NPS Form 10-900-b
(March 1992)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

☒ New Submission ☐ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Adams County, PA Properties Associated with the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1863

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each)

The Civil War Era in Adams County, 1860-1863

C. Form Prepared By

name/title Paula S. Reed, PhD, Architectural Historian

organization Paula S. Reed and Associates, Inc. date 10/16/96, Rev. 1/99, 12/99

street & number 105 N. Potomac Street telephone 301-739-2070

city or town Hagerstown state Maryland zip code 21740

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. (☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Brent D. Glass — April 11, 2000

Signature of certifying official — Date

Brent D. Glass Executive Director
Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission

State or Federal agency and bureau

Adams County, PA Properties Associated with the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1863
Name of Multiple Property Listing

Pennsylvania
State

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and the title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form (National Register Bulletin 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

		Page Numbers
E.	**Statement of Historic Contexts** (If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)	E 1-12
F.	**Associated Property Types** (Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	F 1-16
G.	**Geographical Data**	G 1
H.	**Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods** (Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	H 1-2
I.	**Major Bibliographical References** (List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	I 1-5

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.0. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

TATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS:

The Civil War Era in Adams County
Theme: The Battle of Gettysburg

This multiple property nomination focuses upon properties associated with the Battle of Gettysburg that are not located in the Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District. The existing 11,820 acre District was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1975, and includes the Gettysburg National Military Park, Borough of Gettysburg, Eisenhower National Historic Site and approximately 3,100 acres of Cumberland, Mt. Joy and Straban Townships. An amendment of the existing Historic District will be included in the multiple property submission. Almost 25 years have passed since the Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District was listed, and its boundaries are being reassessed in light of recent development and new information.

Although there are important historic properties associated with the Gettysburg Campaign in adjoining counties and states, the geographic scope of this multiple property submission is Adams County.

As currently configured, the 1975 Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District consists of a cushion of land surrounding the government holdings, including the Borough of Gettysburg, the eastern slopes of the Round Tops and area along Willoughby Run on the west side of the Battlefield. There are however, many important Civil War related sites that lie outside of the Park boundaries and the boundaries of the Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District. It is these outlying properties within Adams County that this multiple property submission addresses, along with the updating of the existing Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District nomination.

Although many of the properties included in this multiple property documentation may be eligible in their own right under such significance areas as architecture, agriculture or transportation, the principal focus for this nomination is military significance. Therefore, only properties where military activity occurred will be part of this multiple property documentation.

Specifically for properties related to the Battle of Gettysburg in Adams County, the following property types have been identified:

1. Encampment Sites

2. Logistical Support Sites and Staging Areas
3. Engagement Sites
4. Headquarters Sites
5. Routes of March
6. Strategic Military Points-Historic Landscape Feature Sites
7. Prison Camps
8. Military Hospital Sites
9. Burial Sites

The property types may consist of a range of components including buildings, landscapes, structures, sites and, potentially, archaeological sites. These components may exist separately or in combination, and may be above ground or archaeological. Properties identified within any one property type may also reflect a combination of types, for example: a house located within an Engagement Site may have been used as a Hospital Site. In these cases, the properties will be referenced to each property type applicable.

In order to understand the Civil War's impact on Adams County, and why and how the conflict was carried into the county, it is necessary to look at the county's and the larger region's developmental history as well as Confederate General Robert E. Lee's motives in bringing the War into Pennsylvania in 1863.

Summary of Adams County History

Adams County was created in the year 1800 from York County, but it has a history of settlement, which extends far back into the 18th century. The initial settlers were a blend of Germans, Scots-Irish and English Quakers. Generally, the Germans located in the southeastern part of the county, the Scots-Irish in the mid and western sections and English Quakers, the least numerous, scattered throughout.

The early economy of Adams County was based on subsistence and local market farming, with principally production of small grains - wheat, oats and rye. The many flour and gristmills depicted on 18th and early 19th century maps of the county are evidence of the importance of grain farming in Adams County. In the 18th and early 19th centuries, a typical farm had less than 200 acres, a few cows, sheep, and hogs, an orchard with various fruit trees and fields of

clover, corn and grain. Pasture and wood lots occupied much of the land. Cash crops were grains, sold in bulk or processed into flour or meal. Fruit and livestock were mostly grown for family use. According to Robert L. Bloom's History of Adams County, "Gordon's Gazetteer reported that in 1830 alone, the farm output [of Adams County] included 100,000 bushels of wheat; 300,000 of rye; 175,000 of oats; 300,000 corn, 70,000 of potatoes; and 3,000 of buckwheat."[1] By 1850, Adams County yielded 318,848 bushels of wheat, 261,779 of oats, and 183,978 of corn. These figures show a marked increase between 1830 and 1850 of wheat and oats production, with a concurrent reduction of corn production, illustrating the importance of flour milling as a leading aspect of the emerging regional agricultural economy. The county's industries and production were agricultural-based through the 19th century. Flour, saw and fulling mills dominated, and continued throughout the 19th century. Yet, despite this agricultural productivity, Adams Countians on the eve of the Civil War were less affluent than their immediate neighbors. Their per capita value of property in 1860 was $59 compared with $70 in Cumberland County, $63 in Franklin County and $61 in York County.[2] Both Cumberland and Franklin Counties were in the fertile limestone belt of the Cumberland Valley, and were served by the Cumberland Valley Railroad, which could explain their higher property value.

As early as the 1830s, orcharding began to advance in the Fruitbelt area of northwestern Adams County. Cyrus Griest, a Quaker, moved from York County to the Quaker Valley section and was growing fruit trees for sale in the 1840s. In these formative early days of the fruit industry in Adams County, orchard produce was sold locally or hauled to Baltimore or Philadelphia for sale. Quoting a newspaper, Robert L. Bloom in his History of Adams County says: "A reader of the Compiler wrote in 1850 to the editor and claimed that 'the fruit of Adams County has a better reputation in Philadelphia than that of any other county in the state, or any other state.'"[3]

The ability to develop these agricultural markets depended upon a system of transportation routes through the county. By the late 18th century, a network of roads

---

[1]Robert L. Bloom, A History of Adams County, Pennsylvania, 1700-1990. (Gettysburg, PA: Adams County Historical Society, 1992), p. 96.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Bloom, History, p. 97.

crisscrossed Adams County, some established in the 1740s and '50s. The main road from Philadelphia, Lancaster and York forked at a place known as the "brick house" east of Gettysburg. The north branch, existing by 1746, passed through Hunterstown and Mummasburg and crossed South Mountain at Black's Gap. The south fork, established by 1748, led to Gettysburg, then to Fairfield, crossing South Mountain at Nicholson's Gap, just north of the Maryland line. Another early road passing through Adams County connected Shippensburg in Cumberland County with Mummasburg, Gettysburg, Petersburg (now Littlestown) and Baltimore. It intersected with the Nicholson's Gap Road at the site of Gettysburg. The Old Monocacy Road established by 1740, leading from Philadelphia to Frederick, Maryland passes through the southeastern corner of Adams County. Most of these early routes are still in use today through the system of state, county or township roads. These and subsequent roads form a web of 10 roads radiating out from the county seat, Gettysburg.

The first railroad in Adams County was begun in 1835. Known as the "Tapeworm" Railroad because of its winding route along South Mountain, it was intended to extend from Wrightsville on the Susquehanna River, through York and Gettysburg, then southwestward to connect with the Baltimore & Ohio somewhere near the Potomac River. Thaddeus Stevens heavily promoted this railroad and the project was abandoned amid accusations of fraud and mismanagement. The portion of the railroad extending east from Gettysburg to Hanover was completed by 1858, but the actual Tapeworm Railroad (which was the part west of Gettysburg) was still only partially constructed until it was completed by the Western Maryland Railroad in 1889. All that existed of this railroad at the time of the Civil War was a partially graded route, cutting through hills, and over a few bridges. An Italianate style railroad depot was erected on Carlisle Street in Gettysburg in 1859 at the terminus of the Gettysburg-Hanover Railroad.

