**“A Dead Cock in the Pit”: Masculine Rivalry, Manhood, and Honor in the Civil War South**

**Introduction**

In early February 1863, soldiers from the 17th and 23rd Regiments, South Carolina Volunteers (SCV) engaged in a fierce battle with each other. Both units were camped in North Carolina and were part of the same brigade that was commanded by General Nathan George Evans, yet this did not prevent what one participant described as a scene of “desperate fighting” between the two regiments in which “the balls flew thick and fast.” Fortunately, the fighting was pretend and not real, and the men exchanged balls made of snow rather than lead. Some of the officers of Evans’ Brigade were, however, already engaged in a very real and serious conflict with each other. David Jackson Logan, a member of the 17th and a contributor to the *Yorkville Enquirer*, had noted the internecine strife a week prior to providing the above description of the snowball fight, explaining that “There is much bad feeling among the officers of our Brigade.”[[1]](#footnote-1) Two key figures within this conflict were Evans, the brigade’s commander, and Fitz William McMaster, the colonel of the 17th SCV. Following the Battle of Kinston in mid-December 1862, McMaster headed up a petition signed by himself and thirty-seven other officers in the brigade requesting that they be transferred to some other command. Their desire to be transferred stemmed from concerns about Evans’ competency and his sobriety. Evans was incensed, and believed – with justification – that McMaster was the orchestrator of this attempt to undermine his reputation and authority. Accordingly, by the time that Logan provided his rather whimsical account of the members of Evans’ Brigade pelting each other with snowballs, Evans and McMaster had already been casting serious aspersions against each other. During the first half of 1863 both officers would come before military courts to address allegations that were made in the wake of Kinston, and the resultant rancor from their clash would prove longstanding.

A close analysis of the dispute between Evans and McMaster offers the historian an ideal opportunity to rethink constructions of manhood and honor in the mid-nineteenth-century U.S. South and, importantly, to also better understand how the circumstances of war impinged upon these constructions. Indeed, by invoking ideas about alcohol and intoxication, cowardice and bravery, insult and appropriate retribution, the dispute clustered around contemporary understandings of what it meant to be an honorable gentleman. The notion that masculinity was a driving force in all of this was neatly encapsulated by a confidant of McMaster, who congratulated his friend that the publication and distribution of McMaster’s court-martial proceedings had left Evans “a dead cock in the pit.”[[2]](#footnote-2) A cockfight was an apt metaphor, as the image of fierce combat encapsulated the need to dominate which lay at the heart of antebellum southern manhood, while the baying audience symbolized the interconnected individual performance and communal sanction of honor. Both Evans and McMaster sought to vanquish the other and, in order to do so, they needed their actions and behavior to be approved by their peers.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The pages that follow outline the evolution of the Evans-McMaster feud during the U.S. Civil War and, in doing so, probe its significance with regards to regional understandings of manhood (for the avoidance of doubt, it must be emphasized that this article focuses specifically on ideas about masculinity and honor held by men of the middle and upper strata of white southern society). A number of fine studies have identified divergent visions of white manhood in the antebellum South, often by portraying an older “masquerade culture” of performative honor and gentlemanliness as being challenged by more modern impulses that were stimulated by the market, evangelicalism, and/or generational transition.[[4]](#footnote-4) John Mayfield, in one such fine study, has noted how both ethics shared an undeniable desire to dominate but the means to that end diverged: “Manhood in the marketplace required shrewdness over fearlessness, cleverness over generosity, a tough rationalism over pride, self-discipline over conspicuous waste, and the occasional need to be downright deceptive rather than transparent.”[[5]](#footnote-5) Amy S. Greenberg’s work has also identified “two preeminent and dueling mid-century masculinities” in the United States: “restrained manhood” and “martial manhood.” Restrained men valued self-discipline and being morally upright, while martial men prized aggression and dominance over others.[[6]](#footnote-6) The hostility between Nathan Evans and Fitz McMaster can, in some respects, be seen as rooted in different visions of idealized manhood (and their attendant values and behaviors). General Fitzhugh Lee spoke to Evans’ more visceral manhood when he characterized him as “a good type of the rip-roaring, scorn-all-care element,” while McMaster had a seemingly more bourgeois (in a cultural sense) understanding of manliness that placed a greater primacy on self-restraint and was influenced by his Presbyterian faith.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Although one could plausibly read the Evans-McMaster feud as a simple product of different masculine ideals, leaving the analysis there would obscure as much as it would elucidate. Such an interpretation would present both men as somewhat hostage to their idealized vision(s) of manly behavior, blur important distinctions between their private ruminations and public postures, and risk making their mutual animosity seem inevitable. As James J. Broomall has astutely noted, white southern men “maintained overlapping models of behavior that were used at different times according to different needs.”[[8]](#footnote-8) Fitz McMaster’s outlook, discourse, and actions at specific moments during his feud with Nathan Evans attest to Broomall’s more complex vision of masculine behavior in two important respects. First, although McMaster highly prized his cool exterior, his private correspondence makes it clear that there were moments when his enmity toward Evans undermined his composure. In fact, he had to look to other white men at several critical junctures to help him fashion his self-controlled prose and public pose, circumstances which point to the vital role group dynamics typically played in shaping the course of these masculine rivalries and the values that underpinned them. Second, McMaster’s consistent projection of himself as a restrained, Christian gentleman should not be interpreted as simply the logical outcome of his attitudes about manhood but also as part of a calculated effort to vanquish his rival. As such, a primary contention of this article is that conceptions of manhood and honor were not merely the rigid and exacting behavioral constraints they have sometimes seemed in the historiography on the subject but could instead be seen as weapons that men could wield to damage their rivals, secure their own reputations, and hopefully fulfill their lofty ambitions.[[9]](#footnote-9) Viewed through this lens, white southern masculinity looks more like a club than a straitjacket.

