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Abstract
Culp's Hill is described as one of the least visited and most under interpreted portions of Gettysburg National Military Park. This paper analyzes some of the sites in the vicinity of Culp's Hill and Spangler's Spring to create a picture of both the fighting on July 2, 1863, and the interactions of veterans and tourists with the area in the years and decades following the Civil War.
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FIRST SECTION

A.

Union soldiers of George Greene’s New York Brigade arrived on the outskirts of Gettysburg during the evening of July 1. So, too, that evening arrived their opponents of the fighting of July 2: Steuart’s Confederate Brigade. Greene’s men arrived at Culp’s Hill on the morning of July 2, 1863, and immediately set about preparing breastworks. The Confederate troops below the hill, of whom Steuart’s Brigade was a part, could hear the Union troops preparing their positions. Some soldiers believed that an attack at that time might drive the Union troops off the hill, though no orders arrived for an assault until the evening of July 2.¹

Throughout much of July 2, this portion of the battlefield remained quiet. Later, in the evening, multiple Union commands posted on Culp’s Hill received orders to assist in defending other areas of the Union defenses, leaving Greene’s brigade to defend an extended stretch of entrenchments. One officer of the 137th New York recalled that they, along with soldiers of another neighboring regiment, shifted their positions to cover “a distance four times greater than [that] originally occupied by us.”² The soldiers of Colonel David Ireland’s 137th New York suddenly composed the extreme right flank of the Union line. Still, much of the trenches on Lower Culp’s Hill remained vacant.

At approximately 7:00 pm on the evening of July 2, the Confederate assault on Culp’s Hill began. Union pickets scrambled to the safety of the breastworks as the Confederates clambered up the slopes towards the Union lines. A fierce fire erupted from the Union soldiers,

killing and wounding many Confederates in their front. The Confederates then retreated to the base of the hill, leaving behind their dead and wounded. Some Union soldiers left their positions to answer the pleas of their wounded foes before the sounds of another assault sent them back to their posts.³ A total of four Confederate assaults slammed into the Union defenses on Culp’s Hill, and, though all were repulsed, the flank nearly broke on at least one occasion.

While the 1st Maryland Battalion and a North Carolina Regiment pressured the front of the 137th New York, some Virginia regiments outflanked the New Yorkers. Colonel David Ireland ordered part of the regiment to shift to a right angle, thus countering the flanking attack, though other Confederates opened fire from the rear, pushing the New Yorkers back into their original positions.⁴ Union forces from further down the line rushed to relieve the badly bloodied New Yorkers; if Greene’s Brigade had retreated, it is possible that the right flank of the Union army, and perhaps the entire Union line, faced the possibility of collapse.

Although the fighting raged on until midnight, the Confederates failed to seize the works on Upper Culp’s Hill. Nevertheless, Steuart’s command occupied a sizable portion of the lower trenches during the night of July 2. The Union regiments on Culp’s Hill shifted throughout the night, allowing the weary New Yorkers of Greene’s brigade to replenish ammunition and rest. In between Steuart’s Brigade and a Union command opposite Culp’s Hill sat Spangler’s Spring, a water source which soldiers of both sides utilized during the night. The following morning, Union forces counterattacked, forcing the Confederates to retreat with heavy losses.

B.

³ Gottfried, 390.
⁴ Ibid, 390-391.
The official narrative of Culp’s Hill is one of heroism and bloodshed on the one hand and reunion on the other. The *Defense of Culp’s Hill Wayside*, for example, praises the determined fighting of the soldiers of both sides in a clean, balanced manner. The suspenseful and determined defense by Union soldiers, for instance, stands side-by-side with “the valiant efforts of the Southerners” in the wayside. The use of “clean” in this analysis points to the absence of a feeling of the savagery of the fighting. Although a quote from a Union soldier on the marker provides an exact description of the atmosphere amongst the troops, little suggests the sheer carnage and chaos of the fighting. According to historian Christian Spielvogel, this problem emerges in markers across the battlefield.