The transportation network led to the development of towns and villages throughout the county. When it was partitioned off from York County in 1800, Adams County already had eight established towns: Gettysburg, Fairfield, Hunterstown, East Berlin, Abbottstown, New Oxford, McSherrystown and Littlestown. These early towns are located in the southeastern half of the county where the land is more fertile and level (and along major 18th century routes of travel).

Gettysburg, was established in 1786, before Adams County was separated from York. Prior to formation of the town, Samuel Gettys possessed 381 acres of land in Cumberland Township at the site of what was to become Gettysburg. There he established a tavern at the

intersection of the Nicholson's Gap and Baltimore-Shippensburg Roads. Apparently there was already some sort of settlement in the vicinity of his tavern at the crossroads. When Samuel Gettys experienced financial difficulties during and after the American Revolution, his son James purchased 116 acres of the property with the tavern at a Sheriff's sale in 1785. The following year, James divided the acreage into 210 town lots.

Gettysburg's location near the center of the county and at a prominent crossroads made it the choice for county seat when Adams County was established. It is situated in rolling farmland known as the Gettysburg Plain. The South Mountain rises approximately 10 miles to the west and a series of diabase ridges known as the Round Tops dominate the landscape at the southeast edge of town. Immediately to the west is a land form known as Seminary Ridge. The central part of the county is drained by Marsh Creek and Rock Creek and their tributaries.

By the early 1800s Gettysburg was the hub of ten roads radiating outward like the spokes of a wheel. The town prospered as a market center for the surrounding countryside. By 1860 at the eve of the Civil War, its population had grown to 2,390.

Among the town's leading industries in the 19th century was carriage making. Most sources agree that Gettysburg was a leader in the carriage making industry with sales primarily in Virginia and Maryland.

In politics Adams County was generally Federalist, then Whig, then Republican. Two newspapers, the Sentinel and the Star supported the views of the Whigs while the Compiler was a Democratic paper. The population was, by the 19th century mostly Germans, of the Lutheran and German Reformed denominations. The German influx into the county soon relegated other groups to minorities.

Higher education became an important force in Adams County with the founding of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in 1826. In 1832 Gettysburg College was started, under the name of Pennsylvania College. Both institutions were inspired by Samuel S. Schmucker, a Lutheran clergyman.

Architecture

The earliest buildings in Adams County were generally of log construction. The U.S.

Direct Tax of 1798 records that 86% of all houses listed in Adams County in 1798 were of log construction. As farms became established, larger log houses and more commodious stone or brick bank barns were built. Later, by the mid 19th century, timber framed bank barns and balloon framed or brick houses dominated the types of buildings constructed.

No known buildings from Adams County's initial settlement period of the 1730s and '40s remain today. The 1798 tax does give an indication of the 18th century appearance of the county, however. In addition to the majority of log houses recorded, 7% were stone houses, 4% frame and 1% brick. The remaining 2% were listed under the category of "combination," meaning they were constructed of more than one material.

No known examples of stone construction date from before 1750 in Adams County. However, examples span from the 18th century into the early 20th century with the largest number of stone houses dating from the middle third of the 19th century. Architectural survey records indicate that brick construction is most prominent in Adams County after 1830, and frame construction was at its peak between 1860 and 1900, reflecting the economy and ease of construction with balloon framing.

Adams County's architectural heritage also includes other types of buildings and structures: barns and other domestic and agricultural outbuildings, mills, churches, schools and bridges. By the 1860s which ends the period of significance for this group of resources, Adams County was pretty well developed in terms of its architectural history. Farmsteads, mills and villages were interspersed among a network of roads that had developed to their current extent. What has occurred since the 1860s is growth peripheral to towns and villages, termed today as "sprawl," and the more gentle progression of newer buildings replacing or adding to existing building complexes.

Architectural expression in Adams County is largely vernacular interpretations of major stylistic trends from the 18th and 19th centuries: Georgian, Federal, Greek Revival, Gothic Revival and Italianate. Usually three to five bays in width with stylish influence expressed with entrance and window treatment. There is a strong traditional component in the county's architecture, largely derived from the influence of the mostly German population, in part evidenced by the four bay two-center-front door facade arrangement. The German imprint is clearly evident in the type of barns used by the farmers of Adams County, large structures of frame with a bank or ramp at the back and a cantilevered forebay at the front. Known at the time

as "Swisser" barns, the term leaves little doubt as to their origins.

Most of Adams County's surviving historic architecture represents second or third generation settlement in the County. Initial settlement era architecture, impermanent to begin with, had mostly disappeared by the 1850s and '60s. An extensive amount of more permanent construction occurred in the 1820-1860 period. Architecture from this period (with the exception of post-Civil War era construction) is mostly concentrated in the towns, but is also dispersed in farmsteads throughout the region's landscape.

The Civil War Era in Adams County

In general, the people of Adams County were opposed to slavery. They were also opposed to abolitionism. Being moderate in their views, they did not support extremist positions on either side. In the election of 1860, although Abraham Lincoln won in Adams County, he earned only 80 more votes among the county's voters than Stephen A. Douglas, who was ambivalent on the issue of slavery. The vote however was markedly different from that in adjoining counties south of the Mason-Dixon Line where Lincoln had almost no showing. For example, in the election of 1860, Frederick County, Maryland, traditionally Democratic, preferred Southern Democrat John C. Breckenridge over Northern Democrat Stephen A. Douglas, with 3,170 votes to 439. Lincoln received only 103 votes in Frederick County.[4] The comparison with an adjoining county in Maryland illustrates the divisive nature of politics in the 1860s, particularly in the border areas between North and South such as Adams and Frederick Counties were.

When war came, Adams Countians supported it as an effort to preserve the Union. Through the war years, Democrats carried the majority in local and state elections, in a reversal of the staunchly Whig or Republican sentiment which had heretofore characterized Adams County. This switch may reflect the economic concerns of the mostly agrarian population of Adams County who may have favored the Democrats' emphasis on local initiative; or the people of Adams County may have felt that the Lincoln administration's views on abolition were too radical.

---

[4]Emile A. and Mary B. Nakhleh, Emmitsburg: History and Society. Emmitsburg, MD: Emmitsburg Chronicle, 1976, p. 41.

Some of the political ambivalence may be explained by Adams County's close commercial ties with Baltimore and Virginia. One of Adams County's main industries was manufacture of carriages. Most of Adams County's carriage sales were in Virginia, and manufacturers had no desire to reduce their market by alienating slaveholders there. The county's three newspapers borrowed liberally from information in Baltimore and Washington newspapers, which tended to be opposed to abolitionism. Yet, the three Adams County newspapers supported the war effort to preserve the Union. In the 1860s, the Democratic Compiler was strongly opposed to abolitionist views. The Sentinel and the Star, both Whig, also did not support abolitionists. Of course, other issues besides abolition were at work, i.e., states rights vs. strong central government, cultural differences between north and south, and economic considerations.

The four adjoining counties, Adams and Franklin in Pennsylvania, and Frederick and Washington in Maryland, were touched by the Civil War in a way few other northern communities were. In the late summer of 1862, Confederate General Robert E. Lee led his army into Maryland, in Frederick and Washington Counties. The purpose of the advance was to gather supplies from the lush agricultural region and to garner support from Confederate sympathizers in Maryland. Lee over-estimated the Confederate support in central and western Maryland. The Maryland Campaign culminated with the Battle of Antietam on September 17, 1862, at Sharpsburg, Maryland, about 40 miles southwest of Gettysburg. The closeness of these events to Adams County filled the population with rumors and nervousness about the possibility of invasion.

