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historic name: Fort Marrow

other names/site number: 46Rd694
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street & number: __________________________ not for publication: X
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3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant nationally ___ statewide ___ locally. (___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)
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See continuation sheet.
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See continuation sheet.
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See continuation sheet.

___ other (explain):
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5. Classification

Ownership of Property

- X private
- public-local
- public-State
- public-Federal

Category of Property

- X building(s)
- district
- site
- structure
- object

Number of Resources within Property

- Contributing
- Noncontributing
- buildings
- sites
- structures
- objects
- Total

- 1
- 1
- 1
- 1
- 2
- 2

Name of related multiple property listing

N/A

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions

Cat: Defense
Sub: fortification, military facility

Current Functions

Cat: Funerary
Sub: cemetery

Cat: Landscape
Sub: private park

7. Description

Architectural Classification

not applicable

Materials (Enter categories from instructions)

- Foundation: N/A
- roof: N/A
- walls: earth
- other: N/A

Narrative Description

See attached sheets
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Significance

- Military
- Archeology – Historic- Non-Aboriginal

Period of Significance

- 1861-1862

Significant Dates

- 1861

Significant Person

- not applicable

Cultural Affiliation

- American

Architect/Builder

- not applicable

Criteria Considerations

- A. owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- B. removed from its original location.
- C. a birthplace or a grave.
- D. a cemetery.
- E. a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- F. a commemorative property.
- G. less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Narrative Statement of Significance

See attached sheets

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography

See attached sheets.

Previous documentation on file (NPS)

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #

Primary Location of Additional Data

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other State agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of repository: ____________________________
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property approximately 8 acres

UTM References

Zone 17
Easting [redacted]
Northing [redacted]

Verbal Boundary Description
See continuation sheets

Boundary Justification
See continuation sheets
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Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets
Maps
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Fort Marrow is part of a Civil War fortification complex located in Randolph County, West Virginia. The earthwork complex includes an encampment area for the men who would have manned the fort, which is represented by ten depressions north of the fort site identified as tent/hut sites by an archaeological survey.

The Fort Marrow site is located in the southern portion of the site on the edge of the ridgeline. The southern face of the fort is located directly above the valley floor with a view of the road as it passes through the valley. The fort and associated camp sites are located on a gently sloping ridge. The tent/hut sites are just north of the 2240 foot contour line in tree cover. The nominated area is in forest canopy, for the most part deciduous trees perhaps ten to twenty years old, though there are some larger, more mature trees. The tree cover is dense enough to slow understory growth, which leaves the site open and easily accessible.

The area between the tent/hut sites and the redoubt is somewhat open, with a mix of young and old trees and some understory plants. This area slopes gently to the south. The redoubt is in tree canopy, with a leaf mat covering both the parapet and the ditch. The tree canopy has helped protect the earthwork from erosion. Trees are growing in both the ditch and along the parapet. The southeast face of the redoubt has the most understory growth.

A two-track road enters the site and proceeds southeasterly until it reaches the fort, where it swings to the west and then due south, ending at the sally port. Trees, grasses and other vegetation reach the edge of the road.

The Fort Marrow site includes one contributing structure, one contributing site, one noncontributing site and one noncontributing structure (Map 2).

Fort Marrow
Fort Marrow (1), constructed by the Union army in the late summer of 1861 as part of the defenses for Camp Elkwater, is a contributing structure and the most prominent feature within the nominated area. The fort is a seven-sided earthen field fortification known as a redoubt, an enclosed earthwork generally designed to repel attacks from all sides. Though constructed as part of a larger defensive system, Fort Marrow is a stand-alone fortification.

Generally, redoubts are encircled by ditches, which are an integral part of the design of the defensive position. The ditch is the key to the defense of the fortification and is the first obstacle
the enemy encounters in the assault of a fortification. Once the ditch is taken, the attackers must climb from the floor of the ditch to the top of the parapet (wall), a height of eight to twelve feet, which must be done while the soldiers holding the fort are firing upon the attackers.  

The ditch at Fort Marrow only covers the northern half of the fort. Given the steepness of the slope on the fort's southern side, where the ridge falls off into the flood plain, a ditch was probably not seen as necessary; the natural terrain provided the same obstacles as those of an engineered ditch (Map 3).

