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- [ ] determined eligible for the National Register
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- [ ] other (explain:)
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5. **Classification**

**Ownership of Property**

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

- [ ] Private: X
- [ ] Public – Local
- [ ] Public – State
- [ ] Public – Federal

**Category of Property**

(Check only one box.)

- [ ] Building(s)
- [ ] District X
- [ ] Site
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Name of Property

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register  1

6. Function or Use
Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

- FUNERARY/cemetery
- RECREATION/park

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

- FUNERARY/cemetery
- RECREATION/park
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)
LATE VICTORIAN/Richardsonian Romanesque
LATE VICTORIAN/Second Gothic Revival
LATE 19th & 20th CENTURY REVIVALS/Colonial Revival
OTHER/cemetery

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property:
BRICK
STONE: Granite, Limestone, Marble, Slate
METAL: Copper, Bronze, Cast Iron
CONCRETE
GLASS

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

The Glenwood Cemetery is located at 2219 Lincoln Road in Northeast Washington, DC, 1.5 miles north of the U.S. Capitol. Continuously active since 1852, the 53.85-acre cemetery offers stylistic interpretations from the Rural Cemetery, Lawn Park, and Memorial Movements. The cemetery is categorized as a site containing more than 48,000 burials and re-interments. Although there are hundreds of significant memorials ranging from elaborate monuments to simple grave stones representing three important periods of cemetery aesthetics, this nomination includes 34 contributing resources as follows: one site, four buildings, 20 structures, and nine objects. The site consists of the cemetery in its entirety; the four buildings include the Gatekeeper’s Lodge, the Mortuary Chapel, a maintenance building and a shed; the 20 structures are identified as fifteen private mausolea, one public mausoleum, two gates, one continuous stone wall with iron fence, and one continuous iron fence; the nine objects are nine key grave markers as described in the text. The property also includes eleven non-contributing resources, identified as one site, two structures, and seven objects.
CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES

SITE
The Glenwood Cemetery, which includes approximately 48,000 burials and re-interments, is sited on 53.85 acres in northeast Washington, D.C. The cemetery is defined by approximately eight miles of roadway that meander over a gently rolling site with steeper grades at the eastern boundary. The serpentine pattern of the road system organizes the grounds into the existing twenty-one demarcated sections and three circles used for burials, a central circle containing a chapel, and a grassy ellipse at the Lincoln Road entrance.

The Glenwood Cemetery Visitor Map, 2000

The cemetery is located just outside the original boundaries of the City of Washington in what was the County of Washington, approximately 1.5 miles directly north of the U.S. Capitol. Although originally bounded to the east by Lincoln Road, NE and to the north, south, and west by privately-owned farmland, today it lies between two historic roads: North Capitol Street (the dividing line between D.C.’s western and eastern quadrants) and Lincoln Road, N.E. The cemetery’s irregular form, which now comprises 53.85 acres, is located directly east of North Capitol Street (extended beyond the Federal City between 1880 and 1894). The cemetery is shielded from road traffic by narrow developments of row houses on short, dead-end streets east of North Capitol Street. Lincoln Road, N.E., forms the cemetery’s southeast and eastern boundaries. Franklin Street, N.E. (established 1899), Trinity Washington University (formerly known as Trinity College, 1897), and a private apartment complex are located to the north on
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land formerly part of the cemetery, and to the south are Prospect Hill Cemetery (1858) and to the southeast St. Mary’s Catholic Cemetery (1870).

The cemetery is located in the upper portion of the Coastal Plain Physiographic Province, approximately two miles from the Fall Line, and the start of the Piedmont Province.\(^1\) Elevations above sea level within the property range from 120 to 180 feet over a rolling terrain marked by two valleys.\(^2\)

---


The cemetery’s boundaries form an irregular polygon, with its longest side on the east running along Lincoln Road, N.E. The gently rolling topography features curvilinear roads and burial sections. Serpentine roads emanate from the ellipse at the Main Gate and connect to four traffic circles, creating a web of circulation around and through the cemetery grounds. The southern portion of the winding road system in a natural setting is based on the Rural Cemetery aesthetic.

The 53.85 acres of The Glenwood Cemetery are picturesquely landscaped, with curving roads and carefully placed trees and shrubs framing a diverse collection of grave markers including monuments, statuary, headstones, plaques, mausolea, exedra, and columbaria. The terrain, the roadway system and curbs, and placement of the trees (cherry, oak, cypress, cedar, chestnut, holly, maple, and magnolia) and shrubs (azaleas are notable) contribute to the organization and overall appearance of the site. This ensemble of circulation system, topography and associated landscaping collectively forms the “site” as identified in the National Register nomination count under Contributing Resources.

The most significant character-defining feature of the cemetery is the curvilinear vehicular road system that was originally designed to serve horse-drawn carriages. Running along the perimeter, a road called the Tour was designed to route visitors around the cemetery, leading to the high ground at the rear and the best views. Chapel Circle is at the heart of the road system with secondary circles and roadways radiating throughout the grounds. The road system is of asphalt and features rolled curbing in some stretches. Early maps showing the cemetery sections and plots are attached as an appendix to this section.
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Photo 2: General view looking north from entry

Photo 3: General view
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Photo 4: General view

Photo 5: General view - Topography
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Common materials for markers including monuments, statuary, headstones and plaques are limestone, marble, granite, concrete, and metals such as zinc and bronze. The section markers include both small, square stones carved with a single letter and simple flat metal signs on metal posts. A few older section markers consisting of embossed and painted cast-iron shields on metal posts are also located throughout the cemetery.

Photo 6: Historic Section Marker

STRUCTURES

Stone Walls and Iron Fencing

The property is enclosed by a milled-point, cast-iron fence set on a stone wall on all sides except the southwest boundary that is shared with Prospect Hill Cemetery, where a milled-point, cast-iron fence divides the two cemeteries. The original 30 acres were bordered by an iron fence. The existing stone wall with iron fence was constructed in a series of campaigns starting in 1899 and completed in 1938. Generally, the stone wall is 2’6” high with the fence rising an additional 4’6” for a total height of 7’ as exposed to the cemetery’s interior, although the wall varies in height around the perimeter depending on the surrounding grade. The southwest boundary is enclosed by a 6’5” high, milled point cast iron fence set into the ground, and constructed in 1921. Along Lincoln Road and in some areas on the west boundary, the grade drops significantly between the cemetery grounds and street level. In these areas, the stone portion of the wall also functions as a retaining wall.
A section of the stone wall continues beyond the northern boundary established in 1973 when four acres were sold to a private developer. This wall represents the boundary line established in 1899 when the cemetery’s active burial area was expanded to include the full acreage under the corporation’s ownership following the sale of property for Trinity College. The current northern boundary is marked by cyclone fencing, adjacent to the 1978 housing development known as Franklin Commons.

**Main Gate**

The Main Gate was constructed in 1898 and is located at the Lincoln Road entrance on the cemetery’s southern boundary. It is formed of two square limestone piers, each topped by a rough-cut stone, rectangular pedestal, on which rests a cast-iron urn.\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) This gate was built for horse-drawn carriages, but is sufficiently wide to allow automobile entry today.
Spanning the piers is a bell-curved, wrought-iron filigree banner within which are set cast-iron letters that read “Glenwood Cemetery.” The words are separated by a scrolled finial at the top of the curve. Wrought-iron gates with decorative scrolled detailing span the piers. The cemetery’s Rules and Regulations are embossed on a black painted metal plaque affixed to the western pier. The eastern pier is directly adjacent to the stone wall and fence, while the western pier abuts a wrought iron pedestrian gate between the main gate and Gatekeeper’s Lodge. These gates were installed in 1898. This gate replaced the Classical Revival-style entrance lodge designed by de la Roche that had welcomed visitors to the cemetery at the time of its opening in 1854.

**Pedestrian Gate**

A second gate intended for pedestrian use, is located along the west property boundary, near the eastern terminus of Douglas Street.

---

Once used for access from North Capitol Street where the streetcar line stopped, this smaller gate structure is comprised of two ashlar, fieldstone piers, infilled by a double-leaf, segmental-arch, wrought-iron entry gate. Each leaf of the gate has a solid metal lower panel, a middle section of individual iron bars, and filigree scroll details under the curve of the arch. Spanning the piers is a wrought-iron filigree banner within which are set cast-iron letters that read “Glenwood Cemetery”. A cast-iron plaque presenting cemetery rules and regulations is affixed to the gate. This gate is no longer in active use as an entry to the cemetery.

**Mausolea**

The contributing Public Mausoleum at Glenwood, also referred to as the Receiving Vault, served as temporary storage for bodies awaiting interment. Shown on the original 1854 plat, the Public Mausoleum was an essential functional component of the cemetery operations from the outset. Identified on the Mausolea Location Key as #11, it was built by Alexander Maxwell of New York in the classical style with elements of Egyptian Revival, an aesthetic that was popular in other Rural Cemeteries such as Mount Auburn.\(^6\)

The vault was built into the side of a small hill, leaving most of the structure underground to cool the interior to ground temperature and provide natural refrigeration. A low stone retaining wall surrounds the entrance. The vault’s New York white marble facade features an arched doorway and curving surround flanked by obelisks, with incised papyrus-leaf details in the upper arch. Chevron-pattern board-and-batten double doors are located under the secondary arch, with small glass portholes in metal frames. A later set of cast-iron picket gates with gilded lance head finials protects the historic doors. Although Glenwood’s Board made plans to build a major new receiving vault in 1888, the plans were never realized.\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) Daily ads for Glenwood in the *Washington Evening Star* from 1854 onward state there was a mausoleum “in which such friends of the dead as may apply can place the departed until they select sites for the graves.”

There are 15 private family mausolea at Glenwood and all are considered to contribute to the significance of the cemetery. The family mausolea at Glenwood are freestanding masonry structures built to hold the remains of a single family. The private mausolea are constructed of stone in various classical styles or red brick in the Romanesque Revival style, and feature iron or bronze iron doors and window bars. The construction dates for the private mausolea range from the establishment of the cemetery in the 1850s to the mid-twentieth-century. A majority of those dating from the nineteenth century are anchored into the hilly terrain or along the northern edge of Mulberry Avenue, while the twentieth century examples are free-standing and located in Section S.

Figure 1: Mausolea Location Key

1. Lynch
2. Jenkins
3. Pickford
4. Regan
5. Allen
6. Unknown Brick 1
7. Unknown Brick 2
8. C.W. Huguey
9. Boteler
10. Unknown Brick 3
11. Public Receiving Vault
12. Craven
13. Shober
14. Kneessi
15. Unknown Stone
16. Huguey
1. Lynch Family Mausoleum

The Lynch Family Mausoleum is, like the other mausolea, built into the hilly terrain. Its simple face is composed of smooth limestone blocks coursed in alternating rows of thin and thick cut stones. The façade composition is punctuated by an arched entry opening that holds a simple iron gate. The family name Lynch is inscribed in a center block above the entry. Its cornice delineates a truncated gable with an unusual reversed return.
2. Jenkins Family Mausoleum

The Jenkins Family Mausoleum is one of the smallest mausoleums at Glenwood. Classical in design, it is a small rectangular block composed of rough cut grey granite. A proportionally large entry is reached via two smooth granite steps flanked by a pair of stemmed limestone urns. The entry, which includes a pair of bronze decorated doors, is flanked by a pair of short Tuscan columns formed of smooth white limestone. Raised by the high rough cut foundation stone, the columns hold a rustic pediment onto which a smooth elliptical plaque presenting the year 1918 in raised numbers is carved. A larger smooth plaque in a rectangular shape includes the name Jenkins in a simple font of raised lettering.

Photo 12: Jenkins Mausoleum
3. Pickford Family Mausoleum

The Pickford Family Mausoleum is simple block sheathed in smooth stucco set on a stone foundation and capped with a stone pedimented gable roof. A frieze of Ionic ornament in low relief runs beneath the cornice without benefit of columns. Four stone steps edged with simple low coping lead to three more steps flanked by a pair of stone urns. The entry features a battered surround derived from classical Egyptian design. The rectangular opening contains an ornamented bronze pair of gates.

Photo 13: Pickford Mausoleum
4. Regan Family Mausoleum

The Regan Family Mausoleum, constructed in 1915, is a large block of rough cut granite. It appears as a heavy form owing to its oversized stone blocks and their rough character and deep set entry. The block is capped by a low cornice that features a centrally placed plaque inscribed with the date 1915. The plaque is flanked by a pair of abstract volutes. These volutes flow to the corners of the block where the volute form becomes that of an acroterion. An exaggerated stone lintel, onto which is carved a plaque inscribed with the name Regan, sits above the centrally placed entry opening. Muscular stone door jambs also are abstracted in their articulation and present in a forward battered form. A wrought iron gate features a curvilinear design flanked by twisted rods.

Photo 14: Regan Mausoleum
5. Allen Family Mausoleum

Constructed circa 1900, the Allen Family Mausoleum is notable for its Classical Revival Style presented in rough-cut and polished granite. A large block of coursed rough cut granite, its classical consists of a high rough cut stone base, supporting a pair of double Ionic columns, which support a large entablature with a wide frieze and an exaggerated cornice. Within the columns is a unique circular arch surrounded with smooth stones with an opening at the base that creates the entrance. This entry is protected by a decorative bronze gate, through which can be seen a marble sculpture of a female figure. The interior is further decorated with a mosaic ceiling, marble walls, and stained-glass windows.

Photo 15: Allen Mausoleum

Photo 16: Allen Mausoleum, interior
The five mid- to late-nineteenth century red brick Romanesque Revival mausolea sited along Mulberry Avenue are very similar in appearance. They were likely built simultaneously and/or by the same builder, as they exhibit similar brick facades with round-arched entrances and stone side walls. Set into the hilly terrain, the entrances feature a segmental arched entry door set (with the exception of the C.W. Huguely mausoleum) into a central bay that extends approximately two feet higher than the rest of the mausoleum. The cornice features decorative corbeled arches and stringcourses that simulate dentil moldings. The entrances typically have solid flush iron doors. Blind round-arch niches flank each entrance. Each mausoleum has a minor difference: Unmarked #1 and #3 are of the same height but the door and arch surrounds on #1 is simpler than that used on the others. #2 and Boteler are taller, which allows space for a limestone plaque on Boteler and flanking blind panels. Boteler also features a unique expression of brick detailing at the door and blind arch surrounds. C.W. Huguely is the only one with a pedimented form, but like Boteler it is taller and has a limestone plaque with flanking blind panels.

Photo 17: Unknown Brick Mausoleum #1
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Photo 18: Unknown Brick Mausoleum #2

Photo 19: C.W. Hugely Mausoleum
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Photo 20: Boteler Mausoleum

Photo 21: Unknown Mausoleum #3
12. Craven Family Mausoleum

The Craven Family Mausoleum, inscribed with the date 1933, is composed of over-sized rough-cut granite blocks. The façade is presented in an abstracted classical form with three granite steps leading to a tetrastyle portico with smooth granite Tuscan columns that support a primitive interpretation of a Roman pediment. The double bronze entry door features Roman lattice above a solid panel. A pair of small urns is set on the stair coping which is a projection of the foundation. This mausoleum is free-standing, sited on a plinth at grade rather than in the hilly terrain typical of the nineteenth century mausolea.
13. Shober Family Mausoleum

Dating to 1929, the Shober Mausoleum is composed of over-sized rough-cut granite blocks. The bronze and glass entry doors are flanked by smooth, heavily veined sandstone columns with Egyptian capitals that support a primitive expression of a classical pediment. The family name “Shober” is spelled out with bronze lettering above the entry, between two bronze decorative applied ornaments. The deep set entry features a plain but prominent surround of smooth marble. This mausoleum is free-standing, sited on a plinth at grade rather than in the hilly terrain as is typical of the 19th century mausolea.

Photo 23: Shober Mausoleum
14. Kneessi Mausoleum

The Kneessi Mausoleum (circa twentieth century) is composed of over-sized rough-cut granite blocks set on a foundation of the same stone. A simplified stone pediment and tympanum also presented in rough-cut granite is set above a simple smooth granite entry surround. The name Kneessi is presented in raised letters in the lintel. A pair of decorative glass and bronze entry doors are reached from a single step. This mausoleum is free-standing, sited on a plinth at grade rather than in the hilly terrain as is typical of the nineteenth century mausolea.

![Photo 24: Kneessi Mausoleum](image)
15. Unknown Family Stone Mausoleum

The unknown family stone mausoleum (circa early twentieth century) is composed of field stone, and features an equilateral arched entry, and a steeply-pitched, front-gable roof that is sheathed in slate tile. Two low field stone walls extend from either side of the mausoleum, creating a border around it. This mausoleum is free-standing, sited on a plinth at grade rather than in the hilly terrain as is typical of the nineteenth century mausolea.

Photo 25: Unknown Family Stone Mausoleum
16. Huguely Family Mausoleum

An exceptional expression of the Art Deco style is the Huguely Mausoleum, a sleek box of polished granite with unadorned fluted pilasters and a pair of large stone urns framing the decorative bronze and glass entry door. Its simple abstraction of a classical form represents one of the best examples of Glenwood’s twentieth century cemetery art.
BUILDINGS

The Glenwood Cemetery contains two significant buildings: the Gothic Revival-style Gatekeeper’s Lodge, constructed in 1899 and located west of the Main Gate; and the Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel, built in 1892 and previously listed individually in the National Register of Historic Places. The Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel occupies the cemetery’s original circle (Chapel Circle) near the center of the property.

Gatekeeper’s Lodge

Constructed in 1899, the two-story Gatekeeper’s Lodge was designed by the architectural firm Freyhold and Walsh in the Gothic Revival style. The building was originally constructed with an L-shaped plan. Circa 1940, a two-bay wide addition with gabled dormers was appended to the west (rear) elevation, making the L into a T. The building rests on a rough-cut, ashlar limestone foundation, trimmed by a dressed limestone water table. The walls are composed of a pale gray brick set in a stretcher bond, and the steeply pitched, cross-gable roof is covered in standing-seam metal. Limestone coping trims the roofline. A side gable tops the southern section, and a front gable caps the northern section. Two front-gable roofs, placed side-by-side, cover the addition. Finials rise from the apex of each gable. A steeply pitched, front-gable dormer pierces the east slope of the southern section of the roof. It features two windows. A brick chimney stack with stone coping rises from the interior of the building. Fenestration throughout the building, including the historic dormer, is comprised of wood, one-over-one double-hung sash, each window topped by a hopper transom. The hopper windows have a limestone lintel. The limestone string course wrapping the first story of the building acts as a sill for the first-story windows. The windows on the half story have limestone sills. All openings on the first story are protected by metal security bars.

Photo 27: Gatekeeper's Lodge

8 D.C. Building Permit #1586 (May 9, 1899), Martin Luther King Jr. Library, Washingtoniana Division, Washington, DC.
Moving from south to north across the first story of the east (primary) façade, there are two windows, the primary entrance, and two projecting bays with two windows. The primary entrance is comprised of a single-leaf, wood-paneled door, topped by a transom, set in a limestone surround. The three southern bays are shaded by a single-story porch that sits flush with the two-bay-wide, projecting northern section of the façade. The porch rests on a rough-cut stone foundation, which is accessed by five stone steps. The flat roof is supported by brick piers with stylized stone capitals supporting a stone arcade. The brick piers are spanned by a stone balustrade, and a brick-and-stone balustrade rings the roof. A single window is located in the upper gable end of the northern bays. The front-gable roof is accented by stone coping and a finial.

The north (side) elevation is four bays wide, and has a raking metal cornice. Moving from east to west across the first story are a secondary entrance and three windows. The entrance is accessed by four stone steps. A two-bay-wide addition was appended to the west (rear) elevation ca. 1940, and is set flush with the north elevation of the original building. It is veneered with yellow brick set in a stretcher bond, and topped by paired, standing-seam metal, front-gable roofs. The roof has a raking metal cornice, and is pierced by two steeply pitched, front-gable dormers. The dormers each contain a wood one-over-one, double-hung sash. Moving from east to west across the first story of the north elevation of the addition are a secondary entrance and a window. The secondary entrance accessed by four steps that lead to a stoop and a flush wood door with a single glazed light.

The west elevation of the original building is completely obscured by the circa 1940 addition. The addition is three bays wide, and is topped by two front-gable roofs, connected by a nearly flat roof at the center of the elevation. Three windows are equally spaced across the first and half stories. The south (side) elevation is comprised of the two western bays of the addition, and the eastern bay of the original building. Two windows are equally spaced across the first story of the addition, and two steeply pitched, front-gable dormers pierce the roof of the addition. A triple window with brick mullions is situated on the first story of the original building, and a single window pierces the upper gable end. The front-gable eaves are accented by stone coping, and a fleur-de-lis finial tops the apex of the gable.

The Gatekeeper’s Lodge was part of a larger service complex until the mid-twentieth century, which included the Lodge, the Rest House, and the Superintendent’s House, both of which were demolished. The Rest House was a rustic style building with restrooms and a sitting room for cemetery visitors. The building was originally a pump house shelter in the center of the cemetery but was moved to its location near the North Capitol Street entrance in 1899. It was expanded and refurbished as part of the relocation, and bathroom improvements were made regularly until the building was demolished in the 1950s.

---

9 Sanborn Map, 1927, revised 1959.
10 Glenwood Cemetery Board Meeting Minutes, 1878-1965.
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A Superintendent’s House was constructed in 1904 to replace the early nineteenth century frame dwelling that served the Superintendent from the establishment of the cemetery in 1852.\textsuperscript{11} Designed by noted local architect Appleton B. Clark in 1904, the D.C. Building Permit describes the house as a “two-story cellar and attic stone dwelling”.\textsuperscript{12} One photograph has been located showing Superintendent McKerichar and his family on the steps of the house, which is detailed similarly to the existing Gatekeeper’s Lodge. This house was demolished in 1953, and in 2011 a new mausoleum was constructed on its site.

\textsuperscript{11} Located in the upper northwest section of the cemetery, the nineteenth-century frame dwelling is described in records as a “quaint old farmhouse in which Dr. Bradley lived for 30 years, and where he often entertained Henry Clay and other worthies of that day.” Bradley, Charles S. “The Bradley Family and the Times in Which They Lived,” Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, DC, Volume 6, 1902-03, 123-142.

\textsuperscript{12} D.C. Building Permit #782, October 10, 1904.
Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel (Previously listed individually in the National Register)

Built in 1892, Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1989. It remains unaltered since its evaluation for the National Register. The chapel is a one-story brick building with a steeply pitched end-gable roof clad in slates. The brick is laid in Flemish bond and the walls slightly flare at the base, implementing design characteristics of the Richardsonian Romanesque and Arts and Crafts styles. Also in keeping with these style influences, the main entrance is a pair of simply crafted, heavy wooden doors sheltered by a massive arch. A round window, replaced with the existing stained glass and square bracing in 1918, punctuates the gable peak. Similar round and round-arched windows are present on the side and rear elevations. The side elevations also feature large projecting bays culminating in gable-roofed dormers; each bay has a pair of arched windows separated by brick pilasters and ornamented with a denticulated brick course. The interior is relatively plain, with exposed brick walls, a wooden pulpit, organ, and open seating area. The ceiling features heavy wooden cross-beam trusses. The original wooden flooring has been replaced with tile, and the original altar rail separating the seating area from the pulpit dais has been removed. The chapel was designed by well-known Washington architect Glenn Brown, and was found to be significant under Criteria A and C.