In October of 1862, JEB Stuart led a successful cavalry raid through Franklin and western Adams Counties. His mission was to collect horses for the Army of Northern Virginia. By this time there were severe shortages of both horses and forage for the animals in Virginia.

The following summer, in June of 1863, Lee again led the Army of Northern Virginia into Northern territory. This time his objectives were threefold. His military goal was to reach Harrisburg, capture the city and cut off rail traffic to Philadelphia and New York. He felt confident in this pursuit because the Army of the Potomac, under General Joseph Hooker, which was in the vicinity of Warrenton and Culpeper, Virginia, had been ordered to protect Washington, D.C. and to maneuver to keep the army between the enemy and the national capital. This gave General Lee plenty of latitude in his movements. A decisive Confederate victory on northern soil would have encouraged England and France to recognize the Confederacy and put

pressure on the north to end the War. Lee's second purpose was to replenish supplies for his army. It is easy to underestimate the importance of this quest. By 1863, Virginia was severely depleted in livestock and agricultural produce. Up to this point in the war, both the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia and the Union Army of the Potomac had occupied Virginia for almost the entire time. All available horses had been taken for use of the Confederate Army and no animals were available to farm the land or transport farm produce. One eyewitness reported walking from Fredericksburg to Richmond and back in Virginia in 1864 and not seeing a single head of livestock in private hands.[5] It was becoming clear that Virginia had nothing left to give. It was critical for Lee to not only feed his army but to stockpile food stuffs for the following winter. Historically, the Cumberland Valley and Piedmont areas of Pennsylvania and Maryland had been regarded as America's breadbasket. This rich agricultural land was a great allure to Lee. He still held hopes of winning Maryland over to the Confederacy, however, so orders not to collect property and goods in Maryland were strictly enforced. Therefore, southern Pennsylvania was Lee's feeding ground. His third objective was political and strategic: to take advantage of the growing peace movement in the North by bringing war to its doorstep. Lee hoped that victory in the North would create demands for a compromised negotiated peace and separation.

Letters and diaries from men in Lee's army attest to the lushness of Pennsylvania and the fruits, vegetables and sleek animals found there. The food and supply gathering mission undertaken by the Confederates as part of the Gettysburg Campaign is well documented in the words of the Southern soldiers themselves. All were impressed with the agricultural productivity and bountiful landscape they saw. Thomas Ware (who, incidentally was killed a few days later at Gettysburg) recorded in his diary, "A great many cherries brought to Camps. Q Masters are gathering all the horses around, beeves &c. Several the boys have seen fine horses tied out in the woods. I eat a great many cherries today. Cooking up 3 days rations of flour."[6] A member of A.P. Hill's Third Army Corps wrote, "I have never seen any country in such a high state of cultivation. Such wheat I never dreamed of and so much of it."[7] Mention is made of Hill's men

---

[5]Robert Krick, "Dissolution of the Homefront" Keynote Address, Annual Conference, Civil War Medicine, Shepherdstown, WV, August 7, 1993.

[6]Mark Nesbitt, 35 Days to Gettysburg: The Campaign Diaries of Two American Enemies, (1992), p.135.

[7]Spencer Glasgow Welch, A Confederate Surgeon's Letters to His Wife, (1911), p. 150.

stripping the trees of cherries along the roads to Fayetteville (in Franklin County, west of Gettysburg).[8] T.N. Simpson wrote in a letter, "I'll send you some cherry seed which you must plant. The fruit is the large white cherry, as large, if not larger than a partridge egg and the finest I ever saw. I hope you may get some of them to come up and grow."[9]

Maj. Gen. William D. Pender, commander of the Third Division of A.P. Hill's Third Army Corps, wrote home to his wife, Fanny, on June 28, 1863, "Until we crossed the Md. line our men behaved as well as troops could, but here it will be hard to restrain them, for they have an idea that they are to indulge in unlicensed plunder. They have done nothing like the Yankees do in our country. They take poultry and hogs but in most cases put out money first. We take everything we want for government use."[10]

Other members of Pender's Division commented as well. In the words of J.F.J. Caldwell, an officer of Company B, First Regiment of the South Carolina Volunteers, "We are now in a beautiful county. In every direction yellow fields of grain extended themselves; on every farm were droves of the largest fattest cattle; gardens thronged with inviting vegetables; orchards pave promise of bounteous fruit yield, and already extended to us an earnest in the most delicious cherries; full dairies, flocks of sheep, and poultry were almost monotonously frequent."[11]

---

[8]John O. Casler, Four Years in the Stonewall Brigade, (1893) p. 247.

[9]Guy R. Everson and Edward H. Simpson, Jr., Eds. "Far, Far From Home," The Wartime Letters of Dick and Talley Simpson, Third South Carolina Volunteers. (1994) p.252. G. Moxley Sorrell, a major on Longstreet's staff at the time, remembered many years after the War that in late June, 1863, "The cherries were ripe and the trees bending with delicious fruit. I recall one special tree near Chambersburg that seemed beyond all the others to tempt me. Sitting quietly in saddle, branch after branch was gently drawn down to the rider's thirsty lips almost to repletion and good is the recollection even to this present day." General G. Moxley Sorrell, Recollections of a Confederate Staff Officer, New York, (1905), p. 168.

[10]William W. Hassler, ed. The General to His Lady, The Civil War Letters of William Dorsey Pender to Fanny Pender, (1962) p. 253.

[11]J.F.J. Caldwell, The History of a Brigade of South Carolinians, (1984) p. 133.

In contrast, only six months later flour was selling in Richmond for $1,200 per barrel and a cord of fire wood cost $150—this while a private in the Confederate Army earned about $11.00 per month.[12] Thus, the move into Pennsylvania was a logical one for the replenishment of food, horses and equipment.

Lee's Army of Northern Virginia entered Pennsylvania by way of the Cumberland Valley. The Cumberland Valley is a 30-mile wide lush passage extending northeastward from the Valley of Virginia to the Susquehanna River near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Rimmed on either side by mountain ridges, it had long been a travel route, first for Indians, then for white settlers passing into the Upland South. Choice of the Cumberland Valley afforded Lee protected passage for his army, with the South Mountain between him and Hooker's Union forces, and at the same time provided some of America's richest agricultural land, yielding plenty of forage and livestock.

Lee first sent General R.S. Ewell, one of his corps commanders, into Pennsylvania with orders to proceed toward Harrisburg. Lee followed with his other two corps, A.P. Hill and James Longstreet's commands and established headquarters just east of Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, along the Chambersburg-Gettysburg turnpike. During the last week of June, Lee assembled the bulk of his army in the vicinity east of Chambersburg, with Ewell ahead at Carlisle, and Jubal Early's Division sent eastward to York. Lee's problem at this point was that he was not sure of the movement of the Union Army, which had just switched commanders from Joseph Hooker to George Gordon Meade. Lee's main source for information was supposed to be from the cavalry under JEB Stuart, which was at this time at the backside of Meade's army and out of communication with its commander. Therefore, Lee had to rely on an informant who reported late in the day on June 28 that the Union Army had crossed the Potomac River and was moving northward toward Pennsylvania. At all costs, Lee wanted to prevent the Union Army from crossing South Mountain into the Cumberland Valley, which was his transportation route back into Virginia. Lee, therefore, made a fateful decision to change objectives. He decided not to proceed to Harrisburg as originally planned, but to cross South Mountain on the Gettysburg-Chambersburg Pike and head to the southeast to confront Meade somewhere near Westminster, Maryland. He sent a courier to General Ewell, who by this time had reached Carlisle, with orders to either return to Chambersburg or to send divisions south toward Gettysburg where he anticipated that they would meet with Hill's and Longstreet's corps, east of South Mountain.

---

[12]Robert Krick, op cit.

