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ABSTRACT

In 1966 James Deetz and Edwin Dethlefsen illustrated how changes in tombstone iconography could be correlated to the spread of changing Puritan beliefs about death. This thesis addresses the possibilities that the adoption of Victorian tombstone style and iconography can be used to trace the spread of Victorian ideas. The theoretical arguments on funerary behavior and attitudes toward death as well as the development of the Victorian cemetery and its association to the rural cemetery movement are discussed. In addition, Victorian styles in funerary architecture and iconography are defined.

As originally addressed, the problem involved establishing that adoption of Victorian elements in the cemetery was simultaneous across the South or finding a time lag between adoption on the Atlantic coast and use in Grace Episcopal Churchyard Cemetery in St. Francisville, Louisiana. The Churchyard at St. Helena’s Episcopal Church in Beaufort, South Carolina, formed the Atlantic Seaboard end of my work.

Further study revealed that more was at work in the selection of tombstones in the nineteenth century than availability. I discovered anomalies in each of the two churchyards. In St. Helena’s, parishioners had rejected Victorian tombstones in favor of maintaining tradition. Low monuments with ledger stones were used well into the last of the nineteenth century. In other locales, these monuments were considered passé by 1850. The possible reasons for this rejection of Victorian cemetery monuments are discussed.

In Grace Churchyard I found that many of the more elaborate Victorian monuments were from a northern marble company, Enochs of Philadelphia. Equally elaborate work was available from Kursheedt & Bienvenu of New Orleans and Rosebrough of St. Louis. However, despite the obvious unpleasant northern association following the Civil War, the
citizens of St. Francisville continued to purchase monuments from the firm’s branch in Bayou Sara, a thriving port at the foot of the bluff on which St. Francisville sits. The Enochs’ name is on monuments dating from 1849 to 1887. Enochs’ monuments are found in six cemeteries along the Mississippi River, but in Philadelphia the company is almost unknown.
DEATH AND THE CEMETERY

In 1966, James Deetz and Edwin Dethlefsen published a seminal paper in *American Antiquity* demonstrating that change in New England tombstone design could be used to trace the spread of ideas and culture outward from Boston (Deetz and Dethlefsen 1966). In the time frame covered by the Deetz and Dethlefsen study, limited transportation insured that the study area could be relatively small. However, by the Victorian period, improved methods of transportation enabled ideas to travel farther, faster than in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Particularly, steamship travel between Europe, the cities of the eastern seaboard and Gulf coast ports should have drastically cut delays in the introduction of stylistic changes, as represented in mortuary iconography.

In this thesis I intend to examine the Victorian elements in Grace Episcopal Churchyard in St. Francisville, Louisiana. By dating the appearance of certain iconographic elements and shapes associated with Victorian monument styles, I hope to get a better understanding of how fashion in mortuary art traveled across the southern United States. Were ideas generated in England and/or the northeastern United States generally accepted simultaneously throughout the southeastern United States? Or were ideas “tested” in the east before spreading westward? Can one assume that acceptance of Victorian shapes and styles was universal? Or, did local preference limit use or favor certain markets? What factors influenced mortuary choices? The dates of the appearance of specified Victorian iconography and tombstone shapes in the churchyard cemeteries of Grace Episcopal Church in St. Francisville, Louisiana, and St. Helena’s Episcopal Church in Beaufort, South Carolina, will form the basis for this study.
The Archaeology of Death

According to Chapman, Kinnes and Randsburg (1981:3), the early history of archaeology could be described as the history of burial excavation. During the late 1700s and early 1800s interest in ancient funerary monuments led to some of the earliest excavations in Europe and the Americas as antiquarians explored Egyptian pyramids, British funerary megaliths, Greek and Roman tombs, and New World mounds.

Historical archaeology is a relatively new social science. Therefore, most early archaeological theory dealt with pre-historic sites. Cultural-normative archaeologists of the early twentieth century used funerary evidence primarily to trace the evolution of cultures: that is, using mortuary displays to study differences between groups rather than within groups of people. This reflected a belief that archaeology as a science was not amenable to the study of social stratification (Tarlow 1999:9-10).

During the 1960s, Lewis Binford and Arthur Saxe proposed that by looking at contemporary cultures for relationships between behavior and material remains in the archaeological record, inferences could be made about past cultures. Mortuary evidence is one of the aspects considered in formulating this middle range theory (Parker Pearson 1999:27-28; Tarlow 1999:10). Binford based his theory of mortuary variability on forty ethnographically described societies from the Human Relations Area Files. The societies chosen could be divided into four subsistence groups which he correlated with degree of sociocultural complexity: hunter-gatherers, shifting agriculturalists, settled agriculturalists and pastoralists.

Binford wrote that mortuary ritual consisted of two parts. The first is the technical aspect of disposing of the decomposing body. The second aspect is made up of a group of
symbolic acts varying in form and in the number and types of referents symbolized. While the same ritual might occur in several groups, the determinant of that symbolic act might differ from group to group. Binford proposed that to understand mortuary rites one must study the types and number of referents symbolized. These could be determined by looking at the social persona of the deceased and the size and composition of the group having a duty status relationship with him or her (Binford 1971:16-17).

The social persona is a mosaic of social identities which the deceased sustained while alive and which are deemed proper for remembrance after death. The higher the rank of the deceased, the more facets of his or her persona recognized during the mortuary rituals. The primary aspects of the persona recognized in mortuary ritual are age, sex, relative rank within the social system and the deceased’s membership in societal groups. Binford found that the number of dimensions or social identities emphasized in ritual rose with the complexity of the society (Binford 1971:17-18; Tarlow 1999:10). A similar idea was broached by Robert Hertz in 1907. He claimed that every individual is not only a biological being, but also a social being. The individual’s social identity is defined for him or her by other members of society. Hertz believed that this theory explained different attitudes to death within and between cultures (Stannard 1977:126).

Much of the mortuary work done by Binford, Saxe and other processualists has been discredited by post-processual archaeologists as producing generalizations with too many exceptions. “Simple” and “complex” have become as politically unacceptable as “savage” and “barbarian” in terms of society categorization. Parker Pearson denigrates middle range theory for looking at what people did rather than why they did it (Parker Pearson 1999:31-32; Tarlow 1999:10-11).
In addition, studies of ranking within, rather than between, societies have proved more interesting to the archaeological community. In one such study, Joseph Tainter conducted a cross-cultural ethnographic study of 103 societies to find if certain mortuary practices were invariably associated with social status. He looked at body treatment, the method of interment, the length of the ritual and if human sacrifice was involved. Tainter proposed a theory of energy expenditure—the higher the status of the individual, the more energy expended on the mortuary rite. In 90 percent of his cases, energy expended in funeral rites and the status of the individual could be correlated (Parker Pearson 1999:31).

The circumstances most damaging to processual mortuary theory are associated with how status is reflected in the archaeological record. For instance, some mortuary practices are less likely to leave evidence for the archaeologist. However, the most interesting problem with associating elaborate, complex mortuary practices with elevated status is that broached by Aubrey Cannon: the social value of elaboration cycles. As more of the middle and lower classes imitate the elaborate fashions of the upper classes, the upper classes will either regulate against the imitation or set themselves apart once more by adopting simple funeral displays (Cannon 1989:437; Tarlow 1999:11).

Cannon (1989) studied the Victorian funerary patterns of England by looking at the historical development of changes in mortuary production. Further, he made the assumption that those creating mortuary displays viewed them as a means of competing in the game of status one-upmanship. The pattern that Cannon studied in Victorian England began with funeral displays by wealthy, higher status individuals in the late eighteenth century. As those in the middle classes acquired wealth, the result of the Industrial Revolution, they emulated the funeral display of the higher classes. Those of higher status
raised the degree of elaboration in order to stay ahead of the middle class. Again, the middle classes followed suit, and the cycle went on. At the other end of the status spectrum, the lower classes struggled to present as much of the prescribed display as they could afford (Cannon 1989:438).

As funeral costs spiraled, reaction set in. Church and government agencies protested. Attempts were made to ban such displays, especially among the lower classes. The poor often went without food or sold their few possessions in order to show their own dead the same respect shown by the more elite. Finally, high status individuals sought exclusivity in simplicity. By the end of the nineteenth century, the fashion for funerary restraint had reached all classes (Cannon 1989:438-439).

In the same paper, Cannon (1989:439-441) adopted the system of analysis used by Deetz and Dethlefsen to study tombstone shape diversity over time. His study involved 3500 nineteenth century monuments in rural Cambridgeshire, England. Cannon found that shape diversity increased until the mid 1800s. Toward the end of the century, the number of tombstone shapes decreased, but not the total number of monuments erected. Higher status individuals tended to have access to more diverse monument types and varied lettering styles earlier than lower status individuals. By the time that lower class individuals adopted elite lettering styles and monument shapes, these attributes had been dropped by those of higher status. According to Cannon, the decrease in the number of tombstone shapes used at the end of the nineteenth century was the result of inundation: further diversity in shape and lettering, “within economically and ideologically acceptable limits,” was not possible (Cannon 1989:441).
Cannon’s hypothesis does not follow as well in the United States where class status is less rigidly ancestral, but more economically based. Cannon chooses to interpret the patterns of funeral elaboration and tombstone size and diversity as status envy or power negotiation. He (1989:438) dismisses as “romantic” the premise that funeral display is a product of prevailing ideologies of death. His study starts with the fact of funeral elaboration among the higher classes, but does not speculate why high status individuals chose that particular way to express their status or their grief.

Mike Parker Pearson, like many post-processual archaeologists, believes that rather than expressing the status of the deceased individual, funerals and monument selection are negotiable events where the social roles of the living are manipulated (Parker Pearson 1999:32-33). In this sense, Binford’s social persona of the deceased is turned inside out to represent the aspirations of the deceased’s survivors. Parker Pearson and others refer to this as “manipulation of the dead,” misrepresentation or masking. Essentially Parker Pearson’s views are representative of Marxian ideology: human motivation is bound in self-interest and attaining the power to satisfy that self-interest (Tarlow 1999:22-23).

According to Sarah Tarlow, burials are not necessarily “manipulated.” What the burial expresses may have nothing to do with the socioeconomic status of either the deceased or kin. To interpret the elements of the burial in that light would be misleading. Instead, the funeral arrangements, the monument, may be expressing values or meaning outside the realm of status. To suggest that power and domination lie at the root of all human motivation shows a very limited understanding of people (Tarlow 1999:22-23).

My own understanding of mortuary ritual is necessarily limited to historical contexts. In the case of historical cemeteries, such as Grace Churchyard, we know from
books, diaries and oral histories that the nineteenth and twentieth century Anglo/European/American response to death was emotional, not manipulative. With Sarah Tarlow, I believe that to suggest otherwise is not appropriate.

“If we are to recognize the humanity of those whom we study, we have to find a way of incorporating into our archaeologies the fact that they were subtle, complex, emotional, motivated people” (Tarlow 1999:24).

The History of Death

Opposing the idea of power being negotiated through burials and monuments is the theory that funeral behavior changes to reflect the changing way in which society thinks about death and the dead. Historian Philippe Aries presented an excellent review of the Western attitudes toward death in a series of lectures given to the history department of Johns Hopkins University in 1973. Aries’ phases of looking at death are based on literature and art from each period.

Aries calls the first period “tame death.” The time frame covered is approximately A.D. 200 to A.D. 1200. People feared, not death, but not being prepared for death. The actual process of dying was ritual presided over by the dying and followed a set protocol. A person should know instinctively when he or she was dying and prepare. The proper way to meet death was lying down with one’s arms outstretched in the form of a cross, facing heaven. The dying person expressed regret at leaving life behind and remembered loved people and things. Those in attendance – parents, friends, children and neighbors – expressed regret at the impending death and asked for forgiveness for any wrong that they might have done the dying person. They were forgiven. After commending the survivors to God’s care, the dying person turned his or her attentions to God with a prayer confessing sins committed and asking for forgiveness. The absolution was given by the priest, and the
dying person waited in silence for death to come. The whole thing was ritual, but ritual
performed with simplicity (Aries 1974: 2-13).

Early canon law forbade burial within the city walls. Martyrs were buried in extra-
urban necropolises shared by pagans and Christians. These revered sepulchers attracted
the tombs of those of people wanting to be buried near the saints. Soon a basilica, under
the care of monks, might be built over the saint’s grave. Sites near the basilica became
veritable mounds of stone sarcophagi. Around the sixth century, the ban on urban burials
weakened. Accommodation was made within the church for the tombs of saints and those
seeking to be buried nearby (Aries 1974:14-18; Curl 1972:28; McDowell and Meyer

The medieval word for church encompassed more than just the building. It was
taken to mean the church, the belfry, and the atrium or cemetery “chimiter.” In the
beginning, the French words for atrium and charnel house were synonymous. The
churchyard, or atrium, was rectangular. The church formed one of the four sides. The
other sides were formed by arcades or charnel houses. Ossuaries, with the bones of the
dead artistically displayed, were located in the spaces above the charnel houses. The bones
came from rich and poor alike. The poor were sewn into their shrouds and laid out in
“fosse aux pauvres”, or ditches. As one ditch filled, an old one was opened and the bones
removed to the ossuary so that the ditch could be reused. The wealthy were buried under
the flagstones within the church, but their shrouded bodies were also placed directly in the
dirt. Eventually, those bones would also be dispossessed and sent to the ossuary. The
important idea was that the bones were the responsibility of the church to do with as it
The role of the cemetery as a public space shouldn’t be forgotten. The space was considered asylum. Houses were built there, the residents enjoying fiscal privileges. The space was treated somewhat like a village green, plaza or forum. People met there to do business, talk, gamble, play or dance. Shops were set up within the charnel houses. Surprisingly, not until the seventeenth century were people disturbed by carrying out business and social activities so close to the dead. As more people were buried in the pits, less time elapsed before they were dispossessed. Sometimes rotting flesh still clung to the bones being moved to the ossuaries. The odor alone must have discouraged social gatherings and business (Aries 1974:23-24; Barrow 1992:78-95).

Around the twelfth or thirteenth century the attitude toward death was modified somewhat. Although death was still accepted as part of life, it became more personal and dramatic. Aries finds these changes in four phenomena. The first is seen through the portrayal of the Last Judgment. On a tomb built around A.D. 700, the Second Coming is portrayed as a majestic Christ surrounded by the four Evangelists. Adjoining the panel is one showing the resurrection of the dead who are holding their arms up to the returning Christ. There is nothing to indicate judgment. Those dead who belonged to the Church in life and death (whose bones were held by the church) had been sleeping (requiescant) and now were awaking in Paradise. Those who did not belong to the church did not awaken (Aries 1974:28-31).

In twelfth century churches, the majestic Christ is still depicted. However, beneath His image is shown the Last Judgment with the separation of the just and the unjust and the weighing of the souls. By the thirteenth century, the Second Coming has been completely replaced by judgment. In a court of law, Christ sits on the judgment seat amid his apostles.
Each person faces Christ, holding his or her account book of life. All the good and bad deeds are separated and weighed. The Virgin Mary and St. John kneel on either side of Christ to intercede on the behalf of the one being judged. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the book is worn about the neck of the risen to be presented on the last day (Aries 1974:31-33; Stannard 1977:11).