Detailed analysis of this feud offers the historian valuable insight into not only southern understandings of manhood and honor, but also how these understandings were influenced by the maelstrom of war. In particular, the Evans-McMaster rivalry enables us to excavate the ways in which the circumstances of war shaped how codes of honor and dueling played out, phenomena typically explored in an antebellum context. Later in their bitter feud, Nathan Evans would challenge Fitz McMaster to a duel, a challenge that was refused as McMaster deemed a duel to be both unchristian and unpatriotic. The Civil War enabled McMaster to justify his refusal not simply on the grounds that it was a sinful practice – something which on its own might have weakened his position due to its ability to be interpreted as an act of cowardice and the view held by some that evangelicalism was unmanly – but to also couch it in the rhetoric of duty and thereby evoke the martial language of honor.[[10]](#footnote-10) Patriotism, a new and malleable element in such rivalries due to the South’s war for independence, enabled McMaster to speak to important aspects of both the martial and restrained visions of manhood, and thereby hopefully buttress his reputation as a man in the eyes of others. Here we see not only some of the aforementioned elasticity that southern masculinity could exhibit, but also the complex, even ambiguous consequences of the conflict for the region’s understandings of manhood. Though it is in some respects intuitive to see the coming of the war, with its bravado, violence, and male military camaraderie, as strengthening the hypermasculine martial credo in the South, the material and social conditions of the Confederacy along with its demands in the name of patriotism could at times add grist to the mill of the more restrained understanding of what truly honorable and manly conduct was.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Finally, before we turn more fully to the dispute between Evans and McMaster, it is necessary to comment upon how much we can truly glean from such a singular focus on this feud. Put another way, what is the wider applicability of the conclusions about manhood and honor presented in this article when the analysis focuses so closely on two men and their bitter rivalry, a rivalry that was in some respects atypical? The Evans-McMaster feud represents a telling and compelling case study for a number of reasons. For one, while a significant proportion of the primary evidence is derived from the personal correspondence and published pamphlets of these two men, particularly McMaster, the perspectives and reactions of the wider white male community are brought to the fore throughout.[[12]](#footnote-12) Such an approach is essential because other so-called honorable gentlemen were the intended audience for the posturing and prose of this story’s protagonists. Accordingly, this article does not merely explore the Evans-McMaster feud but also strives to analyze its wider reception in the Civil War South. The fact that the intensity of their enmity toward each other and the events it led to were atypical should also be construed as a positive rather than a negative, because the considerable lengths which they went to in order to try and prove their status as honorable gentlemen shines a bright light on white culture and ideas about manhood in the mid-nineteenth-century U.S. South. As the field of microhistory has demonstrated, we can sometimes learn just as much, if not more, from an unusual or unconventional example. Indeed, I see the Evans-McMaster feud in a similar way to how many microhistorians conceive of their subjects, “as faintly exotic but somehow emblematic.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

**Evans, McMaster, Kinston, and the Context of the Dispute**

In order to understand the conflict between Nathan Evans and Fitz William McMaster, it is necessary to first understand their backgrounds, their initial interactions, and the events that took place at the Battle of Kinston. Fitz McMaster was the son of John McMaster, who was born in County Antrim but came to America as a child, and Rachel Buchanan McMaster. As a successful merchant and long-serving postmaster in Fairfield District, South Carolina, John McMaster was plainly a man of local repute, and Fitz would go on to be educated at South Carolina College during the 1840s. By the time of the 1860 federal census, Fitz was residing in the state capital of Columbia, where he was listed as living with his wife Mary and their six children and working as an attorney-at-law.[[14]](#footnote-14) Nathan Evans’ family similarly had its roots in the British Isles – Wales, to be precise – and they came to South Carolina, via Delaware, in the 1730s. Nathan’s father, Thomas Evans, was a man of some prominence, serving as a presidential elector for James Monroe and Andrew Jackson and in the state senate. Nathan, Thomas’s fourth child, would benefit from his father’s political connections, as he received an appointment in 1844 to the United States Military Academy at West Point from John C. Calhoun.[[15]](#footnote-15) McMaster and Evans therefore came from broadly similar backgrounds of relative prosperity and they both benefitted from the opportunities this prosperity provided, most clearly in terms of education.

Nathan Evans would gain more than the nickname “Shanks” (apparently due to the thinness of his legs) from his time at West Point as, on the same day of his graduation, he was commissioned brevet second lieutenant in the United States Army. The timing of his graduation in 1848 did, however, deny him the opportunity for martial glory in the Mexican War. Writing in February 1848, Evans was crestfallen by the news of peace, lamenting that he and his classmates had “all ready fought an hundred Battles in imagination and dreamt of the revelling success in the Halls of the Montezumas. But I am fearful from the latest news, that our Battles will be in song, and our deeds of Valor… castles in the air.”[[16]](#footnote-16) “Shanks” seemingly longed for military distinction, and such desires would be at least partly realized in the years before the Civil War. In 1855, he would be handpicked by Secretary of War Jefferson Davis for the new Second Cavalry, which placed him under Colonel Albert S. Johnston and Lieutenant Colonel Robert E. Lee. This unit spent the latter half of the 1850s stationed in Texas, where it was tasked with quelling the raids of the powerful Comanche. In December 1859, the South Carolina General Assembly commended Captain Evans for his “gallant and meritorious conduct” in the Battle of Wichita Village on October 1, 1858, in which he reputedly killed two Comanches in hand-to-hand combat.[[17]](#footnote-17)

A few years later, now fighting against rather than for the U.S. Army, Evans would earn further plaudits for his martial prowess. The First Battle of Bull Run in July 1861 and the Battle of Ball’s Bluff several months later both saw Evans act impulsively yet decisively as he disregarded earlier orders to proactively respond to Federal thrusts.[[18]](#footnote-18) Two days after Ball’s Bluff, where Evans effectively defied his superior P.G.T. Beauregard’s order to retreat if opposed by overwhelming numbers, a Confederate war clerk noted that “some of the red-tape West Point gentry are indignant at Gen. Evans for not obeying orders, and falling back. There is some talk of a court-martial; for it is maintained that no commander, according to strict military rules, should have offered battle against such superior numbers.”[[19]](#footnote-19) Evans did perhaps irk a few military higher-ups but this presumably mattered little to him given the wider acclaim he received; he would be promoted to brigadier-general and received praise from the Confederate Congress and his native state following his performance at Ball’s Bluff. Late 1861 also saw Fitz McMaster’s star on the rise, albeit more modestly, as he was elected lieutenant colonel of the 17th SCV in December and, following the death of J.H. Means on September 1, 1862, McMaster would come to serve as the regiment’s colonel.[[20]](#footnote-20)

The 17th SCV was assigned to Evans in December 1861 before being one of several South Carolinian regiments that comprised a new independent brigade under Evans’ command in mid-1862. Correspondence between Fitz McMaster and his wife Mary makes it clear that it did not take long for him to form a distinctly negative impression of his commanding officer. A letter dated March 25, 1862, described Evans as “a miserable drunken fool.”[[21]](#footnote-21) Three days later he derisively referred to Evans having a “thick cranium.”[[22]](#footnote-22) McMaster’s contempt towards Evans stemmed mostly from the fact that he believed him to be grossly incompetent. In early May 1862, while stationed on the South Carolina coast, the brigade went on an expedition against nearby Federal forces only to return to their camps without actually engaging the enemy. The exercise proved to be a waste of time and a costly one at that. According to McMaster, the exposure and privations the men experienced from this pointless week-long assignment caused several to become seriously ill and, in all probability, they would soon perish. Reporting these events to his wife, McMaster placed the blame for this debacle squarely on Evans. “I believe the death of every man who has died from the effects of our expedition to Johns Island is attributable to the mismanagement of Gen Evans,” he fumed, before suggesting that “the Colonels of the Regts who are all outraged at the mismanagement & stupidity he displayed should prefer charges of incompetency against him.”[[23]](#footnote-23) Though McMaster was not in a position to personally do so at this stage, an idea had clearly taken root.