![Photo 30: Mortuary Chapel](image)

---

13 Please refer to the Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (1989) for further descriptive information. (88003064 NRIS); D.C. Building Permit #297 (August 5, 1892), Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library, Washingtoniana Division, Washington, DC.
A utilitarian maintenance building was added to the cemetery grounds circa 1950. The building is screened from the rest of the cemetery by a row of evergreen trees. The single-story building has an I-plan. It is veneered with yellow brick set in a six course American-bond yellow brick, and capped by an asphalt-shingled, complex roof. The north and south end pavilions are each capped by a front-gable roof, and the central section is topped by a side-gable roof. A tall brick chimney rises from the center of the building. Fenestration throughout typically consists of wood, one-over-one, double-hung sash, accented by square brick molds and stone sills. All windows are equipped with metal security bars.

The front façade is seven bays wide. Moving from south to north across the east façade are two windows that pierce the south pavilion, three windows symmetrically arranged across the center section, and two windows set into the north pavilion. Three windows are symmetrically spaced across the north elevation. Moving from north to south across the west elevation are two blind bays, a window, two pedestrian entrances, a garage opening, and two windows. The pedestrian entrances are closed by single-leaf, flush, utilitarian doors of metal. Double-leaf metal doors close the garage bay opening. Three overhead, roll-up, metal garage doors are equally spaced across the south façade. The maintenance building, a purely utilitarian structure, was constructed during the Period of Significance, has seen little to no alterations, and is still in use as a maintenance building today. Therefore, the building retains its integrity of setting, location, design, materials, feeling and association as a utilitarian building on the cemetery grounds and is thus considered contributing.

Shed

A single-story, rectangular-plan shed is located west of the maintenance building. It is clad in red brick, and topped by a built-up shed roof. A row of square windows with security bars can be found along the east elevation, and garage bay openings are located on the west elevation. Based on form and material, the shed was likely constructed around the same time as the maintenance building, circa 1950. The shed was constructed within the Period of Significance, has seen few alterations, and continues to serve its original use. The shed maintains its integrity of setting, location, design, materials, feeling and association as a utilitarian shed, and is thus considered contributing.

OBJECTS

Grave Markers (including Monuments, Statuary, Headstones, and Plaque Markers)

The interments at Glenwood Cemetery, both below- and above-ground, are marked by a wide variety of memorials dating from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. The forms, materials, images, and designs of the monuments, statuary, exedrae, headstones, plaque markers, as well as their placement within the landscape, illustrate the distinct burial practices and fashions of various periods.
Common materials for markers include limestone, marble, granite, concrete, and metals such as zinc and bronze.
Rural Cemetery Movement Markers

The overwhelmingly popular fashion of the Rural Cemetery Movement during the 1830s through the 1850s influenced the style, form, detailing, materials, and inscriptions of the initial markers at Glenwood Cemetery. The individually-created markers were often so grand as to be categorized as monuments and presented images of hope and immortality. These markers often have highly detailed statuary and sculpted figures; trees and foliage; ornate obelisks on carved bases; broken architectural elements, such as obelisks, columns; logs, furniture, such as chairs and benches; and religious symbols, such as angels, hands in prayer, and crosses. Pictorial symbols of remembrance include logs, trees, birds, animals, robes and veils, drapery, and urns. Notably, there are also markers that incorporate a figure of a sleeping child or a recumbent lamb, reflecting the death of an infant or child.

The first marker to be placed at Glenwood was a simple stone tablet. This marker, which identified the first interment at Glenwood, was actually the re-interment of Mary Ann Donn from Congressional Cemetery. Mrs. Donn’s marker is adorned only with a carved form a horizontally oriented French bracket at its top. Set directly into the ground, it is inscribed with the words: “Mary Ann/ consort of Thomas C. Donn/born in Philadelphia June 12, 1805/ Died in Washington, D.C. July 22, 1854/ Aged 49 Years/ Wife. Mother. Friend./ The First Occupant of Glenwood.”

In October 1854, the first large, sculptural monument was erected in Glenwood Cemetery. Designed by the wife of Joseph M. Tastet to mark his grave, it was sculpted by William Alexander Gaddess, a stonecutter from Baltimore, Maryland. Although damaged by acid rain, the Italian marble obelisk originally incorporated a broken oak tree (a common symbol of death of a person with a respected character) and the motto “cleave not to earth.” The impression of the carving can be detected on site.

In 1858, the Columbia Fire Company erected an elaborate monument for Benjamin Grenup, a young firefighter believed at that time to be the first to die in the line of duty in Washington. The
marble obelisk supported by a carved base was sculpted by Charles Rousseau, and graphically depicts Greenup’s tragic death while responding to an emergency. The monument is also embellished with elaborately carved reliefs of firefighting equipment and an inscription commemorating Greenup’s life. Set on a triangular plot at the intersection of Chestnut Avenue and Chapel Circle, the monument is surrounded by a highly decorative, double picket cast-iron fence. Decorative fire hydrants painted red mark the corners of the fence.

Glenwood, as a "rural cemetery" emphasized the importance of the family and sold large or multiples of plots where all members could be buried together. Lot holders had a great deal of freedom to erect markers of their own choice. This supported the idea of the grave marker as a memorial symbol of the person’s life, his or her accomplishments, good character, and loving spirit. Lot owners were encouraged to celebrate the wealth and power of the deceased by marking the grave with elaborate three-dimensional sculptures and monuments inscribed with artistic symbolism and romantic messages.

The tallest stone obelisk at the Cemetery was installed in 1886 to mark the grave of Richard Taylor. Likely the product of a pattern book, a common means during the Victorian era of selecting a tombstone, this monument represents the continued popularity of the Rural Cemetery movement at Glenwood.
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Photo 37: Taylor obelisk
Another example of the sculptural quality of Glenwood’s monuments is that of the Roose family in Section C. Sculpted by an unknown artist in 1897, the marble memorial features the graceful figure of a woman, draped in robes and a veil, with her arms protectively around an urn raised on a pedestal. The sculpture is elevated approximately three feet off the ground on a square pier, accented by a drip molding. The pier is set on an ashlar-cut rectangular base, on which the name “Roose” is incised. Representative of how late the Rural Cemetery aesthetic lasted at Glenwood is the Roose family monument.
One of the most prominent individual, sculptural memorials is that for Teresina Vasco, which beautifully captures the likeness of the young girl, sitting in a rocking chair with flowers strewn at her feet. Artist Andrea Sichi, who worked in the Washington, D.C. area in 1913, sculpted the marker.¹⁶

![Teresina Vasco Memorial](Photo 39: Teresina Vasco Memorial)

### Lawn Park Movement Markers

Concentrated in the central section of the cemetery, north of the chapel, are the markers influenced by the Lawn Park Movement. Although more restrained than the markers of the Rural Cemetery Movement and deliberately limiting the previously popular use of flora and fauna, the memorials associated with Lawn Park Movement were still chosen to reflect a harmony in materials and design. Initially the Lawn Park memorials presented a new interest in simplicity. The markers of this period gradually became more uniform in size and less ornate. As interest in unadorned forms increased, mass-produced markers became available. The result of this change was a transformation from ornate and lofty forms to low, regularized, almost monolithic character.

Initially, the influence of the Lawn Park movement was expressed as a move away from the highly personalized monument. Instead, simpler, less grandiose forms were selected to

---

memorialize the dead. Early examples from this period include simple forms such as unadorned obelisks on chamfered plinths, flat rounded headstones on bases, and headstones with caps are found throughout the cemetery.

The double marker of George Clendenin, Glenwood’s first Superintendent, who died in 1888, and his wife Mary presents an early example. Although Clendenin had a long relationship with the cemetery, the flat tablet markers are modest, even reminiscent of the simple headstones of a much earlier era, with identical inscribed ornament and minimal text.

The concept of the family plot was still popular during the Lawn Park Movement, but what during the Rural Cemetery Movement had been an ornate monument honoring the family, broadcasting its sentiments, and expressing its wealth and importance was replaced by a less elaborate marker. A large monument form might be used to mark family burial plots but it was typically restrained in its appearance perhaps only stating the family name, with smaller stone tablets or lawn markers indicate the individual graves. A typical early example of this change as presented at Glenwood is the use of a simple obelisk form, squat and much shorter than earlier obelisks, to identify but not sentimentalize the patriarch of the Knox family, while small low, unadorned stone markers were used for individual members of the family.
Although associated with the Lawn Park Movement, some later headstones and markers recount a biographical history of the deceased beyond simply noting their name, birth date, and death date. Others are inscribed with literary passages. Specific references to family patriarchs are found.

The Blundon family plot includes a large marker upon which the names of the individual family members are inscribed. This simple triptych form features a framed bas relief portrait of the...
family patriarch and his dog. Flanking the central portrait are lists of the deceased family members. There are no individual markers displayed at the actual grave locations.

The majority of the Lawn Park markers at Glenwood are concentrated in the northern portion of the cemetery, specifically in Sections T, I, K (expanded), S, U, and V, and Lincoln and McDonald Circles. Many of these markers are homogenous in appearance, providing little individuality in ornamentation or design, relying on their size to connote differences.

There are several types of individual markers in these sections.

![Photo 44: Overview of Lawn Park Movement family markers](image)

Family markers generally appear in two sizes, approximately 36-inches high on a 53-inch-wide base, and a larger size that stands 47-inches high on a 72-inch base. These larger family markers rely on their massing for monumentality, and are typically only inscribed with the family name with the names of the individual inscribed on the reverse side of the stone.
Another type is a beveled wedge. This stone, placed directly on the ground without a base, stands approximately 13-inches high and 23-inches wide. Individual polished granite headstones typically stand around 32-inches high, and are set on a 30-inch-wide base.
Memorial Park Movement Markers

The attributes associated with Memorial Park Movement are also clearly evident in Section S, as well as intermittently throughout the cemetery: flat-to-ground plaque markers and a few wedge-shaped markers. The flat to ground plaque markers are typically granite or a bronze laid on a granite block. Both types are set flush with the ground. The typical granite marker measures 11-inches by 19-inches and is set flush with the grade of the earth.

![Photo 47: Typical Memorial Park Movement plaque markers](image)

Bronze flat-to-ground plaque markers at Glenwood are typically rectangular in shape, although some variations such as heart-shaped markers do exist; while most are limited to lettering, some include bas-relief imagery. Typical rectangular plaques, such as the one for row of five bronze plaques set in granite frames, measure 12-inches by 24-inches.
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Photo 438: Bronze plaque marker

Photo 49: Granite plaque markers
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Organization-Related Markers

Glenwood reserves numerous sections of its grounds for specific organizations. These areas are attractive to people who wish to be buried near their friends and colleagues. Markers inscribed with emblems from various societies, clubs and organizations are common, representing Freemasons, Order of the Eastern Star, Scott’s Legion, Grand Army of the Republic, Odd Fellows, Knights of Pythias, Knights Templar, Knights of Columbus, Firefighters, Daughters of the American Revolution, St. Andrew’s Society, and Young Men’s Christian Association. In addition, the Masonic Circle in the northwest section of the cemetery is reserved for members of the Freemasons and their wives.

![Photo 50: Masonic Circle](image)

American soldiers from the nineteenth and twentieth century wars are interred in various locations at Glenwood Cemetery, honored by the distinctive government-issue markers or insignia carved into their grave markers.

The Peck headstone is a military marker, composed of a vertical stone slab on a rectangular footer, and featuring a carved portrait and two rifles and a personalized inscription.
Glenwood Cemetery
Name of Property

Washington, D.C.
County and State

Photo 441: Peck personalized inscription

Photo 45: military plaque marker
NON-CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES

Mausoleum (Building)

In 2011, the cemetery constructed a Post Modern mausoleum to provide a modern facility for above-ground disposition of the deceased. The building contains individual memorial niches, and also a receiving vault for those awaiting burial. Situated directly west of the Gatekeeper’s Lodge, the single-story, rectangular-plan building rests on a concrete-slab foundation. The steel structural system is clad in square, gray granite plaques that mark individual burial niches. The corner posts and coping are clad in painted stucco. The primary entrance is centered on the north (primary) façade, and is located in a one-and-one-half-story central bay. The central bay is covered by a steeply pitched, asphalt-shingled, front-gable roof, which is highlighted by a series of skylights. The entrance is comprised of glass-and-metal doors, surrounded by multi-light sidelights and transom. Above the entrance is a stylized front-gable pediment, which is detailed to reflect influences from the stone coping from the Gatekeeper’s Lodge. The pediment is capped by metal coping, tinted green to simulate green copper patina. The east and west (side) elevations of the building do not display any fenestration. The south (rear) elevation of the building is similar to the façade. The central, two-story bay is glazed, and the flanking bays to the east and west are clad in polished granite tiles.

---

17 District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Certificate of Occupancy, Glenwood Cemetery Mausoleum, 2011.
Scattering Garden (Site)

The Scattering Garden was added to the cemetery grounds in 2002 to provide a location for families to scatter cremains. The garden, which is on the site of the original Public Lot, is approximately 1/3 acre, tucked between Section M and the eastern property boundary of the cemetery. The layout of the garden is influenced by Zen landscape design, which seeks to create an environment of meditation, self-contemplation, and spirituality through simple forms of natural materials (plants, stones, sand) simply arranged to be viewed while seated. The Scattering Garden is accessed through a wood, flat-arch gate, reminiscent of a simplified Torii gate, on the southwest side of the garden. It can also be accessed from an entrance along The Tour on the western edge of the garden. The garden is bordered by hedges, which screens it from the rest of the cemetery and provides privacy to the families conducting memorial services. The northern portion of the garden features a gravel rock garden with a hexagonal, pagoda-like gazebo for seating. A granite memorial wall is located at the northern edge of the garden, and families can elect to have the name of their loved one inscribed on it. The southern portion of the garden is grassy with ornamental stones, and planted with an assortment of non-native trees and shrubs.

![Photo 53: Scattering Garden](image)

18 GeoEye, Aerial Photograph.
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Columbaria (Objects)

Glenwood features six columbaria of recent vintage for the above-grade inurnment of cremated remains. Constructed of polished granite on rough-cut bases, the columbaria are located in Sections I and J. The structures stand approximately five feet high, and two feet deep, each holding 24 niches. Black granite plaques inscribed in white with the deceased’s name, dates of birth and death, and a brief epitaph mark the inurnments.

In addition to the columbaria, a group of post-1978 markers is counted as a single, non-contributing object.

INVENTORY

In the following inventory, all resources have been considered either contributing or non-contributing based upon the areas of significance, as listed, under Criteria A and C, as well as Criterion Consideration D (cemeteries) for Landscape Architecture, Architecture, and Art, based upon the period of significance of 1852 through 1966. All non-contributing resources have been so noted for being constructed after 1966. The Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel was individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1989.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. Contributing</th>
<th>No. Non-Contributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Circulation system, topography, landscaping</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattering Garden</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Public Mausoleum (Receiving Vault)</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Mausolea</td>
<td>1854-ca. 1900; 1920s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scattering Gardens Gazebo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron Fence</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone Wall with Iron Fencing</td>
<td>1900-1938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Gate</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Gate</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Gatekeeper's Lodge (Office)</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortuary Chapel</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Building</td>
<td>c.1950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>c.1950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Mausoleum/Receiving Vault</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Columbaria</td>
<td>Post 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group of Contributing Markers (statuary, obelisks, pedestals, tablets, chest and flush markers, exedrae, sarcophagi, and others)</td>
<td>1854-1978</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group of Markers (statuary, obelisks, pedestals, tablets, chest and flush markers, exedrae, sarcophagi, and others)</td>
<td>Post 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Objects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark “x” in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

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.

D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

B. Removed from its original location

C. A birthplace or grave

D. A cemetery

E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

F. A commemorative property

G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
Glenwood Cemetery

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)
ARCHITECTURE
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
SOCIAL HISTORY
ART
POLITICS/GOVERNMENT
COMMERCE
ENTERTAINMENT/RECREATION

___________________

Period of Significance
1852-1966

___________________

Significant Dates
1852: Cemetery construction initiated
1854: Cemetery chartered by Congress and opened for burials
1892: Mortuary Chapel opened
1898: Gatekeeper’s Lodge and Gates constructed
1900: Lawn Park Expansion Master Plan approved

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
N/A

Architect/Builder
George F. de la Roche (civil engineer/landscape designer)
George Clendenin (landscape designer)
Glenn Brown (Chapel architect)
Frank N. Carver (Chapel builder)
Freyhold and Walsh (Gatekeeper’s Lodge architect)
Alexander McKerichar (landscape designer)
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SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
Glenwood Cemetery was designed in the Rural Cemetery Movement aesthetic, and was adapted over the decades to accommodate evolving attitudes toward cemetery design through incorporation of Lawn Park and Memorial Park ideals. Glenwood was developed as a commercial entity without religious, civic, or organizational affiliation. When chartered by Congress, it was the first for-profit cemetery in Washington, D.C. and a very early example in the United States. Noted throughout its history for its beautiful setting, the cemetery has become the resting place for many of the District’s prominent residents, memorialized with important works of public art.

Glenwood Cemetery meets National Register Criteria A and C, as well as Criterion Consideration D, and is locally significant under the themes of landscape architecture, architecture, art, and commerce. Glenwood Cemetery meets National Register Criterion A as a physical reflection of society’s evolving views on death as demonstrated through design and as being the first for-profit cemetery established in the city. It meets Criterion C as an intact collection of significant landscape architecture, architecture, and funerary art adapted to a cemetery that transcends multiple periods of design and nationally recognized movements and styles.

The period of significance extends from 1852 to 1966. This range encompasses the cemetery’s history from initial purchase of the land through the last of three land sales reduced the cemetery property to its present size. The cemetery retains high integrity of location, setting, design, craftsmanship, materials, feeling and association.

NARRATIVE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
Established in 1852, Glenwood Cemetery was designed as a Rural Cemetery at a time when few large cemeteries existed in the District of Columbia, and it introduced the idea of a for-profit business into what was at the time a benevolent endeavor typically associated with religious and charitable organizations. Its history also offers insight into changes in cemetery aesthetics from the picturesque Rural Cemetery Movement that redefined cemeteries in the early nineteenth century, the restrained Lawn Park Movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and the controlled Memorial Park Movement that moved the cemetery into modern times.

BURIAL PRACTICES IN THE UNITED STATES
Cemetery Design in America: Pre-1830

The growth of American cities during the first quarter of the nineteenth century led to the strong desire to rid the urban environment of burial grounds. The increasing value of inner city real estate and the growing fear of real and imagined diseases inherent to the dead, awakened citizenry and government alike to the need for a new approach to the problem. As early as 1711,
when asked for advice on the rebuilding of churches in London, British architect Christopher Wren called for a re-definition of burial grounds as quiet, peaceful environments outside the city limits:

It will be enquired, where then shall be the Burials? I answer, in Cemeteries seated in the Out-skirts of the Town... This being inclosed with a strong Brick Wall, and having a Walk round, and two cross Walks, decently planted with Yew-trees, the four Quarters may serve four Parishes, where the Dead need not be disturbed at the Pleasure of the Sexton, or piled four or five upon one another, or Bones thrown out to gain Room.

--Letter of advice from Christopher Wren to the Commissioners for Building Fifty New City Churches (1711)

It was not until Père Lachaise—the now legendary landscaped cemetery established outside of Paris—opened in 1804, however, that a cemetery gained international recognition for its beauty. This cemetery would serve as the inspiration for an entirely new approach to the burial setting and commemoration of the dead in the United States. By the 1830s, it was often cited as both the standard and point of comparison for American efforts.

THE RURAL CEMETERY MOVEMENT (1830-1890s)

In 1831, a citizen’s group in Boston, Massachusetts, devised a solution to overcrowded burial grounds in that city’s center. Led by Harvard professor, horticulturist, physician, and influential citizen Dr. Jacob Bigelow, the group purchased 72 acres of farmland on the edge of Cambridge, ten miles outside of Boston, for use as a new type of burial ground: a Rural Cemetery. Run as a corporation without affiliation to religious or government entities, Mount Auburn was conceived as a benevolent non-profit commercial venture intended to provide plots for those willing and able to pay. Bigelow’s group joined with the Massachusetts Horticultural Society (of which he was a founder) to design and engineer a naturalistic landscape that was distinct from any other to date. Unlike the traditional churchyards or burial grounds, this new idea placed gravesites into a setting of steep hills, ponds, planned vistas, and articulated paths and carriage ways that would allow the mourners to enjoy the beauty of nature and gain peace through a sense of unity among life, death, earth and heaven above.

The result was a beautiful amalgamation of natural and man-made landscapes. This new type of burial ground was referred to as a Rural Cemetery for its location away from the city and the desire to break its connection with the unhealthy, overcrowded, and potentially dangerous urban burial grounds by exploiting nature. Rather than refer to the site as a burial ground, the word cemetery was chosen for its positive associations, as a derivative of the Greek word for “sleeping chamber.” The Rural Cemetery was set in what is now referred to as the suburbs, far from the city’s densely populated core. Its design was intended to provide a picturesque expression of great natural beauty that would be a new and comforting experience for the mourning. Unlike

---

22 Merriam Webster Dictionary (m-w.com) cites the origin of the word cemetery as: Middle English cimetry, from Anglo-French cimiterie, from Late Latin coemeterium, from Greek koimēterion (sleeping chamber, burial place), from koiman (to put to sleep); akin to Greek keisthai (to lie), Sanskrit ṣete (he lies).
the crowded churchyards or regimented civic cemeteries of the past, the rural cemetery offered a place where individuals (both the dead and the mourners) were removed from earthly woes.

Instead of being buried in chronological order of death as was the rule in most churchyards, the rural cemetery emphasized the family unit by selling large plots where all members could be buried together and find solace in their being forever together in the hereafter. It also accommodated individuality by allowing lot holders to erect whatever monument they wished. In contrast to the simple headstones typically marked with warnings of hell and pleas for entry to heaven, this approach to burial supported the memorial as the symbol of the person’s life, his or her accomplishments, good character, and loving spirit. Markers in the Rural Cemetery were not limited to a simple form or text but could and were encouraged to celebrate the wealth and power of the deceased by marking the grave with elaborate three-dimensional sculptures and monuments inscribed with artistic symbolism and romantic messages. Immediately influential in awakening urban centers as to the possibilities for solving the pressing problem of burying the dead, new cemeteries in this new style popped up in the environs of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York within only a few years.