The reunion on Culp’s Hill emerges distinctly from the presence of the 137th New York Monument and the 2nd Maryland Monument. This, however, is just that: reunion. There is no reconciliation present in the text or symbolism these monuments. Both monuments state that they mark the approximate location held by the respective units during at least part of the battle, in addition to a count of the casualties of each regiment. The 137th New York Monument approaches the Union Cause openly with its declaration, “For its services in this and many other great battles of the war it holds a proud position in the history of the ‘Great Rebellion.’” The 2nd Maryland preaches a polar opposite message in the Calvert Crosses present on each side of the monument.

Both monuments are just vague enough, however, that the absence of reconciliation is not readily evident to the average tourist. The supposed burial pit behind the 2nd Maryland

---

Monument, however, provides a significant clue to this fact. There is no interpretive marker to this site, leaving visitors only the image of a slight indentation in the ground blanketed by “Rebel” flags. Although this area does indeed indicate the presence of Lost Cause rhetoric in present-day memory of Culp’s Hill, it provides no insights to the visitor to any context of the sight.

Spangler’s Spring primarily speaks a message of reconciliation and reunion. No mention is made on the monument or accompanying waysides of any fighting around the spring during the night of July 2, though the plaques around the Spring make strong overtures to the myth of the “Shrine of Fraternization.” One declares, for example, “The strife of brothers is past.” This short declaration, in addition to other text on the structure over the spring, speaks to the notion of American brotherhood in the post-war years and the common framing of the war as a conflict between brothers.

One wayside discussing a Union assault on July 3 provides some context to the history of the Springs as a picnic ground and briefly summarizes the fighting that occurred on Culp’s Hill during the evening of July 2. Although this marker does provide visitors a brief glimpse into notions of pastoral tourism in the mid-nineteenth-century, there is nothing present to indicate the site continued in this capacity for decades following the battle. Thus, the Spring misleadingly stands as a seemingly eternal sentinel of reunion and reconciliation following the Civil War.

SECOND SECTION

A.

---

8 Spangler’s Spring, 1895, Stone, Concrete, and Bronze, Colgrove Avenue, Gettysburg, PA, visited April 14, 2017.
When one peruses the official National Park Service driving tour route, one might notice that Culp’s Hill is missing from the list of stops. Spangler’s Spring has an official stop that briefly mentions the fighting on July 2 and Culp’s Hill’s observation tower is mentioned. Nevertheless, Culp’s Hill appears on the map as an interpretive dead zone. “Culp's Hill is still the least visited and under interpreted major part of the battlefield at Gettysburg,” Licensed Battlefield Guide Charles Fennell proclaims.9

Culp’s Hill and Spangler’s Spring present conflicting messages on reunion and reconciliation after the war. The monuments to the 2nd Maryland and 137th New York speak to reunion without reconciliation while Spangler’s Spring preaches a message of eternal reconciliation and reunion beneath the American flag. The monuments on Culp’s Hill, however, speak more subtly on the issue, largely using symbolism and vague wording to put forth their messages. In contrast, the supposed burial pits openly preach Lost Cause rhetoric. The flags speak to a sense of Southern nationalism which Historian Caroline Janney states was used to attempt to unite the white citizens of defeated former Confederate states.10 The 137th New York’s monument speaks to the Union Cause’s efforts to reunite the country without compromise on the principles for which Union soldiers fought and died. For example, Historian Gary Gallagher uses Ulysses S. Grant as an example of those who condemned secession and the attempted dissolution of the Union while still encouraging reunion with former Confederates.11

Although it may seem strange to think of the battlefield as a large cemetery, many of the earliest preservationists of the battlefield seem to have intended this frame of mind for early