The wall of Fort Marrow, the parapet, remains in very good condition. In the northwest section of the fort the parapet has a “V” shaped bend. This bend enabled the defenders to deploy enfilading fire, crossfire, on attackers. This wall of the fort faced uphill and was its most vulnerable area, requiring a strong defense (Map 3).

The remains of the fort demonstrate that it was designed to accommodate field artillery and the historical record documents at least one battery of artillery at Fort Marrow. There are two or possibly three small depressions in the west wall which are probably embrasures, or cannon slots. Given that artillery at Fort Marrow would have been used to cover the turnpike as well as Hamilton Run ravine, embrasures should also be present in the southwest wall of the fort. However, none are visible. They could be eroded or the artillery in this area may have been mounted enbarbette, that is, mounted to fire over the wall rather than through it.

There are two breaks in the walls of the fort, one on the west wall and one on the southeast wall. It is unclear which of these was the original fort entrance, or sally port, although the size and position of the gap on the west wall makes it the more likely. The gap in the southeast wall is probably the result of erosion. Within the fort is a slight rise near the northeast wall. This could be a remnant of the powder magazine but it may also be buildup due to the cemetery located here (Map 3).

The fort is in a good to excellent state of preservation. Most of the walls are about seven to nine feet above the ditch floor and about three to five feet high along the south half where no ditch is present.

---

1 D. H. Mahan, *A Treatise on Field Fortifications*, John Wiley, New York, 1863, pp.5-7. Mahan also mentions that taking the ditch is the key to the assault on the fortification. Mahan taught engineering at West Point.
Tent/hut Sites
The ten tent/hut sites (2) located north of Fort Marrow are a contributing site to the Fort Marrow nomination and are probably the most significant archaeological resource at the Fort Marrow complex. These tent/hut sites are located approximately 65 meters northwest of the fort along a roughly east-west line at the base of the slope between the 2240' and 2280' contours. Some of the men who manned the fort would have lived in this area. A recent archaeological investigation of the tent/hut sites determined that they possess intact archaeological deposits with good integrity (Map 2).

These tent or hut features consist of square to rectangular depressions cut or terraced into the hillside. They range in size from 21 x 10 feet to 8 x 10 feet. The largest tent/hut depressions are numbers 1, 3, 4, and 9, which range from 21 x 10 feet to 16 x 11 feet (Map 2). These depressions are nearly twice as wide as tents/huts 5, 6, 7, and 10, which range from 11 x 10 feet to 8 x 10 feet. Tents/huts 2 and 8 fall in between, and are 14 x 10 feet and 13 x 10 feet, respectively. While these depressions vary greatly in width (east-west), they are remarkably consistent in height (north-south), being either 10 or 11 feet in this direction. These features are consistent with winter hut depressions from other Civil War sites. There is also one round deeper depression north of Fort Marrow. The circular depression is 13 x 18 feet in size and may be the remnant of a powder magazine or other storage cellar (Map 2).

Current research on Civil War tents and winter huts suggests that there was considerable variation in their form, size and construction methods. The three basic tent forms are common rectangular tents or shelter tents made from two gum blankets or ponchos, wedge (or A) tents, and wall tents. Winter huts were generally much more variable in size and construction methods. They were built of horizontal or vertical logs, sawn boards, or of a combination of materials, including canvas tents, which were often used as the hut’s roof.

Based upon the archaeological investigations, Dr. W. Stephen McBride surmised that it was probable that the smaller tent/hut depressions (5, 6, 7 and 10) and even the middle sized ones (2 and 8) were four-man structures. The larger depressions clearly held either more men or were for higher ranking officers. The largest depressions, particularly tents/huts 1 and 3, may represent two structures each, or a double structure. If the larger structures were for enlisted men, they probably held six to eight men each, making this row of tents/huts home for 48 to 60 men. The

---


3 Geier, Orr and Reeves, *Huts and History*, pp. 18-19, 180, 43 and 177-193.
historic record indicates that one or more companies of the 3rd Ohio Infantry and part of a Michigan battery were encamped here in the summer and fall of 1861. A full Civil War era company was 100 men and full artillery battery was 150 men. Depending upon the number of infantry companies encamped at the fort site and the number of guns mounted in the fort, there could have been as many as 650 men at this location. That number seems unlikely; however the figure of 48 to 60 seems low.  

