

**RESTORATION OF
“STORMING A REDOUBT”
THE YORKTOWN PAINTING
IN THE OLD SENATE CHAMBER**

REPORT OF THE SENATE RULES COMMITTEE

To

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA



Senate Document No. 27

1974

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE RULES COMMITTEE

MESSRS. EDWARD E. WILLEY, *Chairman*

WILLIAM F. PARKERSON, JR.

OMER L. HIRST

WILLIAM V. RAWLINGS

WILLIAM B. HOPKINS

HUNTER B. ANDREWS

ROBERT S. BURRUSS, JR.

Louise O'C. Lucas
Clerk of the Senate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Chairman's Report.....	1
II. Technical Treatment Report.....	2
III. York Town: A Symbolic Panorama.....	4

Report of the Senate Rules Committee

Richmond, Virginia
March 9, 1974

To the General Assembly of Virginia:

Chapter 804, 1972 Acts of Assembly

Item 779.2

Out of the contingency fund of the General Assembly there shall be expended a sum sufficient, estimated at \$8,000, for the restoration, by the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, of the painting "Storming a Redoubt."

Pursuant to the above chapter, the Rules Committee directed the Clerk of the Senate to contact Mr. James M. Brown, Director of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, and make the necessary arrangements for work to begin in the Old Senate Chamber on the restoration of the painting "Storming a Redoubt at Yorktown" by Louis Eugene Lami.

On the recommendation of Mr. Brown, a contract was signed with Mr. H. Stewart Treviranus, Conservation and Preservation of Paintings, 1231 Thirty-fourth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., 20007.

Mr. Treviranus was familiar with the work of the artist from the time he (Treviranus) served as apprentice to M. G. Paulet, restorer at Versailles, France, and further, when he served as a Volunteer Technical Assistant at the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D. C.

The committee further directed that the technical treatment report furnished the Senate by Mr. Treviranus be included in this report.

Also included herewith is a short research paper by Mr. Treviranus entitled "York Town: A Symbolic Panorama." In addition to tracing the history of the painting until the time it was presented to the Commonwealth, this paper tells much about the participants in the Battle of Yorktown through the identification of their regimental uniforms.

Mr. Treviranus began his work in July, 1972 and completed same in November, 1973.

This committee herewith expresses its appreciation to him.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward E. Willey, Chairman.

H. STEWART TREVIRANUS
CONSERVATION & PRESERVATION OF PAINTINGS

1231 THIRTY-FOURTH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20007

TECHNICAL TREATMENT REPORT — "YORKTOWN" PAINTING
by LAMI

The following is an outline of the procedures employed and the materials used, in the treatment of the painting, commenced on 8 May 72 and completed 9 January 73:

1. Painting taken out of frame by Buildings & Grounds, being placed upright against East wall.
2. Removal of grime, other accretions and discoloured varnish took place in this sequence:
 - a) 2-propanol
 - b) wax emulsion (for stains, esp. near perimeter)
 - c) n-dimethylformamide (stains & overpaint)
3. Still in vertical position — facing of mulberry (wet-strength) paper attached to front of painting with corn starch paste.
4. Painting laid flat on floor, reverse side uppermost.
5. Wooden stretcher and iron reinforcing plates (attached to stretcher) removed, including all tacks securing fabric to stretcher. This brought to light the only marking, except for artist's signature and date on the front, in the form of a paper label: "To His Excellency The Governor of Virginia", obviously dating from the time the gift was made, since reverse of label is Invitation to Ball "Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington," 20 February 1871.
6. Linen lining removed in strips; also adhesive of white lead, close to 200 lbs.! Removed with a paste of methylene chloride as a swelling agent, and picked up with knife. Due to extreme brittleness, circa 50% of tacking edge fell off.
7. Painting infused with thermoplastic wax-resin, components: 20% piccolyte resin, 80% microcrystalline wax (Bareco, white), applied with brush, levelled with heat sheet.
8. Painting raised above work area, using chain hoist.
9. The auxiliary support assembled. Consisting of four rigid panels of a polyurethane core (90.6% closed cells) with a leather-grained aluminum skin on either side. Panel 1³/₄" thick with a compressive strength of 32.3 p.s.i., weighing only 1.5 lb.p.sq.ft. Made by Buensod/Agitair, Pineville, N.C.. Attached aluminum angles to both long sides & 10" wide aluminum strips to straddle panel joints.
10. With assembled support turned over, smooth aluminum sheets (4) were attached to panel, positioned to "lap" panel joints by 1/2". Adhesive used: Neoprene cement No.7383 by Swift Chemical, Chicago, Ill. Aluminum: 6061-T6 .032 gauge by Reynolds Aluminum.
11. Unbleached muslin attached to smooth aluminum skin with Swift's No. 7383 cement, without allowing adhesive to saturate muslin.

