

Antietam National Cemetery, Lodge House
Boonsboro Pike (State Route 34)
Sharpsburg
Washington County
Maryland

HABS No. MD-936-A

HABS

MD,

22-SHARP,

1A-

REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS

Historic American Buildings Survey
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, DC 20013-7127

ADDENDUM TO:
ANTIETAM NATIONAL CEMETERY, LODGE HOUSE
Antietam National Cemetery
Boonsboro Pike (State Route 34)
Sharpsburg
Washington County
Maryland

HABS MD-936-A
MD, 22-SHARP, 1A-

PAPER COPIES OF COLOR TRANSPARENCIES

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

ADDENDUM TO:
ANTIETAM NATIONAL CEMETERY, LODGE HOUSE
Antietam National Cemetery
Boonsboro Pike (State Route 34)
Sharpsburg
Washington County
Maryland

HABS MD-936-A
MD, 22-SHARP, 1A-

PAPER COPIES OF COLOR TRANSPARENCIES

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

ADDENDUM TO:
ANTIETAM NATIONAL CEMETERY, LODGE HOUSE
Antietam National Cemetery
Boonsboro Pike (State Route 34)
Sharpsburg
Washington County
Maryland

HABS MD-936-A
MD, 22-SHARP, 1A-

PAPER COPIES OF COLOR TRANSPARENCIES

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

ADDENDUM TO:
ANTIETAM NATIONAL CEMETERY, LODGE HOUSE
Antietam National Cemetery
Shepherdstown Pike (State Route 34)
Sharpsburg
Washington County
Maryland

HABS MD-936-A
MD, 22-SHARP, 1A-

PHOTOGRAPHS

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
ANTIETAM NATIONAL CEMETERY, LODGE HOUSE

HABS No. MD-936-A

Location: Shepherdstown Pike (State Route 34), Sharpsburg vicinity,
Washington County, Maryland

Date of
Construction: 1867

Builder: Grant, Jackson & Co.

Original Owner: Antietam National Cemetery – Board of Trustees (1867-1877)

Subsequent Owner: U.S. War Department (1877-1933)

Present Owner: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service (1933 –
present)

Present Use: Antietam National Battlefield offices and public bathrooms

Significance: Located at the entrance gate to Antietam National Cemetery, the
Lodge House is an important part of the cemetery's historic
landscape. This structure served as the living quarters and office
for the cemetery's superintendant while its observation tower
provided a commanding view of the Antietam Civil War
battlefield to visitors. Although similar in function to other
national cemetery lodges, the Antietam Lodge was constructed
under the auspices of the Antietam National Cemetery
Commission established by the state of Maryland. As such it
predates Quartermaster General Montgomery Meigs' 1871
standard plan for National Cemetery lodges. Instead, the Lodge's
Gothic Revival design was executed by Washington, D.C.
architect Paul Pelz. The national cemetery was governed by the
Board of Trustees of the Antietam National Cemetery
Commission until 1877, when the War Department took over
stewardship.

Historian: Susan C. Hall

Project Information: Documentation of the Lodge House was undertaken by the
Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), within the Heritage
Documentation Programs (HDP) of the National Park Service
(Catherine C. Lavoie, Chief, HABS; Richard O'Connor, Chief,

HDP) during the summer of 2009. This effort was made possible through the Sally Kress Tompkins Fellowship, an award established by HABS and the Society of Architectural Historians to recognize and encourage the historical research of emerging scholars. Susan C. Hall (University of California, Riverside), 2009 Sally Kress Tompkins Fellow, produced historical reports focusing on several War Department era structures at Antietam National Battlefield and Antietam National Cemetery. Assistance was provided by many staff members at Antietam National Battlefield, particularly Jane Custer (Chief, Cultural Resources) and Keven Walker (Cultural Resource Specialist). Lisa P. Davidson, HABS historian and Chair of the Sally Kress Tompkins Fellowship committee, served as project leader. Large-format photography was undertaken by HABS photographer Renee Bieretz.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Date of Erection: 1867, precise completion date unknown
2. Architect: Paul J. Pelz
3. Original Owner: Antietam National Cemetery Commission, 1867 – 1877
Subsequent Owners: U.S. War Department, 1877 – 1933
National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1933 – present
4. Builder: Grant, Jackson & Co.
5. Original Plans and Construction: In June 1867, the Board of Trustees first advertised for Lodge designs in the Baltimore *American*. The structure was to cost no more than \$6,000. The next month, on July 25th, Pelz's design had been approved and the Board entered into contract with Grant, Jackson & Co. for its construction. The contract stated that the Lodge was to be completed by November 1, 1867 at a cost of \$5,500.¹ Due to bad weather, however, and

¹ "Specification for a Keepers Lodge for The National Cemetery at Antietam, MD," and "Contract with Grant, Jackson & Co." See also: "Proceedings of the Trustees of the Antietam National Cemetery, at their meeting held in Washington City, December 8th, 1867," (Hagerstown, MD: 1867), 11-12. Specs, contract, and proceedings are available in Box 5, Entry 576 – General Correspondence and Reports Relation to National and Post Cemeteries, 1865-90, Record Group 92 – Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC (hereafter Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I).

Note: It should be noted that the files from Record Group 92 located at both from the National Archives in Washington, DC and College Park, MD. In the Downtown branch (NARA I), they prefer that researchers request

architectural additions, the Lodge was completed later at a higher cost of \$5,956. Grant, Jackson & Co. would not be paid the difference until 1882, when Congress authorized their receipt of the difference.²

6. Alterations and Additions: The Lodge has seen continuous minor repairs since its construction in 1867.³ By early 1927 part of the first floor was converted into a public comfort station.⁴ In 1935-1936, the National Park Service, with the help of Works Progress Administration funding, removed the wraparound porch and completed other repairs.⁵ In 1977, the Lodge saw extensive repair work including the repaving the front walk with handmade brick, replacing woodwork in the tower, and roof repair.

B. Historical Context

Burying the Dead – The Battle of Antietam and Antietam National Cemetery

files using the Record Group, Entry number, and (at times) file number. For Entry 89, specific box numbers are not generally requested by the researcher but rather filled in by the staff members on duty based on the file number entered. Instead, file numbers are pulled based on indexes from Entries 84. In the College Park branch (NARA II), they prefer that researchers request files using the Record Group, Box number, and (at times) Entry number. Those files in Entry 1891, RG 92 do require box numbers.

² Robinson & Associates, Inc., *Antietam National Cemetery Lodge: Physical History and Condition Assessment, Final Submission* (Washington, D.C.: archtrave p.c. architects, 5 March 2003), 17-18. See also: H. Res. 152 (6 March 1882), File No. 2, Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I. A House Resolution in 1882 claimed that Grant, Jackson, & Co. would be paid for the difference owed them. For comparison, the standard plan Second-Empire structure designed by Quartermaster General Montgomery C. Meigs in 1871 cost approximately \$2,700.

³ For example, in early September 1906, the Quartermaster's Office circulated specifications for repair work to be done on the Lodge. The work revolved around replastering the walls, redoing the baseboards and door and window frames, and such related work. By September 25, 1906, a report indicates that no bids had been received for the Lodge work and it was suggested, instead, that a furnace be installed in the basement of the Lodge. Report, A.W. Butt (25 September 1906), File No. 213318, Entry 89—General Correspondence, 1890-1914, Antietam (hereafter Entry 89), RG 92, NARA I. See also: Robinson & Associates, Inc., 28-29.

⁴ A condition report for the Antietam National Cemetery indicates that the public comfort station was already installed in the Lodge by February 1927, at a cost of \$3,742.37. See Condition Report - Building No. 2a, File Folder 0-31 - Antietam National Cemetery, Box 2699 - National Cemeteries, General, Antietam, Entry 7 – Central Classified File, 1933-1949, Record Group 79—Records of the National Park Service (hereafter Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79), NARA II. Drawings from 1935 cited as evidence of a later date in the Robinson & Associates report likely actually indicate the existing bathrooms were tiled at this time.

⁵ For photographic proof of WPA work in the 1930s, see: photographs, “Rear view of office building under construction,” “Repairs to Office Building, Antietam National Cemetery,” “Repairs to Lodge, (now office building, etc.), National Cemetery,” etc., *Administrative Work* notebook, WPA photograph collection, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD. A letter dated October 5, 1935 from Oliver G. Taylor, Deputy Chief Engineer to J.B. Ferguson and Company states that its bid had been chosen to do the porch removal work at the cost of \$7,100. Letter, Oliver G Taylor to J.B. Ferguson and Company (5 October 1935), File No. C 0-31, Part I, Antietam National Cemetery General (From August 12, 1933 – December 12, 1935), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

When the Superintendent's Lodge House was built for the Antietam National Cemetery in 1867, it served as a structural reminder of the importance placed upon remembering and honoring the Civil War dead. However, its transfer to the War Department in 1877 reemphasized the Federal Government's involvement in controlling that commemoration and remembrance of the war. The Lodge continued to be one of the focal points of the Cemetery under the War Department, both for federal regulation and community involvement. The complicated and sometimes uneasy relationship between federal and local interests at the cemetery began when Union and Confederate troops met on the fields of Sharpsburg in 1862.