In a time before public parks became focal points of our cities, Mount Auburn and the other rural cemeteries that quickly followed were seen as large, public gardens where citizens could enjoy nature and relax. Taking lessons from the great gardens of Europe’s royalty, such as Kew Gardens, Windsor Great Park, Versailles, and Peter the Great’s Summer Palace, the Rural Cemetery was a designed environment that was actually not possible in nature. It reflected the emerging interest in the human ability to manipulate nature as demonstrated in horticulture, landscape design, picturesque architecture, and romantic literature that marked British and American culture from the 1830s through the 1860s. In particular, the Rural Cemetery stands as a significant example of the Romantic Movement’s rejection of the rational geometric formality of the earlier French garden, advocating instead acceptance of the beauty, albeit a romanticized expression, of nature.

In keeping with the aesthetic philosophy of Andrew Jackson Downing, America’s greatest proponent of the potential for beauty in a “natural” environment, the Rural Cemetery was, like Downing’s designs, based on idealistic views of nature that could not exist without design intervention. Downing’s influence on American aesthetic values of the time cannot be underestimated and he was particularly active in Washington, D.C. where he re-designed the concept for the National Mall from L’Enfant’s “Grand Avenue” to that of a “National Park.”

The Rural Cemetery Movement also reflected changing attitudes toward the dead. The emphasis on departure, fatalism, and death that characterized earlier eras was replaced by a new attitude focused on hope, rest, sleep, and immortality. Headstones inscribed with words and images of death, such as skulls and crossbones, were abandoned in favor of sculptural expressions of a new life in heaven. Symbols based on nature became familiar, often presenting messages understood through an interpretation of a new symbolic “language.” Expressions related to the life of the departed, whether short or long, became common. The more “heavenly” appearance of white marble replaced the dark shades of grey slate and brownstone. Death was no longer the end; it
was a new beginning—an afterlife. Historian David Charles Sloane describes this change in beliefs:

The new monuments represented a shift from eighteenth-century religious orientation to a more ecumenical, individualistic atmosphere, imbued with nature and hope. The symbols of hope, immortality, and life had long been carved into the markers of America’s graveyards, but now they became prevalent motifs. There were so many that the symbolic language appeared confused, but the central meaning of the ornamentation was inescapable. Statues of Faith, anchors of Hope, stood on pedestals decorated with ornaments of ivy (memory), poppy (sleep), oak (immortality), and the acorn (life).23

This more positive approach to the passing from one life to another brought new enthusiasm for burials. Just as the word cemetery had become the preferred nomenclature for a burial ground, the cemetery became the preferred location for burial.

The success of Mount Auburn would lead to the creation of other major rural cemeteries within the next four decades, including the earliest: Laurel Hill in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1836); Mount Hope in Rochester, New York (1836); Green Mount in Baltimore (1838); Worcester Rural in Worcester, Massachusetts (1838); Harmony Grove in Salem, Massachusetts (1840); Green-Wood in Brooklyn, New York (1839); Albany Rural in Albany, New York (1841); Spring Grove in Cincinnati, Ohio (1844); and Allegheny in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (1845).24

THE LAWN PARK CEMETERY MOVEMENT (1860s-1950s)

By the early 1860s, the Rural Cemetery Movement was falling out of favor in some parts of the country. Replacing the picturesque Rural Cemetery aesthetic were the tenets of the Landscaped Lawn or Lawn Park Movement, a similar but restrained approach to cemetery design. This new aesthetic followed the work of Adolph Strauch, a Prussian horticulturist and landscape designer. While traveling across the United States to observe the beauty of the American Rockies, Strauch was persuaded to stay in Cincinnati to design the landscape of a country estate of a wealthy businessman. This led him to take on the job of rehabilitating Cincinnati’s Spring Grove Cemetery. The cemetery had been established in 1844 following the Rural Cemetery model, but by 1855 it had fallen into serious disrepair. Strauch had apprenticed in Vienna and London, and was trained in the formal, open aesthetic based on vistas that was being used in the design of European urban parks. Responding to his own observations and the public’s growing concern that Rural Cemeteries were overcrowded and cluttered with overly personal memorials, Strauch prescribed an aesthetic marked by restraint and open space.

Although still committed to the Rural Cemetery ideal of creating a place of natural beauty and solace, he relied on a principle that “the decoration of a rural cemetery should exhibit, in its classic purity, a just medium between too great simplicity and the excessive use of ornament usually met with.” The picturesque aesthetic with its individualism, elements of the unexpected, and the abundance of landscape and memorial features was replaced by qualities related to the more open, gentle, regularity of a pastoral landscape. Strauch’s design preserved open lawns, introduced symmetry, organized the plots less densely, limited the number of monuments to one per family plot, condemned individually-designed monuments and symbolic references, controlled the height and size of markers, and exercised a judicious placement of trees and plantings. The roads were still curved, but the radius was softer, more sweeping than before, the undulation of the topography limited or eliminated, and artificial ponds and lakes carefully placed to create open space and allow for views across a broad landscape. Doris Francis, in her paper on “Cemeteries as Cultural Landscape,” writes:

Lawn-park cemeteries, like parks, were an aspect of the struggle by urban residents to control their increasingly chaotic environment—to give order and rationalized efficiency to their surroundings, and to ease conflicts and bring a community together according to the ideals of the ‘City Beautiful’ movement.


Strauch, according to historian David Charles Sloane, sought “an age of new professionalism and renewed accessibility, both physical and psychological.”27 This translated beyond a rational approach to aesthetics into a mandate to manage the cemetery in an organized way “on a scientific plan.”28 His approach limited the role of the individual lot holder by strengthening the role of the Superintendent. Strauch called for the use of paid, trained cemetery workers to care, to design, and to maintain the landscape. The Lawn Park model included a division of labor, with a supervisor of maintenance, a cemetery board to manage finances, and a supervisor for business operations, helped to establish the modern cemetery as a profitable business.

Significantly, Strauch’s influence went far beyond the world of cemetery design influencing such landscape notables as Frederick Law Olmstead Sr. Strauch’s ideas became widely known with the opening of Olmstead’s Central Park, the first landscaped urban park in the United States, in 1857. Historian Sloane finds that “the success of New York’s Central Park brought pastoral landscape concepts to the public’s attention and influenced wider acceptance of lawn-park cemeteries.”29

THE MEMORIAL PARK MOVEMENT (1917 – PRESENT)

By the early 1900s, American attitudes toward death and burials once again shifted. In the early part of the twentieth century, reformers began to advocate for cremation as an alternative to traditional burial. Cremation, proponents argued, aided land conservation and public health. Professional management of burials continued to increase as ownership of cemeteries was no longer dominated by religious groups, but instead had become businesses. Although typically overseen by Boards of Trustees, more and more cemeteries were entrepreneurial operations. These changes dovetailed with a growing desire among the American public to separate life from death, to create a sense of peace and distance, and to make caring for the dead someone else’s responsibility. These factors led to the development of the cemetery design known as the Memorial Park.

The first Memorial Park cemetery was Forest Lawn Cemetery, outside of Los Angeles, California, which was redesigned in 1917 under the direction of Hubert Eaton. Eaton’s efforts to return visitors to cemeteries and lure customers made Forest Lawn a thriving enterprise, and the model for twentieth-century cemeteries.30

Memorial Park cemeteries emphasize expansive open space, with few trees and shrubbery to interrupt the landscape. Its minimal aesthetic is reinforced through the use of cremation as a popular alternative to burial, and manifest in burial markers laid flush to the ground to make the presence of the dead virtually undetectable. The simple flush (flat-to-ground plaque) markers made maintenance of the grounds easier. Without displays of wealth evidenced through elaborate monuments, it was difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the social status of the individuals buried there.\(^{31}\) Although Eaton’s design associated the cemetery with a modern twentieth century aesthetic in an effort to attract positive attention to Forest Lawn, the public’s ultimate embrace of the emotionally restrained Memorial Park Movement is consistent with a growing interest in distancing the mourner and the deceased. Strict, professional management discouraged familial interaction in the funeral and burial processes, and cemeteries became efficient, managed landscapes rather than places designed to be a source of natural beauty or spiritual refuge. The use of “anonymous” markers reinforced the intended separation between life and death, eliminating the value of unique symbolism to connote social status. This movement retains its popularity today, albeit more as a result of its value to the cemetery ownership than in response to the public’s continuing desire to avoid association with death.

BURIAL PRACTICES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (1791-1852)

In the last decade of the eighteenth century when the District of Columbia was being established, the practice of burying the dead on family lands was still active, but in the District, as in other towns and cities, the majority of people chose to be buried in grounds consecrated by a church. Churches with adjacent burial grounds available to members of their congregation existed in Georgetown and Alexandria, and there were a number of churches with burial grounds in the City and County of Washington. For example, Rock Creek Church Cemetery was established around 1719 by the Church of England when its site was within the jurisdiction of the colony of Maryland. In 1789, Holy Trinity consecrated the first Roman Catholic cemetery within the District. In 1794, St. Patrick’s Parish purchased land for a church building and graveyard. Ebenezer Methodist Church on Capitol Hill opened a burial ground in 1805 but it was not immediately adjacent to the church building. St. John’s Episcopal Church on Lafayette Square was established in 1815 with both a church and adjacent church yard for burials. However, as the years passed and the Federal City’s population grew, most of the “inner” city burial grounds were re-located to less urban areas.

On February 28, 1798, the District Commissioners established two public burial grounds: Eastern (Square 1026) and Western (Square 109) Cemeteries. The establishment of the public grounds was intended to support the churchyard burials, providing sorely needed land to handle burials for those without the affiliation or the means to be buried in an existing burial ground. By 1807, these cemeteries were used to bury the poor, criminals, slaves, strangers, mentally and physically ill, and unknowns. The cemetery locations “were considered to be at a proper distance from the populous parts of the city to accommodate the inhabitants at either end,” but more significantly, the selected locations acknowledged the need to place burial grounds away from the formal city. Eastern Cemetery was soon abandoned owing to its marshy soil; Western remained open until 1884 when the land was sold for development, and 3,000 bodies were re-interred to Rock Creek Church and Graceland cemeteries. The District also maintained a string of Potter’s Fields, starting in 1806 with one associated with the Washington Infirmary (also known as the Old Poorhouse) and continuing through 1967. Among other burial grounds for the indigent, abandoned, criminal and insane was the burial ground at St. Elizabeths (then the Federal Government Hospital for the Insane) that was used from 1856 for the hospital’s residents, as well as for soldiers during the Civil War, through the last burial in 1983.

In 1846, following the return of the area south of the Potomac River to Virginia, development within the City of Washington was quickly prioritized. At this time, the opinion of Washingtonians, like that of citizens throughout the country, was intensifying against burial

grounds within populated areas of the city. The public decried urban burial grounds as consuming too much valuable real estate, and threatening public health and safety. This had already led to the establishment of a new type of burial ground: the Rural cemetery. In 1850, Dr. Louis Mackall, a noted Washington physician, published a treatise on the harmful effects of urban burial grounds. His anti-urban burial position was so strong that he went so far as to attack the newly opened Oak Hill Cemetery in what was then Georgetown, the region’s first example of a Rural Cemetery.\(^{35}\) In June 1852, a city ordinance prohibited new burial grounds from being established within corporate limits of the City of Washington as well as expansion of existing grounds.\(^ {36}\)

\[\text{AN ACT to prohibit locating new burial grounds within the city limits.}\
\]

\[\text{Sec. 2. That it shall be and it is hereby made the duty of the Ward Commissioners, each in his respective Ward, to notify in writing any and every peron on attempting to locate new burial grounds or vaults, against the provisions of the first section of this act, that he or they are so prohibited; and if, after notification as aforesaid, the person or persons shall persist therein, he or they shall pay a fine of twenty dollars for each and every day he or they may continue so to offend; the said fines to be collected and applied as other fines and penalties due to this Corporation.}\
\]

\[\text{Sec. 4. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act be and the same are hereby repealed.}\
\]

An Act to prohibit locating new burial grounds within the city limits.

Source: *Daily National Intelligencer*, June 12, 1852

In June 1853, additional legislation seeking to improve the conditions at existing burial grounds within the District mandated that each was to be under the supervision of a sexton, who would be responsible for the upkeep, record keeping, and grave digging.\(^ {37}\)

\(^{35}\) A Physician (Dr. Louis Mackall), Oak Hill Cemetery-, or a Treatise on the Fatal Effects Resulting from the Location of Cemeteries in the Immediate Vicinity of Towns. Washington: Printed by Henry Polkinhorn, 1850.

\(^{36}\) “City Ordinances,” *Daily National Intelligencer*, June 6, 1852, 1.

RURAL CEMETERIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The 1852 municipal mandate prohibiting burial grounds within the “corporate limits of the city” was met with a quick response as numerous cemeteries were established outside these boundaries in what was then Washington County. Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown had been established in 1846, closely following the aesthetic principles of the Rural Cemetery Movement as inspired by Mount Auburn in Massachusetts. It was incorporated by an Act of Congress in 1849 prior to the municipal ordinance. Despite its beauty, there was serious opposition to its proximity to the residential population and a treatise by Georgetown resident Dr. Louis Mackall played an important role in the effort to ban burial grounds in residential areas. Other Rural Cemeteries followed, but all were beyond the city’s boundaries. Glenwood Cemetery, the second cemetery in the District designed in the aesthetic of the Rural Cemetery Movement, was incorporated by Congress as a privately held and funded for-profit enterprise in 1852. Prospect Hill, a 17-acre cemetery immediately to the south and east of Glenwood and designed following in the Rural Cemetery aesthetic, was established by German Lutherans in 1858 and incorporated by Congress in 1860. Mount Olivet, also a Rural Cemetery in design, was established by the Catholic Archdiocese of Baltimore in 1858 and incorporated by Congress in 1862. Rock Creek Cemetery, established in 1719 at the far northern section of the District, re-designed some of its grounds in the 1870s in the popular aesthetic of the Rural Cemetery Movement in an effort to attract new burials.

LAWN PARK AND MEMORIAL PARK MOVEMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Because of the restriction on new cemeteries as well as the expansion of existing cemeteries within the boundaries of the City of Washington, the effect of the Lawn Park and Memorial Park Movements was minimal here. In the County, new cemeteries established in the latter half of the nineteenth century, such as Graceland, Columbian Harmony, and Woodlawn, tended not to follow any particular style. By the twentieth century, land had become too expensive to encourage new cemetery construction even within the Washington County as the housing market boomed in all of the four quadrants. Thus, cemetery organizers looked to the suburbs of Montgomery and Prince George’s County in Maryland. Cemeteries such as the Catholic-owned Gates of Heaven and the adjacent privately owned Jewish cemetery Judean Gardens in Silver Spring present excellent examples of the Lawn Park Movement and the Memorial Park Movement in various sections of their grounds.

Evidence of the Lawn Park and Memorial Park movements in the District is thus limited to newer sections of existing cemeteries. The cemeteries that had room to expand began to employ aspects of these more contemporary movements by introducing new landscaping ideals, burial

38 Daily National Intelligencer, June 12, 1852.
39 A Physician (Dr. Louis Mackall), Oak Hill Cemetery-, or a Treatise on the Fatal Effects Resulting from the Location of Cemeteries in the Immediate Vicinity of Towns. Washington: Printed by Henry Polkinhorn, 1850.
orientation, road locations, and even the types of markers they made available to their patrons. The result is a more blended and gradual effect that can be found at Glenwood, Mount Olivet, Rock Creek, and other older cemeteries.

THE HISTORY OF THE GLENWOOD CEMETERY

Glenwood Cemetery was organized in 1852 and opened in 1854. Glenwood’s design represented the primary aesthetic principles of the Rural Cemetery Movement including a suburban setting outside the boundaries of the city, a high topographical setting allowing long views of the surroundings, an engineered topography to provide a road bed for a serpentine carriage way through the cemetery’s grounds, and carefully laid out burial sections and plots whose development would be coherent with the underlying design framework. It also was being developed by a commercial entity without religious or civic organizational ties.

The Property

The land on which Glenwood Cemetery would be established was located in Maryland when it was patented by Lord Baltimore to John Powell on September 5, 1724. The 100 acre patent was named “Powell’s Dividend,” and was sold sometime between 1724 and 1809, when it was under the ownership of John Dickson and Clayburn Ivey of North Carolina. In that year, Dickson “& Others” sold 75.25 acres to Dr. Phineas Bradley for $1,128.75.

Map of Powell’s Dividend

41 The deed transferring the land to Dickson and Ivey has not been located, so it is not known whether Powell sold the property directly to Dickson and Ivey or if there were interim transfers.

Sections 9-end page 66
Bradley enlarged his holdings by purchasing nine acres from Notley Young sometime between 1801 and 1839, when he sold the combined land, although it is likely that the purchase coincided with his purchase and ownership of Powell’s Dividend.

The two Youngsborough maps

Phineas Bradley, a trained physician from Connecticut, had followed his brother Abraham, the United States Assistant Postmaster General, to the District of Columbia in 1801 to join him in setting up the Post Office Department in the new Federal City. Bradley renamed the parcel Clover Hill. Bradley family lore relates that, after trying for eight years to locate adequate housing for his family in the new, relatively unpopulated city that held fewer than 500 houses, Bradley purchased Powell’s Dividend to be his family’s home. Although it is surprising that this property far from the Post Office Department was Bradley’s only residence, city directories support that finding. Bradley sold the property in 1839 to Junius Boyle and James C. Turner

---

for $6,000.\textsuperscript{46} The deed was conveyed “with the exception of a small portion of land on the eastern side of ‘Powell’s dividend’ heretofore conveyed to form part of a public road,” without indication of the acreage of this portion.\textsuperscript{47} Family legend holds that the Bradley family was buried on the property and that the Boyles were required to maintain the family plot; however, no documentation has been located to support this claim.\textsuperscript{48}

The new owner, Junius Ignatius Boyle (1808-1870), was a member of a prominent Washington naval family and held the rank of Commodore in the U.S. Navy when he died in Norfolk, Virginia in 1870.\textsuperscript{49} As was the custom among Washington’s social elite, it is presumed that the family retained a city residence while they used Shamrock Hill (as they had renamed Clover Hill) as their country residence. The Boyles are listed in 1843 with an address on the “south side of New York Avenue, between 13th and 14th Street, N.W. near 14th Street.”\textsuperscript{50} It is known that Commodore Boyle was stationed in New York in 1851 and, indeed, no listings are found in the Washington City directories for him after that.\textsuperscript{51} In April 1852, thirteen years after purchasing the

\textsuperscript{46} D.C. Recorder of Deeds: Liber WB No.76, Folio 83. Phineas Bradley to Junius J. (sic) Boyle and James C. Turner, signed March 8, 1839, recorded March 30, 1839. James C. Turner was married to a sister of Boyle’s wife, Ann Eliza McLeod Boyle. Turner’s specific role in this purchase is unknown as when Boyle sells the property to William S. Humphreys, it is recorded as being owned by Junius J. (sic) Boyle and his wife (Ann Eliza McLeod Boyle), without mention of Turner. N.b. Boyle and McLeod were married in 1832.

\textsuperscript{47} 90 acres has been quoted as the acreage for Glenwood since the earliest years and what has been published in historic maps; however, the deed between the Boyles and Humphreys for Shamrock Hill (the re-named Clover Hill) transfers only 84.25 acres in two parcels: 75.25 acres (Powell’s Dividend) and an additional 9 acres. The 75.25 acres is consistent with the deeds between Dickson and Bradley, with the additional 9 acres appearing in the deed between Bradley and Boyle. The acreage remains as 84.25 in the transactions of Boyle and Humphreys and Humphreys and Close. The acreage of the area conveyed for the public road is not known at this time. The public road at question is most likely Bladensburgh Road (first known as Moore’s Lane in recognition of Moore’s Farm, located to the direct south of Glenwood, then Bladensburgh Road, then Bladensburg Road, Lincoln Avenue, and now Lincoln Road).

\textsuperscript{48} Charles Bradley, grandson of Abraham Bradley, reported in an article for the Records of the Columbia Historical Society that the terms of the sale required the Phineas Bradley family burial plot to remain intact on the grounds; however, neither the deed between the Bradleys and the Boyles nor that between the Boyles and Humphreys includes such a covenant. Dr. Bradley died in 1845, six years after the sale of the property and was buried in Rock Creek Church Cemetery. His son William A. Bradley, a DC Postmaster, is buried at Glenwood. Early maps of the cemetery do not show a family burial plot located on the grounds and no map earlier than the 1861 Boschke Map has been identified. The location of these remains has not been discovered. The 1861 Boschke Map indicates a house and two or three outbuildings located approximately where Lincoln Circle is today and a private road or drive road extending from the cemetery northerly to the house and beyond the cemetery’s property line. The house and outbuildings are the same buildings shown on the 1899 Plat that have been identified as the Bradleys’ house and outbuildings that were used by the cemetery’s Superintendent prior to 1904 when a new residence was constructed for the Superintendent adjacent to the Gate Keeper’s Lodge. The Bradley house and outbuildings were demolished in 1954. Bradley, Charles S. “The Bradley Family and the Times in Which They Lived,” Records of the Columbia Historical Society. Washington, Volume 6, 1902-03, 123-142.


\textsuperscript{50} In 1843, the Washington City Directory lists the Boyle family living on the south side of New York Avenue, between 13th and 14th Street, N.W. near 14th.

\textsuperscript{51} The next listing for the Boyles is in 1860 with an address of 349 21st Street, N.W. (after street number change, 732 21st Street, N.W.)
farm and presumably as a consequence of re-locating to New York, Boyle and his wife Ann Eliza (McLeod) Boyle sold the land to William S. Humphreys of New York City for $9,000.\textsuperscript{52}

At the time Humphreys made the purchase, the land included a house and outbuildings surrounded primarily by woodlands with farms and forests to the south, west, and north, and an eastern boundary along Old Bladensburg Road (now Lincoln Road, NE). Located on a high elevation, the site included a point that provided excellent views.\textsuperscript{53}

**William Humphreys and the Creation of Glenwood**

William Humphreys’ purchase of 84.25 acres north of the Federal City in April 1852 was made specifically with the intention of establishing a cemetery, most likely in collaboration with a group of investors. Humphreys intended that his cemetery, which he would name Glenwood, to provide a beautiful site for burials outside the city following the model of the Rural Cemetery Movement. Humphreys made very clear that he looked to the plan, topography, and appearance of Brooklyn’s relatively new Green-Wood Cemetery for inspiration.\textsuperscript{54}

Humphreys’ timing was perfect as news reports claimed that the Washington City Council appeared to be on the verge of passing an ordinance prohibiting the location of new burial grounds within the limits of the Federal City, and, on June 6\textsuperscript{th}, within two months of his purchase, the Council proceeded to do so.\textsuperscript{55}

Little is known of William S. Humphreys, the man behind the establishment of Glenwood Cemetery. How he came to the idea of creating a for-profit cemetery or focusing on the District of Columbia for its location is not documented. He was born in Ireland in 1815 or 1816, immigrated to the United States in or before 1840, and became a naturalized U.S. citizen in


\textsuperscript{53} 1861 Boschke Map; This highest point was (and is) close to the location of the now-demolished Bradley and outbuildings in the property’s northeastern section. Boschke, Albert. *Topographical map of the District of Columbia / surveyed in the years 1856 '57 '58 & '59 by A. Boschke; engraved by D. McClelland, Washington, D.C.* Washington: D.C.: McClelland, Blanchard & Mohun, 1861.