TECHNICAL TREATMENT REPORT — continued

12. Prepared-panel surface infused with wax-resin, composition as in 7. above. Because of inevitable expansion of top aluminum sheets, upon application of heat, this phase took place 4 days following phase 10. above; the bond between aluminum and aluminum was thus appreciably improved.
13. Painting lowered onto panel and facing paper removed with water.
14. Vacuum envelope constructed of Mylar & duct tape.
15. The actual lining was done with hand iron, roughly 10" by 10" at a time and rolled out with small but heavy rubber roller. To avoid warping of top aluminum sheet, a resistance-type sensing element was attached to heating iron, allowing instant read-out on controller.
16. On panel edge, muslin interlayer and painting's tacking edge secured to exposed polyurethane core with wax-resin.
17. Excess wax-resin removed from face of painting as well as all remaining overpaint. Painting raised to vertical position.
18. Isolating (first) coating applied with spravgun. Material: Acryloid B-72 i.toluene(Rohm & Haas Co.)
19. Filling of major losses only with calcium carbonate & poly-vinyl acetate emulsion. Inpainting of fillings & major abrasions only with AYAC resin. NOTE: The general crackle pattern imposed by former severe dimensional stresses not inpainted.
20. Three further coatings of acryloid resin applied with spraygun in this order: B-67 (benzine); B-72 (toluene); B-72 (xylene).

Painting without frame is now lighter by approx. 240 lbs.

A complete photographic record was kept throughout, by Virginia Museum, Colonial Studio and H.H.S.Treviranus collectively.



H. Stewart Treviranus
15 January, 1973

YORK TOWN: A SYMBOLIC PANORAMA

by H. Stewart Treviranus

Just as eye witnesses to a particular incident can differ enormously in their respective accounts, so can painters depicting a historic event stray widely from anything like a truthful and accurate account: OUR side exhibiting all the noble characteristics, while THEIR side tends to portray the ignoble ones. After all, it is the victor who wishes to record the occasion for posterity.

The expansive painting by Louis Eugène Lami,¹ here discussed, executed in 1840, carries the title "Enlèvement d'une redoute anglaise par les troupes américaines à Yorktown"² or the more recent version: "The Battle of Yorktown".³ Although this painting evidences a rather more realistic approach, at least from the painterly point of view, than others depicting the revolutionary period, complete with smoldering shell fragments and a recently cooked evening meal, it is not an exception to the foregoing rule.

In contrast to realism, one need only scrutinize historic scenes by such eminents as Emmanuel Leutze. His "Washington crossing the Delaware"⁴ is a grand, idealized version of the actual event, the characters therein with a calm and devout countenance, ignoring completely the obvious discomfort heaped upon them by the icy gale. Leutze's "Engagement at Monmouth Courthouse",⁵ measuring 13 by 23 feet is a perfect example of romanticism, in all the starchy crispness of a studio setting. Similarly, John Trumbull, who after all was an eye witness to many of the events he painted, nevertheless glorified his subject matter out of all proportion, an understandable euphoria, such as in his "Battle of Bunker's Hill".⁶ In this painting, complete with Stars and Stripes, every man plays his symbolic part: The British bayoneting at random, but parried at the last moment by his intended American victim. Finally, his "Surrender of Cornwallis"⁷, along with Peale's "George Washington at Yorktown"⁸ are the only other important paintings, aside from Lami's, of the Siege of Yorktown.⁹ Trumbull in the "Surrender of Cornwallis" went so far as to include the vanquished commander, until public criticism forced him to substitute the officer who actually took his place, Brig. General Charles O'Hara of the Guards. A much more honest document is the painting "Siege et prise d'York" by Louis-Nicolas van Blarenberghe executed in France in 1785 for presentation to the king, with a replica to Count Rochambeau.¹⁰