In the course of the archaeological investigation, additional artifacts that could indicate more encampment sites were located between the tent/hut sites and the fort. These artifacts were not associated with depressions. More archaeological investigation in this area may reveal the presence of additional encampments features. Tent/hut features demonstrate that the fort was manned and that tangible remains of the men who defended the fort are extant.

Hamilton Cemetery
Hamilton Cemetery (3), a small family cemetery located within the earthworks of Fort Marrow, is a noncontributing site, though the cemetery was extant, albeit much smaller, when the fort was constructed. There 77 marked graves and approximately five unmarked burials in the cemetery. Surnames on grave markers include Hamilton, Stalnaker, Gibson, Heldrick, Pritt, Binder, Welsh and Moore. There is also a monument/memorial in the cemetery that reads:

Noah Hadden's Indian fort was built here in 1762 the cemetery is encircled by artillery breast works. A part of Camp Elkwater, Union army 1861-62. The burial site of Boston Stalnaker and six generations of his descendants. Erected by the A. Z. Hamilton family 1970.

Boston Stalnaker, who died ca. 1820, is the earliest burial in the cemetery. The latest burial is Ruby H. Gibson, who died February 13, 2009. The cemetery is closed to further burials, though family members will continue to have access.

The cemetery, which is located within the walls of the fort, has had the most impact on the fort’s integrity. Fortunately, there is a gap between the fort’s walls and the graves so the parapet has not been adversely affected. However, the Civil War archaeological features within the fort have certainly been severely impacted by the cemetery. The cemetery makes any archaeological investigation of the interior of the fort impossible (Map 2).

Two-track road

---
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The two-track road (4) running south to Fort Marrow is a noncontributing structure. The road, which provides access to Hamilton Cemetery, has not impacted the tent sites or any of the historic features of the fort and has a very low overall impact on the integrity of the nominated area (Map 2).

The nominated area is approximately 8 acres and is located as indicated on the Adolph, West Virginia USGS quadrangle map (Map 1). The tract is oriented north-south and is wooded, with grass and other undergrowth. Fort Marrow is located in the southern portion of the tract, just north of the 2200' contour line on what military engineers call the military crest. The tent/hut sites are located approximately 150 feet north of the northern edge of the fortification (Map 4).

Conclusion
The two noncontributing elements do not greatly detract from the integrity of the Fort Marrow site. The fort was sited to take advantage of the terrain associated with the Huntersville Turnpike and the Tygart Valley River. The fort was built on the edge (military crest) of a ridge above the turnpike. The location of the road and a bend in the river would have forced attackers to assault the earthwork head on or to try to find a way around to hit the fort from the west or north. The latter would have required traversing high ridges. The location of the fort also allowed defenders to see south along both the turnpike and the river valley for at least a mile. This location gave the defenders, those within the fort, a strong advantage over any soldiers coming up the valley. Even with the growth of trees and other vegetation at the fort, the view along US 219 is still remarkable.
Statement of Significance

Fort Marrow has statewide and local significance and is eligible under Criterion A for its association with the *Operations in Western Virginia Campaign (June-December 1861)* in West Virginia. The results of this campaign, the defeat of Confederate armies at the Battles of Philippi, Rich Mountain, Cheat Mountain and Carnifex Ferry, forced the Confederacy to abandon Western Virginia and to surrender control of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Kanawha River to the Union. As a result, Unionists were able to create the state of West Virginia.

The site contains significant intact Civil War era deposits, including some relatively deep midden and tent/hut platforms, making this site eligible under Criterion D. This site is an excellent place to investigate research questions related to the daily camp life, camp layout, camp architecture, and the equipment of Union soldiers. The early dates and short occupation span of this encampment make it especially good for addressing questions related to conditions during the first year of the Civil War.