\textsuperscript{54} In July, 1854, one of a series of daily of display advertisements for Glenwood stated, “This cemetery is laid out on the plan of the celebrated Greenwood, of New York, and situated on high ground…” with directions to submit orders to the downtown office “or any other undertaker.” *The Evening Star*, July 1854.

\textsuperscript{55} “City Ordinances,” *The Daily National Intelligencer*, June 12, 1852.
Glenwood Cemetery
Name of Property

1848.\textsuperscript{56} He is believed to have been a cabinet maker who owned a cabinetry and furniture shop in Manhattan on Chatham Street (now Park Row) near the notorious Five Points neighborhood.\textsuperscript{57}


\textsuperscript{57} Humphreys is first listed in New York City Directories in 1840. The various directories spell his name differently, but his profession is consistent. 1840 [sic]: Longworth’s American Almanac, New-York Register, and City Directory for the Sixty-Fifth Year of American Independence - William S. Humphrys [sic], furniture 157 Chatham h. 42 Mulberry; 1841 and 1842: The New York Business Directory - William S. Humphreys, cabinetmaker, 9 & 11 E. B’dway, h. 19 Mott; 1843 and 1844: The Street Directory of the City of New York - William S. Humphreys, cabinetmaker, 163 Chatham, h. 165 Chatham; 1845 and 1846: New York City Directory - William S. Humphrys cabinetmaker, 163 Chatham & 113 Fulton, h. 7 Monroe; 1848: Street and Avenue Directory of the City of New York, Corrected May 25th, 1848 and 1849 - William S. Humphrys cabinetmaker, 163 Chatham and 138 Fulton, h. 43 Chambers; Ensign & Thayer’s Street and Avenue Directory of the City of New York, Corrected October 20, 1849; 1850: William S. Humphrys cabinetmaker, 169 and 197 Chatham, &r. 188 Henry & hotel 49 Chambers. In 1856, Trow’s City Directory, William S. Humphrys furniture, 163 Chatham, h. Washington City.
How Humphreys connected with residents of the District of Columbia necessary to making his land purchase and incorporating the cemetery company is also not known, although in seeking the Congressional charter needed to proceed with the project he convinced some of the city’s most prominent citizens to join with him as supporters and investors in the enterprise. It is possible that his residence and business in New York was the source of the connection. Humphreys’ cabinetry and furniture business and personal residences from 1840 through 1849 were located in the Lower East Side Manhattan’s Five Points neighborhood.\(^{58}\) Five Points was the center of Irish immigration in the mid nineteenth century and the location of the powerful New York City political machine at Tammany Hall. As an Irish immigrant and business owner, it is possible that he had direct association with the men of Tammany Hall, a number of who were elected to the U.S. Congress in the 1840s and 1850s, including Fernando Wood and “Boss” Tweed.\(^{59}\)

Another possible connection with Washington was Commodore Junius Boyle, then owner of Shamrock Hill. Boyle was known for his strong identification with Ireland and support for Irish immigrants. He was based with the U.S. Navy in New York in 1851.\(^{60}\) Boyle also might have made the connection between Humphreys and William A. Bradley, son of Dr. Phineas Bradley, who served as Mayor of the City of Washington 1834-1836 and in 1851 purchased Analostan Island and transformed it from a plantation into a entertainment resort.\(^{61}\)

The Design

\(^{58}\) Humphreys is first listed in New York City Directories in 1840. The various directories spell his name differently, but his profession is consistent. 1840 [sic]: Longworth’s American Almanac, New-York Register, and City Directory for the Sixty-Fifth Year of American Independence - William S. Humphrys, furniture 157 Chatham h. 42 Mulberry; 1841 and 1842: The New York Business Directory - William S. Humphreys, cabinetmaker, 9 & 11 E. B’dway, h. 19 Mott; 1843 and 1844: The Street Directory of the City of New York - William S. Humphreys, cabinetmaker, 163 Chatham, h. 165 Chatham; 1845 and 1846: New York City Directory - William S. Humphrys cabinetmaker, 163 Chatham & 113 Fulton, h. 7 Monroe; 1848: Street and Avenue Directory of the City of New York, Corrected May 25th, 1848 and 1849 - William S. Humphrys cabinetmaker, 163 Chatham and 138 Fulton, h. 43 Chambers; Ensign & Thayer’s Street and Avenue Directory of the City of New York, Corrected October 20, 1849; 1850: William S. Humphreys cabinetmaker, 169 and 197 Chatham, &r. 188 Henry & hotel 49 Chambers. No listing has been found between 1850 and 1856 until the 1856 edition of Trow’s City Directory which lists him as: William S. Humphrys furniture, 163 Chatham, h. Washington City. No subsequent listing was located owing to the lack of either DC or NYC directories for the next few years.


Humphreys did not wait, as did the incorporators of Green-Wood Cemetery, for incorporation or income from the sale of lots before making the necessary improvements at the cemetery. Near the time of the land purchase, Humphreys retained engineer Captain George de la Roche, who had just completed his work on Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown, to survey the property and design a cemetery similar in appearance to Green-Wood.

When arriving at the site, de la Roche was faced with a location “upon a grand elevation, one mile and a half due north of the Capitol, one mile from the City Hall, and command[ing] a magnificent view of the city, river, and surrounding country. The tract is undulating, with hills and dell, a considerable portion of it embellished with grand and towering native forest trees… The ravine that extends around the tract, with its deep and continuous border of forest trees, is one of the peculiar natural ornaments of the premises…” 62 The property was surrounded by “a deep wood, giving it a rural, quiet, and secluded character.” 63

While de la Roche worked on the design, Humphreys “immediately set about preparing it for use as a cemetery. He inclosed [sic] with a high fence, and laid out drives and walks, and improved and embellished thirty acres of it, leaving the other sixty acres in their original unimproved condition.” 64 He brought George Clendenin, also a New York resident, fellow carpenter, and his brother-in-law, to Washington to work as the cemetery’s Superintendent.

---

The natural character of the site, like that of de la Roche’s other DC cemetery Oak Hill Cemetery, involved a property with undulating topography that was defined on one side (in this case, the eastern edge) by a steep change in elevation. This grade required specific treatment to ensure its permanence and a wide stone wall was built on most of the eastern boundary and part of the western edge. The plat shows that the design for the initial 30 acres included a web of four miles of connecting curvilinear roads including a perimeter road, called The Tour, which was directly based on a similar perimeter road, also called The Tour, at Green-Wood Cemetery. With the exception of The Tour and Central Avenue, the roads were named for trees: Cedar, Chestnut, Cypress, Magnolia, Mulberry, and Oak. There are indications of two structures: a Gatekeeper’s Lodge is shown straddling the main entry road and a rectangle in Section G where

---

the Public Mausoleum stands today. Open landscaped areas, not initially plotted for burial, included an ellipse at the main entrance at the property’s southernmost point (now Lincoln Road, then known as Old Bladensburg Road or Moore’s Lane) and a centrally located circle that formed the center of the road system. The sixteen sections (lettered A-H and J-Q) were plotted for burial following the curvilinear arrangement of the roads. The lots are shown ranging from approximately 80 to 320 square feet in size.66

**Humphreys’ Bankruptcy**

As the cemetery was under construction, Humphreys ran out of funds to complete the work. On April 7, 1853, he borrowed $4,500 from Joseph Close, one of the cemetery’s stockholders. As collateral, Humphreys put up one-half ownership of the cemetery property. A deed dated June 14, 1853 documents this arrangement.67

Little is known of Joseph Close and his acquaintance with William Humphreys. Close was a resident of Jersey City, New Jersey where he owned a clothing store. How he knew Humphreys or how he had sufficient money to invest in Humphreys’ scheme is unknown. However, despite this limited connection, Close was to become a key player in the cemetery’s future.

In June 1854, only a month way from Congress securing the cemetery’s charter and two months away from the cemetery’s opening, Close again made a loan to Humphreys. This time the amount was $4,812.67 and the price was the remaining half of the property.68

**The Congressional Charter**

Although Humphreys’ ownership of the cemetery had concluded, he continued to act on behalf of the new owner, Joseph Close. On July 27, 1854, Congress formally approved the cemetery’s incorporation.

Beyond the purchase of the land, the most critical aspect of Humphreys’ efforts to establish the cemetery in the District was gaining a charter from Congress for the cemetery corporation. Until the late 1800s when Congress granted the District of Columbia the ability to issue its own corporate charters, corporations seeking to operate in the District were required to get a Congressional charter. Although Humphreys was a resident of New York City, and to date no specific record of his activities in the District have been located, his knowledge of or connections

---

67 D.C. Recorder of Deeds: Liber JAS 57 Folio 320-323: Wm.S. Humphreys et ex to Jos B Close, signed April 7, 1853 recorded June 14, 1853.
to the District’s political circles was sufficient to serve his purpose. He needed and found local supporters/investors to join him in identifying a Member of Congress to sponsor the bill seeking the Congressional charter necessary before he could open the cemetery.  

Congress was the only path to incorporation and as the process from bill to law was the same as for any congressional bill, this must have required some understanding of the process and the political clout to get the needed sponsors. Humphreys, who has been identified as cabinetmaker and owner of a furniture store in New York City, had to have made significant connections in New York and/or Washington: first, to place him in contact with the Boyles for the sale of the farm property and, second, to enable him to gain the access to members of the House and Senate, so necessary for him to accomplish his goal for the cemetery. Twelve men (Joseph Close and William Phelps from New Jersey, Humphreys and Randolph Evans from New York, as well as Charles B. Calvert, George Parker, William B. Todd, James C. McGuire, William A. Bradley, Charles S. Wallach, Abner Mellen, and William Banks of the District) were named in the petition to Congress as “shareholders” of the cemetery, although by this time an unfortunate turn of events had led to one investor, Joseph Close, gaining ownership of the land. Although no reports document this, Phineas Bradley’s son William, who was like his father and uncle a well-known citizen, grew up at Clover Hill Farm and had been Washington’s Mayor in the 1830s, may have been a link to other influential Washingtonians who could be persuaded to assist in the establishment of a new cemetery within the District. Regardless, from his purchase of the land in April 1852 to the introduction of the bill requesting the charter in late 1853, Humphreys managed to gain the support of at least eight influential Washingtonians and initiate the required legislative process to achieve the incorporation of a private cemetery company. News of the passage of the charter was published in the Washington Globe the same day the act was passed.

Details of the action came out the following day in the morning edition of the Richmond Daily Dispatch. The Dispatch reported that Glenwood Cemetery had been chartered by a unanimous

---

69 In its role as manager of the affairs of the District of Columbia (Article 1, Section 8, clause 17), The District of Columbia, which became the seat of the federal government in 1790, had neither a general incorporation law nor a legislature that could grant charters. So it fell to Congress to incorporate the District’s corporations. Kevin R. Kosar, Congressional or Federal Charters: Overview and Enduring Issues for Congressional Research Service, 7-5700. www.crs.gov, RS22230, April 19, 2013.

70 Review of Congressional charters on behalf of the District of Columbia was limited even at that time. A major act was the incorporation of the Office of the Mayor and the Council of the City of Washington, while others were mainly for banks and non-profit institutions. Between 1791 through 1899, 191 companies and associations were incorporated. Of these, four were cemeteries: Oak Hill (1849); Glenwood (1854); Prospect Hill (1869) and Mount Olivet (1863), presumably other cemeteries operated under the charter of the ownership organization. For information on early congressional charters, see Margaret Fennell, Corporations Chartered by Special Act of Congress, 1791-1943 (Washington: Library of Congress, 1944).

71 It is possible that the unsubstantiated legend that the Bradleys had placed a covenant in the deed of sale of their farm protecting their family burial site was somehow associated with William Bradley’s connection with Humphreys as one of the twelve men listed as “proprietors.” Bradley’s operation of a “entertainment resort” on Analostan Island might also have been how Bradley and Humphreys met.

act of Congress, having first cleared the Senate and, on the previous Friday, the House of Representatives. The bill seeking the cemetery’s charter was brought up in the Senate on January 17, 1854, sponsored by Moses Norris, Jr., Senator from New Hampshire.

Agreeably to notice, Mr. Norris asked and obtained leave to bring in a bill (S. 137) to incorporate the proprietors of the Washington cemetery; which was read the first and second times, by unanimous consent, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Norris was the chair of the Senate’s Committee on the District of Columbia, which took up the bill upon referral from the Senate at large on January 17. The Committee submitted a report with amendments to the Senate on March 7, 1854, and the amended bill was voted on and approved that day for referral to the House.

The bill was brought to the House on Wednesday, March 8, 1854 by Asbury Dickins, Secretary for the Senate, as one of the Senate-approved bills awaiting confirmation by the House. John S. Phelps of Missouri, “acting on the petition of Charles S. Wallach and others,” brought it to the House floor on April 15, 1854, whereupon it was referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia. After amendments from the Committee on the District of Columbia regarding obligations were added, Charles T. James of Rhode Island called for the confirmation of the House approval on Monday, July 24, 1854.

Public Law No. 52, “An Act to Incorporate the Proprietors of the Glenwood Cemetery,” was approved by Congress on July 27, 1854 and published on August 23, 1854. The Congressional charter allowed for a new cemetery to be laid out northeast of the City of Washington, off Lincoln Road, north of Boundary Street (Florida Avenue). The original managers of the cemetery corporation were Joseph Close, President; G.D. [sic] Humphreys, Secretary; George Clendenin, Superintendent; George F. de la Roche, Engineer; and John McGuire, keeper of the grounds. The managers were supported by a board of supervisors comprised of twelve men who were described as the original “shareholders” of the corporation. As published, the law listed the

---

73 “Congress-Monday,” in The Richmond Daily Dispatch, July 26, 1854, 1
75 Journal of the Senate of the United States: First Session of the Thirty-third Congress. Washington, DC: B. Tucker, December 5, 1853, 106. Although this bill was introduced by a Senator, during most of the 1800s, to gain a charter required the assistance of a United States Representative to sponsor a bill; Michael Walsh, with the assistance by Ellen Sweet and Richard McKinney, “An Overview of the Development of U.S. Congressional Committees” July 2008 at www.llsdc.org/assets/sourcebook/cong-cmte-overview.pdf
78 Charles S. Wallach (? -1872) was an attorney in the District, and brother of Richard Wallach, (mayor of the City of Washington from 1861-1868).

Sections 9-end page 77
same men who had been listed as petitioners: Charles B. Calvert, George Parker, William B. Todd, James C. McGuire, William A. Bradley, Charles S. Wallach, Abner Mellen, and William Banks (who were all residents of the District of Columbia), Joseph B. Close and William Phelps (who lived in New Jersey) and William S. Humphreys and Randolph S. Evans (who were residents of New York), and their successors, as the “body politic and corporate, by the name and title of the proprietors of ‘Glenwood Cemetery in the District of Columbia...’.”

The corporation held the power to purchase and hold no more than 100 acres in the District of Columbia, north of the City of Washington in what was the County of Washington. The act specifically references capital stock to be “represented by two thousand shares of fifty dollars each, divided among the proprietors according to their respective interests, and transferable in such manner as the by-laws may direct.” Further, the company was granted jurisdiction over the cemetery grounds as long as the cemetery contained at least 30 contiguous acres.

Significantly, the Congressional charter provided protection for the cemetery’s future by establishing the cemetery as a permanent use, ensuring the security of the interments through fee simple sale of burial lots, and prohibiting the legislative taking of the land for roads or other purposes. These components of the charter were advertised in the cemetery in its promotional literature, as “of vast importance to those who wish their dead to repose where they have placed them, for it has become a custom in all other cities when the burial ground becomes valuable for other purposes, to sell it, and throw the dead promiscuously [sic] into one large pit, and legal measures cannot prevent it as no titles are given to the ground.” The wholesale re-interment of bodies had been already seen in the District as downtown churchyards were sold off for development, making this claim of permanency particularly attractive; the fees simple sale of lots would prove critical to the cemetery’s future; and the protection from the legislative taking of land for roads was equally prescient.

81 Of this group of men, eight were Washingtonians. Charles B. Calvert (1808-1864), a descendent of the Carrolls of Maryland who were among the original 19 proprietors of the land that became the Federal City, was an early backer of the telegraph, the founder in 1856 of the Maryland Agricultural College (now University of Maryland), and a Congressman from Maryland 1861-1863; George Parker, a wealthy businessman who served in various positions with the Bank of the Metropolis, including as co-Director and co-Officer. He lived near his business in a mansion on C and 4 ½ Streets N.W., where his wife often threw parties for the DC elite and military. William B. Todd was a hatter who became a successful entrepreneur and served as the director of the Potomac Fire Insurance Company and the Bank of the Metropolis; James C. McGuire (1811-1888) was a wealthy Marylander who was one of the original incorporators of the Corcoran Gallery of Art in 1869. Born in Pennsylvania, he came to Washington, D.C. as a young man to apprentice as a book-binder. His success led him to pursue interests in real estate development and auctioneering. “J. C. McGuire Dead,” The Washington Post, August 28, 1888; William Bradley (1794-1867), the son of Phineas Bradley, came to D.C. as a child with his father in 1801, became Mayor of the City of Washington 1836-38, and its Postmaster in the 1850s. A known real estate investor, in 1851 he purchased Analostan Island and developed it as an entertainment resort with a dance hall; Charles S. Wallach was the son of a successful Alexandria attorney who became a practicing attorney in D.C. A Southern sympathizer, he left DC for the South when the Civil War broke out. His brother Richard was Mayor of Washington from 1861-1868. Abner Mellen and William Banks have not been identified.

82 “By Authority,” Delaware State Reporter, August 18, 1854, 1.

83 “Glenwood Cemetery,” The Evening Star, July 10, 1855.
The most significant aspect of the Congressional charter was that it established Glenwood as a for-profit business and, as such, is the first use of a for-profit organization for a cemetery in Washington, D.C. There was no mention of a requirement that profit from sales be returned to the corporation to improve the cemetery, as had the 1849 Congressional charter of Oak Hill or the 1842 New York State charter of Green-Wood Cemetery. In fact, the earlier Oak Hill charter includes text that carefully puts forward the method to be used to transition ownership from the incorporating proprietors to the lot proprietors and states explicitly that no profit is to be gained from the cemetery’s operations.

The decision to establish Glenwood as a for-profit business was without precedent in the District and it may be the first application of this business model in the United States. It is highly possible that Humphreys was not only inspired to model his cemetery after Green-Wood Cemetery’s appearance, but also to model his venture into the cemetery business after Green-Wood’s initial entrepreneurial organization. Although Humphreys’ decision to purchase land in the District and transform it from rural farm and woodlands into a “fashionable” cemetery is not documented, his intention of creating a privately owned, for-profit corporation to run a non-denominational (albeit Christian) cemetery rather than establishing a not-for-profit entity is clear, and, like its appearance, has an equally clear precedent in Green-wood Cemetery. Founded in 1838, Green-wood, like Mount Auburn near Boston, was not associated with a specific religious denomination, but was instead open to all Christians. Unlike Mount Auburn, which was owned by a non-profit group, Green-Wood was initially organized as a joint-stock company, intended to be owned by stockholders who would profit from its success. The original for-profit model of joint-stock holders, however, was not well-received and Green-Wood was re-incorporated as a non-profit entity prior to proceeding with development plans. In the promotional material published in 1839 by the cemetery’s founders, they explained the decision to change the organizational structure: “The idea of private and individual profit, and…the conflicting interest of lot-holders and stock-holders…appears not in harmony with an undertaking which, in its nature and aim, is eminently and essentially philanthropic.” This message, however, went unheeded in the organization of Glenwood and would later prove to play a critical role in the cemetery’s future.

The Cemetery’s Initial Management

By the time the cemetery was dedicated in August 1854, Humphreys was no longer owner of the land. His association with the cemetery corporation, however, continued as one of the four men (with Clendenin, Close, and Randolph Evans) named as the corporation’s managers. Close was listed as president, Humphreys as treasurer, and Clendenin as superintendent. Evans was not

---

85 Act Incorporating Oak Hill Cemetery, March 3, 1849 (9 stat 773 ch. 128). A later interpretation of the charter by the Supreme Court disagree with this intention, however, the text of the Glenwood Charter is clear.
86 In fact, the economic benefit was to be realized indirectly through the increase in “traffic” into Brooklyn related to the cemetery’s activities. David Bates Douglas, Exposition of the Plan and Objects of the Green-Wood Cemetery, New York, 1839 quoted in Sloane, The Last Great Necessity, 59.
named in a specific position. As the new owner of the land, it was Close who signed the deed transferring each lot, and each deed clearly declared the purchaser as the fee simple owner of the named lot.

With the incorporation of the cemetery, newly named managers published formal “Rules and Regulations.” These initial rules and regulations ran the gamut from defining the dimensions and material allowed to enclose a lot to restricting the proprietors from allowing those of African descent from being buried at the cemetery (the separation by race a common policy at that time). Aside from racial segregation, the cemetery welcomed the burial of people of any and all Christian religions. The rules forbade the interment of those persons who acquired their lots as remuneration. The cemetery was open at all times to the lot “proprietors.” Finally, the managers reserved the right to remove any monument or planting that marred the general beauty of the landscape.

It appears that the change in land ownership did little to affect the day-to-day operations. Although no longer holding any claim to the property, Humphreys was the corporation’s treasurer. He was in Washington City when the cemetery opened in August 1854 and listed Washington as his residence in 1856. As treasurer, he continued to participate in the cemetery’s operations and his name continued to be the name publicly associated with promoting the cemetery. He published numerous advertisements for the cemetery over the next two years, extolling its location, its beauty, and the fairness and security of the fee simple lot purchase program. When Humphreys permanently cut off his connection to Glenwood or permanently left Washington is not known, although it is known that he died in New York in 1877. Besides Humphreys, Joseph Close, the corporation’s president and the sole proprietor of the 84.25 acres, was the only other active manager. Although he resided in New Jersey, as the corporation president he signed all deeds transferring lots to their purchasers and, it would be later discovered, claimed all profits from the sale of lots despite the earlier notice of a group of twelve

87 Churchyards, Columbian Harmony, Payne’s, and others served African Americans in D.C.
89 “Glenwood Cemetery,” The Evening Star, July 10, 1855, 1.
shareholders. Randolph Evans, the third named manager is known to have lived in New York and there is no record of his participation in any of the cemetery’s activities.  