Eugene Lami, on the other hand was born in 1800, 19 years after the engagement took place and 59 years passed before he completed his large canvas. Lami did not visit the site, nor is it likely that he was able to obtain first-hand information. His biographer makes no reference to the picture at all, aside from a seemingly last-minute inclusion, plus a footnote, in his 1914 Catalogue Raisonné.¹¹ For the sake of historic accuracy, and as an aid to the student, it would seem justifiable to point out, where legend and historic fact go their separate ways, as far as the presently available material permits. At the same time this should not be interpreted as a criticism of the artist, who after all lived in a totally different emotional climate. It is interesting that a "sister" painting exists, of identical dimensions, eleven by sixteen feet, originally known as "The Death of General Pakenham",¹² but also as "The Battle of New Orleans", owned by the State of Louisiana.¹³ The latter is not listed in the Catalogue Raisonné at all, more surprisingly so, since they were not separated until 1878. It is tempting to conclude that both paintings may have been born in the spirit of Lafayette's speech given on the site of the remains of Redoubt No. 10 in 1824: "... where the united arms of America and France have been

gloriously engaged in a Holy Alliance to support the right of American independence . . .".¹⁴

In Paris, oddly enough, no records have been found to shed any light upon the history of the painting, in spite of the artist's prominence and connections, including King Louis-Phillipe. The king became Lami's principal patron, whose talent he appreciated, when, in 1830 he appointed him Drawing Master to his second son, the Duke of Nemours.¹⁵ In planning to turn the Palace of Versailles into a Museum of "National Glory", Louis-Phillipe had Lami in mind, for if we look at the list of commissions in the archives of the Louvre, we find that Lami was given the largest number.¹⁶ His biographer states, that by 1839 he had "grown tired of doing battle scenes" and it is quite likely that the Yorktown painting was the last one.

Eleven years passed, after completion of the painting, when it and its sister painting, were seen by the art historian, M. Buzac¹⁷ at the Paris residence of Robert Morlot, who had commissioned them for 6,000 francs each.¹⁸ Morlot was a French importer in New York and a nephew of Archbishop Morlot, who was appointed one of the seven Counsellors of the Regency, by Louis-Napoleon. The pictures were then lodged in a lumberroom, unrolled, where they were also seen by the art historian and critic, Charles Eliot Norton (formerly of Harvard) when in the company of Prof. Samuel Morse, then of New York University.¹⁹ The latter was impressed by their quality, in contrast to the prominent collector, Walters, of Baltimore, who thought them of "little account".²⁰

It was not until 1878 that the two pictures surfaced again, this time in Richmond, in the possession of an art dealer, Z.B. Stearns, who had been a long-time resident of Paris. In the spring of that year, he called upon W.W. Corcoran, who owned the original Gallery by that name, presently the Smithsonian Institution's Renwick Gallery in Washington, D. C.. He left word that he desired to put them on exhibition and sell them.²¹ After an initial refusal by the Art Committee, it accepted them "if space permits". The two pictures arrived in Washington on March 8th., and were described by the curator, McCloud, as "badly rolled up and cracked through to the canvas". An artist himself, he was even less impressed by Lami: "There is much fine drawing and painting in them, but after all they are *far-far* behind in modern art!"²² Many connoisseurs came to see them, including Buzac, Walters, Norton, Morse, Riggs and of course, Corcoran. The latter was quoted a price of \$1,500 for the pair and the sale was affected on April 3rd.²³ The artists Barlow and Guillaume were approached to repair them. Guillaume's quotation being only one-tenth of Barlow's evidently appealed to the financier. When completed in July, McCloud commented, not surprisingly: "They look well, but a *thorough* repair ought to have been ordered!"²⁴

Meanwhile, Corcoran decided to present the paintings to the States where the events had taken place. He consequently offered the Yorktown picture to the Governor of Virginia, F.W.M. Holliday: "... as an evidence of my admiration for the old Commonwealth, which has been justly designated as the Mother of Statesmen and Heroes."²⁵ Jason McDonald, the Secretary of the Commonwealth duly recorded the offer in the Executive Journal, and on October 9th. the Governor wrote Corcoran to say, with deep appreciation, that the picture had been hung in the Senate Chamber.²⁶

Returning now to the viewer of the painting, he will at once recognize the subject matter: Americans overrunning a British fieldwork. Center stage is occupied by the British Army Commander, the Earl Charles Corn-

wallis at the moment of his capture by two American officers. With the red coats on the verge of retreating, the scene exhibits a certain air of finality. Historically, there was some truth to it: It was to be the last engagement between the British and the Continentals during the revolutionary war.²⁶