---

tourists to the battlefield.\textsuperscript{12} Indeed, both Culp’s Hill and Spangler’s Spring have one key theme in common: pastoralism. Jim Weeks discusses in great detail the process by which the battleground’s natural assets, in addition to the eventual monuments and markers, became a sacred space and a site of great interest to genteel tourists. The status of the battlefield, and thus Culp’s Hill and Spangler’s Spring, as standing memorials with “a civic and didactic purpose” largely holds true today.\textsuperscript{13}

The battlefield, especially in the pleasant fields surrounding Spangler’s Spring, loses much of its ferocity, a fact of great concern to Christian Spielvogel. The language used on the markers and historical monuments, too, remove virtually all the savagery from the bloodshed present during the fighting, enrobing it in a cloak of “heroic masculinity.”\textsuperscript{14} Additionally, the death and wounding of tens of thousands of soldiers take a backseat to the plans of a few commanding officers and the objective of taking or defending Culp’s Hill in the descriptions of the waysides and monuments. Christian Spielvogel identifies these themes as well in discussing problems that arise from the interpretation of Gettysburg through a traditional lens of military history.\textsuperscript{15}

B.

Culp’s Hill and Spangler’s Spring commemoration as sacred ground reunited former enemies as American brothers. Although the pastoral landscape promoted a sense of shared heroism, the words and symbols present on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Maryland Monument and 137\textsuperscript{th} New York Monument paint a picture of reunion without reconciliation. Spangler’s Spring, however, stands

\textsuperscript{13}Weeks, 20.
\textsuperscript{14}Spielvogel, 97.
\textsuperscript{15}Spielvogel, 99.
in stark contrast by advancing accounts of fraternization between Union and Confederate soldiers. The latter landscape appeals to visitors as a depoliticized environment that frames the killing and dying on the hill above as a tragedy without meaning. The historical landscape of Culp’s Hill conveys tensions in the popular notions of heroism, though only the mass grave openly welcomes an interpretation of the concept of the “Good Death.” Historian Drew Gilpin Faust provides key insights into Civil War Era death and mourning, which North Carolinian John Futch’s letters provide a first-hand account of this in the context of Culp’s Hill.

Pastoralism and genteel tourism first made Spangler’s Spring, and Culp’s Hill favorite spots for visitors to the battlefield before shifting tourist tastes left them behind. Jim Weeks’s work on Gettysburg’s culture of tourism and place as American shrine provide valuable clues to some possibilities as to why this shift happened and why it still matters today. In stark contrast to the romanticism of the battlefield’s monuments stand the haunting reality of war’s brutality. Christian Spielvogel’s perspective on the interpretive landscape of the battlefield unlocks this too often forgotten truth of Gettysburg. Indeed, the only readily evident indication of the nature of the fighting on Culp’s Hill is the presence of the supposed mass grass grave, though this has taken on the meaning of a shrine to the Lost Cause and Confederate memory rather than a tribute to the carnage of the fighting along the ground bordering it.

C.

Tour Stop 1: Spangler’s Spring

At the base of Culp’s Hill is a slight dip in the ground with a set of steps leading to a semi-domed stone and concrete structure. Beneath this capped structure lies Spangler’s Spring, a
source of water used by residents of the area, soldiers, and visitors to the park. The spring was
only discovered in 1847, though it sat upon an already popular picnic ground.\textsuperscript{16} As an idyllic
picnic ground, Spangler’s Spring saw so many visitors come to drink from it that the War
Department ordered the current capped, stone and concrete structure built over the spring in 1895
to prevent damage. Nevertheless, visitors could still drink from the spring until the National Park
Service took over management of the Battlefield in the 1930s.

After the battle, tourists joined local picnickers in visiting the ground upon which fighting
had occurred. The first waves of tourists to the battlefield often dubbed themselves “pilgrims” in
their journeys to America’s sacred spaces, of which Gettysburg was now one.\textsuperscript{17} Central to the
notion of sanctity and Gettysburg is the natural features of the landscape, which lent themselves
perfectly to the Victorian ideal of touring both natural spaces and places that symbolized the
nation’s progress.\textsuperscript{18} The scene of one of the bloodiest struggles of the Civil War fit the bill
perfectly. Soon on the heels of this scene followed the myths of reconciliation that mark the
public perception of the area to this day.