1861 Fee Simple Deed for Glenwood Cemetery Lot. Source: Glenwood Cemetery Archives

It was Clendenin who would hold the longest tenure of the early participants in the cemetery’s creation, living on the cemetery grounds until 1878. Although brought to the District by Humphreys, who had master-minded the idea of a for-profit cemetery and would depart soon after forfeiting the property to his creditor Joseph Close, Clendenin lucked into permanent employment. There is no evidence of his training as a gardener prior to coming to DC; instead it

is likely that he worked as a carpenter in New York. His role in the appearance of the cemetery, however, while not at the level of de la Roche, was critical to the cemetery’s initial presentation and continuing operations. When the cemetery was opened in August 1854, the press reported that the grounds “bear evident indications of fidelity and good taste on the part of Mr. G. Clendenin, the superintendent, under whose direction was erected, before the premises were open for interments, the handsome gatehouse of the Grecian order, the front of which is adorned with figures of Time, Penitence, and Love.” Clendenin is credited in the newspaper as the contractor for the Gatekeeper’s Lodge, which was constructed in a manner similar but not identical to de la Roche’s sketch. As Superintendent, his duties would have included oversight of the design of the plantings and maintenance of the general landscape, advising on memorials, and generally handling the logistics of the burials, while John McGuire, who was named as the Keeper of the Grounds, would have been responsible for tending to the landscape. Once Humphreys was no longer involved, it is likely that Clendenin handled paperwork, budget and sales and McGuire handled all else.

The Beautiful City of the Dead

As established in 1852, Glenwood embodied the late-nineteenth-century Romantic tastes for pastoral beauty, which is a hallmark of the Rural Cemetery Movement. The foundation of the picturesque setting was Glenwood’s undulating natural landscape engineered to serve as a cemetery. The hillocks and gentle ravines created unique burial sections, which were defined by wide curvilinear roads that followed the topography. The gently rolling hills provided not only visually interest, but also allowed gravesites to be protectively banked into the ground. Its topography was further enhanced by the retention of native trees, including oak, cherry, and chestnut, and the planting of new trees and substantial ornamental plants. The high fence surrounding the 30 acres clearly established the cemetery’s initial boundaries, and created a somewhat intimate environment for the memorials amidst the rural setting beyond the city’s limits.

The dedication of Glenwood occurred on August 1, 1854, and was reported to have been a grand affair. Invitations to the event had been placed in local newspapers for weeks in advance, touting “appropriate services by the clergy of the city, and every arrangement made to make the occasion what it should be.” On Jul 29th, the Daily National Intelligencer reported that the program the next day was to include an opening prayer by the Rev. R.L. Dashield, representing the Methodist Episcopal Church, an address by Rev. Dr. C.M. Butler of Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church, and a poem by the Presbyterian pastor, Rev. Byron Sunderland. The President of the United States Franklin Pierce and members of his cabinet were invited guests. “Distinguished visitors” and a large assembly of residents from the District attended the ceremony. Rev. Dashield was commended for his prayer, and the crowd paid “profound attention” to all twenty-five verses of Rev. Sunderland’s poem. Rev. Butler’s address noted the beauty of the “natural and artificial arrangements of the ground—the Mausoleum—and

91 “Dedication of Glenwood Cemetery,” The Evening Star, August 2, 1854, 3.
particular eight old cherry trees standing in a cluster at the centre of the Cemetery.”

The refined appearance of white marble Public Mausoleum was praised as being “said to be similar to that in the celebrated Greenwood Cemetery.” Significantly, Rev. Butler addressed the “moral and religious influence of cemeteries, when adorned with the beauty of cultivated nature and of Christian art, in attuning the mind to solemn meditation, and in embodying in its epitaphs and symbols the great truths of Christianity…” The conclusion was that “The services throughout were of the most impressive and appropriate character, and will long linger in the memories of all present.”

With the dedication, descriptions of the cemetery began to be published in various local newspapers, as well as the Baltimore Sun. “The grounds,” reported the Sun, “were laid out under the supervision of the celebrated engineer Captain George de la Roche, whose taste is also seen in Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown, and the manner in which he did his work is an enduring monument of his superior skill and culture.” They noted the Grecian Lodge that stood at the entrance to the cemetery; “A handsome frame lodge, or gate-house, of the Grecian order, has been built by George Clendenin, the present superintendent of the place. It has a beautiful front with figures of Time, Penitence, and Love.” The wood-frame Lodge, it was said, cost $5,000 to build and, as indicated in the 1854 plat, spanned the entry road forming a gate with small buildings to either side. A drawing by engineer de la Roche depicting a “Gateway” for Glenwood Cemetery fits this description of the cemetery’s new Lodge.

The accounts also describe the beautiful rolling grounds, laid out with four miles of graveled roads. The Public Mausoleum that served as a receiving vault was described as a “mosaic mausoleum” vault in the Egyptian Revival-style. It was built for the cemetery by Alexander...
Maxwell, the owner of Alexander Maxwell & Co., a New York marble supplier, which regularly bid on major Federal and New York State construction projects, as well as supplying marble for such elaborate designs as the Marble Palace and Marble Mansion owned by millionaire merchant Alexander Turret Stewart, both by architect John Kellen.101 The mausoleum was reported to cost $10,000 to build, and was designed to house 100 coffins.102 As with the Lodge, a drawing by de la Roche depicting a mausoleum for Glenwood is similar to the existing mausoleum, and it is highly probable that de la Roche was the architect of both the entry Lodge and the Public Mausoleum and that cemetery Superintendent Clendenin acted as interpreter/builder of de la Roche’s schemes.

![Public Mausoleum (Receiving Vault)](https://example.com/public_mausoleum.jpg)
Source: Glenwood Cemetery Archives

Although documentation would later challenge the claim, it was reported at the time of the dedication that Humphreys had paid $10,000 for the property, had expended an additional $35,000, and “still the work of improvement is going on.”103

---


103 “Dedication of Glenwood Cemetery (from yesterday’s Star),” *Daily Union*, August 1, 1854, 3.
Newspaper advertisements signed by Humphreys, were published beginning immediately after the cemetery’s dedication and continued on a daily basis for close to a year extolling “This beautiful burial place,” recently dedicated with “appropriate ceremonies,” featuring a mausoleum having the capacity for 100 bodies, “in which friends of the dead as may apply can place the departed until they select sites for the graves.” The “plan of the incorporators is one of equality in regard to the lots, which will not be put up publicly for sale, but can be taken privately as persons may desire.”

Selecting as cemeteries for the loved and lost spots attractive for their natural beauties, and rendered still more attractive by the works of art and the offerings of affection, are, comparatively speaking, of recent origin. Nearly all our large cities have fitting places of sepulchre. New York has its Greenwood, Philadelphia its Laurel Hill, Boston its Mount Auburn, and Washington its Glenwood.

The First Burial

The first burial at Glenwood took place on Thursday, August 3, 1854, two days after the dedication, when the remains of Mary Anne Donn, wife of Thomas C. Donn, Esquire, were removed from Congressional Cemetery (probably from the receiving the vault), and interred at Glenwood Cemetery. Mrs. Donn had died on July 22, 1854, at the age of 49. A newspaper account of the interment described Mary Ann Donn as a “respected lady,” and, as the first burial in the cemetery, she endowed the grounds with the virtues of age, experience, and the fullness of a life well-lived. Mrs. Donn’s marker is inscribed with the words: “Mary Ann/ consort of Thomas C. Donn/born in Philadelphia June 12, 1805/ Died in Washington, D.C. July 22, 1854/ Aged 49 Years/ Wife. Mother. Friend./ The First Occupant of Glenwood.”

104 “Glenwood Cemetery” advertisement, The Evening Star, published daily from August 5, 1854 through July 2, 1855.
105 “Glenwood Cemetery,” The Daily Union, April 25, 1855, 3.
106 “Funerals Yesterday,” The Evening Star, July 24, 1854, 3.
107 “Local Intelligence,” The Evening Star, August 5, 1854.
In May 1855, less than ten months following the cemetery’s dedication, the *Baltimore Sun* reported: “About 100 interments have been made. Preparations are in progress for completing some of the sacred repositories in styles of modern elegance.”\(^{109}\) In July, Glenwood advertised, “This cemetery is laid out on the plan of the celebrated Greenwood, of New York, and situated on high ground…” with directions to submit orders to the downtown office “or any other undertaker.”\(^{110}\) By 1857, Glenwood contained more than 400 burials.\(^{111}\)

In comparing Glenwood to its contemporary, Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown, *The Daily National Intelligencer* noted:

> The attention given to the improvement of the burial places in Washington and Georgetown has been the subject of frequent remarks by strangers. Indeed, the character of christian [sic] as well as savage people is estimated somewhat by the care thus exhibited for the relics of their brethren. The new Georgetown Cemetery is one of the prominent attractions to visitors, and the Glenwood Cemetery, lately laid out in the vicinity of Washington; will soon be also an object of interest.\(^{112}\)

\(^{109}\) “Glenwood Cemetery--Correspondence of the *Baltimore Sun*” in *Baltimore Sun*, May 23, 1855, 4.

\(^{110}\) “Glenwood Cemetery,” *The Evening Star*, July 10, 1855, 1.


In December 1855, *The Evening Star*’s “Local Intelligence” column reported that Glenwood and Oak Hill Cemetery served as inspiration for the introduction of a new section in the century-old Rock Creek Cemetery to be designed in the style of a rural cemetery. In discussing the merits of the Rural Cemetery Movement and the particular manifestations seen at Mount Auburn and Green-Wood, the columnist stated that “we have our Oak Hill and Glenwood Cemeteries; and we rejoice to find the same spirit of laudable enterprise has led the rector and vestry of the venerable Rock Creek Parish…to appropriate and commence the laying out a large portion of the glebe for a similar [rural design] purpose.”

As time went on, not only were more interments completed, but Glenwood’s reputation as a rural cemetery of great beauty grew. The *Baltimore Sun* referred to it as “that beautiful, romantic resting place of the departed.” Additional descriptions published from time to time add to our knowledge of the cemetery’s early appearance. In May 1857, following three years of work and more than 400 interments, the cemetery’s grounds were described:

> A high fence surrounds the entire grounds, which lay in natural undulations, admirably adapted to the purpose for which they have been set apart. Within, the grounds are beautifully and ingeniously laid out with winding walks of suitable width, and finely graveled, to an extent of four miles. These walks are lined with evergreen cedar, while a natural growth of oak and chestnut overhangs, giving a sweet and rural quiet to the whole scene...On the thirty acres now in use some $60,000 have been expended.

In an undated *Boyd’s City Directory*, presumably from between 1855 and 1865, superintendent George Clendenin signed a full-page ad in which he listed “Lots of prominence” having “nice enclosures or monuments, or both.” This extraordinary list identified people who at the time were perceived as prominent in the city, glorifying Glenwood’s appeal.

---

113 “Local Intelligence,” in *The Evening Star*, 8 December 1854, 3; Rock Creek Parish, where the cemetery is located, was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2009 for its national significance.
Cleneden’s list
Source: Boyd’s City Directory
Vertical Files under Glenwood Cemetery in the Washingtoniana Division
Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library

Public credit for the cemetery’s appearance was now given solely to its superintendent Clendenin:

Nature has done much, and the exquisite taste and skill of Mr. Clendenin, the superintendent, has done more, to render it, as it is, a place of universal admiration. Now that the trees are putting forth their buds and blossoms, and the early flowers are coyly and gracefully revealing their inmost beauties, and while
Glenwood Cemetery

the very air itself is redolent with hope and promise, a visit to Glenwood will richly repay the time and trouble.\textsuperscript{117}

Reinterment at Glenwood

The role of cemeteries outside of city limits was to provide a resting place at a safe but convenient distance from the city that would not be threatened with closure as the city population grew. The six new cemeteries established in the District during the later nineteenth century, including Oak Hill, Prospect Hill, Mount Olivet, Columbian Harmony, Woodlawn, and Glenwood:

…served not only the recently deceased, but also became home to the thousands of re-interments from the city center. Throughout the second half of the 19th and into the 20th century, bodies from virtually all of the District’s family burial grounds and dozens of the city’s early churchyards were relocated to the new cemeteries. The \textit{Critic-Record} reported in 1884 that “popular interest in the excavation of Holmead [Western] Cemetery is on the increase if the crowds that assemble on the scene can be taken as an indication. Yesterday’s operations were of unusual interest. Fifty men were at work and ten bodies were exhumed.\textsuperscript{118}

Thousands of bodies were relocated to these new cemeteries as burial grounds within the city limits were closed to allow development for the growing city. Glenwood proved to be a convenient place to reinter remains from cemeteries being redeveloped downtown. For example, in 1855 bodies were removed from St. John’s Church burial ground, near 16\textsuperscript{th} and H streets, N.W., and were reinterred at Glenwood.\textsuperscript{119} Another example relates to Western Methodist Cemetery, otherwise known as Foundry Methodist Episcopal Cemetery, located at V and 13\textsuperscript{th} streets, N.W. (The church was first located in Georgetown, and then at 14\textsuperscript{th} and G Streets, N.W., neither adjacent to cemetery) Congress enacted legislation in 1867 authorizing the closing of the cemetery to allow the sale of the land, with the caveat that the proceeds of the sale would be used to remove the dead then buried at the cemetery, and reinter them at a cemetery outside of the city limits. Glenwood Cemetery was selected to satisfy this requirement.\textsuperscript{120} On April 18, 1867, the trustees of the Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church purchased Lots 5, 6, 57, and 58 in Section O of Glenwood and a majority of the 1,805 bodies removed from the Western Methodist Cemetery were reinterred at Glenwood. Unfortunately, not uncommon, as a result of the move approximately forty bodies were not identifiable, and were buried in a common grave in Lot 5.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{117} “Glenwood Cemetery,” \textit{The Daily Union}, April 25, 1855, 3.
Similarly, records indicate that fifteen remains from Trinity Episcopal Church graveyard at 3rd and C streets, N.W. were reinterred at Glenwood circa 1867, probably necessitated by pressure to sell the cemetery land for redevelopment.122

**The Battle Ground of the Dead**

In December 1871, a brief paragraph advertising the special quality of Glenwood was circulated:

> Glenwood Cemetery is being made one of the most attractive in the country. The grounds, carriage ways &tc., are well laid out, and the most scrupulous care is exercised regarding the privileges of lotholders. Under the superintendence of Mr. Clendenin it is indeed a “beautiful city of the dead.”123

---

123 This advertisement prepared by Glenwood Cemetery, dated December 13, 1871, from an unidentified newspaper is archived in the Vertical Files under Glenwood Cemetery in the Washingtoniana Division of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library; Although there is no supporting information that Humphreys continued to be active in the cemetery’s management after its first few years, Troy’s City Directory of New York for 1856 lists his home.
It was, however, not too long before the idyllic character of the cemetery was blemished by the unrest of its lot proprietors when an unpleasant event jarred them into the realization that their privileges were not being honored.

The chain of events leading to a significant change in the cemetery’s management began in 1876, when Susan Sherman Bartley, the second wife of former federal Judge Thomas W. Bartley, died. The Judge sought to bury her in the family plot at Glenwood, but Superintendent Clendenin refused on the grounds that the Judge owed, and had owed for a long time, $30.00 to the cemetery corporation for the improvement of the plot. Cemetery regulations, stated Mr. Clendenin, required him to “enforce the rule that no lot owner shall be allowed to use his lot for an interment while he is in arrears for proper charges thereon.”

Bartley immediately sought out his wife’s brother’s assistance in this case. Bartley’s brother-in-law was John Sherman, U.S. Senator from Ohio, who was on the cusp of being named the Secretary of the Treasury, and also the owner of a lot at Glenwood. Sherman immediately shot off a harsh letter to George Clendenin:

Sir,

I have just heard of the demand made by you upon Judge Bartley as a condition that he should bury his wife and my sister upon his own lots in Glenwood Cemetery and I have requested Wm. Jenner to pay you the blackmail you levy. But in doing so I give you fair warning that it will be recovered back from you if the law allows and that I regard your conduct under the circumstances as proving that you are no more worthy to have custody of the dead than a hyena. By what right or law you thus propose to prevent the burial of the dead it shall be my business as a lot owner, a relative, and a man to inquire into.

Very truly yours,

John Sherman

address as “Washington City,” and his name remained listed with Close and Clendenin as an “elected” manager. Close’s active role, other than signing the deeds and collecting profits, is also unclear. All evidence points to Clendenin, who lived on the cemetery grounds, holding actual day-to-day on-site control over the cemetery following Humphreys’ departure through 1878 when Close surrendered control although not hope of retaining ownership; however, Close did sign the deeds for lot purchases. Humphreys died in 1877 in Brooklyn, following at least two years of paresis, a syphilitic disease that affected him both mentally and physically (Medical Center Archives of New York-Presbyterian/Weill Cornell Medical Center, Entry for William S. Humphreys from Bloomingdale Asylum, January-November 1866, “Daily Accounts of Administrators and Discharges”). He was buried in Green-Wood Cemetery.


“More of John Sherman’s Doings,” New York Sun, May 7, 1878, 4. John Sherman was not buried at Glenwood, but at Mansfield Cemetery in Ohio.
As incorporated, all shares in the cemetery were to be distributed only to the original twelve proprietors; therefore, the lot owners, despite owning the land of their plots in fee simple, had no control over cemetery affairs. Now, however, the Glenwood Cemetery lot proprietors were inspired to take on the existing cemetery management. On the evening of April 17, 1876, approximately fifty lot owners gathered to sign a petition to Congress requesting an amendment to Glenwood Cemetery Corporation’s charter. The petition stated:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the District of Columbia, most respectfully represent that we are proprietors of lots in Glenwood cemetery in said District, and feel a deep interest in having the grounds therein, which have been dedicated to the sacred purpose of the burial of the dead, protected and superintended by safe, reliable and suitable persons; that the management and control of said cemetery is at this time and has been for several years, in the hands of three persons who are residents of the city or vicinity of New York, and who have undertaken the management and control of the same for mere private speculation. Therefore, the undersigned respectfully ask that the said original act of incorporation be amended so as to place the control of the cemetery in the hands of the lot proprietors who are residents of the city.126

126 “The Glenwood Cemetery Unpleasantness,” The Evening Star, April 18, 1876, 4.
Judge Bartley, armed with an explanatory statement to support their case, told his fellow lot owners that both houses of Congress had already been apprised of the situation at Glenwood and “that the matter had been referred by each to their respective District Committees, and would probably elicit favorable reports.” On May 1st, the newspapers reported on the charges of inappropriate management, neglect, and lack of security against the defacement of graves. To the charge by the lot owners that the cemetery company was a “mere New York speculation” without regard to the character of its property, the company’s “defenders” responded “if the lot-holders are aggrieved they can buy the stock and conduct the affairs to suit themselves.”

Choosing not to make an outright purchase of the cemetery company, the lot owners’ group relied on support from the powerful Senator Sherman. On February 28, 1877, Congress amended the original charter to give the lot proprietors the majority interest in a new entity, the Glenwood Cemetery Corporation.

The amendment made seven changes to the original charter, including first, an official change of name for the corporation: from Glenwood Cemetery to The Glenwood Cemetery. The second item established a five member board of trustees, with three members to be elected by the “proprietors of the lots” and two by the “original proprietors.” This delineation between original and lot proprietors allowed for the lot owners to take on a management role in the cemetery’s affairs and operations. The new board was to “select and appoint a president, secretary, treasurer, and also, from their own board or otherwise, a superintendent, to have the immediate custody, supervision, and management of the cemetery, under the rules and regulations of the board.”

The third required the lot proprietors to hold an annual meeting with “at least twenty lot proprietors” to constitute a quorum. The fourth placed the cemetery under the jurisdiction of the equity courts of the District of Columbia and declared that that “any person who may refuse peaceable possession of said grounds to said trustees, or obstruct or disturb such possession in said trustees for purposes of burial, shall forfeit and pay, as a penalty therefore, the sum of one hundred dollars for each and every day of such refusal or disturbance, to be collected in an action of debt, in the name of the cemetery corporation; and the sum that may be recovered shall be appropriated for the improvement of the cemetery grounds.”

The fifth, significantly, clarified the definition of the term “proprietors” to mean proprietors of lots. The sixth stated that “from the receipts from the sales of lots hereafter sold, of the ground now dedicated for burial purposes, there shall be paid, on the first Monday in June each year, by the board of trustees, to the original proprietors, one fourth of the gross receipts arising from such sales, the remainder to be devoted to the improvement and maintenance of the cemetery.”

The last authorized any five lot proprietors to call for an initial meeting of proprietors to elect a

---

128 “Letter From Washington; Correspondence of the Baltimore Sun, Washington, April 30, 1876,” *Baltimore Sun*, May 1, 1876, 4. There is no identification as to who constituted the “defenders” but this was the position held by owner Joseph Close.
129 “An act to amend an act incorporating the proprietors of Glenwood Cemetery, approved July twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and fifty-four.” 44th Congress Sess II Ch 77 1877.
board to take over management of the cemetery. Unlike what might have been expected with the establishment of new regular proceedings of an organization, this change in the rules was the beginning of a major new episode in the history of Glenwood Cemetery.

Upon passage of the Congressional amendment, the lot proprietors organized quickly to hold the first meeting of The Glenwood Cemetery Corporation. Gathering on March 7, 1877, the group spent a great deal of time reviewing the amendment and qualifying lot proprietors to vote so that the proceedings could not be questioned as to their legality. To the group’s surprise, Charles Winfield of New Jersey came forward stating that he represented Joseph Close, who he claimed “owns a number of lots on which burials have been made—bodies placed in the vaults and not claimed” and was therefore a lot owner.130 Lot proprietor Lewis Clephane responded that the amendment had made a provision for the original proprietors to elect two of their own trustees, and there was no place for them to participate in a meeting of the lot proprietors. The issue was put to a vote and Winfield lost 31 to 22. S.T.G. Morsell, who had opened the meeting, Judge Thomas Bartley, whose actions had been the catalyst for the tumult of the past years, and John McClellan were elected as trustees representing the interests of the lot proprietors.131

On March 16th, the five (McFarland, Lord, Morsell, Bartley, McClellan) newly elected trustees demanded that Joseph Close and George Clendenin turn over control of the cemetery. Close refused. In early June, the lot proprietors held their first official annual meeting, and the sentiment was the hope that “it would not be too long before the cemetery would be under the control of the lot holders.”132 On July 12th, the trustees filed an equity suit on behalf of The Glenwood Cemetery against Close, Clendenin, Humphreys, and Randolph S. Evans, the managers named in the original Congressional charter. The suit demanded that the cemetery control be turned over to the new corporation, as well as $11,800 in penalties of $100 per day as declared in the amendment. The Baltimore Sun reported the next day that “The suit is understood to be merely a method of enforcing possession.”133 By this time, Humphreys had died and as the court found no evidence of Evans’ having an active role in the cemetery’s operations, the legal claim against Humphreys and Evans was dismissed by the court. Close and Clendenin were now the sole subjects of the suit.