Meanwhile, Meade's Union army had been advancing in a northerly direction from Frederick and Westminster, Maryland. The two armies collided at Gettysburg, where major roads coming from all directions converged. The first shots were fired on the morning of July 1, when members of A.P. Hill's Confederate Third Corps met with General John Buford's Union Cavalry, later reinforced by Brigadier General John F. Reynolds' Union First Corps, along McPherson's Ridge, just west of Gettysburg. The first day's battle took place west and north of Gettysburg, with Ewell's Corps advancing from the north and Hill's from the west against the Union First and Eleventh Corps. By the end of the day, the Union forces were pushed south and east through Gettysburg and took up positions on Culp's Hill, Cemetery Hill and Cemetery Ridge where they were joined during the night by the Union Second, Fifth and Twelfth Corps.

Throughout July 2, the Union Army grouped and organized strong defensive positions along the chain of hills and ridges extending from Little Round Top, south of Gettysburg, northeast to Culp's Hill. Ultimately concentrated there were the Union 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th and 12th Corps in addition to the remnants of the 1st and 11th Corps who had survived the first day. Fanned to the north and west around them were Ewell's, Hill's and Longstreet's Confederate Corps. The fully assembled Union force on the ridge line proved practically impregnable. After major attacks on the northern, southern and finally on July 3, the center portions of the Union line, both armies were exhausted. Lee realized that his best option was to withdraw back to Virginia. This process began late on July 4 with a 17-mile long ambulance train proceeding west from Cashtown and the infantry with remaining supply wagons traveling over the Fairfield Road through Monterey Gap toward Williamsport, Maryland and the Potomac River. The Gettysburg Campaign showed that the Confederate Army was not invincible, and that the North was not immune from invasion.

For the citizens of Gettysburg and the surrounding area the Northern invasion and the Gettysburg Campaign continued for months afterward through the care of the portion of the 30,000 wounded who were unable to leave with the armies, burying the approximately 10,000 dead, clearing debris and repairing damage. It is the affected properties outside the Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District that this nomination projects seeks to record.

ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES:

The property types listed below are associated with the Battle of Gettysburg and may be either districts or individual properties. They may include individually or in combination buildings, sites, structures and archaeological resources. Districts may be either rural landscapes, or villages or a combination of both. The key element within the scope of this MPDF is association with the Battle of Gettysburg. All properties nominated under this cover form must retain integrity of this association. The MPDF focuses on areas of significance relating to the Civil War battle. Other areas of significance will, however, be discussed and explained in the separate nominations that are a part of this multiple property submission.

Encampment Sites

Description:

Encampment Sites are locations where soldiers established temporary living quarters. Except where encampments and their attendant activities may have occurred in and around existing buildings, these sites are archaeological. A full range of activities may be represented in the archaeological record for encampment sites. Generally, the longer the duration of occupation, the greater the number of features and artifacts that are present. Additionally, camp settlement patterns are usually structured by army regulations and therefore are highly patterned. Expected activity areas may include water procurement, horse stabling, blacksmithing, sutlering, bivouacking, commissary, kitchens, latrines, and medical services. Anticipated archaeological features would include latrine-sinks, refuse pits, post-holes (indicating tent sites), burials and fortifications. Above-ground features would include fortifications, fences, buildings, landscape elements and transportation-related structures such as roads and bridges. Artifacts might be clothing; weapons, ammunition and accouterments; personal items; food preparation, storage and consumption items; beverage containers; tobacco pipes; medical items; tools and equipment.

Examples of Encampment Sites outside of the 1975 Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District include the Union First Corps Encampment Site on the north side of Rock Creek just west of US Route 15, and Confederate encampment sites at the Deardorff farm and eastward from Flohr's Church near McKnightstown on the south side of US Route 30.

Significance:

These properties would meet Criteria A and D in the area of Military History. Encampment Sites are important to the understanding of the Battle of Gettysburg by defining the location, approach and assemblage of the various corps as they came to and withdrew from the Battle area. By locating and recording the pre-battle encampment sites, the way in which the conflict developed and concluded may be seen more clearly.

Very few Civil War period encampments have been investigated. It would be very useful to have information and research which defines the archaeological and above ground expression of a Civil War campground (Legg and Smith, 1989:130) especially as it relates to the structural/patterning dictated by Army regulations. Comparisons between long term encampments, which are located far away from battle area, and more ephemeral camps located close to the battlefields would serve as another avenue for research. Comparisons between Federal and Confederate encampments with respect to artifact assemblages and patterning should provide some significant differences. The investigations and subsequent analysis of these site types would also provide valuable information about the soldiers and their quality of life for both Federals and Confederates.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

Above-ground terrain and landscape should be reasonably visually intact, representing as closely as possible the 1863 period. Buildings should portray the period of occupation and natural and man-made features should retain their basic 1863 configurations. Archaeologically investigated sites should contain features and artifacts relating to the specialized activity areas within the encampment. Spatial patterning of features and/or artifacts would be a pre-requisite. For purposes of high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the 1863 land conditions.

Logistical Support and Staging Areas

Description:

Logistical Support and Staging Areas are places where military or civilian supply camps were established to support the battle, or post battle activity. These sites were close to but protected from the battle area, where ammunition and supply trains could be kept in wait. They would be near major transportation routes, along routes of march used by both armies. Ideally,

these were located for easy access to the engagement areas and generally on open farmland for maneuverability. These properties also include staging areas where troops assembled and waited to be deployed. Resources include farmland, farmsteads, historic natural landscapes and features such as hedgerows, woodland edges and roads and lanes. The location of these sites was largely predicated on the logistical/opportunistic use of the Battlefield's geographical, geological and/or cultural landscape.

Examples of Logistical Support and Staging Areas outside of the 1975 Historic District include the Confederate area on Herrs Ridge overlooking the site of the first day's battle.

Significance:

Logistical Support and Staging Areas are eligible under Criteria A and D in the area of Military History. These sites were integral to the Battle. It is from these sites that men and material were moved into action, ammunition was distributed and medical supplies and ambulances were kept. These places were critical to the conduct of the Battle and ability of the Armies to carry on the fight. To some extent, these sites controlled the location of the Battle since neither army could stray far from its supply and support base.

No Civil War period logistical support, staging area, or signal corps property type site has been investigated thus far. It would be very useful to have information and research which defines the archaeological expression of these site types. The investigations and subsequent analysis of these sites would provide valuable information about the tactical and logistical organization for both the Confederate and Federal armies.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

Farmsteads, historic landscape features and small scale elements such as old fence rows should remain intact, and possess integrity of design, materials and setting to the 1863 period. While some loss of integrity is inevitable, natural and man-made features should retain as nearly as possible their 1863 configurations. Archaeologically investigated sites should contain features and artifacts relating to the specialized logistical support functions. For purposes of high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the 1863 land conditions.

Archaeologically investigated sites should contain battle related artifacts. The artifacts should exhibit spatial/horizontal patterning.

Engagement Sites

Description:

Engagement Sites are areas where troops spread out for defensive and offensive maneuvering and where fighting and encounters occurred. Cavalry engagement areas involve combat troops on horses. Battles and engagements flowed over the terrain regardless of the presence of buildings, roads, railroads or other man-made or natural features. As the engagement progressed, these features provided shelter, became focal points or became battlefield objectives. Archaeological components for engagement sites are characterized by a small number of activities and resultant artifacts distributed in sparse array. Army regulations and convention defined cavalry and infantry tactics, therefore, a battlefield pattern is recognizable and definable for analysis with comparative data from other battlefield pattern studies. Typical artifact assemblages include: horse trappings (bridal and saddle parts, leather, boots, horseshoes), weapons and weapon parts, ammunition components, personal accouterments (jewelry, buttons, coins, suspender clips), military accouterments (canteens, cups, spurs), and human remains (Fox and Scott, 1991:98). Features are generally limited to burials. Above ground resources include natural and historic man-made landscape features, farmsteads, buildings and structures, field and woodland patterns from the period. Also structures which directly resulted from engagements such as breastworks characterize engagement sites.