The Battle of Antietam occurred on September 17, 1862, marking the culminating engagement in Robert E. Lee's Maryland Campaign and his first invasion of Union territory. On the 18th, General George B. McClellan failed to attack Lee's wounded army and instead, allowed the Confederate troops to retreat across the Potomac River under the cover of night. As Lee returned to Virginia, he left behind an enormous amount of carnage. Both Union and Confederate armies suffered greatly at the Battle of Antietam. It was and is the single bloodiest day in American history, leading to more than 23,000 Union and Confederate casualties. This number represents more casualties than all of those from the Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Mexican War, Spanish American War, and Indian Wars of the nineteenth century combined.⁶

McClellan's failure to halt Lee's retreating army led to a military draw at Antietam and President Lincoln's decision to remove McClellan as commander of the Army of the Potomac. However, the battle did serve as an important strategic victory for the North. Lincoln used it as a catalyst to issue his Emancipation Proclamation, stating that all slaves held in rebelling states were to be freed on January 1, 1863. He hoped that such an issuance would provide the Union with more foreign support and lead to a strategic blow against the Confederacy, its workforce, and food supply. As a result, the bloody fields of Sharpsburg became a strategic landscape, utilized for a larger, national cause.

While used in Washington, DC to introduce a new strategic vision for the war, however, the fields of Antietam reflected the cruel realities of the battle's aftermath. The 6,300 soldiers who lay dead on and near the fields of Antietam were the physical reminders of the horrors of war.⁷ Working for Mathew Brady, Washington, DC-based photographer Alexander Gardner traveled to Sharpsburg to visually document the shocking scene of Antietam dead. Only two days after the battle, Gardner took approximately 70 photos of the death and destruction. Taken back to the capital city and displayed in Brady's studio, it was the first time that the gruesome carnage of war was brought to the general public.⁸

⁶ James McPherson, *Crossroads of Freedom: Antietam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 3.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ National Park Service, Antietam National Battlefield, "Historic Photographs by Alexander Gardner," available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/photosmultimedia/gardnerphotos.htm>; Internet; accessed 22 August 2009. National Park Service, Antietam National Battlefield, "Photography at Antietam, Part 2," available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/historyculture/photography2.htm>; Internet; accessed 22 August 2009.

While the public experienced the destruction of war through photography, Sharpsburg's civilians— along with the Union details who remained behind —were forced to deal with its grisly reality. Together, soldiers and civilians gathered and dug graves for the bodies of both the Union and Confederate dead. The 137th Pennsylvania buried hundreds of Confederates and only managed to carry out their orders with the help of liquor. While their drunkenness made the task at hand possible, it also led to a disrespect of the dead. Not all of the dead were properly buried—or even hastily buried for that matter. One local farmer found fifty-eight Confederates had thrown down his well.⁹ Other farmers unearthed the remains of soldiers as they went about tilling their fields, making it challenging and gruesome to return to the routines of everyday life.¹⁰

The means by which the Union army dealt with the Antietam dead left much to be desired, and it was not long before the local residents pushed for the removal of the dead from their farm lands.¹¹ On a much larger scale, others campaigned for the proper burial of all the Civil War dead. While concerned for the local farmers, these advocates were also interested in properly commemorating the sacrifice and heroism of the fallen soldiers. Walt Whitman, an avid supporter of establishing a national cemetery system explained that the federal government had “a stewardship, the account of which must be rendered to the spirit of humanity and Christian patriotism, to the friends of republican liberty and of human freedom and progress throughout the world, to the free people of the North, whose dearest sons have been sacrificed...”¹² It was the *obligation* of the living to properly inter the dead, because they had paid the ultimate sacrifice in the name of citizenship and duty.¹³

In 1864, State Senator Lewis P. Firey introduced a resolution to the Maryland Senate for the formation of a joint committee which would purchase a portion of the Antietam Battlefield for the purpose of establishing a State and National cemetery. He wanted to provide the dead with “a decent burial” so that their “memories [could] be embalmed in some suitable memorial.”¹⁴ A year later, four Marylanders and “one Trustee from each of the other States” who lost soldiers at the battle were appointed to the Cemetery Board.¹⁵ By an act of the Maryland State Legislature the Trustees took care of and managed the grounds using funds from

⁹ Drew Gilpin Faust, *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), 69.

¹⁰ Stephen W. Sears, *Landscape Turned Red: The Battle of Antietam* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1983), 355.

¹¹ Robinson & Associates, Inc., 20.

¹² Faust, 229.

¹³ Faust, 211, 218.

¹⁴ Board of Trustees of Antietam National Cemetery, *History of Antietam National Cemetery* (Baltimore, Maryland; J.W. Woods, 1869), 7.

¹⁵ Charles W. Snell and Sharon A. Brown, *Antietam National Battlefield and National Cemetery: an Administrative History* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service, 1986), 2-3.

State appropriations. Removal and proper re-interment of the remains began immediately. The Trustees established carriage ways and properly arranged the cemetery in order to “adapt the ground to the uses for which it has been purchased and set apart.” It also thought it appropriate to “erect buildings”—more specifically the Lodge—to achieve its intended goals.¹⁶ While under construction, the Trustees reported that “the building has been put up in the best manner, and it is believed that it will prove an ornament to the Cemetery, and give general satisfaction.”¹⁷

Firey’s desire to establish a National Cemetery for the dead and a Board of Trustees to carry out the process, however, raised a particularly important question. Would the Confederate dead be interred, properly buried, and honored in the Cemetery, as well? Would their inclusion in the cemetery detract from the larger purpose of the Cemetery as a place to honor those who had died fighting for and protecting the Union? That the question was raised at all is an important one and reflective of Antietam’s distinct situation as a national cemetery. Out of 80 national cemeteries in existence by 1880, Antietam was only one of two established and run by a state during its formative years.¹⁸ According to an article in the *Washington Chronicle* dated December 9, 1867, the Board of Trustees discussed:

the propriety of designating a certain portion of the cemetery for the interment of the rebels who lost their lives in the series of engagements in that section. After a lengthy discussion it was decided to set apart a portion of the enclosure for this purpose, as a section of the Maryland law incorporating the cemetery provided that this should be done.¹⁹

The Trustees argued that just as many Maryland soldiers fell in the Maryland Campaign fighting for the Confederacy as they did for the Union. As a result, they had a “right to demand that a separate part of the Cemetery shall be appropriated to that class and that the Board shall take the same steps towards accomplishing this part of their trust as they have done to fulfill that relating to the Union soldiers.”²⁰ After much controversy and debate, it was decided that Confederate soldiers would *not* be buried at the Antietam Cemetery. Instead, they were removed to cemeteries in Hagerstown, Frederick, and Shepherdstown.²¹ The removal of Confederate dead

¹⁶ The Executive Committee’s report from December 8th, 1867, given by Chairman W.Y. Selleck, states that “at the meeting before mentioned, the chairman was authorized to advertise in the Baltimore American for designs and proposals for a Lodge House, to be erected in the Cemetery.” “Proceedings of the Trustees,” 11.

¹⁷ “Proceedings of the Trustees,” 12.

¹⁸ Snell, 4.

¹⁹ Newspaper clipping, no title, *Washington Chronicle* (December 9, 1867). Clipping found in Box 6, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I. This statement in the newspaper was supported by the Cemetery’s Trustee meeting, where R.E. Fenton stated that “the remains of the soldiers of the Confederate Army to be buried in a part of the grounds, separate from those of the Union Army.” “Proceedings of the Trustees,” 5.

²⁰ “Proceedings of the Trustees,” 7.

²¹ National Park Service, Antietam National Battlefield, “Antietam National Cemetery,” available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/historyculture/antietam-national-cemetery.htm>; Internet; accessed 22 August 2009.

from the Cemetery reiterated the ultimate goal of the Trustees: to establish a “national” burial site meant to commemorate those soldiers who had fought and died to *preserve* the nation, not dissolve it.

In many respects, however, the construction of the Lodge House in 1867 was a reflection of these conflicting views between the Federal Government and a state whose citizens had supported both the Union and Confederacy. Like other national cemeteries developed after the Civil War, the Lodge was intended to serve two primary functions. First, it operated as living quarters for the Superintendent, charged with keeping watch over the fallen soldiers and properly maintaining the grounds of the Cemetery. Secondly, the front Reception Room was intended to be used as a meeting place for funeral guests and other Cemetery visitors. In doing so, the Lodge operated as a welcoming space and place of first contact for those living who came to the Cemetery to mourn, honor, and remember the Civil War dead. The Lodge’s site location directly within the main gates of the cemetery reemphasized this dual purpose as both shrine and pilgrimage site. It literally served as a guardhouse over the dead and the first place of contact for visitors entering the front gates.²²

Despite these similarities to the larger developing National Cemetery System in the late 1860s and 1870s, the Lodge also represents the distinct position of the Antietam National Cemetery. Antietam’s Lodge was designed by architect Paul J. Pelz instead of Quartermaster General Montgomery C. Meigs. Working for the Federal Government, Meigs was in charge of identifying the Union dead and relocating them to national cemeteries. He provided supplies for the search, helped hire superintendents, and also designed the architectural structures found in the cemeteries.²³ Paul Pelz, on the other hand, was a professional architect born in Germany and trained in New York City at the office of Detlef Lienau. Although he worked on a number of federal projects, including work for the United States Lighthouse Board, Pelz’s architectural style reflects a desire to be both functional and architecturally elaborate and ornate.²⁴

As a result, Pelz’s distinct architectural design for the Antietam Lodge was in opposition to the other lodges built at national cemeteries such as Alexandria and Richmond, Virginia, and Nicholasville, Kentucky.²⁵ These lodges were designed as a standard plan by Quartermaster General Meigs in an attempt to streamline and control the cemetery system and its message. Historian Catherine Zipf argues that Meigs’ design emphasized his high standards for regularity and efficiency within the National Cemetery System.²⁶ Importantly, the lodges were designed in

²² Catherine Zipf indicates that the national cemetery lodges throughout the country after the Civil War served these functions. She explains that “the lodges served not only as living quarters but also functioned as centers for welcoming visitors, maintaining records of the dead, holding funerals, and organizing Decoration Day festivities.” Catherine Zipf, “Marking Union Victory in the South: the Construction of the National Cemetery System” in *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*, Cynthia Mills and Pamela H. Simpson eds. (Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 2003), 30.