On October 25th, following months without movement, The Glenwood Cemetery Corporation entered a second suit, this time in the Law Courts, claiming that Close and Clendenin had “defrauded the company and held the deeds to the land without right.”134 Close was entirely unwilling to cooperate with the new board and, it would be learned, challenged the constitutionality of the Congressional amendment.

130 “Glenwood Cemetery: Election of Three Trustees by the Lot Holders,” The Evening Star, March 8, 1877, 4.
131 “Glenwood Cemetery: Election of Three Trustees by the Lot Holders,” The Evening Star, March 8, 1877, 4.
132 Winfield’s claims would resurface in 1895.
The initial case continued through the District of Columbia Supreme Court until June 25, 1878 when Close and Clendenin were ordered to “give up possession of the portion [30 acres] of the cemetery in actual use.” When on July 16th, they had refused to obey and instead “obstructed the company by secreting, or carrying away the books and maps belonging to the cemetery, and also the keys belonging to the private vaults,” the presiding judge directed the defendants to show cause why they were not in contempt of court.135

In August, the case took a new turn when Close’s ex-wife, Ellen M. Close, sued him for failure to pay alimony, and his estate was placed into receivership. Mrs. Close’s suit asked that the stock from the original cemetery charter be reissued to the receiver for her benefit, and that the Congressionally-amended charter declared void. It also called for a Deed of Trust given by Close to his son F.W. Close be considered fraudulent on the basis that F.W. was a minor at the time it was alleged to have been made. Mrs. Close stood to gain approximately $200,000 (the estimated value of Close’s net receipts from sales over the years) if her suit was successful.136 Her suit brought to light that the 2000 shares of stock valued at $50.00 each (total $100,000) described in the original charter had never been formally issued to the twelve shareholders. Close had retained all the shares and while he may have taken investments from his shareholders, he had not distributed any profits. This irregularity had never been brought to light as none of the shareholders formally complained of the oversight or perhaps none had actually bought any shares.

In September 1878, a brief article titled “The Battle-Ground of the Dead” ran in The Washington Post reporting on Close and Clendenin’s response to the charge of contempt of court for having absconded with the cemetery’s records and key. Close claimed to have been out of town for the duration and Clendenin stated that he had “carefully abstain[ed] from all interference with management.”137

It was not until March 25, 1879, that the lot proprietors finally gained physical control of the cemetery from Close and Clendenin - more than two years following the passage of the Congressional amendment. They immediately called a meeting. In anticipation of an imminent decision in their law suit, the board members told the lot proprietors that they expected to win in court but did not expect to receive the $38,000 that Close owed for having interfered with the corporation’s ability to take over the operations.

The following Saturday, March 29, 1879, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia decreed in favor of the cemetery board, ordering Close to convey the thirty acres used as a cemetery to the new company within thirty days. Failure to transfer the title would result in the court decree being considered title.138 The Court dismissed the claims of Mrs. Close; ordered one-fourth of

138 Close failed to give the title to The Glenwood Cemetery Corporation, and until events of 1897, the court decree rather than a deed was considered documentation of the corporation’s ownership at the time. Significantly, this
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annual gross receipts to be paid to Close; ordered all books and papers to be handed over to the corporation within thirty days; granted an injunction enjoining Close and Clendenin from interfering with the management; and named a special auditor to report on the financial status of accounts. The land not used for the cemetery was left in Close’s ownership, and the Court did not award The Glenwood Cemetery Corporation the $38,000 in penalties.\footnote{139}

Immediately upon the issuance of the decree, Close filed an appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and \textit{The Washington Post} predicted “the case will probably land at last at the United States Supreme Court.”\footnote{140} The paper was right. When the Court of Appeals upheld the decision, Close appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, where the case was argued in November 1882 and decided in March 1883 in favor of The Glenwood Cemetery. The decision clarified many aspects of the original Corporation’s rights and responsibilities, establishing that the original Congressional charter anticipated that the cemetery was a “pious and public” entity. Significantly, the decision described how this new type of for-profit business was intended to transform over time into one whose income only was for maintaining and improving the cemetery.

The United States Supreme Court decision settled the situation. The Congressional amendment was upheld and The Glenwood Cemetery Corporation was safe from further attack. In an interesting turn of events, Close was required to transfer to the corporation not only the 30 acres that had been improved for use as a cemetery as decreed by D.C. Supreme Court and affirmed by the Court of Appeals, but all acreage that Humphreys had transferred to him in 1853.

\section*{New Regime}

In early March 1879, four years before the United States Supreme Court would rule on \textit{Close v. Glenwood Cemetery} when ownership was still in an unsettled state, the lot proprietors took control over the cemetery. This move followed Close and Clendenin finally handing over records and keys, as ordered numerous times by Congress and the courts. With the books in hand, the lot proprietors were able to report on the financial and administrative affairs of the cemetery. A special committee composed of some of Washington’s leading citizens had completed a review of the financial books and of the condition of the cemetery, which had been seriously neglected since the Congressional amendment was passed in late February 1877, if not before. The lot proprietors pledged $5000 to make improvements and repairs to the cemetery to include:

\footnote{139} \textit{“Suing for a Cemetery; The Terms of the Decree in Glenwood Cemetery Suit—An Appeal,” The Washington Post, March 31, 1879, 2.}
\footnote{140} \textit{“Suing for a Cemetery; The Terms of the Decree in Glenwood Cemetery Suit—An Appeal,” The Washington Post, March 31, 1879, 2.}
Repairing all roadways and gutters; sodding all neglected graves; cleaning up and trimming shrubbery and grass throughout the grounds; repairing the entrance, building stone walls and fences, and the introduction of water throughout the grounds with suitable under-drainage.¹⁴¹

At their first official annual meeting in June 1880, Judge Bartley reported the sale of 46 plots during the past year and 546 interments. In February 1881, following years without the benefit of a true Superintendent, the Board hired the experienced master gardener Alexander McKerichar for the position.

Superintendent’s House constructed in 1904 to design of Appleton P. Clark.
Source: Historical Society of Washington

McKerichar’s influence was immediate. By 1885, Glenwood was well on its way to gaining back its reputation as “The Beautiful City of the Dead.” The Evening Star published a glowing account of the improvements made since McKerichar had arrived, declaring, “The skill of the gardener has been invoked to enhance the loveliness with which nature has liberally endowed the spot.”¹⁴² Painting, repairs, new paving, tool sheds, worker shelters, and new large greenhouses to provide plants and flowers for the grounds were all either complete or underway. Work to build a new stone wall and iron fence along the cemetery’s east side was about to begin. McKerichar had introduced a “portable and spacious canvas canopy of graceful design” to

¹⁴² “Beautiful Glenwood,” The Evening Star, October 10, 1885, 5.
provide cover from rain or sun for funeral parties.  These improvements brought new attention to the cemetery:

Those who in their drives about the city pass over the inviting and picturesque roads about Glenwood Cemetery cannot fail to notice the great improvements that have been made within a few months in that city of the dead, whose memorial stones bear many family names long and honorably identified with the city of the living, that stretches out, like a splendid panorama, at the foot of the hill.

And it was the Board’s intention “to push the improvements until Glenwood becomes famed among cemeteries of the country for its beauty.”

The trustees’ efforts would seem to have borne fruit when a particularly exciting moment brought great attention to the cemetery. In the spring of 1882, Septimia Meikleham, a granddaughter of Thomas Jefferson who claimed to be his closest living relative, announced that she had selected Glenwood as the most suitable available place for her grandfather’s remains. She was moved to take this action, she stated, with the sale of Monticello out of the family’s hands. She requested the Board of Trustees to convey a “suitable” lot to the United States, and she would arrange for the removal of Jefferson’s remains. Announcing this request at the June 1882 annual meeting, the Board ordered the execution of a deed conveying a lot in fee simple to the federal government for use as Jefferson’s final resting place. Within a week of the announcement, the attorney for the heirs of the late Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Jefferson’s grandson who had served as his executor, sent a letter to Judge Bartley, informing the Corporation that the heirs “will not allow Jefferson’s remains to be moved to another cemetery.” The graveyard, according to the letter, had been exempted from the sale of Monticello and the grave and its remains were their property, not Mrs. Miekleson’s. The Washington Post published an editorial commenting on the letter, stating that “It would now become the Government to consider the propriety of purchasing so much of the Monticello property as will enable it to care for the burial place of the great President in a manner suited to the place which he occupies in this country.” The Board withdrew its part in the effort, but for a long time afterwards, Mrs. Miekleson continued to maintain that she had the right and would move Jefferson’s body.

At the corporation’s annual meeting in 1888, reporting strong financial security and optimistic over plans for increased interments, the Board presented their plan to expand the cemetery’s potential by constructing a new mausoleum. The Board announced that it had contracted with the National Mausoleum Safe Deposit Company to build a $100,000 structure at the center of the 30-
acre cemetery. Its dimensions were to be 80 feet by 100 feet by 75 feet high with space for 8,000 bodies. This ambitious decision was based on an effort to thwart grave robbers, while allowing relatives access “at any time to look at their dead.” The mausoleum included a system, patented by local architect J.G. Myers, whereby a “cold air process causes a gradual dessication [sic] of the body and they are kept in good condition.” A particularly attractive feature of the system was that “if by chance a person should be buried alive the slightest turning in the casket causes a gong to sound.”  

However, this ambitious construction was never initiated. Instead, in August 1892, the Board retained Glenn Brown to design a mortuary chapel that was to include a crypt and a small receiving vault for temporary storage prior to funerals. Brown, “sensing a change in the winds, abandoned the more ornate designs he had always used to try a new style, more restrained in its simple elegance yet beautiful in concept, a Chapel serving as a reverent witness in harmony with its hushed surroundings.” The chapel, rather than costing the $100,000 planned for the huge mausoleum, cost $7,323 to build, with as much as half of construction expenses underwritten by Frank N. Carver, the Washington builder contracted to construct the chapel.

Not only did it add visual interest to its pastoral setting, but the Richardsonian Romanesque style, with its emphasis on clear, strong picturesque massing, corresponded with the more restrained Lawn-Park cemetery movement that had been displacing the Rural Cemetery aesthetic. And more to the point, it was the popular style of the day. The chapel provided a location for funeral services and special ceremonies. It was described at the dedication:


151 Kennedy Watkins, unsubmitted draft D.C. Landmark application for The Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel archived at The Glenwood Cemetery. For further information regarding the design and construction of the chapel, please refer to the Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel National Register Registration Form, listed January 9, 1989.
This building having a seating capacity for 400 is not only for the use of lot owners free of expense, but also for those who as yet have no lots in the Cemetery nor an opportunity in the hour of affliction to select one, but who may be prepared a day or two later to make a selection.

In the Chapel are four catacombs where bodies may be deposited a limited time to meet the above emergency, and also, in severe weather, to avoid the danger of out-door exercises.

All organizations find this a commodious Chapel in which to hold service over their departed members in accordance with their various funeral ceremonies. 152

The construction of the chapel was accompanied by the opening of the section where the Odd Fellows monument was erected, as well as completing the plotting of all the unimproved area adjacent to the Soldiers’ Home.

Mrs. Close Comes Back

In 1895, Ellen Close sued The Glenwood Cemetery Company after the death of her ex-husband Joseph Close. On behalf of the estate, she sued the cemetery for failure to pay the court-ordered gross receipts from the cemetery income. Although Mrs. Close had failed to get back alimony by suing Glenwood, as the executrix of his will, she was now fully within her rights to seek the court-ordered payment to Close. The truth was that Glenwood had not paid Close any money and the corporation was legally liable for the overdue payment.

In the course of this lawsuit, claims by Abraham Winfield and the heirs of Charles Winfield also surfaced. The Winfields held two deeds of trust on the cemetery; the first dated from 1878, the same year the DC Superior Court ordered Close and Clendenin to relinquish all claims to the cemetery, as collateral for a mortgage and bond to Joseph Close. A second was dated 1884, the year after the U.S. Supreme Court’s final ruling on the disposition of the cemetery. Along with the fraudulent deed to his son, Joseph Close appears to have been willing to use the cemetery property in any way to alleviate his precarious financial situation.

In 1897 the court ordered the Glenwood Cemetery Company to pay Close and the Winfields $30,000 in return for filing quit claims on the property and relinquishing any future claims on the corporation or its property. 153

152 The Glenwood Cemetery, 20th Century Memorial to Lot Owners of Glenwood Cemetery, 1900,” 12, archived at The Glenwood Cemetery.
Unfortunately, the cemetery did not have $30,000 on hand to make the payment. Thus, the corporation sold twenty acres of unused grounds to Maurice Talty in 1897. Talty acted on behalf of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, who sought to establish a college for women to complement the all-male Catholic University just to the north of Glenwood. The land became the home of Trinity College (now Trinity University) and the real estate transfer was used to settle the debt to Ellen Close and the Winfields.

Real Estate Transfers,

The Washington Post, July 18, 1897, page 16

On July 18, 1897, *The Washington Post* reported four real estate transfers that finally gave The Glenwood Cemetery Corporation full ownership of the cemetery.

Red line through Glenwood indicates area sold in 1897 to Maurice Talty for Trinity College

Source: 1894 Hopkins Map

“At no streets, lanes, alleys, roads or canals shall be opened…”

Plans for the District to coordinate and expand the street system throughout its boundaries had been in the news since the late 1870s, when Washington County was incorporated into the City’s jurisdiction. This action led the Glenwood board into an extended struggle to protect the integrity of the cemetery. Congress had been working for years to come up with a satisfactory bill that would devise a system to both extend the L’Enfant streets to the edges of the District and connect subdivision streets that had been constructed in the County to the Federal City. In 1886, in response to a bill put forward by Senator William Mahone to fund a plan to extend the District’s streets, the Senate directed the District Commissioners to provide both a budget and a plan for projecting the street system.\(^{154}\)

\(^{154}\) Senate Bill 2201, 49th Congress, 1st Session.
In 1887, prior to any resolution of the Congressional efforts, the District Commissioners instituted condemnation proceedings against the cemetery to take sufficient land to allow Michigan Avenue and two streets created by a new subdivision to the west to be extended easterly—directly across the cemetery’s landholdings. This action, made in response to a petition by a real estate syndicate, headed by A.L. Barbour, which was developing the property to the west of the cemetery, was taken despite both the cemetery’s original Congressional charter and the amendment prohibiting such action. Faced with strong protests from the cemetery’s Board led by Board secretary and prominent Washingtonian Lewis Clephane, the Commissioners abandoned the plan.

The Board and the Commissioners, however, entered into a formal agreement on October 31, 1887 that Glenwood would not object to “lawful proceedings of condemnation” for Michigan Avenue, but were “unable to donate said strip of land for a public highway.” This agreement also stated that plans for “other streets then projected through the grounds of the cemetery would be abolished by the Commissioners.” When the Commissioners abandoned the condemnation, Barbour sought the passage of a new law prohibiting any new bodies to be interred in the County within 1-1/2 miles of the city’s boundaries. Had the act been successful, it would have directly affected Glenwood’s operations by prohibiting any new burials, an action that the developers believed would open the way to their gaining access to the land for the road extension.

In January 1893, as anticipation grew for a comprehensive highway plan, the Baltimore Sun addressed the growing threat of the road extensions for the District’s cemeteries. Already there was a serious push to condemn 17 acres of land at the western edge of Prospect Hill Cemetery to provide for the northerly extension of North Capitol Street. Now, the reporter shared: “Calvary Cemetery has been invaded by streets, and though Oak Hill and Glenwood are safe now, no one can foresee how soon they, too, may be called to give up their dead and go into the real estate business.” On March 2, 1893, Congress passed the long-awaited Highway Extension Act that initiated a full-scale study to address the District’s problematic road system.

In 1895, the problem flared up again. The District Commissioners stated that it was not their intention to lay out streets through Glenwood, although one commissioner asked whether it would be acceptable to show streets on a map even if there was no intention of laying them out

156 "No Right to the Land; Cemetery Company Threatens Suit Against District,” *The Washington Post*, October 23, 1897, 12.
158 “District of Columbia: A One-Mile Limit that Really Fails to Limit,” *The Baltimore Sun*, January 20, 1893, 2. In 1897, Prospect Hill Cemetery was reduced to provide the acreage to extend North Capitol Street. The reference to Calvary Cemetery is unclear as there is no cemetery by that name in DC or Baltimore. Graceland Cemetery in DC was condemned for road expansion.
as shown. The Board replied no. However, on June 4, 1895, the District’s Engineer Commissioner presented the Commissioners with the draft of the Second Section of the Highway Plan, which included streets extended through Glenwood.  

The Board, led by Clephane, immediately filed an equity suit seeking an injunction against the Commissioners. The suit claimed that the implementation of the Highway Act’s plan for the cemetery grounds would “practically destroy the value of their property.” It alleged that area

---

162 “Sued by Glenwood Cemetery: Owners Oppose the Commissioners Proposed Extension of Streets,” The Washington Post, June 15, 1895, 1
of the new streets would affect 5,642 gravesites in which 4,000 bodies were buried, and cut the
cemetery’s usable property from 64 acres to 25. The Board claimed that it was the
Commissioners’ intent:

…to divert Lincoln Avenue through a portion of the grounds and to extend
Albany street through another portion so as to cut off the present entrance,
gateway, and extensive greenhouses, besides destroying an ornamental fountain.

The extension of Detroit street and other streets through the northern portion of
the grounds would divide the land up into blocks… and make it unfit for cemetery
purposes. One of these proposed streets destroys the reservoir that supplies the
cemetery with water, and another destroys the dwelling house of the
superintendent.163

On June 15th, 500 of Glenwood’s lot proprietors met to register their protest against the
Commissioners’ map. Commissioner Ross responded: “We have said and say again that we
never proposed to run a street through the cemetery without negotiations with the authorities in
charge of the same, nor have we taken an initial step toward incorporating the street sketched in
the tentative map prepared in the engineering department.”164 On June 25th, with Clephane and
Glenwood satisfied that the Commissioners had backed down, the courts dismissed Glenwood’s
case, without prejudice.165

In March 1896, Congress included $10,000 as an amendment to the District appropriations bill
for “grading and regulating Michigan Avenue.”166 Nothing resulted from this appropriation until
the following summer, when the Commissioners requested and received the opinion of their
attorney regarding their title to the land condemned in 1887 for the purposes of extending
Michigan Avenue. The attorney prepared a brief that concluded that the condemnation
proceedings taken in 1877 to acquire 120 feet of the cemetery’s land for the purpose of extending
Michigan Avenue were “void for lack of jurisdiction,” based on both Glenwood’s 1854 original
charter and the 1877 amendment.167 With their attorney’s opinion in hand, and despite their
1887 agreement with Glenwood to come to an acceptable price for the land when it was
condemned for Michigan Avenue, the Commissioners took contradictory action, and revealed
their true intentions for the cemetery’s grounds.168 The District, apparently without notice or
legal grounds, and most certainly without consent, took action to extend the street:

163 “Sued by Glenwood Cemetery; Owners Oppose the Commissioners Proposed Extension of Streets,” The
Washington Post, June 15, 1895, 1.
166 “To Grade Michigan Avenue,” The Evening Star, March 11, 1896, 5.
167 “Michigan Avenue Title: Proceedings for Condemnation Through Glenwood Cemetery Declared Void,” The
Evening Star, August 13, 1897, 1.
168 Lewis Clephane died February 11, 1897 and was buried in Glenwood Cemetery. “Lewis Clephane,” The Evening
Star, February 12, 1897, 11; “Lewis Clephane is Dead,” The Washington Post, February 12, 1897, 3; “Funeral of
The land for the proposed roadway was seized and entered upon by the officers and agents of the District of Columbia, the fence of the cemetery removed, trees then growing upon the land cut down, and the surface of the grounds changed and graded, and other injuries done to the cemetery property, all without the consent of the Glenwood Cemetery to these proceedings.\textsuperscript{169}

The Board formally addressed its complaints through a letter to the Commissioners. Despite demands for damages and either a statement abandoning the District’s rights to the land or a written agreement to pay for the land at its fair market value, the dispute remained unsettled. To complicate matters, two things occurred that strengthened the Commissioners’ determination. First, in July, Glenwood sold 20 acres of land that included the proposed Michigan Avenue right-of-way to the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur. The land deal included reserving the Michigan Avenue right-of-way, although it also reserved the cemetery’s right to any claims of damages against the District. Second, Congress authorized $5,000 to widen and grade the proposed road. These events, however, did not affect the Board’s resolve and in August, the disagreement escalated when the cemetery began to build a fence blocking access to the new roadway. Upon notice of the work, the District immediately instructed the police to “not allow the fence to go on.”\textsuperscript{170}

The Commissioners cited the land sale and the Congressional funding to support their argument, claiming that “Congress settled the question” with the authorization of funds. The Glenwood Board was unconvinced. The day following the District action to remove the fence, the Board made a public statement that provided background to the situation. Significant was the reiteration of the information that, at the Commissioners’ request, their attorney, “in a lengthy written opinion, advised them that their proceedings were entirely without warrant in law and that the title of the land was in the Glenwood Cemetery.”\textsuperscript{171} The Board made it clear that they would not back down:

\begin{quote}
If the Commissioners choose to abide by the opinion of their own legal counsel adviser, then there is no conflict between them and the cemetery. But the Board of Trustees will continue to assert their rights and oppose usurpation by the District, in such a manner as they may deem best for the interests of the lot holders whose property is at stake.\textsuperscript{172}
\end{quote}

The Catholic University got involved in February 1898 when the Vice Rector made a public plea requesting the District Commissioners to seek an appropriation of $15,000 to purchase land and pay for improvements needed to complete Michigan Avenue from North Capitol Street to Lincoln Avenue. The construction of Trinity College, he stated, “was being delayed because of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[169] “No Right to the Land; Cemetery Company Threatens Suit Against District,” \textit{The Washington Post}, October 23, 1897, 12.
\item[171] “No Right to the Road,” \textit{The Washington Post}, August 5, 1898, 7.
\item[172] “No Right to the Road,” \textit{The Washington Post}, August 5, 1898, 7.
\end{footnotes}
the unimproved condition of the thoroughfare.”¹⁷³ The resolution of the affair was determined when the District of Columbia Supreme Court directed a “perpetual injunction” against the running of streets through the cemetery.¹⁷⁴ The cemetery did agree, however, to running the 120-foot wide Michigan Avenue immediately to the west of the grounds, consistent with the intent of the Highway Act, in return for fair compensation. This required the condemnation of a strip of the land now owned by Maurice Talty that was soon to become Trinity College and a small chunk of the cemetery’s holdings at its northwest corner. The road was completed in 1899.¹⁷⁵

The City of the Dead

Finally free from the threat of streets running through the property and with the resolution of the debt to Joseph Close’s estate covered by the sale of the northern 20 acres, the end of the nineteenth century found Glenwood Cemetery on sound financial footing. The trustees now felt free to pursue more improvements. The Board appointed an advisory committee whose task was to identify and reach out to lot owners, as well as relatives and heirs of people buried in the cemetery with the goal of “interesting them in the improvements already in progress and in

---

immediate contemplation.”¹⁷⁶ This included needed upgrades such as repaving roads, an iron railing along Lincoln, a stone retaining wall mounted with an iron fence at the Detroit Street entrance at North Capitol Street. But plans for replacing the now out-of-style original Greek Revival Gatekeeper’s Lodge and main entry gates were first in the minds of the Board members.¹⁷⁷

Within six months of the Board’s announcement of its campaign, the District of Columbia issued a building permit to the cemetery to construct a new gatehouse.¹⁷⁸

In May 1899, local architects Freyhold and Walsh designed the new Gatekeeper’s Lodge in a simple interpretation of the Gothic Revival style. The elegant, although modest, two-story light brick building provided offices for the Superintendent, men’s and women’s rest rooms, as well as a place for potential buyers to discuss the advantages of purchasing a lot at Glenwood.