The Fort Marrow site is the tangible remains of a Union defensive position that played an important part in the very significant *Operations in Western Virginia Campaign (June-December 1861)*. The site is part of Camp Elkwater, which played a significant role in the defeat of Confederate General Robert E. Lee’s army at the Battle of Cheat Mountain on September 12, 1861. The strongly defended position kept the Confederates from attacking the Union position in the Tygart Valley River valley and forced the Confederates to take their offensive into the mountains.

Fort Marrow has integrity of location, setting, design, association and feeling. The location, setting, and design of the fort remain the same as when it was constructed in 1861. From the fort, the approach from the south can clearly be seen; the design of the fort was such that it protected the soldiers in the fort and in the encampment behind the fort, in the river valley, from an attack. The noncontributing structure (two-track road) and site (Hamilton Cemetery) do not greatly detract from the integrity of the fort. The overall fortification complex, which includes the tent/hut sites, retains excellent integrity.

History

*The Operations in Western Virginia Campaign*

Two West Virginia transportation routes were deemed to have strategic military value by both sides in the early months of the war, the Kanawha River and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad (B&O). Both sides also had a political objective. The loyal people of the western part of Virginia
sought to remain in the Union and Governor William Dennison of Ohio, with the backing of the Lincoln administration, urged the people of western Virginia to organize a loyal state government. However, this undertaking would be difficult or impossible to achieve if the Confederates continued to wield influence in western Virginia.¹

In late May 1861, Confederate forces burned B&O Railroad bridges west of Grafton, cutting the main railroad from the west into Washington. This action forced the Union to act and Federal troops under the command General George B. McClellan were ordered into Western Virginia.²

McClellan quickly brought results. Victories at Philippi, Laurel Hill, Rich Mountain and Corricks Ford in June-July 1861 secured Federal control of West(ern) Virginia. Those triumphs made McClellan the North’s first battlefield hero. On July 22, 1861, following the Union defeat at Manassas, President Lincoln called McClellan, now known as the “Young Napoleon,” to Washington.³

McClellan believed that he had achieved victory and cleared Western Virginia of the rebel menace. He wrote from his headquarters in Huttonsville prior to leaving for Washington: “Our success is complete, and secession is killed in this country.”⁴ However, the Confederates were not done and the issue of who would hold western Virginia was not settled. Three more engagements would be fought before the Confederates were forced out of the mountains.

Prior to McClellan’s departure, he placed General William Rosecrans in charge of Western Virginia, with orders to build fortifications blocking the main roads leading south. Rosecrans moved department headquarters to the B & O Railroad at Clarksburg and left General Joseph J. Reynolds in command of the First Brigade, Army of Occupation, at Huttonsville, in Randolph County.⁵

---

Reynolds' orders were to hold the ground won. Key to his defenses was an important pass atop Cheat Mountain on the Staunton-Parkersburg Turnpike leading to the Shenandoah Valley. On July 16, 1861, six companies of the 14th Indiana Infantry regiment occupied that rugged mountain wilderness and began to fortify.⁶

By July 30, soldiers of the 15th Indiana Infantry had pitched their tents along the Tygart Valley River and began to fortify the narrow valley floor at Elkwater. These works blocked a road leading to the Virginia Central Railroad. Other Union regiments soon joined the 15th Indiana at Camp Elkwater.⁷

**Camp Elkwater**
On August 4, 1861, the 3rd Ohio Infantry arrived at Elkwater. This regiment erected “Fort Marrow,” naming the redoubt for their colonel, Isaac Marrow. The labor involved in constructing the fort was tremendous. Soldiers felled acres of forest to construct breastworks and clear fields of fire. Colonel George D. Wagner of the 15th Indiana kept nearly a third of his regiment constantly in front, scouting and standing guard. The outlying pickets, when relieved, returned to camp only to exchange their rifles for spades or axes.

Fort Marrow was the key to the Union defensive position at Camp Elkwater. It was a seven-sided redoubt built on a bluff overlooking the Tygart Valley River. The fortification commanded the approach to the encampment and enabled the fort's battery of artillery to fire on any approaching force long before they got into small arms range. The guns of the redoubt could support the infantry in the forward works. Fort Marrow was well placed. As noted above, its location would have made assault by infantry on the work difficult at best (Map 5).