²³ Zipf, 31.

²⁴ Robinson & Associates, Inc., 18-19.

²⁵ Zipf, 33, 39.

the Second Empire style, similar to the post-war structures being built for the Federal government in Washington, D.C. In doing so, Meigs intentionally linked the cemetery system to the authority of the federal government. At the same time, the Second Empire style promoted modernity by imitating the latest building trends in France.²⁷

In contrast, Antietam's Lodge was Gothic Revival in style. Instead of looking to modernity for its influence, the Lodge turned to a romantic past for inspiration.²⁸ Its Gothic Revival features included its stone walls, turret tower with battlements, pointed arched windows, and a gable porch with a crossbracing vergeboards. Despite its architectural details, the Lodge had maintenance problems from its construction. The need for continual maintenance work to keep the Lodge livable and inviting to visitors was at times a challenge to the Board. The President's 1871 report indicates that a field glass was purchased for the Lodge House so that visitors to the grounds might have a better view of the surrounding landscape. However, the Lodge's interior itself remained unsightly. According to the report, "the plastering on the Lodge House is in a bad condition, owing to its having frozen immediately after its application—a large portion of it having crumbled and become detached. To conceal the mouldy condition of some portions of the wall and tower, the same has been whitewashed."²⁹ Among other things, the Lodge's constant care and repair was an added financial burden the Trustees found difficult to handle.

The War Department Era – Solidifying a National Presence

While the War Department had been involved in the development and maintenance of Antietam National Cemetery, it was not the primary caretaker and manager of the site until 1877. G.L. Cranmer's Presidential Address on December 16, 1874 was an indicator of the financial challenges faced by the Trustees before they transferred the Cemetery. He brought to the attention of the Board "the necessity of taking some action to meet the deficiency in funds to enable the board to meet its obligations and the contingent expenses which necessarily arise."³⁰ These obligations were not met, however, and the Cemetery was officially transferred to the War Department in the summer of 1877.

By this point in time, the Cemetery was already fairly established and in some respects, the War Department needed to change little to maintain the property as it saw fit. However, its incorporation into the National Cemetery System did mark a number of important changes for the site. As the headquarters of the cemetery, the Lodge would represent the way in which the

²⁶ Zipf, 37.

²⁷ Virginia and Lee McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1984), 242; Zipf, 37.

²⁸ McAlester, 242.

²⁹ "Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Antietam National Cemetery, Held at Philadelphia, June 21, 1871," Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

³⁰ "Proceedings: Antietam National Cemetery, December 16 1874," 7, Box 6, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

War Department intended to run the Cemetery. War Department policy promoted national patriotism, strength, and unity—under the Federal Government—in light of the fact that the Union still remained very much divided and fractured from the wounds of war.

Most importantly, the Lodge reveals the War Department's efforts to bring the Antietam cemetery into its already well-established and bureaucratic system of national cemeteries. The War Department intended to run the Cemetery with discipline and order, continuing to operate as a final resting place for active soldiers and veterans who had served their country. Almost immediately, the War Department implemented the use of written reports, providing regular updates on the Lodge's condition, other cemetery structures, and landscape features. The Department's reports indicated the value it placed on maintaining a well manicured and approachable cemetery site. On April 18, 1877, the Assistant Engineer of the Quartermaster General reported that the Lodge needed painting. However, his statement also stressed the Lodge's location and view:

From the tower [of the Lodge] a most magnificent view is to be had. You occupy, as it were, the center of a grand Amphitheater, the distant mountains on every side forming the walls while the valley at your feet is the arena in which can be see the positions of the Armies and other points of interest of the hard fought battles of South Mountain and Antietam. The distant heights of Harpers Ferry are also visible.³¹

However, inheriting the architecturally beautiful and visually inviting Lodge from the Trustees proved to be a challenge time and again. On May 11, 1878, A.F. Rockwell was informed that the Lodge had been “thoroughly overhauled” and was in excellent condition. Most of the repair work focused on the structure's slate roof. In repairing the roof, they found it necessary to “cover the stone coping with galvanized iron in order to prevent serious leaks.”³² An 1882 report by A.A. Biggs addressed the faulty construction of the Lodge's walls, flooring, and ceilings. He argued:

Very bad management was displayed in [the Lodge's] construction. Stone was cut in the quarries hauled to the Cemetery and frequently had to be recut...The Lodge House never came up to our expectations, the timbers having parted in many places, the House having leaked badly and a considerable outlay of money having been required to repair its defects.³³

The War Department had the woodwork repainted and the walls and ceilings white washed in 1884. As a result, the interior of the Lodge was described as being in “excellent condition.” However, the report also indicated that the roof leaked during heavy storms and in doing so, left stains on the ceiling. Repairs would require the removal of the slate roof in certain locations.³⁴ A 1909 report indicated that the thick stone walls most likely contributed to the “constant

³¹ Letter, Oliver Cox to Col. A. F. Rockwell (18 April 1877), Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

³² Letter, James Gall, Jr. to Col. A.F. Rockwell (May 11, 1878), Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

³³ Letter, Biggs to B.C. Card (25 May 1882), Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

³⁴ Letter, W.W. Forter to Lieut. Col. William D. Whipple (19 May 1884), Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

dampness” of the Lodge, as well. Though no complaints had been received about such conditions, the dampness clearly affected the need for continual repairs on the interior of the structure.³⁵

Conflicting Interests: Developing a National Cemetery in the Community of Sharpsburg

The Lodge demonstrates far more than the structural challenges the War Department faced when it took control of the Antietam National Cemetery in 1877. As the primary structure in the Cemetery, the Lodge was often the focal point for conflicts that arose between the federally employed Superintendent and the local people of Sharpsburg. These conflicts demonstrate the challenges that arose as a result of the Lodge’s dual purpose as a domestic residence and visitors’ space. They also indicate the complications of running a tightly controlled federal bureaucratic system in the midst of a small Maryland community.

When the Lodge became a part of War Department property, a number of individuals were quite outspoken about who should occupy the structure and under what circumstances. On April 7, 1879, George A. Haverfield, former private in the 126th Ohio Volunteers, became the first Superintendent of the Antietam National Cemetery chosen specifically by the War Department.³⁶ Haverfield’s occupation of the Lodge, however, was fraught with problems. In August 1879, a letter was sent to the Quartermaster General discussing the kind of person that should occupy the Lodge. The author explained, “I think that the Antietam Cemetery is altogether too good a station for a superintendent who either has no family, or who does not have his family with him. The climate is healthy, the lodge is large and commodious, and it is just the place for a superintendent with a family to raise.”³⁷

However, Haverfield failed to bring his family to the post and therefore, failed to meet War Department expectations. According to the author, this is what led to trouble.

Haverfield, having no family with him, had his laborer and the laborer’s wife live in the lodge, and boarded with him. The husband got jealous of the Superintendent, and rather, reversing the usual order in such cases, the husband was shot dead by the accused wife. It was through this sad occurrence that I learned that Haverfield was not living with his family. Had he been, the tragedy would probably not have happened.³⁸

In other words, the author believed the Lodge should have served as a domestic space for the traditional Victorian household, operating as a private space for the *nuclear* family. By failing to

³⁵ Report, “2nd Report on Inspection of Antietam MD, National Cemetery by Major E. St. J. Goeble” (28 July 1906), File No. 213318, Entry 89, RG 92, NARA I.

³⁶ Haverfield is officially recognized as the second Superintendent of the Cemetery under the War Department. Hiram S. Siess is acknowledged as the first. However, Siess had been the Keeper of the Cemetery for the Cemetery Association and merely retained by the War Department in 1877. Snell, 45.

³⁷ Letter, Capt. A.F. Rockwell to the Quartermaster General (20 August 1879), Box 4, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

³⁸ Ibid.

adhere to these traditional domestic living arrangements, Haverfield encouraged questionable behavior, aroused suspicion, and ultimately influenced a severe act of violence.