For Gettysburg the National Military Park encompasses most of the battlefield area. There are several skirmish sites and a cavalry engagement site that are documented, but not protected. These sites are located on farmland west and north of the Borough of Gettysburg outside the boundaries of the 1975 Historic District. These engagements which occurred prior to the actual Battle are important to the understanding and interpretation of the Gettysburg Campaign, and how the two armies happened to clash at Gettysburg.

Significance:

Engagement Sites are important under Criteria A and D in the area of Military History, as places where points of military physical conflict actually occurred. Major battlefield sites such

as those at Gettysburg have been well documented. However, peripheral skirmish/engagement sites are significant in the understanding of events leading up to major battles, as well as, events which occurred outside the major battlefield area while a major battle was in progress.

No known Civil War skirmish/engagement sites have been adequately investigated to date from an archaeological standpoint. Significant information and research could contribute to our understanding of the "Civil War Battlefield Pattern," according to Fox and Scott (1991:97). Using their "Battlefield Dynamic Pattern" approach it may be possible to analyze a skirmish line on the basis of discrete sets of individual signatures (i.e., discarded percussion caps). This approach has not been attempted, but the potential for similar results with Civil War cap and powder technology has been reported by Fox and Scott (1991:95) after their success with self-contained metallic cartridges. Even in the absence of this research tool, the pursuit of gross battlefield patterning (i.e., archaeological identification of combatant positions and the correlation of these phenomena with the historical record) should be attainable by recovered distributional data in the form of percussion caps, broken gear, lost personal items, discarded military accouterments, clothing items, and incoming expended ammunition.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

The historic landscape for Engagement Sites should remain intact. Buildings should retain enough integrity of material, setting, location and workmanship to evoke the time of the Battle.

Archaeologically investigated sites should contain battle-related artifacts. The artifacts should exhibit spatial/horizontal patterning. Features should consist almost exclusively of burials. For purposes of a high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the July 1863 land conditions.

Headquarters Sites

Description:

Headquarters Sites are the main center of operations and control for a designated officer and his staff. These are often, although not necessarily in buildings, such as taverns or

residences. These command centers were quite ephemeral, changing as the corps moved and positioned. It was from these centers that movements of the armies and their components were directed. The resources are buildings or sites near routes of march, points of engagement, or encampment sites. Examples in the Gettysburg area that are not already in the National Park or the Battlefield Historic District include Moritz Tavern on U.S. Route 15, south of Gettysburg, headquarters for USA Brigadier General John F. Reynolds, commander of the U.S. First Corps, and just behind the First Corps encampment site. General Reynolds spent the last night, June 30, 1863, at the Moritz Tavern before he died in battle on July 1. Another headquarters site is the Willow Springs Hotel, an 18th century stone building on old Route 30, Confederate Jubal A. Early's headquarters on June 26, 1863. Both of these buildings are also significant for their architectural expression as early taverns or hotels, but derive their importance in the context of this nomination for their association with the Battle of Gettysburg. Historical documentation and corroboration is important for precise site determinations.

Significance:

Headquarters Sites are eligible under Criteria A and D in the area of Military History. From these places, military operations were directed, most significantly in the days prior to the Battle when both armies were maneuvering for position and defining the location and strength of the other. As command posts, these sites are of particular importance to the conduct and outcome of the Battle.

Archaeologically, the remains associated with these sites would have a similar research potential as with the previously discussed Encampment Sites. However, notable differences should exist between the artifact and feature assemblages of commissioned officers versus noncommissioned military personnel.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

For Headquarters Sites, buildings must retain integrity of design, location, setting, workmanship, feeling and association, to reflect the appearance of the property in the early summer of 1863. Buildings representing this property type predate the Battle. Landscape features, such as topography, woodland, and field patterns should retain as much as possible their historic character. In general, buildings should retain original exterior materials and fenestration patterns. The association with military leaders provides such significance that some loss of

integrity to the site would not affect eligibility.

Archaeologically investigated sites should contain features and artifacts relating to the specialized activity areas within the encampment. There should be an apparent dichotomization between areas associated with commissioned and non-commissioned military personnel. Spatial patterning of features and or artifacts would be pre-requisite. For purposes of a high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the July 1863 land conditions.

Routes of March

Description:

Routes of March are the thoroughfares used by both armies to approach the Battlefield and to withdraw after the fight. Research by local and National Park service historians has produced good information about which roads were used for both the approach and withdrawal routes by each of the armies. Resources of this property type appear as linear districts, taking in portions of historic roads and travel routes and their attendant roadside properties such as houses, taverns, hotels and villages.

Significance:

Routes of March are eligible under Criteria A and D in the area of Military History. Roads and consequently routes of march are particularly important to understanding the Battle of Gettysburg, and the military decisions made by the armies' commanders. Roads from all directions converge at Gettysburg, making a Battle at or near the town almost inevitable, once General Lee decided to cross South Mountain from Chambersburg and General Meade decided to move north through Maryland.

Archaeologically, the remains associated with Routes of March have the same research potential as with the previously discussed Engagement Sites. Numerous points along a given route should contain archaeological materials, however these sites would most likely be diffuse and widely separated.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

The Routes of March property type includes more than just the road or road bed over which the armies traveled. Also considered are roadside resources including villages such as Cashtown and McKnightstown, historic bridges and culverts, taverns and inns. Many of the major roads in the 1860s are also major roads today and so have lost integrity through widening, realignment and resurfacing. The linear districts should be selected to avoid intrusions as much as possible and include sections of road and attendant features that retain the feeling and association with the Civil War era as much as possible. In order to be eligible, roads do not have to retain unpaved surfaces, but should retain original grade, alignment and width.

Archaeologically investigated site areas along a given route should contain battle related artifacts. The artifacts should exhibit spatial/horizontal patterning. Features should consist almost exclusively of burials. For purposes of a high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the July 1863 land conditions.

Strategic Military Points and Historic Landscape Feature Sites

Description:

Strategic Military Points and Historic Landscape Feature Sites are those where the terrain afforded protection or opportunity for certain military activities such as signal operations, defensive positioning, observation, and troop movements, i.e. mountain passes and creek crossing points. Outside of the existing Historic District, Herrs Ridge where Confederate forces assembled on the First Day's Battle, is an example of a known, but as yet unprotected Strategic Military Point, Monterey Pass through which both armies exited the county is another example of a Strategic Military Point. Other known sites are Wolf Hill, and the Railroad Cut, both outside the Historic District. Cultural components include buildings or structures used for observation points, cover and protection or as signal stations.

Significance:

These properties are significant under Criteria A and D in the area of Military History for their strategic role in the military operations pertaining to the Battle of Gettysburg. Although most of the Strategic Military Points and Historic Landscape Feature Sites are already protected as part of the 1975 National Register Historic District, many are not, especially those associated

with the approach to and withdrawal from the scene of the conflict. The terrain and the topography of Adams County are integral to the understanding of the Battle and the larger Gettysburg Campaign. Cultural resources in this category are linked with the terrain, such as a building on an important promontory (the Lutheran Theological Seminary on Seminary Ridge at the west edge of Gettysburg would be an example of such a building).

Archaeologically, the remains associated with these sites would have the same research potential as with the previously discussed Logistical Support Sites, Staging Areas, and Engagement Sites.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

Strategic Military Points and Historic Landscape Feature Sites should maintain an acceptable degree of visual continuity and resemble as much as practicable the appearance of the landscape in 1863. Certainly development has taken place in the intervening years and today's landscape has more tree cover than was the case in 1863, according to historic photographs. Acknowledging these inevitable changes, listable properties must otherwise maintain the feeling and association with the Civil War period.