Camp Elkwater was an admirably chosen position. Bold mountain spurs jut into the narrow valley, leaving a stretch of bottomland barely five hundred yards wide. A member of the Sixth Ohio Infantry recalled:

> Between the river and the road lay a beautiful meadow, which was traversed with formidable earthworks, consisting of a regular parapet, with a ditch in front, and embrasures at favorable points for artillery. On the further side of [Tygart Valley River], and a few yards in advance of the earthworks, was 'Rich Mountain Battery,' half hidden in the shadows of the forest rising behind and above it, and so located

---
⁶ William Houghton, Diary, July 16, 1861, M-147, Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis, Indiana.
that its cannon could sweep the meadow in front of the parapet and enfilade the ditch. There were log breastworks on the peak also, but this elevation was so nearly inaccessible that it was regarded rather as a post of observation than a part of the line to be defended.

The hill-sides across the valley (on the Rich Mountain side) were fortified with greater care, however, by means of rude redans or open field-works, composed of logs and filled in with earth and stones. These were the works upon which the Sixth Ohio chiefly expended its energies. ‘Fort Marrow,’ situated upon a hill above the turnpike, commanded a suspicious-looking ravine leading into camp from the westward, and garrisoned by Company A, of the Third Ohio [Infantry], to which was afterward added a small detachment of Loomis’ [1st Michigan] Artillery.  

By late August, the force at Elkwater consisted of 15th Indiana Infantry commanded by Col. George D. Wagner; the 3rd Ohio Infantry commanded by Col. Isaac Marrow; the 6th Ohio Infantry commanded by Col. William K. Bosley; 17th Indiana Infantry commanded by Col. Milo Hascall; five companies of the 9th Ohio Infantry commanded by Col. Robert McCook; five companies of the 23rd Ohio Infantry commanded by Col. E.P. Scammon; and the Coldwater (Michigan) Battery commanded by Capt. C.O. Loomis—in all some 4,000 men. Regimental camps stretched along the river for more than a mile north of the fortifications. Many notables served in larger Camp Elkwater, including future members of Congress, a Supreme Court Justice, and future Presidents Rutherford B. Hayes and William McKinley.

Defeat of General Robert E. Lee
By August 1861, the Confederate Army of the Northwest, now led by General William W. Loring, had advanced to the Greenbrier River, just twelve miles southeast of the Union forces on Cheat Mountain and Valley Mountain, fourteen miles south of Elkwater. Loring’s army, on paper at least, was nearly 11,000 strong. Union Gen. Reynolds could muster no more than 9,000 men.
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General Robert E. Lee soon followed Loring to the mountains to direct the offensive. Lee hoped to strike the unfinished Union works but was delayed by severe weather. Sickness swept the Confederate camps, triggered by relentless rain, impassible roads, and bitter cold—even snow in mid-August.  

Nonetheless, on September 9, the Confederates launched an attack. Three Southern brigades slipped undetected through the mountain wilderness, while others marched up the turnpikes to confront the Federals at Cheat Mountain and Camp Elkwater (Map 6).  

Gen. Lee’s elaborate plan collapsed when a surprise assault of Cheat Summit Fort failed. Hoping to salvage victory on September 12, Lee followed a brigade of Tennessee Confederates to a mountain overlooking the rear of Camp Elkwater. His disappointment was evident in a letter to Virginia Governor John Letcher, dated September 17, 1861:  

> I could see the enemy’s tents on Valley River, at the point of the Huttonsville road just below me. It was a tempting sight. We waited for the attack on Cheat Mountain, which was to be the signal, till 10 A.M.; the men were cleaning their unserviceable arms. But the signal did not come.  

The Confederates were in no condition to assault Camp Elkwater. A fierce storm had soaked their gunpowder, destroyed their scant provisions, and sapped their will. On September 13, Lee probed the Union right flank at Elkwater. The death of Lee’s aide-de-camp John A. Washington put an end to the skirmishing, which had largely been undertaken by elements of Lee’s cavalry and the 17th Indiana Infantry, which was deployed as skirmishers south of Fort Marrow on either side of the Huntersville Turnpike. Lt. Col. Washington had been Lee’s good friend and tent mate—and the last of that famous family to own Mount Vernon. By September 15, the Confederates had withdrawn.  

