merely as "an invalid and unable to work," so that "his support must be derived out of a portion" of the rents. This was clearly not the whole story.

Additional affidavits were submitted by Helen's sister - who was not identified as such in the document but who certainly should have been - and Albert Dart, "a friend"; they

backed up Helen's testimony in every detail. The "small" property was "assessed at twenty-four hundred dollars," was worth "about" $3,000, and was "in such condition that it will cost several hundred dollars to make it habitable." The net income from it "will fall short of two hundred dollars," and there was an "agreement…that the income of this property should be shared between [Helen and Francis]," and that the property could not be sold by Helen but must be held in trust for the son.

None of these statements was an outright falsehood, but again much was omitted or understated and the truth was more complicated. Indeed, the Pension Office had its suspicions. After a yearlong delay in processing the application, it ordered, in November, 1898, a Special Examination of Helen's financial circumstances. This time, Helen was a good deal more circumspect and, together with her Lambertville attorney, Skillman, supplied crucial details that had been missing from the initial application.

It turned out that the real estate and other assets in question had originally been acquired by Theodore's father, Samuel Stryker, decades before; Samuel had died about the time of the war. Samuel did not leave the property to Theodore outright, but in an "entailed" status, meaning that Theodore had the right to receive the net rents from it during his lifetime, but had no right to sell or borrow against it, or to dispose of it by will. At Theodore's death, the property automatically "descended" to Theodore's "issue" - in this case, his only son, Francis - with no further restrictions on its use or disposition by Francis. This explained why the veteran had not left the property to his widow; by the terms of his father's will, he did not own it and could not have done so. This also strongly indicates that the veteran's father had his own reservations about Theodore's reliability and capacity to deal responsibly with an inheritance - concerns that were borne out in unexpected fashion in the conduct of his grandson, Francis.

Helen now testified as to the *real* reason for Francis's having been pressured into deeding over the property to her.

I am sorry to say that my son is disipated [sic] and he had already squandered one

> half of the estate when that which remains was put in my possession in trust for my son. * * * In fact, [the property] is mine now. I am not legally bound to give him my part of the income from the property, but his health and habits are such that I am morally bound to divide the income with him. My son is a draughtsman[401] and at present in Pittsburg Pa and here is a postcard I just received from him asking for money to come home (card shown Spl Exmr)."

Later she stated, "My son spent $5000 in just two months after getting it." The family attorney, Skillman, testified that although he "drew the deed" from Francis to Helen - and had done so only a year previously - he could "not now remember whether there was any trust [for Francis's benefit] expressed" in it, but that the property had been conveyed "upon an understanding between them" that such a trust, and an agreement to share rents, would be in effect. In fact, there was *no* trust arrangement or any other special arrangement expressed in the deed - the pension agent personally checked it - and, as an attorney, Skillman would have known that such an oral "understanding" was in any case completely unenforceable in these circumstances. Helen could do with the property what she liked, and her own testimony shows she understood this. It as also inconceivable that Skillman was unable to recall whether he had inserted so unusual a provision in the deed, especially since he must have prepared himself for the examiner's deposition. Skillman was by this time clearly concerned over what these unorthodox moves might mean for his professional reputation.

The veteran's widow now provided much more specific information about property-related finances, which also painted a somewhat different picture than had been incorporated in her 1897 affidavit - a picture that, on the issue of her net rental income, even contradicted *itself*.

> The property consists of a house and store combined with the ground that it stands on. My income from the property is *three hundred dollars per year* after the insurance and taxes are paid. …[M]y [residential] tennant [sic] is a poor man [and owes me seventy-one dollars in rent] and I have taken measures to eject him…. A lawyer has an office in the building [Skillman?], and another tennant has the store. The store rents for two hundred and seventy-five dollars per year. The law office for eighty-four….and the dwelling and barn rents for one hundred and thirty-two…making a total rental of four hundred and ninety-one dollars per year. The yearly taxes are seventy-one dollars…and the insurance is fifteen dollars per year, which means a revenue of *four hundred dollars per year* [actually $405], or would were I to receive what is due me." (Italics added.)

Skillman now testified that he had managed the property for the Stryker Estate for about thirty years, that it had been bringing in annual rent of about $455 ("if collected"), and that in his judgment it was worth about $5,000.

In sum, Helen and her various supporting affiants had made fairly divergent claims under oath, both as to the annual net income she was deriving from the property ("short" of $200, $200 to $250, $300, $400, and $455), and as to the property's overall value ($2,400, $3,000, and $5,000; a *disparity* of nearly $50,000 in today's currency). And then there was the awkward issue of Francis's true status - invalid unable to work, or degenerate wastrel - and that of the precise nature of the deed - trust arrangement for son's benefit, or unrestricted conveyance to mother. Small wonder that the Special Examiner, G. W. Moore, was not satisfied as to Helen's financial dependency, *or her credibility*, and that in his report to the Pension Office of November 21, 1898, concluded: "In my opinion, [Helen Stryker] is not entitled under the provisions of the Act of June 14, 1890. I would respectfully recommend that [her] claim be rejected." It was.

And here the trail of her life's story - aging widow of the unreliable Old Veteran and pottery salesman, mother of the Prodigal Son returned from Pittsburg - abruptly ends. At least she had Dart and Skillman and, thanks to the latter, the entire remainder of her son's still-valuable estate – with no legal strings attached. Sad and imperfect as these arrangements may have been, they were a good deal more than those most of her sister widows ended up with in their final years.

Teresa Holy Sullivan. A no less interesting, but considerably more inspiring tale is that of the life that Joseph Sullivan and Teresa Barbra Holy made together. The main features of Joseph's story are detailed in Chapter 7; this section reiterates the main features of his post-war life, and relates the balance of story from Teresa's perspective. Joseph Sullivan, an Irish laborer before the war who was almost certainly of recent immigrant stock, lived nearly his entire adult life in the small southeast Texas town of San Patricio, "Saint

Patrick." By the time he died there on September 3, 1903, at about 58 years of age, he and his wife had worked at ranching for nearly 4 decades, and had managed despite the town's waning prospects to build up a modest but creditable estate.

By all accounts, Teresa was a fully equal life partner to Joseph; she shared his evident capacity for hard work and modest investment, as well as his Catholic traditions and likely strong attachment to the Roman Church, and she managed to raise 5 sons and a daughter on the arid plain of Texas's Gulf Coast. Her own journey as a child and young woman is fascinating, another strand in the long and tough immigrant braid fashioned throughout the young country's first full century.

Teresa had been born in Austria about 1851, near the height of the wave of continental revolution and modernizing that more or less peaked in 1848. The old Austrian Empire was subjected to particularly violent upheavals during the period, and it is likely that this instability and unrest figured prominently in her parents' decision to emigrate to the United States in 1854. The family, which would eventually include at least one sister and one brother of Teresa, settled initially in New Orleans, where Teresa was raised during the next thirteen years: 1854 to 1867, during which she grew from 3 to 16 years of age, the era's conventional age of adulthood. New Orleans was a booming Southern city at the time: by 1840, with over 100,000 residents, it had become the fourth largest city in the U.S., and the largest in the South; this would have been an obvious draw for European immigrants in need of work in their new land. But the city had also become one of the most prone to cyclical scourges of yellow fever.[402] The disease had its worst single year of the nineteenth century in 1853, the year before the Holys arrived there, in which nearly 8,000 died; the next two years together claimed an additional 3,000.[403] This powerful disincentive to moving there during these years evidently did not stop the family.

In 1861 at age 10, with the Civil War looming, Teresa was sent out west to the recently established Ursuline convent in Galveston, Texas. Galveston lay about 300 miles west of New Orleans on Texas's upper Gulf Coast, and had served as the temporary capital of

the fledgling Texas Republic in 1836, and became its small navy's port city. The new Ursuline installation there had been begun in the late 1840s, and was intended to serve as one of the anchors of Pope Pius IX's newly organized Catholic Diocese of Texas. The convent's first school building was completed in 1851, the year Teresa was born; its first 4 sisters, who arrived there the same year by stagecoach to begin teaching, had been dispatched from the New Orleans Ursuline convent.

The latter institution had begun much earlier. Established in New Orleans in 1727, by immigrating Catholic nuns of the Ursuline order, by 1861 the institution was already one of the oldest of its kind in the United States. (It remains today, a thriving example of period architecture and colonial-era religious activity.) According to its current historical literature, the convent, in addition to founding the city's first girls' school and girls' orphanage, "helped raise girls shipped over from France as marriage material for local men, teaching the girls everything from languages to homemaking of the most exacting sort; laying the foundation for countless local families in the process." It is quite likely that Teresa herself had begun her schooling in the New Orleans Ursuline academy for girls, and that it was because of that connection that she found herself being sent by worried parents to the care of nuns of the same order in a hopefully safer location. Ironically, New Orleans was taken over by Union forces in April, 1862, with virtually no fighting or destruction, and occupied for the remainder of the war, whereas a sharp naval engagement took place in Galveston Bay in January, 1863, months after Teresa's arrival, and the city was occupied by the Confederates – and blockaded by the Union Navy – till war's end.[404]

This was a major move for 10-year-old Teresa, and undoubtedly a memorable adventure: a rare example of a young *female* "lighting out for the territories," though she was certainly being watched over by the sisters – and possibly by her parents as well. Although in pension communications she never subsequently related this part of her parents' story, it is possible of course that the entire family journeyed to Galveston at this time. It is known that at least her sister and brother, the only siblings Teresa had, also moved to Texas. By

the early 1900s, her brother, Joseph Holy, had settled in the east Texas town of Navasota, about 60 miles northwest of Houston; nothing more is known of him. More is known about Teresa's sister, however, who probably arrived at the Galveston convent at the same time she did, in 1861. She was almost certainly older than Teresa, for within a decade or so she had entered the order and become a trusted leader within the diocese. In January of 1874, she was placed in charge of 5 other Galveston sisters and, now known as Mother St. Joseph Holly (the spelling of her last name altered slightly), was sent to the "frontier town" of Dallas to found yet another Ursuline convent and school for girls. Dallas was situated about 260 miles northwest of Galveston and, though now reachable by train, was indeed still fairly rustic; among other deficits, it had no high school in operation. Despite the bitter winter and other hardships, Mother Joseph succeeded *within a week* in opening a school and attracting 7 day students. Within one term, the all-female student body had grown to 50, and in another year the sisters had dedicated a convent building and opened a boarding school. The Holy – or Holly – women were clearly resourceful and determined.[405]

At the Galveston convent, Teresa at some point met and befriended a young girl who was most likely a classmate; many years later – the "girl" was by now a 50-year-old married woman living in Corpus Christi and known as Mrs. H.I. Gaffney – the classmate testified that she had kept in touch with Teresa throughout the years. She stated that another Corpus Christi woman, a Mrs. Buckley, had taken Teresa on as a "companion" in 1868 or 1869 - Teresa was then 17 or 18 years old - and that Teresa had moved with Buckley to Corpus Christi where she lived "until shortly before her marriage."

Corpus Christi at the time was already a large, developing port city on the Gulf Coast, about 25 miles downriver from San Patricio. It lay about 200 miles southwest of Galveston. It was undoubtedly there, while she was living with Mrs. Buckley, that she somehow met Joseph, who had joined his family in San Patricio in the fall of 1865. They had important things in common: both were probably the children of immigrants – she surely was - and both were steeped in Catholic tradition; both had been farmed out in their childhood,

essentially to be raised by persons other than their parents; and – quite unusually except among Southerners - both had an experience and memory of war. The two were wed on December 1, 1871, and they returned to Galveston to have the ceremony performed. She was about 20, and he about 25. By the year of the wedding, the Galveston convent was thriving, the school building had been expanded, and a small chapel built; more important, Teresa's sister was still there. It was here in the "Presbytery" that the ceremony was performed, by the Rev. Father J.B. Bellaclas. (As here used, the term "presbytery" meant the area of the chapel customarily utilized by an officiating priest for performing church events.)

About a year and a half later, in July of 1873, the couple began producing a family of 6 children, Teresa giving birth with regularity about once every two years. In keeping with the central place of the Catholic Church in their domestic lives, their first 3 sons were named Joseph John Evangelist, John P., and James R. Sullivan. For the next 30 years, until Joseph expired in 1903, the couple worked hard together to make a living and build up a modest estate, despite the vacillating fortunes of the larger national economy and of San Patricio in particular. Having become used to the small but regular infusions of cash from Joseph's $6-a-month pension, Teresa made her own application for a widow's pension toward the end of the year he died. To aid her in the project, she returned to Ball & McCart, the Fort Worth law firm her husband had used so many years ago, despite that firm's seeming unfamiliarity with federal pension matters. There were most likely very few, or no, pension attorneys in the vicinity to choose from.

Once again, the matter proceeded with frustrating deliberateness. Several months after she had filed, the Pension Office notified her that it needed proof that the veteran had performed no military service before enlisting with the 15th. This seems a stunning example of functionary fecklessness: Joseph after all had been previously awarded a pension based upon his Civil War service and a wartime gunshot wound, and had had to make a similar affirmation at the time; his file was of course available to pension officials at their own

offices. G.D. McGloin, the San Patricio County Clerk, was clearly sympathetic to the widow's plight, and wrote the Pension Office on her behalf in April of 1904:

> I respectfully suggest that a reference to [the] Pension Roll and the evidence on which [Sullivan's] pension was granted would fully show that he did not serve prior to the [July, 1862] date.
>
> I beg to further call your attention to the fact that according to the "Report of Death," hereto attached, his age at the time of enlistment was between sixteen and seventeen years, which will further bear out the fact that it is not very probable he enlisted with either the Army or Navy prior to above mentioned date.
>
> Trusting…that you will at an early date grant to the widow…the pension to which she is *beyond the possibility of a doubt* legally entitled to, I beg to remain very sincerely yours…. [Emphasis added.]

The clerk's impassioned letter produced no result, however. Four months later, Teresa patiently wrote the PO herself making a similar argument (her prose is confident and her penmanship unusually graceful; the Ursuline sisters had done their job well):

> …Beg to say that I know no one by whom I could furnish testimony as to service of my late husband in the Army or Navy of the United States prior to July, 1862, and enclose herein my affidavit to that effect, and must ask you to refer to the testimony upon which he secured Original Pension Certificate No. 516790. He drew a pension of $18 per quarter up to the time of his death.

After another 14 months passed – one wonders what Ball & McCart were doing during this long lacuna – the Pension Office decided it would conduct a Special Examination to straighten things out, and to satisfy itself that Teresa was indeed financially dependent since she had claimed to own property and generate an income. The examination proceeded in November and December of 1905, before W.T. Shockley, Special Examiner. The principal witnesses were 2 of Teresa's sons: John, a "ranchman," age 27, and James, a "cattle man," 32; Joseph's brother, Henry ("Hank") Sullivan, the tax collector of a neighboring county, age 61; a 59-year-old merchant and brother-in-law named S.G. Borden; and Teresa herself, who was also 59 at the time.

The bulk of all of the witnesses' testimony was addressed to Teresa and Joseph's complex combination of real estate and livestock holdings, their efforts to make a go of it as farmers and ranchers, and their small investments in 2 local businesses. These last items – a ferry and a cotton gin – produced only a small amount of annual income. The real estate

consisted of ownership or cultivation rights in numerous tracts of varying sizes and farming quality. As Teresa told the examiner at the close of her convoluted testimony: "Things are so tangled up that it is difficult for me to give any clearer idea [of my finances]." While Joseph was alive, he had somehow kept it all straight, and was able through his own hard labor to keep as many as 200 acres, some of it belonging to other family members, in active cultivation. Even after paying the principal expenses involved – seed and equipment, interest on the mortgages encumbering the land, real estate taxes – he had been able to generate a decent profit. The last year of his life, for example, even though he plowed, sowed, and harvested with the body of a 58-year-old man – a man with a badly wounded leg - he had produced what his wife called "a good crop." Selling it after he died had enabled her to pay off all of his debts, and to use the rest to buy some modest property of her own and pay down the mortgages a bit. His efforts while living had also been instrumental in keeping the couple's home in reasonable repair, producing food for their own consumption, and "husbanding" their livestock, some of the yearly "increase" from which – calves, colts, and young mules – he was able to sell for profit in a good year.

Most of this changed with his death. Hardworking though she clearly was, 53-year-old Teresa simply could not perform the physically grueling manual labor of farming and ranching. Her children helped as much as they could. For example, despite their right under Texas law to claim half their father's estate – Joseph had not bothered to make out a will – they all declared their intention to let their mother keep all of it. And according to Borden in 1905, "…last year one of her sons endeavored to farm the places [his father had farmed] but raised nothing, in fact the boy lost money." Her children were struggling to keep up themselves, and by now had their own families to support.

Teresa had 3 options: sell off the farm property; rent it out to others to farm; or farm it herself using hired help. She could not bring herself to pursue the first option; she and her husband had spent too much of their lives working to accumulate and cultivate their holdings, and they were deeply attached to them. Land values were also quite low at the

time, and a large-scale sell-off would probably have generated far too little to make the project worthwhile. For similar reasons, renting proved economically unfeasible; Joseph had died at a time when the region's land values were depressed and there was virtually no demand at all for rental farmland. The witnesses were unanimous in this opinion, several testifying that they had tried without success to rent out portions of their own tracts.

So Teresa selected the third option; it was really her only choice. Sadly, although she seems to have tried quite hard, things did not go well. The relatively small number of cattle Joseph left to his wife did produce a number of calves, but almost all of them died. The amount of land she was able to put into cultivation decreased, and it cost her a staggering sum to hire the hands necessary to do the work at critical periods of the season. She estimated, for example:

> Altogether I raised about 7 bales of cotton and the corn which I told you about. I got $288 for all of the cotton. For my expenses I paid over $67 for cotton picking[,] and my bill for labor on the [other] places in cultivation of which I made no record I can't say how much I spent in that way. I sometimes had two or three hands at work and again [another time] would hire only one, and I can't estimate more than to say that altogether for labor I am satisfied I spent more than $150.

The house and outbuildings needed repairs that she would have to pay someone to make. The income from the cotton gin was meager: her share was worth about $125 and generated only about $5 per year in income, according to Teresa. Income from the ferry business was problematic:

> I also have a small interest in a ferry called the Borden Ferry [after her brother-in-law, S.G. Borden] over Nueces River on the road to Corpus Christi. The rail road being built has stopped the ferry practically & no income is derived from it. Seven or eight dollars a year was about all I got when it run.

In the end, the government examiner was clearly swayed by all he had heard. In his report to Washington, he described all of the witnesses as having good reputations in the community, and he believed what they had told him. He also felt that Teresa deserved a widow's pension, and said so. He seemed to appreciate the fact that she had chosen the only real option open to her, but that under the constraints she faced she could simply not farm

the land "advantageously." His only criticism was that Teresa, though a good person, was "not much of a manager."

Good ranch manager or not, Teresa was soon awarded the pension she had sought; approval was communicated to her just before Christmas, 1905. She would get the standard widow's rate of $8 a month, $2 more than Joseph had been getting. It must surely have made that year's celebration of the Nativity a fine one; perhaps Teresa allowed herself to revisit the large store of memories she and Joseph had set aside over thirty-two years of marriage. She lived another fifteen years, until 1920, dying at age 69 in the town where she had lived since age 20, probably in the same house where all 6 of her children had been conceived and born. A pretty good life.

CHAPTER 12

MOTHERS & FATHERS

…[W]hen [George] was killed, it was a hard stroke for his mother and all the family, and often have they come to me to tell me their grief and sorrow in regard to him. He was a fine young man, and I have no doubt made a Noble Soldier, as I had frequent Correspondence with him all the time up to his death."

Family friend, regarding Private George Henderson

Come up from the fields father, here's a letter from our Pete.
And come to the front door mother, here's a letter from thy dear son.
* * *
Open the envelope quickly,
O this is not our son's writing….
…O stricken mother's soul!
All swims before her eyes, flashes with black, she catches the main words only,
Sentences broken, *gunshot wound in the breast, cavalry skirmish, taken to hospital,*
At present low, but will soon be better.
* * *
Alas poor boy, he will never be better…,
While they stand at home at the door he is dead already,
The only son is dead.

Walt Whitman, 1865

Wives and children were of course not the only ones sharply impacted by a soldier's death or serious disability. Many mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters also suffered greatly. Poignant descriptions of this suffering, and of what life had been like before the war took its toll, emerge from the many "dependent" pension claims filed by these immediate blood relatives of Company A men.[406]

In fact, such files often contain even more detailed and vivid accounts of nineteenth-century life than do the files of soldiers' widows. For unlike widows who claimed pensions, other relatives had not only to demonstrate a family connection to a fallen soldier, but also to prove that a condition of financial dependency on the soldier existed at the time he died. Later on, as pension eligibility was liberalized, the law only required a showing of financial

want *at the time the claim was filed*, and that want could be from *any* legitimate cause, such as the claimant's own ill health or disabling injury. This being the case, dependent mothers and fathers typically submitted affidavits detailing their prewar and wartime household finances, including work performed by their son for wages or goods and how the soldier contributed to the family's economic support, and describing the family's financial decline after losing the soldier. Often, if the soldier continued to send home part or all of his military pay to help the family, wartime letters or diaries mentioning that fact were submitted to the Pension Office as well. These additional sources often give a good description of the life of the soldier's family, before, during, and after the war.

This chapter looks at all 9 dependent pension claims made by Company A mothers. (See next chapter for analysis of how large a portion of eligible mothers this may actually have represented.) In 3 of these cases, *both* parents of the deceased veteran claimed a pension, first the mother and then, following her death, the father. In those 3 cases, the fathers' claims will also be examined in this chapter to avoid losing the thread of their stories; the 4 additional fathers' claims are examined in Chapter 13. All 9 of these mothers' claims, and 6 of the 7 fathers' claims, were made by the parent of an *unmarried soldier who died during the war*. Such soldiers left behind no widow or children whose claims would have been preferred over those of other family members. (This was also the case in all 3 siblings' claims, detailed in Chapter 14.)

In only one case was a dependency claim filed by a parent of a *married* soldier who died during the war: the claim was that of Jacob Frey, father of Private Peter Frey. Peter died during the war but was married and left a widow whose name was not recorded. She, however, never filed for a pension - she most likely remarried - which allowed the soldier's father to submit a claim late in life.

The single instance of a dependency claim by a relative of a soldier who did *not* die during the war was the claim made on behalf of Charles Housel, a minor child who was orphaned after the war. Charles' father, Private Moses Housel, died in 1882, when Charles

was only 6 years old. There is no record of Charles' mother having filed for a widow's pension, and she died three years after her husband, when Charles was 9. (See Chapter 14.)

The 9 families' dependency claims were made over an extended period of time; the first two, both by mothers, were submitted in 1863, and the last two, both by fathers, in 1891, nearly 3 decades later. Unlike widow's claims, in which financial dependency was more or less assumed for the great majority of women (married as most were to predominantly working class men), a parent or sibling's financial reliance on a deceased soldier often proved difficult to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Pension Office. This meant that in several cases substantial additional evidence was required of applicants following their initial submission, long delays were experienced in obtaining final decisions, and claims were rejected - or abandoned by the claimants - at a higher rate than for widows. (Similarly, fathers' claims, at least in Company A, were less likely to be approved than those of mothers; see next chapter.)

For purposes of reconstructing the historical record, the statutory requirement for demonstrating dependency often resulted in richer primary documentation than exists for veterans' or widows' claims, particularly in connection with household work and economic issues. Claimants in this category were often obliged to describe their financial circumstances - what they had, how they were able to eke out a living, and how their soldier family member had contributed to that effort - in some detail. Sometimes the detail included letters written home by the soldier, as a way of showing a pattern of sending home money. Thus these pension files, though many fewer in number than those of the company's volunteers and their wives, offer an extremely valuable source of description and narrative concerning nineteenth-century life among the company's families.

Mothers' Claims

As stated, claims for dependent pensions were filed by the mothers of 9 deceased Company A men: David Anthony, Jacob Apgar, Martin Grassman, Philip Hendershot,

George Henderson, David Hicks, Cornelius Nevins, Henry Smith, and John Wyckoff. A tenth claim, by the mother of Naum Cregar, was apparently filed in error about 1872, and was not processed by the Pension Office. Cregar was alive at the time and was drawing his own pension as a disabled veteran.[407] All 9 are narrated below. The first 6 cases involve claims made by the soldier's mother *only*; they are set forth in the chronological order in which the applications were filed, from the first in 1863 to the last in 1884. The final 3 cases involve claims made first by the soldier's mother and then, following her death, by the soldier's father; these too are presented in the order filed (by the mother), the first in 1874 and the last in 1882.

Eliza Hendershot. Philip J. Hendershot was a young private in Company A who was born and raised in Tewksbury Township, at the northeast corner of Hunterdon County. He worked as a hired farmhand before the war, on various area farms. Philip's mother, Eliza Hendershot, was the widow of Jacob C. Hendershot, and had several other children at home when her son went off to war in the fall of 1862.

Philip did not survive long. He was one of the first casualties of the company during the hard period of the regiment's first winter encampment at White Oak, Virginia. He came down with typhoid fever, and died on February 9, 1863, having lasted only a little more than 5 months in the war theater.

About 5 months later, after the first shock of her son's death had perhaps been mercifully softened a bit by passage of days, Eliza gathered the strength necessary to fill out papers for a dependency pension claim. Somehow, even in these very early days of the pension program, she was referred to the Washington law firm of Barrows & Millard, who pursued the matter for her. She was illiterate, and signed everything with an X, "her mark".

The Pension Office wanted more evidence of Eliza's financial reliance on her son than she had submitted with her initial papers. At the time, there were few explicit instructions from the government as to how to go about the claim process, and claimants were typically put through significant delays while pension agents decided what more they needed. In

March, 1864, more than a year after losing her son, Eliza and a neighbor, Isaac Hildebrant, submitted affidavits giving more detail.

Hildebrant had employed Philip in 1861 and 1862, up till the time he left for the war. He stated that Eliza received half of her son's wages, "if not more"; that he (Hildebrant) sometimes delivered flour and meat to Eliza, and "at one time a hog for her pork for the winter," and also "carted wood" for her, all of which her son paid for out of his wages. He concluded by stating that Philip was his mother's "main support," and that she "was positively dependent" on him. Eliza herself underscored this testimony, adding that her son "did rent a house and pay the rent for her." She also claimed that from the time of her son's death, she had "been compelled to do manual labor for the support of her family".

Later that year, her dependency claim was approved at the maximum rate of $8 per month (the same amount paid to soldiers' widows). In 1879, following Congressional passage of an act increasing pension amounts, she applied for and received an award of $12 per month, giving her address as Fairmount (northeast Tewksbury). Sometime later she relocated a short distance to New Germantown (now the village of Oldwick, in southern Tewksbury) where, on February 1, 1905 she passed away.

The following day, William Craig, a solicitous neighbor, wrote to a Mr. Kerwin, the U.S. Pension Agent at the regional pension office in New York City:

> Dear Sir:
> It is my duty to notify you that Eliza Hendershot, a widow, died last night at her home not far from here. As she is receiving a pension…I write to inquire as to the proper course to pursue to secure her last quarterly payment which was due….

With bureaucratic but cold efficiency, Kerwin did not bother to answer so far as is known, but simply stopped further pension payments and penciled in at the top of Craig's letter the single word, "Dead."

Sarah Grassman. The case of Sarah Grassman, mother of Private Martin Grassman, is unusual, intriguing, and ultimately quite sad. Although there are considerable gaps in the documentary record, a reasonably confident picture can be drawn of the

Grassman family's complicated prewar and postwar circumstances, at least as they relate to Sarah's pension claim.

Sarah was born about 1803, and probably married her husband, Cyrus (or Cyrenus) Grassman, in the early 1820s, when she was still a young adult, in her late teens or early twenties. Sarah was illiterate, like most country women of the time, and had virtually no property – both conditions would continue for the rest of her life, so far as the record discloses. The couple lived in or near Flemington, in Raritan Township. Sarah gave birth to her first child, Catherine, on November 25, 1825, when she was about 22 years old. As others would later insist, however, the biological father of Catherine was not Cyrus Grassman, but a neighbor named John Rose. Rose, who was 15-20 years older than Sarah, already had a son of his own, Isaac Rose. Nothing is known about John Rose's marital situation, or about the mother of Isaac, except that the mother was *not* Sarah and was almost surely the wife or former wife of John Rose. It is possible that at the time John and Sarah conceived Catherine, both of them had been widowed. It is more likely, however, that one or both of them remained married, which would have made Catherine's birth a potentially scandalous instance of adultery in this still small Hunterdon community. Scandal or not, these domestic circumstances would cause problems later on.

Members of the Rose family were either related to the Grassmans, or were close friends and neighbors. Catherine Grassman grew up referring to John Rose's son, Isaac, as "my uncle." If literally true, this would have meant that *Sarah* Grassman, Catherine's mother, was either Isaac Rose's sister or sister-in-law. In the former case – sister - this would lead to the unpalatable conclusion that John Rose, the father of Sarah's two children, was also Sarah's own father or uncle, adding incest to the scandal of adultery. In the latter case, however, Sarah could have been related to Isaac by marriage; e.g., Sarah's *sister* - if she had one - could have married Isaac, making him merely Sarah's brother-in-law, not related by blood either to him, Isaac, or to his father, John Rose. In any case, once Catherine Grassman and Isaac Rose realized that they were half-siblings and had the same father,

Catherine's calling Isaac "uncle" – he was probably at least a decade older than she - may simply have been a way of acknowledging and perhaps even cementing a relationship that could not comfortably be made public. Every hint in the record suggests that the two families remained close and mutually supportive. Another possibility of course is that the term "uncle" may have been used simply to signify a close and loving relationship between a younger Catherine Grassman and an older Isaac Rose, as neighbors and oft-visiting friends, rather than as literal relations of any degree.

In any case, Sarah Grassman's second child, Martin, was not born for another *fifteen years*, about 1840. Sarah was now in her late 30s, and it is very likely that she was by this time a widow. John Rose was again the father, according to several later accounts. (By this time, it appears both Catherine and Isaac were aware of the intimate relationship between Sarah and John, and that John was indeed the father of both of them, as well as of Martin.). In 1845, Catherine, age 19 or 20, married a man named Craft and moved out of Sarah's home, but remained in Raritan Township. Martin was about five years old; it seems he referred to his older sister as "Aunty Caty" (see second Grassman letter, below). Sarah Grassman was by now in her early 40s. [(Isaac Rose had meanwhile moved away to Illinois, but kept in touch with the family.)

Little is known of Martin's prewar life, but he enlisted with the other volunteers in the summer of 1862, giving his residence as "Raritan Township/Flemington." He was about 21 or 22, single, and had probably worked before the war as a laborer or farm hand. Martin's decision to sign up was probably driven as much by financial concerns as by anything else; every indication is that his widowed mother was relatively poor. She was now 59 years old and in poor health. His military service immediately improved Sarah's impoverished circumstances: the Freeholders (governing body) of Raritan Township promptly voted her a monthly stipend of $6 from the date of Martin's mustering in. But there was potentially a very high price to pay for this improvement, and Sarah was clearly wracked with worry about it.

As described in Chapter 2, Grassman and the 15th New Jersey first arrived in the Washington area at the end of August, 1862, and spent the month of September making and fortifying a temporary campsite in Tenallytown (northwest Washington). During this period, on September 16, Martin wrote[408] his mother:

> Dear Mother you must not think hard of it that I have not written you before[.] Not because I did not want to hear from or say anything to you but I thought that a letter to one was as a letter to all so I did not write to you in particular but sent some word to you in each letter[.] I don't know of anything to write by way of news[.] You have no doubt heard of McClellan's [sic] victories in Maryland and the Rebel loss of 17,000 men[.] If it goes this way I think we will all get home soon.
>
> I want you to tell me in your next letter if you get any better in health[.] I don't want you to worry any about me in my absence for if I live I want to live in God and if I die I want to die in God and meet you in Heaven. I hope to get back & find you well when I come home[.] You will please excuse a short note from me today as I have written nearly as much as will come for [now?]. Tell Higgins that Lewis Higgins is well and sends his love to them[.] I will write some to Mrs. Carkhuff[.] With my love to you and all the family I bid you Good Bye[.]
>
> Your Affct Son M. V. Grassman

The letter makes clear that Grassman had already written to others, most likely his sister, and had been scolded by his mother for not writing her directly! There was not much to report; the regiment had remained in garrison, drilling and getting acclimated to wartime duty. It is also evident that Grassman's information on the war was quite skewed: McClellan had been fighting since April entirely in Virginia, not Maryland. He only tentatively attempted to execute his various stratagems that summer in the eastern Virginia theater, resulting in horrific Union casualties, especially during the "The Seven Days Battles" (June 25-July 1) around Richmond. Grassman's reported rebel losses of "17,000" probably refers to Confederate casualties in these engagements. Though roughly accurate, Union losses were comparable, and there had been no sustained McClellan "victories". (In fact, McClellan was afterwards demoted by an increasingly disillusioned President Lincoln; the general would be relieved of command altogether about 6 weeks later.) In the Second Battle of Bull Run (Manassas) at the end of August, just two weeks before Grassman's letter, Union forces had again been driven from the field, with losses of about 16,000. It is remarkable in these

circumstances, and a tribute to the morale-sustaining efforts of the North, that the young volunteer could still "think we will all get home soon."

The letter also raises the issue of Sarah Grassman's poor health, and also Martin's reliance on his Christian faith to see him through, one way or the other. Finally, it reveals the strong sense of community that pervaded locally raised Civil War companies, especially at this early point in the war. Martin offers comforting news to the family of a fellow Company A soldier, and promises to write to a neighbor; he also assumes his letters home will be shared beyond the persons to whom they are individually addressed.

Sarah's pension file contains a second letter from her son, written jointly to her and her daughter, Catherine Craft, later that fall (probably in October or November). The first part of the letter is addressed to Catherine:

> I will write all that I can think of[.] One thing I want is to know how much state pay Mother has got[,] if she has had more than Six Dollars[.] We have not been paid of yet I expect we will be soon[.] if I get 2 months pay I would like to borrow five dollars of Mother to pay Geo. R. Jones $25 and make it an even Hundred if she has not got it to spare it makes no difference[.] When we get into winter quarters if it is not under the ground I want a box sent me[.] I will want a pair of gloves and several things. I will let you know what I want[.] I don't buy any thing unless I get it of the Sutler I buy cheese and crackers of. Once in a while I am troubled with sour stomach a good deal and Diarrhea and then I don't feel much like eating our rations so I go to the Sutler[.] The Captain boards at a private house[.] I sent with him and got half a loaf of bread[.] We get a loaf as large as a Washbasin for 25¢ This is cheap enough I think[.] You said also that Aaron P. Hoffman wanted me to write to. I have but have heard no answer[.] To Wm. Risler to and get no answer[.] Please tell Mr. Hoffman so and give him my best respects[.] I should be glad to hear from him[.] You said you sent me a letter with seven stamps in[.] I think I never got it[.] I got one with five in and one yesterday with four in. You must keep an account of them and I,ll [sic] send money to you for them[.] You need not believe any rumors that you hear from us until you know it is true.

Grassman's letter then addresses his mother, Sarah:

> I must now say a word to Mother although my stock of news is almost run out[.] Dear Mother I thank you for your kind advice[.] I will try and profit by it[.] I hope that God may hear and answer prayer in my behalf[.] I live in hopes that this war will not last long but that we may all be home soon again. I would like to see you and the children and Aunt Caty and everybody else but you must trust in God in the hope of a happier meeting in the eternal world when this short life shall close[.] You must give my love to Aunty [Sare?] and Mary and tell them I,ll write when I get time[.] My Respects to Carkhuffs[,] Browns and all the neighbors[.] also Remember my love to Mr. [Strock?] and Family and to all my friends[.] Tell Bergen that paper come safe and sound[,] much obliged to him for it. let us be where we will [i.e., wherever we are,] always send your letters to Washington and put on them Company and Regiment[.] I will write to George too on another sheet[.]

Your Affct Son
M. Grassman

Mrs. Sarah Grassman and
Mrs. Craft [Catherine Grassman]

Get a whole sheet of foolscap [writing paper] and write it full yourself [illegible, probably a name]

Once more, several things are apparent from the letter. In what must be a timeless and universal ritual, Sarah had been giving her venturing son motherly advice, and Martin was promising to take it. There is again strong reference to comforting notions of faith and eternal life, although an element of fatalism and even dark humor seem now to have crept in: Martin's mention of "this short life," and his desire for a package from home if his "winter quarters" are "not under the ground." By the time of this letter, although the company had yet to see combat, it had certainly witnessed its consequences. That October, according to Haines:

> …[W]e crossed a portion of the [Antietam] battle-fields, and marked many new-made graves. At various points hospital tents were erected, filled with wounded men, who, from the nature of their wounds, could not bear the risk of removal. The churches, and many barns, were also used for hospitals.[409]

Martin's letter also once again reinforces the impression of strong and pervasive community ties, and introduces some of the many monetary arrangements that must have characterized Grassman's, and many other soldier families', wartime finances, including, it appears, a not insubstantial loan from a man named George R. Jones, the balance of which stood at $125 - about $2,500 in today's currency.

Finally, there is the ominous mention of Martin's new health condition: "once in a while I am troubled by sour stomach." The ailment is serious enough to prevent him from eating army-issue rations (primarily, salted pork and "hard tack" biscuit), and to require him to buy cheese, crackers, and bread from the sutler trailing the regiment.

In the late fall and winter of 1862, the Regiment made its way generally southward into Virginia, having been officially incorporated into the VI Corps of the Army of the Potomac. It participated in an unsuccessful attack on Fredericksburg in mid-December and,

after the abortive "Mud March" of January, 1863, settled into its first winter quarters at White Oak. (See Chapter 3.) It was an unhealthy place, and a difficult winter. As Haines described it:

> …[S]ickness prevailed to an alarming extent. The exposure…was injurious to a large number. Our camp was an unwholesome one, with bad drainage, and very muddy in wet weather. * * * Deaths were frequent. The White Oak Church burying-ground received the bodies of some of our finest young men, while the remains of others were taken home for interment by their friends.[410]

Undoubtedly, the debilitating experience of the mud march, coupled with winter camp conditions, further weakened Grassman and exacerbated the intestinal problems he had written about in the fall. He was almost certainly the victim of an increasingly troublesome case of amebic dysentery. He was not alone. [411]

Toward the end of April, the regiment made ready for its first movement of the 1863 campaign season, and were given orders to break up camp on April 28. By then, it had become evident to Grassman's commanders that he was far too ill to join in the march. On April 24, he was conveyed to the VI Corps General Hospital, a few miles away at Potomac Creek. There he lingered with "chronic diarrhea" for 10 more days, and died on May 4. Martin was 21 or 22 years old. He had likely died a painful death. (The usual treatment for dysentery at the time was "a pint and a half of tea daily," not much help in relieving the symptoms of this ravaging illness.)

His mother, Sarah, was 60. Already ill and living alone on the edge of poverty, the news of her son's death may very well have brought about her own. Sarah died less than 6 months later. In the meantime, however, she did the best she could, no doubt her network of friends and neighbors rallying to her support. Within 6 weeks, with the help of Flemington attorney, David Van Fleet, she filed a claim for a dependent's pension. She would never benefit as the law intended, however, as the Pension Office was unaccountably slow to reply, and had taken no action at all by the date of Sarah's death on October 31, 1863.

But the matter did not there end. After the passage of a year, Sarah's daughter, Catherine Grassman Craft, took up the matter, using her own Flemington attorney, C. Van

Syckle. In the space of only half a year, Catherine had suffered the cruel loss of her mother and only full brother; the government had done little to ease the pain, especially during her ailing mother's final days. She may well have been angry. Catherine demanded, as Sarah's only surviving heir, that she be paid any amount that ought to have been paid her mother before she died. Only now did it emerge that the government had not acted on Sarah's original claim because it was not satisfied she had provided sufficient evidence of financial dependence on her son. For example, the pension official reviewing one of the letters Martin had sent home during the war noticed it did not refer to any soldier's pay being enclosed for his mother; he wrote in pencil on the letter's last page: "No Money Sent." There then followed a long exchange of government requests for further information and Catherine's efforts to provide it.

The exchange revealed that during the war years, Sarah had owned little or no property, and that for the approximately 8 months of her son's wartime duty, the Freeholders of Raritan Township had paid her $6 per month for his "services" - probably her only income unless Martin had managed after his first letter to send home some of his pay. The town's monthly payments were apparently an early form of local welfare; the money does not seem to have been in the nature of a bounty, or compensation to the soldier for *military* services rendered, but rather money paid his mother to replace services or income he had presumably been providing for her *support* before he left for the war.[412]

The matter then lay fallow for several years, but in 1877 was reactivated by a third Flemington attorney, Richard S. Kuhl. The Pension Office now wished to know the "particulars" of Sarah's estate, and Kuhl provided the information. The government was evidently still not satisfied that Sarah had actually been financially dependent on her son, and was continuing to seek evidence of her assets and income before finally determining her old claim. During the war years, according to the local tax assessor, no real estate or personal property whatsoever had been taxed to Sarah. At her death, according to her administrator, Sarah's estate consisted of a modest total of $103.49 in "pension and bounty"

moneys "due or on hand." Adequate evidence in support of the claim seemed finally to be in hand.

But the government now raised *for the first time* an additional concern: the true paternity of the deceased soldier, Martin Grassman. It is possible that the Pension Office became curious about the matter by discovering that Cyrus Grassman had died before he could have fathered Martin (this chronology is very probable, but not certain from the historical record). It is nevertheless unclear why this was an issue that should have affected Sarah's claim of financial dependency, or her eligibility for a pension on that basis. A possible explanation lies in the nineteenth century's tortured and evolving law of "bastardy": a legal classification that extended both to children born "out of wedlock," i.e., to an unmarried mother, and to children born to an "adulterine," i.e., to a married woman as a result of extra-marital intercourse The modern legal term is "illegitimacy." The traditional common-law approach to bastardy was to categorize an illegitimate child as *filius nullius* - no one's child – and to deny both the child and its parents any mutual rights or obligations, to deny in fact any legal relationship. The purpose of this harsh rule was said to be threefold: to police sexual activity, limiting it to marriage; to protect the "legitimate" family from competing claims, e.g., the potential claim of an illegitimate child to a share of its parents' care, or estates; and to protect society from the obligation to provide for the support of *impoverished* illegitimate children.

A combination of republican attitudes and New World circumstances conspired to bring about numerous changes in the American law of bastardy during the nineteenth century, most of which softened or eliminated some of the cruelest consequences of traditional law. Change, however, was directed mainly at the sexual and family aspects of the law: decriminalizing "fornication" as a practical matter, even when offspring resulted; providing mothers and illegitimate children certain rights and protections; enabling children to be "legitimated" through parents' subsequent acknowledgment or marriage; and obligating

biological fathers to provide child support. Changes directed toward recognizing a state or social duty to support "bastard" children mired in poverty, however, remained rare.[413]

Sarah Grassman's pension application provides an intriguing instance of bastardy jurisprudence in this changing context. As a matter of law, any right she enjoyed to federal assistance was based entirely on her relationship to her soldier son, Martin, and to her status as his impoverished, or at least economically dependent, mother. But Martin was apparently an illegitimate child. Under the more enlightened nineteenth-century view of bastardy law, Sarah may certainly have been able to enforce a right to have custody of Martin, and even a right to receive support for him from the actual father, Rose; conversely, Martin would have had a right to the benefit of these things, through his mother, and perhaps even a right to inherit from one or both of his natural parents. But here the era's enlightenment probably ended. Had the matter been litigated, Martin's mother very likely would have been found to have no right to a dependency pension by way of a soldier son conceived either adulterously or without marriage. This was not a question of protecting the child or preserving the family structure; Martin was dead. The issue would most likely have been framed as a question of the larger community's legal obligation to provide material support to a woman who had indulged her sexual appetite outside of marriage, a community obligation that was founded upon the sacrifice of another who was now out of the picture. The same kind of nineteenth-century analysis may also have called into question Sarah's wartime receipt of the monthly stipend she had been paid by the local municipal authority on account of her son's service. By this time, however, she too was long dead and her meager estate extinguished; the government could have done little about this even if it had wished to.

One small mystery remains. In pursuing her deceased mother's pension claim, Catherine and her supporters made no effort to hide what was almost certainly the truth: that John Rose was Martin's biological father, and that Martin had been an illegitimate child – and even that Rose had fathered Catherine illegitimately as well! For example, Rose's

older son, Isaac, who was residing in Illinois in 1877 but who had obviously kept in touch with his half-siblings, submitted an affidavit on Catherine's behalf, stating that his father was also the father of Catherine and Martin Grassman. Catherine corroborated John's paternity in an affidavit of her own. And so did the family's Attorney R.S. Kuhl, in a cryptic letter to the Pension Office dated August 31, 1878:

> Dear Sir -
> In claim No. 31-034, I find that Martin V. Grassman is a bastard child of Sarah Grassman's. I can establish that fact beyond question. Awaiting your reply with further instructions I am -
> Very Respectfully Yours -
> R. S. Kuhl

Why were these people so willing to provide the information about Martin and their families? It almost appears as if both the family and their attorney believed that establishing Martin's bastard status would *help* in their quest for government moneys, rather than hurt. Perhaps they simply did not know better; or perhaps this was an area of "unsettled" law, the Pension Office requesting paternity information before it had even formulated its own position on the matter, and Kuhl offering his "finding" before he understood the ramifications. Or possibly, Kuhl felt obliged to advise the government of his finding even though he knew or suspected it would jeopardize his client's claim. Such an approach to probity and attorney ethics has emerged elsewhere in the record of Company A claims, and may have been a more common impulse in nineteenth-century law practice than it is today.

In any case, at this point - *fifteen years after Sarah's initiation of the claim* and long after her death - the government file was marked "abandoned" by the Pension Office. Perhaps Catherine, now 52 years old, simply did not have the heart to go on, especially as the amount in question was relatively slight. Better that she live out her own life holding fast to warm memories of her mother and young brother, and let go the sorrow of the war – aggravated as it must have been by this final, bitter chapter.

Lorenda Henderson. Three mothers of deceased Company A men, Lorenda Henderson, Catherine Hicks, and Elizabeth Smith, all initiated claims in 1879. Each was ultimately approved.

Lorenda was born about 1805, probably in New Germantown (now Oldwick), Hunterdon County. She was married in that village to William Henderson, the father of the soldier, on July 30, 1842, by the Rev. Henry Pohlman. She was about 37 years old, and illiterate; her husband, who was born on November 1, 1810, was five or six years younger, at age 31, and was a shoemaker. It may have been Lorenda's second marriage. Their soldier son, George B. Henderson, was born June 25, 1843, and was their first child. Surprisingly, in view of her age, the couple produced 6 children, born between 1843 and 1855. Lorenda was about 50 when her last child was born; the normal age range for onset of menopause among modern women is 45-55.

At about 17 years of age, George began working on the nearby farm of Harrison Apgar, who later recalled:

> …[T]he greater portion of his wages went direct for the support of the family. * * * His wages went in money, flower [sic], or such things as a family needs, and was paid by me to him, or som [sic] one of the family sent and got it, and was used for their support and comfort.

A High Bridge storekeeper, William Lance, confirmed this, and stated that after George enlisted, at age 19, he sent his pay home and that his parents used it to buy goods from his store. He described both of the soldier's parents as "infirm" and unable to support themselves (they were 53 and about 59 at the time their son left for the war).

On May 8, 1864, the final day of the Battle of the Wilderness, Company A was completing its withdrawal from a precarious skirmish line it had manned the previous day and night. In the confusion of a rebel assault that "drove in the line," and probably lying wounded on the field, George was captured by rebel forces and conveyed to the Confederate rear. (At the time, based on the report of comrades, Chaplain Haines listed him as killed in action on May 8; his body was obviously not recovered. However, he had in fact been taken

prisoner and taken off the field. The War Department had also incorrectly listed him as killed in action on May 8, at Laurel Hill; the company's assault at Laurel Hill actually took place on May 9. Within two weeks, Henderson had been confined at Richmond's "Winder Building" prison. He survived less than 3 months, and succumbed on August 9 to an illness or condition that his captors recorded as "VS" and that his mother later described as "scurvy."[414]

Harrison Apgar later stated:

> …[W]hen [George] was killed, it was a hard stroke for his mother and all the family, and often have they come to me to tell me their grief and sorrow in regard to him. He was a fine young man, and I have no doubt made a Noble Soldier, as I had frequent Correspondence with him all the time up to his death.

By the time George died, Lorenda's next oldest child, William, had turned 19 years old, and may have moved out of the home; the 4 remaining children, however, were ages 9, 11, 15, and 17, and had to continue to be supported. According to later accounts, Lorenda's husband was not much help. He died on February 6, 1877, at age 66.

In September, 1879, fifteen years after losing her son and two years after losing her husband, Lorenda finally filed for a pension. She was 74 years old, and continued to reside in High Bridge. As with so many "dependency" applications, it took several years to provide the Pension Office with the information it required to determine the claim, and it dragged on. Her initial submission was handled by a New Jersey attorney, Alexander Butts, who practiced in another region of the state: the town of Plainfield, in Union County. She probably had been referred to him by the local veterans' network; two Company A comrades, Naum Cregar and Moses Housel, acted as witnesses on her application. Butts, like many local lawyers not specializing in such work, did not use official forms for the application, and although the affidavits he did prepare and forward were fairly comprehensive, they brought no concrete action from the government.

Accordingly, after a frustrating two-year hiatus, Lorenda availed herself of a specialist, Washington attorney, Joseph Hunter, a member of the rapidly expanding "pension

bar" with offices in the nation's capital. Hunter started from scratch, submitting a new application in June, 1881. This time, her claim was supported by affidavits from several neighbors and local officials, and by some of her late son's wartime letters.

One of the affiants, Mary Berry, was a long-time friend of the family. She stated:

> I am fifty eight years of age and have known Lorenda Henderson for over thirty years. I lived less than one fourth of a mile from [the family] during the year 1864 and have in fact lived near them ever since. * * * they were my nearest neighbors…and from my own personal knowledge, I know that [William] did not contribute to the support of his family. The reason he did not…was that he was a very disapated man. His occupation was that of a shoemaker[.] he was broken down by reason of strong drink and what little he earned he spent for liquor. His income or earning did not amount to more than two or three dollars per month and many [months] he earned nothing. * * * [The family] never owned any real estate and very little personal property consisting of a few household goods not worth more than fifty dollars[.] Claimant only means of maintenance was her children and [in] particular soldier, the rest not being able to earn much. * * * I knew that after the death of her son Geo she was compelled to go out to work in order to support her family.

Another supporting witness, Peter Trimmer, confirmed this testimony: "[William] was a very disapate man and he was broken down by reason of strong drink and did not earn much and spent his earning for liquor. I do not think that he contributed anything toward the support of his family."

It is interesting here to speculate whether Peter may have been a long-time suitor of Lorenda's daughter, Sarah Henderson. Sarah was born on December 3, 1846, and was 36 years old when Peter, who was also 36, made out his affidavit. He stated he had known Sarah's father for 19 years, i.e., since he was 17; had known him "well" for the last 18 years; and "was at his house nearly every day." Had Peter been William's apprentice or employee all those years; if so, why did he not mention the fact? But the two were not married, since Peter swore at the time that he was "not in any way related to Claimant [Sarah's mother]." So he and Sarah had seen each other almost every day for 18 years, when they were both 18 years old, at Sarah's home, yet both of them, at age 36, remained unmarried as far as is known.

Two neighbors, David M. Bird and Mathias Hildabrandt, signed affidavits stating that William had never earned more than $25 in a year. Several local tax collectors and

assessors testified that during the 1870s and 1880s the family never paid taxes on more than $50 worth of personal property, and owned no real estate. (Attorney Hunter took no chances, submitting affidavits from a total of two local assessors and *six* collectors!)

It was enough. At long last, Lorena Henderson, age 79 or 80, was awarded a pension on October 8, 1884. It had been five years since her original filing.

Catherine Hicks. Catherine P. Hicks was the mother of Company A Sergeant, David. E. Hicks. Catherine was probably originally from Nazareth, Pennsylvania, since that is where she and her husband, John H. Hicks, were married. Nazareth lies a short distance across the Delaware River from New Jersey, about 10 miles northwest of Hunterdon County. The Rev. Samuel Rankin performed the marriage, on June 1, 1841. Unlike most of the other mothers of Company A soldiers, Catherine may have been literate; she was at least able to sign her name, though in an uncertain hand that leaves some doubt about her facility with writing.

Sometime after the marriage, the couple moved to New Jersey, perhaps initially to Hunterdon County - David later reported he had been born in Hunterdon - but relocating north to the village of Asbury, in Warren County, by 1861. Asbury sits astride the Warren/Hunterdon County line defined by the Musconetcong River, in northwestern Hunterdon. David may simply have been born "on the other side of town," in the Hunterdon portion of Asbury.

David was the oldest of the 4 children of the marriage, and was probably born in 1842 or 1843, since his parents were married in 1841 and he enlisted in 1862. Catherine and John's 3 other children were still "under fourteen years of age" in 1863, so were all born in or after 1849. The family was poor, and never managed to accumulate enough money to purchase real estate. To support the family, John worked "a small farm on shares" - i.e., as a tenant farmer or "sharecropper" - and as David grew to maturity, he increasingly assisted his father in this work.

The war years would be exceptionally difficult for the Hicks family. In 1861, according to Dr. Alfred Gale, the family physician, John was afflicted with "a severe attack of Typhoid Fever, which permanently and seriously impaired his health, and from the effects of which he never recovered."[415] Although John's date of birth is not recorded, he was probably in his 40s at the time. David, according to his mother, was required at that point "to carry on the farm business" alone, as the family's primary means of support. During the year before he entered service, David took a job "as a clerk in a large store of general merchandise in a neighboring town," and from both the store job and his subsequent military service, "he contributed of his wages and pay to the support of his…mother." Since David reported to his enlistment officer in 1862 that he was a resident of the Town of Clinton, it is likely that the store he worked in was located in that town, and that he had moved there to take the clerk job. Clinton is only about 11 miles east of Asbury, and was a thriving town with a large merchandise store shown on the Beers' 1873 Atlas.

Then, in August, 1862, David left for the war. It did not take long for tragedy to strike, though it struck first from an unexpected quarter. In January, 1863, Catherine and John's young son, Clarence, died. In May, their oldest son, David, would be taken as well.

By available accounts, David Hicks was a model young soldier, courageous and devout, a natural leader. According to Haines, he was "a tall, noble-looking young man, and had endeared himself by his generosity and courage to all who knew him." He was soon chosen to be the Regimental Color Sergeant, a highly honored - and extremely dangerous - position. (See Chapter 3.) He was clearly one of the best-loved young men of the company, and they must have taken it hard to lose him.

At Salem Heights, Virginia, on May 4, 1863, the regiment became involved in one its first serious engagements, against an opposing Georgia regiment. When its advance was stalled on the field by a confederate fusillade, Hicks sprang into action, waving the colors and trying to rally the men of the regiment to resume the attack, and in the process exposing himself to murderous, concentrated fire. He was quickly shot down in a hail of bullets.

Sixteen years later, his mother would write that her son died "by a musket or rifle, shot through the head while bearing the Colors of the Regiment (died instantly)." Haines' vivid account of Hicks's last moments had not yet been written, and Catherine had surely learned these sparse details from her son's comrades. Her simple words carry a mother's defiant pride, as well as every parents' final hope that a dying child at least be spared suffering.

The accumulated losses - John's illness, the deaths of Clarence and then David - were terrible to bear, but also placed the family in desperate financial straights. There was now no farm income or produce, and no more money coming home from David. Catherine had to assume virtually full responsibility for supporting her family. She took boarders into their rented home, and "perform[ed] work and labor in various ways, for other persons, for which…she received a small compensation." A neighbor, Henry Hunt, wrote that Catherine "worked in families and has received aid and assistance in various ways from her friends".

Meanwhile, John "was in steadily declining health," and in 1870, he suffered the further setback of "a fall which fractured his leg and made him a cripple". Catherine's other two children, George and Elizabeth, each married and moved out, leaving her with the added burden of caring for John by herself. The surviving children were unable to help because, according to the generous assessment of their mother, "their circumstances are such that they are only able to provide for and support their own families." Generous or not, it was probably true. On August 13, 1875, John died. Dr. Gale took the unusual step of performing a "post-mortem examination," or autopsy, which "revealed a large internal cancerous tumor, which had been several years in forming, and during this time injured his health and impaired his strength." Catherine, probably in her mid-50s, was now completely alone, and clearly worn out. John had left her with "only a small amount of personal property, the proceeds from the sale of which after his death were not sufficient to pay his debts."

Four years later, in August of 1879, she finally made application for a dependent pension, using a Clinton attorney, William Shipman. Although prosecuting the application

took three more years and numerous additional affidavits from neighbors and others, it was finally approved at the end of 1882, at $8 per month.[416] Moreover, since the Pension Office was persuaded that Catherine had in fact been in a financially dependent status since her soldier son's death, she was awarded back payments from May of 1863. This meant she received a lump sum of about $1,880, close to $40,000 in today's currency. Catherine's financial insecurity was ended for good: small consolation for her life's great losses.

Elizabeth Smith. The third 1879 claim submitted by a mother was that of Elizabeth Smith, whose Company A son was Private Henry C. Smith. Elizabeth Crum (Smith) and her future husband, Jeremiah Smith, were both born about 1812. They were married on March 3, 1834, at Flemington, by the Reverend John Clark, when they were each about 22 years old, and probably lived at that time in Flemington or surrounding Raritan Township. Henry was born more than eight years later, on July 23, 1842, "near" Flemington. His sister, Ellen Ann, was born three years later, on August 22, 1851.

About 1861, the family moved to East Amwell Township, just east of Raritan, and established a residence near the small village of Wertsville. The 1873 Beers Atlas shows a "J. Smith" residence on Indian Path Road, about 2/3 of a mile southwest of the center of the village. Here, Jeremiah set up a shoemaking business. He had never "served an Apprenticeship to the Shoemakers trade but took it up and worked at Coarse work and Cobling [sic] in a Lean-to which had been built for an out Kitchen it being about Ten feet square." To supplement his earnings - he "did not work Steady at Cobling" - Jeremiah "now and then [worked] a day or two at the neighbours at Farm work and about the [family's] lot and garden."

Their son, Henry, who was 18 at the time, hired out as a farmhand. During the growing and haying seasons of 1861 and 1862, he worked for Jacob Herder, who later stated that Henry often mentioned the "dependence of his mother and father upon him for support and his desire to recognize such obligation." He remembered David giving his mother $2 in cash, and some butter and a load of hay for her cow, worth $10. David's sister stated that

"he was a good and dutiful son and a great help and comfort to his parents," and recalled specifically that the month before he left for the war, "he brought [his mother] home a new dress & parasol worth about $4 [and] that at other times he gave her money and things for her maintenance and was in the habit of buying his clothes & bringing them home for his mother to make up."[417] His mother estimated that he contributed to the family a total of about $200 from his farm work before the war.

When David enlisted as a Private in 1862, he had just turned 20 years old. He maintained his practice of sending home most of his pay. His sister recalled specifically that, "in the winter of 1864 [he] sent his mother five (5) dollars and again same winter by check five (5) dollars and in March 1864 a check for ten (10) dollars." Two months after sending the last amount, on May 12, 1864, he was cut down in the "Bloody Angle" fighting at Spotsylvania Courthouse, that most terrible half hour of Company A's war.

Elizabeth and Jeremiah attempted stoically to continue; they had themselves and 12-year-old Ellen Ann to take care of. But Jeremiah's physical health had already been deteriorating, and was now undoubtedly worsened by the shock of his only son's death. His wife stated that during this period he suffered from "Inflammation of his Eyes, Rheumatism [at the time, an indefinite complaint of general debility or soreness], and Lameness in his left shoulder having had his shoulder dislocated two times previous…which infirmities disabled him…one third of his time". This litany may have been a bit exaggerated. Dr. Studdiford, of Lambertville, later discounted the rheumatism complaint, but he did find cataracts in both eyes, of sufficient degree to interfere "very much" with any manual labor.

By the end of the war Jeremiah was about 53 years old, and could no longer hire himself out for occasional farm work, or any other manual labor. James B. Chamberlin and Jacob S. Dunham, two "near neighbors…and intimate friends," later signed affidavits stating that during this period they were frequently "in his 'shop'…seeing and conversing with him" and that, as his health deteriorated, his occupation became "that of doing a little cobling [sic] and hoeing and working about his little yard and garden," and that he and his wife lived

partly from this, and "partly from chickens and duck raised on their lot." They also believed that, as early as 1861, he was already "1/2 totally disabled for regular manual labor, such as is required on a farm, rail-road, or canal."