In the second instance, a pseudo-judgment has been moved from the last day to the deathbed. Aries found these changes in woodcuts printed in books on the proper manner of dying. While the dying person carries out the prescribed rituals, a spectacle which he alone can see occurs. His room is filled with supernatural beings: on one side the Trinity, the Virgin and God’s court, on the other Satan and a host of demons. The book is still there, but not the scales. Aries offers two interpretations. If one looks only at the woodcuts, the scene appears to be a struggle between good and evil, with the dying person the prize. However, the inscriptions indicate that God and His court are there as observers in a last test that the dying person must pass. The person’s whole life, contained in the account book, passes before him or her. The dying must resist the temptation to gloat over good deeds or despair over evil ones. If temptation is resisted, all bad deeds are forgiven. If not, all the good deeds are washed away. Although the dying person still determined how the ritual was played, what had started out as a calming ritual—the deathbed—had now become emotionally disturbing (Aries 1974:33-39).

Also during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the decaying cadaver appeared in art and books. This is not the skeleton or skull found on seventeenth and eighteenth century tombstones. The fifteenth century tomb of Francois de Serra bears his effigy. Frogs and worms are eating his face, and the skin hangs in shreds from his arms. This
The iconography of the 1400s and 1500s could be interpreted as revulsion of death and decaying (love of life), fear of illness or growing old (the living body decaying), or the fear of failing to accomplish all that he or she should have in life. John Huizanga wrote that the 
danse macabre “is a dance of the dead…to remind the spectators of the frailty of vanity of earthly things (Aries 1974:39-46; Stannard 1977:16-17).

The final phenomenon concerns the setting aside of individual burying places. Tomb inscriptions have been found for ancient Romans, but starting in the fifth century marked graves became rare. This is hardly surprising when tombs were only temporary resting places on the way to the anonymous church ossuary. Any stones were anonymous. Starting in the thirteenth century, inscriptions appeared again on the tombs of the rich and famous. Symbolic effigies of the person followed. By the fourteenth century, the effigy might use a death mask. By the seventeenth century, funerary art might have depictions of the person before and after death (Aries 1974:46-52).

For those not so rich and famous, the dead were remembered with small plaques attached to church walls. Unlike the monumental tombs, most plaques are now gone. The inscriptions read much like the tombstones that would replace the plaques in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: “Here lieth Mary Smyth who died ….” The dead were remembered and their burial place identified (generally). The deceased were also remembered by the donation of money for perpetual masses to be said for the salvation of their souls.

What all of these phenomena illustrate is the development of a relationship between the death of each person and that person’s realization that he or she was an individual. According to Aries, between A.D. 1000 and A.D. 1250 the way that people thought about
their surroundings was transformed. How people reasoned, how they distinguished abstract and concrete realities and conceived ideas evolved radically. That transformation is evident in the transformation of the individual’s view of death (Aries 1974:50-52).

Aries’ third period began in the eighteenth century. He calls this “la mort de toi,” or the death of the other person (1974:55). This period was marked by a Gothic revival based on a growing interest in archaeology, the decaying ruins of Catholic monasteries and morbid literature (Curl 1972:22-24). Death was dramatic, exciting and disquieting. Out of this phase comes the cult of memory, the romantic and lyrical treatment of death and the development of the cemetery (Aries 1974:55-56).

Until the end of the fifteenth century death was familiar. It was important and must be considered carefully, but death was not frightening. From the sixteenth century onward, death was considered a discontinuity born in an artistic marriage between the morbid and the erotic. Our loved ones were ripped from our arms by fiends, while we the survivors wept inconsolably. Death became part real, part fantasy. According to Aries, the eroticism was reduced to beauty. One didn’t want to die, but death was beautiful, i.e. romantic death. No longer was the deathbed a passionless ritual, but an emotional scene of tears, prayer and lamentations. The ritual was still there, but with intense feeling. People talked about death—beautiful death (Aries 1974:56-60). Paintings of deathbed scenes were all the rage. Books on the death of virtuous women, heroic men and innocent children were immensely popular. According to Aries, this morbid fascination with death is one of the characteristics of Romanticism and is “a sublimation of the erotico-macabre phantasm of the preceding period (Aries 1974:61)” Romanticism in Europe reached its zenith during the last half of the eighteenth century (Curl 1972:22).
Second, the dying began to distinguish between the distribution of his or her material goods and the bequests inspired by love, affection and good will. A person’s fortune was dispensed with a will. More personal wishes could be expressed to those at the deathbed with perfect confidence that those wishes would be carried out. Until this period, wills specified all of these things—supposedly a sign of distrust in those nearest and dearest. Aries believes that in this delegation of authority to kin, the dying were relinquishing some of the power which they had held exclusively in the ritual of death (Aries 1974:63-65).

**Death in Early America**

Much of Aries’ work addresses the treatment of death in Europe. However, there is also a correlation between ideological change and mortuary remembrance in North America. David Charles Sloane (1991:6) wrote,

“The American cemetery is a window through which we can view the hopes, fears, and designs of the generation that created it and is buried within it. By examining the cemetery from the late eighteenth to the late twentieth century, we can find clues to how the mosaic of death changed within America’s social and cultural framework.”

The best known examples of the relationship between cemeteries and the mosaic of death come from the New England area. James Deetz’s *In Small Things Forgotten* details how changes in how the populace viewed its relationship to God and to death were documented in tombstone iconography. There is little evidence that New England graves were marked prior to the 1650s. Earlier markers, if any, may have been made of wood and rotted away (Stannard 1977:116). Of extant tombstones, the earliest styles depict a winged death’s heads with vacant eyes and a rather macabre grin. This iconography coincides with the period of strictest adherence to the beliefs of orthodox Puritanism during the late
seventeenth century. The skull (Figure 1-1), or in some cases the whole skeleton, was indicative of the brevity of human life (Deetz 1972:68-69). Other symbols used were scythes, hourglasses, picks and shovels (Stannard 1977:117). To portray a heavenly being would have been blasphemous because the individual could have no interaction with the supernatural. Life was merely the Pilgrim’s path to inevitable death. Early Puritans believed fervently in Calvinist predestination. Salvation was open only to the elect and could not be purchased by good works or popish ritual (Stannard 1977:27, 99-101; Jackson 1977:8-9). Burying grounds were often on the town common. Rather than memorializing the dead, the graveyard was merely a place to dispose of the body. The grinning skulls with empty eyes served as constant reminders to those crossing the grounds that life was brief and judgment sure (Coffin 1976:125, 171; Jackson 1977:9; Mytum 1989:295).

Epitaphs such as these give voice to the skulls’ message.

“Behold and see as you pass by;  
As you are now, so once was I.  
As I am now, you soon must be.  
Prepare for Death and follow me.”  
(Coffin 1976:226)
“My youthful mates both small and great
Come here and you may see
An awful sight, which is a type
Of which you soon must be.”
(Deetz 1972:71)

With the Great Awakening of the middle eighteenth century, the faithful were
deemed capable of a personal relationship with the supernatural. This softening of church
doctrine was epitomized in the change from death’s head to cherubs on tombstones. The
soul had gone to its reward (Figure 1-2). All that remained on earth was the corruptible

![Figure 1-2. Cherub or winged soul figure
( Colonial Park Cemetery, Savannah, Georgia).](image)

(decayed) body. The message was reflected in the inscription. “Here lies Jane Doe”
became “here lies the body of Jane Doe.” Epitaphs also changed to emphasize the soul’s
ascent to Heaven.

“Here cease thy tears, suppress thy fruitless mourn
His soul – the immortal part – has upward flown
On wings he soars his rapid way
to yon bright regions of eternal day.”
(Deetz 1972:72)

“Weep not around his cold clay bed,
Nor heave a mournful sigh,
For, O! Father’s spirit fled
To realms above the sky.”
(Coffin 1976:227)
Given that the northeast was settled by English colonists, it is not surprising that the tombstone styles and iconography found there first appeared in England. What is surprising is that in the case of the winged cherub or soul figure, the time between the cherub’s introduction in England and its appearance in some parts of New England was as much as sixty years (Deetz 1972:72-73).

The third iconographic change in the sequence of styles was the urn and willow design (Figure 1-3). According to Deetz, this change was accompanied by a change in the shape of the stone’s shoulders. The tympanums on which earlier winged skulls and cherubs had been carved were flanked by rounded shoulders. Deetz writes that urn and willow tombstones had squared shoulders (Deetz 1972:72). Perhaps this was true in the cemeteries he studied. In seventeenth and eighteenth century cemeteries that I surveyed in South Carolina and in Georgia, as well as in published cemetery photos, I found urn and willow stones with rounded shoulders as well as skulls and cherubs with square shoulders (Combs 1986; Little 1998). The important issue is that the change in iconography reflected a change in how tombstones were used. Inscriptions began with “Sacred to the Memory of” or “In Memory of.” The stone might or might not mark the location of the deceased’s body. Skulls represented the mortal remains. Cherubs represented the fleeing soul or immortal remains. Urns and willows were representative of neither. Epitaphs also became more secular. The achievements of the deceased might be added to the religious message of the earlier stones (Deetz 1972:72-73).

The presence in the coastal South of tombstone styles usually associated with Puritans may seem surprising. However, the coastal area had no stone for tombstones. The markers were imported from either New England or England. The carved slate blanks
were completed with the name and inscription at the destination (Combs 1986:189). The presence of these imported stones produces something of an anomaly. The residents of the Mid-Atlantic States—mostly Anglicans and Presbyterians—shared almost none of the theological beliefs of the Puritans. The use of skull, cherub or willow might tell the passerby something about the theology of the deceased in a New England cemetery. In the South, the iconography used tells more about the site and style of the New England stonemason than about the theology of the dead (Little 1998:22). Combs (1986:2-3) disputes this, saying that the stones produced for the Southern market by New England carvers were more sophisticated than those made for their local markets.

The commons burial grounds of New England were not the only arrangement for burying the dead. In their search for a new life, many pioneers died along the trail. They were buried where they fell and their resting places left unadorned. Although this scenario engenders scenes of wagon trains and seemingly endless prairies, several burials of this type occurred in the mid 1800s in Livingston Parish, Louisiana. The most common type of burial place in rural areas of North America was the family graveyard. This ranged from
that of the Jefferson family at Monticello to fenced-off areas on small family farms. Particularly in the South and in areas with strong ties to the Anglican Church, the European tradition of churchyard burials was followed (Sloane 1991:13-17).

As the Puritan ethic eroded, tombstones changed again. Drapes were added across the top of the tympanum of willow and urn stones. These represented the division between Heaven and earth. Roses and rosebuds began to appear on monuments. The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were a transition period between the rather matter-of-fact death rituals of Puritans and other early English settlers and what Aries called “hysterical death” – the Victorian celebration of death.
THE VICTORIAN CEMETERY

The Victorian cemetery was not necessarily a rural cemetery, in the strictest definition of the term. Rural cemeteries were large, suburban garden cemeteries. Many smaller cemeteries and churchyards continued to be used in the country and in small towns. Because of the smaller populations and available land for expansion, these cemeteries did not normally face the health issues of the cities. However, many of the elements of the rural cemetery could be found in these smaller Victorian Era cemeteries. There are symbolic monuments, the incorporation of nature and an accommodation of the living and the dead (Francaviglia 1971:501-502). The theological, sociological and stylistic issues were the same. Neither Grace’s churchyard nor St. Helena’s churchyard are rural cemeteries. However, given the similarities, I will look at them through the lens of the rural cemetery.

The unhealthy, overcrowded graveyard is the usual reason given for early nineteenth century changes in cemeteries. However, the development of the Victorian cemetery was driven by other factors, as well: romantic theology, the desire to return to nature, and the rise of the middle class. Victorians were also seeking to soften the sting of death and to receive assurance of life after death.

Romantic Death

Romantic theology consisted of a tripartite relationship between God, nature and humanity. God could be found in humanity and in nature. Because of God’s spiritual presence, nature was majestic, mysterious, and tranquil. Nature was the source of life, and, of course, death (Farrell 1980:7). According to James Farrell, Romantic Death had two meanings. To some, death was the perfect model of the tripartite relationship. In death,
mankind returned to God and to nature. The body was buried in the ground, and from the decaying flesh sprang forth life in the form of nature. In this way, death was just one step in the cycle of life and not to be feared (Farrell 1980:7-8, 32-33). At Mount Auburn, communion with nature, according to founder Dr. Jacob Bigelow, meant earth burials. He criticized the use of sepulcher which prevented the body from returning to the “embrace of nature.”

However, death was also equated with horror and fear. Death was a powerful opponent against which each person must struggle. Writers, like Edgar Allan Poe and Mary Shelley, pushed their readers’ emotions to the breaking point by describing the body consumed by worms in the dark, dank grave, the terrible fate of those taken from the grave to the anatomist’ laboratory, or the horrors of being buried alive. Of course these dark, Gothic tales were designed to titillate, but they induced fear because the situations the stories illustrated contained some truth (Farrell 1980:7-8, 33-34; Jackson 1977:61).

To shield themselves from these harsh realities of death, people turned to sentiment. Novels, poetry and art portrayed death, often pathetic death (McKillop1995:93). One understands why Aries coined the phrase “hysterical death” for this period. Popular authors of the day, such as Timothy Shay Arthur (1860; 1887) and Harriet Beecher Stowe, wrung from their readers’ hearts every drop of emotion (Saum 1977:66). Lithographs portrayed grieving women leaning over flower strewn graves and mournful mothers watching over their dying children (Figure 2-1). Young girls demonstrated their skills in embroidery by stitching memorial pictures for family members. Wreaths were woven from the hair of the deceased. Stationers sold paper and envelopes bordered in black (Figure 2-2) for the use of the bereaved (McDowell and Meyer 1994:1; Morley 1971:14).
Figure 2-1. “A Mother’s Dream,” a lithograph by Currier & Ives.

Figure 2-2. Memorial letter written on black bordered mourning stationery
For the first time in America, care of the corpse acquired the same importance as concern for the soul (Harris 1977:103). Elaborate caskets were built. The very name for the vessel in which the body was placed changed. No longer was it a coffin, but a casket – reminiscent of the container in which one placed precious jewels. Beautiful funeral trappings were chosen; private grief was turned into public mourning. Elaborately detailed schedules for mourning behavior were followed. Beautiful monuments carved with flowers, angels and doves were erected in garden cemeteries (Figure 2-3). In a time when death was a frequent visitor in the home, “beautiful death” provided the survivors with a way to express their love and loss (Jackson 1977:61-62; Farrell 1980:34).

Figure 2-3. Angel by John Walz in Bonaventure Cemetery, Savannah, Georgia.

All of this emotional turmoil masked a new theological question. From the earliest Christian traditions, the possibility of an afterlife in Heaven had been offered as a reward
for walking the Pilgrim’s Path from birth to death. In 1859 Charles Darwin published *Origin of the Species*, and it seemed that all bets were off. If humanity was just another evolving organism, how could there be hope for an afterlife? Many Americans were torn between two seemingly opposing poles: Heaven and science (Jackson 1977:61-62). Was the afterlife a natural part of the evolutionary process? Some writers played word games in an attempt to make scientific theory more palatable to the public. Paul Carus assured his readers that there was “preservation of the soul-life after death.” However, he was referring to the continuation of the individual’s ideas: “Deeds live on, and what are we but the summation of our deeds!” Lester F. Ward wrote, “Science is not skeptical as to the immortality of the soul.” However, Ward was referring to the “soul of the least atom of matter.” In evolution, survival of the species, not the individual, is vital. For most Victorians, science was not enough (Carter 1977:112-127). James DeKoven said,

> “Beside some still form, the quiet stillness of the dead, we stand and ask… where is he now?... Tell me not of physical laws and the workings of disease, of forces and gasses, and currents. Philosophy and science and culture have no words warm enough to comfort me. O Cross of Christ! Cast thou thy shadow on my breaking heart!” (Carter 1977:118).