During the night of July 2 and the early morning hours of July 3, 1863, both Union and
Confederate soldiers visited the springs to refill canteens. Although soldiers of the opposing
forces may have crossed paths at the Spring, nothing like the myths of ceasefires between enemy
combatants seems to have occurred. One account, for instance, tells of 23 Confederate soldiers
being taken prisoner near the spring, all with their canteens out looking for water.\textsuperscript{19} Reports
mentioning fraternization at Spangler’s Spring describe accidental meetings and a “live-let-live”

\textsuperscript{17} Weeks 37
\textsuperscript{18} Weeks, 16.
\textsuperscript{19} Charles Morse, \textit{Letters Written during the Civil War} (Boston: T. R. Marvin and Son, 1898), 828, quoted in Pfanz, “Appendix A: Spangler’s Spring.”
mentality. Corporal Horatio Chapman of the 20th Connecticut, for example, said that he knew soldiers getting water at the spring were Confederates, and he was sure that they knew he and his comrades were Union. Nevertheless, they filled their canteens and returned safely to their lines.20

Why has the myth of Spangler’s Spring as a shrine to fraternization become so popular? “One country and one flag. The strife of brothers is past,” one of the plaques on the current structure reads, echoing the sentiments of many visitors who stop at this spot on the battlefield.21 The message of a conflict, and the causes over which it was fought, having been settled plants a misleading image of the battlefield as a politically neutral space populated by eternal stone sentinels. Nearby monuments, however, destroy this belief.

Tour Stop 2: Second Maryland Monument

Up the hill from Spangler’s Spring, and across from the 29th Pennsylvania Monument is the 2nd Maryland Infantry’s monument. During the evening of July 2, the 2nd Maryland participated in the four Confederate assaults on Culp’s Hill that bloodily failed. Nevertheless, the Marylanders occupied a section of vacant trenches on the lower slopes of Culp’s Hill following their attack. They held this position until the next morning when Union troops pushed them off the hill with heavy losses. The series of grassy mounds around the 2nd Maryland Monument represent these breastworks, though these works, date only to a Civilian Conservation Corps project in the 1930s.

The 2nd Maryland Monument became the first Confederate Monument dedicated on the battlefield on November 19, 1886, though only after encountering fierce resistance from Union veterans and Battlefield Commissioners. At the time of the Battle of Gettysburg, the 2nd

20 Horatio Chapman, Civil War Diary of a Forty-Niner (Hartford, CT: Allis, 1929), 22, quoted in Pfanz, “Appendix A: Spangler’s Spring.”
21 Spangler’s Spring.
Maryland bore the designation of the 1st Maryland Battalion, a title also held by one of the Union units facing the Confederates on Culp's Hill. The Confederate veterans agreed to place the 2nd Maryland as the official regimental name on the monument, though a well-carved reminder of the original name sits directly above the official one.

The text on the monument does little to indicate any motive other than to commemorate the fighting in which the Marylanders engaged. On the monument are the casualties and commanders of the unit along with a brief account of the position occupied by the 2nd Maryland. The imagery on the monument at first glance appears to be apolitical as well, aside from indicating pride in the State of Maryland. The state seal of Maryland appears on the side of the monument facing the road, and then four Bottony (Calvert) Crosses appear on each side. This, then, is where the hidden nature of the monument emerges. The Bottony Cross became a widely-used symbol for Maryland Confederates during the Civil War, becoming so widespread that Union authorities forbade their wearing in Baltimore. The symbol’s ties to the Confederacy are almost entirely forgotten today, leaving few clues to the untrained eye about the actual nature of this monument.