Jeremiah's books of account for these years revealed only modest earnings: $106.50 in 1863; $108.60 in 1864; $111.50 in 1865; and $93.40 in 1866, for a four-year average of $8.75 per month. A Union Army Private's pay during this period was $13 per month and, though Spartan, the soldier was also provided with the equivalent of room and board and at least a portion of his clothing. Elizabeth also took over some of the burden of producing income. "I went washing, Housekeeping, Nursing and other work for my neighbors and my earnings were used to help in supporting my family."

Within a decade or so, however, this arrangement had become untenable, even though Ellen Ann had married and moved out and no longer needed her parents' financial support. Jeremiah, through near total blindness and increasing infirmity, had become entirely unable to work and was now completely dependent on his wife. She, according to her neighbors, was failing as well, and "cannot do washing as formerly".

On October 4, 1879, using James Rusling, the well-known Trenton attorney to whom so many Company A claimants had turned, she finally applied for a pension. The couple by now had virtually no sources of income, and no assets except their small house and lot in Wertsville. Neighbors put the total value of the real estate at only about $300, and believed it "would let for [only] $3-1/2 per month." As was typical, the government reviewing agents requested numerous follow-up affidavits and proofs after initial papers were filed and, as was also typical, the Pension Office's final decision on the matter took nearly three years to obtain. But on February 10, 1883, the claim was approved. Elizabeth received the standard $8-per-month in pension moneys and, like Catherine Hicks, was awarded a lump sum of accrued payments calculated as of her son's death in 1864.

Although the historical record is silent on the precise dates, Jeremiah died sometime before 1890, and Elizabeth passed away that year, at about age 78. She had at least had seven or so years to enjoy the fruit of her many labors.

Mary Anthony. The case of Mary Anthony, mother of Company A soldier, David Anthony, is a story of loss and unrelieved poverty. Mary was born about 1810. Like most Company A mothers, she was illiterate. On February 24, 1831, at about age 20, she married George Anthony in Sussex County (New Jersey's northernmost county). A Reverend Crain performed the ceremony. David was probably born about 1840, in Hunterdon County; Mary and George had at least 4 other children: a son, William, born about 1843, and 3 daughters, born in 1849, 1853, and 1857. In fact, Mary and George may have had as many as *10* children. In 1886, their son William stated that after David died in the service in 1864, "the members of [Mary's] family" included "Cornelus [sic][,] Arabl [sic][,] Joseph[,] Mary[, and] Jane [or Mary Jane]." For some reason, William did not mention any of the three unnamed daughters whom Mary listed as being the only minor children - children under 16 - who were still living with her in 1864, who are referred to above.

On July 14, 1860, probably in his 50s, George died of "Pulmonary Consumption" (tuberculosis), for which his doctor had been treating him for five years. At the time, the Anthonys resided in Flanders, a village in western Morris County, about 10 miles northeast of the Hunterdon County line. Mary was left with 5 children still at home: David, who was about 20, William, 17, and her three young daughters, who were 11, 7, and 2 years old. According to the treating physician, Dr. John D. Mills, the family was "very poor" and to help the family "my services were rendered gratuitously."

A year later, David enlisted as a Private. According to his mother and others, he sent home "all the money" he was paid in the army. On May 12, 1864, after surviving the rigors of war for nearly two years, David became one of the company's numerous wounded at Spotsylvania Courthouse; the following day, May 13, he died from his wounds. Mary,

already poor, now had no one but William, age about 19, to support her and her 3 young stay-at-homes.

William, however, moved out of the house and at some point settled in Houser Mills, a small village in Tobyhanna Township, Pennsylvania. The township is part of Monroe County, in the Pocono Mountains region of northeastern Pennsylvania. It lies about 20 miles west of New Jersey, and about 45 miles from Flanders. The area is rugged and laced with mountain lakes and streams, and was thinly populated in the mid-nineteenth century. Houser Mills no longer exists as a distinct place-name in the township. William was able to do little to help his mother and young sisters after David's death. In 1885, the Houser Mill Post Master, A. M. Stauffer, stated: "[Mary's] son Wm Anthony is living here and he is always a poor man ever since I know him for hes a cripple [and] has only one good leg. Can not say what is the Matter of other Leg." William himself, who was at the time about 42 years old, conceded that his brother, David, "was the only support" his mother had, and that after he was killed, "her financial condition was that she had to work wherever she could get work," and that she had continued to do that "up to the present times [1885]."

Meanwhile, on July 19, 1882, at Mount Olive, Mary got married again, to a man named James Odel (or O'Dell). Mount Olive is near Flanders, the area where Mary had apparently lived since the war. She was about 72 years old. Soon afterward, she and James also moved west to Houser Mills, Pennsylvania. Two years later, in 1884, possibly prompted by her son and/or her new husband, Mary finally applied for a dependent mother's pension. They either did not realize that her newly married status would probably disqualify her, or hoped to keep that status hidden from the government.

A new act of Congress, adopted in July of that year, required attorney fee agreements to be in writing, and limited fees that could be charged for various categories of pension applications. Accordingly, Mary signed "Articles of Agreement" on November 27, 1884, authorizing the well-known Washington, D. C., law firm of McNeill & Birch to prosecute her claim; William served as one of the persons witnessing her signature (an "X") on the

document. The agreement acknowledged the law firm's receipt from Mary of 25¢ (about $5 in today's currency), for "postage and other expenses." Under the legislation, the authorized $25 attorney fee was payable only on a "contingent fee" basis; that is, the fee could not be charged "except in case of the granting of [the] pension by the Commissioner of Pensions." No supporting evidence appears to have been submitted with Mary's original claim, even though her specialized D.C. law firm surely knew that the government routinely required it.

Three months later, the Pension Office finally responded, doing what McNeill & Birch should have done at the outset: asking the Houser Mill Post Master to provide:

> …[A]ny information you may possess tending to show the full value of any property owned by Mary Anthony in 1864, and whether [her] income…from all…sources during that year, afforded her a comfortable maintenance, or whether she was dependent on, and supported by, her son, David Anthony….

The Post Master promptly responded, confirming that Mary as well as her son, William, were "as poor as Poor can be". He did not mention Mary's new husband, Odel, but noted that since she had only resided there a short time he had little other information to give. These further exchanges make it fairly clear that Mary was indeed hoping to conceal her married status, and that she may have enlisted the help of the local postmaster in this scheme. It is unlikely she shared the fact with either of her attorneys.

The application languished, and by the following summer (1885), Mary was becoming exasperated. On July 29, she signed a second fee agreement with a new Washington attorney, Jonathan Orme Cole, and submitted a second "original" claim form. The new documents were identical to the old, except that Mary now gave her residence as East Stroudsburg, a village in the same Pennsylvania county a few miles east of Tobyhanna Township. She paid Cole $1 for expenses, rather than the 25¢ her precious attorneys had charged. (Forms had by now become standardized among pension lawyers, and the form of the fee agreement itself was "Prescribed by the Commissioner of Pensions and Approved by the Secretary of the Interior"). Cole turned out to be more aggressive in pursuing Mary's claim.

In September, Mary sent two short letters in an attempt to get things moving and, apparently, to resolve confusion over which law firm was actually representing her. (The letters were written by a friend, Mary signing them with her X.) On September 14, she wrote to Attorney Cole:

> Dear sir[,] I would like you to procede with my claim[.] I havent sined eny papers to give Mcneel and Burch eny powe[r] to act as turney for me[.] I will look for an answer by return mail[.] yours with respect[,]
>
> Mary X (her mark) Anthony

The next day, she wrote to the Pension Commissioner:

> Dear sir[,] i havent received eny information from Mcniel and burch since in march until I emploid John O Cole[.] then they rote to me and then they wanted the claim and I rote to them for the blanks [forms] and they never sent them to me[.] its my request for John O Cole to go on with it[.]
>
> yours with respect[,]
> Mary X (her mark) Anthony

The letters reveal confusion, as well as a slipping – or convenient - memory on Mary's part. She had of course expressly given McNeill & Birch the power to act as her attorneys in 1864, and that firm, whatever its faults, had indeed sent her the necessary forms to initiate her claim, and had filed them with the government. Confusion over who was to act as Mary's authorized attorney would continue.

In September and again in November, 1885, McNeill & Birch sent routine inquiries on printed forms to the Pension Office, asking to know the status of Mary's claim and what further evidence might be required. In October, between the two McNeil & Birch communications, Cole sent a similar inquiry, but seems otherwise to have done nothing throughout 1885 to advance Mary's claim.

In January, 1866, McNeill & Birch submitted an affidavit made out jointly by Mary's son, William, and another local resident, Aaron Fullerton, generally supporting her claim but providing little detail.[418] For the first time, however, the affidavit referred to Mary's remarriage in 1883. At least one law firm was now aware of her married status. The remarriage reference was quickly noted by the Pension Office, and in April the Pension

Commissioner again wrote the Houser Mill Post Master, pressing for information about this specific item.

The Post Master, now possibly embarrassed, seemed almost to sidestep the question, or to pretend ignorance. In a small, backwater community such as this, he may also have been concerned with the additional cost to him and the township's other taxpayers of supporting two recently arrived paupers, and hoped to leave the door open to the federal government's doing so (at least as far as Mary was concerned). He wrote back:

> I don't know anything of [Mary Anthony's] marriage. …[B]oth are very old People and likely to become paupers at any time as the man she claims to be her husband cannot do a days work anymore. * * * …[S]he has told me they were married but did not say by whom and how long ago….
>
> Name of her husband so-called is James Odell[.]

In June, 1886, many more months having passed without word, Mary herself responded to the government's request for further information. She made out an affidavit for "her attorney," which was probably once again McNeill & Birch at this point, since Cole continued to act as if he had no knowledge of her married status (see below). The affidavit now finally gave the government the details of her marriage to Odel in 1882. Mary also stated, somewhat redundantly: "[N]ow if you can get my claim through with the evidence I have sent you[,] Please and Do so for I can not furnish any more evidence[,] for I am unable to go any wheres to get any more evidence[.]" And now for the first time, she signed her X to a signature written as "Mary Odel" rather than "Mary Anthony."

The case history sheet in the government's file shows that the claim was rejected the following month, on July 17, 1886. The "legal reviewer," a man named Harrington, concluded that it was "Barred by limitation; Claimant remarried July 19, 1882 and did not file her application until December 2, 1884." The file's docket sheet adds the finding that legally this meant "there [was] no period for which pension can be paid".

The rejection was apparently not immediately communicated to either law firm nor, presumably, to Mary. McNeill & Birch sent another routine status inquiry in August, obviously unaware of the government's rejection. The attorney's form, however, is marked

up with a notation of the action, and it is likely that the rejection was at this time communicated at least to that firm, and possibly passed along to Mary.

Cole, however, still did not get the word, either from the government or his client. He later sent monthly inquiry slips to the Pension Office for *4 consecutive months* (October, 1886, though January, 1887), without response. Finally, in November, 1887, a year and a half after the rejection, Cole wrote a detailed "form" letter to the pension office, giving the basic history of his filings in the case, referring obliquely to McNeill & Birch's inattention to the matter, and asking that he be recognized as Mary's authorized attorney and informed of the status of the claim.

There is no indication that the government sought to enlighten Cole, but the last entry in Mary's pension file is a date stamp on the case history sheet, marking it "REJECTED OCT 11 1888." This was nearly a year after Cole's last letter. Had he sought to reopen or appeal the matter? There is no evidence of such a move, but the government's reason for the rejection does seem inexplicable. If Mary, a widow, had indeed been even partly dependent upon her son, David, at the time of his death, and had thereafter become "as poor as poor can be" for a period of nearly 2 decades until her right to a pension was legally cut off by remarriage, why was she not at least entitled to an accrued benefit for the long interim period during which she remained an impoverished widow?

Whatever may have been the case, there is no suggestion in Mary's file that she made any further efforts to obtain a pension. By 1888, she was 78 years old, and even if James Odel, her "so-called" husband, were still alive, this old man who could not "do a days work anymore" could not have been of much financial help. By then, Post Master's Stauffer's prediction that the couple would "likely…become paupers at any time" must surely have come true, and the town of Houser Mills was probably paying the cost of it.

Mother's and Father's Claims

Elizabeth and Jacob A. Apgar. Elizabeth L. Apgar, mother of Company A's Jacob D. Apgar, was originally a Tewksbury Township native, from the western Tewksbury village of Cokesbury, or Cokesburg as it was then known. She was born on August 8, 1818, and was married to Jacob A. Apgar in 1836, when she was 17 or 18 years old; he was about 19. Both she and her husband were illiterate.

Elizabeth and Jacob had a total of 13 children, Jacob D. being born about 1844, in "California." This oddly named incorporated village bordered Tewksbury on the north, and lies only a mile or so from Cokesbury; as the territory and then state of California took shape in American consciousness during the 1840s, the village name was changed to "Califon" to avoid confusion.

Jacob D. was one of the older of his parents' 13 children - his mother later stated that, as of 1864 when Jacob had long since left for the war, she still had 7 children living at home under the age of 16. He had moved out of the family's home by about 1859 or 1860 and moved to Raritan Township near the county seat, in order to apprentice to a printer and learn that trade. He enlisted from there in 1862 at about age 18. He was a prolific wartime correspondent, and Elizabeth's pension file contains numerous letters Jacob wrote between April, 1963, and May, 1864.

Like so many others, he was gunned down at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 12 of the latter year. The family also sacrificed a second son to the war, James A. R. Apgar. According to one of Elizabeth's post-war affidavits, James "never returned" from the fighting, and ten years afterward she still did not know if he was alive or dead.[419] The loss of 2 sons to the war - and 2 other children from other causes - was apparently enough to put Jacob the father over the edge. It was from about this time that he ceased effectively supporting his wife and remaining children, and turned to drink, probably becoming what today would be called an alcoholic.[420] (See also Chapters 7, 10, 13, and 15 for the pervasive effects of alcohol and other drugs on Company A veterans and families.) In 1864, perhaps in

acknowledgement of his deteriorating condition, he formally signed over to his wife all rights to any benefits that might be due the family on account of the wartime loss of their sons.

Elizabeth nevertheless managed to get by financially for a decade or so following her sons' deaths. But by 1874 things had become hard enough for her to seek a dependent pension. She was now about 60 years old, and resided in Lower Valley, an area of Lebanon Township that borders Califon. Like numerous other Company A claimants, she retained Flemington attorney, David Van Fleet, to represent her. Reviewing the numerous affidavits submitted by her or on her behalf over the following five years, 1874-1879, the primary reason for her growing desperation is plain: a husband who was not only abusing her, but who was gradually abandoning her and the children and who would in the end nearly disappear.

During the first year of her efforts - July, 1874, to July, 1975 - though represented by legal counsel, Elizabeth's application proceeded somewhat informally. Van Fleet was a reputable Flemington attorney – Company A lawyer, John Emery, had earlier clerked with Van Fleet, and both would later become judges - but was relatively unversed in pension matters. He used no government "blanks" (forms), and submitted her claim and all supporting evidence in the form of handwritten affidavits. Elizabeth's initial affidavit stated that she had been partially dependent on her son's financial help during the war. She explained that her husband had not supported her since her son's death, had developed "intemperate habits," and had in fact "been away" for more than three years. She stated that Jacob D. had regularly sent her $10 per month out of his military pay, and that she had also received another $280 from Captain Boeman in bounty and back pay monies owed her son. Realizing that she could not depend on her husband, she had managed to purchase from these funds a lot in Califon for $450, placing the property in her own name.

The following year, Elizabeth's daughter, Rebecca, made out an affidavit corroborating these facts, and stating that she no longer even knew where her father was. Rebecca's married sister, Anne Denike, also testified to these facts, stating that she hadn't

seen her father for four years, and that he had done "nothing" for the family for fifteen years, i.e., since 1860. Anne described her mother as a poor woman who had only a "poor lot, poor house, a poor stove and of not much value." Elizabeth submitted a second affidavit at this time, in which she acknowledged that her husband, during the years immediately before he abandoned them, had given her "small sums" of from $2 to $5 per week. She put the current value of the lot she had bought at $500, but believed that it would go up some in value because a railroad was being built through it. George Apgar, the local tax assessor, stated that the lot was worth only about $350, and generated only about $40-$50 per year in rent. He also noted that Elizabeth's husband never paid his poll tax, and that when Elizabeth stopped paying it for him his name was "stricken" from the town's list of eligible voters. Apgar also gratuitously observed that the husband was "healthy" and a well-digger by trade, and that there was "no reason" for him to fail to support her.

While appearing to incorporate all the information the Pension Office should have needed to determine the claim, these affidavits were apparently deemed insufficient, and the application lay dormant for three years. Then, in the summer of 1878, it was reactivated by Elizabeth and her attorney. From a modern perspective, it is easy to overlook the daunting nature of even the basic logistical requirements and expenses imposed on persons wishing to initiate or augment such formal, mid-nineteenth-century proceedings as these. Each time she needed to meet in Flemington with Van Fleet, Elizabeth, now elderly, had to travel by horse or horse-drawn vehicle, over dirt roads, a round-trip distance of about 40 miles. This meant a 4- to 5-hour trip *each way*, and probably meant that the trip had to be accomplished over a 2-day period, with arrangements made for an overnight stay.[421] Face-to-face meetings were necessary, since affidavits were prepared based on contemporaneous statements made to the attorney by the claimant, and had to be signed in the attorney's presence; two witnesses had to be present as well. In such circumstances, it is easier to understand the seemingly long lapses that often occurred between bursts of attention, in moving along pension applications.

Practically speaking, the “reactivation” was a new application. Van Fleet now had Elizabeth fill out a standard initial form, entitled "Declaration for an Original Pension of a Mother," which he had evidently gotten hold of since 1875. The information she provided reiterated her earlier statements, except that she now mentioned her husband "has not been at home for 6 years." Elizabeth was now 63 years old, and was getting forgetful; she repeated that she had 9hildren now living, but "can not now give the ages" of any of them. As further evidence of her deceased son's contributions from his wartime pay, she also sent in several of his letters.

This time, Elizabeth's claim was accompanied by affidavits from her son, Joseph, and from one of Jacob's former Company A comrades, Theodore Bellis. Joseph stated that he was Elizabeth's only surviving son, and was 11 years old when his brother was killed in 1864. He claimed that his father now resided in Plainfield, a town in Union County, New Jersey, about 30 miles east of Califon, that he had not contributed "one cent" to his mother's support for more than five years, and that as a result she had had to sell half of her Califon lot, and borrow $100 against the other half. Bellis verified that Jacob's wartime practice had been to send home portions of his pay.

The Pension Office was still not completely satisfied. In reply to its request for further information, additional affidavits followed about a year later, in May of 1879, from 3 family friends. William Robeson, a Califon resident during the war, stated he was well acquainted with the family, and that they had in fact lived in his house for about a year in "1862 or 1863." He recalled that it was Elizabeth who paid him the rent, and that her husband did not support the family at the time, "and has not for many years." He also remembered that the husband was at one point "arrested for abuse of his Family and taken to Flemington, and after that he left his family."

John R. Apgar, who was surely a relative but whose relationship was not disclosed, stated that he was a resident of High Bridge and had known the family for forty years, and that they had lived with him in 1863 and 1864. High Bridge lies about 5 miles south of

Califon. Apgar recalled that Elizabeth paid him the bulk of the rent during those years, "in labor and money," and that her husband was gone from the house for "more than six months at a time," and "did not furnish one fourth [of the amount needed] for the support his family".

Leo G. Neighbour, a friend, stated:

> …[I] furnished the Mother Mrs. Elizabeth Apgar Meat when her son was in the service in the year 1864 and she paid me for it - and she said she would pay [the balance of her] Bill when she received the money [from her son]. I am satisfied that the husband did not at the time contribute to the support of his family to any extent (that the family was supported by her and the Moneys received by Service of her son).

Finally, 2 months later, the government approved the claim, and began sending Elizabeth the statutory amount of $8 per month. Under recent legislation, she was also awarded the amount that would have accrued at this rate since her son's death in 1864. This lump sum probably totaled about $1,450, a remarkably large sum at the time - nearly $30,000 in current funds. Elizabeth's financial difficulties were now over, or at least greatly relieved. She survived for another decade to enjoy her pension income, which was subsequently increased to $12 per month. She died a resident of Califon, on March 23, 1889, at about age 74, from "apoplexy" (stroke).

In less than 7 months' time, her husband, now age 72, decided it was his turn to claim dependence on his long-lost son. He gave his address as Califon, but it is unlikely that he had actually reestablished a residence there. Jacob stated that his son had been working before the war as an apprentice printer, and claimed that he had contributed to his son's support both then and after he entered the service.

The Pension Office was understandably dubious, and requested more information. The following summer, Jacob submitted an affidavit listing the names of all 13 of his children, and the birth years of the 9 surviving ones. His memory at least was far better on such matters than his wife's. He also claimed that he was now blind, and supported financially by his friends and children - though none of his children supplied an affidavit to corroborate this - and that he had also "been depending on Charity for the last eight years." On this occasion, he gave his address as Morristown, the seat of neighboring Morris County,

located about 20 miles east of Califon. He explained that he could not supply wartime letters from his son to confirm his sending home money, since all except 2 had been "destroyed and lost." This was not quite accurate; several letters lay in his late wife's file at the Pension Office, but Jacob was probably unaware of this. The 2 he did have he did not offer for review.

Jacob was able to offer only one supporting affidavit from a third party, a farmer friend from Califon, John A. Seal, who stated that he had known the family since 1855. Seal for the first time raised the matter of alleged health problems as the reason for Jacob's inability to support his family during the war years. He confirmed that Jacob had been a "well maker by occupation," but claimed he "was unable to earn a full support for his family or to do more than 3/4 of the labor of an able bodied man [in 1864] because of kidney trouble, and bleeding of lungs." Somewhat inconsistently, however, Seal acknowledged that Jacob had earned nearly $200 in 1864, and at the time "managed to make a living...by making wells and all kind of work he could get to do." Seal also confirmed that since 1879, Jacob had been unable "to do any work of any kind by reason of total blindness." Finally, Seal swore that during the son's prewar apprenticeship, he had "acknowledged his obligation" to his father, and gave his father "all he could spare." Just how Seal knew this, or was able to remember it a quarter century later, probably appeared as dubious to the Pension Office in 1890 as it does today. The office was also undoubtedly put off by the fact that the claimant's supposed ill health had never been previously mentioned, by anyone.

It is tempting to judge Jacob A. Apgar harshly, and to relegate him to the ranks of abusive, dissembling, and undependable family men. It is worth considering, however, that he does not seem to have been headed in these directions until the war years. Till then, he had presumably worked reasonably hard at a physically demanding job, and supported his wife and rapidly expanding family, for a quarter century. When the war came, he lost two sons to it, sons he probably loved as much as did his wife. He took to drink; he may very well have suffered significant health problems, including tuberculosis. He probably did turn gradually blind, possibly from alcohol abuse. He did make occasional efforts to send a little

money Elizabeth's way, despite his growing estrangement from her and his children. None of these things excuse his failure to do what he could have done to help them, and he surely did not. But few have suffered as he must have.

In any case, the government was not persuaded by Jacob's evidence, and in April, 1893, after a two-and-a-half year delay, it rejected his claim. The reviewing agent grounded the decision on evidence in the *mother's* file that Jacob A. Apgar had in fact been able to support himself. The children probably felt that their long-suffering mother had finally had the last word, and that justice, however unsparing, had been done.

Rebecca and John Nevins.[422] Rebecca A. (Morris) Nevins was born about 1825; her husband, John C. Nevins, was born about 10 years earlier, in 1815. The couple was married in Flemington, by Reverend Charles Bartelett, on November 21, 1840; she was about 15 and he was 25.

Rebecca and John's first child, born October 13, 1842, was destined to become Company A Private, Cornelius J. Nevins. The couple was living in Flemington at the time. They had 6 more children after Cornelius, born between April, 1849, and July, 1862, the last one arriving a month before Cornelius enlisted.

About 1854, half-way through the couple's child-bearing years, John bought "an old farm" of 180 acres, in or near Wertsville, in East Amwell Township. In an affidavit submitted years later, Rebecca related that John paid $38 per acre for the property ($6,840 total). Since he had no cash, he took over the payments on an existing mortgage of $4,840 on the property, and borrowed the $2,000 balance of the purchase price, giving the lender a second mortgage for that amount. Given this financial arrangement, the farm "yielded him net but a small surplus, after paying interest, insurance, taxes, repairs, etc., and he had a large family to support."

Before enlisting in 1862, Cornelius helped his father with the farm, working as a farm hand. Even before he left for the war, his father seemed to be sliding into a long decline in health, and Cornelius had probably stepped into the role of superintending the farm work.

In 1860, John began treatment for various ailments under the care of a Trenton physician, Dr. William W. Wyckoff, which continued for almost a decade. The doctor wrote later that:

> [John] suffered from Neuralgia in the head almost continually, with exhaustion and great debility[,] so much so that I was afraid of Softening of the Brain.[423]
>
> He was not able to do any hard labor during this time. If he attempted to work he would have to quit and remain in the House for a few days.

Rebecca added that John suffered generally from "distress of [the] head" starting in 1861, and that it continued to plague him from that time forward. Given the stresses that John was increasingly coming under during this eventful period - an impossible level of mortgage debt, a farm that was producing virtually no profit after expenses, 4 young children and a fifth on the way in 1862, his oldest and economically most critical child going off to fight - it is quite likely that the conditions Wyckoff and John's wife described would today be diagnosed as severe anxiety and depression. Unlike some, John did not turn to drink or spousal abuse in his distress; there is absolutely no suggestion of that in the historical record. In fact, neighbors attested that he was a man of "good and temperate [sober]" habits, and his persistent efforts to continue in the face of an unusually hard series of blows support this conclusion.

As for Cornelius, 2 Wertsville neighbors, Jacob Dunham and Jeremiah Smith, described him as "an active and industrious young man, [who] took the lead of the work on [the] farm." Jeremiah Smith was the father of Company A volunteer, Henry Smith, who also failed to return from the war; the story of Smith's parents is narrated above. They calculated that "the annual value of his services there were worth to [the] family at least the sum of #150# [$150] to #200# [$200] net, [and] when he left for the army he was greatly missed…and the loss of his services greatly embarrassed them [weighed them down]."

But leave he did, along with the rest of Company A in the fall of 1862. And like so many of them, he too was gunned down at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 12, 1864, having not yet reached his 21st birthday. His parents were then about 39 and 49, and his 5 surviving siblings were aged between 1 and 15. Five and a half years later, on December 5,

1869, the family lost their eldest daughter, Mary Elizabeth, at age 19. How much these blows must have added to their father's deteriorating physical and psychological state can only be guessed.

Without Cornelius and Mary Elizabeth, John and Rebecca found they simply could not keep up the family farm, and John sold it about the year 1870. In the sixteen or so years that the family had run the farm, John had managed to pay down the first mortgage by nearly $2,000, from $6,840 to $4,860. He was now able to sell the property for $7,956, realizing a gain of about $3,100. This was a considerable sum, but it was all a "paper" profit - he lent that amount to the buyer in order to close the deal, taking back a second mortgage on the property to secure the loan. The buyer, who, like John before him, took over payments on the farm's first mortgage, defaulted. The mortgage was foreclosed, the farm sold at sheriff's sale, and out of it John ended up with only $800 of his expected profit from the sale, a crushing financial setback (roughly equivalent today to a loss of $45,000).

And yet he and Rebecca made one more attempt at farming. In 1872, John invested his $800 in "a small farm of 50 acres," probably located near the small village of Mount Airy, in neighboring West Amwell Township. This farm cost $1,800 ($36 per acre), and John borrowed and mortgaged the property for the $1,000 balance of the purchase price. But the cruel specter of death continued to haunt the family.

The following year, 1873, their eldest surviving son, Charles, at age 24, died of "consumption" (tuberculosis), bringing renewed sorrow and also depriving the family of another crucial farm hand. Then, in the winter of 1874, their eldest surviving daughter, Sarah Mariah, died of the same disease one day after her 21st birthday. John and Rebecca, who were now 59 and 69 years old, had now lost 4 of their 7 children in a period of ten years. It must surely have broken their hearts.

They struggled on with the new farm for another three years, but were unable to keep up with debts, including the $1,000 mortgage. The lender foreclosed and the farm was sold in 1877, with the proceeds apportioned among John's creditors. This time, there was

nothing left over for him, and in the nineteenth-century version of a bankruptcy proceeding, even the family's considerable personal property - worth about $790, and undoubtedly including all of John's farming tools, supplies, seed, and equipment - was sold for the benefit of creditors. By law, $200 was "set off [out of the sale proceeds] for the use of the family"; after two decades of hard toil and grievous loss, this was all the family had left.

John, now in his 60s, was afterward reduced to sharecropping or working occasionally as a hired farm hand, and his wife, in her 50s, began doing outside work as well. As Rebecca explained in an 1880 affidavit:

> Since that time we…rented and moved about the country. My husband when well enough farms small patches of land belonging to the farmers upon shares, but most of the time has worked out by the day. I have worked for others at washing[,] ironing and other work to help to support myself. My husband is often unwell and has [this year] been very low with dysentary and unable to do anything to support himself or me and I am unable to do work for to earn money….

Elsewhere, Rebecca wrote that she and her husband "are now both very poor, and aged, and dependent on [our] own exertions & the help of friends." By 1890, the couple had moved to nearby Hopewell Township, in Mercer County. Tax records show that they now owned no real estate, and their personal property was valued at $200, presumably items purchased with the money allotted them from the forced sale in 1877. Rebecca finally filed that year, 1880, for a dependent pension; she was 55. As with so many Company A parents, she utilized the services Attorney James F, Rusling, of Trenton.

The Pension Office ultimately awarded her a pension at the standard rate of $8 per month and, satisfied that she had been in a "dependent" status since the war, also awarded her arrears at that rate from the time of Cornelius's death. This meant a lump sum payment of more than $1,600, and must have seemed like a blessing from God. Rebecca invested the money with care. Adding to it some of the family's own meager funds, she managed to accumulate the sum of $2,200, which she lent to a real estate purchaser, taking back a mortgage as collateral. The loan was at 5% per year, which generated almost $10 per month for the family. In 1886, under new pension legislation, her monthly award rose to $12 per

month. While far from a life of ease, she and John now had enough income to survive comfortably without toiling: a total of about $22 per month.

At some point during the 1880s, Rebecca moved from Hopewell to 214 Mercer Street, in Trenton, and John, probably in 1881, moved to Jersey City. This does not seem to have been a separation; the evidence indicates the couple remained devoted to one another as ever. It is more likely that in view of their advancing ages and states of infirmity, each moved in with one of their 3 surviving children. It would have made sense for the burden of elder care to be shared between 2 households; Rebecca's pension and mortgage income allowed them to contribute so that they did not become financial burdens as well. The record shows that John's Jersey City residence was with one of his sons, in a home the son rented; by 1891, the landlord stated he had known the father for ten years.

On September 27, 1891, at age 66, while living at her Trenton address, Rebecca succumbed to "valvular heart disease and asthma." John had her buried in Hopewell Township, most likely the last place the 2 of them had lived together. Rebecca left the income-producing mortgage, which was in her name, to John. These steps are further indications that the 2 had not separated before her death, at least not in a legal sense.

A couple of months later, John filed his own dependency claim. He turned 76 that fall, and his son's landlord, Jefferson E. Crilley, wrote that John "has no occupation," and "is too old and feeble to work, and …is now dependent on his son." Before the Pension Office could act, however, John too passed away, only a few months following his wife's death.

They had endured an extremely hard life - one that would have demoralized and defeated most. But neither had given up while consigned to this world, and both undoubtedly died in the reassuring faith that they would now enjoy eternity together.

Letitia and Christian Wyckoff. Christian Wyckoff and Letitia (Conover) Wyckoff, the parents of Company A Private, John H. Wyckoff, were born, respectively, about the years 1815 and 1819. Letitia moved with her parents to New Jersey in 1825, when she was about 4 years old. She and Christian were married in Middlebush, New Jersey, on January 24,

1838, by Reverend Jacob Shults. Middlebush is a small village in Franklin Township, Somerset County, about 13 miles east of the Hunterdon County line. She was 18, and literate; he was about 22, and could not read or write.

John was the couple's first child, and was born in November of 1843 after the family had moved to Hillsboro, a Somerset County township that was a few miles closer to Hunterdon. He was one of 8 Wyckoff children, who were born between 1843 and 1858. Sometime during John's youth, the family moved to Lamington, where Christian worked as a tenant farmer. Lamington is also in Somerset, on the Hunterdon/New Germantown (now Oldwick) border.

When John enlisted in 1862, he was only 18. According to a Lamington neighbor, John Van Nest, before the war John's parents "had the benefit of all of his sevasis as a farm hand[,] that is[,] when he was not at School[.] he went some to the district school[.]"

John was one of the unfortunate early casualties of the war's unhealthy camp life. During the company's first winter he contracted typhoid fever, and died on March 8 or 9, 1863, at the regimental hospital at White Oak Church, Virginia. His hospital death certificate described his fatal illnesses as "debilitas" and "Camp Fever," but the War Department later listed the cause of death as "Typhoid Fever". The family's solicitous neighbor, Van Nest, made all arrangements necessary to return John's body to Lamington for burial in the Presbyterian Church cemetery on March 19. At the time of John's death, his parents were 43 and 47 years old, and his 7 surviving siblings ranged in age from 5 to 16. At the time, the family's only financial relief came in the form of two bounties due their son, under federal acts adopted in 1861 and 1866, in the amounts of $75 and $100, and his back pay.

Although the record does not reveal exactly when, sometime during the late 1870s the Wyckoffs decided to make a new beginning and try their hand "out west," in Kansas. The former territory, known during the pre-war years as "Bleeding Kansas" because of the often horrific guerilla warfare conducted between early pro- and anti-slavery settlers, had been

admitted to the Union as a free state in 1861. They moved first to Russell County, a central Kansas county situated on newly opened stagecoach (1865) and railroad (1870) lines connecting to Denver, Colorado. The first permanent settler in the county did not arrive until 1869, and the jurisdiction's population did not begin to increase significantly until the latter 1870s: 1,212 in 1875, growing to 7,321 by 1880. A large number of new settlers from eastern and southern states arrived in the year 1877, and it was probably about then, between 1877 and 1879, that a group of Wyckoffs from New Jersey decided to locate there. In high hopes, they named their settlement "Wyckoff."[424] The place name has disappeared, (but see below).

It was a bold move for Christian and Letitia, who were about 62 and 58 years of age in 1877. They were accompanied by at least one of their children, Charles Simon, who was about 20 years old at the time. Charles appears to have remained in Russell County for the remainder of his long life. A gravestone, etched with the words "Charles S. Wyckoff, b. 1858, d. Mar 24, 1946," lies in the Amherst Cemetery of Waldo Township, Russell County, Kansas. Waldo is located near the north central border of the county, and may be where the Wyckoff clan established its original settlement. As of February, 2000, there were 11 Wyckoffs buried in the cemetery, in addition to Charles.

It is difficult to imagine what the Wyckoffs did to maintain themselves in Kansas, especially as an elderly couple, or why they decided to go there in the first place. Farming at the time was extremely difficult in this arid area of the state, and no attempt had even been made to do it before 1872. Coal had been discovered in parts of the county about 1869, and coal mining and railroad work were the only initial inducements to settlement. A likely explanation is that it was their son, Charles, who wanted to go west - probably with a group of like-minded members of the extended Wyckoff clan - and that his elderly parents determined to go with him in order to enjoy their last years in the bosom of their family, even if that meant settling on the relatively inhospitable prairie. The Homestead Act of 1862 offered 160 acres of land in the Central Plains region to anyone agreeing to pay $10, live on

the land for five years, and attempt to cultivate it. Homesteaders flooded into the plains after the Civil War, settling the central Kansas region by 1880. It is probable that Charles and other Wyckoffs took advantage of the act.

By about 1879, however, Christian and Letitia had become part of a general exodus from Russell, and had moved north about 50 miles, to Eagle Rapids, in Smith County, Kansas. Smith County lies on the northern border of the state, bordering Nebraska. Less arid and better drained than Russell, Smith County was sustained by agriculture and cattle raising in the 1870s, and grew at twice Russell's rate: population 13,904 by 1880. That year, Letitia, at age 62, finally applied for a dependent pension. She used a Washington attorney by the name of Jenkins A. Fitzgerald. In her initial papers, she noted that her husband, now about 67 years old, was getting feeble, and alluded to the harsh Kansas conditions by noting he was now "too old for such work as it takes out here to earn a living." Local officials attested there was no real estate or personal property assessed to Letitia or her husband for tax purposes; they were, in effect, penniless.

The Pension Office routinely referred applications to the War Department's Adjutant General to confirm the pertinent soldier's wartime service, and to the Surgeon General to confirm any claimed wartime wounds, injuries, illnesses, or hospitalizations. (See Chapter 8.) In this case, the office took the unusual step of also referring Letitia's claim to the Treasury Department, to determine who was paid her son's federal bounties and back pay upon his death. This information provided some evidence, at least, of a dependent financial relationship between the parties, and also of what was then commonly termed the soldier's "celibacy" at the time of death: i.e., his unmarried status and lack of offspring, factors which would of course affect other family member's right to a pension. The department responded that in 1866 and 1867, both of Johns' parents and 4 other witnesses had sworn “to soldier's celibacy." It is a revealing use of the term “celibacy,” consistent with Victorian notions of pre-marital propriety. One meaning of the word is indeed "unmarried," but today that meaning is usually used only in connection with clerical vows foreswearing marriage. An

equally common definition in the nineteenth century, however, was "sexually chaste." In the Civil War period, unlike today, these two statuses - “virginity,” itself a problematic term when applied to a male, and bachelorhood - were formally assumed to belong together, even for young men, despite evidence that the moral prescription was violated on a more or less continuing and widespread basis. Significantly, the term was also used to denote that the soldier had fathered no children.

As with most dependent mothers' pension claims, Letitia's proceeded through the governmental bureaucracy with maddening slowness. In 1883, the Pension Office notified her that her attorney, Fitzgerald, had been suspended from practice before the agency. He had also "removed from the city," and thus could not even help refer her to another law firm. In 1885, Letitia found another Washington firm, Charles & William King, who picked up the matter of her pension application and filed additional material, but otherwise appear to have been no more effective than the disappearing Fitzgerald. The claim languished.

By about this time, Letitia and Christian had had enough of Kansas (and probably Washington lawyers as well), and moved back to New Germantown, the Hunterdon County village that adjoined Lambertville, from which they had set out for the plains five or so years earlier. The record suggests they returned to New Jersey about 1884. About six years later, in 1890, taking advantage of new Congressional legislation, Letitia re-applied for the pension. Now she retained a local attorney, from Somerville in neighboring Somerset County, named A. P. Sutphen. Sutphen arranged for the filing of a supporting affidavit from the Wyckoffs’ old friend and neighbor, Van Nest, who described them as old and feeble, "very poor" but "worthy" people, "entirely dependant on their relations and friends for their daily support." The new attorney and new material had the desired effect, and in January of the following year, 1891, Letitia was finally granted an award at the new rate of $12 per month. It had been a long, 9-year wait. About this time, the elderly couple moved across the county line from Lamington, in Somerset County, to New Germantown, in Hunterdon County.

She was only able to enjoy her improved financial condition for five years, and during the last four of them her health steadily deteriorated. About 1892, she contracted "Phthisis Pulmonalis" (tuberculosis), according to her local physician, L.A. Alpaugh, and on February 5, 1996, she died from it. She was, as recorded on her death certificate, "age 76 years, 2 months, 7 days." The local undertaker, also an Alpaugh, saw to the funeral and burial arrangements, and Letitia was laid to rest in Lamington Cemetery beside John, the son she and Christian had themselves buried nearly 32 years before.

Christian wasted no time applying to the Pension Office for a dependent father's award (the granting of which had by this time become fairly routine in the Wyckoffs' circumstances); he also utilized Sutphen's services. Nine months later, in November of 1896, he was granted a pension at the same rate as his late wife, including the amount accrued since her death (a lump sum payment of $108). Christian needed the money. His local doctor, Francis Apgar, testified that Christian had been "totally blind" for the last six years from "atrophy of the optic nerve." He was the last Company A parent to file for a pension.

Christian lived long enough to hear word - and probably the sound - of the millennium celebrations of 1900, and died on August 29 of that year, at age 85.

* * *

Several threads and patterns emerge from the 9 cases of dependent mothers claiming pensions. As a group, the women were born in the first 3 decades of the nineteenth century: from 1803 to 1825 (the birth years for 7 are known). They averaged about 22 years of age at marriage, the youngest known being about 15 and the oldest about 37. (\In a very similar pattern, Company A *wives* averaged 21 years of age at first marriage, and ranged in age from 15 to 32.

They married men who were, on average, just under 24 years old, or about 2 years older on average than they were. One husband, Henderson, was actually 5 or 6 years *younger* than his wife, which narrows the average age difference between spouses. Company A husbands were 3.7 years older than their first wives, on average. One mother, Sarah

Grassman, who conceived 2 children outside her marriage, did so with a man who was 15-20 years her senior; the age of Sarah's husband is not known. The median marriage year for the mothers, based on their 8 known marriage years, was 1837, about 25 years before enlistment of their Company A sons. It was also 25 years before the median marriage year of their sons' generation, the company's volunteers. (See Chapter 6.)

All 9 mothers had more than one child: of the 7 whose exact number of children is fairly certain, the number of offspring ranged from 2 to 13, and averaged 6. The eighth had "several" children, and the ninth had at least 4 and possibly as many as 10. These mothers thus had *twice as many children*, on average, as the Company A wives of the next generation, who averaged just under 3.

The birth order of the soldier son within the family's line of children can be determined in all but one case (Henderson). Intriguingly, of the 8 known cases, the soldier was the first-born child in 6 (75%), and was the first-born *son* in one of the remaining 2. In only one of the 8 cases was the soldier son born later in the birth order: Apgar, where the soldier's precise birth order is not certain, but was definitely among the first 4 or 5 in a line of 13. What could account for this phenomenon? Raised and socialized in a period when children of rural farm families were still deemed critical to the household economy, is it possible that first-born males felt greater pressure to enlist in support, not only of Union, but of hearth and home as well? It is clear from the record that many of them were providing significant financial support or contributing labor to their families before the war. It may have seemed a natural as well as patriotic progression for them to enlist, in the knowledge that as single men they could now consign bounties and regular army pay to their families as well. There is the fascinating possibility that at least some of the apparent propensity to enlist exhibited by fist-born males had to do with the mere accident of their sibling birth order, with its loosely predictable dynamics and psychology: the popular notion that first-borns in general may feel unusually duty-bound - or burdened - by "family" responsibilities and by loyalty to parents.

Though likely to have more children, Company A mothers, in contrast to the generation of their daughters, were less likely to be able to read or write. Of the 6 whose literacy status is relatively certain, only one (17%) was literate. Even if all 3 remaining mothers were literate - which is improbable - the literacy rate for the sample would be less than 50%. This is *dramatically* lower than the literacy rates of Company A's volunteers (about 82%), and their spouses (about 67%). Some of it may be attributable to the socio-economic class origins of this particular group of mothers; as suggested below, they tended to be poor, and almost all were from rural, farming backgrounds.

Some of the low illiteracy may even be attributable to regional disparities in wealth and income, though this must remain largely speculative. Two-thirds of the 9 women resided most or all of their lives in the northernmost reaches of the county, or in areas just north of the county in equally poorly-developed regions of Warren or Morris Counties. The other third was clustered in the lower county area in or near Flemington. The northern region is more mountainous and rocky, more difficult to farm, and more filled with the sort of hollows and backwater enclaves that to this day are associated with Appalachian impoverishment and isolation. By contrast, Flemington was a commercial center and county seat, and its environs a much flatter and more productive agricultural zone.

It must also be remembered that most of these women and their husbands knew a life of farming and householding that was rustic and physically exhausting. Of the 6 husbands who were still alive at the end of the war, 4 worked primarily or partly at farming (all but one as a hired hand or tenant farmer). Especially during the growing season, it was a life that left time for few other pursuits. Schooling was rare. It is likely, then, that the significant generational differences in literacy stemmed primarily from the fact that these women grew up in a period when local, district schools were only just beginning to take hold in the county, and in the state generally, and many probably had no real opportunity - or much time or encouragement - to attend a public or "common" school, or even to find one within a reasonable distance. (See Chapter 2.)

Over the course of their lives, the 9 did not travel or disperse as widely as the next generation would. From what is known, only one, Wyckoff, ever embarked for the "far" west: Kansas. That move seems to have been a late-in-life adventure probably encouraged by a son who invited his parents to go west with him; they were in their late 50s/early 60s when they went, and returned to the Hunterdon area within 7 or 8 years. The only other mother to have relocated outside the county was Mary Anthony, who moved to the nearby Pocono Mountains area of Pennsylvania late in life, apparently to be near one of her adult children.

The timing of the mothers' pension filings fell mainly into 2 phases: 2 women filed while the war was still in progress, in 1863, shortly after their sons had died, while 6 others filed many years after the war, taking advantage of more liberal pension legislation adopted in 1879: 3 that year, and one each in 1880, 1882, and 1884. The ninth mother, Apgar, filed in 1874. The 3 fathers of course did not apply for pensions until their wives had died, which put the timing of their filings quite a bit later: 1889, 1891, and 1896.

The precipitating cause of the financial distress that prompted mothers to file was similar in all cases. In general, the families of mothers who filed were relatively poor, or substantially indebted (or both). The family's first line of defense against complete economic collapse was of course expected to be the male head of household, normally the mother's husband. This expectation was a broadly shared norm, and pension agents certainly assumed it. The family's children, especially its teenaged or young-adult sons prior to marrying and leaving home, comprised only a secondary line of defense against impoverishment. The mothers in this sample did not file solely because they had lost an income-producing or family-supporting son in the war. They filed because they had lost such a son and, for various reasons, they *had also lost the family's primary financial support - their husband.*

Thus, 3 of the 9 mothers were already widows when their soldier sons died; 2 of these (Grassman and Hendershot) filed almost immediately after getting the news, while the third (Anthony) held out till much later. (Anthony did marry another man in the meantime, but

he turned out to be a very poor economic investment.) A fourth lost her husband in 1875 after a long decline in his health and ability to work; she filed four years following his death (Hicks). Two mothers had been actually or effectively deserted by their husbands by the time they decided to file. While the deserting husbands each had a trade (well-digger and cobbler), they were both problem drinkers; one left home and never returned (Apgar), while the other stayed home but used his meager income to buy liquor and never contributed adequately to the family's material wellbeing (Henderson, who died in 1877). The remaining 3 mothers were married to husbands who did not die or desert them before they filed, but who all became so disabled by serious ailments and/or injuries as to no longer be able to work or earn wages (Smith, Nevins, and Wyckoff). These factors reveal just how critically dependent *all* members of nineteenth-century working class families were on the ability of the family's older males (especially the male head of household) to perform wage-earning or farm work. For virtually every one of the 9 families described above, loss of the soldier followed (or preceded) by loss of the soldier's *father* spelled economic doom – at least until a pension could be arranged.

The amount of pension awarded mothers depended on two things: (1) the year of application, and (2) whether the mother could demonstrate that she had been financially dependent on the son at the time he died in service (thus qualifying her for substantial arrears), or only that she was financially destitute at the time of filing (for whatever reason) *and* had lost a son in a service-related death.

From 1863 to 1886, the monthly award for dependent claimants was $8. In the Company A sample, only Hendershot and Grassman were in this category. In 1886, the monthly rate for all dependent pensions was increased to $12. Existing awards were not increased automatically, however; so-called "Increase" applications were required to obtain the higher rate.

Independent of the rate increase legislation, an earlier act in 1879 permitted eligible mothers to obtain a lump sum payment of pension "arrears" dating from their son's death, *if*

they could demonstrate dependency from that date to the date of application. Arrears could thus amount to a sizeable sum, generally in excess of $1,400 (nearly $30,000 today). In the Company A sample, all 7 later-filing mothers (Apgar, Anthony, Hicks, Henderson, Smith, Nevins, and Wyckoff) fell into this category, all except Apgar having applied in or after 1879. (Agar's application, though filed in 1874, was not determined until after the 1879 law had been passed, and arrears were allowed her under the new act.) Of these 7, 5 were approved and received arrears, which amounted to lump sum payments ranging from about $1,400 to $1,900, as well as prospective payments of $8 per month. Only Anthony's claim was rejected, as described above, for the technical reason that she had remarried before filing and was thus disentitled. (Wyckoff's claim under the 1879 law was simply never acted upon by the Pension Office; see below).

In and after 1890, a claimant was only required to show (1) present financial dependency (from any cause), and (2) a son who died from service-related causes, There was no allowance for arrears under this act and, if approved, awards were calculated from the claimant's filing date. Her earlier claim languishing, Wyckoff filed a new claim under this act in 1890; it was approved, and she was *prospectively* granted a $12-per-month pension.

Finally, the mothers' stories tell a consistent tale of the limited wage-earning options available to most women in the mid- and late-nineteenth century, even in circumstances when their production of income became critical to family survival. From the information available, none did heavy farm work, pursued a trade, or sought employment as a store clerk or other "white collar" wage-earner. Certainly none worked on a railroad or canal job. A few "took in boarders" in the home they owned or rented, charging money for shelter, food, and perhaps some domestic service (sewing, washing, etc.). Some performed miscellaneous unspecified "work" or "manual labor" outside the home, or provided washing, "nursing" (probably childcare), and other services to neighbors. One gave piano lessons in her home. One sold ducks and chickens raised in her small yard. One may have made and sold

clothing. Many referred to receiving "support" or "assistance" from friends, or from sources of "charity" in general.

This is not of course to discount the *unpaid* economic contributions made by these and other rural women of the period. Their principal roles in maintaining the household economy and raising young children was *central* to family welfare and survival (including their husband's), and in that more fundamental sense every bit as important as men's roles. They must often have worked longer hours than their husbands, and often at a greater variety of demanding or complicated tasks. "A man works but from sun to sun; a woman's work is never done." In all the cases of family dysfunction and abandonment presented by the families of Company A soldiers, there is not one instance of a mother deserting her children - or her husband for that matter - or becoming voluntarily estranged from them. There is no known episode of a wife's "intemperance," and only one potential instance of a wife's infidelity, the case of Sarah Grassman, and even that episode is shrouded in ambiguity.

In summary. these mothers lived in a world that was both narrowly proscribed in some senses, or as judged by modern expectations, but also primordially rewarding in ways that the contemporary American world is generally not. They were limited in the sense of having only a very small number of socially recognized and economically feasible workplace and "lifestyle" choices - a phrase they would have found fantastic and indulgent, if not sinful. But they clearly emerge from the sparse documents they left behind as women who were fiercely attached to their families, to the sweetness and beauty of their mainly quiet landscapes, and to the pleasures of life they *were* able to enjoy, as gifts from an almighty God. But there is no getting around the sadness that marked each of them.

As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, the 9 mothers' pension claims all involved sons who expired during the war, and all those sons were "celibate" when they died: they left behind no daughters-in-law and no grandchildren. The dates and causes of the sons' deaths cluster in ways that suggest the devastating consequence of the manner in

which units were locally raised and kept together in that conflict: the awful possibility that a particularly unhealthy campsite or lethal battle would suddenly cut like a scythe through the heart of the rural community back home. If the deaths of the sons of the 4 fathers treated in the following chapter are added to the picture - a total of 13 lost soldiers - its painful contours are only sharpened.

The first 4 sons to die all expired from camp diseases, and all 4 died within 8 months of leaving home, 2 from typhoid fever and 2 from chronic diarrhea/dysentery. The sad die-off represented almost 10% of the company's entire wartime losses. Within a day of each other, two soldiers were killed in action at Salem Heights in May of 1863, only a month after leaving the initial months' sickness behind and heading hopefully into spring. The mother of one of the two "never heard of him again"; he was likely buried by Confederate soldiers in an unmarked grave and was probably lucky to have received even that small decency. The following summer, after managing to survive nearly two years of campaigning and camp life, 6 more company sons were all cut down in a Virginia field in the course of a single half hour, on May 12, 1864. A seventh, who had been captured a few days before in the Wilderness fighting, died soon afterward as a prisoner.

Such concentrated spikes of dying must have had the chill feel of an epidemic – or a punishment from God - to the people of Hunterdon's rural towns and hamlets. But this time instead of a wave of infectious disease carrying off the very young - a periodic calamity for which they were at least somewhat prepared - the dreadful swings of the reaper's scythe fell cruelly and without warning upon the bravest and fittest of their young men. After that one awful week in May, 1864, letters were penned by Company A officers and tentmates bound for 7 Hunterdon area homes. Letters went to Tewksbury Township and Flanders in the north; to Wertsville in the south – 2 letters; to Raritan and Readington and Bethlehem Townships in the mid-county area.

Come up from the fields father, here's a letter from our Pete.
And come to the front door mother, here's a letter from thy dear son.

* * *

Open the envelope quickly,
O this is not our son's writing….
…O stricken mother's soul!
* * *
Alas poor boy…,
While they stand at home at the door he is dead already,
The only son is dead.

CHAPTER 13

FATHERS

> This is one of those hard cases, where had the son remained at home, the father would have been in good circumstances and comfortable all his days by reason of the son's labor and services; but the son having given his life for the country, the father now in his old age is reduced to indigence, because of the loss of his son. * * * I believe [a dependent pension] allowance would be in accordance with the meaning and intention of our existing laws, and only an act of justice to this bereaved father in his old age.
>
> Attorney James Rusling to Secretary of the Interior,
> regarding claim of father of Private Joseph Runkle

This chapter looks at the 4 remaining dependent pension claims made by Company A fathers. In these 4 cases, only the father filed and not the mother, despite the fact that mothers ordinarily had priority over fathers in the matter of pension claims. Among the 4 families represented in this chapter, however, the mother had either died before her son (3 cases), or died within a few years afterward, before a claim was contemplated.

As with the 9 mothers' cases, in all but one of the 4 fathers' claims, the soldier son died during the war. In 3 cases, the deceased son had never married, and in the fourth case the soldier had married before the war but his wife remarried afterward, without bearing any children to the soldier. The 4 fathers' tales are set forth below, in the order in which they filed their pension applications.

William Hockenbury. The lengthy pension-claiming saga of William H. Hockenbury (or Hockenberg) reveals a fascinating tale of sharply disputed facts, including whether the father was really dependent on his soldier son, and the role played in his dependency by "intemperate" habits. It also allows a glimpse of an unusual, extended appeal of the government's rejection of a claimant's application.

Hockenbury was born in 1820 in Lebanon Township, a northern area of Hunterdon County. He had a difficult start in life. His father died when he "was about three years of age…[and he] was bound out by the Overseer of the Poor…for his victuals and clothes" until age 21, which he reached in 1841. On November 5, 1844, at age 24, he was married to Rebecca Elizabeth Crate (or Crater), by Reverend Jacob Van Arsdale, at the Stanton Village Church. Stanton is a small village in southwestern Readington, near the municipal border with Clinton Township. At the time, both parties claimed residences in Clinton, which lies midway between Lebanon and Readington. Rebecca was born in 1825, and was 18 when she married William.

William made a living as a blacksmith and wheelwright, with a shop in the southern Readington area. He and Rebecca produced 8 children. Their first, who later became Company A Private Lemuel Hockenbury, was born on May 22, 1845, 6-1/2 months after the marriage. The next 7 were born between December, 1846, and February, 1861. Sadly, Rebecca suffered some sort of serious mental breakdown following the birth of her last child, and was committed in 1861 to the State Lunatic Asylum in Trenton.

The asylum was the result of nineteenth-century activist, Dorothea Dix's, assertive campaign among New Jersey's legislators in 1844-45 to improve the state's primitive treatment of the mentally ill, and build a modern, state facility for them. She succeeded, and New Jersey's first public institution for the insane, the Trenton facility, opened in 1848. Much later, her long public life at an end, Dix retired to an apartment gratefully furnished for her on the hospital's grounds, where she died in 1887. Admitted in 1861, Rebecca Hockenbury became one of the facility's relatively small population of early patients. Unfortunately, she died in December of the same year, at age 36. Her death so soon after being institutionalized was not unusual in this era; a national study covering the period 1847-77 estimated that 29% - *nearly a third* - of hospitalized mental patients died within the first year.[425]

Rebecca's death left William a widower at age 41, in charge of 8 children ranging in age from 10 months to 16 years. Within a matter of months, he began a new relationship with a woman named Amy Trimmer (or Trainer). William evidently preferred to be certain of his prospective wives' ability to conceive children before marrying them. Amy became pregnant early in 1863, probably February. They were married later the same year, and their first child was born in November. They had 3 more, between November, 1865, and June, 1869, brining his total to 12. He also liked a large family.

In the meantime, William's oldest son, Lemuel, had begun helping "steadily" in the shop at age 13, about 1858, and continued in that work until he enlisted in 1862. William later claimed that he was completely dependent on Lemuel's assistance in the shop, and that the boy was not paid for his work but contributed it to the family's support. His help was so crucial, in fact, that when he enlisted in 1862, William stated he could not sustain the work any longer, and "was soon compelled to dispose of [the] shop." He exchanged it "for a small farm which was heavily encumbered [mortgaged] for its full value." This turned out to be a unwise move.

When Lemuel enlisted in 1862, he was only 17, making him a "minor" as far as wartime service was concerned, and he must have lied about his age. Perhaps, among other motives, he was seeking a way to escape the pain of his mother's death less than a year before, or the awkwardness or tension produced by the new relationship his father had begun so soon after her passing. In any event, according to William, Lemuel continued in the army to support the family "by sending home to his Father…the money…paid to him while serving."

In the service, Lemuel became a prolific letter- and journal-writer. Much of his writing was later turned over to the Pension Office in support of his father's claim, and is preserved. His letters are mostly matter-of-fact descriptions of daily movements and blow-by-blow descriptions of the fighting, but they occasionally break into moments of exuberance or commentary. In 1863, for example, he wrote home that "this soldier's life" is "H___ for us

and the horses and a Heaven for the Negroes," a phrase probably picked up from campfire discussions. His letter to his father of May 6, 1863, describing the costly May 3 Battle of Salem Heights, is representative (and see Chapter 2):

> Jam[es] Emmons <u>was killed</u>
>
> Camp Near the Rapahanoc
> May 6th 1863
>
> Dear Father
>
> I now sit down to write to you again and inform you of the proceedings[.] when I last wrote we was supporting a battery[.] we lay in this position till sadurday the 2[nd.] during this their was scurmishing all the way long the line[.] we had a great many wounded[,] some killed[.] toward night the Rebs formed a line of battle on the hights[.] our troops the other side of river formed also and imediately comenced to cross[.] we wher among the first that crossed[.] we cross in boats before the bridg was put down[.] our Artilery also crossed and formed in the line[.] they formed to the right of us[.] the troops continued to cross all night but remember that their had [been] Fighting on the right and left ever sinc the thirtieth [of April.]
>
> In the morning we moved forward till we came to the foot of the hights where the Rebs run out a lot of Artilery and comenced fire[.] our artilery also opened fire and a terrific conflict issued[.] Axheimers [?] battery sent in its shells [and] killed all of the horses of one piece[.] the Rebs put one shell in the second regular battery & it passed through on[e] man [and] killed three horses but this at least did not stop the fire of our artilery[.] we lay in front of the battery in a road[.] the bank was about four feet high so it done us no harm[.] we was then ordered on the left to support this battery of which I speak[.] the Rebs pourd in their bullets[.] we lay flat and they passed over us[.] the Artilery…. [Letter in pension file discontinues at this point.]

Hockenbury's journal lists the officers of the regiment's debating group, the Adelphi Society, in which he must have participated. Though not particularly articulate in a literary sense, this participation marks him as having been one of the more politically curious and socially engaged of the company's men. The journal continues through May 11, 1864, the day the company had finished a forced march from the Wilderness to Spotsylvania Courthouse. The entry reads simply: "11th. Still laying behind the works."

The following day, he and others left the protection of those earthworks to assault the infamous "Bloody Angle" section of the rebel line. Lemuel, according to his father, was "shot three times" in the advance, in "his breast, arms and side of his body." He was later recovered from the battlefield where he had fallen, and removed to the regiment's field hospital in the rear. He lingered another week, but on May 20 he succumbed; with such severe wounds to the trunk, he probably never had a chance of surviving. He was only 2 days short of reaching his 19th birthday.