By 1906, the view of the Lodge as an ideal domestic space for families was beginning to change. Superintendent J.V. Davis believed the space was not large enough to accommodate an entire family in a comfortable manner. His letter to the Depot Quartermaster in Washington, D.C. stated that “it is evident that in the construction of the lodge, it was simply intended for use as an office-with limited accommodations for the Keeper, and not with a view to the comfort or convenience of a family.”³⁹ He provided a number of specific examples to argue his point. First, the entrance of the observation tower was accessible only through the private entry and kitchen of the Lodge, rather than through the publicly accessible Reception Room or outside walls. Because of this entrance, cemetery visitors had access to the family’s rooms on the second floor. Secondly, Davis argued that the first floor had only three rooms in its floor plan, one which was meant specifically for public use. That left two rooms on the first floor to accommodate the Superintendent and his family. The size of these rooms was so small, he complained, that they were even considered small for “bachelor” quarters.⁴⁰ Davis believed that the construction of two adjoining rooms on the lodge would be sufficient space for a dining room and kitchen for “any ordinary sized family.”⁴¹ However, the War Department did not agree that an addition to the Lodge itself was necessary to accommodate the Superintendent’s family. Regardless, Davis’s complaint indicates the changing interpretation of the appropriate family living space at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The Lodge not only signified conflicting and changing views of the cemetery and its function as a domestic space around the turn of the century. It also documented the differing views of cemeteries and the visitors’ relationship to these sacred spaces. In many respects, the Antietam National Cemetery models the intention and organization of the Rural Cemetery and Park Movements of the mid-nineteenth century.⁴² In his article, “The ‘Rural’ Cemetery Movement: Urban Travail and the Appeal of Nature,” scholar Thomas Bender argues that the growth of the Rural Cemetery Movement resulted from the development of overcrowded industrial urbanism. Urban cemeteries were desecrated sites—lacking caretakers, uninviting, and unhealthy to mourners.⁴³ As a result, Senator Hillhouse of Connecticut decided to develop

³⁹ Letter, J.V. Davis to the Depot Quartermaster, Washington, D.C. (22 October 1906), File No. 213318, Entry 89, RG 92, NARA I.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Kelsey Cass describes the nineteenth century cemetery movement in two stages: “In the first, between 1830 and 1855, the “rural” and “garden” cemetery dominated. During this period, the evolution proceeded in tandem with the development of the profession of landscape architecture and the public parks movement. Stage two, between 1855 and 1920, the “lawn” or “park” cemetery, headed by Mount Auburn Cemetery in Boston, prevailed.” Kelsey Cass, “None Else of Name: The Origin and Early Development of the U.S. National Cemetery System” (Ph.D. diss., Claremont College Graduate School, ca. 2001), 12-13.

⁴³ Thomas Bender, “The ‘Rural’ Cemetery Movement: Urban Travail and the Appeal of Nature,” *New England Quarterly* 47, no. 2 (June 1974): 202.

the “New Burying Ground” in New Haven as a “sacred and inviolable” plot of land where citizens could “enjoy a decent, permanent resting place”—at their own cost.⁴⁴

However, park-like cemeteries such as Mount Auburn in Boston were “intended to offer far more than resting places for the dead...[they] were expected, from the beginning, to serve the needs of the living.”⁴⁵ Joseph Story, the orator at Mount Auburn’s dedication day, stated that the “magnificence of nature” rather than the hustle and bustle of the city served to comfort the mourner. The cemetery’s “natural beauty” stood as an inviting counterpoint to the artificial urbanity beyond its walls. The chaotic spirit of progress promoted in the urban centers was set aside for a more reflective, romantic environment in the cemeteries.⁴⁶ Mount Auburn and other Rural Cemeteries became tourist destinations, “resorts” not only for the “aged and the sad of heart” but also for the “young, the buoyant.”⁴⁷ While serving the needs of the living, Stanley French argues that rural cemeteries were also intended to teach visitors lessons in morality. These lessons focused on architecture, landscape-gardening, and sculpture as a means of promoting refinement to the masses.⁴⁸

Although not located near an urban center and paid for with federal funds, Antietam National Cemetery’s organization imitated a number of aspects of the Rural Cemetery Movement. In a similar fashion to Mount Auburn, the National Cemetery was an enclosed space provided with constant, salaried supervision that protected deceased loved ones and gave their burials the proper respect they deserved.⁴⁹ Section Two of the Cemetery Guidelines ordered a Superintendent’s Lodge to be erected so that the Secretary-appointed superintendents who were “meritorious and trustworthy” could guard and protect the cemetery.⁵⁰

As with Rural Cemeteries, disorder, chaos, and modernity were remedied by the ordered landscape of the National Cemetery. The guarded space of Antietam stood as a counterpoint to its surrounding landscape. Most importantly, the Cemetery was established and maintained by the keeper in order to contrast with the Civil War battlefield. It was a beautiful, peaceful space that counterpointed the chaotic and bloody landscape of the battlefield. Removing the cemetery from the surrounding landscape enabled it to become “a

⁴⁴ Cass, 13.

⁴⁵ Bender, 196-197. Mount Auburn, the nation’s first Rural Cemetery was established in 1831.

⁴⁶ Bender, 198-203.

⁴⁷ Bender 206.

⁴⁸ Stanley French, “The Cemetery as Cultural Institution: The Establishment of Mount Auburn and the ‘Rural Cemetery’ Movement,” *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 55.

⁴⁹ Cass, 15-16.

⁵⁰ Cass, 31.

place of enchantment, succor and communion.”⁵¹ However, in romanticizing and softening memories of the Civil War and its heroic, sacrificial soldiers, the Antietam Cemetery also stood in opposition to the present—one that faced the challenges of modernity near the turn of the century. The romantic style of the Lodge’s Gothic Revival architecture supported this message focused on remembering the past.

While Antietam National Cemetery sought to guard the dead and present a romanticized vision of the past, it too served the living. Although public accessibility was essential to the National Cemetery, it also created a problem at Antietam and reiterated the conflicts and challenges of having a federally maintained cemetery located within a small, rural community. High standards of conduct were expected of the Cemetery’s superintendents who were there to serve the public. The Quartermaster General ordered superintendents to avoid monopolizing the Reception Room which served as a welcome place for visitors rather than a family’s living room. They were informed that

This portion of the lodge is built exclusively for use of visitors, and families of superintendents have no right to occupy it; they should enter only to clean and sweep it. Visitors wishing to enter the office should be made to feel, by the surroundings, that they are not intruding upon the domestic arrangements of the superintendent—that they are entering a room set apart especially for their accommodation.⁵²

However, as hallowed ground under the guardianship of the War Department, restrictions were placed on visitors to Antietam National Cemetery. They were required to be “orderly and civil,” and “picnic parties” and the “vending of refreshments” were forbidden.⁵³

As early as 1879, there were signs of discontent toward the Cemetery among the townspeople. The local *Herald and Torch* announced on September 17, 1879 that “the tower on the lodge house is also being replastered, painted and otherwise repaired. We hope that the foolish habit of writing on the wood work will be stopped, otherwise the persons who indulge in it will get themselves in trouble.”⁵⁴ Disrespect extended out beyond the Lodge’s walls, as well. An incident between Superintendent Walter A. Donaldson and the Sharpsburg townspeople in 1880 reiterate the challenges of controlling the conduct of both visitors and superintendents.

⁵¹ Cass, 17.

⁵² Cass, 38. Cass simply quotes the National Cemetery regulations here. The Library of Congress has these materials in their catalogue. However, they cannot currently be located.

⁵³ Cass, 37.

⁵⁴ “Rostrum at Antietam Cemetery,” *The Herald and Torch* (17 September 1879). The article text is hand copied and located in the Antietam Library cemetery files. File Folder – Report National Cemetery Lodge, Box – Antietam National Cemetery, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD.

On August 30, 1880, Charles G. Biggs, Attorney at Law wrote a letter of complaint on behalf of the citizens of Sharpsburg. He explained that since Lieutenant Haverfield had been removed from the Cemetery and Captain Donaldson put in his place, “a great many regulations [were instituted that were] entirely uncalled for and unnecessary and in carrying them into effect acted in the most arbitrary and offensive manner to many of our best citizens, among them some of the most respected ladies in the community.” Biggs stated that the regulations were met without complaint until “other acts of his have aroused the indignation of almost the entire community against him.” Along with neglecting the care of the cemetery, Sharpsburg residents believed Donaldson used the cemetery grounds for private use, and paid his son for labor rather than an ex soldier. In addition, Biggs stated that Donaldson “has insulted a number of ladies in the community to one of whom he was compelled to apologize.”⁵⁵ A signed petition listed pages of Sharpsburg residents who disapproved of Donaldson’s actions.

Donaldson defended himself by relying on his past superintendent experiences at City Point and Hampton Beaufort. He exclaimed, “I have never had occasion to call the attention of visitors to the rules until my arrival here, where the occurrence was daily.” He noted visitors who brought tables and chairs to the cemetery. Spittoons, tumblers and a pitcher of water were brought, as well. The Cemetery became a site for smoking, talking, and general sociability. Donaldson argued that despite being sociable and pleasant, their actions were not “in accord with my ideas of a Lodge in an Office located at the gate of a Cemetery.” Neither did Donaldson approve of Sharpsburg’s younger residents who came to the cemetery and looked at the register as a source of amusement. On Sundays, both male and female residents ran up and down the stairs of the tower showing little decorum or restraint by laughing and peering in to bedroom doors on the second floor, looking to obtain “a glimpse of domestic economy.” In order to maintain the Cemetery as a place of decorum and quiet solitude, Donaldson took extra measures to enforce the War Department’s strict rules regarding both the dead and the living. The Register was put under lock and key and visitors wishing to go up in the tower needed to ring the doorbell and be escorted up. In addition, visitor signs were placed in the cemetery requesting visitors to keep off of the grass. Donaldson complained that “Sharpsburg people regard the notices as though written in sand.”⁵⁶

In 1881, the War Department was sent to inspect Superintendent Donaldson’s activities. Its report attested to Donaldson’s good character, the duties of a War Department Cemetery Superintendent, and the War Department’s dissatisfaction with the community’s disrespect for cemetery order and the dead.