Archaeologically investigated sites should contain battle-related artifacts. The artifacts should exhibit spatial/horizontal patterning. Features should consist almost exclusively of burials. For purposes of a high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the July 1863 land conditions.

Prison Camps

Description:

Prison Camps are encampment sites set aside for prisoners of war. They appear similar to regular encampment sites except that they have the added component of security arrangements, presumably with areas set aside for the confinement of the prisoners. These are archaeological sites except where the encampments occurred in and around buildings and structures, which remain standing today. One P.O.W. site has been documented as lying outside the boundaries of the 1975 Historic District. It is a Confederate encampment site on the east bank of Willoughby Run just south of Pa. Route 116. Artifact assemblages are the same as those listed for

encampment sites, and features are those which define the location of the area where prisoners were confined. Historical documentation and corroboration is important for precise site determinations.

Significance:

These properties are eligible under Criteria A and D in the area of Military History. The fact that only one prison camp site has been documented so far associated with the Gettyburg Battle, indicates how little is known about this important aspect of the Battle. The location, confinement, although temporary, and treatment of prisoners and how these aspects of prison life are expressed in the archaeological record are important areas for exploration.

It would be very useful to have information and research which defines the archaeological expression of a Civil War prison camp. Archaeologically, the remains associated with these sites would have a similar research potential as with the previously discussed Encampment Sites. However, notable differences should exist between the artifact and feature assemblages of non-prison camps versus the prison camps.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

The sites for any Prison Camps must be relatively undisturbed to allow for the proper identification of features and collection of artifacts.

Archaeologically investigated sites should contain features and artifacts relating to the specialized activity areas within the encampment. Spatial patterning of features and/or artifacts would be pre-requisite. For purposes of a high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the July 1863 land conditions.

Military Hospital Sites

Description:

With nearly 30,000 wounded in the Battle of Gettysburg, Military Hospital Sites are an important type of property associated with the Battle and its aftermath. Good documentation

exists for at least the larger hospital sites through research by authors such as Gregory Coco, with locations that have been documented for both armies. Many of these hospital sites lie outside the boundaries of the 1975 Historic District. However, researchers believe that most properties in the vicinity of Gettysburg housed wounded for at least some time during and after the Battle. Hospital Sites encompass the full range of locales where wounded soldiers were medically treated, allowed to recuperate/expire, and awaited transport. It is estimated that there may have been 160 of these locations within the Gettysburg Battlefield vicinity (Coco 1988:9) in order to accommodate the estimated 27,000 wounded (Coco 1995:15). Hospital sites may be dwellings, barns, churches, schools, mills and other shelters large enough to house the wounded. There were also field hospitals in open areas with shelter being provided by military tents. These open air hospitals tended to belong to the various army corps and were larger, official stations. During the battle, emergency first aide stations were set up a short distance from the area of fighting. By August, 1863, the various corps hospitals were closed and remaining wounded were consolidated at an army hospital called Camp Letterman, located on the south side of US Route 30, just east of Gettysburg. Camp Letterman is also not included in the 1975 Historic District. The known Union hospital sites are located east of the Battlefield, along Rock Creek and the Baltimore Pike, in a fairly concentrated area. Confederate hospital sites are more scattered, west and south of the Battlefield, generally along Marsh Creek. Good access to water was important for hospital locations, especially for the larger facilities.

For archaeological properties, in general, the longer the duration of occupation, and the greater the complexity of site function, the larger the number of features that will tend to be of substantial quality. Camp settlement patterns are usually structured by army regulations and therefore are highly patterned. The patterning is often recognizable in the archaeological record (Legg and Smith 1989:99). The diverse array of expected activity areas includes, but is not limited to: patient wards, staff wards, surgery areas, cook/bakery houses, dining areas, the dead house, the embalming area, the graveyard, trash/garbage disposal areas, latrines, and wells or springs. Anticipated archaeological features include: human remains (full burials and amputations), latrines-sinks, refuse pits, medical waste/amputation pits, post-holes (e.g., tent sites), and burials. Artifacts would include clothing (both civilian and military), medicine (drug bottles and misc. medical equipment), personal (jewelry, pocket knives, writing implements, tooth brushes), kitchen (food preparation and consumption--food storage, food remains), indulgences (alcoholic beverage containers- ale bottles, whiskey bottles, and wine bottles), tobacco pipes, and some arms (weapons, ammunition, and accouterments). Field aid stations are expected to contain the fewest number of activity areas, features, and artifacts compared to a sites

like Camp Letterman which would be expected to contain the full array of previously mentioned archaeological evidence.

Significance:

Military Hospital Sites are eligible under Criteria A and D in the area of Military History. They are very important to an understanding of the aftermath of a massive battle, such as Gettysburg, and the impact of such a conflict on the local population. Hospital sites also tell the human story of the pain and suffering of the casualties. The number of wounded from the Battle of Gettysburg exceeded the population of the town by three times, and far exceeded the number of physicians and military staff available for their car. Much of the responsibility for the care and providing the food and water fell to the local population. The hospital sites are also important for the information they provide about military medical practices at the time, and the contribution these sites made to the study of medical treatment for war wounds, infection, and proper site selection.

Very few Civil War period archaeological hospital sites have been investigated. It would be very useful to have information and research which defines the archaeological expression of a Civil War hospital site (Legg and Smith 1989:130), especially as it relates to the structure/patterning dictated by army regulations. Comparisons between medical stations which are located far away from battle areas and those located close to or in battlefields would serve as another avenue for research. Archaeological comparisons between the Federal and Confederated hospitals with respect to artifact assemblages and patterning should provide some significant differences. The investigations and subsequent analysis of theses site types would also provide valuable information about the soldiers and their quality of life and medical care for both the Confederates and Federals.

Property Type Registration Requirements:

These properties may be either architectural or archaeological, depending on their locations. For architectural properties, there must be some written or physical documentation that the property was used as a hospital at some point during or after the Battle. The physical characteristics of the building must resemble the Civil War era appearance; the property must retain integrity of location, setting, materials, workmanship and association with the scene in July of 1863. Open field sites must retain contours and landscape configurations, particularly

connections with water supplies.

Archaeologically investigated sites should contain features and artifacts relating to the specialized activity areas within the hospital site. Spatial patterning of features and/or artifacts would be pre-requisite. Human burials and pits containing amputated body parts should be present. For purposes of a high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the July 1863 land conditions.

Burial Sites

Description:

More than 160,000 soldiers from the North and South fought for three days over about 25 square miles of land in the vicinity of Gettysburg. When the fighting had ended, as many as 50,000 casualties had been sustained (approximately 10,000 dead or mortally wounded, 30,000 wounded, and 10,000 missing or captured). By November of 1863, most of the Union dead had been exhumed from the shallow graves on the battlefields and reburied in the National Cemetery. Many of the Confederate dead had been exhumed and reburied in permanent graves in the South over the next eight years up until 1871. However, as many as 1,000 Confederate dead and several hundred Federals are presumed to have been missed in the exhumation process. These burials remain in the Gettysburg area and could be located in battle areas or at hospital sites.

Significance:

All military burial sites in association with the Battle of Gettysburg qualify under the National Register Criteria A and D. Criterion A includes those sites that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Archaeologically, the burial sites also may qualify for the National Register Criterion D for sites that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. The more than 1,000 burials estimated to remain on the battlefield, are surmised to be almost anyplace where the military presence was located during the Gettysburg Campaign. However, high probability locales for burials would be the battlefield areas and the hospital sites. The sites of exhumed war dead are also high probability areas because of what is known about this aspect

of the Civil War Period exhumation practices—namely carelessness. For example, the archaeologically investigated burials on Folly Island (Legg and Smith 1989:62) revealed partial skeletal material in some cases and whole burials in others after the U.S. Government had contracted for the removal/exhumation of the war dead. The osteological material from the burials would offer an excellent opportunity for demographic analyses (e.g., sex, age, race, nutrition, etc.).