Several interesting movements arose from the evolution controversy. Not only did people want assurances that they could hope for an afterlife, they did not want to be separated from their deceased loved ones (Jackson 1977:61-62). This resulted in at least two aspects of the Victorian Era: spiritualism and the emphasis on family and home in the cemetery (Harris 1977:103).

Spiritualism had its origins in universalism and Swedenborgianism. The first denied the doctrine of Hell, leading to a new vision of the afterlife. The second portrayed Heaven as a continuation of life as the deceased had known it. According to Swedenborg,
at death, the mind fell asleep for three days and awakened in a place called the world of spirits. Older spirits helped the person to adjust to the afterlife. Angels were not supernatural beings but the spirits of the dead. Spirits could also be evil. Spiritualism, which began in the United States, spread to England. People were drawn to spiritualism because the practice promised proof of an afterlife and allowed the bereaved to communicate with the dead. Failure to prove the existence of a hereafter, as well as admissions of fraud, effectively ended spiritualism’s popularity in the United States by 1860. The belief flourished until the early part of the twentieth century in England (Carter 1977:126).

A Quagmire of Old Bones

Overuse of churchyards in England and Europe was noted as early as the 1600s. Following the Great Fire of 1666, Sir Christopher Wren suggested church and churchyard burials should be prohibited. Large cemeteries should be established outside London. His plan was to include beautiful monuments approved by architects to insure a pleasing design. Nothing was done (Curl 1972:35; 1993:136). By the beginning of the nineteenth century, English, European and American cities had a grave problem. Because of growing urban populations, more demand was being placed on burial facilities in and around churches (Habenstein and Lamers 1955:427).

The first garden cemetery in London, Kensal Green, was opened in 1832. However, it was designed for a wealthy clientele and failed to solve the overcrowding issue (Curl 1972 55-77). An 1842 report on London’s intramural burials stated that 44,355 bodies were being interred in 218 acres of burial grounds annually. The practice of reusing graves and tombs was not new. After a time sufficient for the flesh to decay, the bones
were removed to ossuaries, and the coffins burned. By the nineteenth century, burial space was at such a premium that removed remains often had not been reduced to bones. Witnesses near Bun Hill Fields burying ground reported seeing human flesh carried to the furnace, indicating that bodies were burned with the coffins. With more frequent reuse of burial grounds, grave diggers often dug through previous burials in various states of decomposition. The drunken grave digger appeared often in contemporary fiction. In reality, inebriation dulled the senses. As more bodies were interred, burials were closer to the surface, with the attendant health risks. In other places the coffins were burned and the bodies covered with quicklime. Graves for the poor were deep communal trenches left open until filled with bodies. Because of the mass of bodies, decay was slow. With enough burials, the bacteria involved could not survive. Decomposition stopped entirely, and the graveyard became “an embalming matrix, a foul-smelling, slimy mass of putrefaction” (Curl 1972:134-136; McDannell 1995:105-106; Mytum 1989:285-292).

Pamphlets were published in support of legislation to close intramural churchyards. A particularly explicit one was The Cemetery, A Brief appeal to the feelings of Society on Behalf of Extra Mural Burials. A portion follows.

‘Mongst earthy rags of shroud, and splintered shell,  
A quagmire of old bones, where darkly bred,  
The slimy life is busy with the dead,  
Reeks from that bloated earth miasma’s breath,  
The full-fed taint of undigested death,  
Thence, like the fumes from sleeping glutton’s throat,  
The noisome vapours of her surfeit float.

(Curl 1972:136)

The solution was slow in coming. In the 1850s the City of London was still debating the best way to deal with its dead (Curl 1972:113-131).
In the United States, the cities with the highest populations, New York, Boston and Philadelphia, were the areas of most acute need. In New York, a report calling for the prohibition of all inner city burials, with the further suggestion that all cemeteries be turned into parks, was ignored. In 1822 16,000 New Yorkers died in a yellow fever epidemic. The death rate for those living near Trinity Church burying ground was particularly high. The issue of disease and the cemeteries was raised, and dropped, again. The 1838 opening of Green-Wood Cemetery in Brooklyn alleviated the problem somewhat (French 1974:42).

In Boston, space in the churchyard was also at a premium. In 1822 several churches asked permission to bury in vaults in the church cellar. Dr. Jacob Bigelow issued a report to the City Council calling for the end of all intramural burials and the exhumation of all church tombs presently emitting smells into the naves of churches. Bigelow suggested opening a cemetery beyond the city limits. Boston followed New York’s example and did nothing. In 1825 Bigelow organized a private group to promote a garden cemetery. Mount Auburn Cemetery was organized on a tract above the Charles River. From the beginning, the cemetery was open to anyone who wanted to buy a lot, not just the socially elite and the wealthy. A middle class was emerging, the result of industrialization. Members of the middle class—small businessmen, mechanics and other skilled workers—were interested in owning property, including the private property of death. In addition provisions were made to allow lots to be paid off with labor. The cemetery was opened in September 1831, officially the first garden cemetery in the United States (French 1974:42-46; McDannell 1995:105-107; McDowell and Meyer 1994:5; Mytum 1989:295; Sloane 1991:70-71).
Laurel Hill Cemetery in Philadelphia was created because John Jay Smith, Jr. was unable to locate the grave of his five-year-old daughter. There were no markers in the meeting house cemetery. The ground was muddy, yet Smith felt the crunch of displaced bones under his feet. Smith was horrified that his child was sleeping in such a macabre place. In November 1835, Smith and five of his friends formed a private cemetery company. Thirty-two acres of land were purchased along the wooded bluffs of the Schuylkill River. The land had been the site of a private estate and later a boarding school. In 1836 the first burial occurred. Lots were sold mostly to families—socially significant families. Single burials were segregated from family plots. Laurel Hill differed from Green-Wood and Mount Auburn in the degree of access allowed. Cemetery managers restricted who could be buried in Laurel Hill and who could visit there. Families could bury only “white persons.” Dogs, saddle horses and picnics were not allowed inside the gates. To preserve a respectful attitude toward the bereaved and the deceased, visitors were restricted. On Sundays, when most people were not working, admission was open only to “funerals, and the relations and friends accompanying them; or to lot-holders on foot with their tickets (which are in no case transferable) with members of their families, or friends in company.” At any other time visitors must have tickets from John Jay Smith or another of the committee (McDannell 1995:103, 107-112).

A Return to Nature

When John Jay Smith designed Laurel Hill (Figures 2-4 and 2-5), he contrasted well landscaped grounds with the natural, wild scenery along the Schuylkill River. In keeping with the romantic feelings of the time, the various elements of nature were rife with symbolism and emotion. The wildness was to stir feelings of the sublime, to invoke
awe, admiration and wonder. The cultivated areas were designed to demonstrate untamed nature, like death, controlled. The controlled landscaping of the cemetery reminded the bereaved of their deceased’s victory over death. Smith hoped visitors would be

Figure 2-4. Laurel Hill Cemetery in Philadelphia. Millionaire’s Row is on the hill opposite.

Figure 2-5. Spring in Laurel Hill.
overwhelmed by the magnificent yet intimate nature of God seen through the natural environment. All forms of nature worked together to help the bereaved “evoke, purify and preserve their sentiments for the dead.” The cemetery illustrated the promise of Heaven (McDannell 1995:115). Today, when seen from the western side of the Schuylkill River, Laurel Hill is a marble city rising from the cherry and crabapple trees along the bluffs. Smith’s garden cemetery is still a source of inspiration and awe.

The use of natural theology to teach religion and morality became the banner of the rural cemetery movement with Mount Auburn’s dedication (Harris 1977:104-106). For example, in an article on Mount Auburn in the American Quarterly Observer of July 1834, Nehemiah Adams wrote that finding a flower blooming in a hidden away spot should inspire the viewer to act morally in all places, whether seen or unseen; his actions should come from the conviction to do what is right with no hope of reward (French 1974:46-47).

Mount Auburn was established as a joint venture of the cemetery organizers and the Massachusetts Horticulture Society, of which Jerome Bigelow was the founder. Although the Society dropped out of the enterprise fairly soon, their early participation affirmed the legitimacy of the “garden of graves.” Today we might create a garden based on colors, flower heights and fragrance. In the early 1800s, landscapes must instruct and inspire. According to Andrew Jackson Downing, an influential landscape architect, “beautiful” landscapes were simple and free-flowing, calm and restful. “Picturesque” landscapes featured irregular forms and spirited presentation, such as a waterfall in the sun speckled woods. “Sublime” landscapes were wild, with massive, violent forms inspiring awe, such as the Grand Canyon. Mount Auburn was to be in the “picturesque style,

The idea of the garden cemetery could have been suggested in the needlework of the late 1700s. Memorial samplers and pictures, hair art and other products of the cult of memory show the bereaved weeping over monuments in spacious gardens. In these memorials, death is divorced from the bustle of commerce and the decay of the dark, malodorous churchyard (Combs 1986:180-182). The death of George Washington in 1799 stimulated the creation of mourning art (Figure 2-6), but Americans had been creating mourning pictures since the 1770s. Many of the surviving art and needle artwork examples honor Washington rather than family members (McDowell and Meyer 1994:5; Schorsch 1976:5-8; Gabel 2002:39). The Washington pieces expressed sorrow at the passing of a great leader, but also pride in the nation. Embroidery and other needlework skills were taught to girls in schools and at home. The girls copied patterns of the

Figure 2-6. Currier & Ives lithograph “The Tomb of Washington.”
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Washington memorial pieces and used them as patterns for mourning pieces for family (Schorsch 1979:41-45). Traditionally, mourning pictures show a tomb on a lush hillside. A mourner, usually a woman in loose, classical garb, leans over the grave in a posture of grief or despair. To one side, a willow tree hangs over the tomb and the mourner. Those three elements form the basic configuration. Other mourners, vegetation and allegorical figures may be added. The depiction of the mourner leaning over the grave is a reflection of neo-classical art, probably inspired by archaeological artifacts from Pompeii, Herculaneum and other Greek and Roman sites (Harris 1977:106; McDowell and Meyer 1994:18; Tarlow 1999:136). Mourning art is rife with symbolism. Many of the same symbols are found on cemetery monuments: the willow for sadness, the sea for tears, the withering or stumped tree for a life cut short (Gabel 2002:18-49; Muto 1976:353). The popularity of mourning art continued until the mid 1800s, although personalized lithographs (Figure 2-7) took the place of painted and/or embroidered pieces (French 1974:41). According to Stanley French, the basis for the mourning picture was probably the plantation family cemetery of the South. Thomas Jefferson designed his own garden burial place at Monticello in 1771—well in advance of the rural cemetery movement. Pictures of George Washington’s garden burial combined with the southern traditions of private, country cemeteries greatly influenced the rural cemetery movement (Combs 1986:198-199; French 1974:42).

Perhaps the most influential factor in the appearance of the rural cemetery was Paris’s Pere-Lachaise. The land chosen for the cemetery had been owned by the confessor of Louis XIV. The gardens had subsequently been the home of the Society of Jesus. The cemetery of Pere-Lachaise, unlike the American and British garden cemeteries, was
already a garden with winding paths and lush foliage (Bender 1974:201). Grandiose monuments, tombs and mausoleums, in the Neoclassical style popular at the turn of the century, set against the blue skies and the green gardens present the best of nature and art. The roads follow the contours of the land, leading the visitor unexpectedly upon beautiful monuments and breathtaking views. In a pattern that was to be repeated in other garden cemeteries, Pere-Lachaise is divided into sections and divisions. Each plot is numbered and the locations of specific burials can be ascertained. Plots could be bought in perpetuity. Bones would not be dug up and disposed of inappropriately. Other than ridding the cities of dreadful, stinking quagmires, these last may have been the most appreciated aspects of the rural cemetery: the bereaved could visit their dead. In a time when people were passionately interested in both the spiritual and physical presence after death, survivors

Figure 2-7. Standard mourning lithograph filled out for: “Lucy Louisa Rice who died Oct. 14th 1847, Aged 4 Years 7 Mo. 19 days.” Lithograph by Currier & Ives.
could take comfort in the grave (Curl 1980:154-167; Habenstein and Lamers 1955:427; McDowell and Meyer 13; Sloane 1991:70). According to Stanley French (1974:53-55), there is a difference between the French and Anglo/American attitudes toward the garden cemetery. American and English cemetery designers stressed nature over art and emphasized the importance of moral instruction. Some complained that Pere-Lachaise emphasized art to the detriment of the natural, thereby losing the feeling of rebirth and the continuity of life felt at Mount Auburn. Harriet Martineau wrote that, “In Pere la Chaise every expression of mourning is to be found; few or none of hope…There is no light from the future shining over the place. In Mount Auburn, on the contrary, there is nothing else.”

The rural cemetery provided more than a place to dispose of the dead. The rural cemeteries were literally art galleries. Unlike the folk art, slate stones created by New England carvers, the markers in the garden cemetery were fine art (Figure 2-8), carved

![Figure 2-8. Woman lifts lid to allow spirit to escape. (Laurel Hill, Philadelphia)](image)
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from marble in the styles popular in Europe (Bender 1974:206; French 1974:57). Hosts and hostesses took visitors to see the beautiful park-like expanses and the lovely monuments. In 1849 landscape architect Andrew Jackson Downing reported that thirty thousand people visited Mount Auburn (Bender 1974:196-198). The cemetery, with its emphasis on nature and beauty, was a pool of quiet amid the dirt, chaos and misery of cities and towns engulfed by the Industrial Revolution. John Greenleaf Whittier wrote a scathing description of life amid the Lowell, Massachusetts’ mills. However, he wrote of Lowell’s rural cemetery, “It is a quiet, peaceful spot; the city, with its crowded mills, its busy streets and teeming life, is hidden from view…All is still and solemn.” Whittier noted that the cemetery was not visited by the old and bereaved only, but attracted the young, who relaxed under “its soothing influence.” It is not surprising that the garden cemetery is credited with encouraging municipalities to set aside natural and landscaped areas as public parks (Bender 1974:206-208; French 1974:56; McDowell and Meyer 1994:14).