In November 1862, the Evans’ Brigade were sent to North Carolina. They were soon stationed at Kinston on the Neuse River, a strategic position that lay between the U.S. forces under the command of Major General John Foster (who had attended West Point with Evans) at New Bern and the important Confederate railroad hub at Goldsboro. Evans believed that December would prove memorable as he predicted that Federal forces would try to turn the screw by attacking Richmond, Charleston, and the important railroad connections between the two in North Carolina.[[24]](#footnote-24) There were, however, growing concerns among some of Evans’ men whether he was the right man for this important task. William Porcher DuBose, adjutant in the Evans’ Brigade’s Holcombe Legion, wondered whether his superior’s known fondness for whiskey was clouding his judgement. On November 19, 1862, DuBose wrote that “I would dislike very much to go into action under Gen. Evans… I suspect that Gen. Evans is drinking a good deal, & have no doubt he will be having us out on all occasions to meet imaginary enemies on sensational reports.”[[25]](#footnote-25) McMaster expressed similar concerns to his wife at this time, sniping that “Besides being a fool he has been drunk in so many important occasions that I cannot feel any confidence in him in time of danger.”[[26]](#footnote-26)

On December 11, 1862, a sizeable Federal force under Foster’s command left New Bern with the assignment of cutting the Wilmington-Weldon Railroad. Though outnumbered, Evans rightly deemed it necessary to engage the Federals in the hope that reinforcements might arrive at Goldsboro. The two armies would clash at Kinston on December 14 and the Federal troops eventually turned the Confederates’ left, forcing these men to retreat across the bridge over the Neuse. The center and the right, however, received no subsequent orders to retreat and Evans, mistakenly believing that all of his men were safely across the river, ordered the firing of the bridge and continued artillery bombardment. Facing growing Federal pressure and fire from their own artillery, the isolated Confederate line broke and a retreat ultimately ensued. Roughly four hundred men, largely from the North Carolinian battalion on the extreme right, would be effectively cut off and captured. Evans reformed his broken ranks about two miles beyond Kinston and defiantly rebuffed Foster’s demand of surrender. Before Foster could resume the offensive, though, the Confederates withdrew.[[27]](#footnote-27)

**The Dispute Between Evans and McMaster**

Events at Kinston proved to be a tipping point for Fitz McMaster. In the days following the battle, McMaster presented a joint petition, signed by himself and a number of lower-ranking officers in his 17th SCV, the 22nd, the 23rd, and the Holcombe Legion, requesting a transfer from Evans’ command. The officers, according to McMaster’s later statement, had wanted to bring charges of cowardice, incompetency, drunkenness, and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman against Evans, but, in hopes of hastening their transfer and avoiding ill feeling, they simply stated their “great dissatisfaction with and want of confidence in” their general as their reason.[[28]](#footnote-28) While their superiors – Samuel G. French and Gustavus W. Smith – decided that the collective nature of this petition smelled a little too strongly of mutinous conduct, and thus could not be endorsed, McMaster was arrested for misconduct before the enemy.[[29]](#footnote-29) Writing on December 25, 1862, Evans hinted to his wife that there was more
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***Fig. 1 – A Timeline of the Evans-McMaster Feud***

*December 14, 1862* – Battle of Kinston.

*February 1863* – Court of inquiry held to investigate allegations of drunkenness levelled against Nathan Evans.

*March-April 1863* – Court-martial of F.W. McMaster.

*October 1863* – F.W. McMaster begins distributing pamphlet copies of his court-martial proceedings.

*November 6, 1863* – Asa L. Evans writes to F.W. McMaster requesting a duel.

*November 20, 1863* – P.P. Bonneau, A.L. Evans’ second, writes to McMaster prompting him to respond.

*November 23, 1863* – McMaster declines A.L. Evans’ duel challenge.

*February 1, 1864* – Nathan Evans writes to F.W. McMaster requesting a duel.

*February 16, 1864* – John Cunningham, Nathan Evans’ second, writes to McMaster prompting him to respond.

*February 24, 1864* - McMaster declines Nathan Evans’ duel challenge.

*March 2, 1864* – Columbia’s *Daily South Carolinian* publishes the duel correspondence, presumably as an attempt to publicly label McMaster a coward.

*March-April 1864* – Nathan Evans publishes and distributes his court proceedings (along with additional materials pertaining to the feud).

*May-July 1864* – F.W. McMaster publishes and distributes a rejoinder (in pamphlet form) responding to Evans’ published court proceedings, specifically his “To the Public” statement.
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to it than that, stating “the rascal Col. McMaster has attempted to disaffect the Brigade against me, thinking that I am too rash. I have him now under arrest and will keep him so.”[[30]](#footnote-30) As rumors of Evans being drunk at Kinston continued to circulate, he asked for a court of inquiry and, before long, formal charges would be levelled against him by Colonel Spartan D. Goodlett of the 22nd SCV. Both Evans and McMaster therefore had military tribunals on the horizon in early 1863.[[31]](#footnote-31)

Although the Confederate forces at Kinston generally performed well against a stronger foe, the chaotic scenes at the bridge begged questions about the quality of leadership at the battle. The pro-McMaster David J. Logan, of the 17th SCV, privately gave voice to what others would soon publicly claim: that Evans had been intoxicated. Logan recorded in his diary that on the morning of December 14 “our Genl comes “powerful for battle” (more whiskey aboard)” and was critical of Evans’ late efforts to form a line of battle. The artillery, according to Logan, was already gone, and so any effort to re-engage the Federals at this point was “foolish.”[[32]](#footnote-32) Logan’s public description of the battle in the *Yorkville Enquirer* was more circumspect, but it maintained the same critical gist. “Some orders, and firing the bridge, I think were not given and done at the right time. If they had, we should not have lost so many prisoners,” he groaned.[[33]](#footnote-33)

As already discussed, Evans’ impetuousness had served him well earlier in the war, and there is little doubt that he had a reputation as an aggressive military commander. Evans in fact rather performed his never-surrender attitude by ardently rejecting General Foster’s enquiry if he was ready to surrender after the clash at Kinston. Reports of what exactly Evans said vary, with one account claiming that he responded that Foster should know him “too well to suppose that he will ever surrender” – recall that they attended West Point together – while other reports claimed that he more tersely told Foster to “Go to Hell,” but either way it is plain that he tried to burnish his reputation as a fearless commander.[[34]](#footnote-34) While both McMaster and Evans saw courage as an important facet of manliness and would accuse each other of cowardice, they conceptualized these phenomena somewhat differently. Evans, in his 1864 statement to the public (which was an addendum to his printed pamphlet of his court of inquiry proceedings), portrayed McMaster’s courage as fundamentally lacking. Evans claimed that “*fall back! fall back!! fall back!!!* has… been his [McMaster’s] favorite order from Manassas No. 2 [Second Battle of Bull Run] to Goldsboro’.”[[35]](#footnote-35) Rather than an act of prudent calculation in the face of unfavorable odds, Evans sought to render the order to fall back as simply the first step on a craven path that led to retreat and, ultimately, defeat. Given the currency of offensive over defensive tactics among the upper echelons of the Confederate military and the fact that Civil War soldiers “fawned over audacious leaders who epitomized a traditional model of manliness,” such a portrayal of McMaster, if accepted as true, was sure to harm his reputation.[[36]](#footnote-36)