Lee’s first campaign ended in failure. He had nearly been captured behind enemy lines and his reputation was badly tarnished. Lee returned to Richmond in late October 1861, leaving Western Virginia firmly in Union hands. Southern newspapers called him the “Great Entrencher,” and  

---

10 Lesser, Rebels at the Gate, pp. 143-144, 159-160, 167-170, 183-184.  
"Granny Lee." Adding insult, the loyal Unionists of that region had voted to create a new state—West Virginia.\(^\text{13}\)

**Staging Area and Winter Quarters**
Federal troops garrisoned Camp Elkwater through the first year of war. Regiments were detached to fight at Greenbrier River (October 3, 1861) and Camp Allegheny (December 13, 1861), both Confederate victories. In spite of these victories, which were defensive in nature in that the Confederates held their fortified positions, they failed to achieve their larger objective, to push the Union out of western Virginia. Camp Elkwater remained active throughout its existence as a staging area for raids and scouting expeditions.\(^\text{14}\)

In November 1861, a soldier of the 6th Ohio recalled:

> the most hopeful heart at Elkwater [realized] that winter was closing in. Drill grounds became spreading acres of mud, and camp, in spite of ditching and abundant drainage, was scarcely better, while the roads were bottomless.\(^\text{15}\)

Members of the 3rd Ohio Infantry built log huts for winter quarters, while soldiers of the 6th “contented themselves with building sod fire-places, and in other ways fixing up their canvas tents.”\(^\text{16}\) Whiskey was abundant at Camp Elkwater, some of it supplied illicitly by Squire Stalnaker, a mountaineer who lived between the camps of the two regiments. In late November, much of the garrison departed for Kentucky. The soldiers cheered their orders to vacate the lonely post.

Among those not so fortunate were troops of the 2nd and 3rd Virginia Infantry (U.S.). One of the latter wrote:

> The months of February and March [1862] brought to Camp Elkwater the severest weather that had visited that place in many years, which made the life of the soldiers monotonous indeed. There was snow, rain, freezing day and night,

\(^{13}\) Lesser, *Rebels at the Gate*, pp. 196, 198-204, 215-217.


which compelled the soldier to remain within his tent or log hut, except when duty called...\textsuperscript{17}

Although raiding parties bivouacked here later in the war, Camp Elkwater was mostly abandoned by April 1862.

Camp Elkwater served the Union army well. The stubborn Midwestern and mountaineer soldiers refused to be pushed out of the valley by the Confederates. Fort Marrow also served its purpose. Perhaps when General Lee looked down the valley and saw the fort bristling with guns he thought twice about pushing his attack with vigor. As D.H. Mahan wrote in his fortification manual:

\begin{quote}
As a field fort must rely entirely on its own strength, it should be constructed with such care that the enemy will be forced to abandon an attempt to storm it, and be obliged to resort to the method of regular approaches used in the attack of permanent works.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

In other words, if the field fortification is strong enough an enemy will not attack it and may have to resort to a siege. Fort Marrow achieved this end; there was no attack. The fort accomplished its purpose.

**Criterion A: Military**
Criterion A: Military was chosen because the main feature on the site is an earthen redoubt constructed by the Union army in 1861. The redoubt, though a stand alone fort, was part of a larger effort by the Union army to protect the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, to control the Kanawha River and expel the Confederates from western Virginia. Fort Marrow and the Union troops encamped there and in larger Camp Elkwater participated in the *Operations in Western Virginia Campaign*. As a result of this campaign, the Confederates were driven from the region. Politically, Union victory in this campaign led directly to the formation of the state of West Virginia. Fort Marrow is a tangible link to this campaign and the Union soldiers that helped pave the way for the formation of the state.

\textsuperscript{17} Hannaford, *The Story of A Regiment*, pp. 153-156; Theodore F. Lang, *Loyal West Virginia From 1861 to 1865*. The Deutsch Publishing Co., Baltimore, Maryland, 1895, pp. 64, 211, 218.
\textsuperscript{18} Mahan, *A Treatise on Field Fortifications*, p. 17.
Criterion D: Archaeology
This site was also nominated under criterion D: Archaeology. By its very nature, the remains of a Civil War era fortification complex are an archaeological site. An archaeological investigation, which was part of the project that produced this national register nomination, determined that there was intact Civil War era midden, making the site an excellent place to investigate research questions related to the daily camp life, camp layout, camp architecture and equipment of Union soldiers.