I spent Saturday night and Sunday at Antietam and Sharpsburg, and gained such information as I could in regard to Donaldson’s case. The best I can speak well of him, and I am thoroughly convinced that he is, in every way, a better man for the place than Haverfield. The complaints against him are such as should recommend him to the Dept. He has endeavored successfully to curb a license that was permitted by Seiss and only partially abolished by Haverfield, which allowed the people of the place to do pretty

⁵⁵ Letter, Chas. G. Biggs to Hon. Milson Uner (30 August 1880), Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

⁵⁶ Letter, Superintendent Donaldson to Lieut. John McGilroy (14 August 1880), Box 5, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

much as they pleased in the cemetery. In doing this, Donaldson has, of course, drawn upon himself the enmity of a certain---the word, of course,---class of people, who say that he insulted them.

Heretofore, the cemetery has been used as a lounging place for the floating part of the citizens, canal men, loafers, young fellows and their sweethearts, and Donaldson has insisted that if these people visit the cemetery, they must behave themselves, respect the place, and conform to the rules established by Congress and the Dept.

Whilst I was at the cemetery with Dr. Biggs, four or five men, well dressed, came in, walked about a while, then, seeking the shelter and shade of some large evergreens, pulled off their coats to be used as pillows, took out their whiskey flask, and were proceeding to enjoy themselves, when D. confronted them, and politely requested them to do their lounging and drinking outside. Probably these were among the petitioners for Haverfield's return, or may be among those who lay clamor in a future petition for D's removal.

...The men who engineer the petitions are discharged laborers, and their friends, and office-seeking politicians, who expect advantage from re-employment of these men in the cemetery.⁵⁷

The report indicates that while visitors were welcome to the Cemetery, the place was first and foremost hallowed ground. It was a place of honor and reverence for those who gave their lives in the Civil War. The Superintendent retained his post at Antietam and by 1886, even the *Weekly Detroit Free Press* commented on Donaldson's abilities as Superintendent: "under his wise management the place has been very much improved."⁵⁸

Donaldson's trouble with local visitors was common enough to enter local lore. An 1898 fictional story, "Through the Shenandoah Valley Awheel," by Daniel F. Gay reiterated just how common a tumultuous relationship between the Superintendent and local visitors could be. In the story, Jerry began his bicycle tour of Antietam in search of Burnside's Bridge. However, his encounter with "sweet Polly" diverted him to the National Cemetery where they left their bicycles at the "piazza of the attendant's cottage" and headed to the rostrum to watch the rain. It was from here that Polly announced, " 'Look, Mr. [Jerry Travers], there's the attendant...he is saying something to us.'" Jerry moved to the other end of the rostrum where the Cemetery Keeper explained, " 'I said it was against the rules to sit on the grass.'"⁵⁹

These stories represent the gradual shift toward greater emphasis on tourism as a key function of the cemetery and lodge. While the National Cemetery's strict rules and regulations

⁵⁷ Letter, Gall to Woollcott (1881), Box 4, Entry 576, RG 92, NARA I.

⁵⁸ "Antietam. Present Appearance of the Battle Field Description of the National Cemetery," *Weekly Detroit Free Press* (17 July 1886).

⁵⁹ Daniel F. Gay, "Through the Shenandoah Valley Awheel," *Outing: an Illustrated Monthly Magazine of Recreation* 32, no. 3 (June 1898): 232.

were meant to maintain the Cemetery as a sacred and honored site, there was also a nineteenth tradition of leisure activities being welcomed in the rural cemeteries. Antietam became more concerned with providing easier access to the Cemetery and altering the rules of public visitation.⁶⁰ By concerning itself with public visitorship, Antietam not only imitated the Rural Cemetery movement but also reflected the growth of heritage tourism at the end of the nineteenth century.

Early tourism in Sharpsburg often focused on the battlefield itself. However, the Cemetery did not go unnoticed. Guidebooks and articles tended to highlight “Old Simon,” the soldier monument that towered above the Civil War dead, but the Lodge itself was often mentioned as a tourist destination, as well. In 1886, the *Weekly Detroit Free Press* mentioned that a fine view could be had from the top of the superintendent’s house.⁶¹ In 1898, the *Butte Weekly Miner* did a special article on Antietam. In it, it mentioned the National Cemetery, including the “beautiful emblematic monument” and the “stone lodge house” where the cemetery keeper could be buzzed.⁶² In the era before the battlefield visitor facilities had been fully developed Antietam National Cemetery served as a greeting site where visitors could learn about the battle and those who had died there.

By the 1920s, the War Department contemplated tearing down the old Lodge and building a new one. Instead the original lodge was retained and a new Superintendent’s Lodge was constructed nearby.⁶³ The original lodge served purely visitor and ceremonial purposes while the new lodge, or Headquarters No. 1, provided updated living and work quarters for the superintendent. In addition to maintaining the Reception Room, the Lodge also became a comfort station by February 1927. The total cost of improvements and renovation, including the installation of women’s and men’s restrooms were approximately \$3,742.37.⁶⁴ The site as a

⁶⁰ Cass, 46.

⁶¹ “Antietam. Present Appearance.”

⁶² “Antietam Unchanged,” *Butte Weekly Miner*, 7 April 1898, 13.

⁶³ In April of 1927, Superintendent Donaldson passed away. His widow, Mrs. Louis N. Donaldson wrote the Quartermaster General requesting permission to remain in the Lodge for a period of six months. In return, she offered to maintain the “office routine” including the management of papers and reports. Instead, Mr. Fisher, the acting Superintendent of the Antietam Battlefield, was ordered to take on the additional duties of running the Cemetery until a replacement could be found—at no additional pay. In this order, it is noted that “Superintendent Fisher has been instructed to show every possible consideration toward the widow and family of the late Superintendent, and to permit them to remain at the lodge for such reasonable period as may be necessary. It is considered inadvisable for the widow to exercise any authority in cemetery affairs which can be handled more effectively by Superintendent Fisher. In view of the fact that the lodge will be demolished early in July, it is manifestly impossible to grant her a residence later than June 30th.” Letter, Mrs. Louis N. Donaldson to the Quartermaster General (21 April 1927) and H.L. Ward to K.J. Hampton (23 April 1927), Box 57, Entry 1891 – General Correspondence, Geographic File, 1922-1935 (hereafter Entry 1891), RG 92, NARA II.

⁶⁴ Condition Report - Building No. 2a, File Folder 0-31 - Antietam National Cemetery, Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

comfort station was so popular that in April 1928 the Cemetery requested that a drinking fountain be installed to accommodate the large number of summer visitors.⁶⁵ In 1930 a report was made on the old Lodge that declared it to be in good repair and condition—except for the tower.⁶⁶ It was determined that “the use of the observation tower on the old lodge (now comfort station) at the Antietam Nat. Cem., is not necessary, and instructions have been given to the superintendent to keep the tower locked and visitors not to be permitted to use same.”⁶⁷ While the rest of the Lodge appeared in good condition, the sheathing of the wall was warped and “drawn out of place, permitting loose plaster sheathing to sift down the steps and hallway and making it impossible to keep the hallway clean.”⁶⁸

After the War Department – Serving the Cemetery and Antietam Battlefield

When the National Park Service took over the Antietam National Cemetery in 1933, it maintained the Lodge as a comfort station. As under the War Department, the Lodge continued to have maintenance problems. Superintendent John Kyd Beckenbaugh’s thorough inspection in May 1935 with Mr. Howry stated that the plaster on the interior of the structure was applied directly to the stonework. Because of this, it became “so extremely damp that it is thought this dampness” affected the walls of the building and those who occupied it.⁶⁹ Beckenbaugh also suggested that the building needed major changes to the heating and plumbing situations, as well as rewiring and new electrical lighting.⁷⁰ On August 21, 1935, Specifications for the Lodge were written up, and in 1936, extensive renovation work—funded by PWA Federal Project No. 605—began on the Lodge.⁷¹

In the midst of documenting these structural challenges and making the necessary improvements, the National Park Service expanded the use of the Lodge to include a museum, administrative offices, and a Library in February 1936.⁷² The museum and offices were used by

⁶⁵ Letter, H.L. Ward to The Quartermaster General, Re: Improvements to grounds, Antietam National Cemetery (4 April 1928), File 618.32 – Antietam Nat’l Cem., Box 57, Entry 1891, RG 92, NARA II.

⁶⁶ Letter, Chas. C. Burt to the Commanding General, Third Corps Area (15 August 1930), File 333.1 “Antietam Nat’l Cem. – Inspection, (15 August 1930), Box 56, Entry 1891, RG 92, NARA II.

⁶⁷ Letter, HQ 3rd C.A. to The A.G. (22 September 1930), File 333.1 “Antietam Nat’l Cem. – Inspection, (15 August 1930), Box 56, Entry 1891, RG 92, NARA II.

⁶⁸ Letter, Chas C. Burt to the Commanding General, Third Corps Area. Despite these reports, it is unclear if the tower was closed and/or for how long. It should be noted that the tower is not accessible to the public today.