McMaster’s response to these criticisms centered on two points. First, he claimed that Evans was a charlatan who was capitalizing on a reputation for bravery problematically based on his rank, his battlefield successes during 1861, and his own bombast. According to McMaster, such a reputation was ill-founded. “If Gen. Evans ever has been seen under musket fire, or along the line of troops during a battle, I have never yet met the officer who can affirm it,” wrote McMaster in his 1864 rejoinder to his nemesis’ pamphlet of the same year, as he tried to leverage the aforementioned archetype of an aggressive officer who led from the front against Evans. “He is seen before and after a battle, but never during one. He will go in the range of the *shell formation*, which crops out three miles around a battle, (and poor cake-women do that every day at Fort Moultrie,) but never where the leaden veins appear.”[[37]](#footnote-37) The reference to female cake sellers was a scarcely-concealed barb equating Evans’ much-vaunted courage to that of poor (and quite possibly Black) women. Second, and significantly, McMaster stated that moral courage was just as important as physical courage, if not more so, in the measure of a man. In the 1863 publication of his court-martial proceedings, McMaster acknowledged that “all *true* gentlemen are brave,” but that an important facet of courage was honesty, something he believed Evans to fundamentally lack as he accused him of perjury.[[38]](#footnote-38) In his later and more vitriolic rejoinder he doubled down on this point. “I know courage is by no means the noblest trait of man, - all gentlemen have it, and many who are not gentlemen. If the General, by his subsequent life, proves that he possesses it, he will prove that he only has that in which a bull dog would be his equal. But truth is an attribute of divinity: it is the basis of the social fabric, cementing it together.”[[39]](#footnote-39) The key point for McMaster was that, even if Evans’ claims to physical bravery were well-founded (and, to be clear, McMaster emphatically believed they were not), this would still not assure him the status of an honorable gentlemen, as he was bereft of moral courage.

Returning to the fallout from Kinston, the issue of alcohol loomed over discussions of the battle. General Evans’ tribunal in February 1863 focused singularly on one charge, drunkenness, as it was alleged that he had been drunk on several occasions between September and December 1862, including at Kinston. Although Evans would be found not guilty of any of the alleged incidents of drunkenness, it is clear that alcohol abuse was an issue within the Confederate army. The issue of intoxication among its officer corps had in fact become such a concern that the Confederate Congress was forced to address it with new legislation in April 1862. This legislation stated that any commissioned officer convicted of drunkenness by a court of inquiry would be cashiered, suspended, or reprimanded, depending on the severity of the offense. Evans had himself been compelled in June 1862 to bring charges against Colonel John Dunovant after he had found him lying in the road, passed out in front of the brigade.[[40]](#footnote-40)

It is worth briefly pausing for a moment at this point to consider contemporary ideas about alcohol and drinking in the mid-nineteenth-century U.S. South. Alcohol was a key part of white antebellum masculine culture, as men often imbibed heartily at well-established and overtly male communal events, such as militia musters and elections. Public drinking was plainly something white southern men of all classes enjoyed, yet there was also an inherent dissonance when it came to ideas about alcohol. White southern men, who have often been portrayed as jealous guardians of their rights and manly independence, surely enjoyed the implicit autonomy in binge drinking as, to quote W.J. Rorabaugh, “to be drunk was to be free.”[[41]](#footnote-41) But excessive and consistent alcohol consumption might lead to habit or even to alcoholism, and thus to slavish dependence.

Returning to Nathan Evans, he admitted in his address to the court that he drank, but that he always did so openly and never while on duty, “especially when I expected to meet the enemy.”[[42]](#footnote-42) To ascertain the veracity of Evans’ claims, a good deal of the questioning at the trial probed the hazy line between having a drink and having a few too many, and a number of the witnesses on the part of the prosecution focused upon the physical manifestations of drunkenness to try to prove their point. Captain William H. Cain of the Holcombe Legion, for example, stated that he believed Evans to be “under the influence of liquor” in September 1862 at Boonsboro, Maryland, because he was unable to walk straight and allegedly professed to not know where his division was.[[43]](#footnote-43) Major J.R. Culp of the 17th SCV felt that at Kinston Evans “was under the influence of liquor to such an extent as to disqualify him for the discharge of his duties” because of the general’s order to form a line of battle even though, in Culp’s view, they had just been overpowered from a stronger position.[[44]](#footnote-44)

This focus on the physical signs of Evans’ drinking to excess can largely be explained by the legal nature of the material under consideration. The witnesses for the prosecution were trying to explain why they believed him to be intoxicated, a matter which was both somewhat subjective and difficult to prove definitively, and so they understandably focused on Evans’ actions and appearance.[[45]](#footnote-45) Yet embedded in this testimony one can find interesting allusions to the language and dictates of manliness and honor. Returning to the above claims of Cain, the court revealingly responded by querying if the general was “intoxicated to such a degree that his senses were disordered,” to which Cain responded in the negative, while Culp’s testimony hinged on the implicit claim that Evans’ alleged intoxication at Kinston had reduced his ability to reason effectively.[[46]](#footnote-46) The critical factor in determining whether one had drunk to excess was thus the extent to which alcohol eroded one’s physical, emotional, and/or intellectual capacity for self-control.

One’s appearance, behavior, and demeanor served as a transcript for reading not only their sobriety but also their character. This is perhaps manifested in what, at first glance, might seem an unremarkable aspect of the testimony in support of Evans being intoxicated while at the helm: the claim by two witnesses, Fitz McMaster and William Caldwell, that he was very red in the face at Boonsboro. This might be very plausibly read as a simple allusion to a well-known symptom of excessive drinking, but it is also interesting that this claim was offered by two of the witnesses whom Evans believed to be the most prejudiced against him.[[47]](#footnote-47) As Kenneth S. Greenberg has noted, the face (and particularly the nose) was of critical importance to men of honor, and was seen, in some respects, as connoting and signifying their character, hence why southern fistfights had once seen men strive to facially mutilate their opponent.[[48]](#footnote-48) The claim that Evans was flushed in the face may well have had a deeper significance to the men involved in the dispute than it does initially to the modern reader.