**Home in the Hereafter**

The rural cemetery provided a way for families to be together both in life and in death. Prior to the advent of Mount Auburn, burial grounds were collections of community, not families. People were buried wherever space was available. However, Mount Auburn, Laurel Hill and other rural cemeteries promoted the sale of family plots over the sale of single graves. The sanctification of the home was part of a cult of domesticity that was a reflection of popular literature during the early 1800’s. Books such as *Angel of the Household* (Arthur 1860) and *Heroes of the Household* (Arthur 1887) or *Home – The Unlost Paradise* (Palmer 1872), glorified the home and the mother, as the vital central figure in the home. In many of these stories, death is the main character and
dying children and young women are the supporting players. Clergymen and women writers produced a flood of what Ann Douglas (1973) calls “consolation literature” in an attempt to understand their changing places within society. With increasing industrialization, the home was no longer the center of family productivity (Dye and Smith 1986:330). According to Douglas, women, whose sphere of influence was the home, became marginal members of society. By stressing the importance of the home and, by extension, the homemaker, consolation literature was designed to strengthen the family and assure women of the importance of their place in society (Douglas 1973:500-501). Emerson (Combs 1986:188) called the woman of the house the civilizer of mankind whose duty was to “fertilize and make beautiful the moral wilderness of the world through the religious education of her family.” Inscriptions of the Victorian period often listed the feminine virtues of the deceased. The inscription (Figure 2-9) for Theresa Ann Carmody in Grace Churchyard illustrates this. By the middle of the nineteenth century, instructions and the means to make the home the best vessel for nurturing the family were available in books, magazines such as Ladies Home Journal and reasonably priced artwork. The lithographs of Currier & Ives fall in the latter category. In keeping with the emphasis placed on the home and nature during this period, their most popular prints were those of homes, usually in rural settings. The lithograph, “Home on the Mississippi” became their most popular—reproduced 3 ½ billion times (Rawls 1979:243).

Epitaphs of the early 1800s refer to an afterlife and the comforting idea of reuniting with loved ones in a heavenly home (Figure 2-10). The loss of loved ones could be mitigated if the mourners could anticipate meeting them again (Douglas 1973:497; Tarlow 1999:133). To insure reunion with those who had gone before one must live a virtuous
Figure 2-9. “Exemplary and devoted to her domestic relations, 
That Christian faith which she had adorned in life, 
That supported her unshaken in the moment of her death.”

Figure 2-10. a. “We will meet again” (Bonaventure Cemetery, Savannah, Georgia). 
b. “Meet me in Heaven” (Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania).
life and die a good death. A good death was defined as one in which the dying person, surrounded by family and friends, was fully aware of what was happening and was “triumphant in the love of Jesus.” A demonstration of Christian strength and resignation on the part of the dying person gave hope for his or her soul (Saum 1977:78-79). Death then was “a final outward sign of an inward grace evidenced by the departing.” This inscription to Edward Louis Newsham (Figure 2-11) gives voice to the marble child and woman mourning on his monument in Grace:

“To meet in Heaven, how sweet the thought,  
When life’s short years are past.  
No more to weep, no more to part,  
To meet in Heaven at last.

To meet in Heaven, O blessed thought,  
All care all suffering o’er,  
Meet in mansions of the blest,  
And love forever more…”

Figure 2-11. Newsham monument (Grace Cemetery, St. Francisville, Louisiana).
In epitaph, iconography or monument style, tombstones of the nineteenth century
reminded the visitor that the cemetery was an extension of the home, just a wayside stop to
the reunion in the heavenly home (Combs 1986:189).
THE VICTORIAN TOMBSTONE

James Curl rightly discusses Victorian tombstones and monuments in terms of architecture. The *Guide to Laurel Hill* published in 1847 reads, “To the matchless beauties of nature, let us continue to add the skill of the sculptor…the florist…the architect (Harris 1977:107). Tombstone styles from the nineteenth century do reflect contemporary architectural styles, i.e. neo-Classical Greek and Roman, Byzantine or Gothic Revival. Elements which the Romans appropriated from Egyptian architecture also appear in the Victorian cemetery. Richard V. Francaviglia (1971:501) wrote that the cemetery could be seen as a microcosm of the real world. He meant that the architectural and spatial choices which people made in life followed them to the cemetery. This relationship can be seen in the similarities between cemetery architecture and iconography and that of contemporary buildings and interiors. Additionally, in America, the importance which Victorians placed on home and family is also reflected in the cemetery.

**Victorian Funerary Architecture**

As it is basically a grave house, the mausoleum provides the clearest way to describe the various styles or orders of architecture and monuments. A mausoleum is a large above ground tomb, although some portions may be beneath ground level. The form is reminiscent of a temple. The exterior is usually oblong or rectangular. Bodies are placed inside in sarcophagi or sepulchers, usually lined up along the two sides in tiers. Interior and exterior design (Figure 3-1) is limited only by the imagination of the architect or family. The earliest American mausoleums date from the 1840s. The form’s popularity peaked around 1920 (Bliss 1912:23-29; McDowell and Meyer 1994:24, 74).
In Egyptian Revival, there are no arches or tapering columns. The outer walls slant inward at an angle of about 70% and terminate in a concave cornice. The severe simplicity of design and the oversized diameter of columns (if present) give the impression of a massive structure (Figure 3-2). The pyramid, the obelisk, and the sphinx are other Egyptian Revival forms found in the cemetery. Although Rome adopted certain Egyptian forms, such as the obelisk, Egyptian architecture was not really popular until the first half of the nineteenth century. This interest may have been the result of Napoleon’s 1798 expedition into Egypt (Cottrell 1912:55; McDowell and Meyer 1994:127).

Byzantine architecture is defined by the use of domes and the triangular vaulting used to support the dome. Byzantine mausolea are usually built in the shape of a Greek cross with the dome rising from the center and vaulted spaces in the arms (Figure 3-3).

Grecian Doric architecture is simple and heavy. Large, tapering columns rise directly from the base. These are crowned with undecorated capitals which support the
Figure 3-2. Egyptian Revival mausoleum. (Grace Cemetery, St. Francisville, Louisiana).

entablature. The columns create a porch which may run all around the structure. Grecian or Roman Ionic (Figure 3-4) architecture is characterized by slender fluted columns which sit on circular bases. The columns are topped by volute capitals upon which rests the entablature. In the Greek, the volute is more refined than in the Roman. Roman or Greek Corinthian is similar to Ionic, but the capital is decorated with acanthus. The differences between the Greek and the Roman lie in the detail and refinement of the acanthus decoration, the Greek being more refined, the Roman more lifelike (Cottrell 1912:23, 55-56; McDowell and Meyer 1994:24-25). The term neo-Classical refers to architecture of rationality, perfection and beauty that reflects the intellectual and aesthetic qualities of ancient Greek and Roman styles (McDowell and Meyer 1994:23). The style is popular because it is perceived as timeless. In architecture, the neo-Classical style has been popular in the United States since the Revolution. One need only look at public buildings,
especially in Washington, D.C., to confirm the style’s popularity (McDowell and Meyer 1994:45).

Gothic Revival is a return to architectural styles of the Middle Ages. Memorials have pointed arches and tall pillars. The walls are pierced by carved openings in decorative and figurative patterns called tracery. The prominent vertical lines of the structures were created by the use of slender towers and spires (Figure 3-5). This was also the age of the flying buttress, used to stabilize the tall, windowed walls of cathedrals. Buttresses also appear in the construction of some mausolea (Cottrell 1912:56). The Gothic Revival is an outgrowth of the Victorian fondness for the Romantic.

Gothic Revival and Neo-Classical memorial architectures were championed by diametrically opposed factions. Some people considered Gothic too “fussy.” Classical
was criticized because its pagan background was unsuitable for Christian cemeteries. George Templeton Strong (Harris 1977:198) wrote that the “recurrence to heathen taste and anti-Christian usage in architecture or art of any sort is or should be unreal and unnatural everywhere.” In the introduction to James Forsyth’s *Book of Designs for Headstones, Mural, and other Monuments* (1871:3-4), Charles Boutell writes that Classical monuments “are in direct opposition to every Christian sentiment and association.” According to Mytum (2000:3), in the middle of the nineteenth century, the uniform use of Classical stones was replaced by the use of Gothic monuments in Anglican churchyards. Non-conformists continued to favor the Classical. However, most Victorians probably never gave any thought to the philosophical background of either style (McDowell and Meyer 1994:74).

Few tombstones can be categorized exclusively as neo-Classical, Egyptian Revival or Gothic Revival. Various elements might be selected from different traditions and combined to form pleasing hybrids. For example, the obelisk comes from the Egyptian period. However, Victorians sometimes turned the usual pyramid top into Gothic arches. The obelisk also appeared with a gable top, an adaptation of the roof of Classical Greek and Roman tombs.

**Tombstone Forms**

Monument forms typical of the Victorian period include obelisks, columns, crosses, representations of nature, mausolea, urns and other statuary, tablets and gothic tablets. Some of these forms were combined to create variations. Some forms which either predate or supercede the period may be found during transitions, as changes did not occur simultaneously in all areas. This is the case with ledger based monuments.
An obelisk (Figure 3-6) is a vertical, four-sided pillar that tapers gradually as it rises. The original obelisks ended in a pyramid called the pyramidion. The dimensions were carefully calculated. The height of the pyramidion was the same as the bottom width of the shaft. Shaft height was on average ten times the width at the base. The shaft tapered to a width one third of the shaft base width. The pedestal on which the obelisk rested ideally should be only slightly larger than the bottom of the shaft (Bliss 1912:179). Atop the various caps mentioned above, the Victorian obelisk might be surmounted by a cross or an urn, draped or undraped (Figure 3-7). In Britain, the obelisk is usually found in Non-conformist graveyards (Mytum 2000:24). However, the large number found at Grace Episcopal Church leads one to speculate that the form was not considered anti-Anglican in America. Obelisks were one of the more popular styles chosen for the Victorian cemetery.

The column (Figure 3-8) appears less frequently than the obelisk. However, like the obelisk, it is widespread. Columns may be fluted or smooth. They may be topped by a.

Figure 3-6. Gothic and gable obelisks   a- Gothic obelisk with undraped urn (Grace, St. Francisville, Louisiana). b- Gable obelisk (Laurel Hill, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania).
cross, an urn, or a draped urn. Vegetation may twine around the column or fall from an urn on top. The column often appears as broken, to symbolize a life cut short. Most columns were erected between 1870 and 1900. To be strictly architectural, one should consider the column tombstone in each of its possible orders: Egyptian, Ionic, Doric or Corinthian. However, complete columns appear so infrequently that I have not categorized by order. Like the obelisk, the column usually sits on a pedestal. The height of both the obelisk and the column allowed purchasers to erect an impressive monument without the high construction expenses of a more massive design (Brown 1912:187-190; McDowell and Meyer 1994:74).
Graveyard monuments employing the ledger stone in various configurations date from the late seventeenth century (Mytum 2000:3). It was based on the slabs used by the wealthy to mark the location of in-church burials. The form is still used, if sparingly, in cemeteries of the late twentieth century. The ledger is a flat, grave-sized slab. The large sized top gives ample room for any inscription or iconography. In its basic form, the ledger lies on the ground or is slightly raised (Figure 3-9). Ledgers raised on distinct legs are called table tombs (Figure 3-10). Ledgers can also be raised with sides enclosed to
form a box. For the sake of discrimination, I have called those which are less than waist high, low monuments (Figure 3-11a). Those which are taller, I have called chest tombs (Figure 3-11b). I should make it clear that although the monument is above ground, the body is interred in the earth. Monuments which act as containers for the body are called sarcophagi. The name comes from the Greek for flesh eater. The original sarcophagus
was made of Assius stone whose caustic properties caused decomposition of the body within a few weeks (Bliss 1912:59). With rapid decomposition no longer a requirement, the sarcophagus of the Victorian period was constructed of marble, granite or metal.

The cross in the Victorian cemetery symbolizes Christianity and Christ’s redemption of humanity. However, crosses date back to at least 1100 B.C. and were used as symbols in many cultures. According to L. A. Whitehouse (1912:115-117), a mortuary architect, it is probable that all types of crosses developed from three forms: the Tau, the St. Andrews and the Latin crosses. The Tau, which gets its name from the Greek letter “T,” was found in both India and Egypt. The Egyptians used the symbol, which stood for “life,” to mark their gods. The St. Andrew’s cross is nearly identical to the Greek cross. Both have four equal arms connected at right angles. The difference lies in the positioning of the cross. The Latin cross (Figure 3-12) is a replica of the cross on which Christ was
crucified: two arms of unequal length, the shorter crossing the longer a quarter of the way from the top.

Two types of crosses predominate in the Victorian cemetery: variations of the Celtic Revival and of the Latin. The Celtic cross (Figure 3-13) is a wheeled Latin cross often embellished with flowers, Celtic interlace or geometric designs (Whitehouse 1912:118-134). The Latin cross became popular in Britain starting in the 1880s (Mytum 2000:18-21, 36). However, Latin crosses appeared in Grace Cemetery in the 1870s.

The pulpit or desk is a vertical block with a slope cut on the upper front. A book, usually the Bible, a scroll or an inscription may lie on the desk area. Open scrolls are also found on interpretations of nature. The Victorian’s fascination with nature appears in the
cemetery in stone as well as landscaping. The rock, or pile of rocks, is one of the most popular. While the monument may actually be formed from a boulder, most are carved from marble. Crevices between the individual rocks may provide shelter to carved ferns and flowers. The scroll is “attached” to the face of the pile, providing a smooth area for the inscription (Figure 3-14).

The tree, as stump or branches, is perhaps even better known than the rocks. In the South and Midwest regions, the tree trunk or stump (Figure 3-15a) was the symbol for the Woodmen of the World. A similar tree was authorized for use by the Pacific Jurisdiction of the Woodmen of the World. Woodmen of the World was a social/insurance brotherhood formed in 1890. Members purchased a life insurance policy which included the erection of a monument designed by the organization, but prepared by a local stone cutter. As the cost of monuments rose, this was amended to the payment of $100 toward a monument and the
right to use the organization logo. In 1928, the monument clause was dropped from the insurance policy (May 1991:4-5; Stott 2003:3-12).

Tree form monuments other than those for Woodmen of the World exist (Figure 3-15b). The tree or stump is often used to commemorate a life cut short. Sometimes the tree represents a “family tree.” The number of branches equals the number of children, each branch end being inscribed with a child’s name. Sometimes the tree rings on the cut ends indicate the deceased’s age at death. The cracks intersecting the rings indicate the number of children (Ridlen 1999:60-63). Cemetery furniture made of logs was also popular. The use of rustic forms in the cemetery does more than echo the Victorian rapture with nature. In a world turned upside down by the Industrial Revolution, rustic trees, rocks and furniture recall the simplicity, family solidarity, and morality of the pioneer past and were used well into the twentieth century (Roberts 1990:173, 190).
Figure 3-15.  a. Woodmen of the World tree. (Denham Springs Cemetery, Denham Springs, Louisiana). b- Tree to honor soldier in Spanish-American War. All of his equipment “hangs” on the branches. (Grace Churchyard, St. Francisville, Louisiana).

The appearance of statuary in the cemetery is consistent with the purposes of the garden or rural cemetery and, by extension, the Victorian cemetery. Cemeteries such as Mount Auburn and Laurel Hill were to instruct morally and to combine the beauties of nature with the beauties of art (McDannell 1995:115). Angels are by far the most popular statuary (Figure 3-16). These can range from mass produced cherubs to elegant one-of-a-kind sculpture (Figure 3-17). However, many other figures have been used to mark graves. Death, in the form of a cloaked, faceless figure, looks down on the departed. Replicas of
Figure 3-16. a. Small angel child picking flowers (Grace Churchyard, St. Francisville, Louisiana).  b. Young angel holds scallop shell (Bonaventure Cemetery, Savannah, Georgia).