⁶⁹ Letter, Jno. Kyd Beckenbaugh to the Director of the National Park Service (6 February 1936), File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (General), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

⁷⁰ Memorandum, Chas. W. Andrae to Mr. Peterson, Re: Antietam National Cemetery, Entrance Lodge (21 May 1935), File No. C 0-31, Part I, Antietam National Cemetery General (From August 12, 1933 – December 12, 1935), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

⁷¹ “Specifications for the Alterations to Lodge – Antietam National Cemetery, Sharpsburg, Maryland” (21 August 1935), File Folder 0-31 - Antietam National Cemetery, Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II. The work again updated the restrooms for the comfort station.

the Antietam National Battlefield, *not* the Cemetery staff. Superintendent Beckenbaugh suggested that while the Cemetery did not have the funding, the Battlefield had “sufficient funds to employ a charwoman for at least two half days weekly” to clean it in a “thorough manner.” By spending the manpower and dollars to remove a portion of the porch, do internal renovations, and suggest a weekly cleaning of the interior, the federal government demonstrated that the Lodge was important enough to retain.⁷³

Although its function had been altered from its original intention as the Cemetery keeper’s home, the structure remained an important part of the Cemetery landscape and the Antietam Battlefield staff continued to welcome guests via the Lodge. As early as March 1935, Beckenbaugh made a public effort to bring people to the Lodge. In his speech to the Boonsboro Lion’s Club, he explained

In the stone building at the entrance to the National Cemetery is the National Park Service office, where you are at liberty to call at any time for any information you may desire, with assurance that it will always be cheerfully given; to us of the National Park Service, nothing we can ever do for our guests or visitors is ever any trouble.⁷⁴

By October of the same year, the *Washington Post* reported the installation of the battlefield museum into “the building in which the battlefield office is located.” The museum included relics from the Battle of Antietam, many of them collected from the nearby fields in recent years, as well as other donated Civil War items such as Lieutenant George H. Baldwin’s military uniform.⁷⁵

⁷² Beckenbaugh’s report discussed concern for the museum on the second floor specifically because of the poor wall construction: the plaster and dampness “might seriously affect some of the valuable museum exhibits which are to be displayed in the rooms on the second floor. It is not thought that the heating of this second floor would be a very great expense...” Letter Jno. Kyd Beckenbaugh to the Director of the National Park Service (6 February 1936), File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (General), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II. Letter, Jno. Kyd Beckenbaugh, Superintendent to the Director of the National Park Service (26 February 1936), File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (General), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II. This conversion of space is documented in the March 1936 Quarterly Report: “The building containing the comfort station, formerly reported on, has been turned over to the Battlefield Site for use as an office and museum.” Report, “Quarterly Report of the Antietam National Cemetery for the period ended March 31, 1936,” File No. 207 – Antietam National Cemetery Quarterly Reports, Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

⁷³ As early as 1931, while still under the War Department, the Quartermaster General’s Office considered the construction of “a combination Superintendent’s Lodge, office and public comfort station, to be built of native limestone.” However, the old Lodge served as a museum and administrative offices for the Antietam Battlefield park until the new visitor center was built in 1964 as part of the Mission 66 project. Letter, A.K. Baskette to The Quartermaster General, Re: Improvements at Antietam Battlefield (17 November 1931), File 687 – Antietam Battlefield, Box 57, Entry 1891, RG 92, NARA II. Robinson & Associates, Inc., 28-29. Letter, Jno. Kyd Beckenbaugh to the Director of the National Park Service (6 February 1936).

⁷⁴ Superintendent Beckenbaugh, “Address given by Superintendent Beckenbaugh before the Lion’s Club in Boonsboro, MD, March 25, 1935,” 9, File No. 0-3, Part I – Antietam Invitations & Addresses, Box 633 [Cemeteries] National Cemetery Regulations to 0-31 Military Parks, Ft. McHenry Nat’l Monument, Entry P10—Central Classified Files, 1907-1949 [cemeteries] (hereafter Box 633, Entry P10), RG 79, NARA II.

⁷⁵ “Sharpsburg Plans Antietam Museum,” *Washington Post*, 8 October 1935, 13.

These measures to encourage visitorship focused on the Battle of Antietam and the preserved battlefield itself rather than the Cemetery directly outside the Lodge's walls. This is further exemplified by Park Service's decision to approve the sale of NPS literature within the Cemetery walls in 1942. National Cemetery Regulations stated that "the sale of photographs, souvenirs, and refreshments or the taking of photographs of private monuments for commercial purpose will not be permitted." Despite these regulations, the sale of "dignified" battlefield-related literature within the park headquarters at the Lodge would be okay.⁷⁶

Along with the continued—but altered—encouragement of tourism and visitors, the Lodge was also witness to the continued conflict between local residents and Cemetery staff. On June 15, 1938, John Reel of Baltimore, Maryland sent a letter of complaint in regard to the treatment he received from Superintendent Taute at the Decoration Day events on May 30th. Among the witnesses to the conflict was the Clerk of the Battlefield Office located inside the old Lodge. She stood in the office doorway and witnessed the confrontation—apparently encouraged by the intake of alcohol—as it occurred at the entrance of the Cemetery. Superintendent Beckenbaugh, whose office was also located in the Lodge, defended Taute in light of local actions. He stated, "We do at times have to contend with parties under the apparent influence of liquor both in the Cemetery and the Battlefield and must of necessity use our own judgment as to their condition and improper actions."⁷⁷ A local farmer, John E. Starliper, wrote:

I was at the Antietam National Cemetery on Decoration Day, May 30 and saw John Reel, his brother, Victor Reel, and their brother-in-law, all drunk. They were having some argument with the Superintendent of the Cemetery and then came up to me near the entrance and said, "what is that old man's name; we're going to make that old _____ lose his job." I told them the Superintendent's name, then one of them said, "Let's go in and hit the old _____," and I said, "you better watch out what you are doing or you are going to get into trouble."⁷⁸

Like the actions of the canal men in 1880, this behavior was not appropriate for a National Cemetery, particularly on Decoration Day.

⁷⁶ Memorandum, NPS Acting Director, A.E. Demaray to the Superintendent (Gettysburg National Military Park) (22 April 1942), File No. 201, Part I – Antietam Administration & Personnel Administration (General), Box 633, Entry P10, RG 79, NARA II.

⁷⁷ Letter, Jno. Kyd Beckenbaugh, Superintendent to the Director of the National Park Service (23 June 1938), File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (general), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

⁷⁸ Statement, John E. Starliper, Farmer, Sharpsburg District (22 June 1938). See also the following statements: Leroy Mose, Laborer, Antietam National Battlefield Site (22 June 1938); Ellsworth R. Roulette (20 June 1938); Lester Easterday, Secretary of the Antietam Battlefield G.A.R. Memorial Association, Inc. (20 June 1938); Arthur H. Dorsey, Cashier at the Sharpsburg Bank of Washington County (20 June 1938). See also Carl Taute's description of the confrontation: Letter, Carle Taute to the Director of the National Park Service (20 June 1938). All statements are located in File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (general), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

As with Mr. Donaldson under the War Department, Taute was supported by others for his actions. Beckenbaugh explained “I can most emphatically state that Superintendent Taute has always as far as I have been able to learn or see, treated everyone with the utmost courtesy.”⁷⁹ Numerous other letters of witness and support for Taute were sent to National Park Headquarters. This time, local Sharpsburg residents offered support, as well. Pastor M.A. Ashby wrote that Superintendent Taute was a pleasant and affable man who was courteous to all; he always helped visitors—both locals and tourists—who wanted information. Most importantly, “he regard[ed] the care of the ground where the honored dead lie as a sacred trust placed, under his supervision, by his government.”⁸⁰

By 1964, with the completion of Antietam Battlefield’s new visitor center, fewer visitors were guided to the comfort station and museum at the old Lodge. Those who did come were there to see the Cemetery grounds rather than battlefield relics. Today, the restrooms remain open to the public and the first floor rooms serve as office space for the Cemetery and Battlefield’s maintenance crew. However, the tower is still closed and the second floor of the building is currently unoccupied. As throughout its nearly 150 year history, the Lodge still has plaster problems on the second floor and in the tower, but the structure’s exterior appears in good condition.

Originally intended to serve the Cemetery and allow visitors to view the battlefield landscape beyond the Cemetery walls, the Lodge has since transitioned into an important part of the landscape itself. Reports, postcards, and photographs attest to this. Rather than used as a tool to see, the Lodge is now something to be seen; it is an architectural landmark in its own right. In 1940, the *Antietam Sentinel* provided a weekly “resume of this historic battlefield.” In its inaugural edition, a large photograph of the Lodge House is positioned just above the title, “Antietam Battlefield Site, One of the Most Historic Spots of War Between the States.”⁸¹ A Kodak Colorprint postcard from 1969, entitled “Gate and Keeper’s House, Antietam National Cemetery,” does not focus on Old Simon or the 5,000 headstones in the Cemetery. Instead, it focuses on the architectural additions to the landscape.⁸² In 1976, NPS employee Patricia Heinzelman conducted a Classified Structure Field Inventory Report of the Cemetery and included the Lodge as a part of national significance worthy of preservation.⁸³ Today, NPS

⁷⁹ Letter, From Jno. Kyd Beckenbaugh, Superintendent to the Director of the National Park Service (23 June 1938), File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (general), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

⁸⁰ Letter of Support, M.A. Ashby, Paster (20 June 1938). See also: Letter, Allen Poffenberger, Principal of Sharpsburg Schools to the National Park Service (20 June 1938); C.C. Dorsey (20 June 1938); J. Cleveland Grice (20 June 1938). All files regarding support of Superintendent Taute are available at File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (general), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

⁸¹ Mrs. Edna Earley, News Editor, “Antietam Battlefield Site, One of the Most Historic Spots of War Between the States,” *The Antietam Sentinel*, 17 January 1940, 1.