Outside of Evans’ court of inquiry, popular perceptions about alcohol in the Confederacy were shifting. Whether distilled on southern farms or imported, a growing number of civilians and legislators came to see the personal consumption of alcohol as wasteful of resources and a luxury that should be given up as one of the sacrifices the war demanded.[[49]](#footnote-49) Evans’ association with alcohol, manifested most obviously through his Prussian orderly who bore on his back a “barrelita” of whiskey, might therefore harm his public reputation. This is something which the pseudonymous “Personne” sought to address in his defense of Evans, published in the *Charleston Daily Courier* following Kinston. This advocate of Evans worried that the charge of drunkenness was the one most likely to stick because it was the one most often repeated. He acknowledged that Evans’ orderly carried “a small two-quart cask of liquor, from which the general draws his rations… but there is something more touchingly true of that little cask.” According to “Personne,” Evans liberally distributed the contents of the “barrelita” to any badly wounded man, whether he was a friend or not. Indeed, this author argued that the “barrelita” served a primarily medical and compassionate purpose, and evocatively described Evans “dismounting, and on bended knee applying the grateful relief to the parched lips” of the mortally wounded. In conjuring this image, “Personne” clearly hoped to turn the general’s association with John Barleycorn from a personal vice into a public virtue, from a potentially reckless indulgence into a symbol of benevolence. This defense of Evans also points to the importance and malleability of patriotism, as the author painted the “barrelita” as a symbol of selflessness, not selfishness, that eased the suffering of those who had made the ultimate sacrifice for the Confederate nation. And finally, the touching image of the general on bended knee providing comfort “among the feeble ones,” possibly during their final earthly moments, portrayed Evans as a gentlemanly officer with genuine compassion for those serving beneath him.[[50]](#footnote-50)

Nathan Evans’ trial in February 1863 offered him not only an opportunity to refute the allegations of drunkenness levelled against him but also a chance to go on the offensive against McMaster. In his address to the court, Evans claimed that McMaster was the real author of the charges, not Colonel Goodlett – thus portraying McMaster as deceitful and Goodlett as a pawn – as well as alleging that his rival was a coward.[[51]](#footnote-51) These were insults that Fitz McMaster, as a man of honor, was bound to take seriously, especially as he had his own court-martial on the horizon in which he would face charges of cowardice, mutinous conduct, behavior prejudicial to good order and military discipline, and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentlemen.

McMaster, feeling that Evans had slandered him, wrote to his friend James H. Rion. Rion, intriguingly, had had his own run-in with Evans earlier in the war.[[52]](#footnote-52) What McMaster got in reply was a lesson in campaign strategy. Rion revealingly told his confidant to restrain any feelings of anger or indignation at Evans’ testimony; instead, “control any excited feelings that might affect your judgment, and merely consider yourself as playing a game with Evans, in which coolness and industry may determine who is to be the winner.” What followed was step-by-step guidance in what to do to try and secure an acquittal. Rion’s guidance again emphasized restraint, as he told McMaster to “Let your defence have, as little as the nature of the case will admit of, the complexion of an attack on Evans. This is a very important point.” There was no suggestion, however, that McMaster should turn the other cheek. Instead, he should wait until he was on “terra firma,” i.e.: cleared of the charges against him, before resuming the offensive against Evans.[[53]](#footnote-53) Rion emphasized restraint, yet this restraint was not an end in itself but rather a weapon to be deployed to secure victory, to enhance McMaster’s reputation and gentlemanly status.

While Fitz McMaster believed that a cool exterior and measured tone were hallmarks of gentlemanly deportment and surefire ways to vanquish Evans, it was not always easy to stifle one’s passions. As Lawrence T. McDonnell has noted, “self-discipline warred with self-assertion” inside the hearts and minds of many southern white men of the middle and upper strata.[[54]](#footnote-54) When Evans addressed his court of inquiry, McMaster lost his physical and verbal restraint, interrupting proceedings to ask if Evans had the right to slander him before angrily shaking his hand and yelling at his rival. Brooding, McMaster decided to get a later train from Goldsboro after the trial had concluded in the hopes that he might not only get a copy of the inflammatory speech to the court but also an opportunity “to meet Evans on the street to see if I could get some chance at him.” As McMaster continued to narrate events to his wife, he admitted that he “was in a bad fix in court [for] I could not knock him down [.] if I did it would have prejudiced my case & subjected me to a trial for my life.”[[55]](#footnote-55) Tellingly, McMaster suggests in this statement that physically confronting Evans would not have necessarily been wrong in a moral or ethical sense – after all, Evans had publicly called him a coward, something which demanded a vigorous and assertive response – but from a strategic point of view. McMaster accordingly valued the advice of James Rion regarding how to respond to Evans because it helped him strike the restrained and gentleman-like pose necessary to defend his name and ultimately defeat his nemesis. As McMaster confessed in an unusually candid remark to his wife in the build-up to his own trial, “I haven’t got the coolness and selfpossession of Rion & sometimes I feel like cutting Evans throat.”[[56]](#footnote-56) The point here is not that McMaster’s repeated references to coolness and the like in his correspondence were a mere façade, but that the restrained vision of manhood was an ideal rather than an inflexible behavioral code, and its most obvious utility with respect to this bitter feud was as a means of securing McMaster’s reputation and damaging that of Evans.

It should come as little surprise then that Fitz McMaster took much of the advice James Rion gave him, writing to his wife during his court-martial, with a hint of pride, that “My defence will be entirely free from invective – I am bound to say that he has lied – for the evidence proves that – but I will not go beyond the record.”[[57]](#footnote-57) And it turned out to be sound advice, as the court in the spring of 1863 found him not guilty of all charges preferred against him except of conduct prejudicial to military discipline, to which it was deemed the finding itself was sufficient punishment. This decision was surely an attempt by the court to prevaricate, to imply that Evans’ claims were not entirely groundless yet also acknowledge that they were not preferred “with the spirit and for the purpose of promoting the good of the service.”[[58]](#footnote-58)

Two trials and two virtual acquittals might have enabled the feud between Evans and McMaster to at least diminish in intensity, if not end, but both men proved unable and unwilling to let the matter lie. Evans, in announcing the result of McMaster’s court-martial to the brigade, could not resist the temptation to take a swipe at his foe, noting that “the court appears to have been moved more by sympathy for the accused than a sense of moral obligation or the interest of the service.”[[59]](#footnote-59) In a single sentence, “Shanks” managed to both question the decision of the court and cast McMaster as a weak object of pity. McMaster, for his part, might have noted in his diary that he was going to allow his character to speak for itself, but this certainly did not stop him from trying to influence others.[[60]](#footnote-60) In October 1863 the opportunistic McMaster determined that the moment was right for distributing the printed pamphlet containing his court-martial proceedings as Evans was under arrest due to a different alleged breach of military law, as General Roswell S. Ripley charged him with disobedience of orders. By the end of October McMaster had distributed hundreds of copies of his pamphlet.[[61]](#footnote-61) Such actions ensured the continuation of the feud.