In a speech given three days before the Monument Dedication, General Bradley T. Johnson – a former commander of many who served in the 2nd Maryland – addressed a meeting of Maryland Confederate veterans regarding the upcoming dedication of the Monument. The purpose of the monument emerges here. Towards the end of the speech, Johnson states that “we can show that we [the Confederate Veterans of Maryland] have power; and power always

---

compels respect. I hope, therefore, that our demonstration for Friday to Gettysburg will be impressive.”

Thus, the monument stood and still stands, as an early beacon of the Lost Cause: a sense of post-war Southern nationalism that could stand defiantly against the Northern victors.

**Tour Stop #3: Confederate Burial Pits**

In the woods to the rear of the 2nd Maryland Monument is an indentation in the ground, most likely marked by miniature Confederate Battle Flags. This spot is believed by many to be a Confederate burial pit, although there is little definitive evidence to prove this assumption. Yes, Union soldiers dug burial trenches further down the hill from the 2nd Maryland Monument’s location, and several burials appear to exist in this general area of the field per a map produced in 1864. However, many observers have pointed out that the supposed trench looks different from other known burials on Culp’s Hill.

If the site is an actual burial pit, what would the burials have looked like in 1863? A boy who visited Culp’s Hill in the days after the fighting described the burials as follows:

They [Union soldiers] were burying the dead there in long narrow ditches about two feet deep, They'd lay in a man at the end of the trench and put in the next man with the upper half of his body on the first man's legs, and so on. They got 'em in as thick as they could and only covered 'em enough to prevent their breeding disease. All the pockets of the dead men were turned out. Probably that was done by the soldiers who did the burying. They thought they might find a ring, or money, or something else of value.

---


25 Janney, 136.


The burial trenches at first appear to emerge as a means of distinguishing between those dead who were comrades and those who were foes. However, this method also came about as a matter of necessity, as the Army of the Potomac left Gettysburg in pursuit of the Confederates on July 5. Nevertheless, the act of burying the dead in common graves without definite names attached to corpses terrified Civil War Era soldiers. So, too, did looting the dead make many soldiers uncomfortable. As the war dragged on, however, many soldiers looted corpses with greater frequency to obtain clothing.

Most battlefield deaths and burials, though especially mass graves, flew in the face of Victorian sensibilities defining the “good” death. The good death, as described by Drew Gilpin Faust, followed a script that drew heavily upon notions of death among family and friends in which the dying can speak calmly and with the conviction that they would soon be in heaven. Elements of the good death filtered into non-Protestant sectors of society by the 1860s, only for the Civil War to then upend many of these practices. Battlefield deaths were often painful and lonely, and few individuals fell close enough to home for relatives or friends to see and speak to them before they died.

Even in the case where relatives fought alongside those who were killed, the good death was often difficult to enact. For example, a North Carolinian named John Futch who fought on Culp’s Hill wrote to his wife about the death of his brother Charlie in a series of letters. In one letter, John states that he “staid with Charly untill he died he never spoke after he was woundid untill he died.” Although John says in a later letter that he buried Charlie, the inability of the

29 Faust, 74-75.
30 Faust, 6-9.
31 John Futch to Martha Futch, July 19, 1863.
soldiers to send Charlie’s body home or give him a formal burial weighed heavily upon John’s heart.  

Notice once again the small “Rebel” flags placed into the supposed burial trench by visitors. According to Historian Peter Carmichael, this area has only received such recognition by visitors in the last four to five years. Visitors in the present, just as at the monument up the hill from it, transformed the pit into a shrine to the Lost Cause. The unofficial memorial that has emerged at this site shows that the memory of sacrifice, though specifically here Southern sacrifice, are far from forgotten in the minds of many Americans.

**Tour Stop 4: 137th New York Monument**

Further down Slocum Avenue from the 2nd Maryland Monument stands a monument to their opponents from the night of July 2: the 137th New York Infantry. The monument marks the original positions held by the 137th New York on the evening of July 2, which they were pushed back into by Confederate flanking attacks point during the fighting. They held this position until they were relieved by reinforcing Union troops from further down the line, suffering heavy casualties in the process.