Property Type Registration Requirements:

Burial Sites would reasonably be expected to be located wherever the military presence was located during the Gettysburg Campaign. Generally, these sites would likely be associated with the previously described property types Engagement Sites and Military Hospital Sites, which are considered high probability locales for burials. The sites of exhumed war dead are also high probability areas. Archaeologically investigated burials may contain battle related artifacts. In the absence of archaeological investigations, a high probability potential would include intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the July 1863 land conditions.

The above listed and described property types may occur in districts or as individual properties. Therefore, an explanation of the kinds of districts and individual properties likely to contain the property types is relevant.

Historic Districts tend to be predominantly concentrations of buildings, which form a cohesive whole because of shared history. This property type includes small roadside villages with dwellings and associated outbuildings aligned along roads and early turnpikes, crossroads hamlets or portions of larger communities that share historical associations. By their nature, these districts focus more on buildings and structures and less upon landscape features. Of the site types listed above, those, which may be located within buildings, such as headquarters sites or hospitals are most likely to be found within towns and villages. Routes of march also may be included within village historic districts and in some cases like Fairfield and Hunterstown, engagements intruded into the towns when cavalry actions occurred nearby. For village historic districts, the majority of the buildings date from the Civil War era or before. They maintain visual integrity to the mid 19th century era and retain features such as defined lots, alley ways, older plant material and shade trees; and domestic outbuildings such as summer kitchens, smoke houses, chicken coops and small stables. Principal buildings are oriented to the street and usually are set close to the sidewalk.

Districts must retain substantial visual integrity to the Civil War period. The impact of 20th century development in the Gettysburg area has affected almost all properties to some extent. Given the importance of preserving as much as possible of the significant landscape and villages surrounding Gettysburg, some degree of loss of integrity is acceptable, indeed inevitable.

Building clusters in rural historic districts and concentrations of buildings in villages will generally include post Civil War construction. As long as this construction expresses the historic appearance of the farm or village, it shall be considered as contributing. Modern buildings will be counted as non-contributing, although their presence will not generally remove the district from eligibility, unless the concentration of modern buildings is so great in comparison to the surrounding property that the entity no longer retains integrity of location, setting, feeling, workmanship and association. Extensive alterations to buildings in historic districts may remove criterion C from consideration, while integrity of location, setting and association still allow criterion A to provide eligibility.

Any or all of the specific property types may be present in a historic district. At least one of the property types must be present to demonstrate association with the Battle of Gettysburg in order for the district to be eligible as part of this multiple property submission.

For historic districts, above-ground terrain and landscape should be reasonably visually intact, representing as closely as possible the 1863 period. Buildings should portray the period of Civil War occupation and natural and man-made features should retain their basic 1863 configurations. Archaeologically investigated sites should contain features and artifacts relating to the specialized activity of the site. Spatial patterning of features and or artifacts would be a pre-requisite. For purposes of high archaeological potential, non-investigated site types should appear to have intact soils over a landscape which may approximate the 1863 land conditions.

Farmsteads, historic landscape features and small scale elements such as old fence rows should remain largely intact, and possess integrity of design, materials and setting to the 1863 period. While some loss of integrity is inevitable, natural and man-made features should retain as nearly as possible their 1863 configurations.

Collections of buildings in districts must as an entity retain integrity of design, location, setting, workmanship, feeling and association, to reflect the appearance of the property in the

early summer of 1863. Buildings should predate the battle or be part of a cohesive whole that has association with the Battle of Gettysburg. Thus districts may contain buildings dating from after 1863 which are important to the development of the district and will be considered to be contributing to the district although they were not present at the time of the battle. In general, buildings should retain original exterior materials and fenestration patterns. The association with military history may provide such significance that some loss of integrity to the property would not affect eligibility.

Individual Properties Associated with the Battle of Gettysburg

An individual Building (or Buildings) will date from the time of the Battle of Gettysburg or earlier. It will retain original exterior materials for the most part, and important character-defining features such as fenestration arrangement and pattern, windows and doors, shutters, porches and chimneys, and roofing materials. While it is unlikely that all of the exterior definers will remain intact from the 1860s, enough should be present so that the building could be recognized if a participant in the battle happened to see it today. Buildings in this property type may have separate architectural significance in their own right under Criterion C. The setting and location, either urban or rural, are important elements of integrity that will define association with the Civil War. Eligible buildings will have house lots, rear yards or surrounding farmland that will mirror historic uses and functions that are particular to the Battle of Gettysburg. Therefore, the presence of period outbuildings, support structures, fences and drive and walkways will enhance the associative values of the building. Single buildings may have functioned during the battle as hospitals, headquarters or have been a stopping point along a route of march or served as a strategic military point. Buildings may be residential, commercial or industrial.

Another individual property potentially eligible for associations with the Battle of Gettysburg is Sites. These may be places where important events or activities relating to the battle occurred. It is paramount that these places retain integrity of setting and location, with historic topographical features, contours, vegetation patterns, outcrops, roadways and field patterns. The historic functions of sites may include those of any of the nine site types described above.

For individual structures as well as for other properties, important aspects of integrity will be setting and location. Structures may be remnants such as a road or railroad trace, or a portion

of a road that retains its original width and grade. They must have functioned in some capacity related to the battle. They may have accommodated routes of march, been the scene of an action, staging or encampment, or provided protection for soldiers during battle or in preparation for battle. In order to qualify for listing, structures must retain their historic setting.

GEOGRAPHICAL DATA:

This multiple property nomination covers the entire area of Adams County.

SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS:

Between 1978 and 1980 an Adams County Historic Sites Survey was undertaken. It was sponsored by Historic Gettysburg-Adams County, Inc. with assistance from PHMC and was conducted by Preservation Associates, Inc., with Paula S. Reed as survey director. Organized on a township by township basis, the essentially reconnaissance level survey involved very little historical research. The survey identified 3,659 historic resources in the county.

Dr. Walter Powell and Elwood Christ for the Borough of Gettysburg surveyed several resources in the Borough of Gettysburg with NPS/PHMC grant assistance through CLG program at an intensive level in 1987-92. The Borough of Gettysburg has a locally certified historic district, which requires review board consideration prior to work projects, which could impact historic properties.

In 1993 the 20,000 acre Adams County Fruitbelt in the northwestern section of the county was identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and Dr. Paula S. Reed has prepared a National Register nomination for this rural historic landscape. Other existing National Register historic districts in Adams County in addition to the current (1975) Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District include Hunterstown and East Berlin. Individual listings in the National Register include one farm, four residences, four churches, six bridges, two inns, one quarry, and three institutional or public buildings. Five of the individual listings are within the larger Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District.

The Adams County Comprehensive Plan (1992) devotes an entire section to historic resources, and says "In general, historic resources in Adams County are under-appreciated and taken for granted by the population and by local government. While a few outstanding historic resources are well-recognized and featured within the county, there is little recognition of the significance of the large number of "ordinary" historic resources to the social and economic history of the county and, most important, to the character of the landscape." (p. 2-5-5)

This project which expands beyond the existing framework of the Battlefield Historic District's resources, involves research, evaluation and recordation of previously unrecognized properties. The first phase of the project has resulted in preparation of this Multiple Property Nomination form. This format was chosen after research, field evaluation and extensive discussions with the project's advisory group revealed the scattered nature of unrecorded

properties. Activity in phase I included research into Battle-related property types, what they might be and where they might be located. This effort involved archival research, review of existing documentation and discussions and interviews with scholars and historians.

MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES:

Bachelder, John R., Map of the Battlefield of Gettysburg. 1876.

Blackford, Susan Leigh, compiler, Letters from Lee's Army. New York, 1947.

Bloom, Robert L., A History of Adams County, Pennsylvania 1700-1990. Adams County Historical Society, Gettysburg, PA. 1992.

Brown, Kevin M., Archaeological Research on the Leister Barn, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania. Prepared by MidAtlantic Archaeological Research, Inc., Newark, DE. 1985.

Catton, Bruce, Gettysburg: The Final Fury. Doubleday, New York. 1974.

Coco, Gregory A., A Vast Sea of Misery: A History and Guide to the Union and Confederate Field Hospitals at Gettysburg July 1-November 20, 1863. Thomas Publications, Gettysburg, PA. 1988.

_____, Wasted Valor: The Confederate Dead at Gettysburg. Thomas Publications, Gettysburg, PA. 1990.

_____, A Strange and Blighted Land, Gettysburg: The Aftermath of a Battle. Thomas Publications, Gettysburg, PA. 1995.

Coddington, Edwin B., The Gettysburg Campaign: A Study in Command. New York, 1968.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Internal Affairs, Bureau of Topographic and Geologic Survey, Geology and the Gettysburg Campaign. Reprint of an article in the July-August 1961 issue of GeoTimes. Harrisburg, May 1966.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1862-1879 Records of the Department of the Auditor General. Board of Claims. Record Group 2 (Pennsylvania Archives) of the Board of Claims, 1862-71. Damage Claims Applications, 1871-79.

Day, Norman and Associates, Adams County Comprehensive Plan, 1992.

Everson, Guy R. and Edward H. Simpson, Jr., eds., "Far, Far from Home:" The Wartime Letters of Dick and Talley Simpson Third South Carolina Volunteers. New York, 1994.

Fairchilde, Jerry D., Archaeological Survey, Subsurface Testing and Salvage Report on the Rose Farm Messuage. Archaeological Report No. 1, Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg, PA. 1983.

Fox, Richard A. Jr., and Douglas D. Scott, "The Post-Civil War Battlefield Pattern: An Example from the Custer Battlefield." Historical Archaeology, 25(2):92-103. 1991.

Frassanito, William A., Gettysburg: A Journey in Time. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1975.

Gould, Richard A., "The Archaeology of War: Wrecks of the Spanish Armada of 1588 and the Battle of Britain, 1940." In Richard A. Gould (ed.), Shipwreck Archaeology. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque. 1983.

Harper's Pictorial History of the Civil War, June 1863.

Hartwig, D. Scott, "Guts and Good Leadership; The Action at the Railroad Cut, July 1, 1863." Gettysburg: Historical Articles of Lasting Interest, (1):5-14. 1989.

Hay, Conran, et. al., Phase I/II Report, U.S. Route 15 Improvements, Adams County, Pennsylvania. Prepared by Archaeological and Historical Consultants, Boalsburg, PA. 1987.

Herdegen, Lance J., and William J. K. Beaudot, In the Bloody Railroad Cut at Gettysburg. Morningside House, Inc., Dayton, OH. 1990.

Hill, General A. P., "Report on Battle of Gettysburg," Southern Historical Society Papers, 2 (1876), 222+.

Hillyer, George, Battle of Gettysburg, Address before the Walton County Georgia Confederate Veterans, August 2nd, 1904.

Hoffman, Robert F., and Martin B. Reinbold, and Betty C. Zebooker, A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Adams County Business Park Located in Gettysburg, Adams County, PA. Prepared by MidAtlantic Archaeological Research, Inc., Newark, Delaware. 1993.

Hoffsommer, Robert D., "The Aftermath of Gettysburg: the Story of the Casualties." Gettysburg, Civil War Times Illustrated. 1968.

Hoke, Jacob, The Great Invasion of 1863: or, General Lee in Pennsylvania. Dayton, 1888.

Hopkins, G.M., Map of Adams County, 1858.

Legg, James B., and Steven D. Smith, "The Best Ever Occupied:" Archaeological Investigations of a Civil War Encampment on Folly Island, South Carolina. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia, SC. 1989.

Longacre, Edward G., The Cavalry at Gettysburg: A Tactical Study of Mounted Operations during the Civil War's Pivotal Campaign, 9 June-14 1863. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE. 1986.

McKim, Reverend Randolph H., "Steuart's Brigade at the Battle of Gettysburg," Southern Historical Society Papers, 5 (1877), 291+.

Martin, David G., Gettysburg July 1. Conshohocken, PA, 1995.

Nesbitt, Mark 35 Days to Gettysburg: The Campaign Diaries of Two American Enemies. Harrisburg, 1992.

Noel Hume, Ivor, Historical Archaeology. Alfred Knopf, New York. 1969.

Nofi, Albert A., The Gettysburg Campaign: June-July 1863, revised edition. Conshohocken,

PA, 1986.

Orr, David G., Brooke., Brooke S. Blades, and Douglass V. Campana, Archaeological Investigations at the Rose Farm (1981) and Rose Farm Wash House (1980). National Park Service, Mid-Atlantic Region. 1986.

Pfanz, Harry W., Gettysburg The Second Day. Chapel Hill, 1987.

Polglase, Christopher R., Peter H. Morrison, Michelle T. Moran, and Martha Williams, Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Land Proffer from Gettysburg National Military Park to Gettysburg College, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, PA. Prepared by Goodwin & Associates, Frederick, MD. 1992.

"Review of the Gettysburg Campaign," Southern Historical Society Papers, 37 (1909), 74+.

Sanders, Suzanne L., and Leo Hirrel, Phase I Archaeological Investigations at the Proposed Vanderback Subdivision, Adams County, PA. Prepared by Goodwin & Associates, Frederick, MD. 1996.

Sanders, Suzanne L., and Hugh B. McAloon, Phase I Archaeological and Architectural Investigations at Mehring Farm, Adams County, PA. Prepared by Goodwin & Associates, Frederick, MD. 1995.

Sanders, Suzanne L., Michelle T. Moran, Hugh B. McAloon, and Deborah Cannan, Intensive Archaeological and Architectural Investigations of Portions of Ice House Square, Gettysburg, Adams County, PA. Prepared by Goodwin & Associates, Frederick, MD. 1993.

Schildt, John W., Roads to Gettysburg. Parsons, WV, 1978.

Scott, Douglas D., Richard A. Fox, Jr., Melissa A. Connor, and Dick Harmon, Archaeological Perspectives on the Battle of the Little Bighorn. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK. 1989.

Shevchuk, Paul M., "The Battle of Hunterstown, Pennsylvania, July 2, 1863." Gettysburg:

Historical Articles of Lasting Interest, (1):93-104. 1989.

_____, "Cut to Pieces: The Cavalry Fight at Fairfield, Pennsylvania, July 3, 1863." Gettysburg: Historical Articles of Lasting Interest, (1):105-117. 1989.

Shue, Richard S., Morning at Willoughby Run: July 1, 1863. Thomas Publications, Gettysburg PA. 1995.

Sorrel, General G. Moxley, Recollections of a Confederate Staff Officer. New York, 1905.

Stackpole, Edward J., They Met at Gettysburg. Stackpole Books, Harrisburg, PA. 1956.

Stewart, R. Michael, Rhyolite Quarry and Quarry-Related Sites in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Archaeology of Eastern North America, 15:47-57. 1987.

United States Army War College Course of 1913-1914, Paper of Colonel Charles R. Noyes on "The Gettysburg Campaign, Exclusive of the Battle."

United States Department of War, The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Washington, 1889.

United States National Archives, Index of Federal Claims, Quartermaster General Claims Files, Adams County, Pennsylvania.

Welch, Spencer Glasgow, A Confederate Surgeon's Letters to his Wife. New York, 1911.