Let us step out of the narrative for a moment to reflect upon why it was that the Evans-McMaster dispute proved so irresolvable. The two men obviously came to detest each other, but the persistence of the feud was, in many respects, a product of the mid-nineteenth-century U.S. South’s masculine culture. At its core, both men were “giving the lie” to the other, claiming that their appearance differed from their true nature; Evans and McMaster not only claimed that the other had been dishonest but, more fundamentally, through the allegations of cowardice, that they were not what they said they were, i.e.: honorable gentlemen and brave soldiers.[[62]](#footnote-62) This, in turn, interwove their individual claims to manhood and honor. Evans and McMaster could never accept the vindication of the other by military tribunal because this would acknowledge the honor, and by extension the truthfulness, of their foe, and thereby impugn their own status. The only alternative was to say nothing and in effect submit, a word that was tantamount to emasculation in the South. Both men were also compelled to tenaciously cling to their honorable reputations because, as high-ranking Confederate officers, they needed to assert themselves as estimable public figures capable of leading men through the hazards and traumas of combat.[[63]](#footnote-63) There could therefore be no compromise or meaningful de-escalation of the feud.

Another issue that was bound up in this complex web was that of ambition. Both men were covetous of promotion and eminence, prizes they surely believed they could grasp in the midst of war if they proved themselves to be brave and inspiring leaders of men, but their personal war was a clear hindrance to them realizing their aspirations. Such ambition would probably have been honed during their education as they likely absorbed assumptions about the heroic potential of the self and the importance of making a name for one’s self. This was not just a matter of ego, though, but also one of autonomy; by irretrievably damaging the public reputation of the other, Evans and particularly McMaster (as he was serving under his rival) might not only be able to earn the laurels that they craved but, importantly, a greater ability to direct the course of their military careers. By vanquishing the other, both men hoped to wrest control of their destiny and realize their lofty ambitions.[[64]](#footnote-64)

Perhaps inevitably, then, the feud would escalate later in 1863. Smarting from recent attacks in McMaster’s testimony at a different military tribunal (that of Major B.S. Bryan) and in the pamphlet containing the proceedings of his court-martial, Evans wrote to his arch-rival on November 6 that such insults would “receive proper notice at my hands as soon as my official relations towards you, and the duty which I owe to the Government will permit me.”[[65]](#footnote-65) On the same day, Captain Asa Lewis Evans, Nathan’s brother and a member of his personal staff, penned a duel challenge and sent it to McMaster through Dr P.P. Bonneau.[[66]](#footnote-66)

Though Asa Evans is largely a side character in this story, the available evidence suggests that he at times played a notable role in shaping his brother Nathan’s behavior during the war. William G. Vardell, who often served as the brigade’s acting quartermaster, offered a telling vignette of the relationship between the two Evans brothers to his wife. While stationed in Mississippi in June 1863, an order was handed to Vardell requisitioning two of the brigade’s eight ambulances. An order to this effect was then handed to General Evans, but Evans refused, as “he would not have an order sent him by an inferior.” Vardell was similarly reluctant to lose the ambulances in question but felt that such a requisition was justified by a General Order from Evans’ superior, General Joseph E. Johnston, and, after explaining this, Evans acquiesced. Deeming the matter resolved, Vardell set about sorting out the transfer, but on his return “found Genl E in a great fume about the Amb[ulances] & told me not to turn them over.” What had happened to change the general’s mind? According to Vardell, Asa Evans had convinced his brother that he was being ordered around by everybody, that he was not being treated according to his rank and status. Asa and other members of General Evans’ inner circle egged him on, it seems; as those close to him encouraged him to act decisively and, in this case, rebelliously, they constrained his ability to act otherwise. “Genl E has not about him one man of cool temperament, & well balanced mind,” ranted a clearly exasperated Vardell, “He badly needs some man of mature mind & firm principle to advise him, on the contrary he has weak men, idlers, hanging around him to be rid of duty.” Following this incident General Evans would be placed under arrest for disobedience of orders – the reader at this stage will have no doubt noticed “Shanks’” eventful relationship with the Confederate military justice system – but the real significance here lay in the way Asa and other male companions influenced his behavior, fueling his impulsive pride and touchiness. Just as James Rion helped shape the restrained public posture of Fitz McMaster, Asa Evans seemingly stoked the aggressive persona of his brother Nathan, a persona that could not abide the idea of being dominated by anyone.[[67]](#footnote-67)

Asa Evans presumably challenged Fitz McMaster to a duel in early November 1863 because his brother was unable to do so. Not only was Nathan Evans McMaster’s commanding officer but he was also under arrest for disobedience during the final months of 1863 due to charges levelled against him by General R.S. Ripley, as mentioned earlier. Evans was informed unofficially in early November that he had been acquitted but there was a significant delay in the orders being published for his release. General P.G.T. Beauregard was reluctant to restore Evans to command and only released him from house arrest in mid-January 1864.[[68]](#footnote-68) Seemingly wanting to defend his family’s honor when Nathan could not, Asa Evans impetuously issued a duel challenge on dubious grounds. Asa emphasized McMaster’s alleged insult to “a member of his military family” as giving him a right to reparation, yet such logic was unclear and unconvincing. Some of the South Carolina gentlemen Nathan Evans wrote to for advice believed that “Capt. Evans had no right to make a personal demand upon Col. McMaster” (though they felt General Evans himself should seek vindication for the “unnecessarily insulting” language deployed by McMaster).[[69]](#footnote-69)

Having received the challenge of Asa Evans, Fitz McMaster composed a reply before again seeking the advice of James Rion. That McMaster sought another pair of eyes on his response is unsurprising, given his previous willingness to consult others on matters of honor and the significance of these written exchanges prior to a potential duel. Such exchanges were inherently performative, and the letters served as metaphorical stages in which the authors might present and project their status as honorable and righteous men. Consequently, the language deployed in this correspondence was deeply significant, as it was effectively the tool with which these gentlemen sought to buttress that very status by demonstrating their mastery of mannered discourse.[[70]](#footnote-70) The correspondence of McMaster and Rion provides the historian with a window on this process and the linguistic concerns of southern men because it includes a copy of McMaster’s initial draft with Rion’s annotations. Rion’s proposed alterations to the reply, in a similar vein to his previous advice regarding McMaster’s court-martial, sought to make it more measured in tone and to check the instances in which he felt that McMaster’s pride and passions were getting the better of him. Rion, for instance, recommended removing words denying Asa Evans the right of satisfaction that cast doubt on the captain’s veracity. “There should not be any remark, unless necessarily unavoidable, offensive to him,” cautioned Rion.[[71]](#footnote-71)

James Rion was also concerned that some sections of the original draft were overly preoccupied with Nathan Evans, as opposed to the actual proposer of a duel, Asa, and so recommended that they be deleted. An example of this was the following proposed editions from Rion to a section in which McMaster refutes that Asa Evans had a right to defend a member of his “military family” (proposed deletions in square brackets):

… a military family may be supposed to be composed of [fighting] members, each of whom is able to take care of himself [and I see no propriety in a chief making a cats paw of a subaltern to pull the chesnuts out of the fire when the experiment may be encountered by himself].[[72]](#footnote-72)