It is probably not surprising that after losing his wife and son, William sought solace in drink, although the exact onset of his alcohol-related problems is not disclosed by the record. It is clear, however, that by the time he first applied for a dependent pension in 1880, he had gained a reputation for abusing alcohol among at least some in his community.

The timing of William's application was most likely prompted by the liberal pension legislation of 1879, under which he was eligible to receive pension "arrears" from the date of Lemuel's death if he could prove that he had been financially dependent upon him at that time and that he had been unable to make a go of it afterward. Accordingly, in addition to noting Lemuel's prewar work in the shop and his sending home military pay, William also reported in his initial claim that he had been plagued with debilitating injuries from about the time Lemuel left for the war. He stated that in 1862, he "was ruptured in the stomach [abdominal hernia]…[the] rupture sometimes projecting out largely and causing [me] much pain and trouble." About 1873, he claimed, he "also had a rupture of the private parts [inguinal or scrotal hernia] so that [they] frequently extend or project out, causing severe pain." These injuries were at least plausibly work-related, the result of heavy lifting required in the blacksmith and wheelwright trades, as well as in the farming that William took up later on. Finally, according to papers filed in his application in 1883, he had suffered a disabling stroke in 1881, and was "partially palsied or paralyzed on…the right side," from which he had still not fully recovered.

As was usual, William's attorney supplied corroborating affidavits from others. In an 1883 affidavit, Jerome Emmons, a contemporary of Lemuel who had been employed in William's shop after Lemuel enlisted, swore that Lemuel had been his father's main assistant before the war and had "kept the books," and that he had witnessed William fall in 1862 and rupture his stomach. George Bartow, a former Company A comrade of Lemuel who had become a "Practicing Physician" after the war, attested to Lemuel's sending home money from his service pay, and that he knew him to be "a sober industrious man and soldier" who greatly aided his father "in procuring a living." Bartow appears to have been a self-taught

doctor or "homeopath," with a practice in the Readington Township village of Three Bridges. (see Chapter 7.)

There were good reasons for the 2 witnesses to be sympathetic to William's cause. One had worked for him, and may well have been a boyhood friend of Lemuel (and possibly the brother of soldier James Emmons, whom Lemuel reported killed in the 1863 letter quoted above). The other had been a wartime comrade of his son, and had witnessed him lying wounded and near death on the battlefield. Whatever may have been the shortcomings of the father, these 2 knew he had had a hard life, had suffered greatly, and had a large family to take care of. They were going to support his claim.

Others were not as willing. In reply to a standard Pension Office form sent later in 1883 inquiring "as to the standing in the community and the general reputation for truth" of Bartow, the local Post Master - who did not sign his name! - composed a curious response:

> Dear Sir
> yours Received and in reply to the best of my knowledge and belief…the said Lemuel Hockenbury was not depending on his father for support and his father is not capable of having his son's pension claim
> It is said that Dr. G. W. Bartow is working up this claim for said Lemuel Hockenbury's father and is paid for it
>
> Yours Respct.
> Post Master
> Three Bridges

The post master got it backwards: the issue of course was the father's dependency on his son, not Lemuel's on his father. More importantly, the unnamed post master did not reply directly to the Pension Office's question, but instead insinuated that Bartow was being bribed by the claimant to provide false testimony in a formal proceeding. Perhaps Bartow was, but the reply is factually vague and its tone officious.

A more useful opinion was expressed two years later, in August, 1885, by a local named Peter J. Nevins, of Flemington. (Nevins's status, and his relationship to the Hockenburys, are not known, but there were numerous Nevins families living in this part of the county, and two had enlisted in Company A.) His letter to the Pension Commissioner, marked "Confidential" by the reviewing pension agent, reads:

Dear Sir

* * * [William] Hockenbury…during the year of 64…was worth I believe several thousand dollars, owned a fairly good farm somewhat encumbered. since then he has failed (I believe) through his intemperate habits - so that now he is poor, about worn out, rheumatic, and about 68 years old. Has charge of a good farm and with his sons is able to maintain his family - but has a hard time of it.

Yours Respy
Peter J. Nevins

The true status of William's property holdings and income were now placed squarely at issue, and he and his supporters rallied to his defense. John S. Kline, a neighbor, wrote the commissioner in the fall of 1885, stating, "I do not think [Hockenbury] made a living for himself and family [from the shop and farm] as he was very heavily incumbered [i.e., mortgaged or indebted] and for all he was worth and was paying out more interest than he earned…and his main support Lemuel Hockenbury [was] taken away from him." John Ramsey, the Readington Tax Collector in 1885, made a comprehensive search of the tax rolls from 1863 through 1884, a 21-year period and a laborious undertaking, and submitted an affidavit showing William and his second wife's year-to-year assessed property and debts. This indicated that William's net holdings during those years - gross value less debts - ranged from a high of $2,000 in 1871 to a low of $0 in 1867, 1873, and 1877-81. Taken as a whole, they averaged only $400 a year. Wife Amy had no assessed property at all. This schedule essentially corroborated William's earlier affidavit, in which he had described the heavily mortgaged nature of the 2 farms he had owned in succession, and mentioned that each had been foreclosed and sold out from under him by the sheriff to pay his creditors.

But contradictory evidence was also submitted. Kline and another neighbor, Jacob Van Fleet, subsequently testified that they estimated Hockenbury had earned about $500 per year from farming and his shop business between 1863 and 1873, and about $350 per year thereafter. They did not specify whether this was gross income, or net after interest, expenses and taxes, or how they had come to know this information. Also damaging to his claim was a letter Lemuel had written while in the service to his brother, John. Though ambiguous, the letter could be interpreted as a request that the money Lemuel was sending

home be accumulated by John and saved for Lemuel upon his return, instead of being handed over to his father.

In February of 1886, the Pension Office finally reached a decision on the claim, and rejected it. The stated reason was William's failure to show to the government's satisfaction that he really had been dependent, even partially, on his son, during the critical wartime period, and that he had been driven to "fail" by his death. No mention was made of his alleged drinking problem or attempt to suborn Bartow, but these must have been in the mind of the government reviewers.

William was being represented in the matter by the well-known Trenton pension attorney, James Rusling. The latter now took the unusual step of appealing the Pension Office decision to the Secretary of the Interior.[426] The Pension Office's appellate brief remains in William's file, and although Rusling's brief is not preserved, it is quoted in the Secretary's subsequent ruling. Rusling, according to the ruling, had argued essentially that:

> …[T]he evidence…show[s] that the claimant was unable to labor a large part of the time when the soldier died; that the soldier materially contributed towards his support; that his shops were not carried on the whole time, and after paying for the labor…there was no profit, and that his family necessities caused him to be dependent.

The government brief, submitted by Acting Pension Commissioner Bartlett, recited the evidence at length, and then argued:

> …[T]he evidence fails to show that [claimant] was in any manner disqualified for the performance of manual labor, or from carrying on his farm, Wheelright [sic] and Blacksmith shop during 1864, nor for several years thereafter. …[His] income from 1863, to 1873 would amount to $500 a year.
>
> The letter of the soldier…indicates that he expected the money sent home when he returned from the service.

On May 20, 1887, the Interior Secretary issued a letter opinion upholding the Pension Office's initial rejection of William's claim:

> A review of the evidence does not show that claimant's "family necessities caused him to be dependent" at the date of soldier's death. In fact it does not appear of whom his family consisted at this time, nor the manner in which they were supported.
>
> * * * Stronger testimony is required to establish such condition when there has been great delay in making the application and no reason is given for the delay.

Though perhaps a reasonable overall interpretation of the evidence, some aspects of the Secretary's opinion sidestepped important issues of fact. There was ample evidence in the pension file, for example, of the number and ages of William's children, and the fact that many remained living with him and Amy during the period in question. There was also evidence of how he supported them, or attempted to support them, and of the health and financial setbacks he experienced. It appears likely that each of the government officials who reviewed the file came in turn to a similar, though never stated, opinion: William was a drunk and a bankrupt, had more children than he could take care of, exacerbated any legitimate injuries he did have by his own intemperate behavior, and may even have tried to get a sympathetic "doctor" friend to inflate his claims by offering him money.

Whatever may have been the truth of these views, William Hockenbury - as well as his attorney - were no quitters. Two years after the Interior Department's adverse ruling, they submitted yet more evidence to the Pension Office, this time in the form of an affidavit from 2 neighbors and "old friends of the family," John J. Biggs and Abraham V. Cole. The two insisted that, as of the date of Lemuel's death, William's assets had *no* net value. This was contrary to what Tax Collector Ramsey had reported. They also calculated that his annual *net* income from 1864 to the 1889 was only "about seventy-five dollars on average" (not $500 or $350), and that this was "insufficient to support his family." Based on this and other "new" evidence, Rusling petitioned the Pension Office to reopen and reconsider the matter.

The following year, Congress passed the Act of June 27, 1890. Among other pension liberalizing provisions, the act allowed parents of a Civil War soldier who had died in the war to claim a pension merely by showing a *present* state of disability and financial need, from whatever cause. The act, in other words, did not require the parent to show that he or she had been dependent on the soldier. In less than a month, Rusling filed a second and separate pension claim under this legislation, and it was quickly granted, the same year, at the prescribed rate of $8 per month.

But William, through Rusling, continued to pursue reconsideration of the first application. Although the prospective monthly award he would receive under the first claim was the same - $8 - he would also have been eligible for arrears from 1864. By 1890, arrears would amount to a very substantial sum: probably about $2,500 (about $50,000 in current value), probably enough to purchase a mid-size farm of 50 or more acres. The new law only allowed payments from the date the application was filed.

But the Pension Office reaffirmed its earlier rejection of William's older claim. Rusling promptly appealed it *again*, and on November 25, 1891, the Interior Department again upheld its prior decision, stating that "testimony filed since the claim was [originally] before the Department in 1887…does not avail to change the former action." The opinion also expressly noted that the claimant had been granted an award under the 1890 law, a factor which may have influenced the decision.

Rusling would not be deterred. He filed yet more material in the case, and the following year filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the appeal. On December 9, 1892, the Interior Department affirmed the rejection a *third* time, concluding that, "Some additional evidence has been filed since the case was last considered, but it is not of such weight as to warrant any change in the former action." The author of the ruling, Assistant Secretary Bussey, then added a perplexing statement, "It appears that at the soldier's death the appellant did not support himself and family." This was, of course, precisely what Rusling had been attempting for several years to demonstrate, arguing that the reason for this state of affairs was the appellant's (William's) disabilities and the loss of his son.

Before the month was out, the eternally persistent Rusling had fired off another letter to the Pension Commissioner, "beg[ging] leave once again to resubmit to you the case of William H., father of Lemuel Hockenbury." He now argued that the rationale for the previous rejection "really misconceived and misstated the facts," and that although William certainly did own real estate at the time of Lemuel's death, it was so encumbered that "the

net income therefrom was very small, and was supplemented by soldier." In almost plaintive terms, Rusling went on to state:

> It is not disputed, that [William] is now dependent…but it is submitted, that he was also really and truly dependent within the meaning of the law at the date of soldier's death, and I therefore pray for due consideration of his case and its due allowance accordingly under the General law. …[A]ll evidence in his case that places his income at "$500" or thereabouts…related only to his gross income and did not properly distinguish between gross and net income.

In his covering letter, Rusling titled his latest submission a "Motion for Second Review," but referred to it in an accompanying brief as an "appeal." Whatever it was, procedurally Rusling had by now more than exhausted his client's right to have his claim considered and reviewed and was surely out of line, having previously submitted *2 formal appeals* in 1886 and 1891, and *a motion for reconsideration* in 1892, each one seeking the same redress. Nonetheless, his latest request was duly forwarded to the Interior Department, which finally lost patience. Upholding the Pension Office rejection for a *fourth* time, Assistant Secretary Reynolds wrote, on July 18, 1893:

> The accompanying [brief], although denominated an appeal, is simply another motion for a review of [prior decisions], *raising and discussing identically the same points and questions that have heretofore been fully discussed and decided* by the Department, and under these circumstances *any further reconsideration of this claim is hereby denied*, and said motion is overruled. [Emphasis added.]

The matter of William's pension was at last put to rest. He did have $8 per month now coming in from the federal government - later increased to $12 - but there would be no lump sum award of arrears. Why was Rusling so persistent in pursuing this prospect for his client? It is hard to know. With attorney fees limited by statute, the cost to Rusling in terms of professional time was certainly prohibitive, and such extended legal maneuvering appears to have been a rarity. (See Chapter 8.) Perhaps Rusling had become personally invested in William's plight, and "really and truly" felt that an injustice had been done him by the government. Or perhaps, as must have often happened, Rusling held on to the possibility of a much larger fee if arrears were recovered, the result of an informal "understanding" between lawyer and client.

When William's 13-year-long pension saga finally ended in 1893, he was 73 years old. His and Amy's 4 children had probably all left home; the youngest, George Ellsworth, turned 24 years old that year. He did not have long to enjoy his modestly improved financial circumstances. Five years later, on June 25, 1898, William succumbed to "valvular heart disease" at age 78. His family buried him in Flemington. Amy survived him; she served as administratrix of his estate, and in due course forwarded a copy of his death certificate to the Pension Office. The fact that William left enough of an estate to warrant appointment of his wife as administratrix raises the possibility that he had managed to accumulate more wealth than he acknowledged while alive. Pension payments in any case terminated, and the outside of his file jacket was marked simply, "Dead."

Rusling's legal maneuverings were by far the lengthiest and most elaborate of any known Company A claim. It had been a long haul, wrangling with the government, and Rusling and his client had been treated to every conceivable rationale federal officials could come up with to justify their rejection of William's claim for arrears. As captured perhaps in the closing words of a Robert Frost poem: "It couldn't be called ungentle./But how thoroughly departmental."[427]

Abraham Runkle. A case sadly similar to Hockenbury's is presented by the pension claim file of Abraham Runkle, father of Company A Corporal, Joseph G. Runkle. Abraham was born about 1816, and grew up in Pennington, a town in Mercer County lying four miles south of the Hunterdon County line. He was literate. On September 5, 1840, at about age 24, he was married in Pennington to Sarah (Hepburn) Runkle, by Reverend George Hale. By then, Abraham had become a farmer.

Before the year was out, Sarah gave birth to the couple's first child, Jane Eliza. Joseph was born on December 12, 1844. They may have had other children as well. The couple at some point moved about 9 miles north into Hunterdon, and settled in Wertsville, in East Amwell Township. Joseph reported on enlistment that he had been born in Hunterdon, which means the couple had moved there by the end of 1844. Sarah died eleven years after

the marriage, on February 22, 1851; her age is unknown, but she was probably in her late 20s or early 30s.

Abraham was remarried to a woman named Clarinda, who had been born about 1830 and was about 14 years younger than her husband. It is not known when the marriage took place, but the couple produced their own children, including at least 2 daughters. Sometime before the war, Clarinda's father died and left her $1,000. They used this money, and another $1,500 they borrowed, to purchase 126 acres of land in East Amwell – a very large farmstead for the area and time - and to build a house. Farming the land proved difficult, however, and according to later testimony never became enough of a paying proposition to support Abraham's family. However, once the farmable portion of the land was fully utilized and the house and other buildings constructed, later witnesses would put its wartime value between $40 and $60 per acre (about $8,000 to $12,000 today), giving the family equity in the property worth about $3,500 to $6,000, a significant sum. This opinion of value would eventually figure centrally in Abraham's quest for a dependent pension.

Joseph, like Lemuel Hockenbury, was only 17 when he left for the war. He was living with his family and had been working as an unpaid farm hand on his father's farm, contributing his efforts to support of the family. Neighbors described Abraham's son as "an industrious young man, [who] worked steady for his parents on the farm," and whose prewar labor was worth about $150 per year. They stated he continued to send money home after he entered service, at the rate of $13 per month (which would have been his entire pay, $156 per year). Joseph showed an aptitude for military life and, according to Haines, "was a young man of more than ordinary promise, and…endeared himself to a large circle of friends".[428] In May, 1863, he was promoted to Corporal, and was later selected to be a member of the regiment's color guard.

Also like Hockenbury, Joseph was badly wounded during the assault at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 12, 1864. He nevertheless continued to bear the colors forward, and was only later evacuated to the rear. Having received multiple gunshot wounds to his right arm,

Joseph lived long enough to be transported by steamer up the Potomac and hospitalized at Armory Square General Hospital in Washington. But there, 26 days after being wounded, he died, almost certainly from the systemic infection that so often followed such wounds and the amputation of his right arm that must have resulted.

Starting the year before Joseph was killed, his father began seeing Dr. Cornelius W. Larison, in nearby Ringoes, for a mysterious complex of conditions the doctor described as "sunstroke…congestion of the brain…followed by neuralgia of the brain, giddiness on the head, indistinctness of vision, vertigo, palpitation on the heart at times, and a tenderness on the entire spinal column." Larison stated these conditions caused Abraham constant pain in the head during the spring and summer months, and rendered him unable to stand in the sun, or to work "in the open air on a sunny day, nor cud he perform manual labor in a hous". Larison's unorthodox spelling, especially as an educated man, drew comment later on from a pension official; see below. The doctor's undisclosed treatment for these ailments continued for more than a year, until the fall of 1864.

It is tempting to interpret Abraham's symptoms as another potential example of severe psychological distress, or depression, brought on by factors that may have included his first wife's death, his failing farm and inability to care for the family, profound anxiety over a beloved son far away fighting a bloody war, and then profound grief over his being killed in it. Sunstroke, or heatstroke, can indeed produce many of the precise symptoms Larison described, and a farmer toiling all day in the fields could certainly have suffered from such an ailment.[429] But Abraham sought treatment for the condition over a period of 17 months, an unrealistically long time for authentic heatstroke symptoms to persist, or to continue to incapacitate him even while indoors.

After the sunstroke episode - Abraham was about 47 - he claimed he had not been able to work at farming at all. At that point, he hired farm hands to work the farm, or "put out shares," i.e., leased his farm land to others. Abraham would later testify that his farm was never "very good, as it did not get improved as it should have been" and that 20 of its

126 acres consisted of "Mountain Land" which served only as a wood lot. Farmers of the era typically preserved an uncleared portion of their lands for construction timber and heating fuel. He estimated its value at about $45 an acre in 1888.

He stated that during the period he was able to work the farm he had "raised grain of all kinds and grades, some potatoes and other vegetables for our own use - not any to sell." Financially, "the annual value of the crops I raised I could not tell. I never kept any account - I know that I did not make anything after paying expenses - a good deal of the time I did not get me a living - I went broke - I had to hire help - could not do the work myself." In 1881, he was forced to sell off a 10-acre portion of woodland to a man named Hixson, for $10 an acre, to pay debts.

For her part, Clarinda "took in boarders" in their home to help support the family. In 1869, she inherited $400 from her mother's estate, and used it to purchase a piano. This was clearly a huge investment for such a family at the time, equivalent to about $8,000 today. She wanted both to teach the instrument to her two daughters, "whom she was educating in music - to make them teachers," and also to help out financially by giving piano lessons.

In 1885, the family moved off the farm and into a rented place in the nearby manufacturing town of Lambertville. It must have been an enormous adjustment, though some of Clarinda's activities suggest a slightly more urbane background than that of her husband and perhaps it was she who urged the move. Abraham still tried to hold on to the farm property by hiring others to work it and "putting out shares." But things continued steadily downhill. This was a period of national economic retrenchment, and Hunterdon farming and land values were hit especially hard. (See Chapter 7.) In August of 1888, Abraham had to sell off more of his farm property to pay debts; this time he sold just short of 19 acres to a man named Herder, for $50 an acre (total price of $940).

Finally, in December of the same year, 1888, most likely driven by the family's deteriorating financial situation, he applied for a pension. He used Attorney Rusling and, like Hockenbury, claimed dependence on his son from the time of his death nearly twenty-

five years before. And just as in Hockenbury's case, the Pension Office put up strong resistance to the claim, demanding detailed and convincing proof of Abraham's allegations. A big part of the problem both these father claimants encountered was overcoming the government's understandable suspicion that if they had *really* been dependent on a son who died in the Civil War, they would have applied for relief long before they did.

Two years later, in 1890, taking advantage of the same new and more liberal pension legislation that Hockenbury had used, Abraham filed a second application. He was now 74 years old. He did not use Rusling for this claim, however, but hired a Lambertville attorney named L. H. Sergeant. After submission of the usual supporting affidavits and other information by Sergeant, there followed a three-year period of inaction in *both* claims, the old and the new. Then, during a 2-month burst of activity starting in October of 1893, both claims were suddenly resuscitated, and decisions rendered in each.

First, the Pension Office ordered that a Special Examination be conducted as to Abraham and Clarinda's financial circumstances, starting from the time Joseph had died. The Examiner, C.E. Jenkins, interviewed Abraham at length, as well as 2 neighboring farmers, and a Lambertville merchant named James Carren, who knew the Runkles in town and whose father's church they "used to attend." He also reviewed Dr. Larison's earlier written statement. In the process, he elicited most of the information as to the family's property, work, and income mentioned above, as well as some new facts.

Abraham, it seems, had once guaranteed payment of a $700 promissory note made out to a third party by a man named Oscar Winnows. He had put up his farm as collateral for the guarantee. Why Runkle had been talked into this arrangement is hard to fathom. Perhaps he and Winnows were joint-venturers in some money-making project, or Winnows may have been a creditor of Runkle who asked a favor. Or perhaps Winnows was a nineteenth-century "confidence man," taking advantage of a "rube" farmer. Whatever the case, Winnows defaulted on the note, and Abraham, not having the $700 that the note holder then demanded, was forced to borrow the money from his own mortgage holder, a man

named Blackwell, to make good on it. The additional borrowing from Blackwell increased the mortgage on his farm from $1,500 to $2,200, and the 6% annual interest from $90 to $132. The $42-per-year increment was a considerable sum in a cash-poor economy: more than $800 in today's currency.

In 1892, a year before the Special Examination, Blackwell had unexpectedly demanded that the mortgage be paid off in full. He must have had what is called a “demand” mortgage note; i.e., one that the holder, or mortgagee, had the right to “call” at any time. Blackwell was undoubtedly anxious over the fact that at this point the Runkles were unable to keep up with the $132 annual interest payments. They were then receiving only about $100 a year from renting out the farm, and except for Clarinda's contributions from taking in boarders and giving music lessons, had no other source of income. Blackwell, according to Abraham, "threatened to foreclose, and I let him take the farm [in exchange] for the mortgage - I deeded [the farm] to him."

Blackwell did allow Abraham to reserve 10 acres of woodland to himself out of the transfer, but this still meant that Blackwell got about 87 acres for $2,200, an exceptionally good deal for arable land - about $25 an acre – even under the distressed circumstances of the era. Previous opinions and lot sales had placed the market value between $45 and $60 per acre, and economic circumstances began to improve in the 1890s. All Abraham had left now was his 10 acres of wooded and unfarmable mountain land; he subsequently tried to sell that for $20 an acre ($200), but only managed to secure an offer of $12.50. Things for the Runkles were dire.

The examiner, Jenkins, was clearly sympathetic, and was satisfied that Runkle and each of his witnesses had been truthful. With a touch of humor, Jenkins did note, however, that Larison was "an eccentric man - especially as to reform in spelling". On November 1, he wrote the Pension Office with his conclusion that Abraham's *initial* claim, "under the general laws," was meritorious, and recommended it be approved.

In less than a week, on December 5, the government, while not yet responding to Jenkins's recommendation, approved Abraham's *second* application, which afforded him $12-per-month payments from the date of the application in 1890 - but did not include arrears from the date of his son's death in 1864. This must have come as some relief, but not nearly as all that had been hoped for, especially in light of Jenkins's action. Then two weeks later, on December 18, the Pension Office *rejected* the initial application under the general law, citing Abraham's failure in the end to demonstrate his dependence on Joseph as of the date he had been killed. The disheartening news came *six years* after the application had been filed. Abraham was now 77 years old.

Attorney Rusling, who had developed a reputation for perseverance in veterans' causes, took quick action. As in Hockenbury's case, he prepared an appeal to the Interior Department and sent it to Pension Commissioner Lochren on January 18, 1894, where it was forwarded to the Secretary. Four months later, on May 26, Assistant Interior Secretary John M. Reynolds issued a ruling denying the appeal, and affirming the Pension Office's earlier rejection of Abraham's claim. In an accompanying opinion, Reynolds observed that, at the time of Joseph's death in 1864, "taking the mean sum of $50 per acre as a fair valuation of the farm," Abraham owned real estate "worth between $5,000 and $6,000" with a mortgage of only $1,500. Reynolds did note both Abraham's "alleged" inability to work much outdoors "on account of a sunstroke," and Joseph's pre-war and wartime contributions to the family's support, but found that overall these facts "were not such as to render him dependent upon the soldier for support" in 1864, at least not "within the meaning of [the statute]."

Reynold's ruling was influenced by several factors. His language indicates he was not convinced of the authenticity of Abraham's ailments, and may have believed he was capable of doing more work than he let on. Even if Runkle were not able to perform manual labor, Reynolds surely felt he ought to have either cashed in on his farm equity much sooner (which, if invested, would probably have brought in interest income of more than $200 per year), or else succeeded better at either earning rental income from putting out shares, or

profiting from the use of hired hands to run the operation. Reynolds also undoubtedly took into consideration the fact that the claimant had now been awarded a regular monthly pension that totaled $240 per year, under new legislation that he personally may have found overly generous. Finally, unlike Examiner Jenkins, the Secretary had of course had no face-to-face dealings with either Runkle or his many supporters and, like most Washington functionaries, was quite removed from their life experiences. He thus had no direct way of assessing their credibility, and no personal exposure that might have led him to form a more sympathetic attachment to them or their cause.

The indefatigable Rusling nonetheless soon asked Reynolds to reconsider his ruling. He now sensed that the bare financial facts of the case were not on Abraham's side, for exactly the reasons that Reynolds had methodically and accurately recited. He therefore changed tack rather dramatically, in effect conceding Reynolds' technically correct financial analysis, and pleading instead for a more humane and "just" result in keeping with the *spirit* of the law - one that honored the family's sacrifice "for the country." In a letter to Reynolds on June 5, 1894 (only 10 days following his ruling), Rusling wrote:

> This is one of those hard cases, where had the son remained at home, the father would have been in good circumstances and comfortable all his days by reason of the son's labor and services; but the son having given his life for the country, the father now in his old age is reduced to indigence, because of the loss of his son. It is one of those cases that appeal peculiarly to the feelings and common sense of justice prevalent among our people, and I pray, therefore, for a review of this case and its due allowance accordingly. I believe its allowance would be in accordance with the meaning and intention of our existing laws, and only an act of justice to this bereaved father in his old age.

Despite Rusling's rather elegant appeal to popular sentiment, Reynolds remained unmoved. Six weeks later, on July 21, he reiterated his previous ruling. As might be expected, he made no mention of larger issues of ultimate "justice" or the real "meaning and intention" of the law, but fell back once again on his close analysis of Abraham's financial circumstances at the time of his son's death, and the fact "that at that time the labor and contributions of the soldier were neither needed nor necessary to afford [the father] means of adequate subsistence."

Reynolds was probably right, in his fashion. And after all, no amount of arrears would bring Joseph back. But reading between the lines, it is reasonable in this case to conclude that whatever may have been the son's true contribution to his father's material wellbeing, his death truly broke Abraham's heart, as well as his health and his will.

Abraham Runkle continued to receive his $12-per-month pension for another four and a half years. He died in Lambertville sometime in late 1898, at 82 years of age. He too, it might be said, had given a great deal for the country.

George Heath. Hockenbury and Runkle's travails illustrate the problem of a parent's having to establish financial *dependency* on a soldier-son fifteen or twenty years after the son's death. The story of George B. Heath, father of deceased Company A veteran Charles G. Heath, demonstrates the frustrating difficulties that could be encountered trying merely to establish the fact that the soldier's death was *war-related*, decades after the event. In Heath's case, the matter was further complicated by the fact that the soldier died after leaving the service.

The years of both George and Charles's births are uncertain. This is probably because, by the time George needed to provide this information, he was an elderly and feeble man in his 70s, and his memory was likely fading. Charles and his mother had both died by then. In 1890, George signed an affidavit giving his age as 72, making his birth year about 1813. The following year, he signed another affidavit claiming to be 78, rendering his birth year about 1818. He also at that time gave his son's birth date as December 17, 1843, which would have made him 18 years old on enlistment. Charles's discharge certificate, however, gave his age as 21 on enlistment, which would have given him a birth year of 1840, if the December 17 birth *date* is correct. These discrepancies also cast some doubt on George's remembered marriage date to Charles's mother: February 28, 1843.

In any case, George was the son of George and Maria Heath, and was probably born and raised in the southern area of Hunterdon County, in Alexandria Township or Lambertville. He was illiterate. He was married in Delaware Township some time in the

early 1840s, by Reverend Hall; almost no information survives regarding his wife. The couple's first child, Charles G. Heath (shown as Charles *A.* on NJROM), was born either before or soon after the marriage. Charles had become a blacksmith by the time he enlisted with Company A in 1862, and gave Alexandria Township as his residence. His mother died on December 7, 1861, from an unknown cause. She was probably in her 30s or early 40s, and within 6 or 7 months, her son had decided to join the army.

Soon after the company entered camp to spend its first winter, Charles became disabled. The Surgeon General's records showed that he complained of a rupture on January 31, 1863 – this would have been shortly after the injurious Mud March of that month - and was carried on the company roster as "unfit for duty" for the next 40 days. He was finally discharged, at the White Oak encampment, on March 22, and returned to New Jersey, the certificate merely giving "disability" and "unfitness for duty" as the reasons. Later War Department records referred to "Hernia Inguinalis" (testicular rupture) as the cause.

However, according to the later recollections of two fellow soldiers, Abraham Trauger and George C. Van Camp, Charles also became "sick by reason of exposure" during the winter of 1862-63, and was "much disabled and rendered unfit." Two neighbors and family friends, Henry Bodine and George Hoppock, visited the Heath family as soon as Charles came home from the war. They described George as quickly "getting sicker," and finally dying only 5 weeks after his discharge, on April 28, from what they both "understood" to be a case of "Chronic Diarrhea." These first-hand descriptions make it very probable that Charles, in addition to rupturing himself, had contracted dysentery during the first winter of the war, a disease that easily spread among the men in that initial period of stationary, close-quarters living.

Haines describes the period beginning in late November of 1862, as one in which "typhoid fever…broke out, and a number of [the 15th New Jersey's] men were prostrated." The period continued into March of the following year, during which the encampment at White Oak Church became "an unwholesome one, with bad drainage, and very muddy in wet

weather," and "deaths were frequent." He does not specifically mention dysentery, but Bilby concludes that during this period "most of the fatalities were due to typhoid fever and, increasingly, to chronic diarrhea and dysentery." The symptoms experienced by Heath and witnessed by others point toward the latter disease.[430] It is well known that the ailment was one of the major killers during the Civil War. (See Chapters 3 and 5.) As McPherson relates:

> Sickness hit soldiers hardest in their first year. The crowding together of thousands of men from various backgrounds into a new and highly contagious disease environment had predictable results. Men (especially those from rural areas) who had never before been exposed to [various diseases]...promptly came down with [them].... * * * If soldiers...remained for some time at the...base camp - where by poor sanitary practices and exposure to changeable weather they fouled their water supply, created fertile breeding grounds for bacteria, and became susceptible to deadly viruses - many of them contracted one of the three principal killer diseases of the war: diarrhea/dysentery, typhoid, or pneumonia.[431]

George Heath must have been devastated, losing his wife a year and a half earlier and now his first-born son, in his own home. He nevertheless struggled on without them, and without any help from the government, until 1890, when he was in his 70s. Using the services of Trenton attorney, Henry Phillips, he applied that year for a dependent pension under the new law, according to which he needed only to demonstrate that his son had died as a result of a condition suffered during wartime service, and that he, the father, was now dependent (not that he *had been* dependent at the time of his son's death). By 1890, according to neighbors, George had become a "very feeble" old man, with no income, and totally dependent on friends "who are not legally bound to support him." The last clause was a formulaic statement required by the Pension Office, to rule out the possibility that a relative or guardian could be looked to for financial assistance to the claimant, or that someone was being compensated for doing so. By now he was living in Lambertville, probably alone. The Lambertville tax assessor, Judson Fields, testified that George had no property in 1890, and was assessed only the $1-per-year poll tax.

The government was persuaded that the elderly claimant was indeed destitute, but was not yet satisfied that his son had died of service-connected causes, and asked for further evidence of the "origin and treatment of Diarrhea." In 1893, after much searching, George or

his attorney was able to locate Charles's two wartime neighbors mentioned above, Bodine and Hoppock, and obtain from them supporting eyewitness testimony as to Charles's rapid and immediate post-war decline and death. The doctor who had treated Charles at home during his last weeks was long dead. The father then told the Pension Office he could get no more evidence, and asked it to proceed on the basis of what he had been able to provide.

Unaccountably, the government reviewers appear to have bogged down at this point. Beginning a few years after submission of the neighbors' 1893 affidavit, Attorney Phillips tried, with admirable persistence, to prompt a decision. He submitted printed slips to the Pension Office requesting a reply - the slips were referred to in the day as "calls" - on September 11, 1897; August 11, 1898; March 23 and October 14, 1900; February 11 and October 17, 1902; August 27, 1904; and April 20, 1909.

He might have been spared the effort had the bureaucracy taken the trouble at any point to reply, even briefly. Some time after 1893, George Heath had moved to the State of New York, probably to settle in with one of his children. There, in his late 70s or early 80s, he died on September 24, 1896, after a bout with "consumption" (tuberculosis). The Pension Office was promptly sent a death certificate, and marked the file "abandoned." Phillips did not abandon it however, and had continued to try to get his deceased client a pension for another 13-1/2 years!

Jacob Frey. In the case of Jacob Frey, the unanticipated problem, as it turned out, was neither proving the father's late-in-life dependency nor demonstrating the son's death from a service-related cause. Bizarre as it seems today, Frey's problem became that of proving that his son was actually *dead*.

As little is known about the wartime Frey family as is known about the Heaths, They were from the northeastern most part of Hunterdon: the "Fox Hill" area of Tewksbury Township, and the small village of California, later changed to Califon. Fox Hill is today known to be the highest point in the county at 1,096 feet; the township lies generally along a geological boundary in western New Jersey where low-lying flatland and low rolling hills

begin abruptly to fold upward toward higher hills and mountains further north, the folds gradually becoming the state's section of the Appalachian mountain range. On the Beers 1873 Atlas, the county's highest point was put at "Drakes Hill," a rise located about "200 rods" - about 2/3 mile - east of Lambertville, in the *southernmost* region of the county. As good as many maps and surveys were by mid-nineteenth century, measuring topographical elevations was still an inexact art.

Jacob Frey was born about 1817. He could at least sign his name, but his literacy beyond that is uncertain. He married the soldier's mother at Fox Hill, in "Tauckbery" (Tewksbury), on "the last of October," probably in 1838 - the final digit of the marriage year is barely legible in the pension records; a "Rev Mr Scoot" performed the ceremony. The date of birth, marital details, age at enlistment, and prewar occupation of their son, Peter B. Frey, are not known, and almost nothing is recorded about him except that he was born in Hunterdon, was married before the war, and enlisted from Tewksbury.

Many years later, at age 73, Jacob's recollection was that Peter had enlisted "some were abot" August 15, 1862 (the rolls show he had signed up on July 28, and mustered in on August 25), and that he died at "Chancellorsville, Virginia, in May, 1863." He was probably killed at Salem Heights, on the road between Chancellorsville and Fredericksburg. At the beginning of May, 1863, the regiment became engaged in its first sustained combat of the war, and many of its men were lost in an assault against rebel lines on Salem Heights on May 3. Immediately following that engagement, the regimental adjutant listed Frey as "missing and supposed dead," and he was never heard from again. Frey's mother died in "Callafon," in March, 1868 or 1869; in 1890, when he provided this information, Jacob could not recall which year.

Jacob was in his early 50s when his wife died, and he never remarried. His son's widow, almost certainly quite young when Peter disappeared, never filed for a widow's pension, and it is likely she remarried relatively soon afterward, and also that she and Peter did not have any children (see below).

On October 18, 1890, Jacob, age 73, became the last of the company's 4 "father-only" cases to file for a dependent pension. Like so many of the company's claimants, he used Trenton attorney, James Rusling, to represent his interests. Jacob had moved by then to Glen Gardner, a north Hunterdon town situated about 6 miles west of Califon and Tewksbury. Frey testified that as of that time there was no widow or child of Peter.

The following summer, the Pension Office responded to the claim with requests for further information - information that, by 1890, would have been almost impossible to obtain, especially in Jacob's reduced circumstances. The government wanted at least 2 witnesses (other than Jacob) to attest that Peter had been "celibate"; that he had indeed gone missing in action 27 years ago; and that nothing had been heard from him since. By "celibate" the government surely here meant that Frey had produced no children; the pension office could not possibly have meant that he should have had no connubial relations with his young wife before going off to war, which would not have had any bearing on Jacob's claim in any case.

Jacob must have been exasperated and completely discouraged by this unrealistic request. The Pension Office file contains no indication of any further communication from him or his attorney, and the jacket was eventually marked "abandoned." It would be more accurate to say that in this case, the Jacob's government had abandoned him.

* * *

Overall then, at least some pension-claim-related data exist for a total of *13* fathers - as well as 13 mothers - of Company A volunteers: the 4 men discussed in this chapter who filed their family's *only* dependency claim; the 3 men mentioned in the previous chapter who filed a claim after their claim-filing spouse – the soldier's mother – had died; and the 6 men who were married to the remaining claim-filing mothers discussed in the previous chapter, but who died before their wives. Patterns emerge from the stories all 13, and will here be briefly examined, and also compared with the stories of their 13 wives. For some purposes, only the 7 claim-filing fathers will be examined and/or compared, as a discrete group.

The 13 mothers had an average lifespan of about 62 years, while the 13 fathers lived on average about 5 years longer, until age 67. Since these men, on average, were likely to marry women about 4-1/5 years younger than themselves[432], these longevity averages resulted in each spouse having about an equal chance of outliving his or her partner. Indeed, among the 13 couples, 6 wives became widows and 7 husbands became widowers. Among the 6 widows, only one, Mary Anthony, remarried (17%); she was 72 years old at the time, and married a man of about the same age. At least 2 of the 7 widowers remarried (29%), and both took relatively young women who could continue to bear their children (one second wife gave birth to 4, and the other to at least 2). A third widower, Heath, may also have remarried; the record is unclear.

This is comparable to the experiences of Company A veterans and their wives. The average lifespan of the company's war-surviving veterans was about 66-1/2, and that of all company soldiers' spouses about 60. As stated in Chapter 6, the company's soldiers, on average, married women about three years younger than themselves. 19 war-surviving veterans outlived their spouses, while 20 wives outlived their veteran husbands (another 13 were widowed by the war). More than half the widowers remarried, while only a quarter of the "post-war" widows did so.

As mentioned in Chapter 6, available data indicate that Company A veterans and their wives produced about 3 children per couple, somewhat lower than the national average at the time of about 4. The 13 families of soldiers' parents, however, appear to have been significantly larger. For the 11 families for whom fairly reliable data survive, the average number of children produced per family was about 6 (6.2), and the fertility rate was about 5 (5.3).[433] "Fertility rate," as here used, means the average number of children produced by each *wife*, rather than each family or father, which takes into account the fact that in 2 of the 11 families, second wives produced additional children.

The timing of first births, relative to marriage, is known for 7 of the 13 families. Significantly, *in 3 of the 7* (43%), conception of the couple's first child preceded the

wedding.[434] This is generally consistent with the experience of Company A's soldier marriages (see Chapter 6), and is evidence of what may well have been a common practice of the time, at least among farming people and certain other kinds of laboring folk. In a setting where children played crucial roles in the household economy, insuring the fertility of couples contemplating marriage was undoubtedly considered by some to be a wise, as well as pleasurable, strategy. There is no indication in any pension document that premarital sexual relations under these circumstances was considered sinful or inappropriate behavior, though it undoubtedly was among some elements of the population. Indeed, as suggested in the previous chapter, there was not even any *explicit* disapproval in the record of Sarah Grassman's having conceived her 2 children with a man who was not her husband, though the unanswered question in that case is whether either or both natural parents had been widowed by the time the activity took place.

The birth order of the soldier sons of these fathers is consistent with the findings of the previous chapter. Information is available for 3 of the 4 additional fathers' cases; in *each of the 3* the Company A soldier was the first-born child or first-born son of the family. The 3 were born in 1843, 1844, and 1845. Given the large numbers of children families were producing in the pre-war period - an average of 6 per family in the Company A parents' sample, 3 of whom could be expected on average to be males - this birth order datum is remarkable. The demographic factors suggest that any male born during the period most likely to render him susceptible to wartime service had about an equal chance of being his family's first, second, or third son. Thus, if birth order were *not* a factor in enlistment, 8 or 9 of these 13 deceased Company A soldiers would be expected to have been their family's second or third sons, and only 3 or 4 their first-born ones. Yet it is known from birth order data available for 11 of the sons that *9* were first-born (82%). Though the sample is of course extremely small, the data seem too skewed to be merely random. As speculated in the previous chapter, something more seems to have been at work.

The literacy rate among the 13 sets of parents is in the end quite hard to determine, but was certainly lower than that of their sons' and daughters' generation. Whether or not the parent was literate was judged to be very reliably indicated in the case of only 6 of the 13 first wives and one of the 2 second wives; of these 7 wives, 5 were clearly illiterate and only 2 were clearly literate. Assessing literacy for the husbands was even more difficult; only 4 cases were relatively certain, and of them only one was literate. Overall, combining mothers and fathers, only 3 of 11 were literate, a very low rate of 27%. The rate is improved significantly by indulging in reasonable speculation; i.e., by adding several "probably literate" persons, mainly fathers, to the list based primarily on their occupational and/or property transaction histories. It was judged probable, for example, that a cobbler who reportedly kept "books of account," and that a farm purchaser who engaged in somewhat complex financing arrangements, were alphabetically as well as numerically literate. Adding such persons to the list of parents able to read and write raises the literacy rate for both mothers and fathers to 50%.[435] This is still well below the overall 82% rate of their soldier sons and 67% for their wives, but is not surprising in view of the comparative scarcity of local schools at the time. As children reaching school age in the 1810s and -20s, these future parents of company men were simply a generation too early to benefit from the district school movement that would shortly sweep the county.

Looking at the 7 fathers who submitted dependency claims as a separate group, their experiences and characteristics are generally consistent with those of the 9 pension-claiming mothers detailed in Chapter 12. In a few ways, however, they are intriguingly distinct. As a group, the 7 men were all born during a comparatively short period of about eight years, during the second decade of the nineteenth century: 1813 to 1820. This birth year range is much more compact than the 23-year spread of their wives' birth years: 1803-1825. The men married their first wives between 1838 and 1844. It is perhaps significant that *all 4* lost their first wives after an average of only nineteen years of married life (the range was from 11 to 30 years of married life), and after each of the wives had produced one or more children,

in one case as many as 8. Though the age of only one of the 4 wives is known for certain - Hockenbury's wife, Rebecca, was about 18 when they married, and died when she was about 35 – none could have been much older than 50 at death and all 4 were probably much younger. It is known from the record that 2 of the men remarried and produced additional children with their second wives, and that one did not remarry. The experience of the fourth man, Frey, after losing his first wife is not known.

The residence and migration patterns of the 7 fathers were similar to those of the mothers. None except Wyckoff ever left New Jersey, and all except Wyckoff resided most or all of their lives in Hunterdon County. All but 2 were born in the Hunterdon: Runkle came originally from bordering Mercer County, and Wyckoff from bordering Somerset County; Runkle had moved to Hunterdon by the time his soldier son was born in 1844. Wyckoff, except for his and his wife's 5 or so years in Kansas during the late 1870s and early 1880s, lived most of his life in Lamington, a Somerset County village bordering New Germantown (Oldwick), in Hunterdon County. All but 3 of the fathers died in Hunterdon, as far as the records disclose: Wyckoff in Lamington; Nevins in Jersey City at the home of one of his sons, and Apgar most likely in Morristown, in neighboring Morris County, at the end of a long period of separation from his wife in Califon. The farthest away from Hunterdon home ground when he died was Nevins; Jersey City was a relatively densely populated urban community, the seat of Hudson County, and lies just across the Hudson River from New York City, and about 45 miles northeast of Flemington.

The men's Hunterdon residencies were scattered throughout the eastern half on the county, and do not exhibit the north-county concentration of the women. Three (Runkle, Heath, and Nevins) spent most of their Hunterdon lives in the southern portion, in or near Lambertville; three (Frey, Apgar, and Wyckoff) in the northern portion, especially in or near Tewksbury Township and Califon; and one (Hockenbury) in the central portion (Readington Township and Flemington). As a group, they moved a bit more and a bit further than the 9 mothers, but not *nearly* as much as the Company A soldiers and wives of their sons'

generation. In a sense, this tends to demonstrate the socially and demographically "disturbing" influence of the Civil War experience. (See Chapter 7.) Having been so roughly exposed to adventure, travel, and risk – at such early ages – the young men and women who experienced the war most directly seem thereafter to have cast themselves broadly throughout the new land, at least by comparison with their parents.

Why in the end did these 7 particular soldiers' fathers choose to apply for a pension? At least 3 of them appear to have been much better off financially than the mothers discussed in Chapter 12, or at least to have enjoyed periods of life in which they managed to accumulate significant amounts of real estate or other assets and enjoy good income. Nevins, discussed in the last chapter, owned at least 2 different farms in the southern part of the county during his work life, one of which was a substantial, 180-acre spread, and his wife worked hard to augment their income. Hockenbury reportedly owned "a fairly good farm" and earned as much as $500 per year from this and his blacksmith and wheelwright shop. Runkle worked a large and valuable farm that he owned, and both he and his second wife inherited significant amounts of money and earned rents and fees from boarders, sharecroppers, and piano students. (Information for Heath and Frey is scant.) Several of the men had potentially valuable trades, including 2 cobblers, a blacksmith and wheelwright, and a well-digger.

The lives of the 7 do, however, share common threads that may help explain their ultimate pursuit of federal assistance. First, they all appear to have grown quite ill over their adult lives, certainly in a medical or physical sense but also quite possibly in an emotional or psychological sense as well. The details for 3 of the 7 are related in Chapter 12: Apgar turned to alcohol early in his adult life, and later became nearly blind; Nevins lost 4 of his 7 children, one to war and 3 to tuberculosis, and developed severe, depression-like symptoms; Wyckoff appears to have lost 4 of his 8 children, and was no longer fit to do farm work by the time he and his wife tried relocating out west.

The stories of the 4 fathers detailed in this chapter are sadly similar. Hockenbury had had a difficult childhood, at best. He had lost his father at age 3 and been plunged into poverty early in life, and had been "bound out" as a child by the local authorities to earn his keep. He lost both his first wife and his dear young son – who had enlisted while still a minor - in the space of less than three years. In one 10-year stretch, he incurred 2 painful hernias, one abdominal and one testicular. He was responsible for a large brood of children: 13 in all, though they probably were not all living at home at the same time. He turned to drink, probably drinking alcoholically. After a few more years, he suffered a paralyzing stroke, and would later die of a diseased heart. Runkle also lost his first wife and young soldier son – a known favorite of the company and probably of the father as well - within a cruelly short period of time, in his case only about two years. Following the first loss, he began suffering from a series of painful head ailments that would plague and debilitate him for the rest of his life; almost certainly, they were partly psychological in nature. (See Chapter 10.) Heath's wife and soldier son died within a period of only 17 months. Perhaps worse than a war-theater death, out of sight and far away, the son had died in the family's home - most likely in the arms of his own parents - only a month or so after being discharged for chronic illness. Little is known of Heath's life after the war, except that he had become a "very feeble" old man by the time he applied for a pension, in his 70s. Similarly, though even less is known of Frey's post-war life, his wife died in 1868 or 1869, only five or six years after the death of his son in the regiment's first real action, in May of 1863. Looking at the 4 lives together, it is notable that in each case the father, in addition to losing his first-born son to the conflict, also lost his *spouse* either during or within only a few years of the same awful conflagration.[436]

Second, in their work and economic lives, all of the fathers for whom pertinent data survive seem to have made one or more questionable financial decisions, while all of the others seem never to have risen very far on the economic ladder in the first place. As related previously, Apgar appears simply to have quit working at his potentially lucrative well-

digging trade long before health concerns required it; Nevins borrowed so heavily to acquire his farms that he seems never to have been able to keep up with the debt; and Wyckoff decided to move west when he was a relatively enfeebled old man, and growing blind.

In 1862, the year his son left for the war, Hockenbury decided he could no longer make a go of it as a blacksmith, and exchanged his shop for a small, heavily mortgaged farm. This both obliged him to generate sufficient income from selling farm produce or from "renting out shares" to pay interest on the mortgage, and to toil at a kind of work that was at least as physically demanding as blacksmithing. The evidence was that he was in the end unable to keep up, and that his "intemperate" habits, as well perhaps as his mismanagement of the significant income he did sometimes succeed in getting - as much as $500 a year according to witnesses - contributed to his financial failure. Runkle, while inheriting enough money to give him a good stake in a large farm and house, was never able to make the enterprise turn an adequate profit, and gradually lost everything, paying debts by selling off parcels of his once-grand estate at rock-bottom prices. And then there were the 2 disastrous transactions in the 1880s and -90s: first his extraordinarily injudicious guaranteeing of a $700 loan, that promptly went into default, and then his lender's calling the $2,200 mortgage note against his farm.

Finally, there are the related matters of the *timing* of the men's claims, the *category* of assistance they sought, or were awarded, and the relatively low *approval* rate they achieved, compared with the 9 mothers. Unlike the women, who began filing much earlier and continued to file over a 21-year period from 1863 to 1884, all but one of the 7 men filed comparatively late in life, over a more constricted 11-year period from 1880 to 1891, when they were all in their 60s or 70s. Wyckoff, the exception, was 81 when he filed in 1896. For them, seeking the pension was very much a late-in-life, last-ditch effort. It is almost as if they were ashamed, as men and at least nominal heads of household, to go begging for government largesse; they, after all, had not been the ones putting their lives on the line, or suffering excruciating wounds or disabling disease. Three of the 7 filed after their wives had

already successfully obtained an award of arrears in a previous dependency claim; they were therefore only eligible to seek a prospective pension.

Two of the 4 others, Heath and Frey, though eligible to seek arrears, chose not to do so. The 2 made no pretense of having been dependent all along, so as now to deserve a substantial lump sum from the government. Even so, neither of these 2 septuagenarians got a cent; one could not show that his died-at-home son had actually died from the war, and the other could not prove a cruel negative: that his briefly-married son, who had simply vanished in the fighting, had not fathered children before never being heard from again. It must have seemed as if their government was telling them they simply did not deserve help.

The 2 remaining fathers, Hockenbury and Runkle, did seek arrears, and by the 1880s when they filed the award if allowed would have amounted to a king's ransom – as much as about $40,000 in today's currency. But despite the entreaties of their earnest counsel, James Rusling – who incidentally ended up representing 4 of the 6 father claimants whose attorneys are known, another common thread – the government declined their pleas. In each case the Pension Office was understandably wary of a long history of alleged suffering and financial dependence on a long-dead son that had taken twenty or so years to come to light.

In the event, not one of the 4 statutorily-eligible fathers received an award of arrears, and only 3 of the 7 pension-claiming fathers obtained a prospective award (43%). The approval data for these men contrast sharply with the rates for the women. Of the 9 mothers who filed dependency applications, 7 succeeded in obtaining prospective monthly pensions (78%). Only one of the remaining 2 was rejected; the other had simply not been acted upon by the time the applicant died. Moreover, 7 of the 9 mothers submitted applications for arrears and of these, 5 were granted (71%). Again, only one was rejected, and the seventh was not acted upon.[437]

* * *

In sum, all 7 of these claimant fathers appear to have suffered from unusually high degrees of family tragedy and psychic trauma, physical illness or injury, and bad judgment or

bad luck. Though an apparently modest number, the 7 actually constitute a fairly large portion of all potential father claimants. As stated earlier, 42 Company A volunteers failed to return form the war. Thirteen of these were married and left behind a widow who had a superior claim to any pension rights stemming from the soldier's service, at least until she remarried; 12 of the 13 actually did file for a widow's pension. Thus, the number of deceased soldiers whose parents *could* have filed a claim was reduced to 30: 42 less 12.

With respect to the 30, mothers filed dependency claims in connection with 9 of them; mothers' pension rights also came before any rights of a father. This further reduced the field of potential *fathers'* dependency claims to 21: 30 less 9. Finally, it is probable that the fathers of at least a few of the 21 remaining casualties had died before their soldier sons; this is known to have occurred, for example, in at least 2 of the 13 families who filed for a pension (15%), and may have been the case with respect to a third. Reducing the figure of 21 by 15% to account for this probability results in a remaining field of potential fathers' claims of only 18. Thus, the 7 fathers who actually did apply for a pension account for about 39% of all of the company's fathers who were realistically eligible to file – nearly 2 out of every 5.

Developing the same factors with respect to *mothers'* claims produces a similar result. As noted above, about 30 of the company's casualties could conceivably have generated a pension filing by a mother. But again, at least a few mothers had failed to outlive their soldier sons. It is known, for example, that this occurred in 3 of the 4 instances where fathers submitted the initial dependency claim, and that in the fourth instance the mother died within 4 or 5 years of the son's death. These early-dying mothers thus comprise from 23% to 31% of the 13 families affected, and suggests that the figure of 30 potential mothers' claims should be reduced to at least 23: 30 reduced by 23%. The 9 mothers who actually did file claims would then constitute about 39% of the entire field of potential mothers' claims, the same percentage as for fathers - 2 out of every 5.

Looked at in this fashion, there emerges from the mute statistics a steady wail of parent anguish over the war's longer-term consequences. These mothers and fathers of lost

sons were brought low by may blows, but probably for most the hardest one of all was what the war took from them.

CHAPTER 14

SIBLINGS & ORPHAN

…[A] few days before he went to the Army [my brother] gave me a golden heart to wear by a chain around [my] neck…. [He] did all he could - he often said he would be glad to do more…for [me].

Margaret Slater, sister of Private John Slater

Mother is the battle over? Mother is the battle over?
Thousands, thousands have been killed, they say;
Is my Father coming? Tell me, Have our soldiers gained the day?
* * *
Mother dear you're always sighing since you last the paper read…..
Tell me why you now are crying, why that cap is on your head? Why that cap is on your head?
Ah! I see you cannot tell me, Father's one among the slain;
Altho' he lov'd us very dearly, he will never come again! He will never come again.

Civil War song, by Benedict Roefs

The great majority of Civil War pension claims, as previous chapters suggest, were made by veterans or their dependent widows or parents. There were, however, occasional claims made on behalf of orphaned minor children of deceased soldiers - the age of majority for this purpose being 16 – as well as claims made by siblings who could show financial dependency. If a minor child's mother was still living, her claim as a widow was preferred over all others, and only one pension award at a time was allowed. But a widowed mother was permitted to add children under 16 to her own claim, and to receive a separate allotment for them of $2 per month per child.

The number of potential siblings' claim was greatly reduced by the fact that siblings had lowest priority among claimants: not only would a sibling have to demonstrate financial dependency on a deceased soldier-brother - a relatively infrequent scenario - he or she would also have to show that no widow, child, or parent of the soldier had a prior claim. Among all

the volunteers of Company A whose death generated any category of dependency pension, only one orphan and one sibling claim were discovered. A few cases were also discovered involving siblings who claimed benefits other than federal pensions, such as unpaid state or local bounties due to a deceased soldier; these are also mentioned in this chapter.

An Orphan's Claim

In considering the costs of war, it is strange that greater attention is not focused on the plight of the young who lose fathers – and increasingly in modern American warfare, mothers - to fighting, disease, and accidental mishap. Most of these children do not of course become true orphans, deprived in their childhood years of both parents. But the effects of losing even one parent in this context are seldom analyzed, or the pertinent numbers even mentioned. This contrasts sharply with the frequent and appropriate concerns voiced so often over the impact of soldier loss on wives and parents. It is an anomaly.

In Company A, of the 36 women whose husbands entered service in 1862, just over a third, 13, were widowed by the war. Most of the 13 were also *fathers*, and their deaths left behind a total of at least 32 children to be raised and cared for without them. Most of the 32 were young, and some were too young to retain any memory of the person taken away from them forever. Though there is no way conveniently to test the accuracy of such an estimate, it is possible from Company A's sample to speculate roughly on the total number of Northern children left fatherless by the war. Company A lost 42 men, who among them accounted for about 32 children left behind. The 42 casualties equated to about 32 fatherless children, a ratio of 5:4. The company's marriage, age, and child-producing statistics are quite representative of the Union Army as a whole (see Chapter 1), and the total estimated number of Union war dead, according to McPherson and others, was about 360,000. Applying the grim ratio of dead-fathers-to-fatherless-children, 5:4, to the entire number of war dead results in a staggering estimate of 288,000 fatherless Northern children left in the wake of the Civil War. Truly an uncounted cost - one barely ever mentioned.

Charles Housel. In a few cases, of course, the minor child of a deceased soldier or veteran was also deprived of his mother. Such was the case with Charles Housel. In the end, neither the Pension Office nor the fates in general did very well by the family of Private Moses G. Housel. Housel was born in July, 1836, and raised in Glen Gardner, not far from the northern border of Hunterdon County. Not a great deal is known about his pre-war life, except that he was employed in farming and the skilled trade of harness-making, and was married by the time he enlisted, at age 26. He enjoyed a reputation as a robust man and a hard worker. He and his wife, Margaret, seem not to have produced any children before the war.

Housel persevered through nearly two years of fighting and winter encampments without much trouble, as far as the record discloses. But during the confused and desperate fighting of the 1864 Wilderness Campaign, at the Battle of Laurel Hill on May 8, he was seen by comrades to go down, and was later reported missing in action. In the event, he was felled that day by a nasty gunshot wound to the upper left thigh, and then, his position overrun, captured by Confederate forces. He was soon transferred to the notorious Andersonville Prison, in Georgia. He remained there for about half a year when, mercifully, he was paroled and released to Union custody at Savannah.

Housel was in poor condition as a result of his wound and several months' captivity, and was immediately shipped north. Given the still-festering wound-site and the prison camp conditions he had endured, it is a small miracle he survived at all. On December 4, 1864, he was admitted to the army's general hospital at Annapolis, Maryland, to recuperate, and was there diagnosed with an unhealed wound and "debilitas." The term means literally "weakness" or "disability," and in a war context was one of the mid-nineteenth century's terms for what today might be called combat "fatigue," "exhaustion," or "neurosis."

He was soon given a convalescent furlough, and permitted to return home from mid-January to mid-February, 1865. Back in New Jersey, his local doctor began treating Housel for an emerging case of typhoid fever, undoubtedly contracted while a POW or a patient at

the army hospital, and wrote Housel's commander requesting the furlough be extended. Housel was nonetheless required to return to Annapolis. His condition failing to improve and the war in any case coming rapidly to a close, he was discharged from service directly from the hospital on May 4, a month ahead of the company.

After spending nearly a decade after the war trying unsuccessfully to regain his health and find a way to support himself and his wife, Housel finally filed for a pension in June of 1874. A return to the rigorous physical requirements of farming or harness-making had proven impossible, and such light work as he could obtain - such as peddling and selling "gas" - never generated adequate income.

Coming perhaps as a surprise, Margaret, just about the time of the nation's first centennial celebration in July, 1876, became pregnant with the couple's first and only known child. Margaret's age is unknown, but if close to her husband's, she would at this point have been in her late 30s or early 40s. On February 25 of the following year, Charles A. Housel was born. While the infant was undoubtedly a blessing, the father's health and job prospects continued to deteriorate, making his ability to support wife and child even more difficult. Moreover, no action had been taken on his 3-year old pension application.

Then, after initially rejecting the claim the year after Charles was born, the Pension Office finally approved it, in 1880. It was an ungenerous award: $4 per month for a bad wound, including scarring, pain, weakness, and other attendant complications from the Minié ball that was still lodged in his thigh - despite excruciatingly painful periodic probing by surgeons in efforts to find and remove it. Three years after obtaining the award, Moses Housel succumbed, on September 21, 1883, to causes that are not recorded. He was only 47 years old, the first and youngest veteran volunteer of Company A to die. (See Chapter 5.) Son Charles was only six years old at the time - too young to retain much of a memory of his stalwart father, now robbed of any future chance to hear his many tales of wartime exploit and sacrifice.