⁸² Antique postcards are available online at <http://www.nps.gov/anti/photosmultimedia/antiquepostcards.htm>. National Park Service, Antietam National Battlefield, “Antique Postcards of Antietam,” available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/photosmultimedia/antiquepostcards.htm>; Internet; accessed 25 August 2009.

guidebooks on the Cemetery highlight the Lodge as an important site to see when touring the grounds and reflecting “on the sacrifices made by the soldiers buried before you.”⁸⁴

II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: The Lodge House is a stone structure with Gothic Revival features, an irregular footprint, and an asymmetrical profile. Prominent features of the lodge include a three-story parapet tower, a gabled entry porch with a crossbracing vergeboard, and elaborate paneled doors.
2. Condition of fabric: Fair. Both the interior and exterior of the tower have substantial water damage. The first floor appears in fairly good condition and is used today as maintenance headquarters for the battlefield park.

B. Description of Exterior:

1. Overall dimensions: The Lodge has a T-shaped plan with a large, square tower extending from the north side. Length – 37 feet, 0 inches. Width – 34 feet, 3 inches. Height – 15 feet, 4 inches (to the eaves).⁸⁵
2. Foundations: This structure has foundation built from “limestone as found near the premises,” with approximately six inches visible above grade. According to the specifications, the foundation walls and piers were to begin two feet below ground level and be “well bonded and 20 inches thick to the 1st story floor joists.”⁸⁶
3. Walls: The lodge walls are constructed of smooth dressed native limestone in a random ashlar pattern with flush mortar joints. The walls are edged with quoins, and also feature randomly placed L-shaped stones. A Stars and Stripes shield emblem is carved into stone underneath the east elevation gable. A bronze tablet with the text of Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address is located on the west elevation next to the reception room entrance. These tablets were placed on lodges throughout the National Cemetery system around 1909.
4. Structural system, framing: The lodge has load-bearing exterior masonry walls and wood frame roof and interior supports. Retrofitted concrete beams are found along the exterior walls and amidst the wood members below the first floor.⁸⁷

⁸³ Patricia Hienzelman, “Classified Structure Field Inventory Report” (17 May 1976), File Folder – Antietam National Cemetery, Box – Antietam National Cemetery, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD.

⁸⁴ Keith Snyder, “Antietam National Cemetery: Not for Themselves but for Their Country,” (Western Maryland Interpretative Association, n.d.). This brochure is currently sold in the Antietam National Battlefield bookstore located at the visitor center. Antietam National Battlefield, Sharpsburg, MD.

⁸⁵ Condition Report - Building No. 2a Report – Public Comfort Station.

⁸⁶ “Specifications of the Keepers Lodge for the National Cemetery at Antietam, MD.”

5. Porches and stoops: A low brick stoop wraps around the east elevation of the lodge. It replaced a concrete porch in 1977.⁸⁸ This stoop supports a wood porch structure just sheltering the main doorway. This front gable porch is supported by pairs of chamfered posts and decorative carved brackets. Its roof is sheathed with copper. The gable is decorated by vergeboards featuring crossbracing and a stylized floral scrollwork motif.⁸⁹

A similar but smaller and less elaborate front gable entrance porch and brick stoop is located on the west elevation. Here the porch hood with scrollwork vergeboards is supported by decorative brackets only.

6. Chimneys: Two interior brick chimneys extend above the roofline near the center of the Lodge. Both chimneys have simple metal caps.

7. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: The typical doors—all located on the east elevation—are made of heavy wood batten with cross-diagonal bracing, stone sills, and pointed segmental arches above the doorframe. All of the east elevation doors are accessed via the wraparound brick stoop. The main entrance consists of two double doors with a four light transom centered underneath the front gable porch. To the southeast is a single door located underneath a copper pent-roofed hood supported by carved brackets.⁹⁰ To the northeast at the base of the tower is another single leaf door framed by a Florentine arch in the stonework. On the west elevation under the front gable porch hood is a single Dutch door with 12 lights over two vertical panels; it now operates as a window rather than a door.

b. Windows: The typical window on the Lodge is a narrow four-over-four wood sash. Except for the set of three found along the western corner of the south elevation, these windows are found standing alone or in pairs. They are set directly into the Lodge's stone wall with relieved Florentine arches on the first floor and segmental relieving arches on the second floor. In addition, two six-over-six wood sash windows are located just west of the tower on the north elevation and south of the old Dutch door along the west elevation. Two sets of four-over-one windows can be found on the north and south elevations of the reception room.

8. Roof:

⁸⁷ McMullen & Associates, Inc., *Antietam National Cemetery Lodge: Physical History and Condition Assessment, Final Submission*, (Washington, D.C.: architrave p.c. architects, 5 March 2003), 85-88.

⁸⁸ National Park Service, Antietam National Battlefield, 1977 Annual Report, 22. File Folder: 1977 Annual Report, Box – Annual Reports 1974-1984, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD.

⁸⁹ Robinson & Associates, 39.

⁹⁰ Robinson & Associates claims that this awning was most likely added in 1936 when the wraparound porch was removed. Robinson & Associates, 39.

a. Shape, covering: The Lodge's roof is steeply pitched with cross hipped and gabled sections. The open gable section faces east and the hipped section runs north to south. The entire roof has slate shingles and copper ridge caps and flashing.

b. Eaves/Drainage: The Lodge has shallow boxed eaves with internal gutters and simple square brackets. Two small, decorative turrets frame the edges of the front gable on the east. The gable is capped by a small stone pyramid with a circular top.

c. Dormers: Slate-roofed gable dormers with four paned, single sash casements and slate sheathing are located on the north, west, and south elevations of the hipped roof. The sides are decorated with curved brackets and the gable front features applied wood with a triangular zigzag and line pattern.

d. Tower: The Lodge's three-story tower extends from the center of the north elevation. It has a flat roof designed as an observation platform surrounded by a castellated parapet. It is accessed via a first floor doorway at the east elevation brick stoop. Narrow four over four wood sash windows with Florentine relieving arches are located at the second floor level and four-paned oxe-eyed windows on the third floor level on the north, east, and west elevations. The circular oxe-eye windows are framed with stones set in a diamond shape with rounded corners. A cannon-like copper water spout feature protrudes below the parapet on the south elevation of tower.

C. Description of Interior:

1. Floor plans: The Lodge has three rooms on each floor, and a small hall and the square stair tower at the north side of the plan. The largest space is the single room on the east side – on the first floor this was the reception room entered from the main porch. The other two rooms located behind this room to the west were used as the Superintendent's parlor and kitchen. Three chambers arranged in the same layout are located on the second floor. Although not accessible to the public, a partial basement can be found underneath the tower and northwest room.⁹¹

2. Stairways: The three story tower provides stairway access to the second floor and observation deck of the Lodge. The first and second floor levels have a wood winder staircase with a railing consisting of vertical boards and a quatrefoil pattern. An iron spiral staircase with solid diamond tread leads to a hatch for access to the observation platform on the roof. The iron stairs were made by the Dunivage Spiral Stair Company of Hagerstown and are marked with "24 RAD RD RH" underneath the treads.⁹²

3. Flooring: The Lodge's interior features wood tongue and groove flooring. The wood floor in the Reception Room is not original, which, according to specifications, were to

⁹¹ architrave p.c., architects, 61.

⁹² Robinson & Associates, 54.

be alternating strips of walnut and oak.⁹³ Blue mosaic tiles are located in the restrooms while on the second floor the wood floor has been covered with carpeting.⁹⁴

4. Wall and ceiling finish: The Lodge's walls and ceilings are plastered with wood baseboard molding—which is more elaborate in the original Reception Room.⁹⁵ At some point after the Kitchen was converted to public restrooms, glazed white tiles were added and now run approximately 2/3 of the way up the walls. On the second floor, the walls slope inward to accommodate the roof.

5. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors: The typical interior door is four-paneled wood with recessed vertical panels, a wood frame, and wood sill. The design of these paneled doors varies on the second floor. The doors, doorframes, and trim are painted yellow on the first floor and white on the second floor. The doorway to the left of the Reception Room's fireplace was cut into the wall in 1935 when the kitchen was converted to a women's restroom. The doorframe moldings are most elaborate in the Reception Room, where specifications indicated that they should be "architraves 7 inches wide, chamfered double moulded and with a large walnut bead." The original specifications indicate that all other rooms designated with trim were to have "5 ins. wide, chamfered with backband and bead."⁹⁶ At some point in time a utility closet was created in the doorway that led from the Living Room to the "Kitchen" (not the restrooms). The closet has dark wood bi-fold doors with a louvered top and a single panel bottom.

b. Windows: Windows throughout the Lodge have wood painted frames, sills, and trim. They follow a hierarchical pattern so that the most ornate are located in the reception room. The reception room windows have wood sills, block corners supported by cyma molding brackets, and wide trim with a tapered outer edge. The openings also have a deep reveal with a thick bead around the edge. The paired windows in the reception room are surrounded by a single window molding. The trim on the second floor is a bit narrower and standard in design, consisting of a simple panel flanked by two reeds. One window on the second floor has an apron beneath the

⁹³ Robinson & Associates, 50.