Figure 3-17. Angels  a. Catholic Cemetery, Savannah, Georgia.  b. West Laurel Hill Cemetery Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
the deceased were also popular. An example is that of Gracie Watson (Figure 3-18). She was the beloved daughter of the managers of the Pulaski House Hotel in Savannah. When she died at age six, her parents commissioned John Walz, a noted Savannah sculptor, to carve her monument. The presence of mourners in the cemetery is appropriate (Figure 3-19). Usually females, mourners are depicted as either pensive or prostrate with grief.

Some of the finest original cemetery art produced during the Victorian period was done in Italy. Even monument designs by American monument makers might be sent to Italy to be carved. That does not mean that such work was not also done by American carvers. (Mytum 2000:18; Wood, personal conversation). It might be noted that while Victorians brought back the use of sculpture in cemeteries, the Greeks and Romans were by far the most prolific consumers of sculpture. The shrine to Apollo at Delphi was said to
have had a hundred and sixty thousand statues. At the time of the Trojan War, the statue population of Rome supposedly exceeded the human population (Coltman 1912:104-105).

Figure 3-19. The mourners. a. Bonaventure Cemetery, Savannah, Georgia. b. Lemon-Jackson Cemetery, St. John’s Episcopal Church, Laurel Hill, Louisiana.

The tombstone styles most frequently seen in the Victorian cemetery are variations of the tablet shape found in seventeenth and eighteenth century graveyards. Tablets are the descendents of pillar-stones, probably the earliest efforts to mark burials. Greek and Egyptian stelae also appear in the ancestry of the tablet. Stelae were tapering slabs of rock with floral or palmate decoration at the top and inscription below. Later stelae had bas-relief scenes of parting (Bliss 1912:137; McDowell and Meyer 1994:19). Victorian tablets were so common because they were the least expensive monuments available, although elaborate iconography might add considerably to the cost. The basic tablet shape is that of
a cereal box (Figure 3-20a). In fact many seventeenth and early eighteenth century tablets had the same straight top. However, the most likely to be found from the late eighteenth century on have a rounded top (Figure 3-20b). Mytum (2000:12) speculates that this is derivative from eighteenth century ledger stones which feature an arched top with column décor running down the sides. A similar upright stone is shown in Figure 3-21. The pediment tablet is a square stone with a triangular top. The shape is reminiscent of that of the frontal view of a Classical Revival mausoleum. The Gothic tombstone, incorporating the lovely arches, canopies and tracery found on medieval chest tombs, became popular in the mid nineteenth century (Figure 3-22).

Although most Victorian tombstones in the South are carved from marble, exceptions exist. The Monumental Bronze Company of Bridgeport, Connecticut manufactured monuments of “White Bronze.” These were, in fact, not bronze but pure zinc which develops a blue-grey protective coat of zinc carbonate when exposed to air.
Each monument was a special order, as the company did not produce stock items. The purchaser decided on emblems, iconography and tombstone style. The various parts were

![Figure 3-21. Tombstone with “rounded” top and columns at the side.](image)

Figure 3-21. Tombstone with “rounded” top and columns at the side.

![Figure 3-22. Gothic headstones. a. Signed Florville Foy, Grace Churchyard (St. Francisville, Louisiana), b. St. Helena’s Churchyard (Beaufort, South Carolina).](image)

Figure 3-22. Gothic headstones. a. Signed Florville Foy, Grace Churchyard (St. Francisville, Louisiana), b. St. Helena’s Churchyard (Beaufort, South Carolina).
cast separately then joined with molten zinc. The monuments, which were never particularly popular, were manufactured from the late 1870’s until the 1920’s. Because the zinc appears not to be affected by pollution and weathering, most are as sharp as when they were cast (Figure 3-7b and 3-23). However, zinc is brittle and can shatter when struck a sharp blow. The exchangeable plates for names and dates, attached with screws, are popular targets for vandals and collectors (Rotundo 1989:263-293).

Figure 3-23. “White Bronze” monuments. a- Tablet, St. Helena’s Churchyard, Beaufort, South Carolina. b- Note screws attaching name plate to the monument. (Natchez City Cemetery, Natchez, Mississippi)

**Tombstone Iconography**

Some of the iconography on Victorian monuments is consistent with the architectural styles which influenced the period. That the icons were used to imply the original meaning is merely conjecture. Most icons were probably selected for aesthetic rather than symbolic reasons.
However, as in the case of tombstone style, arbiters of Christian propriety were quick to point out that few icons, no matter what their origins, were appropriate. In 1853, the Reverend F. E. Paget, the Rector of Elford in the United Kingdom, wrote *A Tract Upon Tombstones; or, Suggestions for the Consideration of Persons intending to set up that kind of Monument to the Memory of Deceased Friends*. Cherubs were “more ludicrous than solemn.” Doves, if representing the Holy Spirit, were in the wrong place, for the dead the means of grace had ended. If representing innocence, then the symbol was “unfit for even the best of us.” Scythes, hourglasses, skulls and similar icons were inadequate in expressing what the grave alone expressed far better. Urns and extinguished (upside down) torches were decried as heathen. Paget believed that the only true symbol should be the cross. A quick look in any Victorian cemetery shows that few listened to the Pagets of the nineteenth century.

It is impossible to cover all of the possible icons and their meanings in this venue. However, some of those which appear more often in the Victorian cemetery are shown in Table 3-1. As different sources assign different meanings, this is only a rough guide.

From 1797 until 1897 there were more than six hundred secret societies in the United States. In 1897 more than forty percent of the male population belonged to one or more groups. In their search for a shared social identity, nineteenth century Americans joined fraternal and occupation based organizations that covered the spectrum from the familiar Masonic Orders to the Veiled Prophets of the Enchanted Realm (Ridlen 1999:52-53; Gabel 2002b, 1994:1-27). However, some of these are more likely to be encountered in Victorian cemeteries in the southeastern United States than others. A few of these include the basic Masonic Compass with Set Square and the star of the Order of the
### Table 3-1. Meaning of popular Victorian icons not included in text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly</td>
<td>Resurrection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flame</td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain with 3 links</td>
<td>Trinity, or Odd Fellows if with letters in links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Christ's glory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross and Crown</td>
<td>Victory over death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalice</td>
<td>Christ's sacrifice/blood - the sacrament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove</td>
<td>Purity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapery or pall</td>
<td>Mourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>God's omnipresence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye of Horus</td>
<td>Protection against evil, a Masonic symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger pointing up</td>
<td>Hope for Heaven, look to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger pointing up</td>
<td>A call to repentance or witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers</td>
<td>Nature, rebirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I H S, sometimes overlapped</td>
<td>In this sign conquer. From the Greek letters for JESUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>Purity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Strengthened faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Branch</td>
<td>Peace, reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rope Circle</td>
<td>Eternal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop shell</td>
<td>Baptism or rebirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheaf of wheat</td>
<td>Body of Christ, A fruitful life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake biting tail</td>
<td>Unending life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>Divine guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword, broken</td>
<td>A life cut short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword, inverted</td>
<td>Surrender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swords, crossed</td>
<td>Death in Battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torch</td>
<td>Life and truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torch, inverted</td>
<td>Life extinguished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urn</td>
<td>Death, the tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeping Willow</td>
<td>Mourning and grief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eastern Star (Figure 3-24). Other organizations are the Daughters of the American Revolution, as well as the Sons of the American Revolution (Figure 3-25). The children of
Civil War veterans may be represented by Daughters of the Confederacy and Sons of Confederate Veterans. The emblems for the Odd Fellow, the Knights of Pythias, Woodmen of the World and their women’s organization, Woodman's Circle are also common (Figure 3-26). Logos for Woodmen of the World vary somewhat from monument to monument and over time, but usually contain the stump, the axe, mallet and wedge and sometimes a dove (Gable 1994:1-27).

Figure 3-24. Organizational logos.  a. Order of the Eastern Star, b. Ancient Free and Accepted Masons.

Other types of iconography may identify the deceased as a member of a military organization. The initials CSA stand for Confederate States of America. Stones with this are usually Government Issue. The monument is a tablet with a pointed top. Although the Veterans Administration approved these for use on Confederate graves in national cemeteries in 1906, the monuments were not furnished to private cemeteries until 1929. In 1930 the War Department authorized the use of the Southern Cross of Honor on the Confederate monuments (Figure 3-27a). The Cross is a modified Maltese cross with a laurel wreath in the center (Mitchell 2002:4). Obviously these monuments were not part of the Victorian era cemetery, although death dates fall within that period. Persons who
Figure 3-25. Daughters and Sons of the American Revolution

Figure 3-26. Organizational logos. a. Daughters of the Confederacy. b. Sons of Confederate Veterans. c. Knights of Pythias. d. Odd Fellows e. Woodmen of the World
fought for the Union during the Civil War may have monuments with the emblem for the
Grand Army of the Republic. The emblem is a five branched star with a tableau of soldiers
in the center (Figure 3-27b). The emblem used for veterans of the Spanish War (1898-
1902) consists of a cross of St. Andrew (Figure 3-27c). In the branches are the words
“Cuba,” “Porto (sic) Rico,” “Philippine Islands,” and “U.S.A.” A circle in the center
depicts naval and army personnel (Gable 1994:1-27).

![Figure 3-27. Military insignia. a- Southern Cross of Honor. b- Grand Army of the
Republic c- Spanish War Veteran](image)

Individual flowers and other vegetation will be more fully discussed with the
cemetery as a heavenly garden. However, one particular plant that appears frequently
during the Victorian period is the acanthus. Like most depicted vegetation, the acanthus
(Figure 3-28) is a reminder of the garden aspect of the cemetery. The prickly, herbaceous
plant, associated with the rocky ground of early Greek graveyards, is one of the oldest and
most popular cemetery icons (Bliss 1912:235).
Heavenly Home

Victorians visualized Heaven as an idealized extension of the home and the cemetery as the garden of heaven. Tombstone shape and iconography, as well as tombstone inscriptions were used to remind the visitor of the connection. A popular motif was the open garden gate, beckoning one into the heavenly garden (Figure 3-29a). The flowering plants and shrubs of the cemetery are replicated on the stones, including the rose which first appeared on American tombstones in the late 1700s (Figure 3-29b). The rose was commonly meant to represent the “one love left to us from paradise” or maternal love (Combs 1986:99, 190, 201). Another version of the rose is the broken bud, used to show a life cut short and usually found on the graves of children and young adults (Figure 3-29c). The analogy of the flower budded on earth to bloom in Heaven is common. On some stones the hand of God can be seen plucking his “flowers” from the earth to grow in the
garden of Heaven (Figure 3-30). An English tombstone epitaph (Combs 1986:203) explains the religious implications of the plucked or broken flower:

```
```

The appearance of a variety of flowers on tombstones late in the century may be a reflection of the growing Victorian passion for the language of flowers (Figure 3-31). Using popular books, the floral arranger supposedly could use bouquets to send messages (Snyder 1987:94-96). Unfortunately, not all authors used the same symbolism. Using various standard books on the language of flowers, June Hadden Hobbs (2002:241-242) interpreted an arrangement consisting of roses, lilies and poppies. With one text, the message in the flowers was, “Sleep well, beautiful one, until the day of resurrection.”
Figure 3-30. God “plucking His flowers from earth to bloom in Heaven.” a- Grace Churchyard (St. Francisville, Louisiana). b- Evergreen Cemetery (Woodville, Mississippi). c- Ascension of Our Lord Catholic Cemetery (Donaldsonville, Louisiana).

Figure 3-31. Varieties of flowers in wreaths and bouquets. Both are signed Enoch (Grace Churchyard, St. Francisville, Louisiana).

Unfortunately other texts interpreted the message as, “Your falsehood brings no consolation to the sick, so I am going to war.” Beverly Seaton, who wrote a history of the language of flowers, claimed that there is little evidence that the Victorians actually sent messages this way.
If the cemetery is the transition between the earthly home and the heavenly home, tombstones depicting furniture should come as no surprise. Early tombstone carvers in England and New England were often also cabinet makers (Mytum 2000:6-7). Looking at tablet type tombstones from the 1600s on, one can often recognize the back of a chair or the head of a bed, as in examples from a churchyard cemetery in London and from Grace in St. Francisville (Figure 3-32).

![Figure 3-32. Chair back and headboard tablets. a. St. Mary Abbot Churchyard Kensington, Great Britain. b- Grace Churchyard (St. Francisville, Louisiana).](image)

By the Victorian period, the bed had taken a three dimensional form. The Reverend Theodore Cuyler, an author of consolation literature, described the graves of the rural cemetery as a dormitory of slumbering beds (Combs 1986:189). Children are the group most often memorialized by the bed (Figure 3-33). A popular inscription is that they are “only sleeping” (McKillop 1995:95).

Bed monuments were also used for adults. Ideally, these have a headstone and footstone which are alike in style, but differ in size. The two are joined by decorated “sideboards.”
In its most basic form, the bed is made from a headstone and footstone connected by curbs. The “bed” may or may not be filled with vegetation. Although I have found variations of the bed in many cemeteries, those which most fit my definition of the ideal were in cemeteries in Philadelphia and Louisiana. The most spectacular I’ve seen are those in Grace Churchyard in St. Francisville and the Lemon-Jackson cemetery attached to St. John’s in Laurel Hill, Louisiana. A monument which resembles a pallet or chaise is also referred to as a bed (Figure 3-34).

Another popular domestic tombstone form was the chair, commonly used for children (McKillop 1995:95). The three dimensional representations include the child’s clothes, neatly folded and laid aside. Shoes and a favorite toy are nestled on the floor under the chair, waiting for their owner to awaken (Figure 3-35a). In West Laurel Hill in Philadelphia I found two adult sized chairs flanking a mausoleum. Did these symbolize the comfortable relationship of the couple interred within (Figure 3-35b)?

Ellen Marie Snyder (1989:11-30) sees children’s cemetery furniture as representative of the home in another way. While adult men were associated with the world and its lack of innocence, children were associated with the home and innocence. Deceased children had never left the home, never been sullied by the evils of the world. Consolation literature comforted mothers of dead children that these little ones would always be innocent and safe in Heaven. In the cemetery, their small sized monuments set children aside from the worldly adults.

The tombstone in Grace Cemetery for Dorcas and James Howell epitomizes the idea of Heaven as an idealized, reunited family: husband and wife, father and mother, hands clasped and, according to the inscription, at home (Figure 3-36). As that stone
shows, the Victorian cemetery is not solely the resting place of the rich. Victorian monuments are not all large and showy. Obelisks and columns come in all sizes. Angels

Figure 3-33. Children’s beds.  a. City Cemetery (Lancaster, Pennsylvania)  
b. Trinity Oxford Episcopal Churchyard (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)  
c. Grace Churchyard (St. Francisville, Louisiana)
can be beautifully sculpted originals or catalog standards. Tablets bear simple rose buds or garlands of flowers. There are some of all of these even in such preeminent Victorian
cemeteries as Mt. Auburn in Boston and Green-wood in Brooklyn. All reflect the love that Victorians felt for their families and their reluctance to part with loved ones.

The cult of domesticity was almost solely an American aspect of the Victorian cemetery. According to Dr. Harold Mytum of York University (Personal correspondence), British tombstones mimic furniture only in the early chair back characteristics of tablet stones and in elaborate memorial pieces. Family roles in inscriptions follow the “mother of” or “father of.” form. Detailed descriptions of a woman’s domestic virtues, or her skills as wife or mother, are absent.