Exactly what happened next is somewhat conjectural. It is clear that Moses's widow, Margaret, never filed for a widow's pension - a fairly routine procedure and one she would have been expected to pursue quickly had she remained unmarried. Remarriage would have disqualified her. Probably still in her 40s, she was not yet old. Though not a particularly sentimental notion, it may have come as some relief to her to be able to enter again into conjugal relations with a healthy and vigorous man - the kind of man Moses had once been, but had not been now for a very long time. It is also known that when Margaret died, her death was recorded using a new last name: Hockenbury. Though it is not clear from the record whether Hockenbury was her birth name, or the name of a second husband, the latter is much more likely given the conventions of the era. Taking the evidence together, it seems almost certain that Margaret did remarry before she died. Whatever may have been the case, her death came only about two and one-half years after Moses's, on April 4, 1886. Charles, having only recently celebrated his ninth birthday, was now an orphan. If his mother *had* married a Hockenbury, there is no evidence in the record that he made any effort to assume responsibility for the child, his stepson, and nineteenth-century legal doctrine did not impose upon him any such obligation.

Someone, possibly a member of either parents' extended family, must have taken Charles into his or her home at this point, but for the next seven years nothing official occurred on the pension front. In April of 1893, however, a Dover, New Jersey, resident named John A. Lyon, as Charles's court-appointed guardian, applied for a dependent pension on his behalf. Lyons's relationship to Charles is not known. Charles was now 16 years old, and no longer a minor for pension purposes; it is probable that his guardian was seeking an award of "arrears" dating from Margaret's death in 1886. Lyon retained the well-known Washington pension law firm of Tanner to represent Charles's interests.

In July, the Pension Office replied to Tanner with a request for additional information. There was no response from either Tanner's office or his clients, and the file was eventually marked "abandoned." Had Charles been awarded arrears at the statutory

rate for dependents of $8 per month until age 16, the sum would have come to about $680, an amount that was certainly worth pursuing (about $14,000 today). One can only hope that Charles succeeded in having a happier and longer life than did either of his parents.

A Sibling's Pension Claim

Before describing these claims, it is worth noting in passing another kind of cost associated with the war's staggering loss of young men. It was a cost that fell most heavily on the men's sisters, and on the women of their sisters' generation generally, and was one that is at least suggested by the tale of Margaret Slater, narrated below. This cost was the gradual proliferation of lost marriage and family-creating opportunities resulting directly from so large a loss of marriageable men. In his fine biography of William James, psychologist Howard Feinstein discusses the bleak, latter-nineteenth-century marital outlook for William's sister, Alice. Besides William and his equally famous brother, Henry James, the James family included 2 other brothers, Garth ("Wilky") and Robertson (Bob) James, both of whom served from Massachusetts in the Civil War. Both suffered from typical wartime afflictions: Wilky was shot in the foot and Bob fell victim to a case of heat prostration so serious he was almost discharged for it. But according to Feinstein:

> …[I]t was Alice who was damaged most by the war. When peace returned, Wilky's foot had healed and Bob had recovered…. But 600,000 other young men were dead. They would not come back from the battlefields to court and wed the young women of Alice's generation. Raised for marriage as a vocation, she was condemned to spinsterhood and invalidism…for the remainder of her life. * * * …[B]y 1880, when Alice turned thirty-two…the imbalance [between the male and female population of her state] had increased…to 66,000.

This may have meant that as many as one out of every 4 or 5 marriage-age women seeking a husband in that place and time would have been unable, statistically, to find one. While such a cost is hard to grasp in palpable human terms, and while it would have been distributed over the eligible female population in such a vague way as to shield it from accountability, it must surely have taken a cruel toll nonetheless. It arguably turned Alice

James “from an effervescent, hopeful young women into an acerbic, wan invalid,” her only options to “care for sick or aging parents or [to] become sick herself.”

Though the harsh demographics would have affected unmarried rural Hunterdon women in the same fashion, their options were probably far less “bourgeois.” They often did care for sick or aging parents – but the majority of those parents continued to labor as much as they possibly could despite infirmities of health or years - and the young women themselves could simply not afford the indulgence of getting “sick,” lying in a “bed [that][became a fortress [where] legions of physicians were invited to scale its heights, only to retreat before [their] ironic disdain.” [438]

Margaret Slater. Joseph Slater and Sarah Ann Apgar, the parents of Company A volunteer, John Slater, were married by Reverend R. Collier on August 18, 1842. They probably grew up, and in any case settled after their marriage, in the northeastern corner of Hunterdon County, in or near the hamlet of Cokesbury, part of Tewksbury Township. The date of John's birth is not known, but he was probably born in or soon after the year of the marriage; at enlistment, he gave "Cokebury" as his place of residence. He was his parents’ only son.

When John was about 8 or 9 years old, his sister and only sibling was born on May 25, 1852; her parents named her Margaret Jane. As often occurred in that era, Sarah Ann's delivery was difficult and very probably unattended by a doctor, and she expired the following day. Never a family of means, the tragedy added an even weightier burden of care and support to Joseph's already heavy burden of grief. Joseph left "no property of any kind" to his two children when he died. The combination of factors may well have hastened his own death; he lasted only another 8 or so years, dying from unknown causes in 1860 or 1861, probably in his late 40s.

As soon as her mother died, Margaret was taken into the farm household of her maternal grandfather, John W. Apgar, who was later formally appointed her guardian. (There were numerous Apgars in Tewksbury, including one who joined the company; see

Chapter 12.) About the same time, her young brother began to "work out & board" with the grandfather, helping him farm. Both factors are further evidence that Margaret and John Slater's own father, Joseph, was simply unable to cope with raising and supporting his 2 children at this point. Joseph's fate underscores the often critical economic and domestic importance in this era of maintaining two-parent households, especially in rural settings and especially when young children were involved.

There is every indication that John and Margaret formed an unusually close - and probably, in an emotional sense, mutually dependent - sibling relationship. Their grandfather portrayed their farm lives as a somewhat isolated rural existence. "[My] family was composed of [my]self, wife &…John Slater…& Margaret & no others…. [We] lived in the County quite remote from any neighbors."

Brother and sister had already lost much in life, but they still had each other. According to Margaret's later affidavit, 1873:

> [I] never had any means of support except what [I] received from [my] Brother and…grandfather. …[My] Brother contributed of his wages from the time he was old enough…to [my] support. …[He] furnished me with clothing or part of it - a dress at one time - Muslin for [my] union clothing [underwear] - and occasionally gave [me] some small sums of money. * * * …[He] did farm work by day or by month, and as wages increased after war broke out he did more for [me]….

In the second year of the war, John decided to volunteer. He was yet young, probably 18 to 20, and among other possible motivating factors – grief and melancholy over the loss by that time of *both* parents – he must have calculated that his pay and bounties would enhance his own and his sister's material wellbeing. Margaret stated:

> After he went in the Army he sent money to my Grandfather for me, at least Three times over before he left the Camp[,] he sent Twelve Dollars to my grandfather for me - was part of his first pay of $25. This was sent from the camp in Flemington, N.J. He afterward sent $20…$10 [of which my grandfather] paid to me; also he sent at another time Four Dollars for me. * * *
>
> The money after he left N.J. was sent thro' Col. Jonathan Cook, the state agent…my Brother would write telling that he had sent it in that way…. [I] am satisfied from what [my] Brother did for [me] & what he told [me] that it was his intention to assist [me] in procuring clothing & other necessities.

John served with the company throughout its first full campaign season in the summer of 1863, and its first two winter encampments in 1862-63 and 1863-64. By all accounts, during that entire time he was never wounded, fell ill, or accidentally injured himself. He continued corresponding with his family back home, and sending money to his grandfather and sister.

On an otherwise uneventful day at the end of March, 1864, while the regiment was still encamped near Brandy Station in Virginia, John's luck ran out. In an era when notice to family of the war's casualties was a haphazard, non-official affair, it was left to 2 close Company A comrades to write the folks back home about what had happened to John. Benjamin Wean, one of Slater's tentmates, did so on March 31, writing to John's grandfather, John Apgar. The missing punctuation, grammatical liberties, and tortured but generally phonetic spelling of the letters that follow are intentionally retained, with corrections made only when necessary to insure understanding. This is done for the sole purpose of doing justice to the letters' semi-literate authors: to convey their own matter-of-fact but caring way of expressing what they had to say and even of attempting to soften the blow, as well as to impart a sense of the men's dialect and pronunciation. Wean wrote:

> Mr John Apgare
>
> Sir[,] deare frend[,] I take the aper tunedy this mor[n]ing off informen you that John Slater is ded[.] he dide on the 30 [of March] and his death was a very sudent [sudden] one[.] he complaned off his legs a herten in the mor[n]ing wen he got up but he eate his brekfeast and about 10 O Clock he lade do[w]n and told Charley Scherer to not wake him up if he got a sleep unles thar was drill and thar was no drill so Charls did not wake him[,] and I was not in the tent My Self untill about 4 O Clock wen I spoak to him but he did not anser me[,] and I then tuck [took] the Civers [covers] off his face and I fond him ded[.]
>
> he will get bered [buried] to daye in the oners [honors] off war[.] the Captan tuck charg of his things and will send them to you I expect
>
> the docters was cal[l]ed to examen him but did not find the cas [cause] off his deth as I heard
>
> I will clos for the present[,] from yore frend
>
> Benj F Weane

Another soldier, Silas Hockenbury, wrote home the next day, April 1. Hockenbury's letter is to someone he calls "fredick" (Frederick?), possibly Hockenbury's brother, or a relative of John Apgar (see below). Hockenbury himself was killed 6 weeks after writing the

letter, at Spotsylvania Courthouse, and little is known about him despite his wife's filing of a widow's claim in August of the same year. He wrote:

> Sir[,] I will Attempt to write A few lianes to informe that I air [are] well at present and I hope that this will find you in good helth and all the rest[.] Sir I will send u had news and that is John Slater is dead[.] he was dead in his tent[.] he died the 30th of march[.] no one nose what was the matter with him[,] he was not well for Sum time but the day he died he was out A round beetwean 8 and 10 o clock and A peared to bee well then[.] I belive I cant tell eney more bout him now[.]
>
> Well fredick [Frederick] we have fine wether hear and I Suppose it is so in jersey[,] I hope so at least[.] when u write pleas tell me how things is in jersey[.] u must keep things Strat [straight] A round there and i will down here[.]
>
> Well I ges I will Close by wishing u to write Soon[.] no more At present[.]
>
> S.N. Hockenbury
>
> good biy

In his regimental history, Chaplain Haines recalled the mysterious death of Slater (see Chapter 3), and briefly described the service he conducted over the body: "We had funeral services in the chapel, and as we gathered around his coffin, I spoke from the words 'Boast not thyself of tomorrow.' This is the fifth who has died in the regiment in this camp [Brandy Station]."[439]

When Slater's sister later submitted a claim for a dependent pension, the Pension Office sent for and obtained what little official information existed as to cause of death. The Adjutant General's records advised simply "cause not stated," while the Surgeon General reported that Slater had died "of Apoplexy" (stroke). A cerebral hemorrhage or possibly a heart attack are as likely to be the cause as any, and either is consistent with Slater's reported fatigue, leg pain, and "not [feeling] well for Sum time".

A couple of months after John died, David van Fleet, a Flemington attorney then serving as the Hunterdon County Surrogate[440], appointed the soldier's grandfather to be legal guardian of his sister, Margaret, who was now 12 years old. In a practical matter, John had been acting informally in this capacity since Margaret was born in 1852. He would surely have continued until she reached majority, without formal appointment, had it not been for the prospect of a sibling pension and the government's need to impose some sort of judicial supervision over use of the funds.

In November, 1865, about half a year following the end of the war, John Apgar got around to filing a pension application on Margaret's behalf, alleging previous financial dependency on her deceased brother. The application appears to have languished for several years with the Pension Office, until a Trenton attorney, Whitfield S. Johnson, assumed responsibility for the matter in 1869 and began submitting additional documentation in support of it. Margaret was now about 17 years old and legally an adult.

Johnson arranged for the filing of several corroborating affidavits, including Margaret's in 1873, and those of fellow Company A volunteers, Nahum Cregar and Benjamin S. Wolverton, and that of a family member named Frederick H. Apgar, all in 1874. Frederick Apgar may have been the "fredick" to whom Silas Hockenbury's letter about Slater's death was addressed; he was likely the son of grandfather Apgar, which would have made him the dead soldier's uncle. The 3 latter witnesses stated essentially that Slater had been "a sober man not indulging in intoxicating liquors [and] was of good moral habits up to the time of his death." Yet *still* Margaret's submissions failed to prompt action by the government.

Finally, in September of 1875 - Margaret was now 23 years old! - the Pension Office conducted a complete review of her file. The reviewing officer recommended that her claim be "admitted" (approved), and on October 1, 1875, she was awarded the amount of $8 per month, calculated from the date of her brother's death. Although the details were not set forth in her file, it is assumed that this retroactive award ran only to the date of her 16th birthday: May 25, 1868. Nevertheless, this would have afforded Margaret a lump-sum payment of about $400, or approximately $8,000 in today's currency - certainly a benefit worth pursuing and a propitious way for the young 23-year-old to begin marriage and a family of her own. That is, if she managed to avoid becoming one of the ones, out of every group of 4 or 5 women her age, whose future husband already lay buried on the killing field of war. Regrettably, the pension records reveal nothing about the remainder of her life.

Other (Non-Pension) Siblings' Claims

Siblings of 2 other Company A soldiers killed in the war later submitted formal claims for benefits accruing as a result of their deceased brothers' military service. Both involve post-war efforts by surviving brothers and sisters to obtain their share of the soldiers' accrued but unpaid bounties and/or final pay.[441]

The Starker Siblings. Andrew Starker was a young unmarried man from Lebanon Township, about 21 years old, when he joined the company in the rank of Private. He contracted typhoid fever sometime during his first year or so of service, was hospitalized, and died on November 28, 1863, at Douglass (Army) General Hospital, in Washington, DC. Almost nothing is known about his service beyond these bare facts.

In September of 1865, the war over, Starker's six surviving siblings - 2 brothers and 4 sisters ranging in age from 18 to 30 - retained Flemington Attorney, David Van Fleet, to petition the state "for the purpose of obtaining the amount of State pay due…[the] deceased from the State of New Jersey, pursuant to the 'Act for the relief of such portion of the Militia of this State as may be called into service, approved May 11th, 1861.'"

They averred that their brother "at the time of his death…was about twenty-two years of age," that he had never been married or had children, and that they were his only heirs, i.e., that their parents were by this time both dead as well. The state records indicate that the total owed Private Starker came to only $31.26. This amount would have been barely sufficient to pay Van Fleet's fees, unless he waived or reduced them as a family favor. Unlike fees for attorneys representing federal pension claimants, fees for state matters were not regulated. Even without deducting fees, the sum would have generated only $5.21 apiece when divided six ways! Still, at about $100 each in today's currency, the siblings must have thought it worth the trouble and the dredging up of sad recollections.

The Vorhees Siblings. The other known instance of a sibling claim for accrued pay related to Company A Sergeant Lucian (or Lucien) A. Vorhees. It is not known how much the claim was worth - probably in the same range as the Starker claim - but its

documentation it in New Jersey's state archives nonetheless strongly suggests an early instance of maddening "government red tape," and of claimants being stalled and frustrated by interminable bureaucratic maneuvering.

Vorhees, whose age is unknown, enlisted as a single man from Readington Township. He must have been well-regarded by his fellows, as he was immediately made one of the new company's 4 Sergeants. Surviving the regiment's first full campaign season in 1863, he was, like so many others, killed during the Wilderness Campaign, on May 8, 1864.

Within about a year of the end of the war, Lucian's half-sister, Louisa V. L. Hoffman, wrote the New Jersey Adjutant General requesting payment of her half-brother's "Bounty and Back Pay." As with Starker, Vorhees's parents were apparently both deceased. The state "suspended" her request, and asked for "the affidavit of two disinterested persons, stating the names of all brothers and sisters, either of the whole or half blood, and that those named therein are all the brothers and sisters the soldier ever had." Louisa seems to have delayed a very long time before attempting to respond to the government's request; there is not indication in the file of any further action or communication for another twenty years! Apparently in 1884 or the beginning of 1885, she did finally try to supply the required affidavit. In January, 1885, her proofs were nevertheless found "defective" and her claim was "suspended" for a second time. After 4 more years passed by without anything happening, the state Adjutant General's office sent a letter, dated April 25, 1889, reiterating the history of the claim but without specifying just what it was that had been judged defective. In fairness, perhaps it had done so previously; the state file is incomplete, and the precise chronology and content of the documents the parties exchanged is not entirely clear.

Louisa tried again two years later, in 1991. She obtained and sent to the AG an affidavit from William and Mary Hoff, whose relationship to the family is unknown but who this time correctly specified the status of Lucian Vorhees's surviving siblings and other pertinent details. It had been twenty-five years since Louisa had initiated the claim. The government's reply came in February of the following year. It was typewritten, the long

passage of time having allowed for such written communication to evolve from manuscript to mechanical format. In it, J.N. Patterson, an Auditor working for the state, stated:

> …[Y]ou are informed that the latest affidavit purporting to be made by Wm. And Mary A. Hoff, while satisfactory in statement as to family history, was *improperly prepared, having been attached to office form 66 and not signed upon the paper upon which it was written*. A new affidavit should be made out properly signed and executed. [Italics added.]

There is nothing further in the file. Whether the redoubtable Mrs. Hoffman had the gumption to offer yet another affidavit in support of her aging claim - much less receive any actual benefit - is lost to history.

CHAPTER 15

DOMESTIC DISCORD

He was one dear during those [28] years of separation as I positively knew nothing of him or his doings.

Sarah Justice Bunn, widow of Sergeant George Justice, describing her second husband, James Bunn

[M]y second husband often left me without a cent of money; he abused me and deprived me of clothing, and I have been obliged to go for the pension to keep me in my distressed condition. He has not used me right at all….

Matilda Dayton Van Dyke, widow of Private James W. Dayton, describing her second husband, Henry Van Dyke

A punch or an uppercut [to discipline my 'nagging' wife] is against the law, but a good backhand stroke is perfectly legal.

William A. Dilts, Hunterdon County Civil War Veteran (regiment unknown), age 88; ca. 1936[442]

Much modern scholarship has dealt with the changing marital, familial, occupational, and property-ownership roles and rights of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American women. Such scholarship has contributed dramatically to a better understanding of women's - and men's - domestic and interior lives, and to more specific understanding of certain aspects of marital dysfunction and the legal context in which that dysfunction occurred and was sometimes addressed during this period. Groundbreaking work has been accomplished, for example, by Elaine Tyler May, on the era's marriage and divorce practices; Norma Basch, on female property rights; and Nancy Cott, on the state's increasing interest and involvement in marital arrangements.[443]

A great deal of this work, however, has been limited by two interrelated issues: the availability or nonavailability[444] of court records - the main primary source for historians' efforts in these areas - and the comparative economic wealth and social standing of the people who *generated* such records - and therefore of the women whose stories tend to be

recorded, recovered, and later described. Conversely, relatively little is known about the marital and property arrangements among the poor and property-less, or among the laboring and farming classes.

As is the case today, formal divorce in this period required the hiring and paying of lawyers, and often exposed the most intimate details of one's family life - and often one's sexual behavior or, more usually, a spouse's alleged sexual *misbehavior* - to intense community scrutiny.[445] These factors could only have operated as powerful disincentives, or insurmountable obstacles, to many potential litigants whose financial circumstances simply did not warrant or make possible resort to lawyers and formal proceedings, or whose relatively strong links to rural or village communities must have discouraged them from washing dirty laundry in public by way of embarrassing or scandalous litigation in open court.[446]

Similarly, as Basch points out, the various "married women's property acts" that were enacted by most states' exclusively male legislatures during the middle decades of the nineteenth century were generated almost entirely by the concerns and lobbying efforts of wealthy or "bourgeois" women, and not by those of the laboring classes or the poor. The acts protected the incomes and estates of the better-off to a much greater degree than those of the women at the low end of the socio-economic ladder. The latter women often earned little or no income and owned no estate, and in any case had no practical way judicially to enforce whatever new "rights" to their meager wages or separate property they may have managed to secure.[447] As Anatole France once put it sardonically: "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep beneath bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."[448]

Thus, examination of the lives of Company A mothers, wives, and widows - lives spent mainly in rural or village surroundings as members of laboring or farming families (see, for example, Chapters 6, 11. and 12) - sheds light on the marital worlds of those whose domestic and material circumstances rarely if ever propelled them into the courtroom. As

much as any other category of nineteenth-century women, and perhaps more, these women had to grapple with the daily challenges of making ends meet, caring for their children and other family members, and sometimes protecting themselves from abusive or unproductive spouses. Like the returning veterans to whom many of them were married, they left behind no post-war diaries or letters that survive, and had usually to discover means other than lawyers and document-generating lawsuits to improve their life chances. But the pictures of several of them that emerge from *pension* records and a few other sources occasionally provide remarkably detailed and poignant domestic information, and may in the end constitute examples of the only reliable stories we have of such women's married lives.

This chapter, then, is an effort – so far as is known, the first of its kind – to utilize such sources to paint as detailed a picture as possible of how and why things went wrong in some of these latter-nineteenth-century marriages. In many cases, it has been possible to narrate the story using some of the participants' own words and impressions, or those of their neighbors, family members, or public officials who had personal contact with them. As with the rest of this work, the attempt has been to put a human face on small historical events and interactions, and to avoid reducing the past to numbers, formal texts, and the final – and most abrasive – reduction: temporarily prevailing contemporary agendas as to what *ought* to be, then or now. The chapter is nominally organized by category of "discord."

Rupture of the Marital Relationship; Issues of Separation, Desertion, and Divorce

As expected, there is evidence in the cases of several Company A wives and mothers of significant marital discord, or worse. The evidence does *not* consist of formal divorce proceedings, however. *Not a single formal divorce* appears to have occurred among the 13 sets of parents for whom some detailed domestic information has been found, the company's 52 war survivors known to have been married at some point in their lives, or the men's several remarried widows. This is a total field of approximately 50 married women, at least 6 of whom were married twice, and one three times. As mentioned, formal divorce was

something of a luxury during much of the nineteenth century, and the legal proofs and attorney's fees required to obtain one evidently discouraged the attempt. In New Jersey, for example, where most of the mothers, wives, and remarried widows lived out their post-war years, only 2 grounds existed at the time for obtaining a divorce, adultery and desertion, and it was not until 1923 that a third ground, cruelty, was added.[449]

Much more common than divorce was *informal termination* of the marriage: one of the marital partners, almost always the husband, simply moved out of the marital home and, in many cases, disappeared into the relatively anonymous, public-record-less, and sparsely populated nation. If continued, the community would after a while view the break-up as a more-or-less permanent separation or, more commonly, as a husband's desertion or abandonment of his wife and children. If the move was essentially agreed to by both partners, and especially if a support obligation to wife or child continued to be performed or recognized by the husband, then the marital break-up might be considered a "voluntary" separation, though this sort of arrangement appears to have been rare. In the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century, spousal obligations of material or financial support flowed almost exclusively, in both a legal and practical sense, from husband to wife; modern concepts of gender neutrality or equality in matrimonial matters - of alimony being a remedy available to husbands as well as wives - were unknown. This strong jurisprudential bias followed naturally from men's and women's different prevailing roles in home and workplace and, particularly among middle- and upper-class families whose practices set the template for matrimonial law, the general restriction of women to the "domestic sphere."

If, on the other hand, the break-up was "involuntary" - that is, undertaken by one partner *against the wishes of the other*, whether to avoid having to provide financial support (men), or to provide sexual "service" on demand or escape physical abuse (women), or for any other disinclination to remain in the relationship - then both law and prevailing culture might deem the matter an act of culpable desertion or abandonment, the guilty partner being the one whose actions were deemed intolerable under the circumstances.

Company A records suggest at least 7 cases of separation or desertion, involving one of the company's original volunteers, the second wife or remarried widow of a volunteer, or a volunteer's mother or father. While only inconclusive evidence survives for 3 of these, the 4 other instances are clear. In the first category are the cases of Andrew Clawson, Theodore Stryker, and the second wife of George W. Bartow. Obvious instances of separation or desertion are presented by the cases of Samuel Case, Andrew F. Henry, the remarried widow of George C. Justice, and the mother of Jacob Apgar.

Instances of Possible Desertion or "Trial" Separation

Andrew and Katherine Clawson. The Clawsons' case provides an apparent example of a husband's *attempted* desertion of his wife and child, followed by a reconciliation of sorts. (What is known of the domestic life adventures of Andrew Clawson and his wife, Katherine [or Catherine] Seals, is narrated in Chapter 1). Andrew and Katherine, whose first child was born about 5 weeks before the ceremony, were married in Pennsylvania by a Justice of the Peace on August 10, 1861. The following summer, Clawson enlisted in Company A as a "Single" man, at an enlistment location that was some distance from his home and in another county, rendering the possibility that his wife would learn of it much less likely if he chose not to tell her. As mentioned earlier, however, Clawson's planned desertion - if it was what it appears to be - was either discovered or confessed, and whatever marital doubts Clawson may have temporarily entertained seem to have been resolved and a more or less stable - or at least long term - marriage relationship ensued. Andrew and Katherine conceived two more children, and remained together until her death many years later.

Theodore and Helen Stryker. A similarly suspect but not entirely certain case of desertion or temporary separation by a Company A husband is presented by the intriguing record of Theodore Stryker. In his case, however, the pattern appears to have been that of periodic episodes of desertion over the course of an entire marriage, interspersed with intervals of conjugal living.

Stryker was an unusual man, one of Company A's older and more experienced volunteers when he enlisted at age 27 in 1862. Born in Lambertville about 1834, he moved to Ohio sometime before the age of about 21. In late 1855, he enlisted in Cincinnati for a 5-year term with the regular (federal) army, and was assigned to Company K, 9th United States Infantry Regiment. He served only about half a year, but during that short time apparently made his way with the army as far west as the still relatively unsettled west coast region of Oregon. Due to a service-connected hernia, he was medically discharged in 1856, and given a $4-per-month pension. Stryker's skill in obtaining federal benefits thus began early.

From 1856 onward, the hernia would be variously and confusingly described as being inguinal or scrotal (though these terms were sometimes used interchangeably at the time); *left side or right side*; and caused from "passing from troop transport to another vessel" near Fort Vancouver, Washington Territory,[450] or "from lifting cannon" at Cascade, Washington Territory, or while engaged "in the field at Aquia Creek Va." While such iterations were not unknown in Civil War record-keeping, they did not in this case do much to enhance Stryker's reputation for accuracy or truthfulness, as will appear. Interestingly, the record reveals a similar characteristic on the part of his wife that emerged following his death; see below.

Having apparently got a taste for nautical life during his first military experience, he then went to work as a sailor, probably aboard a vessel plying the coastal waterways of Long Island Sound between New York and Connecticut, and possibly working out of the small Eastern Long Island port of Sag Harbor. It was here that he met his future wife, Helen M. Elliot.

Helen had grown up in New London, Connecticut, another port town directly north and across the sound from Sag Harbor, a distance by water of only about 25 miles. Her family had moved to Sag Harbor before the Civil War. According to Helen, she and Theodore had met "six or eight years" before they were married, which would have been shortly after Stryker's 1856 discharge from the Army, when he was about 22 and she about 18.

In April of 1861, as the war broke out, Stryker signed on for a 3-month hitch with a newly forming New Jersey outfit, Company E, 3rd New Jersey Volunteer Infantry Regiment. The scant - or non-existent - pre-service physical examination common during this early wartime period failed to turn up any evidence of the prior hernia for which Stryker had been discharged and pensioned only five years previously, and evidently Stryker himself did not mention it. A wary pension office nonetheless discovered Stryker's new enlistment, and immediately suspended payment of the pension. Undoubtedly because of his age, about 27, and prior military experience, Stryker was promptly promoted to the rank of Quartermaster Sergeant, an important regimental staff position. But in less than 3 weeks, he was "reduced" back to Private *at his own request*. He would remain in that rank, despite his age and prior experience, throughout his 3-month enlistment with Company E and all of his subsequent tour of duty with Company A. These facts suggest that he was not man inclined to shoulder more than minimum responsibility, another aspect of character that may have affected the quality of his marital and paternal relationships. The 3rd New Jersey saw virtually no action in that first summer of the war but was consigned mainly to construction and guard duty around the national capital. Stryker was duly discharged toward the end of his 3-month hitch, on July 31, 1861.

Three months later, on October 29, he and Helen were finally married, the ceremony being performed at Sag Harbor's Methodist Episcopal Church, by the Rev. Charles Kelsey. They were, respectively, about 27 and 25 years old. Theodore's family apparently still resided at the time in Lambertville. By the standards of the time, this had been an unusually long courtship, voluntarily interrupted, on the groom's side at least, by a period of wartime service. It was also a later-than-average first marriage in terms of both parties' ages; the average age of all Company A volunteers at the time of their first marriage was 24, and that of their wives, 21 (see Chapter 5). Together these facts may reflect a certain lack of decisiveness or commitment on one or both parties' parts, and a foreshadowing of future difficulties. Although the record is frustratingly unclear on the precise chronology of events,

it is known that the couple's only child, their son, Francis, was born sometime during the 1860s. It is at least possible the child was conceived or even born out of wedlock, perhaps complicating an already tenuous relationship.

In any case, Stryker apparently soon plotted to escape the marriage, and possibly the responsibilities of fatherhood. He too, in the summer of 1862, enrolled in Company A, his *third* military enlistment in seven years. Like Clawson, he enrolled as a "Single" man, even though he had by now been married for about 9 months. He also directed that his *mother*, not his wife, receive the usual subsistence allotment from his pay.[451] He claimed Lambertville as his current residence, and was probably living with his parents. It is likely on the basis of this and other evidence that Helen was not residing with him in Lambertville and that she was unaware of the enlistment. Indeed, his own parents were probably not aware of his marriage at this point. Oddly, but in keeping with his unsteady regard for the truth, Stryker listed his pre-enrollment occupation not as soldier or sailor but as "civil engineer," a skilled work background for which there exists no evidence in the surviving record.

Perhaps not surprisingly, Stryker lasted only one campaign season with the company - summer of 1863 - and on March 31, 1864, was transferred to the Veterans Reserve Corps for what was undoubtedly his inability to withstand the rigors of service in a front-line infantry outfit. The reason he most likely claimed - possibly with a grain of truth - would have been his previously incurred inguinal hernia. Later the same year, on November 26, he was discharged altogether from the military because of the hernia, but at the time he made no mention of his pre-war history of rupture or his earlier federal pension. The medical officer who examined him on discharge was clearly skeptical of Stryker and probably doubted his veracity. He wrote on the discharge certificate:

> …Stryker…[is] incapable of performing the duties of a soldier because of left Inguinal Hernia, Contracted *he states* in the field at Aquia Creek Va in the month of March, 1863. - …[B]eing unfit for duty in the…Res. Corps, [he] elects to be discharged in accordance with Circular 65 from the War Department…. <u>Not a case for pension.</u> A.J.M Kelway, Asst Surgeon [Author's Italics; underlining in original.]

At some point prior to 1877, which was fourteen years after his third and final army discharge, Theodore and Helen appear to have resumed cohabitation, this time at the Trenton, New Jersey, address of 5 Monmouth Street. Their son, Francis, would have been a teenager at the time, and Theodore was most probably working as a railroad conductor. He decided that year to apply for "restoration" of his original $4 a month pension, which had been suspended in April, 1861, when he signed on for wartime service. He explained in his application that he re-enlisted in 1861 "supposing at the time he was sufficiently sound for the service but had to be discharged for the same disability after a little more than two years service" because his hernia "became aggravated by the severity of his [wartime] service." Eventually, in 1879, the application was approved, and he was even allowed arrears calculated retroactively to 1861, the government deducting only for the months the veteran was paid for active duty with the 3rd and 15th Regiments.

The retroactively accrued pension amount, paid in a lump sum, would have been a relatively large figure: nearly $800, or about $16,000 in current funds. This and perhaps other factors seem to have prompted Stryker to quit his job as a train conductor, and move to Stamford, Connecticut. For within five years, by 1883, he had applied for a doubling of his monthly pension award, giving Stamford as his residence and claiming that he had had to give up his "occupation of Conductor" for health reasons. His increase application did not allege any new health condition, only a worsening of his scrotal rupture the fact that the "trusses" he wore had become "insufficient." There is no indication whether he was living with Helen at this point. The application was granted.

About a decade later, in February, 1892 - Stryker was 58 years old - he applied once again for an increase in his pension moneys, this time asking the government both to award him an increase to $12 per month under the more generous terms of Congress' Act of June 17, 1890, *and* to restore his old $4 per month pre-war pension as well! The first application was granted 7 months later, but the second was understandably rejected. Stryker was

certainly not living with Helen at this point. He gave his residence in 1892 as the New Jersey Soldiers and Sailors Home in Kearny, whereas Helen by this time appears to have moved in with her sister, Matilda ("Tillie") at 55 Bayard Street, Trenton.

The precise reason for the veteran's move into a state home in this period cannot be determined from surviving records. There were certainly health reasons that could have explained the decision. By this time, the veteran not only continued to suffer from what must have been an increasingly painful and disabling hernia, but had also developed “sciatica" and some difficulty seeing. He had also managed, about 1889, to fracture both bones of his lower left arm, rendering him "not able to do any manual labor." But there were many such ill or injured veterans his age who remained living at home, and even working. Another equally plausible explanation for the move is that it represented the final chapter in a series of marital separations more or less intentionally undergone by Theodore and Helen over the 36-year duration of their marriage. For Theodore, it probably also had something to do with his evident attitude that the government owed him a great deal, as much as he could get.

Finally, about 1893, Theodore made what would be his last change of residence, this time moving out of the Soldiers and Sailors Home and back in with his wife, at her Trenton address. He died four years later, on August 22, 1897, at age 63. Helen later stated that during this four-year period, Theodore worked as a "Salesman for a pottery manufactory.” He had probably been able to do work such as this right along. She reiterated as well that "before a temporary absence [from Trenton]" he had worked as "a Conductor on the Pa RR." The "temporary absence" probably referred either to the veteran's relocation to Stamford in the early 1880s or to his sojourn in the Soldiers and Sailors Home in the early -90s, and is further evidence that these had indeed constituted intentional interruptions of the marital relationship.

Sadly, almost immediately after his death, Stryker’s next of kin began to exhibit certain defects of character that may well have reflected the example he himself had set for

most of his life. (The misadventures of Stryker's surviving son, Francis, and the corresponding travails of his widow, Helen, are described in Chapter 11.)

Matilda Bigelow, second wife of George Bartow. Finally there is the case of the *likely* but not certain separation of Matilda Bigelow (later Bartow), during her first marriage. The date of Matilda's first marriage, to Oscar Spencer Bigelow, is unknown, but it is likely that he was from Somerville, Massachusetts, and it is known that the couple had at least one child, a son. Matilda was born about 1847, and it is likely that she married Oscar during or soon after the war and that their son was born in the late 1860s or 1870s. Matilda was undoubtedly a long-time Hunterdon County resident, and had probably grown up there and first met Bartow when both of them were children. She stated late in life that she had known Bartow - who lived almost his entire life in the county, mainly in the Three Bridges area near Flemington - long before their marriage, "and remember him as long as I can remember anyone."

It is a mystery how Matilda met a Massachusetts man. There seems to have been some local connection between the families of the two. Thirty-five years after Oscar's death, a *cousin* of his named Martha Davis, living in New Jersey, supplied an affidavit in support of Matilda's widow's pension claim; Martha had remained familiar with Matilda's domestic and financial circumstances all those years and had evidently kept in close touch.

When Bigelow died in 1872, most likely in his 20s or 30s, he was residing in Winona, Minnesota, a newly-thriving Mississippi River town more than a thousand miles from Hunterdon.[452] Matilda would then have been only about 25 years old, and her son most likely an infant or young child. Oscar had died young, probably the result of an accident, or perhaps even foul play in this rough, new, riverside town. Whatever may have been her first husband's reasons for going to Minnesota, he had not stayed long enough for his family to elect to bury him there. His body was transported all the way back to Somerville, Massachusetts, for interment. There is no indication in the record that the couple ever resided together either in Massachusetts or in New Jersey. Nor is there any evidence that

Matilda and their young son had accompanied Bigelow to his distant western destination. And within a few years of Oscar's death, Matilda was *unquestionably* residing in New Jersey; either she and her child had returned from Minnesota or had, most likely, never gone.

George Bartow's first wife, Elizabeth Van Cleve Merrill, died in 1876, at an age and from causes that are not disclosed. George was only 33 at the time and she had probably been about the same age or a few years younger. The couple almost certainly failed to produce any living children; George's 1870 pension application did not mention any or seek the usual additional sum for children under 16. It is of course possible that Elizabeth died in childbirth, along with child.

Whatever happened to cut Elizabeth's life so short, George and Matilda, who had known each other as long as Matilda could remember, probably began courting after a year or so, and were married in 1879, three years following Elizabeth's death. George was then 36, and Matilda 32. The outcome this time would be happier for both. George, the self-taught medical doctor (see Chapter 7), lived until 1907, dying of a cerebral stroke only a month short of his 64th birthday; he left a modest but secure estate out of which his wife was able to take care of herself. Matilda, who unlike most Company A wives possessed a small separate estate of her own worth about $400, lived another five years, dying in 1912 at age 65. Her son still resided in the area at her death, and saw to it that she received a decent burial and that the expenses of her last illness were paid (though when she died, according to her son, she had "practically no debts").

Instances of Certain Separation or Desertion

Samuel Case. Samuel Case was a life-long resident of Hunterdon County; he was born a few miles from Flemington and grew up in Raritan Township. He was a farm boy before the war, lost his father at an early age, and enlisted when he was probably about 21.[453] The town's Post Master described him in 1887 as "quite illiterate." Case married comparatively late in life, in 1885 at about age 44. His wife was Frances A. ("Addie") Lake,

and they were married by Rev. Robert Hyde, in Flemington. They had no children. Although very few other details of Case's domestic life are known, an affidavit he filed with the Pension Office in 1915 - he was then about 73 - stated that he and Addie had "separated." By 1917, Case was living in the Soldiers and Sailors Home in Kearny, New Jersey, where he expired a decade later, on April 1, 1927.

Andrew Henry. Andrew F. Henry was born in 1840 in neighboring Mercer County and enlisted with Company A from Hopewell, stating his pre-war occupation as "farmer." Like Case, he was illiterate. At about age 21, during the first year of the war, he had enlisted for 3 months' service with I Company, 3rd New Jersey Militia Regiment. It was probably sometime following this first period of service that Henry married for the first time, to a woman named Harriet ("Hattie") Fish, who was about 2 years his junior; very little else is known about Hattie or the circumstances of the marriage. Henry enlisted with A Company, 15th New Jersey, in 1862, and served through the close of the war, incurring a serious gunshot wound to the left thigh in 1864.

On March 9, 1867, Henry married a second time, on this occasion to Mary Martha Van Horn, at a Methodist ceremony conducted by Rev. Joseph Garrison somewhere "near" Flemington. He was now about 27 years of age and had relocated from Mercer to the southern area of Hunterdon County, where he would remain for the rest of his life. Mary was about 19. Obviously, sometime before 1867 Andrew and Hattie had separated. It is probable that they never again took up with one another after Andrew came home from the war, and even that they had not actually seen each other from 1862 onward. Mary was aware of the first marriage, but Hattie was dead as far as she was concerned (and surely no longer resided in the region). According to an affidavit Mary made in 1908, "…[W]hen [she] married [Andrew Henry] he told her his first wife was dead, but soon after her marriage she found out that she was not dead…." Nor of course had Hattie and Andrew been formally divorced, which rendered his marriage to Mary invalid and, hypothetically at least, a criminal act of bigamy on his part.

Nonetheless, Mary stuck by Andrew. She bore him 3 children, born in 1871, 1874, and, after a 13-1/2 year hiatus, 1888! Mary was then 39 or 40 years old. Four years after their third child was born, Hattie, who had also gotten married again, in her case to a man named Bayron, actually *did* die, in Trenton at about age 50, of dysentery. To make things right, Andrew and Mary, on March 9, 1897 - the 30th anniversary of their original marriage ceremony - were "remarried" by the same pastor, Joseph Garrison, this time at the Warren Street Methodist Episcopal Church, in Trenton. He was 57 and she 49. Apparently with the good Rev. Garrison's gracious connivance, the marriage certificate recorded, untruthfully but perhaps understandably, that neither participant was "previously married."

Andrew Henry died of a stroke in 1900, at age 61. Mary went on to outlive him by 3-1/2 decades! In those final years of her life, however, she managed to outdo him on the spousal front. In 1903, she married Samuel Stockton, of Trenton. Stockton lasted only another six years, however, dying in 1909. In 1914, Mary married her third husband, William Servis, who lived another sixteen years, expiring in 1930. Probably realizing that her widowhood might now remain permanent – she was 82 - Mary at last applied for a widow's pension the same year that Servis died. After another year of attempts to document properly her many marriages and former husbands' deaths, her efforts were rewarded with a $40 a month pension. She was able to enjoy it for four more years, dying of heart disease in 1935, at age 87. She was still living in West Amwell Township in southern Hunterdon. Somehow, it is a story that greatly satisfies.

Sarah Justice Bunn. Finally, there is the sad case of Sarah Ann (Hinkley) Justice, the widow of George C. Justice, who was gunned down on May 12, 1864, at Spotsylvania Courthouse. Sarah had been born in New York City, and brought to Philadelphia by her parents as a young girl; George had been born and raised in Philadelphia. The evidence suggests that the couple's marriage had been a love match from the start. They met in the city during the 1840s, when Sarah was a teenager of 15 or 16 and George a young man of about 20. He was bright, curious, and a Romantic - at the time was very likely pursuing an

interest in stage acting - all of which must have made him appear dashing and captivating to his young belle. Perhaps they had met in the artistic swirl of Philadelphia's theater world. (See Chapters 3 and 7 for George Justice's Philadelphia and other background.)

Their ardor was sufficient to bring about early conception of a child, and they were married on September 20, 1847, at the 20th Street Methodist Church, by Rev. Frederick Swentzel. The child, Adela Adelaide, was born eight months later, in May, 1848. Over the next thirteen years, the couple would produce 6 more children, all but the last one girls. Sarah began bearing this brood at age 17, and bore her final child, George, Jr., at age 29; she was evidently a hardy woman.

The couple remained in Philadelphia for seven or eight years after marrying - their second and third children were also born there - but by 1856 had moved east across the Delaware River to Burlington, a small New Jersey town on the east bank of the river, about half way between Philadelphia and Trenton. Their fourth child was born here. By 1858 they had moved again, this time north and back across the river to the riverbank town of Point Pleasant, Pennsylvania, where their fifth and possibly also their sixth child were born. Finally, the couple settled in Lambertville, recrossing the Delaware a last time; there, in 1860, their seventh and last child and only son was born. The restless Justices had established 4 residences during their first 13 years of marriage, always choosing Delaware River sites, never moving more than about 35 miles, and generally moving upriver.

It was from Lambertville that George enlisted, and was immediately named 1st Sergeant of the company, the unit's highest enlisted rank. This was probably in some measure a result of his age, 36), his status as a "settled" family man and well-versed father, and his varied life experience and unusual array of prewar skills - for occupation, Justice listed "actor, shoemaker, and lecturer." But the assignment also indicates that he was already known to some of his fellow volunteers, and regarded as a man they could depend on for leadership and steadiness in the fighting to come. This trust was more than borne out. Within a year, Justice was promoted to officer status, becoming the company's 2nd Lieutenant

on the departure of Emery in 1863. Then came the awful day when he was killed while trying to rally the company's men on the enemy's breastworks at Spotsylvania Courthouse: May 12, 1864. Colonel Campbell, the Regiment's Vice Commander, called him "brave as a lion."

News of her husband's death in battle, after surviving nearly two years of war and two dangerous winter encampments, must have come as the cruelest possible blow to Sarah. The love of her life was gone; she was only 33 years old; and she was now solely responsible for comforting and raising the pair's seven minor children, ages 3 to 15.

Pulling herself together, Sarah applied for a widow's pension about 2 months after receiving the news. She must have retained connections with Philadelphia; her extended family probably resided there. Even though she now lived in Lambertville, she hired a Philadelphia attorney, Joseph Devitt, to handle the application for her. Its processing by the relatively new Pension Office became a nightmare; Sarah could produce no documentary evidence of her marriage, or of the birth of any of her children. The matter dragged on for nearly a year, but was finally approved in June of 1865. She was awarded $17 per month for herself, and the standard $2 per month for her five children who were still under the age of 16, a total monthly allotment of $27 (about $500 in today's currency).

At some point during the next couple of years, Sarah met a Hunterdon County man from Whitehouse, a town at the opposite end of the county from Lambertville, named James Bunn. He was a widower with 4 children of his own, Andrew, James Jr., Emma, and Ella, but was not a veteran. According to later observers (see below), Bunn had a very difficult personality, but was bright and a capable "mechanic." Sarah must have been desperate, and in financial difficulty despite the pension. In the middle of winter, on February 8, 1968, less than four years after losing George, she and James were married by Rev. Thompson L. Landon, at the Methodist Episcopal Church in Phillipsburg. Phillipsburg is in Warren County on the Delaware River, just north of the Hunterdon County line. Sarah was 37; James was 45 or 46.

The couple, with their newly combined family of 11 children, resided for a year in Whitehouse and then moved to Belvidere, a town situated further up the Delaware River, and the seat of Warren County. They had lived there only about two years when James, on April 4, 1871, abruptly left the family and headed west. According to Sarah, they had had no quarrel, neither parent's children had quarreled with their stepparent, and she had no idea at the time that James intended to desert her and the children - including his own four. He told her merely that he was going west to “buy lumber” and “ship it to New York." The real precipitating cause, as it later turned out, was his having "forged a note on" Jacob Creagur of High Bridge.[454]

By November of that year, Bunn had reached Warsaw, Indiana, from which he finally brought himself to write to Sarah and tell her the truth. He stated he had no money, and warned her she would now "have to look out for [her]self." This unhappy state of affairs would continue for the next *thirty-two years*, until James Bunn finally died, in 1903. He never again contributed in any meaningful way to the support of Sarah or the family. A few years short of his death, Bunn did return to Hunterdon, and took up residence in Franklin Township. The parties never resumed cohabitation, however, and it is unlikely Sarah would have considered it at that point. As she later put it: "He was one dear during those years of separation as I positively knew nothing of him or his doings."

For the rest of her life, Sarah did the best she could to support herself, as well as her and James’s children. She survived until 1910, expiring at age 80 from "extreme exhaustion" stemming from diarrhea. Any lesser woman and mother would have died from exhaustion a good deal sooner. She became a dressmaker, and earned some income in that work. She never obtained a divorce, and so remained ineligible for restoration of her widow's pension until James died.

Given her financial straights, and the existence of clear grounds, desertion, it seems odd at first that Sarah never initiated formal divorce proceedings. But the reason was clear:

cost, and the real uncertainty of a successful outcome despite the strength of her legal position.[455]

Sarah must have been frightened and angry at this turn of events. But she did not give up, and acted decently toward Bunn's children in the circumstances. She even kept from them the real reason for their father's disappearance until his son, Andrew, only twelve years old at the time, reported the news to her himself! It appears that James's children were transferred to the care of relatives, probably on his side of the family, and that his 2 daughters, at least, did not afterward keep in close touch with their stepmother. In 1904, Sarah indicated that she had not had not seen Ella "since she was 10." Atypically for women of the time, she reverted to using the last name of "Justice" - a small gesture of retaliation and defiance that must have pleased her. She moved to the small commercial town of Phillipsburg, on the Delaware River in Warren County, where paid work as a dressmaker was undoubtedly more available. It was the town where she and James had been married, and she probably had family there; by 1872, her 7 children ranged in age from 12 to 24 and some of her older daughters had probably married and moved out by this time. Besides, she and George had always had a penchant for Delaware River towns.

As for James, his life after abandoning the family and leaving New Jersey appears to have become depressingly bleak and lonely. Perhaps that is what he deserved, and possibly his conscience bothered him. After he died in 1903, Sarah did finally apply for restoration of her widow's pension, and the Pension Office conducted a Special Examination into her and James's domestic circumstances and his service background (see below); it is from the testimony of several witnesses in this proceeding, including Sarah herself and one of James's sons, that a picture emerges of James's lonesome life "out west."

When he left New Jersey in 1871 after defrauding Creagur, Bunn apparently traveled first to the small Illinois town of Warsaw. This turned out to be as far west as Bunn ever managed to get. The town lies on the eastern bank of the Mississippi, across the river from Iowa and Missouri. It was from here that Bunn wrote his wife later that year that he

had no money and she would have to look out for herself. Sarah testified that she then "had no further word from him" for the next twenty-eight years when, about 1897 or 1898, he finally returned to Hunterdon County.

Where had James been during those long years? According to Sarah, James had told her before he left New Jersey, in somewhat grandiose mien, that "he was going to Chicago, then to Bourbon Indianna and through the west to buy up lumber." Bourbon is a small town in eastern Illinois that lies only a few miles from Indiana. But after the letter she received from Warsaw later the same year, "for 28 years I never heard of him or do not know of him or what he was doing during that time neither do I know where he made his home…."

According to his son, Andrew, he had "heard" when his father left New Jersey that he was going to Fort Wayne, Indiana, but did "not know positively that he was there." There is no other indication that James ever resided in Fort Wayne. Andrew had no further word of his father's whereabouts until fifteen years later when, in 1886, Deboise Williamson, the pastor of a Dutch Reformed church in South Bend, Indiana, wrote Andrew to let him know his father was now residing there, but giving few other details. James had been a member of the Dutch Reformed Church in Belvidere, before departing, and may have been trying to "get right with God" at this point.

Other witnesses whose testimony was taken during the Special Examination in 1904 were able to place James in South Bend and, subsequently, in Terre Haute, Indiana, during a period of about twelve to fifteen years, and to fill in some of the details of his life in that period. By the mid-1880s, James was certainly living in South Bend, and working as a skilled laborer for the Studebaker Wagon Company.[456] Two articulate former co-workers, Albert B. Frank and W. B. Stover, remembered him well. Frank recalled Bunn as having started with the company in the "early 80ties" as a "gearmaker" and that he had stayed for "8 or 10 years."

> He was an elderly man 50 to 60 years of age, grey whiskers if not dyed…. I took him for a bachelor. He kept to himself and had very few associates. His habits were good, not given to drink. Was rather peculiar in his ways and had ideas of his own. We used to

> take meals in the restaurant together. …I think he hung around Müeller's Grocery, and roomed in the vicinity. He never spoke of a wife or a family. * * * He was crabid [crabbed] and disagreeable. We at one time were on good intimate terms, and all of a sudden he got mad at me and went away to Terre Haute and never came back. He sold his nice tool chest for a song in a pawn shop. I don't think he had any intimate associates while here. He was a one sided man in his ideas, but an intelligent man and rank [extreme] in politics.

Stover's recollections of Bunn, whom he remembered as staying "10 or 12 years" and employed in the "wood working carriage department," were even less flattering:

> I remember him as about 5 ft 5 or 6 in, full beard, light weight, rather stooped, dyed whiskers and wore them long. Crabid old cuss, and quarrelsome, hotheaded, and I thought one day he intended to kill Mr. Studebaker. * * * I thought him an old fraud and don't think he made any pretensions. * * * I never knew that Bunn was married. He was a crusty old bachelor as I thought, and had no intimate associates…. Was a mystery to me. I never knew that he was a forger. I don't think he drank liquor. You wouldn't fancy the man, as he acted as though he had a grudge against himself.

In 1896 or 1897, after quarreling with Frank and possibly Studebaker as well, Bunn relocated to Terre Haute, a west Indiana city on the bank of the Wabash River, about 200 miles from South Bend. There he obtained employment with another carriage manufacturer, Adolph & Herman, and remained for about two years until deciding to return to New Jersey in 1898 or 1899. His Terre Haute days were remembered by another co-worker, Albert Magel:

> James Bunn kept batch [roomed as a bachelor] at No 20-1/2 North 12th Street above the city and I was boarding at No. 20 same street. …I knew him…about two years. * * * Bunn was very poor and we made up money to help pay his fare back East to his old home as he said. He never while I knew him referred to any family except before he left here he spoke of a son in New Jersey area [and] that he had written to said son for money to make his trip on but had not received it. We made up funds enough to carry him as far as Pittsburg Pa.

James was about 75 or 76 years old at the time, and evidently had no savings or other means to pay for the trip east. Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, was only about half-way to New Jersey from Terre Haute. James's son Andrew confirmed that, after a silence of about 25 years, he had finally heard from his father sometime following his arrival in Terre Haute, and had sent him some money. When his father wrote him for money again in 1898, claiming he needed it "to come home on to be buried," Andrew refused, thinking his father "might have taken to drink." Nevertheless, James shortly set out from Terre Haute, and

managed to reach Pittsburg with the money his co-workers had raised. Without further funds, he must have turned quickly into a pathetic and homeless vagrant. A month after receiving the latest letter from his father, Andrew received one "from an officer in Pittsburg Pa. stating that he had picked up a man on the street there giving his name as James Bunn." At this news, Andrew relented and immediately sent the funds needed for his father to reach New Jersey.

After having returned to New Jersey, James moved in with a married daughter, Ella Mitchell, in Lansdown, a town in Franklin Township, and never went west again. The following year, 1899, his son, James Jr., was killed while working locally for the Lehigh Valley Railroad. According to Sarah, "he was run over by the Black Dimond Express on January 10th." James's attendance at his son's funeral was in fact how Sarah learned of his recent return to New Jersey. Sarah's local minister, Rev. Mr. Jones, also attended, and afterward relayed to her the news.

After James's return, his children appear to have treated him kindly despite his having abandoned them so many years earlier. One of his daughters and his son-in-law permitted him to move in with them. Andrew spoke of visits with him, although he was clearly saddened or frustrated by his father's uncommunicativeness after a quarter century of estrangement.

> …[H]e would visit me once in a while. [But] I never could get anything out of him as to his history, while he was out west. I could never get him to say anything about his wife…. * * * He never said whether he had remarried after leaving her. I do not know how long he was at Terre Haute.

James himself survived for only another four years, and died "suddenly" of "heart failure," on July 17, 1903. He was 81. He may have been working as a mechanic or carpenter for the same railroad that had taken his son's life, since it was a foreman from the that company who was gracious enough to bring formal word of his death to Sarah. In an era before widespread use of life insurance - or any form of state-mandated workers compensation insurance – large employers like railroads sometimes offered jobs to an

aggrieved family member as a form of charity, knowing the party could not actually perform the work satisfactorily; that may have been the case here. Sarah identified the foreman as "Mr. William Harwig, a leading Boss over the Carpenters and Bridge Builders of [the railroad]." James's children buried him in Bethlehem Township's Presbyterian Church cemetery. He had gotten his wish to "come home…to be buried."

Sarah, understandably, wasted no time attempting to improve her financial circumstances. Within a week of James's death, she filed an application for renewal of her pension. It was delayed for a year because of the Pension Office's formal inquiry "to determine whether the second husband James Bunn ever obtained a divorce from the Claimant and whether he ever served in the US service." It is probable that the government was actually trying to assist Sarah by pursuing these possibilities. Either one might have increased the amount of her award.[457] To complicate matters, however, Sarah suffered a bad fall in February, 1904, and became "crippled." She was 73. According to Mary Person, the daughter with whom Sarah now lived, the fall rendered her unable to work any longer at dressmaking, or even to dress herself.

The pension examiner who deposed Sarah in August of 1904 found her credible, "a woman of good reputation…poor, and supported by her children in a great measure." Later that month her renewal application was finally approved, and she again began receiving a widow's pension of $17 per month. The amount allowed widows had not increased in the forty years since the war and was now worth even a bit less than it had been worth then, because of inflation. She died on January 25, 1910, at age 79, still residing with her daughter, Mary, in Phillipsburg. Mary submitted her own application, for reimbursement of her mother's outstanding bills totaling $165: a doctor's bill for $24.50, funeral and burial expenses totaling $90.50, board of $20, and nursing care for $30, the last two items having been provided by Mary herself and her sister, Sara Hicks. Mary collected $86 in life insurance - which the government prudently deducted from its reimbursement allowance - but her mother otherwise left no estate whatsoever. Sarah died penniless. But she died with

the satisfaction of knowing she had done her best by her and her first love's 7 children, and that the family circle they had created together remained unbroken at the end.

One would even like to imagine that on the warmer evenings of Sarah's final year she was able now and then to gaze out across the placid Delaware, where it flows gracefully south along Phillipsburg's western boundary, and think of her George, who had died so violently so many years ago. The river seemed to be their favorite place; all of their children were conceived and born on one side or the other of it, and she had lived along its banks almost her entire life. Now she was going home, where George had been waiting for her. She too had been brave as a lion.

Other Forms of Domestic Discord

Abuse, Neglect, and Fraud

Matilda (Dayton) Van Dyke. The post-war life of the widow of Private James W. Dayton presents another fascinating but sad story of domestic discord. James's date of birth is not known, but he was probably born in the early to mid-1830s. On July 16, 1853, he married Matilda Banter. He was probably about 20, and Matilda, whose birth year was 1836, was 16 or 17. At the time, they both lived in Pennington, a Mercer County village about 4-1/2 miles south of the Hunterdon County line. Matilda was illiterate.

James and Matilda had 4 children before the war: John, born in 1853, 4 months after the marriage; George, born in 1858; Susan, born in 1860; and Mary, born in 1861. The last 2 children were born while the family resided in Woodsville, another Mercer County village only about 2 miles from the Hunterdon line. When James enlisted with the other Company A volunteers about a year after his last child was born, he gave his residence as West Amwell, indicating that by then the family had moved again, this time a few miles north and into Hunterdon proper. Dayton was then probably about 30, making him one of the older members of the unit.

Sadly, James became one of the first casualties of disease that swept the regiment during its first winter encampment. (See Chapter 3.) He was sent to the regimental hospital at White Oak Church, Virginia, in early February, 1863, and after suffering from "remittent [typhoid] fever" for 3 weeks, finally succumbed on February 27. His death left Matilda a widow, with 4 fatherless children ranging in age from 2 to 9 years.

Matilda now set out to do the best she could, but appears to have acted with unaccountable delay. She did not make application for a widow's pension until 1867, four years after losing her husband. At the time, she gave her residence as Trenton. She employed a Lambertville Attorney, Charles A. Skillman, to represent her, the same lawyer Stryker's widow would go to much later for help with her "dissipated" son (see Chapter 11). After additional delay at the hands of the Pension Office's, the application was finally approved in 1868, five years after James's death, and Matilda began receiving the standard $8 per month. Some of the agency's delay was occasioned by Matilda's initial inability to provide evidence of the birth dates of her 4 children.

By this time, 1868, Matilda had moved with her 2 teenaged sons to what is now known as the Borough of Brooklyn, New York, and had turned over the care of her 2 youngest, Susan and Mary, to the New Jersey Soldiers' Children's Home. Accordingly, she was only awarded the standard $2 per month per child supplement for each of her sons. Matilda objected to this determination, and in 1869 applied for the additional $2 per month she felt was due her for her daughters, who were now 6 and 8 years old. She insisted she was still responsible for them even though they were living in a state-run institution, and had not "abandoned" them. It does not appear as if this request was granted. Whatever her intent, the state was footing the bill for the care of her daughters and to allow the mother to receive pension moneys on their account must have struck officials as unwarranted liberality.

While living in Brooklyn, Matilda met a "seafaring" man named Henry Van Dyke. On December 18, 1878, the two were married in the town of Flatlands. Flatlands, later

incorporated into Brooklyn, lies at the southeastern corner of that city, on the western shore of Jamaica Bay. She was now about 42 years old; Henry's age is not known. Unfortunately, Henry did not prove to be a kindly or reliable husband, and probably fit the era's conventional caricature of the drifting and abusive "drunken sailor." Perhaps Matilda foresaw this even at the outset of her marriage. For she did not report her new status to the Pension Office, as she was legally required to do, and continued to receive and spend her widow's pension even though the marriage rendered her ineligible for it.