Cornwallis's capture was of course symbolic, since four days elapsed between this event and the capitulation. If a map is believed to have been in Lami's possession, then the respective dates were probably also. Aside from the Earl's portrait, there is also one of Lt. Col. Alexander Hamilton, who was in command of the storming party of some 400 men, New Englanders and New Yorkers. He is shown approaching Cornwallis with sword raised, at the double. The field officer with his hand upon the Earl's neck cloth, is evidently not a portrait, for his likeness resembles too closely that of the men around him. At this point in the action, with confusion rife, several units could have been involved, such as the 20 men of the 4th. Connecticut under Lt. John Mansfield,²⁷ the leading party, traditionally known as the Forlorn Hope. Entering the work behind them would have been the Rhode Islanders under Capt. Olney²⁸ belonging to Lt. Col. Gimat's battalion, on the right wing of the advance, and the men from Connecticut and New York of Hamilton's own battalion, on the left, under Maj. Nicholas Fish.²⁹ Since the various uniforms will be dealt with later, suffice it to say that none of these can be identified without question. In the middle distance a figure resembling George Washington can be made out, mounted on a buckskin, surrounded by mounted couriers.³⁰ According to an eyewitness, Doctor Munson, Washington stood on foot, along with Generals Knox and Lincoln, watching the assault through the embrasures of the Grand Battery. This battery would have been out of the picture, to the right. Artist's license can safely be assumed in respect to the TIME of the assault. Lami's setting is in broad daylight; while according to every source but one³¹ it took place at 8:00 of an overcast October night! A Sgt. Martin, with the Forlorn Hope related that the only light was provided by the fire of British musketry*, the Americans having advanced with unloaded³² weapons, under cover of darkness.

The topography of the painting shows a familiarity with the site: the field work was of square design and accurately appears battered by the allied bombardment, with the implements of siege-craft, gabions, palisades and abbatis in disarray. The work's location was immediately above the precipitous bank of the York River.³³ Following the York from left to right, sunken and scuttled British shipping is seen; then a windmill³⁴ and on the extreme right of the first allied parallel, Admiral Cmte. de Grasse's French Fleet. This fleet at that time was anchored off Cape Henry to guard both the York and James Rivers, was a principal reason for the capitulation.

Ensign Dennis, who kept the British Garrison's Orderly Book,³⁵ records that: "Forward Redoubt- Left", known to the Allies as "No. 10", was that night occupied by a company of the 71st Foot, some 50 officers and men, under the command of Maj. James Campbell.³⁶ This regiment was raised in the Scottish Lowlands in 1776 for service in America and officially known as 71st (Fraser's) Highlanders.³⁷ As a Highland Corps they would have worn highland dress complete with the Universal Military or Government Tartan, and white facings.³⁸

It can be safely assumed, though specific evidence is lacking that field service in America, especially during the summer months in the South, demanded issuance of breeches and gaiters in place of kilts. This was standard issue for regular line regiments, and probably why Trumbull's painting "The Surrender of York Town" for example, does not show any of

the British regiments in kilts, even though two were Highlanders. Other details demand attention such as cocked hats, never worn by a Highland Corps. They invariably stuck to their bonnets, whatever other clothing items may have been substituted. The Frasers moreover, wore a red hackle in their bonnets.³⁹ Also at this time, all Highland Regiments wore single black belts, and did not adopt the white or buff cross-belts shown, until after 1790.⁴⁰ The latter are actually the French pattern and "lie", the English being narrower and always had a buckle in front. Lami, here, was simply painting the type he knew best. He quite evidently, had no knowledge of the actual garrison on the night of October 14, and depicted instead a reasonably standard regiment of the line, with the French look extending even to the sumptuous cocked hats and full-cut skirts. Virtually the same characters can be found in battle-scenes of the First Empire, even to the way they stand!

The flag exchange in the centre of the painting is purely symbolic: running up the flag of the victor. Assuming, as one can with some certainty, that the British flag is a Regimental one, it would neither have accompanied a single company, nor be placed in a forward position. In actual practice, it is only carried by a full battalion in battle order. Similarly, the American flag would not have been carried in a night assault, moreover, the Stars and Stripes would only have been flown, at General headquarters. The design of the flag is intriguing! Peale's painting "Washington at Yorktown", clearly shows an eagle within the circle of stars, while Lami omitted the eagle.