Rion felt that the final section was an unnecessary slur on Nathan Evans, while his opposition to the word “fighting” was that it might be interpreted as implying that all military men were fighting men and, therefore, duel fighting men. This recommendation, even though it only concerns the single word “fighting,” is illustrative in two respects. First, it underscores how a precise command of language and measured tone were seen to be hallmarks of an honorable southern man, who should expunge ambiguous and loose passages from his writings. A projection of self-control and mastery should typify one’s prose as well as one’s posture. Second, on a more pragmatic level, this deletion might save McMaster from fighting a future duel. Asa’s challenge might have been based on unsound ground, but it was highly likely that Nathan Evans would present his own challenge, in which an earlier allusion to a connection between being a soldier and a duelist could be used to corner McMaster. Revealingly, Fitz McMaster took virtually all of Rion’s advice when he sent his reply to A.L. Evans.[[73]](#footnote-73)

On February 1, 1864, Nathan Evans did indeed write to McMaster demanding the satisfaction due to a gentleman, having “been delayed in making this call by being hitherto under official responsibility and military arrest.” John Cunningham, no stranger to affairs of honor and the *code duello*, was authorized to make arrangements on Evans’ behalf.[[74]](#footnote-74) McMaster declined the challenge to a duel for several reasons. For one, he was born and raised a Presbyterian. As McMaster put it, the Presbyterian faith “holds duelling to be a complex crime of both murder and suicide, neither of which am I prepared to commit.”[[75]](#footnote-75) But in the rhetorical joust between McMaster and Evans the matter of religious faith was of greater significance than merely the basis of the former’s refusal to take to the dueling grounds. Nathan Evans was in fact well aware of McMaster’s faith and had already used it as a weapon to attack his foe during his court of inquiry. In his address to the court, Evans seized upon McMaster’s Presbyterian background and used it to portray him as cowardly and effeminate, claiming that “He bears the reputation in the Brigade of that of an Elder of the Church, who is remarkable for being engaged in his devotional exercises when his Regiment is engaged with the enemy.”[[76]](#footnote-76) In his response to Evans’ challenge, McMaster turned the claim that he was more fond of prayers than bullets against his rival by querying what valor was to be won from challenging a man to a duel whom he knew was certain to decline. Evans was welcome to whatever “cheap reputation” he might gain from this stunt, McMaster derisively responded, but he would not give him “an opportunity to establish a character for courage.”[[77]](#footnote-77) This was an unsubtle dig at Evans because, according to the dictates of honor in the nineteenth-century U.S. South, honor and reputation could be defended or upheld on the dueling grounds but it could not be created there.[[78]](#footnote-78)

Another reason Fitz McMaster rejected Nathan Evan’s challenge to a duel was the fact that a bloody war for southern independence was currently being waged. As we saw with the discussion of alcohol and manhood, the war could have marked consequences for wider ideas about what was and was not acceptable within the Confederacy. McMaster lectured, “my life belongs to my country, in whose defence I have frequently heretofore exposed it and am ready to expose it again,” but he was not willing to waste his life in a duel.[[79]](#footnote-79) Put another way, accepting Evans’ challenge would not simply have been unchristian but unpatriotic, a rhetorical position that enabled McMaster to appeal to both the restrained and martial models of masculinity by blending the persona of a pious Christian with that of a brave and devoted soldier. Had McMaster relied solely on his Christian scruples in his response, it surely would have made him more vulnerable to accusations of cowardice.

McMaster sought to convey his patriotism not only through language but in his behavior. In his dealings with Dr P.P. Bonneau (Asa Evans’ second) and John Cunningham (Nathan Evans’ second), McMaster was slow to respond, requiring prompting both times.[[80]](#footnote-80) This was intentional, as he hoped to not only “annoy & make the Gen [Evans] feel uneasy,” but also to implicitly criticize the ritual of dueling and disrupt its keen sense of rhythm and traditional practices.[[81]](#footnote-81) It was also surely a comment about a man’s duty to country. McMaster’s leisurely responses to these challenges was in part an effort to project himself as a man who had his priorities straight and who would accordingly treat said challenges as a secondary concern behind his duties to the Confederacy. These unspoken messages were picked up by at least one of his supporters, who was delighted that “you sent your replies through the Post office or the servise [sic] & not through “a friend” - & that you took your time as a busy servant of his country should have done for answering there [sic] communications.”[[82]](#footnote-82)

Although Fitz McMaster portrayed himself as a paragon of restrained and pious manhood in his response to Nathan Evans’ duel challenge, his personal correspondence makes it clear that he was not as cool or self-assured in private. The truth of the matter was that a refusal to accept Evans’ challenge would diminish McMaster’s reputation in the eyes of some of his peers. As he admitted to his wife, “the challenge riled me no little for I did not like the idea of not gratifying the scoundrel although my sense of duty told me it was wrong – I knew some men would think better of E. and worse of me.”[[83]](#footnote-83) One correspondent perceptively picked up on this sense of inner conflict between the “natural man,” that is to say McMaster’s more primal urges, and his better convictions. This writer fully accepted McMaster’s conscientious concerns yet could not resist a pang of “regret that you did not accept his invitation” and thus nipped Evans’ boasting and bragging in the bud.[[84]](#footnote-84) Evidently somewhat conflicted and anxious about his public reputation following his rival’s challenge, McMaster again looked to other prominent white men whom he respected for guidance. E.J. Arthur, a Columbia lawyer and member of the South Carolina state senate, helped him draft his reply to Nathan Evans.[[85]](#footnote-85) Such input was critical to the modest, measured, and mature tone he strove for in his refusal to take to the dueling grounds. As McMaster himself put it, “I sent the paper I had prepared to Mr Arthur asking him to prepare a note for me if mine was not proper - For I feared that my hatred to Evans might render me obnoxious to the charge of too much malevolence.”[[86]](#footnote-86)

The acrimonious rivalry took another twist when Nathan Evans published correspondence relating to the two duel challenges in the March 2, 1864, edition of Columbia’s *Daily South Carolinian*, in what was an obvious attempt to publicly label McMaster as a coward. John Cunningham’s statement urged Evans – and through the means of publication, the wider community of honorable men– to “Let him go; he is not *worthy of your steel*, or the further notice of any gentleman.”[[87]](#footnote-87) Around the same time, Evans also published and distributed the proceedings of his court of inquiry, including a supplementary and inflammatory “To the Public” address (which labelled McMaster as “a liar, a coward, a hypocrite, and totally destitute of the principles that should characterize an officer and a gentlemen”) and the duel correspondence.[[88]](#footnote-88)

This one-two punch from “Shanks” put McMaster on the ropes and presented him with a conundrum. How should he respond to this attempt to publicly tarnish him? Should he even respond at all? His wife Mary urged him to let the matter lie. Upon learning that he was preparing a reply to Evans, she warned Fitz that “This thing has been brought so much before the public that it will become disgusting – tiresome – tedious … if you value your reputation don’t answer any of his hard sayings.” She implored her husband to demonstrate genuine restrained manhood: “I think the truest – and most manly – and highest-toned spirit – would be to treat it with silent contempt.” Mary, however, did not expect her advice to be heeded, and suspected that McMaster was being influenced by some of his fellow officers, men who delighted in “bull dogging and broiling,” a presumed reference to a more boisterous, confrontational, and outwardly aggressive sense of masculinity among these military men.[[89]](#footnote-89) Mary McMaster’s prediction that her point of view would be ignored proved prescient, as Fitz McMaster did indeed publish a rejoinder to Evans.