By 1885, seven years following the wedding, Matilda and Henry were residing in East New York, another Brooklyn town about 4 miles northeast of Flatlands, near what is today the Borough of Queens. About this time, or in early 1886, the Pension Office somehow discovered that Matilda might have remarried and been receiving pension payments illegally. By then, Matilda had in fact received a substantial sum unlawfully: over the seven-year period, about $674, about $13,000 in current value. The agency was not going to let the possibility of such large defalcation go uninvestigated. It promptly launched a Special Examination.

The two-phase proceeding was conducted over a 3-month period, from March to June of 1886, by an examiner whose name appears to be L. Serdner. His signature is difficult to read. In March he deposed Matilda, who was then age 50 and described herself as a "housekeeper," and her daughter, (Susan) Adaline Randolph, who was 26, a dressmaker, and a widow herself. Matilda denied that she had been *formally* remarried, but conceded facts that probably at least rendered the relationship a marriage at common law:

> I have never married since my husband's death in 1863. * * * I am living with Henry Van Dyke as his wife & I am known as Mrs. Van Dyke. I have been living with him as his wife since about six years. ...[A]ll know me as Mrs. Van Dyke. I never had any children by him, but I look upon him as my husband & he looks upon me as his wife, only there has never been any marriage ceremony between us. He is a boatman & in the winter a gen'l [illegible].
>
> The reason I did not get married to him is because I did not want to lose my pension. He is willing at any time to have the marriage act performed. My witnesses...are my daughters & live with me now. [Van Dyke and I] are husband & wife to all intents and purposes.

Matilda was clearly attempting to accomplish several things at the same time with this testimony: explain why she appeared "to all intents and purposes" to have married Van Dyke but had not actually done so; make her cohabitation with him look morally acceptable; keep herself out of trouble with the pension authorities; and protect her pension income. Adaline backed up her mother in every detail.

> …[M]y mother's…statements are true & correct. * * * She is now living with Henry Van Dyke as his wife…& they occupy the same bed. * * * I know that there never was any marriage ceremony performed between them for my mother has often told me that she would not marry because that would lose her pension….

The special examiner was not taken in. In his report to the Pension Office of March 10, he remarked that it had been difficult even to find Matilda Dayton Van Dyke, "because [the] address upon the Rolls [that she had given the government] was too vague, being simply East New York, which covers many miles of territory." He continued:

> Adaline Randolph was present when I questioned pensioner. When I began questioning pensioner about marriage or living in marital relations, this daughter interfered & wanted to know whether that was any of my business. Her manner raised my suspicion & on pressing the point further [I decided to depose both of them formally].
>
> There is of course enough evidence to forfeit her pension, but in view of the fact that it may turn out she was actually married, in which event she would be criminally liable, I have the honor to recommend that she be suspended from the roles [sic] & that her case be sent to the criminal examiner for a full Special Examination.

The examiner was right on all counts. Matilda and her daughter had sworn to facts that had established clear grounds for pursuing the matter further. The Pension Office immediately suspended the pension, and ordered the investigation to continue. In June, examinations were conducted by a new Special Examiner, Mr. B.R. Shopp. On June 7, he deposed Matilda a second time, with much different results. Now, after finally acknowledging that she was in fact "the lawful wife of Henry Van Dyke," she gave a full accounting and explanation of her past acts.

> I would like to state here that after my marriage to my second husband I had miserable trouble and a hard lot to get a living, and I was advised to go right ahead and draw the pension. I did so but the pension money was used entirely for the benefit of myself and children by my first husband the soldier in buying clothing for us all and such other things as were necessary for our support and no part of the money has been invested in [illegible] securities of any kind but have all been spent as I have said. I have been sorry a great many times that I have acted against my own judgment but under the

> advice of others. * * * …[W]hen friends said "You're foolish if you don't get it," why, I did [illegible] it and was advised to do so by others. I didn't intend to draw any more pension and now give up my pension certificate.
>
> * * *
>
> I was married to Henry Van Dyke by the Rev. Mr. Dubois at the Dutch Reformed Church of Flatlands, L. I. [Long Island], and it was about 7 or 8 years ago as near as I can tell. * * * …[W]e have from that time…been living and cohabiting together in marriage relations.
>
> * * *
>
> [Van Dyke knows] nothing at all [about the pension], and if I should be arrested he would not do anything for me but would very likely say "It serves you right".
>
> * * *
>
> I…am very sorry indeed…but my circumstances and needs have been such that I yielded to the advice of others and drew the pension when I should not have done so. My husband has derived no benefit from it whatsoever.

Matilda was now clearly concerned about the possibility of arrest and a criminal prosecution. She talked things over with her daughter, Adaline, and 2 days later gave a third deposition, probably this time at her own request. After providing a few more details about the marriage ceremony in 1878, she listed several more grievances against her husband.

> …[He] pretends to own the place that is now our home; he tells me very little about his financial affairs but I understand the house is mortgaged to about fifteen hundred dollars. He is very queer [strange] and I have had my own troubles with him, and had it not been for his conduct in depriving me of clothing and the necessaries of life I would not [have] thought of touching a cent of the pension.
>
> * * *
>
> [I was prompted to do it] because my second husband often left me without a cent of money; he abused me and deprived me of clothing, and I have been obliged to go for the pension to keep me in my distressed condition. He has not used me right at all and while that is no excuse for my action yet if I had received different treatment I would never have touched a penny….

Adaline also provided further testimony on this occasion; she was undoubtedly becoming worried about her own false swearing, both at her first deposition and for many years prior to that when she had routinely co-signed her mother's pension vouchers stating of her own knowledge that her mother remained unmarried.

> [I knew that I was doing wrong] but mother needed the money and the money was all used for proper purposes - why, for our support and clothing and to help me learn my trade as a dress maker.
>
> * * *
>
> [I was prompted to sign the vouchers] because my step-father, Mr. Van Dyke, was

> indifferent to the wants of his step-children and mother was in great need of the money. But we have been very sorry indeed many times for doing so and regret that we have not the power to refund the money.

Matilda also brought along on this occasion a neighbor and close friend, Angeline Roh, who was 60 years old and also a self-described "housekeeper."

> I am very well acquainted with the lady…and have known her for about four years…and been a near neighbor to her and have often visited her on occasions of sickness and also on social visits.
>
> I have always found [her] to be a lady in every way: quiet, peaceable, and a good neighbor and her character all around here is good. Her reputation for truth and veracity in the community is good.
>
> Mr. Henry Van Dyke…is a seafaring man, but[458] he and…Matilda…live and cohabit together in the relations of husband and wife….
>
> * * *
>
> [She] is regarded as an honest and respectable woman and is well thought of.

A few days later, Shopp received a letter from the current pastor of the Flatlands Dutch Reformed Church, verifying the Van Dykes' marriage in 1878. He also received a communication from the Brooklyn Department of Health stating that a search of its files revealed no record of the marriage, and speculating that it was "likely" that "no return [for registration] was made of the certificate." The registration of marriages, as well as other "vital statistics," had become a legal requirement in New York. Shopp reported his findings to the Pension Office in a letter dated June 21, 1886. He recommended that Matilda "Dayton" now be dropped permanently from the pension rolls, "and that such further action be taken as may be deemed proper."

With some prescience, Shopp, an attorney, also advised in his letter that "the great difficulty" in prosecuting Matilda for "perjury by swearing [before the pension clerk] to her continued widowhood" would be in finding a clerk who could actually recall one of these events and identify her in court. The payment procedure at the time required pensioners to appear personally at a regional pension office on a quarterly basis, present their pension certificate, and sign a voucher swearing to their identity and continued eligibility. They would then receive a draft on the federal treasury, similar to a check, for 3 months of pension moneys, which they could cash or deposit at a bank. Shopp had already checked into the

matter, and determined that the clerk who had witnessed Matilda signing her final voucher in March of that year "cannot identify her," and suggested the U.S. Attorney interview other clerks who might remember her from previous occasions.

In August, the U.S. Attorney General's Office at the Department of Justice, In Washington, wrote the Secretary of the Interior - who had general charge of the Pension Office - advising that the latter's request to prosecute the pensioner had been granted. "[T]he United States Attorney for Eastern New York has been instructed to bring criminal suit against Matilda Van Dyke, Madison Avenue, East New York, Kings Co., New York for violation of law in connection with her pension claim, as Matilda Dayton, No. 8992." Matilda was subsequently charged, and her trial was set for March 21 of the following year (1887).

On the trial date, Matilda Van Dyke, somewhat surprisingly, was acquitted of the charge. What seems to have occurred is that the judge, who may well have been sympathetic to her plight, found a way to dismiss the case against her by resorting to what today might be called a "legal technicality." What little is known of the exact circumstances of the trial appears in a letter sent later the same day by the U.S. Attorney - the prosecutor - to the Commissioner of Pensions. He was clearly miffed by the trial outcome and felt it necessary to explain what had happened. His signature on the letter, perhaps mercifully, is indecipherable except for his first name, Stephen, and his identity is unknown.

To obtain a conviction, the government would have had to introduce at trial, among other things, a crucial piece of foundational evidence: the testimony of a pension clerk who had actually witnessed Matilda's signing of the payment voucher and her swearing to the accuracy of the affirmations it contained. The voucher itself could then be introduced, showing the signatures of the clerk and the pensioner. Apparently in order to make it easier for the government to provide this evidence and gain convictions in cases such as this, federal legislation allowed the prosecutor to proceed without having actually to call the pertinent clerk as a witness. Rather, the prosecutor could simply obtain a written "designation," or identification, of the particular clerk involved, and introduce that writing

into evidence in lieu of the clerk's own testimony. Once properly "designated," the clerk's signature on the original voucher was then deemed sufficient to "authenticate" that document, and create a presumption that it was valid and that the defendant whose signature also appeared on it had in fact signed it. (Without the legislation, such a move would be barred by the traditional rule excluding hearsay evidence. Under that rule, documents cannot normally be used to authenticate themselves.) The designation, however, had naturally to *specify* the clerk who had actually had contact with the defendant, and probably also had to be in the form of an affidavit, made by the clerk under oath.

Instead, the prosecutor in Matilda's case attempted to use a document that simply listed *all* pension clerks who had been authorized to witness vouchers during the month in question, and the list was not sworn to. This was enough of a loophole for a sympathetic judge to allow Matilda to wriggle free. According to the prosecutor:

> …Judge Benedict to-day directed a verdict of acquittal, upon the ground that the designation of the Clerk to administer oaths before whom [Matilda Van Dyke's] affidavit was taken, was informal and insufficient. The evidence upon this point was a list in which this clerk's name appeared,…headed: "List of clerks authorized to administer oaths…. Month of March, 1968." * * *
>
> Judge Benedict…was of opinion that the former paper was not such designation in writing as the statute…requires.
>
> I think it proper to report this to you in order that such instructions may be given that similar obstacles may be avoided in the future.

A "directed verdict" suggests that this was a trial by jury, and that the evidence had already been presented and all witnesses had testified when the judge made his ruling.[459] The ruling essentially took the matter out of the jury's hands and found in Matilda's favor. It is probable that the judge personally found Matilda and her supporters credible witnesses, and was swayed by their sad account of "queer" Henry Van Dyke's long-term abuse and neglect, and failure to provide life's "necessaries" to wife and family. If so, Judge Benedict had to find a way to keep the jury from convicting her, and probably sentencing her to prison, since her guilt was otherwise clear - she had previously confessed after all, and none of her exculpatory explanations constituted a legal defense to the charge. The way he seems to have hit upon was the somewhat technical defect of an "insufficient" piece of documentary

evidence in the government's case. Why the prosecutor did not simply introduce Matilda and her daughter's *confessions*, elicited under oath and transcribed during the Special Examinations, is baffling. Perhaps the Pension Office had not made the original transcripts available for trial; the transcripts were - and remain today - in Matilda Dayton's government pension file, and there is no indication they were ever forwarded to New York for use in the government's case!

The true reasons for the outcome of the trial will never be known. But it is quite plausible that here was an instance of a late nineteenth-century judge, who, when faced with what he determined to be an oppressed Civil War widow and mother - who had in her own way suffered greatly for her country and her children and who had become caught in a relationship with a non-serving, non-supporting, abusive bum of a husband - decided that the woman was simply not going to be sent to jail if he could help it. It is by such means that actors in a formally-constrained legal system sometimes knowingly break those constraints, in order to accomplish what they believe in their hearts to be a higher form of "rough justice." In losing her first husband to the war and in then straying into her marriage with Van Dyke, Matilda Dayton had been punished enough.

Bigamy, Desertion, and Fraud

Francena (Woodruff) Cottrall. Francena Slack was another Company A widow who experienced a difficult time after the war as a result of remarriage. In her case, however, her new husband's shortcomings were quite different from those of Matilda Dayton's post-war mate.

Not a great deal is known about Francena's first husband, Company A Private, Daniel Woodruff. He was probably born about 1830, and lived in Raritan Township before enlisting. On November 6, 1852, he was married to Francena ("Fanny") Slack by a minister named Israel Paulson; he was then probably about 22 years old. Fanny was from Delaware Township immediately to the south of Raritan, and was about 20 when the couple married.

The pair had 2 children over the next several years: William, born in 1856, and Mary, born in 1859. When he volunteered in 1862, Woodruff was in his late 20s or early 30s, making him one of the older men in the unit. His children were 5 and 3 when he left for the war; they would never see him again and their memories of him later in life were probably quite dim, or nonexistent. He survived the worst fighting the 15th New Jersey was involved in but, only 7 months from the end of hostilities, was killed in action at Opequan, Virginia, during Sheridan's sweep down the Shenandoah Valley in the fall. According to the terse report of Lieutenant Manuel Kline: "[Woodruff] was wounded while in the performance of his duty near Winchester on September 19th 1864, a shell striking his leg near his body and shattering it to pieces. He was taken to hospital at Winchester Va and died the following day...."

The following spring, Fanny engaged the services of Flemington Attorney, Richard Kuhl, to help her apply for a pension. At the time, she lived in Sergeantsville, a village in Delaware Township, in the southwestern area of the county where she had grown up and probably had extended family. She gave her age as 32. Two years later, she would give her age as 37, creating a three-year age discrepancy that was never subsequently resolved. The application was approved in August, and she received the standard widow's award of $8 per month from the date of her husband's death. She was also awarded the usual $2 per month for each of her children till age 16; they were then 8 and 6 years old.

A few years later, about 1872, Fanny met and was courted by a man named Smith S. Cottrall[460], of Federal City, New Jersey. Federal City, a small village with an ambitious name, is located in Hopewell Township, Mercer County, only about 10 miles from Sergeantsville. The couple decided to marry, and Fanny duly notified the Pension Office that she would no longer be eligible to receive her pension; the last payment was made in December of that year. Fanny's children were now 16 and 13, so only her daughter, Mary, remained eligible for the children's award of $2 per month.

On New Years Day, 1873, she and Smith were married in Lambertville by a minister named C. K. Fleming. Both Fanny and Smith reported residences at Lambertville at the time of the marriage, and it is likely they met there. Remarriage for a pensioned widow with one or more children under 16 at home represented a significant financial gamble; to go through with it she had to surrender further receipt of considerable monthly income, and place entire trust in a new husband's willingness and ability to assume full responsibility for material support.

In Fanny's case there was a large problem. Smith Cottrall was already married, and in fact was the father of a young child. On October 26, 1871, only about 14 months prior to his marriage to Fanny Woodruff, Smith had been married in Trenton to Susan Palmer by Reverend Richard Thorne. Susan was a barely literate, or illiterate, domestic worker, employed in the household of a Trenton gentleman named Benjamin W. Titus, who somewhat delicately described her as "what is called a servant." Although the age of Susan's child is not recorded, it must only have been an infant at the time of Cottrall's marriage to Fanny. It is likely that the child was conceived prior to his marriage to Susan, and was in fact the chief - perhaps sole - reason for that arrangement: the "right" thing for him to do. Cottrall, after all, strayed from his first marriage unusually quickly, and tried hard for a while to go on with his life as if it had never occurred.

Trenton and Lambertville lie only about 14 miles apart along the eastern bank of the Delaware River, and were connected by regular railroad service. Though not easy, it would have been possible for Cottrall to make frequent half-hour train trips back and forth between the 2 towns, keeping each of his relationships concealed from the other. That, it appears, is exactly what he managed to do, at least for a while.

But by May, 1873, 4 months into his second marriage, Cottrall's first wife was getting suspicious, or at least financially desperate. That month, she filed a formal complaint with Lewis Keyser, Trenton's Overseer of the Poor, stating that her husband "refuses to support his family and remains continuously away." Apparently, Cottrall had decided on a course of

desertion and was not even attempting to live a double life. In less than a month, he was apprehended by a Mercer County Deputy Sheriff, jailed on June 5, and ordered to appear in court the next day to answer the complaint. Judicial proceedings moved much more quickly in the nineteenth century than they do today. The fact that Cottrall was apprehended by a Mercer County officer indicates he was in Trenton at the time; the officer's jurisdiction would not likely have extended into neighboring Hunterdon. This in turn suggests that Cottrall may have been working in Trenton at a location known to his first wife - a location she could report to the arresting officer – even though he was now surely residing most of the time in Lamington with Fanny, perhaps "commuting" between the two places.

In court, the case was heard by two Justices of the Peace, James W. Degnan and Alexander P. Kelley, who clearly did not yet know about the defendant's new marital arrangement. At the end of the short trial, they issued the following order:

> Whereas it hath appeared to us the said Justices…upon the oath of Susan [Palmer] Cottral, that the said Smith S. Cottrall, has deserted his lawful wife and child, and neglects to support and provide for [them], contrary to an Act…to describe, apprehend & punish disorderly persons…passed March 11th 1864,…we therefore…do hereby adjudge him…guilty of deserting and neglecting to supply his wife and child, and thereupon we do order that [he]…shall pay…the overseer of the poor of the City of Trenton…for and towards the support and relief of said wife and child, the sum of Three Dollars ($3) weekly and every week from [today]….

This amount of support was not a princely sum – about $250 a month in current currency – but it was equivalent to the early Civil War pay for a private and would most likely have put a dent in Cottrall's budget. How did he explain to Fanny his unanticipated, 24-hour absence from their home while he was being arrested, jailed overnight, and then tried before being released? Whatever he told her, it must have been enough for the moment.

As for Susan, though possibly suspecting that her husband was having a relationship with another woman, she clearly did not know at the time who the other party was or that her husband had actually married her. But by January of the following year, 1874, she had apparently received more intelligence, and that month she filed an additional affidavit in her non-support case in which she alleged:

> …[S]aid Smith S. Cotterill [still] neglects to take care of her or provide for [her] in any way, and remains away continually from her, and does not furnish any provisions for her nor any money to buy provisions and that he spends his earnings elsewhere, and further she has just cause to believe that [he] has been married to another woman, and has never been divorced from her….

At about the same time, Fanny also learned the truth: her husband was already married, was the father of another woman's child and under a court order to support them both, and had lied to her. In March, 1874, 2 months after Susan Palmer filed her follow-up affidavit in Trenton, an undoubtedly deeply hurt and angry Fanny filed her own affidavit in her pension file in Washington, seeking immediate restoration of her widow's pension. In it, she stated "that I married a man by the name of Smith Cottrel who I supposed at the time was a single man, [but] who I have since found out was a married man having a wife and child living at the time I married him."

The Pension Office, after confirming Cottrall's marriage to Palmer - and even investigating the hopeful possibility that Cottrall actually *had* secured a divorce from her, which would have meant no restoration for Fanny - approved Fanny's renewal application later that year, in August. The records show that the regional pay agent was authorized at that time to resume pension payments to Fanny, "the remarriage of Jny 1, 73, being null and void." There the matter might have ended.

But Smith S. Cottrall was a persistent suitor, as least as far as Fanny was concerned. Somehow he succeeded in patching things up with her, and at some point over the next several months, he married her a *second* time, once again in Lambertville! Whether or not he had in the meantime obtained a formal divorce or annulment from Susan – neither of which would have been an easy thing to accomplish legally – is not disclosed in the record, but is highly unlikely. In connection with Susan's ongoing case, the Trenton Clerk of Court searched the records in May of 1874 and found no record of a divorce involving Cottrall.[461] Though he surely must have assured Fanny that he had been divorced this time, or else convinced her that his first marriage to Susan had been invalid from the start, she was taking no chances this time.

Undoubtedly to keep things quiet and ensure that her valuable widow's pension checks would continue to arrive, *even though she would now once again be legally ineligible to receive them*, Smith and Fanny's second marriage ceremony was not performed by a minister, but by one of Fanny's relations, a Lambertville attorney and Justice of the Peace named Charles W. Angel. Fanny did not contact the Pension Office to report her new status, and the newlyweds quickly relocated to a point further upriver, in Frenchtown, where they would not be as well known. So great was Fanny's rapture that she was willing to forgive or at least take back the inconstant Smith, and to become a criminal law-breaker in the process. She was then about 43 years old.

Unfortunately for Fanny, Special Agent W. E. Dulin, one of the Pension Office's growing army of field investigators - pension fraud was becoming a problem) - soon discovered the marriage, and reported it to his superiors in April of 1875. Dulin went so far as to contact the Frenchtown Post Master, who confirmed that Smith and Fanny were indeed now residing in Frenchtown and holding themselves out as "Mr. and Mrs. Cottrall."

For reasons unknown, possibly understaffing in Washington or simple bureaucratic inefficiency, it took the Pension Office two full years to begin serious follow-up inquiries. Fanny's son would have been about 20 by this time, and her daughter 18; it is likely that each of them had by now gone their own way, but the record on this is silent. In April, 1877, the agency wrote to the Baptistown Post Master asking for further corroboration of the residence and marriage of the parties. The Cottralls must have moved to Baptistown in the two intervening years and their movement followed by Dulin; it lies only 3 miles east of Frenchtown. Next month the agency wrote directly to Fanny, demanding she supply an affidavit "rel to re-marriage." The game was up; there is no indication that she responded.

Finally, in the following month, June of 1877, Fanny's pension was suspended. There is no record in her file that she protested the action or ever again renewed her claim. Nor is there any suggestion that the Pension Office tried to get her to pay back the two years or so of pension moneys that were wrongly paid her. The amount would have been

significant, about $400, or approximately $8,000 in today's currency. Unlike the severe action taken against Matilda Dayton Van Dyke, the government left Fanny alone. Hopefully, Smith Cottrall remained with her as she lived out her days.

Infidelity and Venereal Disease

Abram and Cordelia Van Fleet. Abram Van Fleet was born on October 15, 1840, in Centreville, a small village in the southern part of Readington Township, on the eastern side of Hunterdon County. At age 21, he enlisted from the same township, and was mustered in with Company A. The details of Van Fleet's enlistment, service, temporary desertion (see below), transfers, and ultimate discharge are muddled[462], but the chronology given here is believed on all the evidence to be substantially correct. On May 3, 1863, during the regiment's first serious campaign, he suffered an extremely grave gunshot wound in a battle at Mary's Heights, near Fredericksburg. The ball entered the right side of his chest, passed through a good part of his trunk, and exited from his back, just missing the spinal column.

After recovering for about 4 months in hospital, he was transferred, on September 7, to Company E, 3rd Regiment, of the "Invalid" (Veterans Reserve) Corps, and placed on light duty. From that unit he soon "skedaddled" (deserted), probably in order to get married to a woman that he probably either had met while convalescing, or before leaving for the war. On October 10, 1863, he married Cordelia M. Akins (or Ayers), in New Hope, Pennsylvania. This is the only known instance of a Company A volunteer's *wartime* marriage; all other marriages took place either before or after the war. New Hope lies directly across the Delaware River from Lamington, and the two towns are connected by a bridge. New Hope is not particularly close to his hometown of Centreville, and the ceremony was performed by a Justice of the Peace named Hiller rather than by a clergyman, one of only 2 such instances among the company's marriages. It is probable that in view of Van Fleet's status the couple was trying to draw as little attention to themselves as possible. Nonetheless, the authorities caught up with him, and he was shortly arrested.

In November or December, the records indicate he was released from arrest, and returned to his VRC unit. He was apparently never formally charged with desertion - it would have disqualified him from the pension he later received, and would have appeared in his application file. It is even possible that he voluntarily surrendered to authorities after his marriage, promising to return to duty. Given his prior service and serious recent wound, and his partly disabled condition, the army would likely have gone along with such an arrangement. One price Van Fleet did apparently pay for his sojourn in Pennsylvania and New Jersey was being pressured later to re-enlist, which he did in August, 1864, thereby extending the potential length of his service until August, 1867.

When the war ended in 1865, Abram was still under arms. At some point, probably in the summer or fall of 1865, Van Fleet contracted syphilis. His VRC regiment must have been detailed at the time to the State of Maine, because on October 10, 1865, Van Fleet was admitted to the Army General Hospital in Augusta, Maine, where he was diagnosed with the disease. He was treated for a month [463], released, and soon discharged from military service on November 20.

How and where had Van Fleet contracted syphilis? Did he confide to his new wife that he had the disease? Or did he contract the disease from her in the first place? This last is at least a possibility, but unlikely because of their limited access to one another and the timing of his hospitalization. If Cordelia had transmitted the disease to Abram in the fall of 1863, during the time they spent time together and were married, he would have noticed primary symptoms within about a month, and more significant secondary symptoms in 6-8 weeks: January or February of 1864. These would either have required treatment at the time – for which there is no record - or would have spontaneously disappeared long before his hospitalization 20 months later. It is most likely, then, that Van Fleet contracted the disease by sexual contact with someone else, most likely while in Maine shortly before his discharge. Did he in turn infect his wife? Did the infection further impact the health of either of them or their child? Answers to these questions will never be known. What is known is that the

couple only conceived one child, a son, and it took them from two to four years to do that (see below). This varies considerably from both Company A and general population fertility norms, and could have been due in part to problems associated with syphilis.

Cordelia died in 1908, age probably about 65, from causes unknown. The couple's son, Charles, died four years later, also for unknown reasons, at age 43 or 45 - Abram, who was by then suffering from "senility," was no longer certain at this point whether his son's year of birth had been 1867 or 1869. Van Fleet himself lived a long time, but appears to have been quite ill and infirm during his last decade or so. By 1921, at age 81, he was described by his physician as suffering from "continuous vertigo, arterio-capillary fibrosis, enlarged prostate gland, defective vision, and constitutional weakness." A pension medical board described him about the same time as suffering from "marked muscular tremor of entire body." Most of Van Fleet's late-in-life symptoms are consistent with long-term, or *tertiary*, effects of syphilis. He died in 1925, at age 84.

Whatever may have been the answers to the questions posed above, it is almost certain that Abram's condition signified at least one episode of marital infidelity in the last months of his army career, and that the lapse occurred when his marriage was less than two years old. At that point he was out of danger, and no longer had the combat soldier's excuse of fearing each day might be his last.

CONCLUSION

> …[I]n order that the will of Napoleon and Alexander (on whom the whole decision [in the battle] appeared to rest) should be effective...[i]t was essential that the millions of men in whose hands the real power lay - the soldiers who fired guns and transported provisions and cannons - should consent to carry out the will of those feeble and isolated persons….
>
> * * *
>
> In historical events great men - so-called - are but the labels that serve to give a name to an event, and like labels, they have the least possible connection with the event itself.
>
> Leo Tolstoy, *War and Peace*, 1865-69

So what are we to make of the collective sagas of Company A's men and their families? Ultimately, the principal burden of this project has been to give them bodies and voices or, as promised in the Introduction, "to put [them] right here/In front of you on this page." Aside from this, the work has not pretended to plow new ground nor, for certain, to advance academic theory, new or old, or intellectual conceit, or otherwise to engage in the heavy shifting of scholarly paradigm.

But these pages *have* told a story - several stories - worthy it is hoped of the telling. What is made of the tale, if anything must be made, is left to the reader. If postmodernism teaches anything, it teaches that none of us "really" knows whereof we write, and that in any case once writ, the meaning given our words is forever beyond our power to determine. Such things were of course appreciated long before the modern era. The medieval Persian poet, Omar Khayyam, for example, wrote, "The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ/Moves on…."[464]

But scholars are a stiff-necked people, and some sort of concluding authorial witness, even though it be like the chimera of "closure," is nonetheless expected. Here follows something that may pass for it.

Restatement

Part I of this work suggests that the 100 original volunteers of Company A were not much different from their 2 million or so Northern fellows who also put on the uniform at some point during the Civil War. They pursued the same kinds of occupations in about the same proportions, went mostly to the same churches in the same numbers, were as likely to marry and have children, and displayed the same large range of human nobility and cravenness. This may be more important than it sounds. It means their minute and detailed experiences, expressed where possible in their own voices, may be capable of telling us a great deal about an entire generation.

The men's wartime experiences were gruesome. That is nothing new, and has been amply – perhaps *obsessively* – laid out in much prior work of both a scholarly and popular nature. The best of it kind may have appeared in the form of historical fiction: contemporary novels like *Cold Mountain* and *Oldest Living Confederate Widow Tells All* and, in his time, Ambrose Bierce's exceedingly dark and "modern" short stories.[465] But a brief retelling of the gruesomeness was necessary here to place the men in context - to place them squarely within the most formative experience of their lives - before trying to describe what happened to them after that.

The final important point made in this scene-setting part is motivation. The men did not go to war either to free the slaves or to save the Union – though both these things, especially the latter, were probably fine things indeed with most of them, and deeply believed in and held on to by a few. They were also things that were probably *needed* somewhere in the recesses of their minds, to reconcile them to the tests and tasks they surely sensed lay ahead, even as they began entraining for the front. But the most *propelling* motives a majority of the men felt were older and more basic: their young male peers were doing it, and their families somehow depended on them to do it. Once they got into the war and realized how far its horror exceeded their naïve imaginings of it, they continued to be sustained by very old impulses: in this case, by the urge to stick by comrades, and to held and stroked by a

growing – or new-found – faith in their own heavenly salvation. This was a personal faith: whatever happened in the hellish environment of the battlefield, Jesus would be there.

Part II attempted to lay out what the men endured – and enjoyed – when they came home from the war. Overall, their health and physical conditions were appalling; almost none of them climbed out of war's boiling cauldron unscalded. Most of their diseases were "chronic": an inadequate medical expression of the idea that they lasted virtually all their days and afflicted them constantly. Many of their wounds were poorly healed, painful or at best annoying, and most important, left them partly or entirely unable to carry on the hard labor most of them were fated to perform. Even the routine wartime stresses their strong young frames had been required to undergo – especially the marching, hefting, and occasional falling - took a massive toll; the men's tissue literally rent, their vessels stretched and deformed. Many of course suffered from ailments that could not be seen – or at the time, even named – but that broke them down just as effectively. Despite all of it, they made do and in general outlived their peers; few facts testify better to their sheer toughness and will. The Nobel-winning poet, Seamus Heaney, once said that "poetry is our comeback to life." For these men, stubborn survival was their comeback to Death.

And in fact, most of them did better than merely making do. With the help of their mostly rustic wives, the men became husbands and fathers and grew into full participation in the small worlds of their communities and workplaces. They raised a generation of children who would be schooled better and longer than they had been – just as they themselves had done better on this score than their own mothers and fathers. They worked at a wide range of post-war jobs, in every standard occupational category available to latter nineteenth-century males. A few of them achieved much; the majority, however, managed only barely to stay afloat, and many experienced a slow and steady sinking - ending life broke, or in a state home, or both.

Most returned after the war to the rural region they had grown up in and stayed there the rest of their lives; many relocated west, some to stay. Whatever long-distance

movement there was seemed always to be westward; no one moved to New England or the Deep South, no one went back to Europe. In this at least, Robert Frost was right; these latter-day pioneers had indeed given themselves outright, in "many deeds of war/To the land vaguely realizing westward." Several of course could never hold on to a job – or remain living in one place – for very long. And some of these runners ran ceaselessly until they finally collapsed and died, one or two even attempting to leave behind all they knew, including wife and children.

By the end of their days, virtually all the men sought their government's help. And sooner or later, virtually all of them got it. Some received too little, some probably far more than they deserved. In a sense, though, no amount of the blossoming nation's new wealth could repay the men for what they had done. In the long conversation that necessarily accompanied their seeking after aid, the men and their young country made a great deal of progress in defining just what kind of bargain they had all made together at the outset. The social contract that might only have been a comforting fiction – a quaint eighteenth-century Enlightenment notion bandied about by the founding elite – was now hammered out, its terms taking shape in the course of animated negotiation. The country got the right to require its own young men to fight to the death, *on pain of death* – unless of course they volunteered, or bought their way out. The young men, now older, got the right to be cared for by their country, till death did them part. This contract was no fiction – no "construct" – it was real and enforceable, and involved the largest transfers of blood and gold the parties had yet ventured. In a very large sense, and though it would certainly not be the last such rearrangement, this first new deal made the parties who they were...and who they remain today.

Part III was a reminder that the women of the era were not just along for the ride. Out of their own bodies, they had delivered the men who would fight this war, and into their own bodies – and hearts – they would take them again when it was over. At least they would take back those who were left. Most of the "company's women" – the men's mothers, wives,

sisters, daughters – did not live in separate spheres, were not particularly invested in worshipping cults of domesticity. They were usually far too busy working with their hands and feet, fashioning lives for themselves and their families, to have much time for the self-indulgent pastimes of respectability. In their case, much of the work they did involved taking care of the men - sick, unfit, broken – whom they had, in their own way, offered up to the great national project of war. Some day in the future, women like them would benefit greatly from the work of some of their contemporary middle- and upper-class sisters: they would some day vote, get different kinds of jobs, earn better wages, be less subject to abuse – and to the unpredictable whims and fancies of men in general. Perhaps some day young men would get a better shake as well, and not be led by their fathers into war.

Like the men, the women discovered that they too might be parties to the work-in-progress of the social contract. When this dawned on them – and it surely occurred to them earlier and lasted over a longer period of time than it did for the men – they proved up to the task. They bargained as hard as the men, in comparable numbers, and achieved as much as they did. As widows, they did it for their and the men's children as well as for themselves. In the process, they too had a hand in shaping the very terms of the arrangement. They displayed the same range of character the men had: they were by turns patient and modest in their requests, or shameless and insistent in their demands. Some of them, like some of the men, were frauds. Their gendered disadvantage was sometimes to be treated by male lawyers and male bureaucrats as incompetent, naïve, weak, and out-of-their-element – qualities that in reality applied to very few of them. Their advantage was to be imagined, usually by the same men, as frail maidens in need of a male champion, or lover – a male fantasy that also applied to hardly any of the women, but one that at least a few of them seemed happy to indulge. Women's strategies for dealing with men had, after all, evolved over a very long time.

In the end, it is exceedingly hard to summarize all this "data" – to boil down the stories that are left of the lives of a 100 or so men and a comparable number of women – much less come up with a convincing "conclusion." Perhaps another story helps.

A "Burial"

At the height of GAR influence nationally, and of the old Civil War veteran presence locally, an unlikely war-related episode took place in Hunterdon County. It was directed this time not by the veterans themselves, but by others in the community who knew them, were related to them, had even treated their illnesses and tried on occasion to serve as their spiritual guides.

The Hunterdon County Historical Society was formed in Flemington in 1885 – a year when Company A's survivors were, on average, about 65 years of age. The society was an elite affair, at least by Hunterdon standards, its charter members comprising most of the town's doctors and ministers - the local literati - in addition to a few other local notables. So far as is known, there were no Company A men among them. But there were relatives: a Case and a Servis, for example, and later on a Connet and a Bellis. The area was growing and changing; memories of early days were fading or disappearing altogether. The organizers wanted to begin writing things down, gathering the county's stories, preserving a sense of the place for future generations.

They were also deeply affected, it appears, by the great conflict they had watched from the sidelines twenty or so years before, and by their daily encounters with the aging men who had fought that struggle and come home to live out their remaining days. They undoubtedly knew about the tens of thousands who lay buried somewhere throughout the war's many theaters of combat, about the men whose graves lay undiscovered…perhaps forgotten. Some must even have read the sad passages describing some of the 15th New Jersey's hasty burials, written by the regiment's chaplain, Alanson Haines, in the popular history of the unit he had published a few years before. (See Chapter 3.) All these thoughts

and feelings conspired, I believe, in the spring of 1891, to produce a touching and remarkable venture by these historically-minded folks.

More than a century earlier, in December of 1776, a brief but sharp engagement between a small number of Colonial irregulars and British cavalrymen had taken place in the county, only about 5 miles south of Flemington. The fight was known locally as the "Amwell Skirmish" and, although a comparatively minor episode, was locally regarded as one of the county's proud contributions to the Revolutionary War. As with many wartime events, however, the actual facts of the engagement were not quite as glorious as they may have seemed.

On that cold day in December. a small detail of mounted British soldiers were on the way home to their to their camp in nearby "Penny Town" [Pennington], which is situated about 15 miles south of Flemington. They were returning from a relatively uneventful foray into Flemington, and the route home took then through Amwell. Tipped off to their approach, 8 local militiamen took up concealed positions in the wood-line next to the road the British were expected to travel. When the British obligingly rode by, they were ambushed as they passed, and the Colonials managed to kill its leader, a young officer and Coronet named Francis Geary, of the 16th Queen's Light Dragoons. Geary was ignominiously abandoned by his fleeing fellows on the ground where he had been shot off his horse. The ambushers stripped him of his uniform and buried him on the spot in a shallow grave. (Today, the actions of the Americans would undoubtedly be described by an enemy such as the British as the terrorist tactics of an insurgency.)

Now, 115 years later, the members of the county's historical society set out to locate Geary's remains, and give him a proper burial. Perhaps miraculously, they did just that. They went to the spot in Amwell where oral tradition placed the grave site, and with the property owner's permission, dug there and found human bones. They sifted the surrounding soil and discovered a uniform button bearing the legend "16 QLD," and knew they had their man.

They then excavated a deeper and more proper grave and, after due observances, reburied the remains. They even subsequently located Geary's descendants in England, and wrote them with the news. They raised funds for a substantial commemorative stone, and had it placed over the grave so that it would be marked for good and not further disturbed.

In doing all this, they themselves surely felt that they had finally stepped into the quiet waters of historical memory, taking their places with the men of the Civil War - men whose experiences of combat and loss they could not precisely share, but whose sense of life's sadness, and whose deep respect for history and its innumerable small actions and actors, they surely could. They had long watched these veterans struggle to place appropriate meaning on their own lives, and in performing this small but decent act, they had been able to place some of the same meaning on their own.[466]

The Red Badge of Courage

When I was in college in the early 1960s, I read Stephen Crane's Civil War novel published in 1895, *The Red Badge of Courage*. The Dell paperback edition I had – printed in 1960 and costing 50¢ - contained an introduction by Ralph Ellison, the black man who had recently been lionized in the literary world for his breakthrough autobiographical novel, *Invisible Man*, in 1953.

I don't remember much from that first reading of Crane's work; I was only about 18 years old, full of myself, and had no premonition of how war would soon proceed to the center of my life. But I do remember some of what Ellison said in his introductory essay, and have carried it with me ever since: both the memory and the little Dell edition. Even at that early time in the Civil Rights movement, Ellison was trying to bring to the fore the idea that "[t]he America into which Crane was born was one of mirrorlike reversals in which the victors were the defeated and the defeated the victors; with the South…carrying its aggression to the North in the form of guerilla politics, and with the North, compromising as it went, retreating swiftly into the vast expanse of its new industrial development, eager to lose any

traces of those values for which it had gone to war." Ellison burned with this idea, and so did I.

> …[W]hile the setting of *The Red Badge* is the Civil War, its issues are drawn from the lax society which Crane viewed as hostile to those who would achieve manhood and moral identity, whose tendency toward moral evasion he set out to overcome…. * * *
> *The Red Badge*…implies a deep skepticism as to the possibility of the old American ideals being revived by a people which had failed to live up to them after having paid so much to defend them in hardship and blood.

Ellison was of course reinterpreting the past to suit the new passions of his time. In the early 1960s, before the Bay of Tonkin and the Selma March and everything that would follow from events such as those, we too thought we were living in a morally lax period of conformity and materialism, failing to live up to the ideals displayed by our GIs in making the great sacrifices of WWII. Of course, it was the leaders and members of that very GI generation, now called by some "the Greatest," who got us into the post-war mess in the first place, though I did not appreciate that then.

As suggested in my Preface, when I set out to research and write this work, the "ideals" of my own generation, and particularly for me the American sacrifices of the Viet Nam War, were much on my mind. I wanted somehow to bring out the difficult lessons I believed we had learned in that conflict: the limits of our power and arrogance, and what I felt was the ultimate decency of the American people in finally insisting that we end our part in the slaughter. It had been extremely costly, but at least we had learned something we may not have been able to learn any other way. Perhaps my 10 lost men would have been satisfied with that; at least it was something. I could emphasize the point, I thought, by encouraging readers to look at the human face of war – in this case the human faces of a small bunch of long-dead Civil War veterans and their women – and by drawing a connection between them and us, between all soldiers and soldier's families.

That was ten years ago. Since then, one of the unworthiest, most cowardly, and most frightened of men ever to sit as an American President has almost single-handedly demolished whatever redemption I may have claimed from my own war experience…and

devalued the sacrifices of the soldiers of my generation – 56,000 of whom are dead - to near meaninglessless. He has personally reset the grim counter: 4,000 Americans, tens of thousands of Iraqis and Afghanis, dead, and counting. Hundreds of thousands of human beings maimed, tortured, imprisoned, and traumatized…and counting. The connection between this president's war and Viet Nam is meanwhile denied, while histories of the latter undergo scholarly revision in the interest of bringing out a more uplifting outcome. I can no longer look my ten dead men in the eyes.

All this, I guess, is to say that for humans the study of history is one of the most important things we can undertake. History's "lessons" will always be contested – and there are those who believe history should not be looked at for didactic purposes in any case. But that does not excuse the failure to make the attempt, to engage in the contest. Honest historians, I believe, are the keepers of an ancient, life-saving tradition: the telling of a community's most important stories. Every so often, they must even gather themselves up to perform the greatest story-telling ritual of all: telling the community's biggest and best story, its meta-narrative, its founding myth. (This is where I personally am sure we are all headed, with the current buzz over "Global" and "Big" History. The [New] Greatest Story Ever Told.)

So here is my conclusion: my small contribution to the meta-story. War is Hell. Not in the sense of aphorism. It is our literal Hell, the source of our human *idea* of Hell, as well as the actual *site* and *experience*. Just as I do not believe that God is "out there" (or "up there" for you Ptolemaists), I do not hold with Hell being "down there." It's right here, within us. And Hell is everywhere we make war on one another.

Think about it.

ENDNOTES

[1] The demographic and economic history of Hunterdon County summarized in this chapter is taken primarily from Hubert D. Schmidt, *Rural Hunterdon: An Agricultural History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1945), which remains a model of its kind.

[2] The present-day configuration of Hunterdon County was established in 1838 (prior to that date, it comprised a larger area), and has thus not changed since the period under consideration in this study. Several village and other place names *within* the county *have* changed or dropped out of use since that time, however, and several of the county's municipal boundaries (towns, boroughs and townships) have been expanded or reduced. To avoid confusion, contemporary, 19th-century names and municipal boundaries are used throughout this work, and reference to present-day names or areas added only when necessary for clarification.

[3] Schmidt, while devoting considerable attention to the establishment of Hunterdon's various Protestant churches, makes virtually no mention of Catholic ones (though, by the time of his 1945 work, there were many throughout the county). He does state, however, that "the greatest concentration of…Irish [Catholics] was at Lambertville, where there were 230 natives of Ireland in 1850" (*Rural Hunterdon* 43). He reports they were "somewhat segregated in a section…known locally as Dublin," and quotes from an 1859 local newspaper article describing a "merry time" being had at their "Catholic picnic." A county historian writing in 1881 gives 1842 as the apparent date of Hunterdon's first Roman Catholic Church (St. John's, in Lambertville). James P. Snell, *History of Hunterdon and Somerset Counties, New Jersey* (Philadelphia: 1881) 280. Snell also states, with respect to Flemington, the county seat, that "prior to 1847, there were but two families of this faith in [the town] – four adults and one child," and that although a service was held for transient Irish laborers at a local copper mine as early as 1847, Flemington's first Roman Catholic church was not built until 1858.

[4] Schmidt, *Rural Hunterdon* 205. He also notes, however, that this trend was later reversed: "…by 1870 the temperance people were making their weight felt, and a sudden decrease [in taverns] resulted."

[5] Edward Cohen, *Lambertville's Legacy: The Coryells, Ashbel Welch and Fred Lewis* (Lambertville: self-pub. by author, 1999) 65.

[6] Dates compiled from US Department of Agriculture summary of "Usual Planting and Harvesting Dates, By Crop," for State of New Jersey; 2/4/08. http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/nassr/field/planting/

[7] A forge is a factory where metal is heated in order to be "wrought" or beaten into a particular shape. A foundry is a factory where metal is heated to its melting point, so that it can be cast into a molded shape.

[8] Kilns are industrial or other large-scale ovens; limestone heated in kilns broke down into lime or "quicklime," which had many nineteenth-century uses, including serving as a key ingredient in stone and brick mortar, as fertilizer, a disinfectant, and as a flux in producing iron from iron ore.

[9] Earl Schenk Meiers, *New Jersey and the Civil War*, The New Jersey Historical Series vol. 2 (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964) x.

[10] Meiers 14.

[11] McPherson, *Battle Cry* 335, 346-48.

[12] Haines 8.

[13] McPherson, *Battle Cry* 491-92.

[14] Camille Baquet, *History of the First Brigade, New Jersey Volunteers, From 1861 to 1865* (Trenton: MacCrelish & Quigley, 1910), 222.

[15] Haines 8-9.

[16] William Fox, *Regimental Losses in the American Civil War* (Albany: 1889), 4-5, 64-65 (RLACW); and Wiley 319-20.

[17] Wiley 320; and Jack Coggins, *Arms and Equipment of the Civil War* (Wilmington: Broadfoot Publishing, 1987), 21. Coggins, quoting another source, states that attention focused on the regiment partly because, at the time of the Civil War, it was the army's "'tactical unit,'" i.e., "'the largest body of troops that can be commanded by a single leader, and…be able to appear in close order on the battle-field [sic] without risk of…ruinous losses….'" The war would prove this a questionable assessment.

[18] Wiley 319.

[19] Haines's list of the company's original men totals 99 (324-27). The list used in this work was compiled primarily from New Jersey Office of the Adjutant General (William S. Stryker), *Record of Officers and Men of New Jersey in the Civil War, 1861-1865*, vol. 1 (Trenton: 1876, and cited in this work as "ROMNJ"). It was checked against a combination of other sources (see Appendix A), and includes one additional Private, William Jackson (who deserted before mustering in), but is otherwise identical to Haines's. Haines probably omitted Jackson intentionally because, unlike the other three men who "deserted before muster," Jackson never returned to the unit after signing up, and performed no period of service with it. Fifteenth Regiment historian, Joseph G. Bilby, following Haines, also lists 99 men and officers on the company's initial Muster Roll. Joseph G. Bilby, *Three Rousing Cheers: A History of the Fifteenth New Jersey from Flemington to Appomattox* (Hightstown: Longstreet House, 1993), cited in this work as "BFNJ," 357-59.
[20] F.W. Beers, *Atlas of Hunterdon County, New Jersey* (New York: 1873) 48-53.
[21] The 15th NJ's records list him as "deserter," and as "transferred to 1st NJ Cav" as of September 2, 1862. The five-month lacuna in his record, from September 1862 to February 1863, may have been simply a clerical error, or may indicate he was placed on some sort of punitive detail, or perhaps even jailed, during this fall and winter period. (Lattarette's career in the 16th NJ Cavalry Regiment is taken from that unit's section of ROMNJ, vol. 2.)
[22] Punishment for desertion, especially as the war dragged on, was severe, typically resulting in one to five years' imprisonment at hard labor, or execution by a firing squad of one's peers, carried out in front of the deserter's entire brigade. Some were even branded on the forehead with a "D". Wiley 205-07.
[23] Coggins 21.
[24] The 7th New Jersey Infantry had been mustered in during the first summer of the war, for a three-year term. It was sworn in at the beginning of September, 1861, and had seen action with "Hooker's Division". For the balance of the year, it was mainly engaged in "provost" (military policing and security) duties in the capital, but took an active part in the Peninsula Campaign the following summer. ROMNJ 300.
[25] Haines 9-10.
[26] Transfers *into* the company included officers from other companies assigned to replace a deceased, resigning, or promoted Company A officer, as well as enlisted men transferred from units being disbanded, or whose manpower shortages were deemed less critical than those of Company A.
[27] Unlike the 100 men listed as original volunteers, numbers for replacements, especially for men listed as "transferred" into the company, are somewhat arbitrary. Haines and Bilby, apparently following the ROMNJ compilation, list a total of 83 "additions" to the company's original roster of enlisted men (to which should be added the 7 replacement officers assigned to the company throughout the war, for a total of 90 "replacements" according to their count; Haines and Bilby do not break down replacements by category). For a complete company roster and discussion of enlistment categories and sources used, see Appendix A.
[28] About 180,000 African-Americans eventually served in the Union Army, most of them former slaves from Confederate or border states who enlisted as the South was increasingly occupied by Union forces. This represented only about 4% of the total African American population, north and south. Overall, white males serving in the war (for both North and South) constituted roughly 10% of the total white population of the country (the white Union Army was about 9% of Northern white population; the white Confederate Army, which came close to total mobilization of eligible white men, constituted about 13% of the white South). Though relegated mainly to garrison and occupation duties, blacks suffered a reported overall death rate (mainly from disease-related death) that was approximately the same as the overall mortality rate for *all* combatants: about 21%. (The North's overall rate was about 17%, whereas the nearly all-white Southern army died at the horrendous rate of about 32%, nearly one of every three men serving.) See, for example, Noah Andre Trudeau, *Like Men of War; Black Troops in the Civil War, 1862-1865* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1998) vii, xviii, 466.
[29] The story is told in Joseph G. Bilby, *Forgotten Warriors; New Jersey's African American Soldiers of the Civil War* (Hightstown: Longstreet House, 1993) 9-15. Adding injury to insult, New Jersey's Black veterans were much less likely after the war to claim state bounties due them, or apply for federal pensions.
[30] Fox (RLACW) 62; and Dorothy and James Volo, *Daily Life in Civil War America* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1998) 99; no source citation given by latter. Soldier's average ages in 1862 and 1865 is from Wiley 303. Median age is from McPherson 608; no source citation given.

Despite the existence of Civil War records from which precise age (and much other "anthropological") information could be definitively though laboriously determined, it appears that no

one has yet done so. The most comprehensive study, on which modern historians still rely, was published in 1869 by Benjamin A. Gould, an actuary working for the United States Sanitary Commission, entitled *Investigations in the Military and Anthropological Statistics of American Soldiers*, NY, part of a series called "Sanitary Memoirs of the War of the Rebellion". Gould compiled vital statistics for more than a million Union volunteers, about half the Army. For references to Gould, see Fox (RLACW) 62, unnumbered footnote; Wiley 298-99; and McPherson 606, *fn*31.

[31] Wiley 298-303; Fox (RLACW) 62; and McPherson 608.

[32] Volo 99; no source cited.

[33] Fox (RLACW) 62; McPherson 606; Volo 103. Wiley's separate sampling puts the portion of native-born men at "probably more than three-fourths": Wiley 301.

[34] The most numerous foreign-born soldiers in the Union Army were German and Irish (respectively, "probably" more than 200,000, and "nearly" 150,000, according to Wiley). Overall, immigrants were nonetheless slightly underrepresented as a proportion of the North's eligible male population; according to McPherson, foreign-born males of military age constituted 30% of the Union states' population, but only 25% of the army. Wiley 307-09; McPherson 606 and *fn*31.

[35] Percentages and all other statistical data presented in this study are approximations based on the data found, which data are often incomplete. Most numbers are rounded to the nearest whole number. A number in [brackets] is the total number of persons (from the maximum "field" of persons included in the category) for whom the information in question was considered reliable.

[36] See Appendix B for the general geographical areas from which all ten of the regiment's companies were raised, and for information on other Union regiments raised from New Jersey and Hunterdon County throughout the war.

[37] Except for the Snyder brothers, available data did not disclose whether any of these men were brothers, or fathers and sons. It is probable, however, that several of them were at least cousins, or otherwise related.

[38] RLACW 63; McPherson 607-8; and Wiley 303-4.

[39] Wiley made a detailed examination of men's specific pre-war occupations in 123 Union companies (a maximum number of about 12,300 individuals), and found that farmers constituted "nearly half" the total (about 6,000), and "common laborers" "more than a tenth" (about 1,200). Other trades and professions were as follows: carpenters, 610; shoemakers, 374; clerks, 367; blacksmiths, 325; painters, 200; mechanics, 183; sailors, 178; soldiers, 173; machinists, 155; masons, 143; printers, 126; teamsters, 99; and teachers, 97. Wiley 304.

[40] President Lincoln's first call for troops from the Union states, in April, 1861, resulted in New Jersey's sending five regiments, each formed that month from existing state militia units. The "3rd Regiment - Militia" was mustered in on April 27, 1861, at Trenton, entrained to Washington, D.C., and remained there without seeing action until mustered out on July 31 of the same year. The regiment sustained no combat-related deaths or wounds, although one officer and two enlisted men died of disease while in service. ROMNJ 40, 52.; and Meirs 14, 21.

[41] Wiley 305-06; Volo 100; and McPherson 19-20.

[42] Of the company's 100 volunteers, 40 were reliably determined to be literate and 9 to be illiterate; the literacy of another 17, for whom a pension file or other significant record *does* exist, could nevertheless not be reliably determined. No records were found for the remaining 34 men. See Chapter 2.

[43] Ethnic assessment is made primarily on the basis of the men's family names, and the known historical settlement of the county by European immigrants. (See Chapter 1, supra.). In a few cases, however, specific information was discovered on the foreign nativity of a volunteer, or of one or both parents.

[44] For example, Wiley 267-74; and see generally, Chapter 4 of this work.

[45] Wiley 263.

[46] Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church* (New York: Scribners, 1959) 507-11.

[47] Pre-war church attendance, and participation in Haines's "regiment" church, cannot be precisely determined. (See Chapter 4.) Though usually describing religious sentiment among the regiment's soldiers as "increased," "very marked," well-supported by the regiment's officers, and "pour[ing] out upon the regiment (63, 104-05, 124), even at peak participation Haines claimed only 130 men (out of about 500-600 at this point) "who [publicly] professed Christ." (124) This is generally consistent with scholarly overviews of nineteenth-century religious trends; see, for example, Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1977) 22-23. Douglas claims that although church membership was comparatively very high by the mid-nineteenth century, it was still low in absolute numbers (one in seven Americans), and that American Protestantism was already well on its

way to being "disestablished." Wily also points out that many wartime chaplains were unpopular in their regiments, and their services poorly attended. Much of course depended on the quality of the chaplain himself, and especially his willingness to share wartime risks and duties. (Haines clearly did this, and clearly was one the 15th's favorites.) Wiley 264-68.

[48] Research for this work did uncover evidence pointing to the *possibility* that at least one of the company's substitutes, Jacob D. Abrams, was Jewish. Abrams, a short (5'2"), dark-skinned, dark-haired individual, was born in Germany about 1841, and was single and working as a tailor in New York City when he joined the company in 1865. Soon after the war, he married Yetta Michaels (apparently in a church, but even that is not clear), and the couple moved to Brooklyn where Abrams continued to ply his trade as a tailor, working for an employer named Levi; the couple had 5 children.

[49] As mentioned in this chapter, Hunterdon County was initially populated by northern Europeans of predominantly Protestant background. Ranking of Protestant affiliation is deduced from available wedding data; see Chapter 4. These data also disclose only two identifiably Roman Catholic wedding ceremonies involving the company's original men, John P. Collins and Joseph E. Sullivan. (Several Catholic weddings appear among later substitutes, especially those of Irish lineage, and other data indicate the *possibility* of one substitute's Jewish background or affiliation; see preceding footnote.)

[50] Emery later reported that he entered the service as a Private, and there is no reason to doubt this; it is probable that he was either selected for promotion by the company's other two officers, or voted on by the men, shortly afterward.

[51] Numerous subsequent pension claims contain the affidavits of family doctors who had treated, or neighbors who had known, a man before the war, invariably stating that the man had been "fit" or "stout" (strong or robust, in the usage of the day) prior to the war, and well able to perform manual labor. (See, generally, Chapter 5 on men's pre-war health and pre-enlistment examinations.)

[52] Volo 99, no source cited; and RLACW 62, citing Gould.

[53] As mentioned above, in this section of Chapter 1, the number of the company's 100 volunteers for whom the relevant information could be determined is shown in brackets, thus: [23].

[54] The RLACW compiler also remarked on the "incomplete" nature of soldiers' height records (62).

[55] According to the National Institutes of Health, Company A's men enjoyed an excellent Body Mass Index (BMI) rating of 24.3, which is at the heavy or "stout" end of the "normal" (healthy) weight range for men of their average height. Prior to the war, they did not suffer significantly from either overweight or underweight conditions, and certainly not from the obesity that has assumed epidemic proportions among Americans today. See http://www.nhlbisupport.com/bmi/.

[56] Listings for later additions to the company included even more problematic categories, such as "ruddy", "red", and "sandy" to describe the complexion of three substitutes.

[57] Bilby 280-346.

[58] Heights ranged from 4'11" to 6', although reported height measurements during the era sometimes varied by as much as an inch for the same man. Weights ranged from 111 pounds, for the company's shortest man, to 220 pounds, for a man whose height was not recorded. (Weight was not recorded at enlistment, and is taken from first available post-war examinations, usually ten to twenty years later. Lifetime weight variation for the same individual appears to be less than that for modern American men). Civil War medical and military forms typically listed hue or color for three features: complexion, eyes and hair. Complexion hues listed for Company A's original men include fourteen "Fair"; six "Light", Pale" or "Sandy"; and four "Dark". (Since the men were initially examined toward late summer, the work environment of most would have exposed them for several months to outdoor sunlight, and the faces and necks at least of many were probably darkly tanned [there are virtually no depictions of shirtless men during the period]. Unless examining doctors judged complexion after clothing was removed, it is possible that these predominantly North European subjects were actually even fairer or lighter than described.) There were ten listed with "Grey" eyes, seven "Blue" (or "Blew"), four "Brown", two "Hazel" and one "Black". Fourteen men had "Brown" hair (including one "Light Brown"); eight "Dark" or "Black"; one "Light"; and one "Gray". ("Light" was apparently used at the time for "Blonde" or "Yellow" hair color, since the latter terms nowhere appear for this group.)

[59] McPherson 19-20.

[60] McPherson 19-20, and *fn* 18. With regard to American soldier literacy, Wiley concurs, writing that "[t]he average company in the Union Army [only] had from one to a half-dozen illiterates," a number which works out to a literacy rate for all Union soldiers of well more than 90%. Wiley 305-06 (no primary source cited).

[61] As mentioned in Chapter 1, of the company's 100 volunteers, 40 were reliably determined to be literate and 9 to be illiterate; the literacy of another 17, for whom a pension file or other significant

record does exist, could nevertheless not be reliably determined. No records were found for the remaining 34 men. A veteran was judged illiterate if he signed his name with an "X"; if the *only* instance of his writing was a poorly rendered signature, *and* accompanying, first-person text was done in a different hand; or if the file contained express evidence of illiteracy (typically, an examiner's statement that "claimant does not write."). Since some illiterate veterans were probably able to sign their names, it is possible that the reported literacy rate for Company A may actually be overstated.

[62] See, for example, Roscoe L. West, *Elementary Education in Jew Jersey: A History* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964) 1-2, 43-45; Robert D. Bole and Laurence B. Johnson, *The New Jersey High School: A History* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964) 28-58; and Nelson R. Burr, *Education in New Jersey, 1630-1871* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1942) 205-219. For an early and much rosier treatment of the development of education in New Jersey, see David Murray, *History of Education in New Jersey* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1899) 29-49.

[63] Use of the term, "common school," is confusing. It sometimes appears to have meant a "public" school, available to all "in common" and supported generally by property taxes levied on all property owners. In other instances, it appears to have referred to a local, elementary school open to anyone willing to pay a relatively modest tuition, but on an essentially private contract basis, with participating parents employing the teacher directly and setting the terms of employment. In either case, a nineteenth-century common school must be distinguished from the more expensive and exclusive "private" school or "academy," to which, as today, better off families could send their children to obtain a more rigorous education, preparing them for entry into professional training or a higher educational institution. At least two such private schools operated in Hunterdon County prior to the war, though only one Company A volunteer is known to have attended either. (See below, for the educational history of John R. Emery, who attended both of Hunterdon's known prewar private schools.)

[64] Bole and Johnson 19, quoting nineteenth-century public education reformer, Richard S. Field.