In recording the tombstones of Grace, I found several of a form which the 1908 Sears and Roebuck Catalog refers to as a block with cap (Figure 3-37). However, before researching the form, I informally labeled it a “house.” Given the Victorian desire for family reunion in a home in Heaven, one wonders how purchasers defined the shape.

Figure 3-37. Pedestal with cap or “house?” (Grace Churchyard, St. Francisville, Louisiana).
How to Purchase a Tombstone

The Victorian cemetery appears to be a cornucopia of shapes and styles. How did the bereaved go about purchasing a tombstone? By the early nineteenth century, most locales had stone carvers who were capable of producing standard tombstone shapes with fairly nice iconography. Marble was imported mainly from Vermont, Italy, Georgia or Alabama. For most of the nineteenth century, monument companies published few catalogs.

However, the carver had pattern books from which he could copy popular designs. The book printed in 1871 by James Forsyth, a Philadelphia sculptor, includes some rather fantastic monument designs (Figure 3-38) despite the author’s intention to produce “dignified memorials which rise to the very highest standards of excellence.”

Figure 3-38. 1871 monument design. From A Book of Designs for Headstones, Murals and Other Monuments.
However, other pattern books were more helpful. These printed both large and small designs, any part of which the carver could choose to replicate on the stone. Figures 3-39 and 3-40 were taken from Samuel Leith’s *The Tradesmans Book of Ornamental Designs*, published in 1847. Figure 3-41 is from *Knights Ornamental Designs* published in London, date unknown. Both have been reproduced by Dover Publications.

If you lived in Philadelphia, New Orleans, Charleston, Savannah, Mobile or other major towns, you could go directly to the marble cutter. Successful marble works in large towns might affiliate with out of town dealers, offering exclusive access to their work. Tombstones were not the main business of marble cutters. Their profits came from cutting marble into mantles, stairs, door sills and other architectural pieces. The same was true of
Figure 3-40. Variations of flower heads. Note that the side elevation of each is given. Taken from *Victorian Ornaments and Designs* by permission of Dover Publications.

Figure 3-41. Leave designs. Taken from *700 Victorian Ornamental Designs* by permission of Dover Publications.
local marble carvers or dealers. The establishments might have some standard tombstone shapes on hand for you to choose from. Advertisement lithographs from the mid 1800s in Philadelphia show yards with urns, obelisks and pedestals (Figure 3-42). The personnel at the marble works would carve any data, epitaph, inscription or decoration on the blank stone (Figure 3-43).

For something unique or more complicated, the purchaser must either buy through a workshop with a trained sculptor or have the piece ordered from Italy. Signatures on these pieces sometimes included the title “Sculpt.” An example of original, signed cemetery art work is the pensive mourner in Figure 3-19a, carved by Civiletti in Palermo,
Italy in 1879. The angel and cross (Figure 2-3) and Gracie Watts (Figure 3-18) were carved in Savannah by John Walz. A noted Philadelphia carver was John Strothers. Some of the work done by Enochs of Philadelphia embodies the incredible detail of the sculptor. Whether the work was done by the Enochs or contracted out is unknown.

Until 1876, the marble quarries of Vermont sold only rough sawn marble for marble cutters and carvers to finish into architectural pieces or tombstones (Figure 3-44). In Figure 4-3, the yard to the left holds large blocks of marble ready to be sawed and cut in the marble works. In 1876 a small finishing shop was opened in Proctor, Vermont to do monumental finishing. That shop was the beginning of the Vermont Marble Company. Other Vermont quarries followed suit (Gale 1922:113). By the end of the century, Vermont
Marble was publishing a 582 page catalog of finished monuments. It should be noted that these were available only to dealers, not to individual customers (Vermont Marble Company 1900).

However, the 1895 catalog of Harrod’s Stores in London (Adburgham 1972:877-888) offered complete funerals directly to the customer. These included all mourning clothes, coffins, embalming or cremation, funeral cars, mourning coaches and tombstones. Harrod’s promised that “on receipt of Letter or Telegram, competent Assistants sent to any part of the Kingdom to take instructions.”

Sears, Roebuck and Company was advertising tombstones and monuments, ornamental iron fencing and vases in their catalogs by 1908 (Schroeder 1971:160-161). In a rather successful attempt to cash in on the monument trade, Sears advertised a fifty
percent savings over locally sold stones. They also guaranteed a complete refund if the stones were not as advertised and lettered as requested. The same guarantee covered damage in shipping. From a time when individual carvers could be identified by their work, the monument business had become largely impersonal by the beginning of the twentieth century.
METHODOLOGY

James Deetz wrote in *In Small Things Forgotten*, that all artifacts can be characterized by three inherent dimensions: time, form and space. By that definition, the tombstone in a historical cemetery is the perfect artifact (1977:64-65). Its form is readily discernible. The stone delineates the space of the grave it marks. Its approximate date is written on the face. While some tombstones may have been moved or been erected well before or after the death commemorated, most tombstones are erected within a year of the death and remain where erected. One could go one step further and add the dimension of “who,” as most tombstones have the deceased’s name or initials. In 1695 Puritan clergyman Cotton Mather, referring to an overly complementary epitaph, commented that “the stones in this wilderness are already grown so witty as to speak.” That is just what artifacts, especially tombstones, do (Meyer 1989:1). The ultimate artifact, tombstones have proved valuable in, not only dating the burials that they mark, but in providing datable references to public preference and social mores as well as personal taste and private sentiment. I am interested in the capacity of the tombstone to indicate public and private sentiment and preference. I can only hope that the stones of Grace Churchyard will speak.

The inspiration for my thesis was the 1966 article by Edwin Dethlefsen and James Deetz, “Death’s Heads, Cherubs, and Willow Trees: Experimental Archaeology in Colonial Cemeteries” published in *American Antiquity*. Deetz and Dethselfsen traced and dated stylistic changes in New England. Could the same be done using the Victorian elements of tombstones to trace and date the spread of Victorian culture? Were changes within the period called the Victorian Era reflected in the cemetery?
My study focused on the Victorian aspects of the churchyard cemetery of Grace Episcopal Church in St. Francisville, Louisiana. In order to cover transition periods on either end of the Victorian Era, I analyzed monuments from 1830 through 1910. Burials are arranged by family plots rather than chronologically. A stylistically distinct area directly behind the parish hall contains mostly modern burials. I did not record that area. I did record all other burials in the cemetery, whatever their dates. Although I plan to use data only from stones of the above period for my thesis, I believe that the information on all should be noted. Genealogists have used the cemetery for research, but their interests are limited to family data. A visit to cemeteries in the Philadelphia area only reinforced my belief that archaeologists must record information from what is proving to be a finite resource (Rodwell 1989:173-180). In an advertising booklet (1937), the Vermont Marble Company claimed that marble monuments erected in Vermont cemeteries prior to 1800 were still “unharmed by the ravages of time.” However, pollution, particularly acid rain from coal burning factories, has now so damaged the marble tombstones in parts of the northeast that information is often illegible (Figure 4-1). The once beautiful iconography looks like melted Styrofoam. Cemeteries everywhere have become targets of vandals and thieves supplying the antique and landscape trades. In Victorian Cemetery Art Edmond Gillon Jr. (1972:xiii) wrote that one advantage of cemetery art is its permanence. “Hundreds of architectural landmarks have been destroyed, but cemetery art tends to remain very much as its creators intended it.” He was wrong.

Fieldwork

I worked in Grace Churchyard for a period of two and a half years. On a good day, one person could record about fifty monuments. Because I had a full time job then,
most of my fieldwork was limited to weekends, vacation days and holidays. I avoided working at the church when services were being held. The high heat and humidity of summer further limited the days when fieldwork could be done. After I had worked alone for a year, Debra Kelly volunteered to help me. Her assistance not only cut down on the time needed to record that cemetery and the cemeteries in Beaufort, but provided a safety factor. Although Grace Churchyard has enough visitors to provide a sense of well being, a lone woman in a deserted area can no longer assume that she is safe. Many of the cemeteries that I surveyed in my search for Enochs were either not in well traveled areas or were in high crime areas.

The churchyard is kept up by the church maintenance crew. However, this does not include trimming or removing unwanted bushes. Because the huge oak trees attract birds, volunteer plants are common. Some of these grow over the tombstones, making
reading the data difficult. Wear and algae provided other challenges to reading old
tombstones. I experimented with various recommended methods. For some, especially
ledgers, pouring water over the stone provides enough contrast. Loose dirt also provides
color contrast. For one particularly difficult monument, I experimented with shaving
cream. Not only was the method useless, but I have since learned that shaving cream
harms the stone. The most efficient method is to tape newsprint to the stone and use a
crayon or thick pencil to do a rubbing. However, if the marble is degrading (the surface
becomes extremely rough), even rubbing is useless. Occasionally tombstone data is just
irretrievable.

In Grace, I recorded 1207 markers. Four hundred sixty-two of these have dates
between 1830 and 1910. Fifty-one others probably fall into this period but have no dates,
or the dates are illegible. They are not included in my analysis. I adapted guidelines from
Harold Mytum’s *Recording and Analyzing Graveyards: Practical Handbook in
Archaeology 15* (2000) to establish definitions for the various tombstone shapes. Because
domesticity is not an issue in British churchyards, Mytum’s classifications did not
include shapes such as the bed and the chair. I added these shapes. I made a cheat sheet
(Appendix A) of the basic shapes in which I was interested and the possible variations of
each. Because I had assistance in recording the markers, I found that graphics of the
shapes maintained uniform classification.

In designing a form for recording, I started with a form used by Dr. McKillop’s
Archaeology of Death class to record Magnolia cemetery in Baton Rouge. That form
addressed only sixteen tombstone shapes and forty-seven instances of iconography. I
deleted a section covering monument measurements. My new form for recording Grace
Churchyard (Appendix B) covered all pertinent information except measurements. For this thesis I was primarily interested in iconography and tombstone shape. In addition, due to the number of monuments involved, time precluded measuring each stone. The form underwent considerable growth in the process of recording. Shapes were originally defined pretty broadly: obelisks, columns, tablets, etc. However, within the category “obelisk” were markers with pyramid tops, gothic tops and round tops. Any one of the above might have an urn, a draped urn or a cross on top. The same was true for other classifications. Columns might be broken or plain, and topped with urns or draped urns.

Also, in the interest of not missing any type of iconography that might later prove useful, the iconographic section grew to seventy-three items. I rearranged these under general headings for ease in locating a particular instance. While information such as the relative placement of burials and inscriptions for husbands and wives, the language of the inscription and the directional orientation of both body and inscription were not used in this paper, the data was recorded for future study. I entered all of the data for each monument into a Visual dBase data base. The entries for most categories are represented numerically for ease in sorting.

I created a sketch map of only the recorded portions of cemetery (Figure 4-2). This map, keyed by monument and plot number, was primarily for use in locating specific monuments in the data base. The churchyard is divided into easily discerned rectangles, as this map shows. However, each of these areas may include more than one plot. Individual plots might be marked by iron fencing, curbs, vegetation or a break in any of the above. Each monument has been given a monument number and a plot number. Before recording each rectangular section, I sketched the section at the top of the
first record sheet for that section. I included fencing, types of curbing, and any vegetation. Plots and monuments were represented with their respectively assigned numbers. The rectangular areas along the western side of the churchyard had been laid out in an obvious pattern in which each section relates in size and shape to every other section. The sections are generally identically sized (about 13.4 meters by 2.9 meters). The exception to this occurs when a family plot takes up two sections, eliminating the walkway between the two. After placing the first section on the comprehensive map, the others fell into place easily. However, the sections at the rear of the church, while still in rectangles, vary in size and layout. These were stepped off and spatially related to the western sections for inclusion on the master map. Because of the amount of detail, the finished map is much too large for legible inclusion in this paper. Therefore it serves only to illustrate the rectangular layout of the recorded portions.

At the beginning of my project I obtained from the church office copies of the 1835 through 1910 burial records. Some entries had faded too much to be legible. In others, the handwriting was difficult to read. Using a magnifying glass and with some knowledge of the families in the cemetery, I was able to decipher much of the information on the sixty pages of the record. This information was helpful because, in most cases, the record gives the date of burial, date of death, age, place of residence, cause of death and place of burial. The date of death and place of burial were particularly helpful. Between the burial records and the data from the tombstones, I was able to verify that some dates assigned to difficult to read monuments were probable. For people for whom funeral services had been held by the church and who had monuments in the churchyard, I noted my assigned data number in the rewritten burial record. It should
Figure 4-2. Sketch map, not to scale, of only the recorded portion of Grace Churchyard. Included to indicate layout of rectangular sections.
understood that not all of the people for whom the rector of Grace read the burial service are buried in Grace’s cemetery. Likewise, not all of those buried in the cemetery are listed in the burial records. Also, not all people who were buried in the churchyard have existing markers. Finally, not all people who have monuments are buried in the cemetery. Some of these are obvious. The ledger stone for the Charles Percy family lists five names with places of death as far away as Ireland and London. The inclusive death dates, 1792 through 1831 predate the cemetery. Because of spatial overlaps with the earlier old St. Francisville cemetery, the stone may have been placed at the death of the most recent Percy—the only one listed as dying in Louisiana. The rest of the family was commemorated at that time, a practice noted by Harold Mytum in Great Britain (2002:4-5).

I also recorded information on forty-three monuments from the Lemon – Jackson Cemetery, a churchyard cemetery at St. John’s Episcopal Church in Laurel Hill. Twenty-four of these fall within the desired period. St. John’s is a chapel of ease associated with Grace.

Shifts within the Catholic cemetery and Grace Churchyard have played havoc with markers from what I believe to be the oldest burying ground in St. Francisville. Burial records refer to it simply as “St. Francisville.” Some of these stones are now in Grace, some are in the very back of the Catholic Cemetery, and some exist as pieces placed in a strip of asphalt at the front of the Catholic Cemetery. Markers now within the boundaries of Grace Churchyard, I included in the Grace data. I recorded the other monuments and pieces of monuments in a separate data base. This amounted to eighty-seven pieces with data, sixty of which had readable death dates.
I was fortunate to find wonderful informants whose families are buried in either Grace or St. John’s. Ann Stirling Weller provided a great deal of information on the people buried in Grace as well as history of the cemetery. She obtained permission for me to visit St. Mary’s Episcopal Church, another chapel of ease, which is behind a padlocked gate on private land. Mrs. Weller also introduced me to Paul Haygood whose family built and is buried at the Lemon-Jackson cemetery at St. John’s. Mr. Haygood shares with me an interest in the history of the Enochs Marble Company of Philadelphia. He is trying to duplicate the older Enochs monuments to mark the grave of his recently deceased mother.

I started the process which resulted in choosing St. Helena’s by getting a list of Episcopal churches in the Dioceses of North and South Carolina. The history of West Feliciana Parish indicates that many of the settlers were Carolinians. Next, I eliminated any churches for which I could not confirm the presence of churchyard cemeteries. A coastal location, such as that of Beaufort, seemed ideal for the early importation of ideas. When my list of possible sites was reduced to five, I called the churches and established the dates and approximate size of each churchyard cemetery. Then I looked for a fit with Grace and St. Francisville. I chose St. Helena’s Episcopal Church in Beaufort, South Carolina as a coastal benchmark for dating the appearance of Victorian elements in churchyards. The choice seemed appropriate because of similarities between Grace and St. Helena’s, St. Francisville and Beaufort. Like St. Francisville, Beaufort was a community whose main function was providing services to the surrounding plantations. Like Grace, St. Helena’s is one of the oldest Protestant congregations in the state. Throughout the early days in the South, the Episcopal Church was considered the church
of choice for the well-to-do and the elite. While Victorian tombstone elements were not limited to elaborate, expensive monuments, the elite of a period were usually the first to be exposed to and embrace new ideas. Both churches experienced damage during the Civil War and have been restored. Both towns have remained small, deriving a good part of their modern income from tourism. The churches are considered important assets to their communities in terms of tourism, as well as spiritual influence. This importance, as well as the continuous use of the cemeteries, has decreased the degree of modern vandalism often experienced in old cemeteries.