If there was any concern about paying for these improvements, this was allayed when in October 1899, Talty made a second land purchase on behalf of the Sisters. This time, he purchased 7.4 acres adjacent to his first purchase for $40,000 (approximately $5,500 per acre), clearly showing a more sophisticated negotiation on the cemetery’s part. The Evening Star reported that Glenwood was not interested in selling and placed a very high price in anticipation of discouraging the potential purchase. The price, however, was accepted. The transaction, opined the reporter, was “merely an instance when one person has something that he does not wish to part with and some one (sic) else wants it.”¹⁷⁹ The Board placed this money in a “Sinking Fund” to support future improvements. By the year 1900, the Board of Trustees had operated the

¹⁷⁸ D.C. Building Permit, No.1856, May 9, 1899
cemetery for close to twenty years and had brought the property to a new level of financial strength.\textsuperscript{180}

Hills, Vales, and Tombs: The Lawn Park Movement at Glenwood

On June 14, 1903, on the eve of the cemetery’s fiftieth anniversary, \textit{The Washington Times} published a long and well-illustrated story on the cemetery. “Hills, Vales, and Tombs of Glenwood Cemetery” profiled the cemetery’s history in a romantic narrative. Focusing on the more illustrious people buried at the cemetery and the artistic merit of their monuments, as well as the Glenn Brown-designed Chapel, the new Gate, and the Gatekeeper’s Lodge, this article presented the cemetery in close to the most idyllic way possible. There was no mention of the difficult times that resulted in the change in ownership, fights with the District Commissioners, debts, or Board squabbles; neither was there mention of planned changes that were coming.

In response to the cemetery’s prosperity, the trustees directed Superintendent McKerichar to prepare a plan expanding the cemetery’s burial grounds to its full 56.75 post-sale acreage. This plan, approved by the cemetery’s Board in 1900 and filed with the District of Columbia’s Office of the Surveyor that year, clearly illustrates McKerichar’s expertise as well as his knowledge of trends in cemetery design.

The 1900 plan extended de la Roche’s road system in a way that was consistent with the original scheme and yet represented an elegant shift to the Lawn Park aesthetic in the newly platted area. Although Strauch’s Lawn Park aesthetic had been introduced almost fifty years earlier, the soon-to-be fashionable Memorial Park Movement was not yet conceived.

\textsuperscript{180} “Meeting was Breezy,” \textit{The Washington Post}, June 5, 1900, 2.
McKerichar’s scheme acknowledged the tenets of the Lawn Park Movement through the introduction of a more open site plan north of the Chapel circle area, including the placement of a large central circle, later to be named Lincoln Circle, as the main feature of the plan. Although topography is not indicated on the drawing (nor is it on de la Roche’s original plan), the minutes of the Board of Trustees document the intention to grade the area level rather than continue the undulation that characterizes the original 30 acres. The slightly angled grade increase from south to north allows the markers to the north to retain some visibility from the south, a visual trick that Strauch applied at Spring Grove. This northern area evidences the implementation of the plan’s straight regular rows of burial lots within the curved road system. As time went on, more modest and artistically controlled markers and monuments were used as was the increased use of a moderately-sized family marker with smaller markers for the individual family members.

The tenets of the Lawn Park aesthetic also suggested the restricted use of ornamental shrubs, and encouraged the selective use of trees. These recommendations were easily accommodated in a manner consistent with de la Roche’s curvilinear landscape plan. Planting of new trees was concentrated along the avenues, and only a few shrubs were located within the burial sections. Smaller monuments also helped to give a sense of open space, allowing for the appreciation of the undulating landscape and irregularly shaped burial sections of the rural cemetery design. In contrast to a fully developed Rural Cemetery scheme, the combination of the selective use of foliage and the smaller headstones gives the northern section of Glenwood a more open, park-like feeling than the sections that were completed earlier. Not surprisingly, the juxtaposition of the two aesthetic movements at Glenwood is very similar to what Strauch achieved at Spring Grove.

The Lawn Park Movement also included new methods for managing cemeteries. Interestingly, despite Glenwood’s Rural Cemetery aesthetic, its management had always been much in keeping with the Strauch model. From its start, Glenwood’s operations depended heavily on a professional Superintendent.

Work over the next ten years to implement McKerichar’s plan also greatly improved the cemetery’s infrastructure. Iron fencing at the south and east edges of the cemetery along Lincoln Avenue were completed in 1898. New water lines were installed in 1900. The year 1901 saw 112 new trees (54 pin oaks and ornamentals) planted “where most needed for landscape effect.”

With the opening of the new North Capitol Street electric streetcar line running just 45 feet to the west of the cemetery, a Rest House, styled as a rustic cottage, was added near the North Capitol Street entrance. Designed to accommodate visitors who took advantage of this new “easy means of access for foot travelers,” the Rest House encouraged visitors to enjoy Glenwood’s idyllic setting regardless of their association with the cemetery.

181 “Twentieth Century Memorial to Lot Owners,” The Glenwood Cemetery, 1900, 9. The pin oaks were planted 50 feet apart along Lincoln Road; Picca Concolor, Picca Pungens, Abies Cephalonica, Glyyptostrobus Sinensis (Chinese Cypress), Retinopora Plumosa Aurea, Acer Polymorphum (blood-leaved Japanese Maple) were planted in the open spaces around the lawn and avenues leading from the main entry gate.

The following year the stone retaining wall mounted with an iron fence went up along the western edge of the property near North Capitol Street. Entry into the cemetery at this point was now through new decorative iron gates. In 1903, a section of The Tour was finally laid to define the western curved edge of Section E near the entrance.

In 1904, Appleton P. Clark, Jr., a popular and skilled local architect, was retained to design a new house for the Superintendent. The Bradley House where McKerichar lived with his family was located in the farthest northwest corner of the property within a planned circle on the new master plan. The trustees had determined that the 140-year old house was “of great age, and in a hopelessly insanitary condition, injuring and endangering his [the Superintendent’s] own health and longevity of his family,” not to mention that its site, on which there were no burial plots, was “exceedingly valuable for the purposes of the cemetery.” The new site selected for the Superintendent’s residence was to the west of the Gatekeeper’s Lodge. Clark’s design for this two-story plus attic brick and stone residence was presented in a style similar to the adjacent Lodge. *The Washington Post* reported that the cemetery association intended “to erect a building which will be a credit to them and add to the appearance of the grounds.” This year also saw the laying of a new road to be called Spruce Street that dramatically enlarged the perimeter of the original (but unopened) Section F following McKerichar’s plan.

---

183 Although shown as a section of The Tour in the 1854 plan, the trustees decided to name it Crescent Avenue. The name Crescent Avenue, however, is not found in any of the plans or maps of the cemetery and is not used today.


185 “A New Home for the Superintendent” The house was demolished in 1954.

Glenwood’s success was acknowledged when in 1905, the new Association of American Cemetery Superintendents selected Glenwood and Rock Creek Cemetery as locations for their annual two-day event. The improvements continued with a new stone stable and carriage house built next to the new Superintendent’s house in 1906. The extent of the existing roadway system was macadamized that year. In 1908, The Tour was extended along the cemetery’s eastern edge, contiguous with Lincoln Avenue. In 1909, a stone wall was constructed along the cemetery’s western boundary.

The end of an era came with the death of Superintendent McKerichar in 1914 at age 83 after 33 years at Glenwood. The Board recognized that his successor must be well-qualified “in many particulars, and be well-versed in landscape gardening and kindred arts.” It was not until 1918 that the Board selected James McDonald as the new Superintendent.

---


188 The stable and carriage house located adjacent to the 1904 Superintendent’s House and were demolished in 1954 when the Superintendent’s House was razed.

189 “Illness is Fatal at the Age of 83; Alexander McKerichar was for 33 Years Superintendent of Glenwood Cemetery,” *The Evening Star*, July 27, 1914, 3.


During the first half of the twentieth century, Glenwood saw a vast increase in the number of burials. Starting with the tragedy of the Spanish influenza, World War I, the 1920s when the District’s population dramatically increased as the federal government grew, and then the losses associated with World War II, Glenwood saw a substantial rise in the number of burials. On average, the cemetery conducted over 300 interments each year between 1900 and 1930. Some years recorded over 400 interments, with the exception of 1918, during which 815 victims of the influenza epidemic that swept the country were buried.¹⁹²

Board Minutes reveal many improvements during the first quarter of the new century. In 1917, Central Avenue was extended from the chapel north to meet a newly laid large circular road. In 1920, the circle was dedicated as Lincoln Circle and planted with flowering Japanese cherry trees, and Section I, J, and K were opened. The milled iron fence that divides Glenwood from Prospect Hill Cemetery to the south was erected in 1921. Significantly, it was also that year that the Board of Trustees reiterated their commitment that the northern section of the cemetery would be developed as shown in McKerichar’s plan and that the topography was to be graded as a flat surface for easier upkeep. This decision supported McKerichar’s introduction of the Lawn Park aesthetic and provided a setting consistent with the introduction of the Memorial Park Movement in the twentieth century.

Although a time of continued change, McDonald’s influence was cut short when he died suddenly at the age of sixty-five in December 1923. His tenure at Glenwood only covered five years, however, his work earned him a tribute that neither de la Roche or McKerichar gained when the Board of Trustees named the small circle at the western side of the grounds in his memory.¹⁹³

In January, E.B. Pratt, who had been the Assistant Superintendent under McDonald, was named as the interim Superintendent, and then officially appointed in April 1924.\(^{194}\)

Pratt served as Glenwood’s Superintendent through many years of active change at the cemetery as previously undeveloped land was improved during the 1920s and 1930s to accept new interments.\(^{195}\) Many actions were undertaken to implement McKerichar plan: a new fountain for the ellipse at the entry gate on Lincoln Avenue was installed (later removed), new roads were laid and paved, and new sections opened. One section was reserved for single sites. A decision was made to reserve Section S for additional burial sites for the Masons. Concrete paths were laid in various locations around the grounds to protect the gravesites and additional water piping was installed. Fifteen pin oaks were purchased and planted.

The need for retaining walls, however, occupied most of the trustees’ time. In 1925, the Board voted to establish a Sinking Fund to stabilize the property from damage anticipated to result from the District of Columbia’s grading operations near the cemetery. In January 1928, the Board rescinded its Sinking Fund resolution as the problems needed to be addressed more quickly than expected. In March, a contract was awarded to build a retaining wall at the cemetery’s western edge near Bryant Street. On October 9, 1928, the cemetery’s embankment near Channing Street failed and a landslide damaged neighboring properties, requiring immediate repair. Starting in 1932, as the District’s plans to re-grade Lincoln Avenue progressed, the Board acknowledged that the iron fence that ran along the road’s western edge would need to be replaced by a retaining wall. In June 1935, the Board set up a new special fund to pay for the repair of existing and erection of new stone retaining walls on the west, north and east edges of the grounds. By 1937, the District had completed its plan for major re-grading of Lincoln Avenue along the entire length of the eastern boundary of the cemetery. The cemetery worked with the District’s architect Louis De Ladurantage, who provided the Board of Trustees with a plat showing the grade requirements. The Board was able to devise a retaining wall to support the cemetery above the grade of the road below.\(^{196}\) To stabilize the eastern border, the cemetery constructed a stone retaining wall, over twenty feet high in places, with an iron fence above running the entire length of the cemetery’s eastern boundary. In 1938, *The Washington Post* noted the erection of the stone wall at the intersection of Lincoln Road and Franklin Street, N.E., for $6,500.\(^{197}\)

---


\(^{196}\) “Plat Plan of Glenwood Cemetery, Showing New Stone Wall at Lincoln Road, N.E.,” August 2, 1937, Office of the Surveyor.

1937 Permit drawing for stone retaining wall and iron fence –

*Please note the footprints in the upper northwest corner of the property of the original circa 1806 Bradley farmhouse and auxiliary structures that served as Glenwood’s Superintendent’s House from 1852 through 1904. The buildings and structures were demolished circa 1904 when a new Superintendent’s House was constructed near the Gatehouse.*

Source: National Archives Record Administration Group #351.4

---

Historic and Current Photos of Lincoln Retaining Wall
Source: Glenwood Cemetery Archives; EHT Traceries
In 1939, the District surveyed the cemetery’s northern boundary in preparation for connecting Franklin Street just above the cemetery’s grounds. Shown on a District map as early as 1927, the land for the street came not from the cemetery but from Trinity College. Once put in place in 1942, Franklin formally divided the 27.4 acres purchased by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur from the 56.75 acres of active cemetery.

Baist Maps from 1936 and 1943 showing the location of Franklin Street across Glenwood’s property
Source: Washingtoniana Collection, Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Library

It was not until July 1958 that Glenwood imposed restrictions on the size and type of monuments and markers allowed in the cemetery. Prior to the restriction, markers appeared in an array of sizes, scale, materials, and styles. Subsequently, the markers in the sections that were developed later reveal a change in appearance that conforms generally to the simpler, smaller, styles popular at the time. At Glenwood, this simplification, although not uniform, is evident in the northernmost sections of the cemetery. Although the new burial sections were laid out in curvilinear forms consistent with McKerichar’s interpretation of the Lawn Park Movement, the sections that were the last to be improved, specifically Section S, show a preference for a plaque marker associated with the Memorial Park Movement. The use of these simple markers has given Glenwood’s northern sections a slightly different character, one that has a more open and grassy landscape, more consistent with the characteristics of a Memorial Park cemetery than with the aesthetics of the earlier movements. Plantings and trees were also limited in the northern sections of the cemetery, another aspect of the Memorial Park influence. Limited foliage and the interment of remains in orderly rows with smaller lawn flush mounted plaque markers streamlined the maintenance for this part of the cemetery. The appearance of the northern area

marks the final expansion of the cemetery, and the incorporation of the last nationally recognized cemetery movement.

**Glenwood Today**

Raising money to support the cemetery has been a continual issue at Glenwood, especially as the demographics in Washington changed. Sales of cemetery lots declined through the 1970s and 1980s following the loss of white population following the race riots of the late 1960s. A capital appeal to lot proprietors and family members in 1976 kept the cemetery solvent. In 1978, Glenwood sold 4.6 acres of unused property at the northern extent of the cemetery to create a trust fund to defray expenses. The cemetery has not changed in size since that time.

In 2002, under the guidance of then-superintendent Terrance Adkins, Glenwood created a small scattering garden in a ravine along the east property boundary. The Zen-inspired garden provides family and friends of the deceased with a private area to hold a ceremony and scatter cremains. As an alternative to burying cremains, scattering the ashes of the deceased over a beautiful landscape or over a location that the person had a specific connection to in life has become increasingly common. The scattering garden at Glenwood includes a memorial wall, approximately 30-feet long, on which the name of the deceased can be inscribed.

The most recent addition to Glenwood is the mausoleum, built in 2011. The Post Modern-style mausoleum is located west of the Gatekeeper’s Lodge, near the main gate of the cemetery. The mausoleum has space for 877 interments, and was designed and constructed by the Butch Ingram Construction Group, based in Louisiana.

Today, Glenwood Cemetery endures as a place of interment, as well as an attraction for local residents and visitors to the nation’s capital. The Rural Cemetery, Lawn Park, and Memorial Park Movements are represented throughout the cemetery, offering a visual continuum of cemetery design practices and marker styles, situated within a century-old picturesque landscape.

**Final Resting Place for Notable Persons**

Glenwood Cemetery includes approximately 48,000 interments and is the final resting place for residents of the Washington metropolitan area from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. The remains of many of the city’s prominent citizens, veterans of several wars, and members of various religious denominations and fraternal organizations lie here.

Early in the cemetery’s history, the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia, the main lodge of all of the District’s Caucasian Freemasons, purchased all the lots within one of the cemetery’s

---

circles for the burial of its members. Consequently, the burial section came to be known as the Masonic Circle. Prominently located within the boundaries of the Masonic Circle is a granite marker and bronze lawn plaque commemorating Valentine Reintzel, whose remains were moved to Glenwood when Georgetown Presbyterian Cemetery was redeveloped. According to the marker, Reintzel was the first Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia. Reintzel participated with President George Washington in laying the corner stone of the U.S. Capitol building on September 18, 1793.202

Albert Gallatin Mackey was born in Charleston, S.C. on March 12, 1807. Trained as a physician, he graduated with honors from Charleston Medical College in 1832; however, he is best known for his membership and involvement with the Free Masons. From his initiation in 1841 to St. Andrew’s Lodge, No. 10, Charleston, S.C., Mackey worked up the ranks of the Masonic order, ultimately becoming Sovereign Grand Inspector General, Thirty-three degrees, in the Ancient and Accepted Rite. He retired from medicine in 1854 to devote his time fully to the studying and recording of the Masonic institution. He edited, wrote for, and published a number of Masonic journals. Upon moving to Washington, D.C., Mackey affiliated with Lafayette Lodge, No. 19, Lafayette Chapter, No. 5, and Washington Commandery, No. 1, Knights Templar. Mackey passed away on June 20, 1881 at the age of 75. His funeral was elaborate, organized by various Masonic groups in Washington D.C. In addition to a public procession, the funeral ceremony combined religious and Masonic rituals, with a ceremony of the Rose Croix cross being undertaken by the freemasons.203

202 Reintzel is not buried at Glenwood. His body was buried in the Presbyterian Cemetery in Georgetown, which was closed by 1907. Reintzel’s body is not among the very few whose re-interment was recorded. The site is now a playground on Volta Place. “Row of Georgetown Houses Historic,” The Sunday Star, May 13, 1934, 87-88.
Joseph Wilson was born in Ireland, immigrating to Washington, D.C. as a child. At the age of 16 he became a messenger for the United States Treasury Department, and worked his way up as a clerk – eventually becoming the Chief Clerk of the General Land Office in 1860. In 1866 he was promoted to Commissioner of the General Land Office, a position his brother John had also held. He died on June 23, 1874.
A significant member of Washington society was Amos Kendall, interred at Glenwood in 1869. Kendall is most remembered for his founding of Gallaudet University (a National Historic Landmark), the first institution for the advanced education of hearing impaired students in the world. Kendall is also considered to have been the intellectual force behind Andrew Jackson’s presidential administration. He was appointed the fourth auditor of the U.S. Department of Treasury in 1829, where he aided the formation of President Jackson's anti-bank policy and, in 1835, he was appointed Postmaster General of the United States. Ten years later, Kendall became associated with Samuel Morse, and became a wealthy man by managing Morse’s telegraph patents and incorporating his telegraph company. There is some irony in the fact that Kendall was buried at Glenwood Cemetery as the land had once been the farm of Phineas Bradley, an assistant postmaster general. Kendall had managed to get Bradley and his brother,
Abraham, fired from the assistant postmaster position during William Berry’s tenure as postmaster general.\textsuperscript{205}

Clark Mills, one of America’s most accomplished sculptors, is buried at Glenwood. Among his works for the District of Columbia are a bronze mounted statue of General Andrew Jackson in Lafayette Park; a mounted statue of George Washington in Washington Circle; and the statue of Freedom that is on the dome of the Capitol building. He died on January 12, 1883 at the age of 77.\textsuperscript{206}

Constantino Brumidi, best known for his extraordinary fresco work in the U.S. Capitol building, was buried at Glenwood Cemetery at his death in 1880. Brumidi immigrated to the United States from Rome in 1852, and became a naturalized citizen of the U.S. in 1857. He stopped in Washington, D.C. on a trip between New York City and Mexico in 1854 and offered his services to decorate the interior of the U.S. Capitol building to Army Corps of Engineers Lieutenant Montgomery Meigs, who was supervising the construction work at the Capitol. Having a highly favorable reaction to Brumidi’s work, Meigs accepted the offer and arranged for him to gain the position. Brumidi’s work on the Capitol was considered of such quality that he earned the

\textsuperscript{205} Donald B. Cole, \textit{A Jackson Man: Amos Kendall and the Rise of American Democracy} (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University, 2004), 296.

Emmanuel Gottlieb Leutze was born in 1816 in what was at the time the kingdom of Wurtemburg. He grew up in Philadelphia but returned to Germany in the early 1840s to seriously pursue painting. His paintings focused on historical events – at first European, then American. Although his early works were critically acclaimed, he is best known for his 1851 painting Washington Crossing the Delaware. He returned to the United States in 1859. A fresco he completed upon his return, Westward Course of Empire, is located in one of the stairways in the House of Representatives. He passed away in July 1868.  

207 The most influential use of Brumidi’s nickname Michelangelo of the United States Capitol appears to be the title of a 1950 book on his life: Michelangelo of the United States Capitol by Myrtle Cheney Murdock. Mrs. Murdock is also responsible for locating Brumidi’s burial place at Glenwood.  


Although documentation records several African Americans were buried at the cemetery in the early part of the twentieth century, it officially remained identified as a segregated burial ground at least through 1950.\(^{210}\) Officially allowing African Americans to be buried within the a “whites only” cemetery would have required Glenwood’s Board of Supervisors to vote to amend the rules and regulations initially established for the cemetery, since Rule Number 4 of the 1854 edition of the cemetery’s Rules and Regulations specifically stated that African Americans were not permitted to be buried in the cemetery. It is more likely that an exception was made because Rule Number 4 remained in Glenwood’s Rules and Regulations as late as 1953.\(^{211}\) It is confirmed, however, that in 1979 African American Everett L. Cooper was interred at Glenwood.\(^{212}\) Cooper is an important figure in DC police history. A lifelong resident of Washington, he was born in 1915. After attending school, he joined the Municipal police department in 1942. He later became a Special Investigator with the Missing Persons Bureau of the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia. In 1971, he was the first African-American elected president of the nearly 70 year old D.C. Policeman’s Association. This was a 2-year position that relieved him of his regular officer duties. After his term, he retired from the department for medical reasons. A freemason, Sgt. Cooper was a member and past grand exalted ruler of the Elks and a member of Social Lodge No. 1 of the Masons. In his lifetime, Sgt. Cooper served as vice president of the International Conference of Police Associations, was an honorary

\(^{211}\) Glenwood Cemetery, circa 1953, *Office Routine Schedule*, Exhibit 1, 17, On file with Glenwood Cemetery.  
member of the D.C. Retired Firemen’s association, and was on the Board of Trustees of the Glenwood Cemetery.213

The Designers and Superintendents

George De La Roche

George Henri Frederic Franck de la Roche was born in Germany in 1791 a family friend. In 1805, he was apprenticed at 14 years old to Captain Lloyd Jones to be trained as a sailor until he turned 21. At the commencement of the War of 1812 he joined the U.S. Navy, where he attained the rank of captain. In 1817, he became a shipping merchant and is believed to have been studying engineering. Around 1820, he was hired as a civil engineer by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and research suggests that he may have been involved with planning the line between Baltimore and Washington, D.C.