Writing in 1899, Murray relates an 1820 anecdote regarding New England's unflattering view of New Jersey's schools, and seeking to refute it. In the anecdote, a New England minister discourages a family from settling in New Jersey, because "...there are no good schools there," and "...most of [the teachers] are immoral." Murray counters with evidence of a very high (97%) literacy rate among 600 Revolutionary War-era residents of Middlesex County (as judged by ability to sign their name on post-war claims for destruction of property), concluding that "...the prejudice which commonly prevailed in New England against New Jersey...is unfounded." Murray 29, *fn*1.

[65] West 1, 28-29; Bole and Johnson 18; and Burr 218-19.

[66] In 1828, "The Friends of Education," a self-appointed committee of New Jersey worthies including former state Chief Justice, Charles Ewing, and former U. S. Senator, Theodore Frelinghuysen, surveyed the state of New Jersey's "common schools" and published a county-by-county report. For Hunterdon, a total of 900 children were reported to be "destitute of instruction," and in the only township for which specific figures survive (Tewksbury), only 104 of 254 children were receiving any schooling. Murray 154, 156.

As of 1850, Hunterdon had no free schools of any sort. The common schools charged students a quarterly tuition that averaged about $2.10 as of 1850, a considerable sum for a rural, farming family. West 30-31.

An 1899 statewide school facilities survey reports, somewhat cryptically, that Hunterdon County's "nearness to Trenton and to other educational centers has prevented it from developing any great amount of enterprise in this [educational] direction." The same year, Lambertville, the "largest and most important place in the county," had still failed to establish a public high school. Murray 80.

[67] Cornelius S. Conkling, *History of Schools in Hunterdon County, New Jersey*, ms. 1870, Hunterdon County Historical Society, Flemington. The fact that by 1870 there was such a county-wide official indicates growing recognition of the need for universal, taxpayer-supported schooling at the elementary level.

[68] Schmidt 268.

[69] Conkling 113.

[70] D.H. Moreau, ed., *Old Times in Hunterdon: A Collection of Articles and Historian Addresses Which Originally Appeared in Hunterdon County Democrat* (Flemington: Moreau self-pub., 1961) 14-16.

[71] Newspaper article published in 1883, by Edward L. Campbell, former Major in the regiment. Cited in Bilby 11, and *fn*408

[72] Philadelphia was a cultural leader in the colonies. Until 1830, it was the largest city in the United States; that year, it had a population of about 175,000, which grew rapidly to 566,000 by 1860. In 1698,

Philadelphia established the first public school in the America colonies. A corporation called "The Overseers of the Publick Schoole founded in Philadelphia" supervised the school, and directed that, "All children and servants, male and female, whose parents, guardians and masters be willing to subject them to the rules and orders of the said schoole, shall from time to time, with the approbation of the overseers thereof for the time being, be received or admitted, taught or instructed; the rich at reasonable rates, and the poor to be maintained and schooled for nothing." The first American theater company was also formed in the city in 1749. The city could even lay claim to sparking Justice's unusual interest in electricity, being the location where Benjamin Franklin, in 1752, conducted the first experiments in America demonstrating its existence and properties, and installing a lighting rod to protect a building.

[73] In 1826, a brick schoolhouse known as "The Academy" was established at Flemington, offering a classical curriculum. It reportedly lasted "a good many years". A "manual-labor school" was established in 1830 near Locktown, in the northwestern corner of Delaware Township, but failed "financially." A Baptist high school also opened in Flemington, in 1855, but closed "after a few years". Murray 81, 160.

[74] Boeman sold his valuable interest in the business when he left for the war, but it continued to prosper. The 1873 county atlas includes a partial directory for Flemington, which lists the firm under the new name of "Anderson, Nevins [sic], and Connett". Beers 58-61.

[75] While it is unlikely that many illiterate veterans undertook to become literate upon their return from the war, it is quite possible that a few learned to read and write during their three years of military service. Wiley, for example, records the emergence in some regiments of informal "schools," where literate soldiers could offer their less fortunate comrades "...the opportunity for repairing the defects of their early education...." Given the seasonal nature of Civil War campaigning, and the long winter adjournment of active hostilities with soldiers normally remaining in garrison throughout, such activity is quite plausible.

It is also possible that, as boys in the pre-war period, some future members of the company learned basic reading and writing skills in their churches, while attending "Sunday School," or were tutored by literate parents or other family members.

[76] While many of these tasks would normally have been performed only by the company's captain or his lieutenants, non-commissioned officers were expected to be able to assume such duties in the event of officer losses, and were the first to be considered for promotion into commissioned positions.

[77] In the 15th Regiment as a whole, several men had college and professional training. Edmund Halsey, for example, was the son of a well-to-do Morristown family, and entered as a Private in Company K (most likely the only private in the 15th with a uniform professionally tailored in Newark!) with the "understanding" that he would be immediately detailed to serve as Clerk to the Regimental Adjutant. Halsey had graduated from Princeton University. (Adjutants were essentially administrative and recording-keeping officers, serving in comparative safety and comfort as part of the regiment's headquarters staff.) The regiment's surgeons were also likely to have had a college education and some formal medical training; one of them was a Princeton classmate of Halsey's. The regiment's Major, Edward L. Campbell, was an attorney prior to the war.

[78] John T. Cunningham, *New Jersey; America's Main Road* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966) 172-189.

[79] See, for example, Michael E. McGerr, *The Decline of Popular Politics; The American North, 1865-1928* (New York: Oxford UP, 1986), especially 7, 12-13, and 211. The fifth party system was a creature of the Great Depression of the 1930s, and the country's profound political response to the crisis.

[80] Quoted in Joseph F. DiPaolo, *"A Hot Bed of Secession": New Hope and the Civil War* (Bedminster, PA: Adams Apple Press, 2001) 2. Elements in New Hope continued throughout the war to oppose it; in February, 1863, a delegation of 100 of its citizens petitioned the Pennsylvania legislature to seek a convention of Union states to assemble for the purpose of negotiating an end to the war. DiPaolo 14-15.

[81] Cunningham 170.

[82] Hubert G. Schmidt, *The Press in Hunterdon County, 1825-1925* (Flemington: The Democrat Press, 1960) 34.

[83] The county's first newspaper, the *Hunterdon Gazette*, had been established in 1826 by Charles George, a Philadelphian with newspaper experience. Beside purely local news, he promised the paper would "…contain a comprehensive summary of the latest and most comprehensive intelligence, foreign and domestic." It cost subscribers $2.00 per year, half in advance, provided they picked up the paper at its Flemington office. After a hiatus of about six years during which no county newspaper appears to have been published (1832-1838), a new editor recommenced issuing the Gazette, as "a paper which will combine, with the news and politics of the day, the latest agricultural, literary, and scientific

intelligence," and which would have " the character of a good family paper." The paper, which had begun its career being mildly supportive of Andrew Jackson, had by the late 1830s become moderately Whiggish in sentiment.

Two years later, in 1838, the Gazette encountered its first local competition, *The Hunterdon Democrat* , founded as a party organ by George Clinton Seymour. (In its first issue, Seymour proclaimed, "We commence today the publication of a weekly Journal, the title of which indicates the principles we shall endeavor to advocate.... A thorough and unflinching Democratic Journal...has long been required in this particular section of the state. * * * In hoisting the Democratic flag in 'Old Hunterdon,' charity would dictate that we warn our enemies of their entire downfall by the approach of these victorious principles over the oligarchical misrule and moneyed aristocracy...of the Federal whiggery...."

Spurred by the hurling of this gauntlet, and by their natural rivalry and race for advertisers and subscribers, the political cast of the two papers hardened: the Gazette now unabashedly Whig and the other an explicitly Democrat organ. Editorial argument partook of the verbal excess common to the period, the Democrat's editor soon accusing his competitor of being a "creature," a "swine," and, worst of all, "a blue hyena".

The 1850 census reported the Gazette's circulation at 840, and the Democrat's at 800.

In 1844, a third county paper, *The Telegraph*, got off to an uncertain start in Lambertville, under John R. Swallow; within a few years it had been sold and renamed The Delaware Valley Diarist. The paper was never a success. The Lambertville area of this period had not yet been significantly industrialized, and the area that Swallow canvassed for subscribers was farm country. As Schmidt explains, "Hunterdon's farmers were very conservative and close in that day [and] not many were willing to subscribe to a newspaper." The 1850 census reported only 400 subscribers for the Diarist and, unlike its Flemington counterparts, described the paper as primarily "literary" rather than political. It was, in the latter 1850s, sold again, becoming *The People's Beacon*. Schmidt, *The Press* 2, 12-13, 15-28.

[84] After the demise of the Whigs, the *Gazette* went on initially to support the Constitutional Union Party (successors to the American, or "Know-Nothing," party of the late 1850s), and then fixed on the "Douglas Democrats" in the election of 1860. It enjoyed a brief resurgence in the immediate post-war period, changing its name in 1866 to *The Democrat*, and the next year was merged with *The Hunterdon Democrat* to become *The Hunterdon County Democrat*. Under the new name, the paper survives to this day. Schmidt, *The Press* 35, 43.

[85] As quoted in Schmidt, *The Press* 30.

[86] McGerr 5.

[87] Gillette 62.

[88] Schmidt, *The Press* 35.

[89] Schmidt, *The Press* 36. Bartow's denial of Republican collusion was of course untrue, though Bartow may not have known it at the time. Brown had been encouraged and partly financed by a secret cabal of ardent abolitionists, mainly from Massachusetts; many were Republicans.

[90] Gillette 65.

[91] Stanley N. Worton, *Shaping New Jersey: A History of Its Government and Politics,* NJ Dept. of State, NJ History Ser. (Trenton: NJ Hist. Commission, 1997) 45.

[92] McPherson 803-04; Gillette 290-94. It is also fascinating to note the 15th Regiment's lukewarm feelings toward McClellan, who was of course a fellow Jerseyman. Haines managed a studied omission of the two crucial episodes of McClellan's life during the war years, even though he was in some quarters New Jersey "favorite son". Thus, when McClellan was relieved of command by Lincoln for a second and final time in October, 1862, Haines reports it in a single sentence, without emotion or comment. Lincoln's 1864 win, and McClellan's loss, Haines mentions not at all, passing over the November 8 election with the sentence, "Nothing of special interest occurred with us until the 9th of November, when we moved camp some seven miles, and halted...." This is circumspection indeed, even for the politic Chaplain. Haines 20, 287.

Bilby provides evidence that McClellan received very "mixed reviews" among the regiment's men, one Private writing home that his dismissal deserved to be "...greeted with joy throughout the north". Bilby 28.

[93] Schmidt, *The Press* 41.

[94] Gillete 323. The other three Copperheads were from Bergen and Warren counties, and the city of Newark.

[95] 2nd Inaugural Address; March 4, 1865.

[96] Vinovskis 3-7.
[97] RLACW 46.
[98] RLACW 46-47. Waterloo's figures were uncannily similar to Gettysburg's: it too involved opposing armies totaling about 150,000 men, and was fought over a three-day period with losses of about 20,000 on each side. (Waterloo took place in June, 1815, in Belgium, with Napoleon's French army pitted against the combined armies of Britain, under Wellington, and Prussia, under Blucher.) RLACW characterized the French-Russian Battle of Borodino, in1812, as the single "bloodiest battle since the introduction of gunpowder" (total dead and wounded approaching 60,000), but calculated that, in view of the much larger armies involved, Borodino's casualty *rate* "was very much less" than Gettysburg and Waterloo. These nineteenth-century records of military bloodletting endured until WWI. For artillery brought to bear at Gettysburg, see http://schwartz.eng.auburn.edu/ACW/arty/arty.html, and McPherson 662
[99] D. Scott Hartwig And Ann Marie Hartwig, *Gettysburg: The Complete Pictorial of Battlefield Monuments* (Granite Publications, 1988) 5-7.
[100] Robert L. O'Connell, *Soul of the Sword: An Illustrated History of Weaponry and Warfare from Prehistory to the Present* (New York; Free Press, 2002) 190-93. As O'Connell points out, the war's death toll was made worse by its tacticians' failure to respond to the new weapon's lethality; many key generals had learned their trade in the Mexican-American War, where much less accurate and reliable smooth-bore muskets were still used, and massed linear formations of infantry, and the bayonet charge, were the (successful) norm.

The carnage could have been much worse. By 1862, both a rugged "repeating" rifle (the seven-shot "Spencer"), and a 200-shot-per-minute prototype machine-gun (the "Gatling Gun"), were available for production. Both were turned down by the Union Army, on the ground they would consume too much ammunition in the hands of common soldiers. O'Connell 191, 195.
[101] A soldier of the 6th Alabama Regiment, cited in Robert K. Krick, "Confederates in Sharpsburg's Bloody Lane," Gary W. Gallagher, ed., *The Antietam Campaign* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1999) 232; which collection see generally for essays on the Battle of Antietam. Also, McPherson 539-45.
[102] RLACW 3.
[103] Converting nineteenth-century currency values to modern values is an uncertain enterprise. See discussion in Part II. A multiplier of 20 is used here and elsewhere for very rough estimates of current dollar value.
[104] The North named significant battles after nearby waterways (rivers, creeks, etc.), while the South named them after nearby towns or villages. Union names are given in this work, with the Southern name sometimes also given in parentheses.
[105] This was the Lincolns' 11-year-old, and youngest son, Willie, generally regarded to be unusually promising and his father's favorite. He had died, probably of typhoid fever, on February 20, 1862, six months before the 15th's arrival. The President, on first seeing his son's corpse, uttered, "It is hard, hard to have him die," and wept bitterly over the loss. Mary Todd Lincoln seems never to have recovered completely from the death. Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln, The War Years*, vol. 1 (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1939) 454-59.
[106] ROMNJ 697.
[107] A peculiar focus on the war dead, and on the business of burying them, has emerged in recent historical scholarship. Large claims have been made for the historical meaning of such things. In the Civil War context, for example, one recent major work went so far as to assert that "[d]eath created the modern American union," and that "[t]he work of death was Civil War America's most fundamental and most demanding undertaking." See Drew Gilpin Faust, *The Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Knopf, 2008). If historians are indeed "officers of the dead" (see Preface), Faust has put in for a generalship.
[108] Picket duty involved individual men being positioned at intervals along a line well forward of their unit's main line of troops, or defensive position. Its purpose was reconnaissance: to allow the commander to stay in contact with an enemy line, or to know of an enemy advance. If an enemy force assaulted, pickets normally fell back to join their main body of troops. The men in opposing picket lines often taunted each other, or simply conversed; at some points in the war, they even arranged temporary truces to trade scarce goods.
[109] Bilby 25.
[110] Haines 55, 63. According to Haines, the 15th NJ entered the battle on the morning of May 3 with 350 men, 154 of whom (44%) had become casualties by the end of the day. Of the 154, 28 were killed. See also Bilby 62-72.

[111] Bilby 68.
[112] This Maryland hamlet is mentioned in some local historical records found online, but has disappeared as a modern place name.
[113] Wiley 64; Bilby 54.
[114] Bilby 86, 412; and ROMNJ 701. (Haines missed this Company A casualty in his own narrative of the day's events, reporting no soldier killed and "only one man… seriously wounded." Haines 92.
[115] Bilby 88, quoting Kuhl's July 11, 1863, letter to his sister; and Vorhees's letter to the *Hunterdon Republican* newspaper, published July 24, 1863.
[116] Haines 106, 108. Chronic diarrhea continued to plague the unit that fall. By late September, Haines was recording in his diary, "The nights were very cool, and sickness - more particularly chronic diarrhea - attacked numbers of our men, and quite a deputation of sick men was sent to general hospital." Haines 109.
[117] Bilby 106-07, quoting from a *Hunterdon Republican* article of December 18, 1863.
[118] Bilby 109-10; Haines 125-6.
[119] Bilby 110.
[120] Haines 133.
[121] McPherson 732.
[122] Bilby 129-30; Haines 153.
[123] Haines 174-77. The oak tree in question, actually 22 inches in diameter, remains on display at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington. Gordon C. Rhea, *The Battles of Wilderness and Spotsylvania,* US National Park Service, Civil War ser. (Eastern Nat'l Park & Monument Assoc., 1995), 50.
[124] T. Harry Williams and Editors of *Life, The Union Restored,* The *Life* History of the US, vol. 6: 1861-1876 (New York: Time, 1963) 85.
[125] Quoted in Rhea 50.
[126] Company A Private James Bullock, a friend of Paul Kuhl, asked permission to retrieve his body from the battlefield, and later wrote that, "Paul's body was nearly riddled." Bilby 146.
[127] Haines 182. On May 18th, the regiment returned to the area of the Bloody Angle, and Haines led a group to see that "[a]ll our dead had been buried,…and after marking more permanently the graves of those we had buried on the night of the 13th," rejoined the unit. Haines 186.

Another example of the differences in rank observed in burial protocol occurred in May of the following year, when the regiment passed through the area of the Salem Heights fighting. Haines attempted to locate the graves of men of the regiment, and observed, "There were graves, but none of them marked, although when we were refused leave to enter their lines with a flag of truce, the Confederates promised *that all the graves of our officers* should be marked." Haines 315, emphasis added.
[128] Haines 205-06.
[129] Bilby 168, quoting letter of Dayton Flint to his sister, July 5, 1864.
[130] Haines 241, 253, 268, 282. The "field return" (daily report) on August 13, for example, gives 234 15th NJ men available for duty with the regiment (19 for Company A); on September 8, 175 for the regiment (14 for Company A); on September 23, 231 men (in addition to "a large number of unarmed recruits and some convalescents" unfit for duty); on October 19, the regiment "went into battle [Cedar Creek] with two hundred and fifty muskets, and came out with one hundred and seventy-eight." By September, Haines states, "As a regiment, with the exception of a few men of the old Fifteenth, and some transferred from the Second and Third Regiments, we were now mostly made up of recruits and substitutes." Haines 253.
[131] Bilby 237-38; Haines 306. According to contemporary reports, the sluggish steamer was caught in very severe winds, and the rolling of the ship caused kerosene and oil cans in the engine room to be thrown against the boiler, starting a fire that quickly spread. The ship burned to the water line, and other vessels responding to the disaster were only able to pick up a few survivors. Tragically, most of the passengers were escaped or paroled Union prisoners, or members of the discharged 11th Illinois Infantry Regiment, heading home. New York Times, 4/3/1865 and 4/14/1865; http://home.att.net/~florencestockade/genlyon.htm

It is unclear why Bullock and his (unidentified) "22 recruits" were aboard a steamer heading north (North Carolina to Virginia) instead of south. It is possible that the steamer's first port of call after departing New York was in North Carolina (to pick up the large contingent of former prisoners and the Illinois unit), and that Bullock et al. were to be dropped at Fort Monroe on its return trip, there to make their way inland to join Grant's army at Petersburg. The fort is situated at the mouth of the James River, the main water route inland to the Petersburg area.

[132] Bilby 245-46.
[133] Of those taken prisoner, none returned to service during the war. Some died in prison of wounds or disease, some were "paroled" during hostilities (allowed to return to the north in exchange for Confederate POWs, and for giving their word - "parole" - that they would not again bear arms in the war), and some were not released until the war ended.
[134] Transfers *out* of the company included: those promoted to commissioned officer rank (or existing commissioned officers promoted to higher rank), who were then assigned to other units in need of officers; enlisted men deemed unfit for front-line service, but fit enough for transfer to a "Veterans Reserve" unit; and replacements, especially late in the war, assigned to other units after serving some period with the company.
[135] About 200,000 Union men deserted, about 80,000 of whom (40%) were captured and many forced to return to duty. Increasingly as the war continued, apprehended deserters were shot, though many officers remained opposed to this punishment. Gerald F. Linderman, *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War* (New York: Free Press, 1987) 176-77.
[136] Estimate calculated by author, from detailed description in Haines of routes traveled throughout war (sometimes including mileages). This total is conservative, and does not include miles walked or hiked by men from camp or other stationary position to forage for wood, food, and water, or to perform other necessary details; and does not include miles marched in tactical maneuvering during campaigns. The men also were occasionally transported over significant distances, by train or river steamer. 2-1/2 miles an hour was (and still is, in contemporary US Army) considered standard walking or marching speed, with packs, and can be sustained for relatively long periods or distances by seasoned troops. See, for example, Coggins 23.
[137] **For example, [sights: no face, dangling arm, oozing brain, no head, blackened, bloated bodies] ; smells ["offensive" smells of rotting bodies; gunpowder?]; sounds [moans and screams, musketry, death rattles]; felt [officer being hit with guts, head]; taste [dust? Cartridges?]**
[138] Walt Whitman and Louisa Mae Alcott are two well-known examples.
[139] The 21st original surviving member, Abram Van Fleet, was excused from the review on June 22, because of a painful and disabling case of chronic diarrhea. The results of this condition, aggravated by a serious gunshot wound, would plague Van Fleet for the rest of his days. (See Chapter 5.)
[140] The text of the inscription was written by the deceased's cousin, Colonel Samuel Fowler, the original commanding officer of the regiment. Haines 8, 34.
[141] James M. McPherson *What They Fought For, 1861-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1994) 3.
[142] McPherson 27, 45, and Chapter 3 generally. George F. Forgie has provided an extended analysis of the Civil War generation's cultural and psychological predisposition to prove itself in combat, as worthy inheritor of the "heroic" legacy of the Revolutionary War generation. See *Patricide in the House Divided; A Psychological Interpretation of Lincoln and His Age* (New York: Norton, 1979)
[143] Linderman. Gender historian, E. Anthony Rotundo, argues that the Civil War's legacy of "manliness" and the "martial virtues" contributed greatly, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, to a culture of "life as warfare". *American Manhood: Transformation in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* New York: Harper Collins, 1993) 232-34.
[144] Reid Mitchell, *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and Their Experiences* (New York: Viking, 1988).
[145] Earl J. Hess, *The Union Soldier in Battle: Enduring the Ordeal of Combat* (Lawrence, Ks: UP of Kansas, 1997), esp. Chapters 4 through 8. Hess's challenge to Linderman is at page x.
[146] Stephen Crane, *The Red Badge of Courage* (New York: Dell, 1960 ed., 7th printing 1966; orig. Pub. 1895) 182.
[147] Wiley 39.
[148] Hess 95.
[149] Bilby located private letters sent by the following seven Company A volunteers: Pvt. David Anthony to a friend in 1862 and 1863; Pvt. James Bullock to a friend in 1864; Pvt. John Emery to unknown recipients (probably parents), date unknown; Sgt. George Justice to unknown recipient, undated; Sgt. Paul Kuhl to his sister and a friend in 1862, 1863, and 1864; Pvt. Andrew Starker to a friend in 1863; and Sgt. Lucien Vorhees to unknown recipient, date unknown. Bilby 18, 77, 88, 96, 119, 121, 146, 408, 411 -13, 412, 415, 417, and 423-4.

Haines refers to and quotes portions of an 1863 letter he received from Pvt. Martin Grassman, who was dying in hospital with severe diarrhea.

The ninth man whose letters survive is Lemuel Hockenbury (see supra).

[150] William had submitted the letters and diary in support of his claim that his son had been sending home money for his support before being dying of wounds received in the "bloody angle" fighting at Spotsylvania. The claim was approved after a long delay, but the letters and diaries were never returned to the father . The story of his application, and of what is known of Lemuel and William's lives, is told in Chapter 13.
[151] And see the comment by a Company H soldier (reported Chapter 2) that the "cind" of the prostitute (here meaning race) made no difference to "a soldier." While pragmatically egalitarian, the comment's implication of course is that black race might indeed make a difference to a white *non-soldier*, or in a black/white relationship of a different character than sex-worker/customer..
[152] Bilby, *Forgotten Warriors*, esp. Chapter 1. New Jersey's African-Americans certainly did serve in the war, however. According to Bilby's analysis, of nearly 5,000 service-eligible blacks in the state in 1860, nearly 3,000 joined either federal "colored" regiments led by regular (white) US Army officers, or other states' all-black regiments (particularly those of Pennsylvania and New York). For a comprehensive history of black soldiers in the Civil War generally, see Noah Andre Trudeau, *Like Men of War*.
[153] Bilby 7-8.
[154] RLACW 522-23.
[155] Trudeau 233-51, 424-30.
[156] Trudeau 156-69. According to Trudeau, one colored soldier, hearing about the massacre, wrote: "I do not wonder at the conduct and disaster that transpired at Fort Pillow. I wonder that we have not had more…."
[157] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedmen's_Bureau 2/20/08
[158] Wiley 37-38.
[159] Gillette 161.
[160] Bilby 5.
[161] Wiley 38.
[162] Haines 7-9.
[163] See, for example, D. G. Hart, "Conservatism, the Protestant Right, and the Failure of Religious History," *The Journal of The Historical Society* IV 4 (2006): 447-493. Hart, characterizing religious history as a subfield of "marginal standing," observes (citing David A. Hollinger) that: "The United States…[is]' the most Christian of the major industrialized nations of the North Atlantic West,' and yet its specialists in the history of Christianity play little role in the interpretation of that society.'" (452)
[164] Harry S. Stout, *Upon the Altar of the Union: A Moral History of the Civil War* (New York: Viking, 2006).
[165] Mitchell 77-78, 173-74. Mitchell's inventory of motives is essentially set out in Chapter 1.
[166] Linderman 83. Linderman's description of "courage" in mid-nineteenth-century America and the Civil War is set out mainly in Chapters 1 and 2 of his book.
[167] Hess 103-4. In the same chapter, Hess also identifies notions of both manly courage and ideology ("the cause") as motivating forces, thus supporting both McPherson and Linderman, but argues that motive is generally more multi-layered and complex than either of those two have suggested, and that religious factors should be included among the most important.
[168] Stout xx-xxii.
[169] Stuart McConnell, *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1992) 21, 182.
[170] Stout 37-38.
[171] This was a popular Biblical quotation among abolitionists, taken from Paul's Letter to the Hebrews, part of the Christian New Testament. The first three verses of the Chapter (King James Version) state: "Let brotherly love continue./Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angles unawares./Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; *and* them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body." William Lloyd Garrison, one of Brown's backers, had used the quotation in a well-known speech in 1854.
[172] Brian MacArthur, ed., *The Penguin Book of Historic Speeches* (London: Penguin, 1995) 355.
[173] Wiley 159-60. The 15th sang the song during its Shenandoah campaign with Sheridan, on August 10, 1864, "as we neared the [Charleston] courthouse where [Brown] was tried, and came in sight of the plain where he was executed." Haines 239-40. Richard Crawford, *The Civil War Songbook* (New York: Dover, 1977) vi-vii, 5, 9.
[174] Wiley 159-60. Wiley found that the "'Battle Hymn'…never gained among soldiers anything like the popularity of the original 'John Brown,'" which constituted "the number-one song in Federal camps."

[175] Lincoln later wrote that he believed the address would "wear as well as - perhaps better than - anything I have produced…." MacArthur 369-70.
[176] "Woe to the man by whom the offense cometh" is from the Book of Matthew, Chapter 18, Verse 7, and "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether" is from the Book of Psalms, Chapter 19, Verse 9.
[177] See Chapter 1 for account of African-Americans and slavery in Hunterdon County.
[178] Sandburg vol. III, 189.
[179] Sandburg vol IV, 361.
[180] Haines describes the Christian attributes of five Company A men killed in action or dying from wounds, which constitutes the only such data discovered for four of them. (The tenor of Haines's unit history, as well as his own pension file, also provide a good idea of the evangelical tilt of his wartime chaplaincy, and identify the denomination of the church he served after the war [Presbyterian]).
[181] September 1862 Letter of Paul Kuhl to his sister. Bilby 18.
[182] Haines 37. Haines always refers to his wartime congregation in nondenominational terms. (He himself was a Presbyterian minister, but one clearly imbued with "Methodism". See discussion, in text, infra.) It is always the "regimental church," or "the army church."
[183] The Christian Commission, founded in November, 1861, was the evangelicals' alternative to the "more secular and professional, Unitarian–based Sanitary Commission." Both these non-governmental organizations operated throughout the war using volunteers, and aided Army chaplains ministering to soldiers, proselytized, and augmented scarce supplies where possible. Stout 90.
[184] Being "received" meant joining the "regiment church" Haines has founded. Many of these had undoubtedly been baptized at birth, but subsequently "fallen away" from the church of their parents or local community - these would not have to have been baptized a second time. Only those never before baptized would have elected to undergo this sacrament, hence the smaller number than those joining.
[185] The sacrament of communion recapitulates the Biblical narrative of Jesus's teaching at the "Last Supper": his gathering with the twelve disciples the evening before he was crucified. In its usual Protestant version, worshippers solemnly eat bread or wafers symbolizing Christ's body, and drink wine or grape juice symbolizing his blood (the "memorials" of Christ), and are urged to "believe in him" and to recall his sacrifice for all humankind.
[186] Haines 284. Haines's meaning in choosing this text from the Book of Genesis is interesting. The clause quoted, "How dreadful is this place," would seem to refer to the ghastly battlefield that served as the venue for the church service. But in Genesis, the passage comes near the end of a familiar story in which Isaac's son, Jacob, sleeping alone in the wilderness, has a vivid dream of a ladder reaching from the ground up to heaven, with angels "ascending and descending," and with God at the top announcing that He would give Jacob the land on which he slept, and cause him and his "seed" to prosper there. Jacob awakes and is frightened by the dream, but decides the place is "the house of God" (Bethel) and the gateway to heaven, and then speaks the words quoted by Haines.

An archaic (but still used) meaning of the word "dreadful" is "inspiring reverence or awe," and it is likely that this was the meaning intended here. ("Dreadful" is the word used in the 1611 King James version of the Bible; the 2001 New Oxford Annotated Bible, for example, replaces the word "dreadful" in this passage with "awesome". That currently overused word now itself has connotations beyond the Oxford editors' intentions.) Possibly Haines used the passage quite intentionally, drawing on its connotative richness, suggesting the battlefield as a place of both overwhelming terror, and sacred gateway to God's heavenly mansion.
[187] Haines 309. The "Hallelujah Chorus" most likely refers to a chorus of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," mention in Chapter 2; each chorus repeats the refrain, "Glory, glory, halleluja," three times. The 96th Psalm, one of the psalms - or song poems - of the Hebrew Bible (Christian Old Testament), is a song of extravagant praise and rejoicing, familiar to Protestant church-goers ("O Sing unto the Lord a new song: sing unto the Lord all the earth…."). In Christian parlance, the "doxology" (literally, "praise words") refers to a 16th century Swiss hymn, with English lyrics ascribed to Thomas Ken (1637-1711); it has become one of the most familiar and commonly used songs of praise and thanksgiving in the Christian hymnal. ("Long metre" simply denotes the older - and slower - of two similar versions of the hymn's tune.) Most church-going Protestants in the ranks that day - and some others simply by association - would have known the two hymns, and probably the psalm, from memory.
[188] Bilby 17-18 (quoting Kuhl letter of September 22, 1862).
[189] The highly detailed atlas, published in 1873, shows one or more churches situated in nearly every village of any size. A total of eighty-six are depicted, over a third of which (thirty) are identified as Methodist Episcopal ("ME"). By this date, there are still only two Roman Catholic churches depicted in

the county: one at Lamington, and one at "Junction" (a burgeoning railroad town in Bethlehem Township, which no longer exists as a town or place name); Flemington's early Roman Catholic church is not shown, and may have shut its doors.

Schmidt states that "[t]he Presbyterians [were] the most numerous sect of the county" (249), but the source of his information and the time period to which he it applies are unclear. It is of course possible that Methodist-Episcopalian church congregations were more numerous but smaller in size, and that overall Presbyterian Church membership in the county was larger.

[190] **define terms**

[191] ME Church history adapted from Winthrop S. Hudson, *Religion in America, Fourth Edition* (New York: Macmillan, 1987) 74-5, 118-19, 129, 133.

[192] Hudson 134.

[193] Hudson 169-70.

[194] Book of John, Chapter 13, Verse 15.

[195] Frederick Herr, "Major Boeman," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter"* 16 1 (Winter 19__) 5.

[196] Frederick W. Rickord, ed., *Successful Men of New Jersey* (New York: NJ Hist. Pub. Co, 1896) 25; John Whitehead, *The Judicial and Civil History of New Jersey* (Boston: The Boston Hist. Co, 1897), 366-67; *Biographical and Genealogical History of Morris County, New Jersey* (New York: Lewis Pub, 1899) 161-63; Mary DePue Ogden, *Memorial Cyclopedia of New Jersey* (Newark: Memorial Hist Co, 1917) 53-57. Virtually all information for this Company A volunteer comes from these sources. Though he probably could easily have qualified at some point for a disability pension based on the long-term consequences of his dysentery (and though he certainly qualified for an age-based award when he reached 70 in 1912), Emery had the grace never to apply. He did not need the money, and may well have considered himself "undeserving" in a soldierly sense, which would have been to his credit.

[197] Tim O'Brien, *The Things They Carried* (New York: Broadway Books, 1990) 21-22.

[198] Antoine de St-Exupery, *Wind, Sand and Stars*, orig. pub. 1932, trans. By Lewis Galantiere, collected in *Airman's Odyssey* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1984) 192.

[199] Geoffrey Marks and William K. Beatty, *The Story of Medicine in America* (New York: Scribner's, 1973) 14, 98-113.

[200] Marks and Beatty 196-97. Apprentices had to have "competent knowledge of Latin and some initiation in Greek." Their "preceptors" (mentoring doctors) had to agree to train them for at least four years, for 100 pounds per year.

[201] Marks and Beatty 205.

[202] John Duffy, *The Healers: A History of American of American Medicine* (Urbana: University of Illinois P, 1979) 228-31.

[203] Wiley 23, 125.

[204] Wiley 337-38. The woman, "Albert Cashier," was probably a transvestite, as she was known to wear male clothing and assume a male identity both before and after the war. She served her entire three-year enlistment and participated in several campaigns. Known by comrades as quiet, reclusive, and of a "retiring disposition," she was honorably discharged and later pensioned (as a male). Her physical gender was not discovered until she was hospitalized in 1911!

[205] Duffy 208-14.

[206] Duffy 220.

[207] Duffy 220.

[208] "The [attack] formations used in the first years of the war were holdovers from the days when the infantry weapon was not accurate beyond 100 yards. No attempt was made to modify existing tactics…. Consequently the slaughter was as terrible as it was unnecessary." Coggins 24.

[209] Coggins 63-81.

[210] The "bacteriological revolution" – discovery of the link between bacteria and infection - has been called the most significant medical advance of the nineteenth century. Though fairly well-established among European researchers by the 1850s, American medicine did not completely and effectively adopt the idea till the 1880s and -90s. See, for example, Duffy 230-31.

[211] See, for example, McPherson 485 and *f*7, and sources cited therein. McPherson, in commenting on the disparity of death-from-wounds rates between Union and Confederate Armies, states that one reason may have been the alleged tendency of Confederate officers to report only more serious wounds, which resulted in a relatively higher count of wounded southern soldiers dying from reported wounds, compared with their northern counterparts. It is possible that, compared with other Union regiments, the rugged 15th New Jersey also indulged in the "manly" practice of reporting only more serious

wounds. Or perhaps they simply had the misfortune of being engaged in relatively sharper fighting, which had the effect of producing comparatively more lethal wounds.

[212] Both of the recorded shell fragment wounds were to the victim's thigh.

[213] McPherson 486. Of the 7 known wound sites of company men killed in action or who died of their wounds, 2 were shot through the head (Isaac Dayton and David Hicks), and probably died relatively quickly. Lambert Boeman, astride his horse and commanding a regiment, was shot in the heart or abdomen ("lower chest"), uttered one remark (reportedly, "Carry me off," and promptly expired; his body was not recovered till the next day. Paul Kuhl was shot first in the thigh and knocked down, and then suffered multiple additional gunshot wounds while lying in an exposed position trying to staunch the bleeding with a tourniquet. James Apgar received a serious leg wound requiring amputation, from which he expired a week later. While fetching water at Gettysburg, Isaac Cathrall was shot in the back and groin area, "the ball traveling into the bladder." He was shipped to a hospital in Philadelphia, where he died in about 10 days. Joseph Runkle, while acting as color bearer, was shot three 3, the balls penetrating his "breast," "arms," and "side of body"; he nonetheless lived for almost 4 more weeks.

[214] Haines, for example, reports that Lieutenant George Justice was "shot by one of the skulking prisoners" taken at the Bloody Angle fighting as he rose waving his sword on the breastworks, whereupon the prisoner "was in turn run through by the bayonet of a man from Company A." Haines 175.

[215] Haines 145-46. Company A's fighting that day took place only about 60 miles from the capital as measured along the likely evacuation route: about 18 miles by horse-drawn ambulance along principal roads to Fredericksburg/Falmouth (4 hours); 9 miles by train, to Aquia Landing (1/2 hour); and 34 miles by riverboat, along the Potomac to the capital (5-6 hours).

[216] The substantial scholarly literature on this subject includes sources mentioned in Chapter 4, such as, generally, Linderman, Hess, Mitchell, and Rotundo.

[217] This number, 36, is developed from wartime records only, and may be slightly understated. Several war survivors later claimed to have suffered from wartime illnesses and injuries that were not reflected in Company A or Surgeon General records. While some of these claims were probably the result of active imaginations and desire for a pension, others were probably truthful.

[218] McPherson 485-86.

[219] Duffy 216-18.

[220] William H.L. Dornette, ed., *Illustrated Stedman's Medical Dictionary, 5th Unabridged Lawyers' Edition* (Cincinnati: Jefferson Law Book Co, 1982) 524, 1507.

[221] Dornette 431.

[222] Dornette 1267.

[223] Today "rheumatism" is medically defined as "an indefinite term applied to various conditions with pain or other symptoms which are of articular [joint] origin or related to other elements of the musculoskeletal system." Though no longer in professional use, it carried this meaning in the nineteenth century. (The term is also "an obsolete word for rheumatic fever," which is a specific condition resulting from bacterial infection, and leading often to dangerous cardiac complications; the term did not carry this meaning during the period in question.) Dornette 523, 1232.

[224] Even so, reviewing doctors in the latter nineteenth century, faced with a proliferation of claims based more or less solely on "rheumatism," began to question its usefulness as a diagnostic category. In the sympathetic case of William Clark, for example (see below), a medical board in 1885 recommended against an award on that basis alone. (Clark was already receiving a modest pension for having had his upper teeth knocked out by a wartime prisoner, and was seeking an increase based solely on "rheumatism.") The board reported that Clark's rheumatism-related complaints were "entirely subjective," and they could find no objective evidence of adverse changes in his heart, musculature, etc., on which to base a medical finding or "rate" disability.

[225] McPherson 487-88.

[226] McPherson 485; Duffy 207.

[227] Gerber 163.

[228] Dornette 642.

[229] A more detailed account of the charge and of Bellis's fall and injury is set forth in the January 27, 1883, affidavit of his fellow soldier, William Barber, who also stumbled and fell in the cornfield ditch. See pension claim file of Theodore Bellis.

[230] Dornette 1534.

[231] Welsh was somewhat unique among the men of the company, with little attachment to Hunterdon County. He was born in New York City and orphaned early in life, at which point he was taken to

Pennsylvania (probably by relatives) and grew up farming. At some point, he moved across the Delaware into lower Hunterdon County (Delaware Township, probably Rosemont), where he was living as a bachelor at enlistment. He initially returned to New Jersey at the close of the war, but within two years moved to Maryland, where he married (3 times!) and remained for the balance of his life. He was evidently a loyal Grant man, naming his first son, born March 1, 1879, Ulysses S. Grant Welsh. (Grant had been president from 1869 to 1877.) Whether out of premature desire for an "old age" pension, or innocent lack of information, he was never able to establish the year of his birth to the satisfaction of the authorities; at different times, Runyon gave it as 1840 and 1844. (See Chapter 6 for Welsh's story.)

[232] In 1881, the examining doctor reported (with uncharacteristic resort to professional jargon): "Has external hemorrhoids in a moderate degree. Curable by ablation [surgical removal]. Did not originate from his service, but from diathesis [predisposition; inborn defect]. In my opinion there is no disability."

[233] Bilby 3.

[234] *New York Times* 4/3/1865; information about ship's manifest, including listing of Bullock and "22 [unnamed] recruits," at http://home.att.net/~florencestockade/genlyon.htm.

[235] Walt Whitman, "O Captain! My Captain!" (orig. pub. 1866), *Walt Whitman Selected Poems* (New York: Gramercy Books, 1992) 211.

[236] The stethoscope was invented in France in 1816 by R. Laennec and was standardized in Europe by the 1850s, but was not in common use in The U.S. until the second half of the nineteenth century.

[237] Total claims in each of the three categories (53) exceed total first-time claims (48) because a few claims asserted more than one wartime condition.

[238] Dornette 663.

[239] The problematic nature of painful scar tissue was noted in 1889 by GAR Surgeon General, Horace Porter:

> The subject…needs abundant ventilation; hundreds of our comrades are drawing a pension of four (4) to ten (10) dollars per month for gunshot wounds, who are entitled to from twelve (12) to thirty (30)…for resulting painful cicatrix and the chain of nervous disabilities which accompany it.
>
> SG, GAR, Circular Letter No. 1; Topeka, Ks, 12/28/1889

[240] In 1889, the GAR SG also called for legislation especially aimed at compensating "the heart disease which is now so alarmingly prevalent among the surviving soldiers of the late war." SG, GAR, Circular Letter No. 1; Topeka, Ks, 12/28/1889

[241] His "Increase Applications" were filed in 1876 (rejected; Attorney Kuhl); 1879 (approved for $10 after initial rejection; Attorney Rusling); 1887 (rejected; Attorney Hunter); 1888 (approved for $12; Attorney Morris); 1889 (approved for $14; Rusling); 1890 (rejected; Rusling); and 1891 (rejected; Rusling). Danberry died in 1895.

[242] The lodged or "embedded" ball theory now seems bizarre, but perhaps that is only with the benefit of having access to medical assessments covering 43 years of the veteran's life. By 1879, sixteen years after being struck, Hoffman's wound appears to have healed well for the most part, and the only sign of the gunshot's original *exit* wound may have been his lost and crumbling teeth, remarked upon by several medical boards. (Essentially, the ball had exited through his mouth.) Thus Paterson and others failed later to detect any exit wound, and some concluded from this that the ball must still be somewhere inside Hoffman's trunk. (The 1906 medical board also found "no exit scar," but noted that "teeth are in a poor condition.")

[243] Hoffman's graphic language reflects experience and knowledge common to farmers of the era, who typically butchered at least some of their own livestock, and had a basic grasp of internal anatomy.

[244] Haines wrote that the day "was intensely hot. The enemy shelled us in the morning from their batteries near the town [of Petersburg]. One man was wounded from …the Fifteenth, who was in the provost [military police] guard. At one time the shells were bursting all around us." Haines 219.

[245] Dornette 677.

[246] If a pensioner died without leaving a widow or *minor* child, or assets sufficient to pay his last debts (which was the case with Barber, even after applying the insurance proceeds), a person bearing the expenses of the pensioner's last illness and burial was eligible to receive any accrued but unpaid pension payment due the pensioner. In Barber's case, his last pension payment ($48 for 3 months) had been paid in January, and when he died in April, a total of $42.40 in accrued prorated pension payments were due him. This was the amount paid to Sperry, but it did not cover his total outlay.

[247] Probably "Dorrington," as no "Dovington" exists in Shropeshire. This landlocked county is located in Wales, in west central England. Dorrington is southwest of the county seat, Shrewsbury.

[248] Company A's John Butler, Jr. was therefore not Butler Sr.'s child. Moreover, the former enlisted from a different town in Hunterdon County than the latter; was born before any of the latter's three children; and gave his birthplace as Hunterdon County, not England.
[249] Dornette 1100.
[250] Mary Eliza Mattison's age is not known, but she was married to James in 1869, twenty years before Samuel's birth. James was 26 years old at the time of the marriage, and it is unlikely his wife was younger than 20. According to the Company A average, she would have been about 24.
[251] Mattison may well have suffered from tuberculosis, a highly contagious disease when in an active, untreated stage, and may in turn have infected his daughter. Though the effectiveness of isolating patients in sanatoria was known (and being practiced) in Europe by the time Mary Bell died in 1889, the widespread construction of such facilities in the U.S. would not begin to occur until a decade or so later.
[252] By 1900, Van Camp was complaining to board doctors of "dizziness in head, occasional attacks of diarrhea, loss of memory, rheumatism in my right shoulder, distress over my left breast & shortness of breath." The report of the 1900 board at Doylestown is a good example of the advances made by the end of the nineteenth century in the art of medical examination and diagnosis. It is remarkably detailed, includes a diagram of the regions of Van Camp's leg and wrist fractures, and is typewritten.
[253] The Doylestown board appears to have been more liberal than some other boards in crediting veterans' claimed disabilities. In this, Trauger's experience was similar to Van Camp's, narrated above.
[254] *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970* (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975 ed.)
[255] Michael R. Haines and Roger C. Avery, "The American Life Table of 1830-1860: An Evaluation," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Summer, 1980) 73-95.
[256] Robert W. Fogel, "New Sources and New Techniques for the Study of Secular Trends in Nutritional Status, Health, Mortality, and the Process of Aging," *Historical Methods* 26, No. 1 (Winter 1993) 29-32.
[257] This statistical average only includes company men who both reached age 20, *and* also survived the war, war exposure being an unusual and highly lethal variable that would not apply to most members of the larger group. For this unusually high-casualty unit, incorporating those who died in the war into overall life expectancy for the men would have lowered the average to about *46* years of age.
[258] Cited in Fogel 27.
[259] Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Oxford UP, 1985) 28, 54-55, 60-61.
[260] Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1981) 13-15.
[261] Smith-Rosenberg 13.
[262] Smith-Rosenberg 61.
[263] Ryan 17.
[264] Smith-Rosenberg 13.
[265] Jeanne Boydston, *Home & Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford UP, 1990) xvii. Boydston's work focuses on the prewar period of the nineteenth century, but her general comments accurately characterize the latter part of century as well, especially for the rural and agricultural sectors of U.S. life.
[266] Boydston 88, 93.
[267] Michael Grossberg, *Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1985) esp. 1-63. Much of the discussion in this section is taken from this fine work, which benefits from the author's background as a trained attorney as well as historian.
[268] For other treatments of American matrimonial law in the nineteenth century, see Elaine Tyler May, *Great Expectations: Marriage and Divorce in Post-Victorian America* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980), Norma Basch, *In the Eyes of the Law: Women, Marriage, and Property in Nineteenth-Century New York* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982), and Nancy Cott, *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000). And see comment on the limited sources generally relied on by these historians, in Chapter 15.
[269] 29 deceased single men, 13 deceased married men, and 54 survivors, add up to only 96 soldiers. The other 4 were deserters, so that while the pre-war marital status for them is known (they were all single), there is no other information regarding their wives or marriages, or whether they even survived the war.

[270] This generic phrase was often used to describe the officiating minister, and appears simply to have signified an ordained person, without indicating denomination.
[271] Current (2003) life expectancy at birth for white Americans is about 75 for males and 80 for females (these ages each rise about a year for men and women surviving to age 20). As in the Civil War era, grooms are still on average about two years older than their brides, at first marriage. Accordingly today, married women may expect to outlive their husbands by an average of about 7 years. Data from U.S. Census; life expectancy tables reported at:
http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/datawh/statab/unpubd/mortabs/lewk3_10.htm, and age-at-marriage at:
http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/fertility/slideshow/table01.csv
[272] Dornette 758-60.
[273] According to the 1870 national census. See, for example, US Bureau of the Census, Series A 255-53, "Selected Characteristics of Households: 1790-1957, v. 11 in *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957* (Washington, D.C., 1960) 16. Lawrence Kreiser's detailed study of the post-war lives of members of the 103rd Ohio Volunteer Infantry Regiment revealed a smaller average family size of only 2 children per family, but his sample is for 1870 when the regiment's veterans had been married, on average, for only about five years.
[274] Private Alfred Bellard, originally a volunteer in the 5th New Jersey Regiment, was wounded at Chancellorsville and ultimately transferred to a VRC unit in Washington the fall of 1863, the same area and about the same time as Hoffman. Bellard later wrote his memoir of his days in the service, and the portion dealing with his days in the capital provides a humorous and frank account of day-to-life in the VRC at that time. There was near-constant drinking and debauchery, according to Bellard, and his company was often detailed to perform provost (military police) duty, rounding up drunken soldiers, clearing out brothels, and containing fights. David Herbert Donald, ed., *Gone for a Soldier: The Civil War Memoirs of Private Alfred Bellard* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co, 1975) esp. chaps XVI and XVII.
[275] Margaret Leech, *Reveille in Washington: 1860-1865* (New York: Harper & Bros, 1941) esp. chaps XI and XIII.
[276] Although the sample is of course small, there does not otherwise seem to be a correlation between a wife's longevity and a higher than average number of children produced, at least among the wives of Company A men. Of the 9 women in the sample (of 46) bearing 4 or more children, 5 outlived their veteran husbands.
On other hand, childbirth could be dangerous. William Clark's first wife, Annie Ewing, died a month after their first child was born, at the age of 20.
[277] Hoffman enlisted from Old Germantown in Tewksbury Township, and returned to that area after the war to work at farming. Although he would move away to live with a son in old age, there remain today numerous Hoffman families in Tewksbury, many of them farmers until recently. One of them, Terry Hoffman, served as mayor during the 1980s. (Author's personal knowledge, as former resident.)
[278] Though not one of Company A's original volunteers, a recruit named William Gulick, who joined the company on February 25, 1864, produced two pre-marital children with his future wife, Julia Anne (née Frazy) Sutton. William and Julia's story is interesting on several accounts, and is related here.

When she met William, Julia was still lawfully married to another 15th New Jersey soldier, Peter J. Sutton, of Company F, but apparently no children had been born of this marriage. (The date of her prior marriage to Sutton is unrecorded, but she must have been quite young at the time; she was only about 13 when the war broke out, and about 17 when it ended. Sutton enlisted in August, 1862, and expired during the war. Unless he returned at some point on furlough to marry Julia [very unlikely], she would only have been about 14 when they wed.)

Sutton was listed as missing after the Regiment's engagement at Winchester, Virginia, on August 17, 1864. Official post-war records, however (NJROM, published in 1876) reveal that Sutton was captured in that action, and died about 2 months later, on October 18, 1864, at Lynchburg, Virginia, and was buried in nearby Poplar Grove National Cemetery. Julia, and Peter's comrades, apparently received no subsequent government information about Peter's death and were unaware of the NJROM entry; the affidavits of 2 comrades, filed with the Pension Office in support of Julia's pension application in the early 1880s stated simply that he was taken prisoner at Winchester and "never heard from again."

Gulick and Sutton appear to have been from the same area; Gulick lived his entire post-war life in and around northeastern Hunterdon County, and Sutton joined a company that was raised just over the county line from that area, in Chester, New Jersey (Morris County). It is probable that the 2 had been acquainted before the war, and that Sutton also knew young Julia before he enlisted. They were

both poor and illiterate. (Gulick was also quite young: only 16 or 17 when he joined the company in 1864, very close to Julia's age.) In any case, relatively soon after returning from the war in June of 1865, and certainly before the close of that year, William and Julia began their own romance. It resulted in their first child, Mary, who was born on August 12, 1866, and a second, Ada, born June 25, 1868. They were married 2-1/2 months following the second birth, on September 4, 1868. The marriage was performed in German Valley (now Long Valley), just west of Chester, not by a minister, but by David Welsh, IV, listed as "Justice of the Peace." (Under the circumstances, a religious or church marriage may have been ruled out, although this is not certain; civil marriages were quite unusual among Company A's men.) William was by this time about 21, and Julia about 20.

The couple went on to have 4 more children over the next eleven years. William, a farm hand and laborer, died suddenly in an accident on August 24, 1881. He was then only about 34 (32 according to one source), and he and his family were still living in the German Valley area (probably in Fairmount, in Tewksbury Township; he was laid to rest in the "Methodist burial yard at Fairmount" on August 29.) Gulick had been working in the trench of a surface iron mine at Hacklebarney (many such mines were sprinkled throughout northern Jersey at the time), and the trench caved in, crushing and asphyxiating the veteran. According to a fellow worker Isaac Emmons, "[I] was working with him at Hacklebarney mines at the time he was killed by the mines caving in…. [H]e was instantly kill and buried under a mass of rocks and was not excavate until two day afterward."

The episode must have been horrible, not only for poor Gulick but for his young wife and children as well, who undoubtedly rushed to the scene. Philip Yawger, the undertaker, confirmed that the victim had been completely "covered" by the cave-in, and his body not recovered for "two days & two nights." The weight of the collapsing rock had been enough to disfigure William's features. His family doctor "from childhood," Eliphulet C. Willet, M.D., stated that, "I was there while he was under the rock and debris and immediately after he was taken out, and assisted in laying him out [preparing him for burial] and putting the head and face in shape…."

Julia passed away a few years later, on June 17, 1887 (age about 39), while living "at home" in Chester. (Possibly the young, twice-widowed wife was now too heart-broken to go on.) She left behind all 6 children, ages 9 to 21.

Gulick had applied for a pension before he died, but his local attorney had done little to pursue it. In 1893, six years after Julia's death, an aggressive new law firm, McNeil & Birch (based in Washington, DC) managed to obtain a significant amount of accrued pension moneys for the now long-deceased soldier, payable from his 1865 discharge date. The money was distributed to William and Julia's children, all 6 of whom were still living. (The desultory performance of the prior attorney, Willard Cutler of Morristown - *begun for William in 1879* - had failed over more than a decade to produce any results for either William or, after he died, for Julia, his widow.) McNeil & Birch also arranged for a guardian to be appointed to receive and disburse *prospective* pension moneys to which Julia's 3 children under the age of 16 continued to be eligible. (Gulick's accrued benefits totaled $1,600, or $260 per child [about $5,000 today], and the guardian began to receive $2 per month for each of the 3 minor children).

[279] Boydston 93.

[280] "Housework" is noted on Larien Cregur's 1937 death certificate as her "occupation." She had just turned 84 and was still living in her marital domicile, Glen Gardner. It is possible, of course, that the certificate informant meant only to indicate she had been a homemaker throughout her adult life, and that she did not earn wages from such work.

[281] McPherson 464-68.

[282] Grossberg 242-43.

[283] See, for example, Smith-Rosenberg, who appears to attribute much of the sea change in women's history to her own work. Smith-Rosenberg 30-31.

[284] The documents are rich, however, in depictions of all-male "subcultures," particularly those of comrades-in-arms (Chapter 3), and the GAR (Chapter 9), and in a few instances they portray male-female worlds (mother-son, father-daughter, wife-husband, and sister-brother). One all-female group and subculture suggested but not well described in the documents was the women's counterpart of the local GAR post, the Flemington chapter of the Women's Relief Corps (Chapter 9).

[285] See, for example, Nell Irvin Painter, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States. 1877-1919* (New York: Norton & Co, 1987), and David Montgomery, *The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1987).

[286] Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: Norton & Co, 1978), esp. chap. 1.

[287] Hunterdon County is bordered in New Jersey by the Counties of Warren (north), Morris (northeast), Somerset (east), and Mercer (south); and in Pennsylvania, immediately across the Delaware River, by Bucks County (west). The northwestern corner of Hunterdon also touches the southeastern corner of Northampton County, Pennsylvania, though the two do not share a border.

[288] Regrettably, there is no comprehensive history of New Jersey's 2 Soldiers and Sailors Homes, or of northern state homes in general. (Virtually every Union and Confederate state established one or more homes for Civil War veterans in the post-war period.) The federal government also created veterans' homes, starting in 1865, that eventually grew to a total of 9. Initially referred to as branches of the "National Asylum," the name of the federal institution was later changed to the "National Home." See Patrick J. Kelly, *Creating a National Home: Building the Veterans' Welfare State, 1860-1900 (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997).*

[289] See Chapter 11 for discussion of widow's migration patterns following the death of their veteran spouses, and place of residence at time of death. More often than not, widows, who were much less likely than veteran widowers to remarry, resided for the balance of their lives in the same town (often at the same address) where they resided at the time of their husband's death (59%). About 75% of the company's widows died in New Jersey; 31% in Hunterdon County. Two widows are known to have died in a New Jersey Soldiers and Sailors Home.

[290] Washington, which had been part of a larger "Oregon Country" territory jointly occupied by Britain and the United States, was ceded to the U.S. by treaty in 1846. It was thereafter settled by migrating easterners, and was admitted to the Union as a state in November, 1889, the same month that John Collins, together with his wife, relocated there from their previous home in Newark, New Jersey.

[291] Burns variously reported his date of birth in Ireland as June 15, *1841* and June 15, *1845*. When his date of birth became an issue in subsequent pension filings, he claimed the church where he had been baptized had "burned" and no records survived. A mid-point date of birth (1843) has been used for all age estimates.

[292] Though generally recognized at the time as a lawful form of marriage, common law arrangements were widely attended by a certain stigma of inferiority. The printed pension increase application form in use in 1877, for example (one of which was completed by Burns), contains the following instructional text:

> Widows and children of Colored Persons and Sailors are entitled to pensions provided by law without other proof [of marriage] than that the parties had habitually recognized each other as man and wife, and lived together as such: *Provided, however*, When the usual proof of marriage can be furnished, it will be required as in other cases.

[293] The author's conclusion, based on the detailed description and diagram provided by the Easton board in 1887 and on the circumstances of the battle itself, is that Burns was indeed struck 3 times, as his army discharge record indicated and as he himself insisted. Burns was probably struck first in the right shoulder, while in an upright position facing the enemy, the ball passing through his shoulder horizontally. This strike would likely have knocked him to the ground or, if it did not, would likely have prompted him to hit the ground in a prone (chest down) position, still facing the enemy. I believe he was then struck in the upper right buttocks, by a ball that passed through about 3 inches of his right gluteus muscle and exited, leaving what was described as an "irregular 1-1/2 x 1 in[ch] slightly depressed" scar, the largest of any of Burns's 5 battle scars. At this or some later point, as Burns crawled around to withdraw from the field while still in a prone position (but now with his back, or feet, to the enemy), he was most likely struck a third time, the ball entering the bottom portion of his right buttocks, near the anus. This ball was either later removed by a field surgeon (after probing for the ball via the exit wound caused by the second shot), or (as Burns believed) left where it had lodged, in his right leg or hip.

[294] The "town" of Flemington was "formed" within Raritan Township in 1870, became officially known as the "village" of Flemington in 1894, and separated from the township, becoming an independent "borough" by referendum in 1910. Each municipal category (township, town, village, borough) has particular legal attributes under state law. See, John P. Snyder, *The Story of New Jersey's Civil Boundaries* (Trenton: NJ Bureau of Geology and Topography, 1968). Danberry's pension records all indicate he was born in, enlisted from, returned after the war to, was residing during each of his several medical exams at, and ultimately died and was buried in, "Flemington."

[295]Information concerning Northern Pacific Railroad history and development from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northern_Pacific_Railway, 3/15/08

[296] Other potential sources of asset information that were *not* reviewed for this project include county real estate and probate (estate) records, and census records.

[297] The relative occupational composition of the company's survivors is comparable to that of the original company as a whole (see Chapter 1), although for purposes of this post-war job trend study, I have included "farm hands" and "farm laborers" with "laborers," rather than with "farmers." The comparable occupational breakdown for all 100 original volunteers is as follows (survivors' breakdown in parentheses): *all* farm workers and laborers, together, 58% (52%); tradesmen/mechanics, 36% (42%); "commercial pursuits" (clerks, businessmen, salesmen, etc.), 5% (4%); professional, 1.6% (2%). See Chapter 1.

The distinction between farmer and farm hand or farm laborer is imprecise. Contemporary and modern compilers both lump them together, which does set up a useful category in terms of Civil War soldiers' rural or agricultural *background* and work *experience*. However, in terms of soldiers' pre-war (or immediate post-war) economic and social *status*, and possibly even motivation to improve one's "situation," it was founds more useful to distinguish "farmers" - a term implying at least some degree of land ownership and a greater degree of commitment to the farming enterprise - from farm "hands" or "laborers" - terms implying hired, seasonal, wage-earning work, performed for a farm-owner. In that sense, it seemed better to group such hired farm workers with other self-described "laborers." The career trend patterns discerned among Company A's surviving men support this allocation.

[298] Post-death affidavits indicate total assets of about $2,800 ($2,300 in real estate, and $500 in personal property), against which there was a mortgage debt of about $5,000.