The form and methods used to record the tombstones in St. Helena’s Churchyard differed slightly from those used at Grace (Appendix C). I plan to do further analysis of the total Grace Cemetery population which will not be done for that at St. Helena’s. At St. Helena’s, I recorded only those tombstones dating from 1830 to 1910. I also identified the person or persons memorialized, not by name but as either male or female, or both. I recorded 265 monuments at St. Helena’s and 17 and 14 at the Chapel of Ease and Old Shelton, respectively. All monuments recorded at the abandoned churches fell within the desired date range.

Insight gained from analysis of the St. Helena’s data caused me to look closer at aspects of the Grace data, especially that having to do with the choice of monument makers/distributors. One company, Enochs of Philadelphia, appeared unusually often on signed stones both in Grace and nearby St. John’s Churchyard. Because the use of a Philadelphia distributor seemed so unusual for the period in history at this location, I did an informal walking survey of cemeteries along the Mississippi River. My search reached from Thibodeaux to Simmesport on the west side of the river and from Metairie
up to Natchez on the east side. The survey consisted of looking at every monument for the Enochs signature. Enochs appears in Episcopal churchyard cemeteries in St. Francisville (14), Laurel Hill (8) and Innis (7). Enochs signed stones do not appear in Episcopal churchyard cemeteries at Napoleonville and Thibodeaux. In addition, in mostly Protestant city cemeteries I found three Enochs stones in Jackson, Louisiana and nineteen and one respectively, in Magnolia and Highland Cemeteries in Baton Rouge. The only other Enochs signed work was found in Woodville, Mississippi. Informal surveys in Mobile and Savannah also failed to uncover Enochs stones.

A search through early Baton Rouge, West Feliciana and Pointe Coupee newspapers (Pointe Coupee Democrat 1858:3; Bayou Sara Ledger 1861:4; Tri-Weekly Advocate 1870:6; Feliciana Ledger 1871:3) at Hill Memorial Library, part of Louisiana State University, disclosed that G. B. and E. Enochs of Bayou Sara were advertising as a branch of the “main office” in Philadelphia. Why were they in Bayou Sara?

Having hit a roadblock in Louisiana, Ms. Kelly and I traveled to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to look for Enochs. I had made an appointment with Erika Piola, the Visual Materials Cataloguer at The Library Company of Philadelphia. The Library contains collections which document the historical and cultural background of the United States from the colonial period through the nineteenth century, especially archival information pertaining to Philadelphia. The facility was founded as a subscription library in 1731 by Benjamin Franklin to provide reference works for those not wealthy enough to own private libraries. It is the oldest such facility in the United States. In anticipation of our visit, Ms. Piola had pulled all references to Philadelphia monument companies and marble works from the nineteenth century. These consisted mostly of advertising
lithographs and a few newspaper ads. I made arrangements to obtain scans of selected material with appropriate copyright permissions for use in my thesis at a later date.

At the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, I looked through city directories for the period 1840 through 1905 for any mention of the Enochs business or the names of the two men that I assumed to be the owners, G. B and E. Enochs. A search through the Society’s indexes for pertinent information on any marble or monument companies produced an interesting ledger from a contemporary marble cutter, but nothing on Enochs. The account books provided an interesting glimpse into the nineteenth century barter system. Food, clothing, work and building materials were traded for marble in the form of architectural goods and tombstones. The cost of lettering varied with the size and complexity of the job.

Ms. Kelly and I spent four and a half hours one night at the Van Pelt Library of the University of Pennsylvania reading microfilm of nineteenth century editions of the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Pennsylvania Gazette. We were looking for monument company ads. We found nothing on Enochs. However, we found only one advertisement for any marble company. While in Philadelphia, I consulted with Harvard Wood III who is an authority on the history of the monument business. His marble and granite business has been a family concern since 1855.

Several days were spent searching for Victorian Era Episcopal churchyard cemeteries. Those of St. Barnabas’ Church Grounds, All Saints Church Ground, Old St. Paul’s Churchyard, and part of Christ Church Cemetery are now parking lots, playgrounds, vacant lots or simply holes in the ground. We surveyed St. Luke’s Church Burial Ground, St. Peter’s Cemetery, St. Timothy’s Churchyard and the churchyard at
Trinity Oxford for signed stones. Although we did not record these churchyards, we examined every stone. Ms. Kelly and I spent a day at Laurel Hill, one of the most spectacular Victorian cemeteries, doing the same. In addition we spent a day surveying parts of West Laurel Hill and Woodlands, which like Laurel Hill, are garden cemeteries. Due to the size of these last three, it was impossible in the time to examine every monument in these huge cemeteries. I randomly chose sections with monuments from the desired period. We examined all stones in the sections for signed stones. I took photographs of any located. There were no Enochs’ stones.

Using a combination of information from the Louisiana newspapers mentioned above and Philadelphia city directories, I was able to locate the site of the Enochs marble yard. The site is relatively near both Laurel Hill Cemetery and the Woodland Cemetery, so it is not unlikely that Enochs provided stones for those cemeteries. Unfortunately the building has been razed, and the site is now a service station. However, the buildings across the street give an idea of how Enochs Marble Works must have looked (Figure 4-3). Contemporary advertisements for other Philadelphia marble works, such as J. E. & B. Schell at the corner of Tenth and Vine Streets, show similar establishments (Figure 4-4).

Data Analysis

Within Grace Churchyard, I looked at frequency of occurrence of types of iconography and types of tombstones. I used five year blocks, starting with 1830 and ending with 1910. I used the same procedure for monuments within St. Helena’s Churchyard. I then compared data from the two cemeteries. I decided not to use the data recorded for the various chapels of ease in this paper.
Figure 4-3. Buildings across the street from the site of Enochs Marble Works at The corner of Ridge and Girard Streets in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Figure 4-4. City Marble Works and Steam Mantels: J. E. & B. Schell. “Having greatly improved their facilities for the Manufacture of every variety of Marble Works. Flooring, Tombs and Monuments, are prepared to supply all orders upon reasonable terms.” Lithograph used by permission of The Library Company of Philadelphia.
I had planned to use battleship charts, after Deetz and Dethlefsen, to illustrate chronological differences in shape and iconography. I found that for my data, tables or regular graphs provided a much clearer picture. This is possibly because in the Victorian period, change, like transportation, was much more rapid. To “see” battleship patterns, one would have to show occurrence by year rather than decade or five year increments. Since I am dealing with only two cemeteries, the small numbers of occurrences per year don’t lend themselves to battleship charts.

For comparisons within a cemetery, I decided to limit the use of percentages of total tombstones in my tables. Because the occurrences are so small in some periods, percentages skew the picture. In other words, graphing that 100% of all tombstones in 1830 – 1835 are low monuments is misleading, as there is only one tombstone from that period.

Comparing percentages of iconography is misleading in all cases. Deetz and Dethlefsen were dealing with tombstones which had only one of three types of iconography. In the case of Victorian tombstones, one monument might have many iconographic aspects; i.e. if one stone has a lamb, an angel and a rose, does that mean that 100% have angels, 100% have roses, and 100% have lambs? In Victorian cemeteries, there are no iconographic assemblages by which elements can be grouped for analysis. Another issue with displaying patterns of iconography based on percentage of tombstones concerns the number of stones with no iconography. Only 57% of the Victorian Era monuments at Grace have iconography. The percentage at St. Helena’s is only 39%. For the above reasons, I believe that tables with the number of monuments per period and the
number of stones with iconography, matched to the number of each element being studied will prove clearer than battleship charts and percentage tables.

Archival Research

In addition to the sources mentioned in this chapter and in the Results chapter, I used archival material from a collection I’ve made of nineteenth century funeral and cemetery books, ephemera and documents. This includes mourning stationary, Currier & Ives lithographs and other mourning prints, early catalogs and tracts and books printed on designing and choosing appropriate tombstones

Archival collections other than my own used in this thesis included those of Hill Memorial Library at Louisiana State University; The Library Company of Philadelphia; the Van Pelt Library of the University of Pennsylvania; the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; the collections of Harvard C. Wood III; materials held by Grace Episcopal Church in St. Francisville, Louisiana, and materials held by St. Helena’s Parish Church, Beaufort, South Carolina.
GRACE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

The colorful histories of St. Francisville and Bayou Sara belie St. Francisville’s present day image as a sleepy, little town. The Felicianas have been claimed, lost and regained by a confusing host of European and European-American political entities. The Bayou Sara area was once second only to New Orleans in terms of wealth and commerce in the state. The inhabitants of St. Francisville, Bayou Sara and the surrounding plantations played important roles in the development of Louisiana politically, economically and spiritually. Many of these men and women are now buried in Grace Churchyard.

West Feliciana Parish

The area was explored by Hernando de Soto in 1542, and the river and all of the adjoining territory claimed for Spain. One hundred forty years later Rene Robert Cavellier, Sieur de la Salle claimed the same territory for Louis XIV of France. It was La Salle who named the area Louisiana in honor of his king. In 1699 French explorers Iberville and Bienville went up the Mississippi River. Iberville is reputed to have given the Houma people cotton and apple seeds. In light of the Felicianas later dependence on cotton production, that act can be seen as a harbinger of things to come. In 1717 Louis XIV made large land grants to a number of French colonists in the area between Natchez and New Orleans (Butler 1924:90-93).

During its early history, the area around St. Francisville had been included in territory under the spiritual control of the Catholic Bishop of Quebec who appointed the Capuchin Friars Minor of Champagne, France as missionaries to inhabitants on both sides of the Mississippi River. The French Friars named the ridge for the founder of their order, St. Francis. By the Treaty of Fontainebleau in 1762, France gave Louisiana to Spain. The
Spanish Capuchins replaced the French, retaining the French name for the location (Butler 1924:92). The Treaty of Paris in 1763 gave Florida, that is, the territory from the Mississippi River east, to the British. That area was divided into East and West Florida. West Florida had its capital in Pensacola. Despite large land grants, the territory remained largely unsettled until the American Revolution. Settlers from Georgia, Virginia and the Carolinas increased the population so, that in 1778 West Florida was further divided into the district of Mobile and a district containing Manchac and Natchez. The third British governor of West Florida wrote that the westernmost district contained more respectable, wealthy planters than all of the rest of Florida (Butler 1924:93-94; Wall 1990:52-53).

In 1779 Spain declared war on Great Britain, and Bernardo de Galvez, the governor of Spanish Louisiana, took the British forts at Butte and Baton Rouge, as well as outposts along the Amite River and Thompson’s Creek. Under the seizure, the area of the Felicianas became Spanish once more (Wall 1990:66-67).

The Spanish Capuchins received a grant from the King of Spain for the tract of land now occupied by parts of the old Catholic Cemetery and parts of the present Episcopal Church property. Between 1775 and 1789, a monastery was built, and the dead were brought across the Mississippi River from Pointe Coupee for burial there. The site on the ridge was safely above the annual inundation by the Mississippi (Butler 1924:92).

The Treaty of Paris in 1783 ended the American Revolution. East and West Florida were returned to Spain, and the United States claimed all land from the thirteen colonies west to the Mississippi. However, the treaty did not set a definite boundary between the Spanish territories and those belonging to the United States. Americans claimed the boundary was south of the thirty-first parallel. Spain claimed that the line was
at thirty-two degrees, twenty-eight minutes, or level with Natchez. Another dispute concerned American use of the Mississippi River. Americans claimed the Treaty gave them the right to travel down the River to its mouth. Spain disputed this and on occasion closed the river to American traffic. The treaty of San Lorenzo, or Pinckney’s Treaty, settled both issues in the favor of the United States in 1795. In the meantime, the ongoing boundary dispute meant that the road north of St. Francisville, in the Tunica Hills, was a no man’s land mostly in the hands of highwaymen (Butler 1924:98; Wall 1990:80-81).

Spanish immigration policies were so loose that many Americans moved into West Florida, particularly to the soil rich area north of Baton Rouge. The United States encouraged American migration. Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson wrote to President Washington, “I wish a hundred thousand of our inhabitants would accept the invitation. It may be the means of delivering to us peaceably what may otherwise cost a war.” Settlement never reached those levels, but enough Americans moved in to assure the United States that, should it wish to do so, it could overrun West Florida. Many of the new families—the Turnbulls, Stirlings, Barrows, Percys and Matthews—were the rich planters of the nineteenth century (Butler 1924:97; Wall 1990:82, 94).

In 1800 France and Spain secretly signed the Treaty of San Ildefonso which would give Louisiana back to the French. Fear of further restrictions on American shipping in New Orleans led Thomas Jefferson to dispatch diplomats to France to negotiate the purchase of the city. Also sought was “free and undisputed” right to navigation on the Mississippi. Unexpectedly, Napoleon offered all of Louisiana, and in 1803 the United States purchased the territory (Butler 1924:98; Wall 1990:83-86). However, the Purchase did not establish definite boundaries for Louisiana. The United States insisted that West
Florida was included in the Purchase, while Spain insisted that Spanish West Florida extended to the Mississippi River. The United States made no formal effort to take the territory. For Americans under it, Spanish rule was not considered onerous. However a lack of voice in government, lawlessness along the thirty-first parallel and the desire of Americans to be part of the United States led to the West Florida Rebellion (Butler 1924:98; Wall 102-103).

On July 1, 1810, several hundred inhabitants met at the Stirling house. They elected John Mills, John Rhea, William Barrow and John K. Johnson as representatives of the “District of New Feliciana.” A meeting of representatives from all of the Florida Parishes on July 17, 1810 selected a committee to approach the Spanish commandant in Baton Rouge to request aid in suppressing banditry and to obtain some degree of self government. While pretending to cooperate with the committee, Commandant de Lassus sent messages to Don Vicente Folch, the Spanish governor at Pensacola, requesting military aid. One of these messages was intercepted, and the settlers took matters into their own hands. Seventy men attacked the fort at Baton Rouge. Because the attacking force was so small, the garrison might have repulsed them. However, a local farmer, familiar with the area, directed the attackers to the unguarded path through which cows were driven in and out of the palisades. Most defenders gave up without a fight. (Butler 1924:99; Wall 1990:103).

The Spanish having been pushed out of the Florida Parishes, a “congress” of citizens declared the province an independent republic with its capital in St. Francisville. The group adopted a constitution and sent a formal request to President James Madison requesting admission to the United States. The letter was unnecessary. Upon hearing of
the revolt, Madison had already ordered the governor of Louisiana territory to annex that portion of West Florida. The independent republic lasted seventy-four days. From the territory, the county of Feliciana was established and divided into parishes of Feliciana, Baton Rouge, Saint Helena and Saint Tammany (Butler 1924:99; Wall 1990:103). The parish of Feliciana was divided into East and West in 1824 (Butler 1924:97).