The monument was erected and dedicated in 1888, and, though initially vague in its symbolism, the text of the monument is more straightforward in its support of the Union Cause. The New Yorkers’ heroism earned them a “proud position in the history of the ‘Great Rebellion,’” one portion of the monument declares. Even the use of the term ‘Great Rebellion’ places the monument squarely within a political stance on the constitutionality of the actions of

---

32 John Futch to Martha Futch, August 6, 1863.
34 137th New York Infantry Monument
the seceded states, and thus within the context of the memory of the Union Cause. The symbolism on the monument achieves this as well, depicting a cartridge box between two crossed muskets surrounded by a laurel wreath – the classical symbol of triumph. The crossed rifles and cartridge box, meanwhile, speak to pride in Union service. These themes are essential to one of the core Union Cause tenants of the services of citizen-soldiers in defense of the Union and the Constitution.\textsuperscript{35} The listing of casualty counts on the reverse side of the monument reinforces this claim as well by highlighting the sacrifices of these citizen soldiers. The lack of explanatory text on the monument as to why the men fought also finds an explanation in the Union Cause; historian Gary Gallagher points out that veterans largely expected visitors to understand why the men fought.\textsuperscript{36}

The area surrounding the 137th New York Monument on Upper Culp’s Hill attracted throngs of visitors in search of bullets in the years directly following the war. Although Gettysburg Monument and Battlefield Association members threatened legal action against those who took axes and picks to the trees of Culp’s Hill, tourists continued to hunt for bullets embedded in the trees for decades to come. Even the trees themselves were not safe from relic hunters, as natural objects such as flowers, moss, and bark also possessed certain sacred, romantic associations in the memory of Gettysburg.\textsuperscript{37} For some, these mementos provided a personal connection to where they or relatives had fought. For example, red flowers and berries were evocative of the blood shed during the fighting to many visitors, melding romantic pastoral perspectives with patriotic memories of the sacrifices of Gettysburg.\textsuperscript{38} Given the sacred associations heaped upon Gettysburg, it is little surprise that many visitors felt compelled to

\textsuperscript{35} Gallagher, 157.
\textsuperscript{36} Gallagher, 157.
\textsuperscript{37} Weeks, 41.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
attempt to harvest relics of the fighting, just as, many a medieval pilgrim relished an opportunity to touch or possess relics of a saint.

D.

As one of the most under visited portions of the battlefield, the rich interpretive landscape of Culp’s Hill and Spangler’s Spring offers a rich cross-section of the history of the Battlefield that few visitors experience. Spangler’s Spring echoes the myths of soldiers fraternizing amongst the chaos of war, removing, at least temporarily, the carnage and suffering of the surrounding landscape and the political meanings of that suffering. Additionally, the message of reconciliation turns foes into brothers who simply had a terrible quarrel, lessening the cost and ramifications of the conflict as a whole.

The monuments to the 2nd Maryland and the 137th New York stand in contrast to one another and Spangler’s Spring. These two monuments speak, respectively, to the Lost Cause and the Union Cause, showing the themes of reunion without reconciliation. The New Yorker’s laurels of victory conflict with the defiant Calvert Crosses of the Marylanders, eradicating Spangler’s Springs’s message. So, too, does the supposed Confederate burial pit contribute to this message, though complicating the dynamic by introducing a modern, undying devotion to the Lost Cause in many visitors to the battlefield.

The more recent sanctification of the supposed burial trench and the capped spring remind visitors that battlefields, and thus national parks, are not static entities. Where once tourists flocked to hunt for gruesome relics of the fighting are now only the occasional groups of curious visitors. Nevertheless, genteel tourism and pastoralism still hold sway over many visitors
to Gettysburg, as evidenced by the continued role of Gettysburg, to many, as a shrine to liberty and American sacrifices in its name.
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