[299] Homeopathy was one of a variety of standard nineteenth-century medical theories or systems which today seem bizarre. Its central tenet was that sick patients should be treated with small doses of items that would, in healthy persons, produce the same symptoms suffered by the ill patient. (Hence the term "homeopathy," literally, "like sickness" in its Greek roots.) In an era that lacked a theory or understanding of bacteriology or sepsis, this was no stranger than bleeding with leeches, the four humors theory, or the "science" of phrenology.

[300] Bledstein 34, 84-86, 191-93.

[301] This quote, and other background information on Emery, from *Biographical and Genealogical History of Morris County, New Jersey* (New York: Lewis Pub., 1899); and Mary DePue Ogden, *Memorial Cyclopedia of New Jersey* (Newark: Memorial Hist. Co., 1917).

[302] Kermit L. Hall, *The Magic Mirror: Law in American History* (New York: Oxford UP, 1989) 218.

[303] Quoted in Arthur E. Sutherland, *The Law at Harvard: A History of Ideas and Men, 1817-1967* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1967) 140.

[304] Sutherland 142.

[305] San Patricio's history is taken from, "The Handbook of Texas Online," a Texas Historical Association website, updated to 12/4/2002. http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/SS/hls13.html.

[306] There is no indication in the veteran's pension file of any further government-ordered medical examination after the initial one in 1882. Although such examinations were sometimes waived in cases of clear injury and disability with no practical prospect of improvement, it is surprising in this case because Sullivan must have applied for an increase about the year 1890, based presumably on a worsening condition. Possible explanations are that the pension office liberalized its requirement for periodic examinations later in its existence - the 1890s were the heyday of pension claims - or that it was more inclined to waive them for veterans living in parts of the country where doctors were few and far between, and where the hardship to disabled veterans required to travel great distances to be examined would have been significant (e.g., from San Patricio to Austin, Texas).

[307] Labor historian, Nell Irvin Painter, has pointed out that "[f]igures on the distribution of wealth (property) and income (wages, salaries, rents, and dividends) are hard to come by for the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, before the income tax made such statistics available." In her book, *Standing at Armageddon*, Painter nevertheless developed a table of wealth and income distribution among "poorer," "middle," "well-to-do,'" and "wealthy" classes in the United States, based on an 1896 work by Charles B. Spahr. The table assigns families in 1890, with less than $500 of annual income and average wealth of $150, to the poorer class; and those with annual income of $500 to $5,000, and average wealth of $1,500, to the middle class. Painter xix-xx. On this basis, the Sullivan family would qualify as income poor but tending toward middle class by property owned. It should be remembered, too, that any farming or ranching family in this era, as distinct from urban or other wage-earning families, probably produced most of the food it consumed, made many of the things it used, and built many of its own homes and other structures. Such families may also have been more likely to barter than to pay cash for needed items. Income alone, then, may be a less-than-adequate measure of class standing in this transitional period in American life.

[308] See, for example, Theda Skocpol's extended discussion in *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1992) especially chap. 2, ""Public Aid for the Worthy Many: The Expansion of Benefits for Veterans of the Civil War," 102-51; and Costa chap. 8, "Pensions and Politics," 160-87. A useful, but damning, popular account of the system is contained in Richard Severo and Michael Lewis, *The Wages of War: When American Soldiers Came Home - From Valley Forge to Vietnam* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989) especially Part Three, "The Civil War," 119-86.
[309] Skocpol 102.
[310] Conversions of nineteenth-century dollar amounts to current dollars are unreliable, except in a very general sense. Equivalents in this work are estimates based on two conversion sources: the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis' "Consumer Price Index (Estimate) 1800-2008," (based in turn on U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics), found at http:minneapolisfed.org/economy/calc/hist1800.html, 3/24/08); and "Inflation Conversion Factors for Years 1700 to estimated 2002," by Robert C. Sahr, Political Science Department, Oregon State University (http://backissues.cjrarchives.org/resources/inflater.asp as of 3/24/02). The two sources produce results that vary from 0% to 20% for a given year. Generally, mid- to latter-nineteenth-century dollar amounts have been multiplied by a rounded factor of 20 or 25 (except for one short Civil War period of high inflation, in 1864-67, when the conversion factor fell to a rounded 15). In the twentieth century, conversion factors again fell, to a rounded number of 10 to 15 depending on year.
[311] Costa 161.
[312] Costa 163.
[313] Costa 162. Costa points out that during the pre-income tax era in which the pension program made most of its distributions, about half the federal budget was funded by tariff (import/export tax) revenues. Pension advocates consistently lobbied for high tariff rates as a means to guarantee continued funding of the pension program, and this "regressive" tax, she maintains, fell disproportionately on the poor. On the issue of rampant corruption and mismanagement, see Severo & Milford, chap 12, 169-86.
[314] Skocpol 151. In fact, except for the similarly limited and justified national pension system for disabled WWI veterans - which never became as generous as that of the Civil War - governmental old age and disability pension systems would not emerge in the United States until the late 1920s and early 1930s, and would be undertaken initially not by the federal government, but by various states. See, for example, Costa 166-73.
[315] The 1890 act did contain a provision that claimants 65 years or older might be turned down if "the evidence discloses an unusual vigor and ability for the performance of manual labor," but in no instance did research for this work uncover a claim rejected for this reason, or even an effort by the government to discover or consider evidence for such a rejection.
[316] Costa 203.
[317] Total claims in each of the three categories (53) exceeds total first-time claims (48) because a few claims asserted more than one wartime condition.
[318] Skocpol 114, 117; Severo & Milford 172, 175.
[319] Severo & Milford 171.
[320] Halsey's life is described in Bruce Chadwick, *Brother Against Brother: The Lost Civil War Diary of Lt. Edmund Halsey* (Secaucus: Carol Publishing Group, 1997). He was a great friend of Regimental Chaplain, Alanson Haines, and a fellow graduate of the College of New Jersey (renamed Princeton University in 1896), supplying Haines with much of the material for the latter's unit history. Halsey was an invalid throughout later life, as was Haines, both suffering from the long-term effects of wartime camp life. Halsey also suffered the tragedy of outliving all but one of his 7 children, 5 of whom died before age 8, and one at age 26. Six of his 8 grandchildren, all born to his one surviving child, Cornelia Halsey Kellog, also died in childhood.
[321] Trinidad history from http://www.sangres.com/colorado/lasanimas/trinidad.htm and http://www.sangres.com/history/batmasterson.htm (3/18/08). Information on Campbell from Bilby 259. Bilby reports that in Trinidad Campbell "gained a reputation as an eccentric old soldier who sat wrapped in a shawl in a big chair" at the local druggist's store. He died peacefully at his home on San Pedro Street on Thanksgiving Day, 1913.
[322] William H. Glasson, *Federal Military Pensions in the United States* (New York: Oxford UP, 1918) 166, *f*1, cited in Severo & Milford 171.
[323] Bledstein 120; and Kermit L. Hall, *The Magic Mirror: Law in American History* (New York: Oxford UP, 1989) 216-18.

[324] The usual $10 fee would be equivalent today to about $200 - only enough, that is, to cover an hour or so of attorney time. Most attorneys in 1900 were reportedly earning from $2,000 to $5,000 per year (about $40,00 to $100,000 in current dollars). Hall 213. Assuming the average attorney worked 2,500 hours per year on client matters - probably a high estimate - these reported incomes would equate to an hourly rate in 1900 of from $20 to $40. By this measure, the $25 fees typically charged by attorneys prior to fee regulation appear quite reasonable, and the limited statutory fee inadequate. The low fee would have contributed both to an attorney's losing interest in a case if time-consuming problems developed, and to the concentration of pension claim cases in Washington firms specializing in them, where political assistance and economies of scale were more achievable. Even among such firms, however, containing costs could become a problem. (See below, in this chapter.)

[325] Indeed, there is no record of any Company A Keller in ROMNJ. Keller's name does appear on the microfilmed index cards for the 15th NJ Regiment, in NARA's T-288 index (see Appendix A), his card probably having been created solely on the basis of his bogus application (No. 1252,006) and claimed service with Company A.

[326] Bilby 25. The ninety-day requirement was potentially a much greater factor in the claims of Company A draftees and substitutes, almost all of whom entered service in 1865, the majority during March of that year.

[327] See, however, Chapter 2 for discussion of the existence of significant anti-war sentiment in the Hunterdon County region (principally in moderately industrialized Lambertville, and neighboring Pennsylvania) prior to the outbreak of war. Here as elsewhere, such "Copperhead" leanings appear largely to have evaporated, or at least to have gone underground, with the firing on Fort Sumpter. The *Hunterdon County Democrat*, a Flemington-based newspaper aligned with the Democratic Party, strongly supported the war throughout.

[328] There is little scholarship on the Spanish-American War pension program. It is mentioned obliquely in Severo and Milford, at 205 and 210.

[329] Fogel, at 28, concluded that examining physicians in the postwar period had done quite creditable work in performing their duties:

> It is the judgment of the physicians working on the project that the diagnoses of the pension surgeons are comparable to the quality of clinical diagnoses that might be conducted today by U.S. physicians working under field conditions in a rural third-world country without access to blood or tissue analysis….

[330] Whatever his physical limitations - or appearance - they did not prevent Hoffman from marrying and producing a large brood of children with his young wife. Two days after being discharged, at age 24, he was wedded to 15-year old Hannah Ryan, of Georgetown, New Jersey. The couple had at least 12 children over the next twenty-four years (they may have had more, since pension records only disclose those still living as of 1898)! Between 1912 and 1915, Hannah died, before reaching her 65th birthday (exact year of death is unknown); her husband survived another decade and died, at age 85, on Independence Day, 1926.

[331]

> What had been a mere theory of lawyers… - that the nation preceded the states, in time and importance – now became a lived reality of the American tradition. * * * Up to the Civil War, the "United States" was invariably a plural noun: "The United States are a free government." After Gettysburg, it became a singular: "The United States is a free government." This was the result of the whole mode of thinking Lincoln expressed in his acts as well as his words, making *union* not a mystical hope but a constitutional reality.

Garry Wills, *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words That Remade America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992) 145.

[332] Skocpol in fact makes this point, at 151.

[333] RLACW 465-524.

[334] Costa 134.

[335] Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers & Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983) 2-3. Rosenzweig's study deals primarily with urban-based laborers, not rural farmers as does the present study, but as he suggests, the association between leisure activity and mental outlook would seem to hold for any societal group.

[336] Rosenzweig 3-4.

[337] Rosenzwieg (at 3) noted the same problems in approaching the investigation of his much larger population of urban-based laborers in Worcester, Massachusetts, between 1870 and 1920. "In exploring such questions…historians face more than the usual problems of studying a group that has left few written records; they also confront the vexing difficulties of examining [a] group's private behavior."

[338] Almost all information as to surviving veterans' post-war leisure pursuits comes from local, Hunterdon County sources. Accordingly, very little is known about such pursuits among those who resided elsewhere after the war.
[339] Costa 134. Costa's figures are for urban wage-earners; as she remarks, there are no comparable early surveys of rural farmers or farm workers. There is considerable anecdotal information, however, on the *nature* of rural, nineteenth-century leisure activities.
[340] Painter xix-xxi; Schimdt 64. Schmidt reports that national economic fluctuations were particularly hard on Hunterdon farmers in the latter nineteenth century:

> In the early 1870s came a slump in values which was to continue for over thirty years. By the latter part of the decade [tax] lists show many farms selling at less than $50 per acre. * * * [After a brief respite in] the more prosperous 1880s…the downward trend was soon resumed at an accelerated pace. In 1890…many farms could not be sold for sufficient amounts to cover their mortgage encumbrance.

[341] "Expenditures are, of course, a very narrow measure of recreational consumption. Many [1930s] retirees…reported that they spent their time 'visiting friends,' an activity that requires relatively few expenditures." Costa 137.
[342] Costa 149. For a useful overview of Civil War music and the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century developments in sheet music and piano production that led up to it, see Crawford's "Introduction" in *The Civil War Songbook*.
[343] Wiley 157-169.
[344] This and following information on New Jersey GAR taken from Rosters of the Department of New Jersey, Grand Army of the Republic," years 1883, 1900, and 1909-10. HCHS, box 3.
[345] Some veterans became members of posts outside the county or the state, in the areas to which they relocated after the war. Theodore Stryker's Flemington post membership, for example, was formally transferred in 1889 to another post. On the other hand, some long-time members retained and continued to pay dues for their Flemington membership long after moving to another area. In 1899, for example, William Barber sent in his $2 annual dues from far away Centralia, Illinois, asking to be "remembered to the boys." He repeated the action in 1904, enclosing a check for the increased dues amount ($3), and sending news about his life. In 1908, John Burns sent a letter to Post 48's commander enclosing a check for current dues, which he said he "forgot" to send sooner; he was then proprietor of Blairstown House, an inn in Warren County about 35 miles to the north. James Mattison, while not explicitly renewing his membership in the local post, wrote to it in May, 1890, from his office at the Treasury Department in Washington, regretting his inability to be with the members for that year's Memorial Day observances, those "usual exercises that I have so many times enjoyed with my comrades[,] in decorating [the] graves. * * * Comrades, go on with the good work[,] my heart will be with you on that grand occasion." HCHS box 1.
[346] Slack had once employed Company A veteran John Burns as a barber's apprentice, but the arrangement did not work out. See Chapter 7.
[347] The undated, handwritten roster appears in a store account notebook of "Nevins & Connet, General Dealers in Dry Goods, Groceries, Clothing, Boots, Shoes, Hats, Caps, Etc., Hopewell Building, Flemington, NJ." The 85 does not include 3 members whose names are crossed out in the notebook, including Company A veteran, John Burns (see *f*146, above). The year of the roster is post-1883, and it probably dates from the late 1880s. HCHS box 3.
[348] There were local posts, for example in Hackettstown (Warren County), German Valley (Morris County), Somerville (Somerset County), Trenton (Mercer County), and other locales where company veterans are known to have relocated.
[349] Mary R. Dearing, *Veterans in Politics: The Story of the G.A.R.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1952) 308, 402, and 445-46; and McConnell 208-09.
[350] McConnell 54. McConnell's claim is based mainly on his detailed analysis of the members of 3 GAR Posts in different settings (urban Philadelphia; "mid-sized industrial" Brockton, Massachusetts; and rural Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin). Acknowledging that "it is not possible to examine in detail [the memberships of] each of the 6,928 GAR posts" that were ultimately created, he states that "an analysis of…3 representative posts…supplemented by [other data], will give a good idea of what kinds of people were involved in the GAR…." While not an unreasonable claim, it is possible that in a still largely agricultural and developing U.S., farmers and unskilled laborers predominated among GAR members, and that many of these men were relatively poor. In the Chippewa Falls post, farmers constituted about a third of the membership, and unskilled laborers another quarter. This post was probably most akin to Flemington's Post 48. McConnell's class analysis does not include data on actual income earned

or wealth accumulated by GAR members at the 3 posts, but relies on the men's occupational self-identifications.

[351] Post 48 meeting minutes, publications, and reports are from HCHS box 1.

[352] In one wartime poem, for example ("As Toilsome I Wander'd Virginia's Woods"), Whitman anticipated the hold such graves would forever maintain on the imagination of those who had lived through the war's ordeal:

As toilsome I wander'd Virginia's woods,
* * *
I marked at the foot of a tree the grave of a soldier;
Mortally wounded he and buried on the retreat….

Long, long I muse, then on my way go wandering,
Many a changeful season to follow, and many a scene of life,
Yet at times through changeful season and scene, abrupt, alone, or in the crowded street,
Comes before me the unknown soldier's grave, comes the inscription rude in Virginia's woods,
Bold, cautious, true, and my loving comrade.

Whitman 197.

[353] In 1966, at President John F. Kennedy's inauguration, U.S. Poet Laureate, Robert Frost, also pronounced a poem rich in the language of law and of wartime sacrifice, two perpetual and deeply significant elements of the American experience that Sunderlin had expressed 7 decades before. Its title was "The Gift Outright."

Something we were withholding made us weak
Until we found out that it was ourselves
We were withholding from our land of living,
And forthwith found salvation in surrender.
Such as were we gave ourselves outright
(The deed of gift was many deeds of war)
To the land vaguely realizing westward….

Robert Frost, *In the Clearing by Robert Frost* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962) 31.

[354] Frederick W. Hawthorne, *Gettysburg: Stories of Men and Monuments as Told by Battlefield Guides* (Hanover, PA: The Sheridan Press, 1988) 78; also National Archives, Department of Defense Records Group, at http://liberty.state.nj.us/state/darm/links/guides/sdea0011.html

[355] In skeletal form, the GAR soldiered on for more than 3 more decades. In 1938, it participated in the 75th (and last) Anniversary Reunion at Gettysburg (virtually all of the approximately 1,400 Union and 500 Confederate veterans in attendance were over 90 years old; a few died en route). Incredibly, against the backdrop of gathering war clouds in Europe, the Civil War veterans participating witnessed a fly-by, on the last day of the reunion, of the latest examples of the new Army Air Corps' pursuit and bomber aircraft. They included six Boeing B-17 "Flying Fortresses," destined to play such an important (and ghastly) strategic role in the coming war against Hitler. Men's first fragile attempts to engage in powered flight lay almost 40 years in the future when these veterans had gone to war.

The GAR's own last national "encampment" was held at Indianapolis in 1949. Six of its 16 surviving members attended, all over 100 years old.

[356] Psychiatric description of "Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder," or PTSD, is from *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, third edition* and *third edition, revised* (DSM-III and DSM-III-R), as cited and analyzed in Allan Young, *The Harmony of Illusions: Inventing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995) 98-99, 288). The description has been significantly revised in DSM-IV, but remains useful for purposes of the present work.

[357] The term has been in *medical* use for some time, where it has been utilized to refer to problems in the functioning of specific organs. "Minimal brain dysfunction," for example, is defined as "a mild degree of impaired cerebration which may be manifested by dyslexia, dysgraphia, hyperactivity, etc…." Dornette 432.

[358] Vieda Skultans, *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975) 49, quoting William Willis Moseley.

[359] Skultans 45-46, quoting Moseley.

[360] Skultans 36-37, quoting George Man Burrows.

[361] Skultans, 2-3, 5-6, citing John Locke and Thomas Hobbes.

[362] Skultans 50-51, quoting James Sheppard.

[363] Young 13-16, quoting Erichsen.

[364] Young 21.
[365] The theoretical divide between those urging the importance of physical (or "organic") factors, and those suggesting purely psychological ones as best explaining mental disease, continues, with powerful proponents lining up on both sides.
[366] Eric T. Dean, *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War* (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1997) 27-29.
[367] NIH/NSF study reported in Aaron Levin, "Civil War Trauma Led to Combination of Nervous and Physical Disease," *Psychiatric News*, v 41, no 8, 2 (April 21, 2006).
[368] Dean 100-11.
[369] Dean, especially Introduction and Chapters 5-8. Soldiers' reactions to combat trauma are generally divided temporally into immediate or short-term responses (the "combat fatigue" or "combat neurosis" of WWII), and longer-term responses (PTSD). The former manifests itself before, during, or soon after fighting, and can disable a soldier from continuing as a combatant. The latter typically emerges much later, often years after the war, and can become disabling to the veteran in a variety of ways. Dean does not carefully distinguish between the two; he deals mainly with the latter but also describes instances of the former among Civil War soldiers at the front. See, for example, Chapters 3 and 4.
[370] Dean 211.
[371] Dean poses the question in his Introduction:

> Can one perhaps conclude – contrary to the post-Vietnam tendency to view war as a negative, toxic substance – that there was, in spite of, in addition to, or as part of the mental suffering, something positive and invigorating in the experience of the war for the Civil War generation – and perhaps for individual Vietnam veterans as well?

In his concluding chapter, he seems to answer in the affirmative, for the survivors of both wars:

> [Civil War soldiers]…considered the experience to be riveting, the most meaningful time of their lives, something that could never – for better or worse – be forgotten or trivialized. * * *
>
> * * * An underappreciated fact concerning Vietnam veterans is the extent to which these people, including those who suffered terribly, believe that they have been strengthened by the experience. * * * To be subjected to a severe ordeal of this nature and magnitude [Dean offers the example of John McCain's 5-year Vietnam captivity], and to come through the trial alive, can give a person a sense of inner strength, self-reliance, and compassion for others.

Dean 6, 213-14.
[372] The flaw in Dean's project (if there is one) is that its fundamental thesis is never clearly articulated. It seems, however, to be that throughout history war has been universally horrific, and potentially traumatizing for combatants (war's constants, he asserts, "that transcend time and place"), and yet for veterans (i.e., those lucky enough to survive) there is at the same time "something positive and invigorating in the experience of war." While this thesis seems a bit of a paradox, and while Dean himself appears to be somewhat conflicted about it, such facially inconsistent and even irrational notions in response to wartime hardship are articulated by many veterans, including this author.
[373] Young 5.
[374] Young is wrong on this. Prior to the Civil War, the nation had enacted pension laws for veterans of both the Revolutionary War (beginning in the 1780s) and the War of 1812 (beginning in 1818). The War with Mexico also eventually sparked federal pension legislation, but not until 1887 (as part of a bill relating to Civil War pensions). See, for example, Severo and Milford 84-88.
[375] Levin 2.
[376] Tom Williams, ed., *Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders: A Handbook for Clinicians* (Cincinnati: DAV Press, 1987) 8-13.
[377] Williams esp. Chapters Twelve, and Fifteen.
[378] Williams 14, 24-26, and Chap. Seven; and Dean 166-70.
[379] On criminality, see Edith Abbott, "The Civil War and the Crime Wave of 1865-70," *Social Service Review* (June 1927), 1-25. Abbott was Dean of Social Work at the University of Chicago, and an abridged version of her intelligent article has been incorporated in Logue and Barton's 2007 anthology. Characteristic of the failure of social historians to come to grips with the societal consequences of the Civil War has been the complete (and continuing) lack of any scholarship on this important subject for the last 80 years since Abbott's work!
[380] Dean 143-4.

[381] John P. Wilson and Gustav E. Krauss, "Predicting Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders Among Vietnam Veterans," 109-116, in William E. Kelly, ed., *Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and the War Veteran Patient* (New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1985).
[382] Dornette 497.
[383] Dornette 943
[384] Among the evidence that bears on the question are the following items: Reading's extreme susceptibility to wartime ailments that excused him from combat duty and that, in several instances, were not more specifically diagnosed; his absence (avoidance?) of virtually all combat episodes experienced by the company while he remained with it, and his inability even to serve in a VRC unit; the suspect nature of his discharge diagnosis of heart disease; his failure, *for 18 years*, to press the pension claim he filed immediately after being discharged; his first examining physician's failure to find any evidence of heart disease or other ailment; his apparent failure to maintain contact with any wartime comrade (none submitted supporting affidavits in his pension claim), even though this was common practice and many remained in the same area in which he lived; his ability to work as a mail carrier for 5 years, while insisting he was unable to work at all, and did no work for extended periods before and after; relatively frequent work and residence changes; the possibility that one or more of his children died prematurely; his first wife's premature death (probably in her 40s); his attempt to bribe an examining physician; the inconsistency between his outwardly healthful appearance and his claimed ailments, as noted by at least 3 different boards over a seven-year period; certain diagnoses over his entire adult career, such as "irritable heart," "debility," "neuralgia"; and his supporters' postwar description of him as a "wreck."
[385] Early Vermontville history taken from: http://www.vermontville-mi.gov/about.htm#history
[386] Methodist Episcopal Church affiliation was by far the most common among Company A members whose denominational affiliation is suggested by the record. See Chapters 1 and 4.
[387] Rotundo 168. This is part of the recent scholarship of "men's" or "masculinity" studies that attempts to explain feelings such as those described largely in terms of prevailing social and cultural attitudes - to assert, that is, that such feelings are socially- or culturally-constructed – and that minimizes or discounts biological and developmental factors as fundamental contributors.

Rotundo's particular work, moreover, is limited by his focus on the comparatively small minority of mid-nineteenth-century males *in the middle class* (or actually, as he divulges in an appendix, to the even smaller minority in the *upper* middle class). He justifies this by arguing that such men were the cultural leaders of their time, and thus disproportionately influenced the cultural views and values of the era. Perhaps this is so, but no evidence is provided to support the point. As with nineteenth-century marital and domestic scholarship in general (see comment in Chapter 6), it is possible that "middle class" or "elite" historical actors are selected for examination simply because they happen to be the ones most likely to have left written records of their cultural leanings.
[388] Williams 9.
[389] Williams Chapter Nine.
[390] James Marten, "Nomads in Blue: Disabled Veterans and Alcohol at the National Home," 275 et seq., in Gerber.
[391] Gerber 288.
[392] Some modern commentators have suggested that traumatized veterans whose violent behavior results in their being gunned down by others are actually committing a form of ritual suicide. Such, for example, may have been the case of Viet Nam Sergeant and Medal of Honor recipient, Dwight Johnson, who began suffering significant psychological symptoms on his return to the U.S. He ultimately attempted to hold up a liquor store, brandishing a gun that turned out to be unloaded, and was shot and killed by the store's owner in the summer of 1971. (Account is related, for example, in Ben Shephard, *A War of Nerves: Soldiers and Psychiatrists in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2001) 357.)
[393] Indian Wars background from John M. Carroll and Colin F. Baxter, *The American Military Tradition: From Colonial Times to the Present* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources Books, 1993) 99.
[394] Carroll 100.
[395] Bozeman and Ft. Ellis background, and details of fort life, from Thomas C. Rust, *Fort Ellis: A Documentary History* (Gallatin County Historical Society, 2004)
[396] Rust.
[397] From "Good Night Irene," twentieth- (some sources say nineteenth-) century folksong, first popularized in 1940s by Lead Belly.

[398] 29 deceased single men, 13 deceased married men, and 53 survivors add up to only 95 soldiers. The other 5 were deserters, and while there is pre-war marital status for 4 of them, there is no other information regarding their wives or marriages, or whether they even survived the war.
[399] Setting aside the company's 5 deserters, there are only 7 war-surviving veterans - 2 men who were married when they went to war, and 5 men who were single - concerning whom the historical record regarding their wives is otherwise absolutely silent. Most of the 7 never filed pension claims, and the seven's pre-war marital status is known only because this datum was recorded for each man upon mustering in.
[400] This potentially fatal disease is caused by a neurotoxin released into the body by *Clostridium tetani* bacteria, and often occurs as a result of a deep penetration wound. The toxin causes painful and severe muscle contractions – hence the common term "lockjaw" – and was a dangerous killer in the pre-vaccine, pre-antibiotic era. Dornette 1432.
[401] In the nineteenth century, this uncertain term may have meant either a man employed to work drafthorses, or a person skilled at drafting plans of machinery or structures (or even less likely, a scrivener employed in the drafting of legal documents). Francis's father at one time claimed the occupation of civil engineer, which *if true* might point to the second meaning of the term.
[402] Yellow fever is a tropical disease caused by a liver-attacking virus that is typically spread (in urban environments) by mosquitoes. Symptoms include fever, slow pulse, jaundice (hence the name of the disease), congestion of the face, hemorrhages, and hematemesis (bloody or "black" vomit); it is fatal in 5-10% of cases. Dornette 524.
[403] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Austria#The_Nineteenth_Century
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_New_Orleans#The_Civil_War; and
http://nutrias.org/facts/feverdeaths.htm
[404] http://www.sacred-destinations.com/usa/new-orleans-old-ursuline-convent.htm
http://www.library.ci.corpus-christi.tx.us/oldbayview/merrimanhistorybyetm.htm
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Galveston
www.swschool.org/pdf/History.pdf
[405] The school is today known as the Ursuline Academy of Dallas, a prestigious college preparatory high school, and is the oldest high school in the city. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ursuline_Academy_of_Dallas#History
[406] According to one historian of the Civil War pension system, the federal government in the case of dependents "attempt[ed] to replicate the breadwinning role assumed by many veterans [the author here actually means "many soldiers," a large portion of whom did not live to become veterans] within their family circles," and "took on the role of father [or family-supporting son]." Overall, in the early years of the program, 1862-74, dependents receiving pension checks outnumbered veterans. Patrick J. Kelly, "Establishing a Federal Entitlement," Logue and Barton 236.
[407] The NARA files show a claim number for Cregar's mother, indicating she did submit a claim, but no pension certificate number (or any other information), indicating it was not approved and probably never processed. Cregar's second wife outlived him, and obtained a widow's pension in 1929, which would have been well after the death of his mother, who was born about 1812.
[408] Martin's penmanship and grammar is relatively good, especially for Company A men. He also consistently uses a single German letter, ß, to write a double "s" (ss). This echoes his Germanic ancestry.
[409] Haines 18.
[410] Haines 45.
[411] See Chapter 2.
[412] This monthly payment information was provided to pension officials by Wm. R. Risler, probably a freeholder or township clerk, and the person to whom Grassman states he had written a letter in 1862 (see second Grassman letter, *supra*).
[413] For a useful discussion of the American law of bastardy in this era, and its social and cultural contexts, see Grossberg ch. 6, esp. 196-228.
[414] "Scurvy" is the name usually given to the debilitating condition suffered by sailors before the modern era, as a result of insufficient Vitamin C in their diets (from, for example, fresh fruit or vegetables). Typical symptoms are exhaustion, swelling and ulceration, especially of the gums and mucous membranes, and bleeding into the skin. There is also something known as "land scurvy" (idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura), which produces similar symptoms and is sometimes fatal. Perhaps "VS" stood for "veterans scurvy," and was a relatively common condition of the period, brought about by the restricted soldier's diet of meat and grain. Dornette 1267.

[415] Beers 1873 Atlas shows Dr. Gale's office centrally located in the Warren County portion of Asbury; Gale also owned a large farm in the town.
[416] Catherine Hicks's pension file contains an unusual example of an internal "Brief" worked up by a pension agent. It contains concise summaries of the affidavits of three supporting witnesses, under headings relating to the claimant's required showings of legal entitlement (i.e., mother of unmarried and childless soldier, deceased in war), and dependency (lack of property or income, soldier's past contributions to support, etc.). In an era experiencing an exploding volume of applications because of liberal 1879 legislation, such briefs would have been a way to expedite the review of claims evidence by more senior agents, by organizing and summarizing a files' numerous original documents.
[417] The transcriber of Ellen Ann's statements wrote in a Germanic hand, and rendered "$4" as "#4#" (and all other dollar amounts similarly, bracketed by #s). The reference to "making up" clothes suggests that, to save the family money, David bought bolts of cloth from his own wages, and gave them to his mother to sew into clothing.
[418] The affidavit is dated January 2, *1885*, but is stamped with a government receipt date in 1886. The pension file's docket entries also list the affidavit as having been filed on January 8, 1886.
[419] This probably means that James either became "missing in action," or had been taken prisoner. The ultimate fate of many of these soldiers - a huge number - was never learned, although they were usually presumed to have died on the field or during captivity. James A. R. Apgar was not the same soldier as Company A's James H. Apgar, who had also been a Tewksbury resident from Farmersville, and who is known to have "died of wounds" in 1863: a gunshot wound requiring amputation of the leg, followed by uncontrolled gangrenous infection.
[420] The terms “alcoholic” and “alcoholism” are well known today, especially as the result of the founding in 1939 of Alcolhilcs Anonymous in the United States, and the subsequent worldwide diffusion of its work and “meeting” groups. The terms were apparently first used in their modern sense about 1849 by Magnus Huss, a nineteenth-century Swedish physician who studied the condition. Like so many other medical innovations of the time, European understanding of te condition as a disease was slow to reach the U.S. See, for example, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alcoholism
[421] Horse-mounted cavalry troops in the war could cover about 35 miles in an 8-hour day, without undue strain on men or animals. Coggins 51. This converts to a sustained speed of about 4-1/3 miles per hour.
[422] Also rendered in pension records as Nevius and Nevious.
[423] "Neuralgia” (severe or chronic headache) and “softening of the brain” were sometimes viewed in the nineteenth century as symptoms of traumatically-induced mental illness, the theory being that such illness was cause by lesions of the nervous system, which includes the brain. See Chapter 10.
[424] Regarding Russell County, see
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russell_County,_Kansas. Regarding te Wyckoff grave site, see
http://www.interment.net/data/us/ks/russell/amherst/index.htm
[425] Regarding the work if Dix, see Henry M. Hurd, ed., *The Institutional Care of the Insane in the United States and Canada* (Baltimore: John Hopkins P, 1916), Ch. III, 101-36. For mortality, see Charles A. Kiesler and Amy E. Sibulkin, *Mental Hospitalization: Myths and Facts About a National Crisis* (Newbury Park: Sage Pub., 1987) 31.Stats: Mental Hosp, p 31.
[426] The exact procedure used is unknown. It appears from the papers in Hockenbury's file that appeals of this nature were taken to the next higher office, in this case the Department of the Interior. Both parties were then permitted to submit written arguments, or briefs, and in due course, probably after review by a legal officer, an official acting for the Interior Secretary issued a written decision.
[427] Robert Frost, “Departmental,” first published in *The Yale Review*, Winter 1936.
[428] See Chapter 3.
[429] Heatstroke is a dangerously high elevation of the body’s core temperature, cuasing headache, vertigo, collapse and in severe cases coma and tachycardia (racing, irregular heartbeat). Dornette 623.
[430] Bilby 45. The symptoms of the two diseases are quite distinguishable. Typhus is spread by louse-borne bacteria, *Rickettsia prowasekii*, and results in "high fever, mental and physical depression, and a macular [discolored] and papular [pimple-like] eruption," lasting about two weeks. Dornette 1507. Dysentery is usually caused in humans by an amoeba, *Entamoeba hystolytica*, and its symptoms are "watery stools, often with blood and mucus…pain, tenesmus [painful spasm of the anal sphincter], fever, and dehydration." In severe cases, it can lead to "prostration, collapse, and often death." Dornette 431.
[431] McPherson 485-88.

[432] There is fairly good evidence for age at marriage for 11 of the 13 mothers, and 10 of the 13 fathers. Among them, there was only one groom younger than his bride (he was about 31 and his bride about 37), and the largest age difference was about ten years (wife 15 and husband about 25). Average age at marriage was about 24 for men and about 21 for women; brides' ages ranged from 15 to 37, grooms' from 19 to 31. See Chapter 6 for comparable data for the company's war generation.
[433] The precise number of children was reliably indicated for 8 first wives. Average fertility for this group was 6.25 children. The *minimum* number of known offspring was used for 2 additional first wives and both second wives, resulting in an almost certainly *low* fertility rate of 2.75 for this group. One other first wife was known to have had a minimum and 5 and a maximum of 10 children; the midpoint number of 7.5 was used for her.
[434] Hockenbury's first child was born 6-1/2 months after his first wedding. His first child by his second wife was also likely conceived before the wedding: it was born in November of the year in which the couple wed, but the date of birth was not found. Runkle's first child was born 3 months after his first wedding; no information survives regarding the timing of his second wife's births. Heath's first child was born close to the wedding date, possibly before it took place. In the remaining 4 families, first children were born from 11 months to 8 years following the wedding.
[435] For each gender, 4 were judged literate on the basis of "informed" speculation, and 4 illiterate. Literate mothers were determined to include Grassman, Hicks, Wyckoff and Nevins (second wife); and fathers included Henderson, Smith, Hockenbury, and Runkle. Illiterate mothers were Anthony, Hendershot, Henderson, Apgar; fathers were Apgar, Wyckoff, Heath, and Frey.
[436] Though not developed among the arguments in Chapter 4 regarding volunteers' motives for enlisting, it is at least plausible that in the 3 cases described in this chapter in which a young, *unmarried*, first-born son enlisted, one motivating factor was either the death of his mother (Hockenbury and Frey) or the remarriage of his father (Runkle). In each case, the mother had been relatively young when she died (respectively about 35, 30s, 40s), and death in 2 of the cases occurred only about 7 months before the enlistment decision (Hockenbury and Heath).
[437] The 2 mothers who did not apply for arrears both filed applications in 1863, shortly after their sons had died, and received benefits calculated from their dates of death. Later in the program, awards were allowed only from the date of filing; this difference in treatment was resolved by the "Arrears Act" of 1879, under which the calculation of an award could, in appropriate circumstances, be once again made from the soldier's date of death.
[438] Howard M. Feinstein, *Becoming William James* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984) 272-73. Given the 1880 Massachusetts population of about 1.8 million, the 66,000 male/female imbalance, concentrated as it must have been among a cohort of men who were mostly in their late 30s and 40s, would have been quite noticeable. A *conservative* estimate indicates that, at a minimum, one out of every 8 or 9 women seeking a husband in that state at that time would be statistically deprived of an eligible male; the figure was probably closer to one of every 4 or 5.
[439] Haines 133. Haines's text was from the Old Testament *Book of Proverbs*, Chapter 27, Verse 1. In the context of the war's day-to-day soldiering and dying, the passage contains a rather stern and fatalistic admonition: "Boast not thyself of tomorrow, for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth."
[440] "County Surrogate" was, and remains, an elected official responsible for various family-related public and legal matters, such as the recording and "probating" of wills (approving a will's authenticity and validity); appointing people to represent decedents' estates; and appointing guardians for minors.
[441] There were probably numerous such claims for unpaid bounty and pay due relatives of deceased soldiers, particularly parents and widows, but these seem generally to have been satisfied in routine fashion, without the necessity of filing formal papers. Only these two siblings' claims were discovered, and both were revealed by searching state archives relating to the regiment, and not federal pension files at NARA.
[442] John W. Kuhl, "Still Full of Fight," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter,* 40 2 (Spring 2004).
[443] Elaine Tyler May, *Great Expectations: Marriage and Divorce in Post-Victorian America* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980); Norma Basch, *In the Eyes of the Law: Women, Marriage, and Property in Nineteenth-Century New York* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982); and Nancy Cott, *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000).
[444] One late-nineteenth-century marriage law reformer, attempting to compile and examine state marriage and divorce records for the period 1867-1889, concluded that most states kept such poor records "that precise statistical analysis of the nation's nuptial practices was impossible." Samuel Dike, leader of The New Engalnd Divorce Reform League, in 1889; cited in Grossberg 90-91.

[445] This is much less true today than it was in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Unlike the limited and morally loaded grounds for divorce then available - typically, adultery or desertion (defined as failure to provide material support or sex) - litigants today have some version of "no-fault" grounds available in virtually every state, and a simple divorce can be and often is prosecuted by the litigants themselves, without attorneys. Moreover, the broad availability of state-funded legal aid programs permits the least affluent members of society to obtain low- or no-cost legal representation in court, particularly if support, custody, or physical abuse is at issue.

[446] May's excellent study, for example, nevertheless omits any data comparing wealth or socio-economic class with relative frequency of resort to formal divorce proceedings. The only related comment she offers is that "issues surrounding money…became increasingly prevalent" in divorces between 1880 and 1920. This occurred, she theorizes, as a result of rising prosperity and standards of living at all societal levels during this period, and the consequent rising expectations of all - rich and poor - to share in the abundance, and the increasing demands on husbands to provide it. May 137-38.

Similary, while observing that "no known causal link between…urban living and the emergence of [high divorce rates] has ever been proven," May's own evidence shows that "[d]ivorce has always been concentrated much more heavily in cities than in rural areas." May 3, 9.

[447] Basch, see notes sub "class"

[448] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anatole_France. France was a turn-of-the-century French author, and won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1921.

[449] Basch 5.

[450] Stryker's assignment so far afield during his brief service with the national army is an interesting story in itself. John C. Calhoun, who became Secretary of War in 1817, had taken steps to regularize and organize the young nation's military service and, for a 2-decade period beginning in 1841, Commanding General of the Army, Winfield Scott, also did much to improve the professionalism of the officer corps and the training offered at the U.S. Military Academy.

Meanwhile, the British-affiliated Hudson Bay Company, in 1825, established a principal trading base near the mouth of the Columbia River, at Fort Vancouver, just north of what is today Portland, Oregon. The Columbia River had recently been explored and preliminarily surveyed by Lewis and Clark's famous "Corps of Discovery" expedition in 1804-06. The river, which today constitutes much of the boundary between Washington and Oregon, served in 1825 as a contested but "unofficial" boundary between the territorial claims of the U.S and Great Britain.

In the early 1800s, a trickle of U.S. settlers, known as "Bostonmen," began growing to a steady stream, determined to occupy and farm the rich Willamette Valley of the western Columbia. Fort Vancouver became the western terminus of the Oregon trail. In 1846, competing U.S. and British territorial claims were settled by dividing the two nation's lands along the 49th parallel about 300 miles to the north. In 1849, the U.S. Army established a military presence near Fort Vancouver, calling it Columbia - and later Vancouver - Barracks, and the Hudson Bay Company abandoned their fort and moved north to Canada.

By Stryker's time, six years later, the entire Pacific Northwest was being inundated with U.S. settlers, and the nation's small army, which totaled only about 11,000 men in this period, was preoccupied with surveying and mapping duties, and with mounting punitive campaigns against numerous local Native American populations. For example, the 4-month North Pacific Surveying and Exploring Expedition was conducted during the latter half of 1855, and two sharp military encounters with Native Americans in the Seattle area took place in late 1855 and early 1856, during the time Stryker was serving in or near the Fort Vancouver area - December, 1855-May, 1856.

Internet: http://www.nps.gov/fova/history.htm See also, Jerry K. Sweeney, ed., *A Handbook of Military History* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996) 43-52; and Carroll & Baxter 98-99.

[451] It was customary during the war for soldiers to nominate dependent relations - usually wives or mothers - to receive all or portions of their pay, and the record of whom Company A's original volunteers named for this purpose survives. Stryker apparently nominated his mother to receive "subsistence" pay, and $18 was paid to her in 1863 - that amount appears to be standard in this category - according to the archival record.

[452] Winona was founded by a riverboat captain in 1851, and within the next twenty years was booming as a lumber processing and marketing center, wheat production center, and major railhead and transshipment point. www.winonahistory.org Bigelow probably migrated here from the northeast in the 1860s, to try his hand in one of these industries.

[453] Conflicting census records reviewed by the Pension Office showed Case as 8 years old in 1850 (1842 birth year; about 20 at enlistment), but as 15 in 1860 (1845 birth year; about 17 at enlistment). Case

himself was never able to provide documentary evidence of his birth date, and near the end of his life gave two different dates (July 1, 1841, making him 21 years old at enlistment, and about 44 when he married; and July 4, 1842, making him 20 at enlistment, and about 43 when he married).

[454] It is not clear what "forging a note on" someone actually consisted of in this case, but it may be speculated. If Creagur himself were a reputable local businessman or man of means, and if Bunn was known or thought to have had some sort of business relationship with him (e.g., as agent or employee), Bunn may have forged a promissory note or bank draft from Creagur to himself, signed Creagur's name to it, and presented it for payment at a bank in which Creagur had funds - what today could be accomplished by forging someone else's signature on one of his or her checks, made payable to the forger. From what is known of the circumstances, Bunn may have told the bank (as well as his wife) that Creagur had engaged him to travel west to purchase lumber for his (Creagur's) account, to be transported back east and sold.

[455] It is probable that under the much less standardized procedural law of the era, a New Jersey court could not have acquired jurisdiction over James while he resided in another state - and thus render a judgment of divorce against him - without his physically showing up in New Jersey and being personally "served with process," i.e., handed divorce papers by a law enforcement official. And surely Sarah was not about to exhaust limited resources on traveling to the state of James's residence on such an uncertain venture and attempting to sue him there. She appears in any case not to have known exactly where he was.

[456] The Studebaker brothers started as successful blacksmiths in South Bend in 1852. By 1868 they had turned the enterprise into a large and growing carriage and wagon manufacturing facility, having benefited greatly from army wagon orders during the Civil War. By 1885, the company's production topped 75,000 vehicles, and by 1887 sales exceeded 2 million dollars. Bunn worked there during this period of explosive growth. The Studebakers were the only horse-drawn vehicle makers in America to convert successfully to automobiles in the first decade of the twentieth century. http://www.studebakermuseum.org/history.asp

[457] By the twentieth century, pension benefits had become more liberal and easier to claim. A divorce would have made Sarah eligible for accrued widow's benefits, based on her first marriage to a veteran, that dated from the divorce rather than from Bunn's later death. Military service by Bunn would have entitled her to whatever accrued benefits he may have been eligible for but never claimed.

[458] The use of the word "but" is interesting, and probably meant to reflect what would be generally understood by a nineteenth-century hearer of this sentence: that Van Dyke was away a great deal, but despite that the couple continued to enjoy intimate relations when he was home.

[459] Traditionally, only the jury in a jury trial may determine the "facts" of the case, and ultimately render a verdict. The judge's role is limited to making calls on the admission or exclusion of evidence, and other procedural objections, and to "instructing" the jury on the law applicable to the case after all evidence has been presented. The term "directed verdict" derives from the authority of the judge to remove the verdict-rendering power from the jury, and "direct" a verdict of his own, if he determines that one side's case had not been proved, *as a matter of law*. This judicial authority is rarely exercised. Here, the government's case must have depended on the crucial documentary evidence identifying the clerk who actually witnessed Matilda's act of perjury, and when the judge ruled it inadmissible, he then had a legal rather than factual basis for directing a verdict of acquittal.

[460] Cottrall's name is also variously spelled in the historical record as Cottrill, Cotterill, Catrall, and Cottrell. It may be the same surname as Company A's Isaac Cathrall, also spelled Cathrell.

[461] Presumably, Cottrall this time obtained a divorce from Susan Palmer, but the court records have not been searched for this information.

[462] There is some confusion regarding the exact circumstances of Van Fleet's service and unit assignments. NJROM shows Abram Van Fleet in the initial (August, 1862) rosters of *two* 15th NJ Companies, A and F.

The *Company A* roster shows him being transferred to the VRC on September 9, 1863, which would be consistent with a May wound and 4-month hospitalization. (Van Fleet himself stated in his 1879 pension application that he joined up with Company A and, after being wounded in May, 1863, was hospitalized for "three of four months.") The roster then states that he re-enlisted in the VRC on November 24, 1864, and that he was discharged from his VRC unit (Company E, 3rd VRC Regiment), on November 20, 1865.

The *Company F* roster shows only that he was transferred to Company A on September 1, 1863, one week before he was transferred to the VRC.

Other records show Van Fleet was married in New Jersey on October 5, 1863 or 1864; "released from arrest" in November or December, 1863; and admitted to the Army General Hospital in Augusta, Maine, on October 24, 1965, a month prior to his discharge. In his pension filings and at his medical board examinations *prior to 1881*, Van Fleet gave his only combat unit as Company A, and *after1881* as F. His earliest Company A claim, in 1879, at age 39, was supported by two Company A comrades, Mattison and Case. No comrades are mentioned in his later identifications of Company F. *It is clear that Company A was Van Fleet's only combat unit.* His inclusion in Company F's roster in NJROM is a mistake, compounded by Van Fleet's growing senility and confusion as he aged. The other pertinent chronology is very probably that he "skedaddled" from the VRC unit in the fall of 1863 in order to be married; was married in October 1863 (not 1864); was caught and arrested, and allowed to return to his VRC unit, in late 1863; and remained with that unit until his discharge in 1865, re-enlisting in the meantime.

[463] The most common treatment at the time involved ingestion of small doses of mercury. There is evidence that this may actually have been effective in some cases.

[464]

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

From *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* (1048-1143), translated by Edward J. Fitzgerald, ca. 1859

[465] Charles Frazier, *Cold Mountain* (New York: Random House, 1997); Allan Gurganus, *Oldest Living Confederate Widow Tells All* (New York: Knopf, 1989). For useful comment on Ambrose Bierce's wartime writings, see Cathy N. Davidson, ed., *Critical Essays on Ambrose Bierce* (Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1982) esp. 169-208.

[466] The Amwell Skirmish story, and the historical society's subsequent interest, is recounted in Kathleen Schreiner, "The Amwell Skirmish," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter,* 13 1 (Winter 1977).

There is a regrettable but revelatory postscript to this vignette that illustrates the degree to which regard for history may have waned in the last century or so, and how modern suburban sprawl is no respecter of antique sensibilities. In 2001, the society expended much effort arranging for a full-uniform reenactment of the skirmish, and the attendance of the British Consul from New York City. By this time the tranquil area surrounding the gravesite in this still-rural township had been turned into an upscale residential development. The development was aptly named "Geary's Ridge," and the winding streets nearest the grave dubbed "Geary Ridge Road" and "Coronet Way." It all seemed…perfect. But the Geary Ridge Homeowners Association blanched at the idea of an actual historical intrusion into its modern facsimile, complete with Redcoats and Colonial Insurgents, and according to the society "threaten[ed] police intervention if anyone trespasses on private property." (The gravesite has been on private property since poor Geary was buried in it.) The event was cancelled, another casualty of 9/11 which had occurred only 3 months earlier. Roxanne K. Carkhuff, "Amwell Skirmish Site *Not* Revisited," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter,* 37 4 (Holiday 2001).

Time heals most wounds. By 2007, an accommodation had been worked out. Interested persons may now take a "pleasant, easy walk" of "several hundred yards" starting from Gear Ridge Road, between house nos. 17 and 21, and visit the well-marked gravesite at the end of the path. And the society continues to keep the memory of Geary and the Amwell militiamen very much alive. John W. Kuhl, "Geary's Grave Location," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter,* 43 1 (Winter 2007).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(INCLUDING ABBREVIATIONS USED AND GLOSSARY)

Books

Baquet, Camille. *History of the First Brigade, New Jersey Volunteers, from 1861 to 1865.* Trenton: MacCrelish & Quigley, 1910.

Basch, Norma. *In the Eyes of the Law: Women, Marriage, and Property in Nineteenth-Century New York*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982.

Beers, F.W. *Atlas of Hunterdon County, New Jersey*. New York: 1873.

Bilby, Joseph G. *Forgotten Warriors; New Jersey's African American Soldiers of the Civil War*. Hightstown: Longstreet House, 1993. (All references to Bilby in the text refer to the following work, and not to this work, unless specifically noted.)

---. *Three Rousing Cheers: A History of the Fifteenth New Jersey from Flemington to Appomattox.* Hightstown: Longstreet House, 1993. Cited in this work as "BFNJ". (All references to Bilby in the text refer to this work, and not to the preceding work, unless specifically noted.)

Biographical and Genealogical History of Morris County, New Jersey. New York: Lewis Pub, 1899.

Bledstein, Burton J. *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America.* New York: Norton & Co, 1978.

Bole, Robert D. and Laurence B. Johnson. *The New Jersey High School: A History*. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Boydston, Jeanne. *Home & Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic.* New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Burr, Nelson R. *Education in New Jersey, 1630-1871*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1942.

Carroll, John M. and Colin F. Baxter. *The American Military Tradition: From Colonial Times to the Present*. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources Books, 1993.

Chadwick, Bruce. *Brother Against Brother: The Lost Civil War Diary of Lt. Edmund Halsey*. Secaucus: Carol Publishing Group, 1997.

Coggins, Jack. *Arms and Equipment of the Civil War* 1962; Wilmington: Broadfoot Publishing, 1987.

Costa, Dora L. *The Evolution of Retirement: An American Economic History, 1880-1990.* Chicago: U. of Chicago P, 1998.

Cott, Nancy. *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000.

Crane, Stephen. *The Red Badge of Courage.* New York: Dell, 1960 ed., 7th printing 1966; orig. Pub. 1895.

Crawford, Richard. *The Civil War Songbook*. New York: Dover, 1977.

Cunningham, John T. *New Jersey; America's Main Road*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.

Davidson, Cathy N., ed. *Critical Essays on Ambrose Bierce.* Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1982.

de St-Exupery, Antoine. *Wind, Sand and Stars*, orig. pub. 1932, trans. by Lewis Galantiere, collected in *Airman's Odyssey*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1984.

Dean, Jr., Eric T. *Shook Over Hell: Post-Traumatic Stress, Vietnam, and the Civil War*. Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1997.

Dearing, Mary R. *Veterans in Politics: The Story of the G.A.R.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1952.

DiPaolo, Joseph F. *"A Hot Bed of Secession": New Hope and the Civil War*. Bedminster, PA: Adams Apple Press, 2001.

Donald, David Herbert ed. *Gone for a Soldier: The Civil War Memoirs of Private Alfred Bellard*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co, 1975.

Dornette, William H.L. ed. *Illustrated Stedman's Medical Dictionary, 5th Unabridged Lawyers' Edition.* Cincinnatti: Jefferson Law Book Co, 1982.

Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture.* New York: Knopf, 1977.
Faust, Drew Gilpin. *The Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Knopf, 2008.

Duffy, John. *The Healers: A History of American of American Medicine.* Urbana: University of Illinois P, 1979.

Feinstein, Howard M. *Becoming William James*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.

Forgie, George F. *Patricide in the House Divided; A Psychological Interpretation of Lincoln and His Age*. New York: Norton, 1979.

Fox, William. *Regimental Losses in the American Civil War*. Albany: 1889. Cited in this work as "RLACW."

Frazier, Charles. *Cold Mountain*. New York: Random House, 1997.

Frost, Robert. *In the Clearing by Robert Frost* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Gallagher, Gary W. ed., *The Antietam Campaign*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1999.

Gerber, David A., ed. *Disabled Veterans in History*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2000.

Gould, Benjamin A. *Investigations in the Military and Anthropological Statistics of American Soldiers*. New York: 1869.

Grossberg, Michael. *Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth-Century America.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1985.

Gurganus, Allan. *Oldest Living Confederate Widow Tells All.* New York: Knopf, 1989.

Haines, Alanson A. *Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers.* New York: 1883.

Hall, Kermit L. *The Magic Mirror: Law in American History.* New York: Oxford UP, 1989.

Hartwig, D. Scott and Ann Marie Hartwig. *Gettysburg: The Complete Pictorial of Battlefield Monuments.* Granite Publications, 1988.

Hawthorne, Frederick W. *Gettysburg: Stories of Men and Monuments as Told by Battlefield Guides.* Hanover, PA: The Sheridan Press, 1988.

Hess, Earl J. *The Union Soldier in Battle: Enduring the Ordeal of Combat.* Lawrence, Ks: UP of Kansas, 1997.

Hudson, Winthrop S. *Religion in America, Fourth Edition.* New York: Macmillan, 1987.

Hurd, Henry M., ed. *The Institutional Care of the Insane in the United States and Canada.* Baltimore: John Hopkins P, 1916.

Kelly, Patrick J. *Creating a National Home: Building the Veterans' Welfare State, 1860-1900.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.

Kelly, William E. ed. *Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and the War Veteran Patient* New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1985.

Kiesler, Charles A. and Amy E. Sibulkin. *Mental Hospitalization: Myths and Facts About a National Crisis.* Newbury Park: Sage Pub., 1987.

Leech, Margaret. *Reveille in Washington: 1860-1865.* New York: Harper & Bros, 1941.

Linderman, Gerald F. *Embattled Courage: The Experience of Combat in the American Civil War.* New York: Free Press, 1987.

Logue, Larry M. and Michael Barton, eds. *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader*. New York; New York UP, 2007.

MacArthur, Brian, ed. *The Penguin Book of Historic Speeches.* London: Penguin, 1995.

Marks, Geoffrey and William K. Beatty. *The Story of Medicine in America.* New York: Scribner's, 1973.

May, Elaine Tyler. *Great Expectations: Marriage and Divorce in Post-Victorian America.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

McConnell, Stuart. *Glorious Contentment: The Grand Army of the Republic, 1865-1900.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1992.

McGerr, Michael E. *The Decline of Popular Politics; The American North, 1865-1928.* New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

McPherson, James. *Battle Cry of Freedom*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988. (All references in the dissertation to McPherson are to this work, except for references in Chapter 4, all of which are to the following McPherson work.)

---. *What They Fought For, 1861-1865*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1994. (All references in the dissertation to McPherson are to the preceding work, except for references in Chapter 4, all of which are to this McPherson work.)

Meiers, Earl Schenk. *New Jersey and the Civil War*. The New Jersey Historical Series vol. 2. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

Mitchell, Reid. *Civil War Soldiers: Their Expectations and Their Experiences*. New York: Viking, 1988.

Montgomery, David. *The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Murray, David. *History of Education in New Jersey*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1899.

New Jersey Office of the Adjutant General (William S. Stryker). *Record of Officers and Men of New Jersey in the Civil War, 1861-1865*, 2 vols. Trenton: 1876. Cited in this work as "ROMNJ," with all references to Volume 1 unless noted.

O'Brien, Tim. *The Things They Carried*. New York: Broadway Books, 1990.

O'Connell, Robert L. *Soul of the Sword: An Illustrated History of Weaponry and Warfare from Prehistory to the Present*. New York; Free Press, 2002.

Ogden, Mary DePue. *Memorial Cyclopedia of New Jersey*. Newark: Memorial Hist. Co., 1917.

Olsen, Bernard A., ed. *Upon the Tented Field*. Red Bank: Historic Projects, 1993.

Painter, Nell Irvin. *Standing at Armageddon: The United States. 1877-1919*. New York: Norton & Co, 1987.

Rhea, Gordon C. *The Battles of Wilderness and Spotsylvania*. US National Park Service, Civil War ser. Eastern Nat'l Park & Monument Assoc. 1995.

Rickord, Frederick W., ed. *Successful Men of New Jersey*. New York: NJ Hist. Pub., 1896.

Rosenzweig, Roy. *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers & Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformation in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Harper Collins, 1993.

Ryan, Mary P. *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865*. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1981.

Sandburg, Carl. *Abraham Lincoln, The War Years*. 4 vols. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1939.

Schmidt, Hubert G. *Rural Hunterdon: An Agricultural History*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1945.

---. *The Press in Hunterdon County, 1825-1925*. Flemington: The Democrat Press, 1960.

Severo, Richard and Michael Lewis. *The Wages of War: When American Soldiers Came Home - From Valley Forge to Vietnam*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989.

Shephard, Ben. *A War of Nerves: Soldiers and Psychiatrists in the Twentieth Century* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2001.

Skocpol, Theda. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1992.

Skultans, Vieda. *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Snell, James P. *History of Hunterdon and Somerset Counties, New Jersey*. Philadelphia: 1881.

Snyder, John P. *The Story of New Jersey's Civil Boundaries*. Trenton: NJ Bureau of Geology and Topography, 1968.

Stout, Harry S. *Upon the Altar of the Union: A Moral History of the Civil War*. New York: Viking, 2006.

Sutherland, Arthur E. *The Law at Harvard: A History of Ideas and Men, 1817-1967*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1967.

Sweeney, Jerry K. ed. *A Handbook of Military History*. New York: Harper Collins, 1996.

Trudeau, Noah Andre. *Like Men of War; Black Troops in the Civil War, 1862-1865*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1998.

Vinovskis, Maris A., ed. *Toward a Social History of the American Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Volo, Dorothy and James. *Daily Life in Civil War America*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1998.

Walker, Williston. *A History of the Christian Church*. New York: Scribners, 1959.

West, Roscoe L. *Elementary Education in Jew Jersey: A History*. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Wiley, Bell Ervin. *The Life of Billy Yank: The Common Soldier of the Union*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1952. (All references to Wiley in the text refer to this work, unless specifically noted.)

---. *The Life of Johnny Reb: The Common Soldier of the Confederacy*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1943. (All references to Wiley in the text refer to the preceding work, and not to this work, unless specifically noted.)

Williams, T. Harry and Editors of *Life*. *The Union Restored*. The *Life* History of the US, vol. 6: 1861-1876. New York: Time, 1963.

Whitehead, John. *The Judicial and Civil History of New Jersey*. Boston: Boston Hist. Co., 1897.

Whitman, Walt. "O Captain! My Captain!" (1866). "As Toilsome I Wander'd Virginia's Woods" (18). Collected in *Walt Whitman Selected Poems*. New York: Gramercy Books, 1992.

Williams, Tom ed. *Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders: A Handbook for Clinicians* Cincinnati: DAV Press, 1987.

Wills, Garry. *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words That Remade America*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

Worton, Stanley N. *Shaping New Jersey: A History of Its Government and Politics*. NJ Dept. of State, NJ History Ser. Trenton: NJ Hist. Commission, 1997.

Young, Allan. *The Harmony of Illusions: Inventing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995.

Periodicals

Elder, Jr., Glen H. "Military Times and Turning Points in Men's Lives." *Developmental Psychology*, 22 (March, 1986).

Fogel, Robert W. "New Sources and New Techniques for the Study of Secular Trends in Nutritional Status, Health, Mortality, and the Process of Aging." *Historical Methods* 26, No. 1 (Winter 1993).

Haines, Michael R. and Roger C. Avery. "The American Life Table of 1830-1860: An Evaluation." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Summer, 1980).

Hart, D. G. "Conservatism, the Protestant Right, and the Failure of Religious History." *The Journal of The Historical Society* Vol. IV, No. 4 (2006).