Around 1840, he relocated from Baltimore to Georgetown, where he established himself as a successful engineer, and was also known as an architect.214 As an architect, he may be best known for his design of the old U.S. Naval Observatory.215 As an established and successful local engineer, de la Roche was charged with the task of surveying and grading Oak Hill Cemetery in Georgetown, which was completed in 1851. There is some evidence that indicates that he may have worked with A.J. Downing, a nationally prominent landscape designer, on the landscape for Oak Hill.216 If this is the case, de la Roche would have learned his skill from the most admired landscape designers in the country at the time, and would have made him the natural candidate to design Glenwood. In 1854, de la Roche completed the landscape for the first 30 acres at Glenwood.217 The success of his work at both Oak Hill and Glenwood led to a third rural cemetery commission, at Oakdale Cemetery, in Davenport, Iowa.218

---

215 Oak Hill Cemetery Gate House, HABS No. DC-249, On file at the Library of Congress; The Old Naval Observatory at 23rd and E streets, N.W., was designated a National Historic Landmark (NHL) in 1965. George F. de la Roche was assigned to draft the plans for the original core of the building by the Department of the Navy in 1842. A further account of the construction of the building is presented in Astronomical and Meteorological Observations made during the year 1871, at the United States Naval Observatory by Rear-Admiral B.F. Sands in 1873, published by the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 18-19.
217 “Local Intelligence,” The Evening Star, December 8, 1854, 3.
218 Harry E. Downer, History of Davenport and Scott County Iowa, Vol. 1 (Chicago, IL: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1910), 226; Oakdale Cemetery was established in 1857. A notable burial is legendary jazz musician, Leon Bismarck “Bix” Beiderbecke.
George Clendenin: Little is known of George Clendenin, the cemetery’s first Superintendent. He was born in New York City on May 13, 1812, lived there as late as 1850. He resided at Glenwood Cemetery from 1853 through his death on November 28, 1888. He and his wife are buried in Glenwood Cemetery. Although originally coming to Glenwood to assist his brother-in-law, William Humphreys, his tenure at Glenwood continued after Humphreys was no longer associated with the cemetery. His role was extremely important to the cemetery’s operations and its appearance.

Alexander McKerichar: McKerichar came to Glenwood Cemetery following a distinguished twenty-year career as the Superintendent of the White House garden and grounds. Born in Perthshire, Scotland in 1831, he apprenticed at the gardens of the Duke of Atholl at Dunkeld starting in 1850 for four years before immigrating to the United States to work in the gardens of Robert Steele of Winchester, Virginia. In 1854, he gained a position at the United States Botanical Garden, where he worked first under the supervision of one of America’s most notable botanists, Superintendent of the Garden and fellow Scot William Brackenridge and his assistant William R. Smith, also a Scot. McKerichar left the Botanical Gardens in June 1855 to begin a twenty-year career at the White House, first as foreman for the President’s garden and then Superintendent of the gardens and grounds. He also ran a small nursery and florist in Alexandria, Virginia before taking on the Superintendent’s position Glenwood.

AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Architecture

Glenwood Cemetery contains numerous architecturally significant resources, including the Main Gate and associated stone wall and wrought iron fence, 1854 Public Mausoleum, private mausolea, Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel, Gate Keeper’s Lodge, and over 48,000 markers and memorials representing three major aesthetic periods associated with nineteenth and twentieth century cemetery design. The cemetery is entered through elaborate cast-iron gates, built in 1898–99, and is encompassed by a milled point, cast-iron fence on a fieldstone base. The designed gates announce one’s entry into Glenwood, while the encircling stone wall mounted with an iron fence serve to preserve the picturesque acres of the nineteenth-century cemetery. The Mortuary Chapel, listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1989, was constructed in 1892 and sited on the small circle at the center of the original 30-acre site. The building is the

---

only extant ecclesiastical building in the District of Columbia by master architect Glenn Brown, and is an important example of Richardsonian Romanesque-style architecture in deep red brick. The 1899 gatehouse is a Gothic Revival-style pale gray brick and limestone cottage with a steeply pitched, cross-gable roof designed by local architects Freyhold and Walsh. The building was expanded circa 1940, by a two-story addition that is sympathetic to the original design.

Art

In addition to the landscape, buildings, and structures, many of the statuary, monuments, headstones, and markers in the cemetery are significant works of memorial art. Outdoor Sculpture, James Goode’s outstanding record of Washington’s best outdoor sculpture, includes five examples (Eliza Mayo, Benjamin Grenup, Victor Blunden, and Teresina Vasco) of Glenwood’s memorials. In the mid-to-late nineteenth century, many of these monuments and markers were recognized by the contemporary press and described in newspapers in Washington, as well as in neighboring cities. William Alexander Gaddess, a stonemason based in Baltimore, sculpted the first monument placed in the cemetery in 1854. This monument, sculpted of marble comprising an obelisk and a broken oak tree, is representative of the unique and elaborate monuments of the rural cemetery period. Many of these memorials incorporate sculpted figures or obelisks, such as the large marble monument honoring Benjamin Grenup erected by the Columbia Fire Company in 1858. Andrea Sichi, an Italian immigrant, created a notable marble monument for Teresina Vasco in 1913, portraying a toddler, sitting in a small rocking chair with flowers piled at her feet. A granite monument dating to 1936 by an unknown artist depicts a relief portrait of Victor S. Blundon sitting cross-legged on the ground next to his Irish setter. Numerous unique memorials incorporate intricately carved female figures, draped in robes, expressing grief, or angels. Examples more consistent with the later Lawn Park Movement are smaller and less personal, but no less beautiful in the memorialization of loved ones. An example of this more restrained monument is the female figure sculpted for the Roose family memorial. The Art Deco mausoleum designed for the Huguely family is an exceptional example of the style and interpretation of the restrained approach of early twentieth funerary art. Pre-fabricated headstones that the cemetery corporation offered for sale to its patrons with the turn of the century include broken columns and obelisks, as well as stylized and symbolic components such as trees, logs, angels, hearts, cherubs, ivy, and sheaves of wheat. These examples of memorial art represent the artistic development of cemetery art from the mid-1850s through today. Significantly, as the cemetery is not associated with a single Christian denomination, the art includes motifs representing a variety of religious, ethnic, and geographic symbolism and style popular during these past 160 years.

Politics/Government

Glenwood Cemetery was incorporated by an Act of Congress in 1854. This action was required because although the United States Congress incorporated the City of Washington in 1802, it did not otherwise change the terms of the Organic Act of 1801. The 1801 act formally organized the District of Columbia and placed the entire District, including Washington, Georgetown, Alexandria, and the County of Washington under its exclusive jurisdiction. As the cemetery
intended to operate outside the Federal City, its incorporation required Congressional authorization. Today, the incorporation of an entity within the District is primarily bureaucratic; in the 1850s, it was primarily political.

Incorporation required gathering Congressional sponsors to support the action and preparing documentation acceptable to those sponsors. Glenwood was not the idea of a Washingtonian familiar with the unique governmental processes in place in the District, but instead was brought to Congress by an entrepreneur from New York City. William Humphreys was a fairly recent Irish immigrant who lived on Manhattan’s Lower Eastside. What connections Humphreys had in Washington or Congress and how he was able to identify potential sponsorship that would satisfy the committee members is unknown. Humphreys managed, however, to purchase land in the County, entice prominent Washingtonians to join him as “shareholders” in the enterprise, and gain the Congressional sponsorship needed for passage of the bill. The significance of this is heightened as the stipulations in the proposed act were not typical of the business that Humphreys was seeking to operate. He put forward the innovative and unorthodox business model of a for-profit entity to run a cemetery at a time when cemeteries were not considered commercial operations. When in 1876, angry lot holders who believed they were being deprived of their rights brought a request for an amendment to Congress, they relied on the powerful Senator John Sherman from Ohio to make their case. The amended charter was met immediately by a legal challenge on constitutional grounds by Joseph Close, who held the deed for the cemetery and acted as the sole share holder of the Glenwood Cemetery corporation. Years of legal battles between the Congressionally-sanctioned lot proprietors and Close resulted with the case going to the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1883, six years after Congress passed the amendment, the Supreme Court held in favor of the lot proprietors.

The politics of government, however, did not end there for the lot holder-controlled company now formally named The Glenwood Cemetery. Efforts of the District Commissioners to extend streets through the cemetery grounds despite the specific stipulation that such action was a violation of both the 1854 charter and the 1877 amendment began in 1887 and continued intermittently until 1899 when the cemetery corporation was able to gain support of the District for a deal that provided for Michigan Avenue to be extended around the cemetery property. The failure of (or implicit dismissal of) Congressional action to hold sway over its appointed District Commissioners reveals valuable insight about the politics of both Congress and the District of Columbia.

Commerce

William Humphreys’ concept for the Glenwood Cemetery was a for-profit enterprise. Based on the initial, although quickly abandoned, financial organization of Brooklyn’s Green-Wood Cemetery, Glenwood’s business plan was intended to profit its stockholders, who were to have each invested $50.00 per share of a total of 2,000 shares of stock. The Congressional charter supported this approach, making no mention of the need for the stock-holders to re-invest their profit into the cemetery’s operations and improvements. This cannot be seen as an oversight, as the Congressional charter for Oak Hill Cemetery in 1849, five years before Glenwood’s charter,
clearly states a more benevolent approach. The Oakwood Cemetery Company was to be composed of proprietors of lots with holdings not less than 300 square feet, and that all proceeds after expenses were to be “applied solely to the improvement, extension, ornament, and preservation of the said cemetery,” and not used as a source of profit for any lot proprietors.\(^{223}\) The charters for Prospect Hill Cemetery in 1860 and for Mount Olivet in 1862 follow this non-profit model. Indeed, there is no evidence that when Joseph Close took over control of the corporation, he actually sold any shares of Glenwood, but instead retained full ownership of the land and the corporation, and personally took all profits. This resulted in a revolution of the lot proprietors and a Congressional amendment to the charter in 1877, re-organizing the corporation into a non-profit owned by the lot proprietors which required income to be re-invested in the cemetery’s operations, which is as it remains today. Humphreys’ original business plan dating to 1852, however, can be seen as somewhat prescient of things to come. The concept of the professional, for-profit operation of cemeteries is consistent with the tenets of the Lawn Park and Memorial Park Movements and, starting in the early twentieth century, it has gained popularity in the United States as a legitimate business approach.

NATIONAL REGISTER EVALUATION

Glenwood Cemetery meets Criteria A and C and Criterion Consideration D for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

National Register Criterion A

The Glenwood Cemetery meets Criterion A as a local embodiment of the ideals of the Rural Cemetery movement in Washington D.C. and was particularly distinguished as being the first for-profit cemetery established for the city. Along with Congressional, Oak Hill, Rock Creek, and Mount Olivet Cemeteries, Glenwood is locally recognized as one of the District of Columbia’s five cemeteries established during the height of the Rural Cemetery movement. The Rural Cemetery movement presented not only efforts to design cemeteries to reflect the picturesque embodiment of pastoral life, but was also the first community-based movement for burials that occurred near urban areas throughout the United States during the nineteenth century. Prior to this time, interments were confined to church cemeteries or family plots. What made Glenwood Cemetery unique among these five major cemeteries in the District of Columbia was that the Congressional Charter established it as the first for-profit cemetery organization in Washington D.C., paving the way for other future for-profit cemetery organizations during the latter nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Glenwood cemetery is also the final resting place of many individuals of importance to the political and social history of Washington D.C. including Mayor William A Bradley; veterans of the Civil War including Union General John Simpson Crocker; important leaders of local Masonic chapters such as Albert Gallatin Mackey; high-ranking federal officials including Commissioner of the General Land Office Joseph Wilson; prominent members of Washington’s early social society, as well as national leaders such as

\(^{223}\) Act Incorporating Oak Hill Cemetery, March 3, 1849 (9 stat 773 ch. 128).
Amos Kendall, a co-founder of the school that would become Gallaudet University; members of Congress including Senator Edwin Freemont Ladd and Congressman Hiram Walbridge; federal judges including Thomas Bartley; and prominent nationally recognized artists Clark Mills, Constantino Brumidi, Alexander Gardner, and Gottlieb Leutze.

**National Register Criterion C**
Glenwood Cemetery meets Criterion C for local significance as an intact collection of significant landscape architecture, architecture, and funerary art adapted to a cemetery that transcends multiple periods of design from the mid-nineteenth century to the late-twentieth century. The original plan of the cemetery still incorporates the picturesque elements that were a hallmark of the Rural Cemetery Movement with its rolling topography, curvilinear roads, and substantial ornamental plantings. Funerary art from the Rural Cemetery Movement, as well as later period design elements reflect both the Lawn Park and Memorial Movements are exemplified in over 48,000 markers and memorials associated with nineteenth and twentieth century cemetery design. Notable elements of funerary design can be seen in the obelisk and sculptural memorials that were popular during the Rural Cemetery movement, the simplicity and harmonious markers popular during the Lawn Park era, and the flat-to-ground plaque-type and granite markers popular during the Memorial Park movement. Major buildings and structures, most notably mausoleums and gates, reflect popular architectural design trends of the nineteenth century, most notably Classical Revival, Gothic Revival, Romanesque Revival, Egyptian Revival, Arts and Crafts, Richardsonian Romanesque, and Art Deco designs. The boundary walls and gates of the cemetery, constructed between 1899 and 1938, contain cast and wrought-iron elements artistically arranged with shaped ashlar and fieldstone. Mid- and later twentieth century architecture as seen in the cemetery’s maintenance and utility buildings reflect more utilitarian, modernist designs that were popular during these eras.

**National Register Criterion Consideration D**
Glenwood Cemetery is a cemetery that embodies all three major movements in cemetery design, is an early example of a for-profit burial ground, contains the graves of a number of individuals of importance to the District of Columbia and the nation, and is home to several important sculptural works of art as well as dozens of representative examples of typical, period-specific mortuary art. For that reason, Glenwood Cemetery meets Criterion Consideration D.

Although no systematic archaeological survey has been conducted within the boundaries of Glenwood Cemetery, and no historic or prehistoric archaeological sites have yet been identified, the property may have both prehistoric and historic archaeological potential. The upland setting of the cemetery site, on a cliff overlooking the eastern portion of the land leading to the Potomac River, would likely have been attractive to American Indians for camps or special use sites. Similarly, during the early nineteenth century, the site was part of a farm or country estate with a main house and auxiliary buildings dating at least to 1806, remnants of which may survive below ground. And finally, unmarked graves, especially from re-interments, are highly likely at Glenwood, just as are clandestine burials on the margins. Still, despite the likelihood for Glenwood Cemetery to yield some archaeological evidence of earlier uses of the land, no archaeological sites are known to exist.
INTEGRITY

Despite notable deterioration of older markers, material changes resulting from the modernization of nineteenth century features, and the encroaching urbanization of the surrounding properties, Glenwood Cemetery retains sufficient integrity of design, materials, workmanship, location, feeling, and association to convey its significance.

Design

The design integrity as reflected in the landscape elements of the various periods of cemetery development, the funerary art, and the architectural elements of the cemetery remain intact. Overall landscape planning design features associated with the cemetery through its period of significance 1852-1966 remain intact. The original thirty acre, mid-nineteenth century, Rural Cemetery period area retains its original curvilinear avenues, irregularly shaped burial sections, and undulating topography, in addition to many varieties of trees and other plantings, all of which are hallmarks of the Rural Cemetery movement. The twenty-four acres that are associated with the later nineteenth century/early twentieth century Lawn Park Movement with their more sweeping curves and open landscape are similarly intact to the 1900 master plan. Although the road plan was not altered from the McKerichar Plan, the influence of the Memorial Park Movement can be seen in the topography of the most northern sections of the cemetery which are those that were open for burial in the mid-twentieth century. The topography is flatter than seen in the earlier sections where de la Roche’s original rolling topography is intact. All major buildings constructed during these period retain their character defining design features reflective of various periods of development in mausoleums, the Gothic Revival styled gate keepers lodge, the Richardsonian Romanesque mortuary chapel, and the more utilitarian architecture constructed after 1945. Finally, most of the funerary art representing the various periods of cemetery development remains intact.

Materials and Workmanship

Notable material changes have included the asphalt surfacing of the original roadways and paths that were originally unpaved. The markers in the oldest sections of the cemetery, specifically those burial sections near the main gate, have experienced the most visible deterioration from acid rain, erosion, natural deterioration, and settling of the earth. The inscriptions on the numerous markers that date to the first decade of the cemetery’s opening have worn away. Some of these markers have tilted, while others have been stabilized on new stone bases. However, nearly all of the monuments retain their original materials and convey workmanship qualities and high artisanship notable during the Rural Cemetery Movement. Similarly, the more simplistic markers that are commonly identifiable with the Lawn Park and Memorial Park Movements retain a high degree of integrity of materials.

In addition to the funeral monuments, all of the main gates still retain their original materials and workmanship characteristics, most notably in the intricate cast and wrought-iron work, integrated with shaped stonework. The mausoleums, gate house, and the memorial chapel retain exquisite
masonry features along with stylistic wood working reflective of their period design. Despite the notable changes with the roadway system and the materials deterioration, the cemetery as a whole retains materials and workmanship integrity.

Association and Feeling

The Glenwood Cemetery retains integrity of association and feeling as a cemetery. Since its creation by an Act of Congress in 1854, Glenwood has been a continuously active cemetery in the District of Columbia. The landscape that composes the cemetery continues to convey the picturesque pastoral feeling that was originally intended with its creation during the Rural Cemetery Movement and continued with the Lawn Park Movement.

Location

The Glenwood Cemetery has remained in situ outside the original boundaries of the federal city, even though the city has grown to surround it. Accordingly, it retains integrity of location.

Setting

The cemetery’s setting has changed dramatically since its opening in 1854. Originally established within an agrarian setting outside the limits of the City of Washington, urban encroachment that has been part of the growth of Washington D.C. has replaced the original rural setting. Adjacent construction to the west includes new roads which are joined to North Capitol Street, row houses, and a garden apartment complex. Franklin Street and Trinity University are to the north on land that was part of the original cemetery property. The southern boundary was originally farm land but since 1858, Prospect Hill Cemetery has occupied this area. The transition from rural to urban, has diminished the integrity of the cemetery’s setting.
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  Name of repository: The Glenwood Cemetery, Washington, DC
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 54 acres

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates
Datum if other than WGS84:________
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)
1. Latitude: 38.925452 °N Longitude: 77.003086 °W
2. Latitude: 38.920945 °N Longitude: 77.004330 °W
3. Latitude: 38.919810 °N Longitude: 77.006412 °W
4. Latitude: 38.920461 °N Longitude: 77.007849 °W
5. Latitude: 38.921262 °N Longitude: 77.007463 °W
6. Latitude: 38.923449 °N Longitude: 77.008600 °W
7. Latitude: 38.826337 °N Longitude: 77.005961 °W
8. Latitude: 38.924701 °N Longitude: 77.004652 °W

Or

UTM References
Datum (indicated on USGS map):

☐ NAD 1927 or ☐ NAD 1983

1. Zone: Easting: Northing:
2. Zone: Easting: Northing:
3. Zone: Easting: Northing:
4. Zone: Easting: Northing:

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)
Glenwood Cemetery is comprised of approximately 54 acres located approximately 1.5 miles north of the U.S. Capitol building in the Northeast quadrant of Washington, D.C. The irregularly shaped parcel is bound to the north by Franklin and Girard streets, N.E.; to the south by Lincoln Road, N.E., and Prospect Hill Cemetery; to the east by Lincoln Road, N.E.;
and to the west by a service alley associated with residential development east of North Capitol Street, N.W. The main gate is located at 2219 Lincoln Road, N.E.

This boundary includes the previously listed Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel (listed in 1989).

**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)
Historic Boundary is the same as the property boundary.

11. **Form Prepared By**

name/title: Emily Hotaling Eig, Architectural Historian
organization: EHT Traceries
street & number: 1101 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 600
city or town: Washington state: DC zip code: 20004
e-mail: Emily.eig@traceries.com
telephone: 202-393-1199
date: July 13, 2016

**Additional Documentation**

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)

**Photographs**

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer,
photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

**Photo Log**

Name of Property: The Glenwood Cemetery

City or Vicinity: Washington

County: N/A  State: DC

Photographer: EHT Traceries

Date Photographed: 2014-2015

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:
Glenwood Cemetery

Name of Property

Washington, D.C.

County and State

I of 14. View looking north toward Glenwood Cemetery main gate.
2 of 14. View looking southeast toward the pedestrian gate.
Glenwood Cemetery

Washington, D.C.

3 of 14. View looking southwest toward the east (primary) and north (side) façades of the Gatehouse.
4 of 14. View looking north toward burial Section A. Note Rural Cemetery-influenced monuments, curved burial section, and ornamental plantings.
5 of 14. Detail view looking southwest toward Roose family memorial, an example of a Rural Cemetery monument incorporating sculpture, in burial Section C.
6 of 14. View looking west across burial Section E.
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7 of 14. View looking east across burial Section D toward the National Register-listed Glenwood Cemetery Mortuary Chapel.
8 of 14. View looking northwest toward the entrance to the original mausoleum along Mulberry Avenue in Section G. Note papyrus entablature, obelisks, and pylon-like massing, evoking the Egyptian Revival style.
9 of 14. View looking southeast along Mulberry Avenue toward nineteenth- and early twentieth-century mausolea. Note the use of brick on nineteenth-century mausolea, compared to use of granite and limestone on early twentieth-century mausolea. In addition, note the horseshoe-arch entrance to the Allen mausoleum, second from left.
10 of 14. View looking northeast across southern portion of burial Section F. Note modest markers, suggestion of pedestrian paths through the markers, and selective use of vegetation, hallmarks of the Landscaped Lawn Parks movement.
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12 of 14. Detail view looking west toward Roe family monument, located in burial Section D. Note incised lettering, restrictive use of ornament, and standardized size, hallmarks of the Memorial Parks movement.
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13 of 14. View looking southwest across burial Section K toward Section M. Note standardized markers of Memorials Parks movement (foreground) and Landscaped Lawn Parks-movement markers and grave organization in undulating Rural Cemetery landscape.
14 of 14. View looking southwest towards the north (primary) façade of the Mausoleum.
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Site Map showing Glenwood Cemetery
(USGS Quad Map)
Map of Glenwood Cemetery showing National Register Boundaries and Key to Photographs
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