⁹⁴ Although it does not indicate where, John Beckenbaugh's report in February of 1936 mentions the new installation of "fine new terrazzo and inlaid linoleum floors" in the old Lodge. Letter, Jno. Kyd Beckenbaugh to the Director of the National Park Service (6 February 1936), File No. C 0-31 – Part II, Antietam National Cemetery (General), Box 2699, Entry 7, RG 79, NARA II.

⁹⁵ A January 11, 1905 report indicates that at that time, the walls of the Lodge were papered. Letter, D.H. Rhodes to Quartermaster General of the Army (n.d), 1, File No. 213318, Entry 89, RG 92, NARA I.

⁹⁶ "Specifications of the Keepers Lodge for the National Cemetery at Antietam, MD;" Robinson & Associates, 48-49.

sill to accommodate window air conditioners.⁹⁷ The dormer windows on the second floor have simple, white painted, wood sills and frames.

6. Decorative features and trim:

a. Interior Fireplaces: The first floor fireplace in the Reception Room has a slate mantle, while the second floor fireplace has a wood mantle.

7. Hardware: The Lodge retains original box locks on a number of its interior doors.

8. Mechanical Equipment: None of original nineteenth century mechanical equipment is present today.⁹⁸

a. Heating, air conditioning, ventilation: The Lodge is currently heated by a two-pipe hot water radiator system. Some of the radiators appear historic but they date to the twentieth century rather than the nineteenth century. There are convectors located in the restrooms. Some of the offices have window air conditioning units.

b. Lighting: The structure is now supported by electricity, though it would not have been at the time of its construction. Lighting and power appear to date to the 1930s or later. Lighting fixtures today consist primarily of fluorescent bulbs.

c. Plumbing: Water for the Lodge was originally accessible from a cistern. When the new superintendent's lodge was built in 1928, a well was dug, providing water to both locations. Indoor plumbing was first provided in 1924 and in 1927 the public comfort station bathrooms were added.⁹⁹

D. Site:

1. General Character: The Lodge is located just west of the main gates to the Antietam National Cemetery. Its central location served as point of contact with visitors to the cemetery. The cemetery headstones and large soldier monument are located south of the Lodge, while the rostrum and flagstaff stand to the west. The new superintendent's lodge from 1928, Headquarters No. 1, and the Mule Barn are located to the east.

2. Walkways and Hardscape Features: The front entrance to cemetery is paved. Now that the cemetery is "closed" to any more internees, the front entrance is primarily for pedestrians.¹⁰⁰ A red brick patio in herringbone pattern extends from the stoop that

⁹⁷ Robinson & Associates, 52.

⁹⁸ Most of this information came from the "Cemetery Lodge Physical History and Condition Assessment" from 2003.

⁹⁹ Robinson & Associates, 26.

¹⁰⁰ It should be noted that soldiers were interred in Antietam National Cemetery until 1953. After that date, the cemetery was closed to non Civil War soldiers. The one exception was the burial of Patrick Howard Roy who was killed aboard the attack on the USS Cole in 2000. Snyder.

borders the east elevation of the lodge. The patio has two benches and an iron tablet map of the cemetery.

3. Plantings: A number of large bushes and small trees line and shade the Lodge along the north, south, and west elevations. A fare portion of the first floor is hidden behind these plantings except along the east elevation porch.

III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural drawings: A compilation of floor plans for the Lodge can be found in architect p.c. architects' *Antietam National Cemetery Lodge: Physical History and Condition Assessment* conducted for the U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service and finalized in March 2003. Historic American Buildings Survey measured drawings from 1986 (HABS No. MD-936-A) are located in the HABS collection at the Library of Congress.

B. Early views: The largest collection of historic photographs of the Lodge is located in Antietam National Battlefield's library collection in spiral notebooks titled "Administrative," "Administration Work," "Buildings," "Miscellaneous," "National Cemetery," and "Photographs of the Battlefield." Dating from the 1930s, these photographs show WPA work on the structure and its surrounding landscape, and at times, guests touring the Cemetery.¹⁰¹ Two photographs of the Lodge are also located in a Quartermaster General's condition report dated February 3, 1923.¹⁰² In addition to these photographs, other views of the Lodge are accessible from historic postcards of the Cemetery.¹⁰³ It is important to note that many early photographs of the Cemetery are taken from the tower of the Lodge and therefore do not include the Lodge itself.¹⁰⁴

C. Bibliography:

Primary and Unpublished Sources

Note: See footnotes for a more detailed listing of relevant archival materials from the National Archives, Antietam National Battlefield Library and Cultural Resources Department, as well as newspaper and periodical articles.

National Archives, Washington, D.C. (NARA I)

Record Group 92 – Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General
Entry 576— General Correspondence and Reports Relating to National and Post
Cemeteries ("Cemetery File"), 1865-1914, Boxes 4, 5, and 6 (Antietam)

¹⁰¹ WPA photograph collection, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD.

¹⁰² Condition Report - Building No. 2a Report – Public Comfort Station.

¹⁰³ National Park Service, Antietam National Battlefield, "Antique Postcards of Antietam," available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/photosmultimedia/antiquepostcards.htm>; Internet; accessed 25 August 2009.

¹⁰⁴ Snyder.

Entry 89—General Correspondence, 1890-1914, Antietam

National Archives, College Park, MD (NARA II)

Record Group 92 – Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General

Entry 1891 –General Correspondence, Geographic File 1922-1935, Boxes 56 and 57

Record Group 79 – Records of the National Park Service

Entry P10 – Central Classified Files, 1907-1949 [Cemeteries], Box 633

Entry 7 – Central Classified Files, 1933-1949, Box 2699 - National Cemeteries, General, Antietam

Newspapers, Journals, and Pamphlets

The Antietam Sentinel (Sharpsburg, MD)

Butte Weekly Miner (Butte, MT)

The Herald and Torch (Hagerstown, MD)

Washington Chronicle (Washington, DC)

The Washington Post (Washington, DC)

Weekly Detroit Free Press (Detroit, MI)

Board of Trustees of Antietam National Cemetery. *History of Antietam National Cemetery*. Baltimore, Maryland: John W. Woods, 1869.

Gay, Daniel F. "Through the Shenandoah Valley Awheel." *Outing: an Illustrated Monthly Magazine of Recreation* 32, no. 3, (June 1898).

Snyder, Keith. "Antietam National Cemetery: Not for Themselves but for Their Country." Western Maryland Interpretative Association, n.d.

Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD

File Folder: 1977 Annual Report, Box – Annual Reports 1974-1984, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD

Hienzelman, Patricia. "Classified Structure Field Inventory Report." 17 May 1976. File Folder – Antietam National Cemetery, Box – Antietam National Cemetery, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD

WPA photograph collection, Antietam National Battlefield Library, Sharpsburg, MD

Antietam National Battlefield – Cultural Resources Department

Photo collection, Cultural Resources Department, Antietam National Battlefield, Sharpsburg, MD

Secondary Sources

- architrave p.c. architects. *Antietam National Cemetery Lodge: Physical History and Condition Assessment, Final Submission*. Washington, D.C.: architrave p.c. architects, 5 March 2003.
- Bender, Thomas. "The 'Rural' Cemetery Movement: Urban Travail and the Appeal of Nature." *New England Quarterly* 47, no. 2 (June 1974): 196-211.
- Cass, Kelsey. "None Else of Name: The Origin and Early Development of the U.S. National Cemetery System." Ph.D. diss., Claremont College Graduate School, ca. 2001.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.
- French, Stanley. "The Cemetery as Cultural Institution: The Establishment of Mount Auburn and the 'Rural Cemetery' Movement." *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 37-59.
- McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1984.
- McPherson, James. *Crossroads of Freedom: Antietam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- National Park Service, Antietam National Battlefield. "Antietam National Cemetery." Available online <http://www.nps.gov/anti/historyculture/antietam-national-cemetery.htm>. Internet. (Accessed 22 August 2009).
- _____. "Antique Postcards of Antietam." Available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/photosmultimedia/antiquepostcards.htm>. Internet. (Accessed 25 August 2009).
- _____. "Historic Photographs by Alexander Gardner." Available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/photosmultimedia/gardnerphotos.htm>. Internet (Accessed 22 August 2009).
- _____. "Photography at Antietam, Part 2." Available from <http://www.nps.gov/anti/historyculture/photography2.htm>. Internet (Accessed 22 August 2009).
- Sears, Stephen W. *Landscape Turned Red: The Battle of Antietam*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1983.
- Snell, Charles W. and Sharon A. Brown. *Antietam National Battlefield and National*

Cemetery: an Administrative History. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service, 1986.

Zipf, Catherine. "Marking Union Victory in the South: the Construction of the National Cemetery System," in *Monuments to the Lost Cause: Women, Art, and the Landscapes of Southern Memory*. Cynthia Mills and Pamela H. Simpson eds. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 2003.