Kreiser, Jr., Lawrence A. "A Socioeconomic Study of Veterans of the 103rd Ohio Volunteer Regiment After the War." *Ohio History* 107 (Summer-Autumn 1998).

Levin, Aaron. "Civil War Trauma Led to Combination of Nervous and Physical Disease." *Psychiatric News* Vol. 41, No. 8 (April 21, 2006).

Electronic Sources (alphabetically by words in **bold**)

http://**backissues**.cjrarchives.org/resources/inflater.asp as of 3/24/02

http://www.**cdc**.gov/nchs/datawh/statab/unpubd/mortabs/lewk3_10.htm

http://www.**census**.gov/population/www/socdemo/fertility/slideshow/table01.cs

http://**home**.att.net/~florencestockade/genlyon.htm

http://www.**interment**.net/data/us/ks/russell/amherst/index.htm

http://**liberty**.state.nj.us/state/darm/links/guides/sdea0011.html

http:**minneapolis**fed.org/economy/calc/hist1800.html

http://www.**nps**.gov/fova/history.htm

http://www.**sangres**.com/history/**batmasterson**.htm

http://www.**sangres**.com/colorado/lasanimas/**trinidad**.htm

http://**schwartz**.eng.auburn.edu/ACW/arty/arty.html

http://www.**studebaker**museum.org/history.asp

http://www.**tsha**.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/SS/hls13.html.

http://**usda**.mannlib.cornell.edu/reports/nassr/field/planting/

http://www.**vermontville**-mi.gov/about.htm#history

http://en.**wikipedia**.org/wiki/**Alcoholism**

http://en.**wikipedia**.org/wiki/**Anatole**_France.

http://en.**wikipedia**.org/wiki/**Freedmen's**_Bureau

http://en.**wikipedia**.org/wiki/**Northern**_Pacific_Railway

http://en.**wikipedia**.org/wiki/**Russell**_County,_Kansas

http//www.**winona**history.org

http://www.**nhlbi**support.com/bmi/>

Other Sources

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. "Ethan Brand." Orig. pub. in *Boston Museum* magazine, January 5, 1850.

Carkhuff, Roxanne K. "Amwell Skirmish Site *Not* Revisited," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter*. 37 4 (Holiday 2001).

Cohen, Edward. *Lambertville's Legacy: The Coryells, Ashbel Welch and Fred Lewis*. Lambertville: self-pub. by author, 1999.

Conkling, Cornelius S. *History of Schools in Hunterdon County, New Jersey*. ms. 1870. Hunterdon County Historical Society, Flemington

Herr, Frederick. "Major Boeman," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter*. 16 1 (Winter 1980).

Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975 ed.

Hunterdon County Historical Society, 114 Main Street Flemington, New Jersey 08822. Unless otherwise noted, all references are to "Lambert Boeman Post 48, G.A.R." collection; 3 boxes.

Kuhl, John W. "Geary's Grave Location," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter*. 43 1 (Winter 2007).

---. "Still Full of Fight," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter*. 40 2 (Spring 2004).

Moreau, D.H., ed. *Old Times in Hunterdon: A Collection of Articles and Historical Addresses Which Originally Appeared in Hunterdon County Democrat*. Flemington: self-pub by author., 1961

Rust, Thomas C. *Fort Ellis: A Documentary History*. Gallatin County Historical Society, 2004.

Schreiner, Kathleen. "The Amwell Skirmish," *Hunterdon Historical Newsletter*. 13 1 (Winter 1977).

Abbreviations Used, and Glossary

AG - Adjutant General, identified in text or by context as either state (New Jersey) or federal

BFNJ - Joseph Bilby, *Three Rousing Cheers: A History of the Fifteenth New Jersey from Flemington to Appomattox*, 1993

GAR - Grand Army of the Republic

HCHS – Hunterdon County Historical Society (114 Main Street, Flemington, New Jersey 08822); and see bibliographical listing above.

HFNJ - Alanson Haines, *History of Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers*, 1883

MR - Muster roll, or list of soldiers assigned to a unit; unless otherwise indicated, refers to semi-official MR of New Jersey units contained in ROM

NARA - National Archives and Records Agency, or "National Archives";
Washington, D.C., and College Park, Maryland

NCO - Non-commissioned officer; in Civil War usage, Corporals, Sergeants, and 1st Sergeants.

PO - (Federal) Pension Office

RLACW - William Fox, *Regimental Losses in the American Civil War*, 1889

ROMNJ - New Jersey Office of the Adjutant General (William S. Stryker). *Record of Officers and Men of New Jersey in the Civil War, 1861-1865*, 2 vols. Trenton: 1876.

SG - (Federal) Surgeon General

VA - Veterans Administration/Bureau of Veterans Affairs

VRC - Veterans Reserve Corps, later name given to Union reserve units to which were assigned wounded or injured soldiers deemed unfit for combat or front-line duty, but judged still fit for light duty; originally named "Invalid Corps"

APPENDIX A

ROSTER OF MEN OF COMPANY A
15TH NEW JERSEY VOLUNTEER INFANTRY REGIMENT

Set forth below are lists of the members of Company A, 15th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry Regiment. Taken together, they constitute as complete a roster as possible of all men who served with, were assigned to, or were officially carried on the muster roll ("MR") of the company at any time during its nearly three-year period of activation in the American Civil War (August, 1862 through June, 1865). They total 224 Individuals. The lists are compiled by category of enlistment.

Volunteers. The first is a list of the 100 original volunteers who, in the summer of 1862, enlisted for a 3-year term of service in the company, and who were officially mustered in on August 25 of that year. One company volunteer, Emerson Lowe, is not included on the list, because immediately upon induction he was promoted to regimental Quartermaster and assigned to the regiment's "Field and Staff" unit [headquarters]; he never thereafter traveled, fought, or camped with the company. Two others are listed although they failed to show up for mustering in: William Jackson deserted prior to muster and was never heard from again; Andrew Clawson apparently decided at the last minute to remain behind with his young (and newly pregnant) wife, and did not catch up with the company until the following year. (See his story in Chapter 1.) With a few exceptions, these 100 men, and their families, comprise the group examined in this work.

Recruits. Next are listed 44 men who later joined the company as "recruits" - men who (like the original 100) were induced to "volunteer" for service by the promise of bounties, or appeals to patriotism and duty. They began to trickle in as replacements when the company had been in the field for about a year, and the majority joined up sometime during its second full year of campaigning (1864). About 3/4ths of the company's recruits also signed on for 3-year tours of duty; the rest for only one year.

"Bounty jumping" (deserting once part or all of a new soldier's bounty had been paid him) became a significant problem as the war dragged on and worsened, and three of Company A's recruits committed this crime: a desertion rate among recruits of about 7%. This was nearly double the rate at which the unit's original volunteers, who served a longer time, deserted (4%). Moreover, two of the three deserting recruits "skedaddled" before even reaching the war zone, contributing nothing to the company's fortunes. (The third at least fought with the company throughout the entire Wilderness Campaign, including the horrid battle at Spotsylvania Courthouse, before "going over the hill".)

Drafted Men and Substitutes**.** The north did not resort to conscripting soldiers for the war until the approximate midpoint of the struggle: the summer of 1863. (The south employed conscription almost from the start.) The draft was, perhaps understandably, a controversial measure, and in some quarters, sparked active resistance and even violent rioting. (The draft riots in New York City between in July 13 and 16, 1863, were the most deadly civil disturbance the nation has ever endured. Assuming tragic ethnic and racial dimensions, it resulted in the deaths of an estimated 100 persons, primarily Arican-Americans, mainly at the hands of marauding Irish immigrants.)

Whatever the combination of reasons may have been, New Jersey in general and Hunterdon in particular managed, through aggressive recruiting and bounty incentives, to keep raising most of its quotas of new soldiers, as required by the federal government. Thus, it was not until quite late in the conflict that appreciable numbers of "drafted men" - or, much more often, the "substitutes" such men paid to go in their places - began to reach the company as replacements. By the time they did, almost all of the hardest fighting had been done.

Following the list of recruits, then, are lists of 4 draftees and 36 substitutes who joined the company in the waning months of the war. Almost all the men in these two categories had only 1-year enlistments. All but one of them arrived in February or March of 1865, thereby escaping not only most of the fighting but also the worst of the disease-plagued

winter encampments. The comparative ease and safety enjoyed by these last two groups of Company A replacements is attested by the fact that not one of the conscripts or substitutes - a total of 40 men - was killed or wounded in the war, and only one died of camp disease (typhoid fever). In contrast, the company's 44 recruits suffered 5 killed and 3 wounded - most of these in the Wilderness and Spotsylvania fighting - and lost another 2 to illness: a lethal attrition rate of about 16%. (This is still not close, however, to the 42% attrition rate experienced during the war by the company's 100 original volunteers.)

Transferees**.** After drafted men and substitutes, there is a list of 10 other men who were transferred to Company A from other units during the course of the war. Most of these - 8 of the 10 - are men from one of the other nine companies in the same regiment, who were later assigned to Company A (usually after being promoted) to replace commissioned or non-commissioned officers who had been killed or discharged. (The other two "transferees" are enlisted men from other regiments; they appear to have been sick or lightly wounded, and sent to the company to convalesce while their own units were being marched elsewhere.)

The foregoing lists have been put together from the company's semi-official muster roll, as published in ROMNJ in 1876. That source lists a total of 194 men making up the unit's combined roster over the course of the war (100 original volunteers, 44 recruits, 4 conscripts, 36 substitutes, and 10 transferees; the men are not, however, broken down by enlistment categories in that source).

The roster of original volunteers is consistent with the company's official military enrollment record, created in 1862 by the enlisting officer, and now maintained with other 15th New Jersey Regiment documents at the New Jersey State Archives in Trenton, New Jersey. It is also very similar, though not identical, to the roster given by Regimental Chaplain Haines in his 1883 unit history.

Other Men Listed as Having Served with Company A**.** Finally, there is a list of 30 additional men who spent time with the company but whose names are *not* on the ROMNJ Muster Roll. These names were taken from two NARA sources: the so-called T-288 and T-

289 index card microfilms. The first set of card microfilms (T-288) is a comprehensive list of all Union soldiers, by regiment and company, and the second (T-289) is a comprehensive list of all Union soldiers, alphabetically by last name. (Each set constitutes a collection of about two million cards!). These sources were used, independently of the ROMNJ source, to develop a roster of all men recorded by post-war archivists as having served with Company A of the 15th New Jersey Regiment at some point during the war. Review of several of the pension files of the additional 30 men revealed that they too all seem to fall into the category of "transferees". They were men who initially enlisted with other units, and spent relatively short periods of time with Company A, convalescing, or completing their enlistment terms when their own units were disbanded.

More importantly for purposes of this work, both sets of microfilmed cards record the identification numbers the Pension Office originally assigned to pension claims submitted by veterans or their family members. A number was simply assigned to a claim in the order it was received by the office; e.g., the 1,000th claim received was numbered "1,000".) If a claim was not approved, the initial number was the only one the claim received, and the file remains indexed by that number. If a claim was approved, the file was given a second "award" number - based on order of approval - and from that time on the file was indexed and referred to by the second number only. (NARA indexing and filing follows this convention.) Finally, some later claims were transferred from the Pension Office to the Veterans Administration, and these were then assigned a third number preceded by an "X" or "C" and are indexed and filed (by the VA) under that number. All three numbers are usually recorded on the two index card sources mentioned, but instances were found where the latest - and necessary - file number appeared only on *one* of the soldier's two cards.

NARA maintains the vast bulk of federal Civil War pension claim files in their original folders, the papers in virtually the same condition and order as when created by the Pension Office. (A few later-filed claim files are maintained by the Bureau of Veterans Affairs, at their Washington office.)

Claims were made by five kinds of claimants. The three most prevalent were veterans' claims, referred to in nineteenth century parlance as "Invalid" claims (or "I" claims, though the letter was often omitted from this category, it being by far the largest); widows' claims ("W"); or parents' claims ("M" or "F" for mother or father). Rarely, a child's claim (marked "Minor," "Child," "Son," or with an abbreviated form of "Daughter") was submitted on behalf of an orphaned child of a veteran. (There was only one such claim in Company A, which was made on behalf of the orphaned son of Moses Housel. Most often, the standard $2-per-month benefit for a deceased soldier's child under 14 was simply added to the award granted a qualifying widow.) Finally, the dependent *sibling* of a deceased soldier, in practice invariably a sister, could also make a pension claim; they were marked simply "Sister". (Sibling claims were also rare; the only dependent pension claim made by a Company A sibling was that of Margaret Jane Slater, sister of John Slater, who died mysteriously in his tent in 1862.)

On the lists below, wherever there is a record of *any* claim having been filed by or in connection with a Company A soldier, the claim number is provided following his name on the list. The number is five to seven digits long, reflecting the period when it was filed. If the claim was approved, a second, "award" number, is also provided, following a "slash" [/] after the first number. The award number is always a lower number than the first (fewer claims were approved than were made), but is typically five to six digits in length. A veteran's pension claim number is not preceded by any letter; a widow's claim is preceded by "W," and a parent's by an "M" or "F" as appropriate. If a hyphen appears after the slash [/-], it indicates the claim was not approved; i.e., that it was rejected by the Pension Office, abandoned by the claimant, or that the claimant died before final action was taken.

The pension files themselves almost always contain documents corroborating the dates and military organization(s) of the claimant's wartime service, usually including official sources such as Surgeon General and Adjutant General records. These provided an additional check on the accuracy of the rosters (and other data) developed from other sources.

Investigating specific information provided or claims made by the author of this work, regarding an individual member of the company or his family, is a relatively straightforward task, and can be accomplished in person at NARA, or by requesting and paying for pension file document copies by mail. A small form (NA Form 14027 [1-86]) requires only the name of the Civil War soldier, his unit ("A/15 NJ"), the designation that a "pension" (rather than "military") record is sought, *and the crucial pension file number or numbers, and category of claimant*. In the lists below, pension claim numbers and claimant categories are provided for all soldiers for whom pension claim files were listed (nearly all of which were located and retrieved for this study by NARA personnel). In sum, my research has developed a total number of 224 men who served at some point during the war with Company A.

From the perspective of the men themselves, however, it is highly likely that only its original volunteers, its longer-serving recruits who joined the unit *before* the 1864 Wilderness Campaign, and its replacement officers from other 15th New Jersey companies, were regarded (or regarded themselves) as "real" members of the unit. Late-arriving recruits, drafted men and substitutes, and transient transferees deposited with the company for logistical or recuperative reasons, were surely not.

In fact, this divide among the men was undoubtedly accentuated by significant demographic differences that would have been quite apparent to them. Besides arriving late and avoiding virtually all the war's hardships, Company A's conscripts and substitutes were overwhelmingly urban tradesmen or laborers, not rural farmers; were much more likely to be foreign-born and recently immigrated (especially substitutes); and had, as a group, a noticeably more Irish or German (and Catholic) cast than the unit's original soldiers. A couple of the German substitutes spoke little or no English; one may have been Jewish. Among this group of 40, for example, were 6 men with identifiably Gaelic names (Collins, Campbell, Carey, Cash, Cochran, and McNulty) and 13 with German ones (Bischof [later

Anglicized to Bishop], Dobelman, Droll, Ehrisman, Henzerling, Kuhn, Marggraf, Ryberg, Strassburger, Studer, Winkler, Somers, and Zwickey).

It is also interesting to note the markedly different pension claim experience of these two groups, draftees and substitutes. *All 4 drafted men, and one widow of a drafted man, submitted claims after the war, and all 5 claims were approved.* (Except for Collins, the drafted men have decidedly Anglophone names: Broadwater, Chester, and Whitford.) In contrast, more than half of the substitutes (19 of 36) left no record of ever having submitted a pension claim. As for the remaining 17 substitutes, 13 "Invalid" claims were filed, 4 Widows' claims, and 2 Mothers' claims. Of this total of 19 pension claims, *11 - more than half - failed to gain Pension Office approval* (they were either rejected or abandoned by the claimant).

There was no significant difference in the degree of wartime hardship to which the two replacement groups were exposed, and no discernible difference in the degree of their commitment (no man deserted from either group), so the two groups' contrasting pension experience cannot be readily explained on this basis. Yet the groups made much different decisions as to whether to apply for a pension at all (in one case, 100% of the group did so, and in the other case, only about 47% of the group did). Moreover, of those who sought government largesse (either directly as veterans, or as family members), one group had a 100% success record, whereas the other had a less than even chance of obtaining federal help. There is only one plausible explanation for these glaring statistical discrepancies in both filing and approval rates: nineteenth-century attitudes of ethnic or Nativist discrimination *against* substitutes. Though not a part of this study, there is specific evidence in some of the substitute pension claim files that supports this discrimination theory, that would form a basis for intriguing follow-up investigation.

Lists

Abbreviations used:

NOT FND=individual not found on Co A MR
NF=no pension file found for individual
OK=no microfilmed card found for individual identified as 15th NJ soldier

MR=on Co A Muster Roll, but NF (no pension record found)

P=Private
CRP=Corporal
CPT=Captain
SGT=Sergeant
1LT=1st Lieutenant
2LT=2nd Lieutenant
MUS=Musician
POW=Prisoner of War

R=Recruit
S=Substitutes
D=Drafted Men

KIA=Killed in Action
DOW=Died of Wounds
DOD=Died of Disease
MIA=Missing in Action, presumed dead
DIS=Discharged

VA=Veterans Administration file (not at NARA)

B through K, followed by CO=Other 15th NJ Companies
VRC=Veterans Reserve Corps

ORIGINAL VOLUNTEERS

1. ALGARD, David **P/KIA**

2. ANTHONY, David **P/DOW** M 321,607/-

3. APGAR, Jacob D. **P/KIA** M 219,912/184,845 F 407,776/-

4. APGAR, James H. **P/DOW** W 35,655/28,889

5. BARBER, William T. **CRP** 472,280/251,986

6. BARTOW [Barton, on Muster Roll], George W. **P** 154,612/109,878

W 870,508/671,800

7. BEAVERS, George S. **P** 406,855/349,608 W 1196,811

8. BELLIS, Theodore B. **P** 403,692/309,254 W 977,765/737,375

9. BOEMAN, Lambert **CPT/KIA** (Major, 5/63) W 72,716/42,996 - 11/19/64

10. BRIGGS, William W. **P** 1361,068/1137,222

11. BROGAN, John **P/KIA**

12. BRYAN, Jacob F. **P/DOW**

13. BULLOCK, James J. **CRP TO SGT TO 1LT, I CO**

14. BULMER, John **P** 639,369/421,418

15. BURNS, John **P** 101,367/59,338 W 1203,181/939,413 [Also XC 940,003 **VA**]

16. BUTLER, John, Jr. **P** 828,669/-

17. BUTLER, John, Sr. **P, to VRC 9/63** 111,644/216,684 W 247,940/194,723

18. CASE, Samuel **P** 324,391/214,718

19. CATHRALL [Cathrell on Muster Roll], Isaac **P/DOW** W 36,567/15,294

20. CLARK, William D. **P** 289,565/245,088 W 831,607/608,233

21. CLAWSON, Andrew C. **P** 196,168/132,630

22. CLAYTON, William B. **MUS** 828,705/591,999 W 777,915/554,313

23. COLLINS, John P. **CRP** 77,257/48,704 W 910,097/956,307

24. CREGAR, Naum **P** 157,069/126,315 W 1652,973/- M 187,363/- [Also XC 2,625,934]

25. DANBERRY, Isaac N. **P** 98,106/59,135 W 616,973/426,018

26. DAYTON, Daniel G. **P/DOD**

27. DAYTON, Isaac **P/MIA** W 110,296/91,011

28. DAYTON, James W **P/DOD** 27,495/8,992

29. DUNGAN, Wm B. **Sgt** 120,064/86,650 W 1077,932/820517

30. DUNHAM, Warren M. **Corp/KIA**

31. EMERY, John **2LT/DIS 63**

32. EVERETT, James **P/DOD**

33. FREY, Peter B. **P/MIA** F 468,780/-

34. GRASSMAN, Martin V. **P/DOD** M 31,034/-

35 GREEN, Erin (Evin on MR) J. **P/DOD** W 66,752/43,408

36. GREEN, John S. **P** 745,488/1069,112 W 1603,569/- [Also, C 2,523,791]

37. GREGORY, Thos. R. **MUS** 784,895/674,765 W 1045,302/809,752

38.. HASSEL (Harsel), Isiah **P/DOD**

39. HEATH, Chas. G (A on MR). **P** F 473,317/-

40. HEIMBOLD, Herman **P/KIA**

41. HENDERSHOT, David D. **P/DIS63** 4/10/85 537,333/522,388

42. HENDERSHOT, Philip J. (I on MR) **P/DOD** M 32,321/19,959

43. HENDERSON, Geo. B. **O/P/DOD-POW** M 251,699/209,602

44. HENRY, Andrew F. **Sgt** 438,268/238,765 W 1682,178/- [Also, XC 2,637,183]

45. HENRY, John W. **P/MIA**

46. HICKS, David E. **Sgt/KIA** M 250,224/198,309

47. HIGGINS, Lewis **P/MIA** W 124,067/87,059

48. HIGGINS, Wm L. **P** 160,204/116,626 W 414,014/285,604

49. HOCKENBERG (-bury in MR), Lemuel **P/DOW** F 274,471/286,966

50. HOCKENBERG (-bury in MR), Silas N. **P/KIA** W 61,434/32,694

51. HOFFMAN, Jms **P** 131,038/107,455

52. HOGAN, Garret **CRP**

53. HORN, Elijah **P/DIS to VRC**

54. HOUSEL, Moses G. **P** 192,985/169,753 M 575,051/-

55. HURLEY, James **P/DOD**

56. JOHNSON, Henry P. **P** 77,193/75,764 W 709,105/505,845

57. JUSTICE, Geo. C. **Sgt-Lt/KIA** W 74,486/43,278 M 184,274/14?,043

58. KISE, Solomon **P/DIS** 3/23/80 353,742/231,024 W 592,543/404,960

59. KLINE, Manuel **SGT-1SGT-LT** 10/24/02 1292,127/1060,862

60. KUHL, Paul **1SGT/KIA**

61. KUTTER, John A. **CRP/DIS** 9/30/63 33,578/22,442 W 232,875/-

62. LATTARETTE, Abraham **P, "deserter" to 1st NJ Cav**

63. MATTISON (Madison on MR), James **P/DIS** 7/7/71 166,952/153,955

64. NEVINS (Nevius ON MR), Cornelius J. **P/KIA** 6/12/80 M 267,981/262,014 F 532,766/-

65. NEVINS (Nevius), Peter **P/DOD** 6/4/63 W 23,531/7,248 M 168,211/145,990

66. PALMER, James C. **Corp** 2/9/70 152,613/312,825

67. PARRISH, John W. **MUS** 9/25/79 311,556/199,241 W 696,210/410,938

68. PEER, Wm **P/KIA** 2/11/65 W 82,639/57,271

69. READING, Albert J. **CRP/to VRC 64** 6/14/64 46,575/219,531

70. READING, John **P/to VRC** 551,608/336,573 W 814,007/592,980

71. RUNKLE, Jos. G. **CRP/DOW** 12/11/88 F 385,387/387,801

72. RUNYAN (Runyon on MR), Levi **Sgt** 238,945/551,333 W 1046,914/799,812

73. SERVIS, John F. **CRP-SGT** 216,744/148,482

74. SERVIS, Samuel **P**

75. SLATER, John **P/d. in tent "suddenly"** Sister 116,350/170,772

76. SLOAN, Wm. H. **Sgt to Lt** 1212,727/1034,163

77. SMITH, Henry C. **P/KIA** 10/4/79 M 252,305/198,888

78. SNYDER, Lewis **P** 12/28/87 633,693/408,000 W 591,110/404,967

79. SNYDER, Wilson H. **Corp to Sgt** 7/28/90 829,447/901,285

80. SORTER, Robt. S. **P/DOW**

81. STARKER, Andrew C. **P/DOD**

82. STARKER, Sutphen **P/DOD (POW)**

83. STOUT, Thos. P. **1LT to Cpt Co F 4/63**

84. STRYKER, Theodore **P/Dis 64** 7/6/91 1037,332/808,794 W 662,525/-

85. SULLIVAN, Joseph E. **P to Corp** 6/15/80 382,736/516,790 W 795,919/602,495

86. TEN BROEK, Peter I **P** 4/30/69 142,897/103,994 W 772,901/562,769

87. TRAUGER, Abraham **Crp** 6/16/71 166,483/122,312 W 1159,239/894,017
M 961,626/726,650

88. VAN CAMP, George C. **P** 9/11/88 671,665/711,836 W 757,199/544,672

89. VAN FLEET, Abram **P** 273,495/168,474

90. VOORHEES, Lucien A. **SGT/KIA**

91. WEAN, Benj. F. **P** 6/29/80 401,062/344,161 W 578,377/382,320

92. WELSH (Welch on Muster Roll), Michael **P** 3/25/90 764,178/768,642

93. WOLVERTON, Benj. S. **P** 8/8/83 492,277/335,150 W 823,639/597,410

94. WOODRUFF, Danl **P/MIA** W 96,010/52,777

95. WYCKOFF, John H. **P/DOD** M 93,961/282,059 F 629,028/434,412

96. YORKS (York on Muster Roll), John **P/Dis 63** 386,945/219,895

Listed Deserters (all Privates)

97. AGIN, Wm. H. **Fom hosp 2/14/65**

98. GARMO, Chas. **From White Oak 1/17/63 (w/ Young)**

99. JACKSON, Wm. B. **Before muster** in 62

100. YOUNG, Wm. H. **From White Oak 1/17/63 (w/ Garmo)**

RECRUITS

1. BAKER, John **R/P/to I Co OK**

2. BEAM, Jacob **R/1/64/KIA** Mthr 280,470/218,825

3. BOOTH, Benj. **R63/P/to C Co OK**

4. BOWMAN, Jonathan B. **R/64/P TO D Co** 788,126/-

5. BROWN, Chas. **R/65/NF**

6. BROWN, William **R/ex D Co, 9/64** 911,207/671,390

7. BROWN, William (#2) **R/ex K Co, 4/65**

8. BRYAN, William P. **R/2/64** 977,661/1045,191

9. CANTRILL (Cantrell), David (S.) **R63/P/TO I/15** 1166,940/992,542 W 813,852/591,744

10. EVANS (Evens on Muster Roll), John **?/P/MIA** F 131,974/-

11. EVERETT, Jos. C. **R/P/KIA** W 65,410/36,400 M 199,021/155,245

12. FORCE, Thomas **R/65/P to G/2**

13. GREEN, Mahlon **R/64/P to K**

14. GULICK, Wm. **R/P** 330,257/853,499 M 497,831/368,504

15. HAMMITT, Van Meter P. **R/P** 430,656/268,901 W 1030,672/782,886

16. HARRINGTON, Michael **R/64/P to B**

17. HENDERSHOT, Abraham **R/63/P to D**

18. HOPKINS, John **R/63/P to D**

19. HOWARTH, Eli **R/64/P to K**

20. INGLE, David P. **R/P** W 427,539/311,632

21. JACKSON, Alfred B. **R/64/P to D**

22. JOHNSON, Abraham, Jr. **R/63/P to D**

23. JOHNSON, Bernard **R/63/P to D**

24. JOHNSON, Joseph **R/64/P to K**

25. KESSLER, Simon N. R. **R/64/P to vet res**

26. KREWSON, Joseph M. **R/64/P to B**

27. LANGDON, Jos. **R/63/P to I**

28. MCGARVEY, Thos. **R/63/P to D**

29. MOSER, John **R/P/WIA** 1/31/66 101,287/65,807

30. MULLEN, Patrick **R/63/P to D**

31. OLBON, Wm. **R/64/P to K**

32. RAY, Michael **R/65/P to G/2**

33. SCHEERER, Chas. **R/63/P/KIA**

34. SMILEY, Chas. E. **R64/P** 4/13/80 357,609/219,409

35. STAATS, John C. **R64/P/DOD** 10/11/65 W 112,017/150,365

36. STEWART, Chas. B. **R63/P** 6/24/80 W 270,848/303,753 [E2, I15]

37. STONEMETZ (Stamets on Muster Roll), Theodore **R64/P/MIA 5/6/64**

    F 218,386/180,140

38. SUTTON, Geo. **R/64/P to D**

39. VAN ETTEN, John **R64/P** 1/24/89 W 387,706/280,332 [C/15, D/2]

40. WHITE, John M. **R64/P** 8/26/90 890,945/854,070

41. WINTERMUTE, Watson **R/64/P to D**

Deserters

42. MILLER, John **R**

43. ROUCH, John **R**

44. STANLEY, Chas. H. **R**

SUBSTITUTES

1. ABRAMS, Jacob D. **S/3/65** 566,437/445896 W 761,465/- [aka JACOBS, Henry & Jacob D. Abrams, Abrahams), QV]

2. BANFIELD, Thomas S. **S/3/65** 1130,738/-

3. BANKS, Charles **S/3/65** W 757,989/552,572 –

4. BAXTER, Chas. **S65/P OK**

5. BISHOP [Bischoff on Muster Roll], Christian **S/3/65** 939,440/710,829 [XC873,386] **VA**

6. BLANC, Louis **S65/P** 1,027,874/786,796

7. BUTT, Wm. **S65/P OK**

8. CAMPBELL, Adam **S/65/P/DOD**

9. CAREY, Hugh **S65/P/ OK**

10. CASH, Michael **S/3/65P** 800,625/695,596

11. COCHRAN [CORCORAN], John **S/3/65** 1323,364/-

12. DEWITT, John J. **S65/P**

13. DOBELMAN, John **S/3/65** 778,035/583,706

14. DROLL, Joseph **S/3/65** 821,261/651,826

15. DYBERT, Henry **S65/P**

16. EDWARDS, James **S/65/P to Co F/2**

17. EHRISMANN, Herman **S/65/P to F/2**

18. GOODWIN, Henry **S/65/P to F/2** 976,795/- W 655,205 M 41,140/-

19. HARMAN, Peter **S/65/P to G/2**

20. HARRIS, John (aka Schaeffer, John) **S/Crp** 1389,988

21. HENZERLING, Chas. **S/P** 478,086/-

22. KUHN, Ferdinand **S/65/P to F/2**

23. MCNULTY (MCNALTY on Muster Roll), Philip **S/P** 9/29/88 W 381,201/338,322

24. MARGGRAF, Ferdinand **S/P** 8/10/82 457,041/-

25. QUARTZ, Henry **S/65/P to F/2**

26. REDDING, John **S/65/P to G/2**

27. RYBERG, Peter M. **S/65 to G2** 8/18/91 1051,426/961,302

28. SOMERS, Alfred **S/65/P to F/2**

29. STOREY, Jos. **S/65/P to G/2**

30. STRAS[S]BURGER, Frederick **S65/P** 7/2/92 1119,746/1048,592

31. STUDER (Stuter on MR), August **S65/P** 9/27/81 430,538/290,174 W

32. WEST, Rufus **S/65/P to G/2**

33. WHITE, Chas. V. R. **S65/P** 7/22/71 Mother 197,956/181,862

34. WINKLER, Frank **S/65/P to F/2**

35. YOUNG, Wm. **S/65/P to G/2**

36. ZWICKEY, Frederick **S65/P/NF**

DRAFTED MEN

1. BROADWATER, William **D/3/65** 315,832/564,

2. CHESTER, Robert **D/3/65** 518,008/285,431

3. COLLINS, Alfred **D/2/65** 902,290/702,447 W 959,561/721,240

4. WHITFORD, Alexander **D65/P** 10/17/90 W 498,024/308,151

"TRANSFEREES"

OFFICERS/MEN FROM OTHER 15NJ INF UNITS

1. COMINGS, James H. **?/ex I Co, 7/64/L** (aka HUSTEN, James/JAMES, Charles H.)

1154,329/869,912 W 769,173/550,493

2. CONNET(T), Samuel R. **TI/L** 586,399/403,834 W 588,251/391,613

3. DAVIS, Ebenezer W. **TI/Lt to Brvt Maj, Maj** 1312,272/1083,271 W -/384,468

4. DONNELLY, James **?/ex H Co, 7/64/L** 315,932/293,603 W 614,750/412,486

5. FOWLER, Henry M. **2LT TO CPT/NF**

6. JACKSON, Chas. **Sgt/KIA**

7. LEWIS, Horace E. **P-LT-BRVT CPT** 7/28/90 W 435,629/323,184

8. SHIMER, Cornelius **63/Lt toCpt/KIA** 8/2/81 F 285,457/285,509

Others

9. DAWS, Joseph S. **P/DOD** W 68,497/56,820

10. WHITNEY, Augustus **P/DOW**

"NOT FOUND ON MR"

1. ADAMS, Abram **NOT FND** 658,217/866,715

2. ALLEN, Edward **NOT FND** 527,710/298,237

3. ANDERSON, Thomas **NOT FND** 1026,654/- W 558,666/363,595

4. BANTER (aka BENNET), Charles (B) **NOT FND** 824,014/630,513

W 536,470/333,361

5. BLACKWOOD, William F. **NOT FND** 434,056/805,318

6. COLLINS, George **NOT FND** 311,370/266,653 W 765,510/545,217

7. DUMBLE, John **NOT FND** 67,430/50,418 W 579,608/382,214

8. EMERSON, Lowe **NOT FND** 1318,147/1092,592

9. FLYNN, Patrick **NOT FND**

10. GIBSON, Wm. **NOT FND**

11. JOHNSON, Jms R. **NOT FND** 85,870/50,416 W 693,153/481,627

12. KELLER, Frank **NOT FND** 7/27/00 1252,006/-

13. LOZIER, Alexander H. **P/NOT FND** 9/17/90 953,145/706,116

14. MIDDAUGH, Benjamin **?/NOT FND** 6/24/05 1337,454/1126,318

15. MIDDLEDORF, Henry **P/NOT FND** 5/16/82 449,585/306,736 W 494,133/- [same as MITTELDORF, Henry [same "I" #s] W 435,733/294,315

16. MORROW, James **?/NOT FND** 990,923/937,609

17. MURPHY, John **?/NOT FND** 8/14/90 856,710/616,185 W 740,374/535,596

18. MURPHY, John (#2) **P/NOT FND** 7/3/90 W 427,613/423,920

19. REDDEN, Harvey **P/NOT FND** 209,803/140,611

20. ROBERTS, Elias (aka ROSE, Elias M.) **NOT FND** 6/17/92 1117,263/-

21. SAYERS, Jacob F. **NOT FND** 888,169/1023,440

22. SHAUGER, Wm. H. **NOT FND** 363,135/1101,528

23. SLAUGHTER, Chas. C. **NOT FND** 130,160/343,737

24. SPACHIAS, Wm. N. **P/NOT FND** 286,141/176,536 W 977,105/735,610 [A&C3]

25. THOMPSON, Lewis M. **/NOT FND** W 126,596/106,739 M 187,363/148,468

26. TURNER, Albert F. **P/NOT FND** 789,220/510,689 W 612,414/425,512

27. VAN DE GRIFT, John H. **P/NOT FND** 125,847/88,604 W 583,303/516,769

28. VAN EMBURGH, George **P/NOT FND** 774,008/554,183 W 1175,489/918,706

29. VAN RIPER, Abraham **NOT FND** 8/21/65 83,988/82,174

30. WELSH, Morris **NOT FND** 7/22/90 838,072/672,642 2/4/21 W 1169,396/903,715

APPENDIX B

NOTES ON ROSTER SOURCES AND COMPOSITION

COMPANY A, 15TH NJ VOLUNTEER INFANTRY REGIMENT

For this study, information on the *identity* and *enlistment status* of the members of Company A, and on the post-war lives of the men and their immediate families (parents, wives, children) has been compiled from a combination of sources.

ROMNJ. The most accessible basic source on the men's individual enlistment status and *wartime* service is the two-volume, *Record of Officers and Men of New Jersey in the Civil War, 1861-1865* (ROMNJ), published by the New Jersey Adjutant General's Office in 1876. (In the years immediately after the war, virtually every northern state government commissioned an encyclopedic effort to create one or more volumes listing all units raised and contributed by the state to the war effort. The works typically provide company rosters and at least some information for each soldier listed, as well as basic statistical data usually broken down by regiment, such as overall strength and casualty figures.)

ROMNJ lists all New Jersey regiments in order of call up, and each regiment is in turn broken down by company. Each company's muster roll lists all men who served with the company at any time during the war, broken down by several categories. Listed first are all officers and non-commissioned officers of the company. In Company A's case, almost all of the unit's original, three-year volunteers were mustered in en masse, on August 25, 1862, at Fair Oaks Camp, in Flemington, New Jersey.

Listed first, in order of highest rank achieved while a member of the company, are all officers (Captains and Lieutenants), *regardless* of their status by the end of the war (e.g., "killed in action", "resigned", "promoted [and transferred to another unit]", or transferred from another unit *into* the company). This convention for officer listings differs from that

used for enlisted men, and results in *all* of Company A's officers being confined to this initial category.

Listed next, in order of rank, are all enlisted men (Sergeants, Corporals, Musicians, and Privates) who served until the end of the war. Almost all in this category were either discharged from hospital on May 3, 1865, or from the ranks, en masse, on June 22, 1865, in Washington, D.C., following their participation in the Union Army's "Grand Review". In this and all other categories, Non-Commissioned Officers (NCOs) and Musicians are listed first, subdivided first by highest rank achieved, and then by date of promotion to that rank, and all are shown with last names *last*; followed by all Privates, listed in alphabetical order, last names *first*.

Following this initial category, a second category appears under the heading "Discharged". This list includes enlisted men discharged *before* the war ended and, inexplicably, a few who, like those among the first category, were discharged from hospital *after* the war ended, in May or June, 1865. (The only distinction between post-war hospital discharges appearing in the first and second categories seems to be that those in the first category were all discharged by telegraphed instructions sent to the hospital by the Adjutant General's Office of the War Department ["Tel. Ins., War Dept., A.G.O., Washington, D.C."], whereas those in the second category appear to have been discharged by the local authority in charge of the field or general hospital to which the soldier had been admitted.) Wartime discharges within this category were for "unfitness" resulting from wounds or chronic illness (what would today be termed medical discharges).

The third category, under the heading "Transferred," lists all enlisted men who were transferred *out of* the company to another unit, either before the end of the war, or after the main body of the company's surviving men were "mustered out" at war's end. (ROMNJ provides no category for men transferred *into* the company from other units; this information has had to be gleaned from other sources.)

The fourth category ("Died") lists all enlisted men who were killed in action, or who succumbed to wounds, disease, or other causes of death while in service with the company.

Under a final heading ("Deserted") are listed all men who deserted, either "en route" to being mustered into the company (after having signed an enlistment agreement), or after having served with it for some period.

In separate columns, ROMNJ provides basic information for each man, including:

1. highest rank achieved while a member of the company;

2. date of state enlistment (or "enrollment") agreement (or, in the case of officers, date of commission);

3. date subsequently "mustered in" (i.e., reported for duty, thereby formally submitting to military authority and swearing oath of allegiance, and thereafter "carried" on the unit's books until death, transfer, hospitalization, or discharge);

4. period of enlistment (one or three years);

5. Date "mustered out" of service (if discharged while still a member of the company).

6. In a final column, titled "Remarks", some additional information is provided for most men listed (both officers and enlisted men).

Of primary importance is identification of the enlistment category of each enlisted man who was not among the company's original one hundred volunteers, but who joined it later as a replacement ("Recruit", "Substitute", or "Drafted"). (Men who enlisted as "Volunteers" with the original company are given no particular designation.)

It is usually possible to determine original rank, promotion and assignment data for NCOs, and to reconstruct the list of all individuals rotating through a particular leadership position in the company, by noting "Enrolled" or "Mustered In" dates and information contained in the "Remarks" column.

For example, ROMNJ information reveals that Company A's original 1st Sergeant was George C. Justice, who remained in that position until promoted to company 2nd Lieutenant on March 18, 1863. Justice was replaced as 1st Sergeant by Paul Kuhl, on April

22, 1863, Kuhl having begun service with the company in 1862 as a Corporal. Following the disastrous engagement at Spotsylvania Courthouse the following year, in which Kuhl was killed, James J. Bullock, who had also mustered in with the company in 1862 as a Corporal, was promoted to company 1st Sergeant (May 29, 1864). Bullock, however, was soon commissioned a 1st Lieutenant (July 3, 1864) and transferred to another company in the regiment. He was in turn was replaced by Manuel Kline, who had originally joined the company in 1862 as a Sergeant, and was promoted to 1st Sergeant on July 28, 1864. Kline too was shortly promoted to Officer rank and transferred out of the company (September 10, 1864), and was ultimately replaced, on February 1, 1865, by William B. Dungan, who had joined the company in 1862 as a Corporal and been promoted to Sergeant on May 31, 1863.

Reviewing ROMNJ information for all Company A Officers and NCOs reveals three general promotion and assignment practices that were almost invariably observed. First, *all* men promoted from Private to NCO rank (Corporal or Sergeant), or promoted from one NCO rank to another, were selected from within the company, and in all but one case, from among the company's original volunteers. (The single exception found was William P. Bryan, an 18-year old Hunterdon County farmer, who joined the company as a Recruit, in the rank of Private, on February 29, 1864. Almost a year later, over the heads of several other original Company A Privates, he was promoted to Corporal, on February 1, 1865, and served the company in that rank for the balance of the war. On June 21, 1865, the day before the bulk of the company was discharged, he was transferred to another regiment, where he served another three weeks and was promoted to Sergeant. He was evidently an enterprising soldier, and his Hunterdon origins, youth, and farming background probably allowed him to become popular among the company's longer-serving men, despite his later enlistment.) *No* individuals were transferred from other units into an NCO position in the company, regardless of prior experience or time in service.

Second, in sharp contrast to the company's NCOs, new Company A *Officers* were almost all assigned from outside the company, rather than promoted from within it.

Company A was formed in 1862 with a standard cadre of three Officers (Captain Lambert Boeman, 1st Lieutenant Thomas P. Stout, and 2nd Lieutenant John R. Emery), each of whom was directly commissioned into his first military rank and position. Of the eight men who subsequently served the company in these three positions, seven were transferred from other units, and only one promoted from within Company A. Specifically, all three men who served as Captain (after Boeman was promoted to Major in May, 1863) were 1st or 2nd Lieutenants promoted and assigned from other companies within the 15th Regiment. Of the four men who served as 1st Lieutenant (following Stout's promotion to Captain and transfer to another of the regiment's companies, on April 7, 1863), three were assigned from other units (one 2nd Lieutenant and one Sergeant from other companies in the regiment, and one Private from another regiment), and only one, a 2nd Lieutenant at the time, was promoted from within the company. And the one additional man who served as the company's 2nd Lieutenant (after Emery was discharged for disability on February 23, 1863) was a Sergeant promoted and assigned from another of the regiment's companies.

And third, Officers were usually appointed (commissioned) directly into their initial Officer rank, rather than promoted from enlisted rank. Of the eleven men who served during the war as Company A Officers, seven were appointed directly into their initial Officer rank, apparently without prior military experience. Only four were commissioned from enlisted ranks (one, Justice, from Company A, and three, James H. Comings, James Donnelly, and Horace E. Lewis, from other companies), and such promotions were usually made, as would be expected, from upper enlisted ranks. Of the four, three were promoted from the two highest NCO echelons: Justice from 1st Sergeant, and Comings and Donnelly from Sergeant. No Corporals were promoted directly to Officer, but one Private was: Lewis. (Lewis appears to have been a special case. In May, 1861, the first year of the war, he enlisted for three years with a company of the 2nd New Jersey Infantry Regiment, in the rank of Private. In December, 1863, five months before the end of his period of service, he re-enlisted and, a little more than a year later [February 9, 1865], after more than *3-1/2 years* of enlisted

service, was commissioned a 1st Lieutenant, and transferred the same month to Company A.) No enlisted man was promoted directly to an Officer rank higher than 1st Lieutenant; thus all Company A promotions to the rank of Captain or higher were made from other Officer ranks.

Recruits were men who voluntarily enlisted after the original company had been formed and entered service, usually induced by state and local recruitment efforts and the payment of one or more bounties. Each state, and each recruitment subdivision within the state, were given a quota of men they were required to enlist for service in the Union Army, and recruitment (because "voluntary") was deemed preferable to conscription. Recruits were generally assigned to existing units as replacements for original volunteers killed, wounded or discharged.

When recruitment efforts failed to generate a sufficient flow of replacements, conscription (the draft) was enforced, in 1864-65. The draft in turn produced a new and bleak "free market" institution during the Civil War: purchase of the service of men willing to enlist and risk exposure to combat in exchange for a substitute "fee", enlisting in the place of another man who had been drafted. Substitutes "brokers," locating substitutes and matching them with drafted men for profit, became a commonplace. The ROM's final two categories of service were, accordingly, "Drafted" and "Substitute".

See Appendix A for total roster, list of men serving, and breakdown by enlistment category.

Pension Files**.** A more detailed source of information on the wartime experience of many Company A men consists of veterans pension claim files, maintained at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), in Washington, DC. Moreover, these files are the primary - and often the *only* - source of information on their and their immediate families' *post-war* lives. (See Appendix A.)

State Regimental Records**.** A third useful source are the regimental records maintained for the 15th New Jersey Infantry Regiment in the New Jersey Archives, located

at the State Library at Trenton, New Jersey. (NARA also maintains wartime regimental records but these were not reviewed, as the work focuses on the men's *post-war* lives.) These, however, consist mainly of data for each soldier as of the date of his enlistment only (for most, July or August, 1862), and are therefore most useful in providing a glimpse of the soldier's immediate *pre-war* circumstances (residence, marital status) and his physical attributes at the time of entry into service.

Unit Histories**.** Finally, there exist two "unit" histories of the 15th New Jersey, separated by more than a century. Both are extremely helpful in describing the day-to-day experience of the regiment *as a whole* throughout its approximately 34 months of wartime service, both "in the field" during active campaigning, and "in camp" during winter months or between engagements. The first is (Regimental Chaplain) Alanson Haines' *History of the Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers* (New York: Jenkins & Thomas, 1883), and the second is Joseph G. Bilby's *Three Rousing Cheers: A History of the Fifteenth New Jersey from Flemington to Appomattox* (Hightstown: Longstreet House, 1993). Occasionally, these two sources yield precious wartime details about particular members of Company A. Bilby's work, in two supplemental sections ("Lives", beginning at page 253; and "Photo Gallery", beginning at page 277) contains brief, individual notes on numerous Company A men, and wartime photographs of several of them.

Haines counts 99 officers and men on the original company muster roll, and 83 "additions" (combining enlisted transfers, recruits, substitutes and draftees), for a total wartime roster of 182. (Bilby, apparently using Haines' count, comes up with identical numbers.) Haines does not include the seven officers transferred into Company A from other units during the war, which would reduce the discrepancy between his and ROMNJ's numbers to only five (189 for Haines/Bilby; 194 for ROM).

APPENDIX C

NOTES ON UNION ARMY ORGANIZATION, THE 15TH NJ VOLUNTEER INFANTRY REGIMENT AND ITS 10 COMPANIES, AND OTHER UNION REGIMENTS RAISED FROM NEW JERSEY AND HUNTERDON COUNTY

Union Army Organization, and 15th NJ's Place in Union Forces

The overall organization of Union forces became more or less standardized by 1862. At the top was the commander in chief of all army (land) forces, Lieutenant General Ulysses S. Grant (the position was first created in 1864, and Grant was the only person to fill it during the war. Prior to this promotion, Grant had commanded the Army of the Tennessee, in the western theater). Grant chose to make his headquarters as commander-in-chief with the Army of the Potomac, in the eastern theater, but was not technically in command of that army.

At the next level were discrete "armies" operating in particular geographic areas; e.g., the Army of the Tennessee (western theater), and the Army of the Potomac, and Army of the James (eastern theater). The 15th NJ was incorporated in the Army of the Potomac throughout the war. This army was also commanded by men in the rank of Lieutenant General; its commanders were Irvin McDowell (to July, 1861); George B. McClellan (July, 1861 to November, 1862); Ambrose E. Burnside (November, 1862- to January, 1863); Joseph "Fighting Joe" Hooker (January, 1863 to June, 1863); and George Gordon Meade (June, 1863 through the end of the war in April, 65). The 15th therefore served under all Army of the Potomac commanders except McDowell.

Below the level of army were corps, which at full strength could total as many as 30,000 men. The Army of the Potomac consisted of as many as eight infantry corps, each corps being commanded by a Major General. Under Hooker, for example, this army included

the I, II, III, V, VI, IX, XI, and XII Corps. (Since units were soon reduced to operating at strengths of only 25-50% of their full complement, Hooker's army numbered only about 90,000 men at the time he was relieved shortly before Gettysburg.) The members of each corps were assigned a distinctive corps badge, to be worn on the hat or cap. The 15th NJ was assigned through most of the war to the VI Corps, commanded by Major General John Sedgwick. Its badge was a Greek cross (:). (Sedgwick was appointed commander during the winter of 1862-1863, while the unit was in winter quarters.) Sedgwick, whom Haines described as "the beloved chief of the Sixth Corps," (161) was shot in the face by a rebel sharpshooter on May 9, 1864, during the Battle of the Wilderness, and died within a half hour. Command was transferred to General Horatio B. Wright, till then the commander of the corps's First Division. He served in this capacity until the end of the war.

Each corps contained several divisions, usually three, of about 9,000 men each. Divisions were assigned colors (red for 1st, blue for 2nd, white for 3rd, etc.), and the division's corps badge would be of that color. The 15th NJ was assigned to the VI Corps's 1st Division, so its Greek cross badge was colored red.

The final level of organization above regiment was brigade; there were several brigades in each division, typically three, and at full strength each brigade might number 3,000 men. Brigades were usually commanded by Brigadier Generals. On October 3, 1862, the 15th NJ was incorporated into the 1st Brigade of the 1st Division, VI Corps. The brigade was referred to as the "First New Jersey Brigade," as it was made up entirely of regiments raised in that state. (The other regiments of the 1st Brigade in 1862 were the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th NJ Infantry, each of which was comprised of 3-year enlistees.) The 1st Brigade commander at the time the 15th joined it in 1862 was Colonel (later Brigadier General) Alfred Thomas Archimedes Torbert. The brigade was subsequently commanded by Colonel William Penrose, from April, 1864 to the end of the war.

The 1st Brigade's four other regiments were raised primarily from the three other military districts of the state (northeastern, southeastern, and southwestern). The 15th NJ

was raised from a five-county region in the northwest part of the state (Sussex, Warren, Hunterdon, Morris, and Somerset; see county map). The Appalachian Mountains cross the northwest corner of the state on a southwest-northeast axis. Topographically, the lower, or southeastern, border of the range runs along upper Hunterdon and Somerset counties, and the gradually rising hills of the range include most of the other three counties; hence the 15th was sometimes known as "the Mountain Regiment," even though most of its Hunterdon County members resided in the county's relatively flat or low-lying hill country south of the range.

New Jersey raised and sent into the war a total of 15 three-year infantry regiments (numbered 1 through 15) and 3 three-year cavalry regiments (numbered 1 through 3). As mentioned, the 15th suffered more war-related deaths than any other New Jersey regiment. New Jersey's regimental losses ranged from a low of 106 (the 13th NJ Infantry: 35 DoD; 68 DoW [includes KIA]; and 3 DiP], to the 15th's high of 361 (99 DoD; 247 DoW; and 15 DiP). Average losses for all 3-year NJ regiments, including cavalry units, was 234, so the loss experience of the 15th NJ was more than 50% greater than average.

Primary causes of death among the regiments varied greatly. Disease, for example, accounted for as few as 39 deaths in one regiment, and as many as 142 in another. This disparity points toward the fortuitous circumstances of winter camp location, contagion by a particularly virulent strain of "camp disease," and hygiene (which was more or less accidental, especially during the earlier period of the war).

Death on the battlefield accounted for as few as 68 casualties in one regiment, and as many as the 15th's record high of 247. The disparity in this case was probably due to two main factors: the fortuitous circumstance of the particular engagements the regiment happened to be committed to during the war (the extremely bloody encounter at Spotsylvania, for example, versus a much less lethal skirmish); and the relative grit and determination of the unit itself (which sometimes, though not inevitably, would produce more casualties).

Finally, deaths from imprisonment by the enemy also varied greatly by regiment, from a low of 3 to a high of 52. Here, reasons for the difference would likely have included the fluidity and confusion of particular battles to which committed (men being more likely to be separated from the main body of their regiment in such circumstances, and to fall prey to capture), and the particular role of the regiment itself. The 3 cavalry regiments each experienced comparatively high losses in this category - 37, 40, and 47, for an average of 41 - whereas the overall infantry average was only 20, or half that amount. Unlike infantry, cavalry units were highly mobile, and often used for deep penetration, harassment, and reconnaissance missions behind enemy lines, where capture was much more of a risk.

The 15th NJ's original organizer and commander was Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Fowler, a popular and charismatic leader from Franklin, Sussex County, New Jersey. He was born in 1818, and grew in the home of a well-respected local family; his father was an educated "mineralogist and scientific man". He studied law before the war, but like his father, devoted his time mainly to mining and inventing. He was commissioned at the age of 44. Unfortunately, like so many of his men, he fell ill with typhoid during the unit's first fall season, traveled home with his brother's body, and then attempted to rejoin the regiment in late 1862. He was still too ill to accompany the men into the field (remaining behind during the notorious "mud march" in January, 1863), and was at last forced by deteriorating health to tender his resignation, departing for good in March.[11]

A lasting legacy was Fowler's appointment of his cousin, Alanson Haines, to the position of regimental chaplain. Haines turned out to be one of the most popular and hard-working field-grade officers in the unit, and ultimately produced the finely written regimental history that is so frequently cited in this work.

---

[11] Haines 8-9, 43. Fowler returned to New Jersey where he was subsequently elected to the state legislature. He insisted on attending an opening session in early 1865, and expired in his hotel room at Trenton in January of that year.

In Fowler's absence, another popular leader, Lt. Col. Edward L. Campbell, assumed the duties of command. Campbell had originally been requested by Fowler, and was appointed initial vice commander of the regiment; he had had valuable combat experience with the 3rd NJ Volunteer Regiment in 1861 and 1862 (including Antietam), before being transferred to the 15th. In April, 1863, however, Washington promoted and assigned a regular army officer, First Lieutenant William H. Penrose, to take over command, and Campbell reverted to his vice commander position, which he held until nearly the close of the war (and see below).

Many of the regiment's men felt Campbell had deserved the privilege of leading the 15th, and were initially resentful of Penrose. ("Jersey Brigade" commander Torbert apparently pulled political strings to help Penrose, and "[n]ot everyone was happy with the…appointment". [Bilby 49, 266].) Haines apparently shared this view but, tactful as ever, he handled the matter in his regimental history with the following commentary:

> [After Fowler departed], command of the regiment…devolved upon Lieutenant-Colonel Edward L. Campbell. Almost from the day he joined us he had been in command. With *the exception of a few intervals* he thus continued until near the close of the war, *leading it in every great battle in which it participated.* (43-44; emphasis added.)

So much for the actual commander of the 15th, Colonel Penrose, whose "interval" at the helm amounted to about 12 months. Penrose nevertheless turned out to be a competent, though never beloved, field officer, and served with the regiment until April, 1864, when he was promoted to command of the entire 1st Brigade. He was promoted to Brevet Brigadier General in October, 1864, and in June, 1865, one day before the 15th was mustered out, transferred to command of the 2nd NJ Regiment, a step down in terms of unit size.

<u>The Ten Companies of the 15th NJ</u>

The 10 companies of the 15th were raised predominantly in the following areas of northwest New Jersey (principal towns listed first, asterisk [*] indicating county seat, followed by county in parentheses; 9-10):

A – Flemington* (Hunterdon)

B – Hackettstown and Belvidere* (Warren)

C – Morristown* and Mendham (Morris)

D – Lafayette and Branchville (Sussex)

E – Somerville* (Somerset)

F - Chester (Morris)

G - Frenchtown (Hunterdon)

H - Washington (Warren)

I – Newton* and Montague (Sussex)

[no J]

K – Hamburg and Franklin (Sussex)

Totals: Sussex: 3; Morris: 2; Hunterdon: 2; Warren: 2; Somerset: 1

Within the 15th New Jersey, war-related deaths and other losses appear to have been relatively evenly distributed among 8 of the 10 companies, but significantly higher for the remaining 2.[12467] Among the 8, deaths ranged from 26 to 36, and averaged 31.5. For the remaining 2 companies, however (A and D), deaths totaled 48 and 50, respectively, a loss experience more than 50% higher than the other 8. Overall, the 10 companies averaged 35 deaths each.

Research has shown that 42 of Company A's 48 deaths (88%) occurred among the company's original 100 volunteers. It is therefore clear on whom the greater burden of the unit's war-fighting fell, as between volunteers and all other categories.

But one can only speculate why, among the 10 companies, deaths in Companies A and D were significantly higher. It is possible that, again, much of the difference had to do with the fortuitous circumstance of where, along the regimental line, the hardest blows fell

[12] Regimental records (ROMNJ) gives total deaths in all 10 companies of the regiment as 350 (11 fewer than Haines's compilation of 361, but still well above any other NJ regiment). The range was from a low of 26 (Companies G and K), to a high of 50 (Company D), nearly double the low number. Company A ranked a close second in deaths among the companies of the regiment, with 48.

during the bloodiest fighting. Such a line, typically made up of two rows of from 200-300 men each, advancing side-by-side, could extend across a distance of a few hundred yards, and the sharpness of the fighting along it could vary considerably from place to place. In Company A's case, their role as the "honor" company, situated on the right flank of the regimental line and expected at all costs to anchor the regiment as it advanced, may possibly have contributed to a higher than average casualty count.

This ROMNJ information is generally consistent with Haines's list of men mustering out of the regiment on its last day of federal service in 1865. The number remaining to muster out from each company is a rough indication of the company's relative losses during the war, although by the end all companies had received replacements and Haines's list does not distinguish among categories. He calculated that a total of 341 men mustered out, a company average of 34. Company A was left with the *fewest* men to muster out, 29 (indicating relatively higher losses), and Companies H and K the most, 40. (Hard-hit Company D also mustered out a lower than average number, 31 men.)

A further indication of Company A's honored status among the regiment's ten companies was the rapid rise of initial commander, Captain Boeman. When a vacancy was created, in May of 1963, by the resignation from the regimental staff of its original Major, Daniel R. Burrell, Boeman was promoted to that rank and assigned to assumed Burrell's position. (The staff Major was third in the regiment's chain of command, after its Colonel and Lieutenant Colonel.) In October, 1864, he was temporarily assigned to command of the 10th New Jersey. (Boeman was shot and killed in this position, at the Battle of Cedar Creek, on October 19, 1864.) When Boeman was transferred out of the 15th NJ, the man who had replaced him as Company A's commander, Captain Ebeneezer Davis, was again chosen to take over the position of regimental Major. Clearly, the company enjoyed favored status, and was looked to provide leadership at the regimental level.

CURRICULUM VITA

Michael K. Heaney

Academic Institutions Attended:

Middlebury College, 1960-64; BA; Anthropology and Sociology Major; Russian Studies Minor

Columbia University, 1967; Non-matriculating; Political Science, International Relations

Harvard Law School, 1967-70; JD

Rutgers University, 1988-08; PhD; American History Major; Legal History Minor

Occupations and Employers:

United States Army, Infantry, 1965-67; Rifle Platoon Leader, Republic of South Viet Nam

Heaney & Heaney, Attorneys at Law, 1975-2000; Partner, practicing attorney; Member, Bars of Maryland, New Jersey, District of Columbia, and Federal Courts (including U.S. Army Court of Appeals)

Tewksbury Township, New Jersey, 1979-86; (part-time) Township Committeeman, Mayor

Borough of Bernardsville, New Jersey, 1979-99; (part-time) Municipal Prosecutor

Borough of Peapack and Gladstone, New Jersey, 1990-99; (part-time) Municipal Prosecutor

Hurricane Island Outward Bound School, 1985-2001 (seasonal); Senior Instructor/Wilderness Guide; Sea, Land, and Vietnam Veterans Programs; Soviet/American Veterans Exchange Program (1989-91)

Rutgers University, 1998-Present; (part-time) Adjunct Professor, History and American Studies

Yale University, 2004; Visiting Lecturer, American Studies

Trinity College (Hartford), 2000-06; Adjunct Professor, History, Political Science, First Year Program, Public Policy & Law Program