Before we turn to the contents of McMaster’s rejoinder, it is necessary to reflect upon the significance of his decision to ignore his wife’s advice and respond to Evans. If Mary’s hunch that her husband’s behavior was being shaped to a considerable extent by the influence of other officers was correct, then McMaster’s decision to publish another pamphlet tells us something important about the ways in which the Civil War shaped the process of masculine validation. According to Peter S. Carmichael, though common soldiers never stopped looking toward home as a site of approval, support, and emotional encouragement, they increasingly came to see their comrades as the “arbitrators of duty, honor, and courage” as the war went on.[[90]](#footnote-90) McMaster’s decision-making process in the spring of 1864 – albeit relating to officers instead of the rank and file – seems to speak to Carmichael’s point.

McMaster’s determination to publicly refute Evans and not turn the other cheek also reaffirms that, while the restrained ideal of manhood was something he valued and aspired to, it was hardly a rigid rulebook that dictated his every thought and action. Mary’s entreaty to Fitz was correct in that leaving the matter alone would be the epitome of Christian self-control, but he could not bear the thought that his nemesis might damage his public reputation and have the last word. McMaster justified his course of action to his wife by modestly asserting that, “my life may soon be cut short & I have nothing to leave as a heritage to my family but an honest name,” yet he also hinted at the combative element in play and his steadfast refusal to be bested by Evans when he remarked that “I hope my reply will be the finishing strike.”[[91]](#footnote-91) The fact that McMaster seemingly did not publicly respond to Cunningham, who also impugned his reputation as a gentleman in one of the documents published in the *Daily South Carolinian*, suggests that the primary desire behind the rejoinder was to discredit and hopefully dominate Evans, as opposed to merely defending his name and what it stood for. It was primarily an offensive, rather than defensive, act.

Fitz McMaster held off publishing his rejoinder for a short period because, on April 16, 1864, Nathan Evans was involved in a serious buggy accident in Charleston that it was initially rumored he might not recover from due to a fractured skull. Though the accident did not kill Evans, it did leave him unable to assume his military duties for some time.[[92]](#footnote-92) When it became clear that his rival would recover, McMaster pressed on and published his rejoinder. In it, he reiterated a good deal of what he had said before, but he concluded by averring that the braggadocious stylings of “Shanks” Evans were not reflective of true manhood and that the ongoing war only made this point more potent. “The courage of an officer,” lectured McMaster, “is not manifested by vulgar oaths and swaggering, about the vast odds a Southern soldier can whip, by displaying excitement, and creating it in others, and ferociously galloping a fine horse… but in evincing to his men by a calm and determined manner, that he is ready for the shock of arms, giving confidence to the feeble minded, and encouragement to the strong.” With respect to dueling, he did not hold back either. The code of honor was “clap-trap” that might be “captivating to pompous, unfledged college boys,” but not, by implication, to real men. If Evans was desperate for an opportunity to demonstrate his courage, McMaster pointed him to the battlefield, where he could serve the cause of his ailing country.[[93]](#footnote-93)

**Conclusion**

Following the series of publications by Nathan Evans and Fitz McMaster during the first half of 1864, their feud lacked notable flashpoints, though the mutual hatred did not subside. While “Shanks” would die in 1868, McMaster carried his dislike over to his son John Gary Evans (who would serve as governor of South Carolina during the 1890s) and was reported to have described him as a “miserable wretch.”[[94]](#footnote-94) Shifting our gaze away from the feud’s legacies and back to its origins, it is tempting to interpret it as a product of fundamentally different conceptualizations of the dictates of manhood and honor. There is definitely something to this – to be clear, I believe that there were real differences in the mentalities and outlooks of these two men – but it cannot tell us everything about their mutual animosity and subsequent actions. To explain the Evans-McMaster feud solely as a clash between rugged and restrained masculine ideals simplifies what is in fact a more complex, even messy, story. McMaster did try to project himself as a composed, Christian gentleman, but this was often a product of his determination to have the last laugh at his foe, to leave Evans “a dead cock in the pit.” A clear theme running throughout the fallout from Kinston, from the military tribunals to the duel challenges, was McMaster’s willingness to construe public perceptions about honorable and manly behavior not just as something that should determine his own actions but as something that could be leveraged against his bitter rival.

One should also note the important role of other men – James Rion in particular in the case of McMaster, Asa Evans in that of his brother – in shaping the actions of this story’s two protagonists to outwardly fit a more binary characterization of southern masculinity. It was Rion who pruned McMaster’s prose to make it more restrained, clearly suggesting that this was a goal that his confidant strove for but was unable to meet on his own because of his passion and thirst for retribution, while it seems as though Asa Evans fueled his brother’s touchy and impulsive nature at times. In trying to understand honor and masculinity in the mid-nineteenth-century U.S. South it is imperative that, as this article has strived to do, we consider not only the public performances of manhood but the conditions and stage management that helped produce them.

Finally, this article has shed important light on how the South’s struggle for independence contoured understandings of what was manly and honorable. Indeed, it is impossible to make sense of the Evans-McMaster rivalry without being attentive to its wartime context. When Fitz McMaster stated at Evans’ court of inquiry that he had no dislike of his rival but that “when I consider my duty to my country I am his enemy,” he neatly articulated how patriotism could be weaponized to both attack one’s rivals and add a virtuous veneer to personal or even petty vendettas.[[95]](#footnote-95) As illustrated by the discussion of alcohol, patriotism could also prove a malleable concept, as supporters and detractors of Evans were simultaneously able to cast his strong association with strong liquor as selfless or selfish, thereby adding weight to their competing appraisals of him as a man and an officer. The Civil War had a similarly notable impact upon the codes and rituals of honor, as it enabled McMaster to disrupt and deflect Nathan Evans’ duel challenge as he deemed it incongruous with his status as a Presbyterian *and* a dutiful Confederate soldier. McMaster’s refusal to meet his nemesis on the dueling grounds pragmatically melded notions of Christian, national, and military duty, enabling him to position himself as both a restrained and martial man. As this example – and in fact the wider Evans-McMaster rivalry – demonstrates, historians must be mindful of the dynamic interplay between different manly ideals and how individual men could exploit this interplay in their efforts to dominate others and make a name for themselves.
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