The archaeologist, Dr. W. Stephen McBride, posed the following research questions for the site:

1) What is the spatial layout of the encampment? Did it conform to military regulations? Is there evidence of more huts/tents then the ten found during the survey? What is the nature of the artifact concentration around shovel test pit 4? Is this another hut/tent area, a cooking area, refuse area, or what?

2) What types of housing are present at Fort Marrow? Were these structures made of canvas, logs, boards, of a combination of these? What construction methods were utilized and how much variation in hut/tent size is present? Is there evidence of these huts/tents being heated?

3) Is there evidence of officer and enlisted men segregation at Fort Marrow? Is there evidence of artillery and infantry unit segregation at the site?

4) Given the early war nature of this site, the type and variety of military and personal material culture is of great interest. Is there evidence of early (out-dated) weaponry and state issued uniforms and equipment at this site? Do food and beverage consumption patterns follow military ration regulations or is there evidence of purchasing or foraging for other food and drink? Is there evidence of extensive alcohol consumption at this site?

Integrity
Overall this site retains excellent integrity. It has integrity of location, setting, feeling, association and materials. The tents/hut site retains good integrity as archaeological features. Fort Marrow is an intact Civil War era fortification with many of its original features extant. Visible features include the parapet, the ditch, sally port and gun embrasures.

The proximity of the fortification to US 219, the historic route of the Huntersville Turnpike, is intact. The view from the fort down the Tygart Valley River valley remains. The location of the
road and river were why the fort was sited in this location. The extant tent/hut sites show the relationship between the fortification and those charged with defending it.

The only two noncontributing features, the two-track road and the Hamilton Cemetery, do not greatly detract from the integrity of the site. The two-track road does not compromise the site at all. The cemetery is within Fort Marrow, and in fact, the fort was constructed around the cemetery, as evidenced by the earliest death date, 1820. It does detract from the visual integrity of the fortification, but only once the viewer is within the earthworks. It is very likely that the presence of the cemetery has helped preserve the fort. As noted above, continued use of the cemetery after the Civil War did not harm the parapet of the fort, though it would have damaged or destroyed any fort features built inside of the parapet.

Summary
Fort Marrow retains good integrity and has statewide and local significance for its role in the Operations in Western Virginia Campaign (June-December 1861). This campaign helped the Union army push the Confederates from Western Virginia, which allowed Unionists to create a new state, West Virginia. Fort Marrow is a tangible representation of the defensive works that were constructed by the Union army to help defend the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. The success of the fort and associated campaign allowed Unionists in Western Virginia to become the dominant force in the western counties of Virginia.
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Verbal Boundary Description

Beginning at a point approximately on the south line of the fortification complex and the north line of the fortification complex, the boundary shall be a straight line from that point to the north line of the fortification complex. From that point the boundary shall follow the north line of the fortification complex. There, the boundary turns nearly due west, closing the boundary.

Boundary Justification

The boundary as drawn encompasses the fortification complex including the associated tent/hut sites. These features are all of the extant historic and archaeological features associated with the Fort Marrow complex. Fort Marrow was key to the Union defensive position at Camp Elkwater.
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County: Randolph County
State: West Virginia
Name of Photographer: Joseph E. Brent
Date of Photographs: April 2009
Location of Original Digital Files: 129 Walnut Street, Versailles, KY 40383

1. Northwest Parapet and ditch at Fort Marrow looking SE.

2. Cemetery entrance and parapet of Fort Marrow looking SE

3. View of northwest corner of Fort Marrow from inside looking NW

4. Two track road to fort from Kumbrabow Road looking SE

5. Fort Marrow looking SW

6. Northern wall and ditch of Fort Marrow looking S

7. Interior of fort note Hamilton Cemetery with parapet in background looking NW

8. Looking north from fort toward encampment area

See Map 7