Identification of the American uniforms depicted is rather more difficult. Little enough references have been located to date, and infinitely less was available in Lami's day. In this climate, the artist's or patron's intent may prove a clue. As a well-known military painter, Lami was commissioned to record the uniforms of the First Empire and the Restoration periods,⁴¹ and one can accept the fact that he did not intend to show Frenchmen in this painting. The French infantryman's white coats would have been unmistakable. Even the light-blue uniforms of the Royal Deux-Pont regiment, the sole exception to white, could not have escaped notice. The last-named indeed took part in the simultaneous attack on redoubt No. 9.⁴² Records indicate that only Americans entered No. 10, the one Frenchman participating, Lt. Col. Jean-Joseph Sourbader de Gimat, commanding the lead battalion, and holding a Continental commission, was wounded outside the redoubt.⁴³

The Continental Congress on Nov. 4th, 1775 established the first official regulation as to uniforms.⁴⁴ Thereafter the War Board published two orders in 1779⁴⁵ and 1782⁴⁶ which relate to dress. The former was the initial endeavor to clothe regular units uniformly, establishing blue as the basic colour in place of the previous *brown. However, in view of the perennial shortage of suitable cloth and money, exceptions became the rule, and some men probably never wore a "uniform". Typical of the extremely rare mention of references relating to uniforms in biographical material of the period concerning Continental troops, is General Stueben's remark at the surrender ceremonies. The Continental troops were drawn up in two lines, those in the first line wore for the most part, the uniform, but those who stood behind them, "were a ragged set of fellows, very ill-looking".⁴⁷ Lami must have been unaware of this shortcoming. However, he evidently did know that Lafayette's Light Infantry was involved (Light Infantry Division), for almost all the Americans are wearing a type of light Infantry cap similar to that illustrated in the official uniform work published by the Quartermaster Department of the Army, the date being 1782.⁴⁸ Lefferts⁴⁹ the noted uniform historian, painted "a light infantryman of Lafayette's corps. . . in the fighting dress

worn in the Virginia campaign of 1781 . . .". Nevertheless, it is improbable that such authorized headgear was either manufactured or issued to any extent. In addition, Lami's version is rather too luxurious a helmet and reflects a later, French style. The officers, on the other hand, including Hamilton, are properly wearing cocked hats. While the colouring of the coats and facings are believable, the men's coat-tails are much shorter than was customary, and again of a later style.

It is therefore impossible to identify the Continental troops shown, with any particular unit, primarily for reason of confusion with garments dating from the post-revolutionary war period. In view of the scarcity of information, Lami deserves considerable credit. To what extent he may have consulted the United States Ambassador, Lewis Cass, or the War Department, through Cass, formerly War Secretary,⁵⁰ or perchance one of the U.S. officers then stationed at Saumur⁵¹, is still unknown.

Historically then, this painting has the distinction of documenting the final clash of arms between British and Americans in the Revolutionary War. Inaccurate it may be in detail, but can one over-look the exciting agony of battle?

References:

1. 1800-1890, France.
2. Paul-André Lemoisne, 1914, *L'Oeuvre-D'Eugène Lami*, p. 388.
3. Corcoran Register, Folio 6, 1878. A Washington newspaper account of March 10, 1878 uses "Taking of the Main Redoubt at Yorktown." The present, correct, caption is "The Storming of Redoubt No. 10, October 14, 1781."
4. Coll. J. William Middendorf, II.
5. 1854, Coll. University Art Museum, U. of California.
6. 1786, Coll. Yale U. Art Gallery.
7. 1787, U. S. Capitol.
8. Maryland House of Delegates, Annapolis.
9. James Willson Peale, Coll. Clements Library, U. of Michigan.
10. Letter from Marshall Phillipe-Henri Marquis de Segur to Count de Rochambeau, June 2, 1785. Clements Library, U. of Michigan. Painting in Coll. Musée National de Versailles.
11. Lemoisne, 1914 footnote p. 388: "Cette peinture, signée Eugène Lami 1840, qui est aussi importante que les grandes toiles de Wattignies et Hondschoote à Versailles, se trouve dans L'ancienne chambre — du Sénat au capitol de Richmond, Elle nous a été aimablement signalée par notre confrère M. P. Vitry." Vitry was a former Keeper of Prints and Drawings at the Louvre.
12. Lt. Gen. Sir Edward "Ned" Pakenham, January 1815.
13. Coll. Louisiana State Museum.
14. The actual site of the action. Today, erosion by the river has washed away all but one corner of the redoubt.
15. Lemoisne, 1912, Eugene Lami, p. 44. In *Catalogue des Venites*, Vol. II, Frits Lugt, referred to as "Professor au Conservatoire."
16. Lemoisne, 1912 p. 45.
17. *Corcoran Gallery Journal* (Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D.C.), Entries 14 & 19 August 1878.
18. *Corcoran Gallery Journal*, 14 August 1878.
19. " 18 March 1878.
20. " 23 March 1878.
21. " folio 27, 19 February 1878. A Richmond newspaper article, undated (prob. after 23 May 1878), states "... the large painting of the battle of Yorktown, which was for sometime on exhibition at the store of Messrs. J. H. Tyler & Co., in this city . . ."
22. *Corcoran Gallery Journal* 8 March 1878 (emphasis by curator).

23. *Corcoran Gallery Journal* 3 April 1878: "W. W. Corcoran intimates sale." In contrast, the New Orleans Democrat, 13 November 1878 reports "... painting of the Battle of New Orleans . . . this magnificent work of art cost \$20,000." (!)
24. *Corcoran Gallery Journal* 31 July 1878.
25. W. W. Corcoran Mss., Vol. 47 #254, Library of Congress.
26. Vol. 48 #332,
27. Corr. of Cornwallis, Ross, 1859 p. 128. Cornwallis to Clinton 20 October 1781, refers to sortie on 16 October against the *French* lines by 350 men.
28. *Yorktown Campaign & Surrender of Cornwallis, Johnston*, 1881, p. 146. Capt. Stephen Olney being severely wounded, did not enter redoubt.
29. *Johnston*, p. 145. Order of advance.
30. The *buckskin* is believed to have been altered to a *grey*—by a well-meaning fan through overpainting. The recent conservation treatment again reveals the original version. (Author's photographic record).
31. Col. Richard Butler's Diary, 8 His. Mag., 109.
32. Thatcher, Military Journal, p. 284.
33. J. R. Sullivan, 28 May 1937, lists 3 possible positions as to siting. Nat. His. Park Coll. 5012.
34. Like most maps of Yorktown, Col. Lauders, Army War College, 1931, shows one windmill, N. W. of town, therefore *behind* viewer, and helps to confirm that Lami consulted a map.
35. Copy in Library, Nat. His. Park, Yorktown.
36. Ms. Rolls of Surrender, Maj. Despard. Also Wickwire, *American Adventure*, 1970, p. 380.
37. Actually the Frasers were "revived" at that time as 71st Foot, with 2 battalions. The original Frasers were raised in 1757 as 78th Foot, serving in America against the French, disbanded 1763. Mss. Scottish United Services Museum.
38. Gaines Army Register 1782.
39. By order of Lt. Col. Maitland, Uniforms of Scottish Regiments, Barnes & Allen.
40. Mss. Scottish United Services Museum.
41. *Lemoisne, 1914*. See Catalogue Méthodique.
42. Located 250 yards to the south of No. 10. A stronger fieldwork, manned by 120 British and Hessians. It was carried the same night by 400 French grenadiers and chasseurs under Lt. Col. Comte Guillaume de Deux-Ponts. *Encyclopedia of American Revolution*, Boatner, p. 1244-5.
43. *Johnston*, p. 146.
44. Journals of the Continental Congress, Ford, ed., III, 323.
45. General Order, 24 July 1776. Varick Transcripts, Washington's General Orders, Library of Congress.
46. General Order, 2 October 1779. Varick Transcripts, Washington's General Orders, Library of Congress.
47. J. C. Miller, *Triumph of Freedom*, p. 610.
48. Another later version was issued to company officers and men of Wayne's Legion between 1792-4. *Military Dress of North America*, Windrow & Embleton, 1973, f.p. 50.
49. Composite watercolor, Coll. Anne S. K. Brown, Brown University Library.
50. Cass took an active interest in uniforms while Secretary of War. Also, as a personal friend of Louis-Phillipe's, Lami might well have met him. Lewis Cass, Woodford, 1950, p. 198.
51. The famous French Cavalry School founded in 1768.