Bayou Sara and St. Francisville were the two most important towns in West Feliciana. In the 1790s, John Mills came from Natchez to establish a cotton port near the mouth of Bayou Sara. Supposedly the bayou, from which the town was named, got its name from that of an old woman who lived at the bayou’s mouth. The name is certainly preferable to those on early French maps which call the stream “La Riviere de la Pucelle Juine” (the River of the Jewish Virgin) or “Baiouc a la Chaudepisse” (Bayou Gonorrhea). The source for this information gave no reason for these rather exotic names (Butler 1983:5).

Bayou Sara sat at the base of the bluffs below St. Francisville. According to the 1816 diary of William Newton Mercer (Davis and Andreassen 1936:401), the shanty town that grew there was the home of “riotous young men.” By 1850, Bayou Sara was the largest shipping port between Memphis and New Orleans. The port was the point of exchange for cotton and produce going out and fine furnishings and finished goods coming in. Steamboats carried travelers to and from New Orleans and points north. Bayou Sara was the end point for the West Feliciana Railroad, the first standard gauge rail line in America. The railroad brought cotton from as far away as Woodville, Mississippi, to be warehoused and then transported to the factors in New Orleans. The port was a thriving center of commerce. There were saw mills, hotels, boarding houses, commissioners,
druggists, a bank, grocers and dry goods stores, an ice house, livestock yards and fish markets. The Civil War, fires and the boll weevil helped devastate Bayou Sara as a port. In addition, the spread of railroads throughout the country spelled the end of the river as a major method of transportation. However, the Mississippi delivered the coup de grace. The town washed away in a series of river floods until in 1924, little remained. Today the St. Francisville – New Roads ferry, the *Delta Queen* and the *Mississippi Queen* dock where the town once lay (Butler 1993:5-8).

St. Francisville developed along the narrow ridge above Bayou Sara. The streets were laid out by John H. Johnson who sold the first lots in 1807. While the port was a center of commerce, St. Francisville was a cultural, religious and political center. The third newspaper in the Louisiana Territory was published there. The second library in the state was started in 1812. That St. Francisville developed the accoutrements of culture so rapidly is not surprising. Many of the families who acquired land for plantations were not just starting out. These settlers were already well-to-do and came west looking for new ventures. For example, Olivia Ruffin Barrow, a North Carolina widow, came to the Felicianas in 1798 with her three daughters, three adult sons and their families, slaves, trunks of family heirlooms and fine furniture. In 1804, her oldest son, William Barrow, supervised the building of Locust Grove. The Barrow family was responsible for establishing or maintaining Greenwood, Rosebank, Ellerslie, Live Oak, Afton Villa, Rosale and Rosedown plantations. Other early families such as the Turnbulls, Butlers and Stirlings had similar beginnings (Butler 1924:102-103; Butler 1990:9-10, 38-39).
A Church History

“Whereas a number of citizens of the Parish of West Feliciana and State of Louisiana, being desirous to establish a church in connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, and being desirous to call a clergyman of that denomination of Christians to officiate in said church, have associated themselves together for that purpose; and on the 15th day of March, 1827, at the town of St. Francisville, in said Parish, did organize themselves for that purpose...” (Grace Episcopal Church N.D:2).

A vestry elected at that meeting met on March 31, 1827 and issued a formal call to William R. Bowman. Bowman was an Episcopal priest from Pennsylvania and the brother of Mary Bowman Stirling. He married Eliza Pirrie Barrow, the widow of Robert Hilliard Barrow. Grace Church became the second Episcopal Church in Louisiana, the first outside of New Orleans. An earlier congregation was incorporated in Baton Rouge, but was not organized and admitted to the Diocese as St. James Church until 1844. By virtue of its early formation, Grace Church was to play an important part in the organization of the Episcopal Church in Louisiana (Grace Episcopal Church N.D:2; Weller 1999:57, 59).

On September 27, 1828, the vestry purchased lots three, four, five and six of Square Five in the town of St. Francisville. The first church was located to the rear of the present church. A contract was made for the construction of a substantial brick church fifteen feet long by thirty-eight wide with a height of twenty feet. The contract called for the church to be completed by Christmas day 1828, but did not include plastering, painting or installing a ceiling. Services were held in the winter of 1828. On February 7, 1829, the Louisiana State Legislature passed an Act of Incorporation which gave the vestry the power to conduct church business. $1100.00 was raised in 1830 to complete the church, but the work was not done (Church Leaflet N.D:2; Grace Episcopal Church N.D:2).
The early enthusiasm died in 1835 with the first rector. The building was consecrated in 1838, but never completed. Interim rectors served the church after Bowman, but the church building suffered from neglect until the arrival of Daniel Smith Lewis as rector in July 1839 (Grace Episcopal Church N.D:3; Weller 1999:60).

In April 1838 delegations from Christ Church and St. Paul’s in New Orleans and Grace in St. Francisville met to draft a constitution for an Episcopal Diocese of Louisiana. The Right Reverend Leonidas Polk became the first Bishop of the Diocese of Louisiana. Polk was to earn the sobriquet “the fighting bishop from Louisiana,” when he resigned his post and fought as a general for the Confederacy. Polk died in 1864 at the Battle of Pine Mountain, Georgia. Because the Diocese of Louisiana did not elect another bishop nor meet during the war years, Louisiana became one of the few Southern dioceses which did not join the “Church in the Confederate States” following secession (Grace Episcopal Church N.D.:4, 8).

The first Parochial Report of Grace Church to the Annual Diocesan Convention (Grace Episcopal Church N.D.:4) reported “fourteen white and thirty-one colored infant baptisms, seven white and twenty-five colored adult baptisms; three marriages and fourteen funerals. There were fourteen Episcopalian Communicants, twelve white and two colored. There were fifteen communicants belonging to other denominations.”

By 1854, Lewis had an assistant who took services at the various chapels of ease in the Parish as well as conducting services for the slave congregations at Troy and Greenwood Plantations. Chapels of ease were small mission churches which provided plantation families with a place to worship closer to home. Chapels were formed or fell into disuse with property ownership changes. Of the chapels of ease, only two remain.
Both are on the National Register of Historic Places. St. John’s in Laurel Hill (Figure 5-1) is a timber church constructed in the carpenter gothic style. Services are held there once a month. In an unusual turn of events, what appears to be a churchyard cemetery preceded the church. The cemetery was the Lemon-Jackson family cemetery (Figure 5-2). In 1873

Figure 5-1. St. John’s Episcopal Church, a mission or Chapel of Ease for Grace Church.

Figure 5-2. The Lemon- Jackson family cemetery beside St. John’s.
Col. Vincent D. Walsh provided the funds to build the church in memory of his daughter, Susie. Both Susie and her mother died from yellow fever. His pew was situated so that he could look out the window and see Susie’s grave. The cemetery, which is still in use, is a tiny gem with wonderful beds and obelisks (Audubon Pilgrimage Booklet 1980; Grace Episcopal Church N.D:5; Paul Haygood, personal conversation). St. Mary’s, in the Weyanoke community, was organized in 1854. The church (Figure 5-3) is brick with a bell tower over the apse. Although the building has been repaired several times, a falling tree and vandals have damaged the structure. The church now sits on private property, behind a padlocked fence. With Ann Stirling Weller’s assistance I was able to visit the church.

Figure 5-3. St. Mary’s Episcopal Church (Weyanoke Community, Louisiana).
There had been a churchyard cemetery, and as late as 1970, genealogists recorded information from the stones. On my visit only three stones remained and these fell too late for my study (Grace Episcopal Church N.D.:5; Ann Stirling Weller, Personal Conversation).

Grace Church began in 1838 to buy land in bits and pieces to enlarge the churchyard. In 1858 the thirty-year-old, never completed, church was dismantled and the cornerstone laid for a new church. Charles Nevitt Gibbons designed and built the present church, including the interior wood carvings. The plan was based on that of English country churches: pointed Gothic lines, simple and unadorned. It is ironic that Gibbons died a pauper in a Bayou Sara hotel and is buried in an unmarked grave in the Potter’s Field (Church Leaflet N.D:2; Grace Episcopal Church N.D:6).

The first service in the new church was held April 28, 1860. The churchyard was enclosed and parts of the current iron fencing were erected. The live oaks were planted by slaves of Harriet Flowers Matthews with acorns from the LeJeune Oaks on Butler Greenwood Plantation (Grace Episcopal Church N.D:6). Both Harriet and her husband George are buried in the churchyard.

In 1863, on its third anniversary, the church was shelled by Union gunboats. As the only structure visible above the trees, gunners used the belfry as a benchmark. In a report dated more than seven months after the event, Lieutenant Commander James Foster reported that “one hundred and eight shots were fired slowly and with great accuracy.” The belfry was demolished, and the church was a shell. The stained glass windows were shattered, and an unexploded shell lay in front of the altar (Times Picayune 1937:B1). Two stories are told of this incident. In one, the rector is said to have sent a servant under a flag
of truce to admonish the gunners for “firing upon God’s House.” At the reminder, the
gunners changed their direction of fire. The other story is that one of the gunners,
remorseful over the action, gave the church $100.00. The money was used to purchase the
red Bohemian glass windows in the door of the South Transept (Church Leaflet N.D:3).
The second story has some basis in fact. The first story is unlikely. Foster reported that the
town was shelled because:

“The town of St. Francisville has been a perfect hotbed of secession ever
since I have been in command of this place, and has been the constant resort
of Confederates, where they were continually entertained and urged on to
acts of plunder and abuse upon the people of the lower town, Bayou Sara,
for their Union proclivities. Moreover, there is not one inhabitant of the place
(St. Francisville) who has ever shown himself favorable to the Union.”
(Times Picayune 1937:B1)

That Foster expected to find the citizens of St. Francisville favorable to the cause of the
Union is puzzling. However, there is the rest of the story. The name of the gunboat firing
on St. Francisville was the USS Albatross under the command of Lieutenant Commander
John E. Hart. Hart had been ill and while in a fever shot himself in the head. He was a
Mason and had given instructions that, rather than a Navy burial in the Mississippi, he
wanted to be buried with Masonic ritual in the earth (Church Leaflet N.D:4; Grace
Episcopal Church N.D:6; Times Picayune 1937:B1).

The men of the Albatross rowed to shore under a flag of truce and in Bayou Sara
learned that there was a Masonic Lodge in St. Francisville. Mason and Confederate
Captain William Walter Leake acceded to Hart’s request. The few Confederate Masons at
home and the Union Masons from the Albatross conducted the service and buried Hart in
the Masonic plot in Grace Churchyard. Hart’s children visited St. Francisville after the
war to take his body back to Schenectady, New York. Because of the honor and care given
the grave, they decided to leave him in the Churchyard. His grave (Figure 5-4) is one of the most visited at Grace (Grace Episcopal Church N.D:6-7; Times Picayune 1937:B1). The ledger stone over the grave was placed by the Masonic Lodge of St. Francisville in 1955.

Figure 5-4. Grave of Union Lieutenant Commander John E. Hart.

At the end of the war, the remaining white communicants were holding religious services in their homes. From a congregation of seventy-two white and twenty-seven African Americans in 1861, there were only thirty-two white and two African American communicants in 1866. The group held services on Easter Sunday, 1866 in the church shell. The church building was repaired as funds were available. Grace (Figure 5-5), restored to its 1853 design, was reconsecrated in 1893 (Grace Episcopal Church N.D:8).

The Churchyard

The earliest cemetery in St. Francisville was that associated with the Spanish monastery. The monastery burned and no markers, if there were any, from that period
remain (Butler 1924:92). The Burial Records for Grace Church, that is, the record of burial services performed, begin in 1837. The first burial listing Grace as the place of burial is for Edward Baldwin, a five month old infant thrown from a buggy in 1840. Burials before that date generally list the burial place as St. Francisville. Based on the location of tombstones predating Grace and stones for people for which the burial records list “St. Francisville” as the place of burial, I believe that this earlier cemetery partially overlapped both the present Catholic Cemetery and Grace Churchyard. Existing stones are scattered through Grace, found at the rear of the Catholic Cemetery and imbedded in asphalt at the front of the Catholic Cemetery.

One of the definitive factors of the Victorian cemetery is the arrangement of graves in family plots. In Grace Churchyard these plots are generally delineated by cast iron fences or curbs of brick, concrete, granite or marble (Figure 5-6 and 5-7). Unfortunately time, weather and vandalism have taken a toll on the beautiful ironwork. The dimensions
of the plots vary by location. The rectangular areas along the west of the church are approximately 13.4 meters by 2.9 meters. Double areas are 13.4 meters by 6.7 meters.

Figure 5-6. Curbing around family plots in Grace Churchyard. Sections are roughly 13.4 meters by 2.9 meters.

Figure 5-7. Iron fencing around plot in Grace Churchyard. Each gate in the cemetery is different.
The large sections behind the church are 20.12 meters by 7 meters. The smaller sections in this area are portions of this.

Because the arrangement is by family rather than chronological, a burial from 1853 may lie next to one from 2002. As in other Victorian cemeteries (McDannell 1995:103, 107-110; McKillop 1995:88), children and adults are intermingled. Some of the earlier family plots are still being used, as shown by several recent burials and information from current plot owners (Celeste Spann, personal conversation; Ann Weller, personal conversation).

The cemetery surrounds the church on three sides (Figure 5-8). The church faces slightly west of south, so that graves meant to face the east are really facing several degrees south of that. To the rear and along the northeast side of the churchyard is a large ravine which will limit expansion in that direction. The Catholic cemetery is on the western boundary of the churchyard. Houses abut the churchyard on the east and a road on the south. The burials which lie behind Jackson Hall are generally modern. I did not record this modern section. Jackson Hall houses the parish hall and church offices.

The trees donated by Harriet Matthews are now huge, shading most of the churchyard. Camellias, azaleas and other shrubs and flowers dot the cemetery. The churchyard is bounded by the cast iron fence (Figure 5-9) begun when the present church structure was new. The section on the west is modern. At the time that it was erected, an error was found in the property boundaries which gave more land to Grace. This error may have compromised the location of earlier burials.

Burial records and incidents in the church history mention a Potter’s Field for the burial of the indigent. The Potter’s Field was not part of the churchyard. Church members
believe that this was located to the rear of what is now the Catholic Cemetery (Ann Klein, personal conversation). One informant mentioned that during the 1853 yellow fever epidemic, people were buried in a pit located to the east of the church. I have not had that confirmed.

A frequent query concerns the racial demographics of the cemetery. That is, are any African Americans, slave or free, buried in the churchyard. According to the church
Figure 5-9. Iron fence around perimeter of churchyard.

burial records, there are three slave burials. However most other slaves for whom the burial services were read were buried on the home plantation. These were primarily slaves belonging to the O’Conner’s and the Matthews’. Many entries in the burial record are made after the fact and use ditto marks for repeat information. I believe that the three entries showing Grace as the place of burial for slaves were cases of misplaced ditto marks.

According to the church history, land was purchased twice from members of the Chew family, free people of color (Grace Episcopal Church N.D:5). Funeral services for Marla and George Chew were performed at the church. Both are shown as being buried in St. Francisville cemetery. Marla Chew died in September, 1837 (Church Burial Records). Her tombstone is within the present day boundaries of Grace, probably by virtue of the spread of the churchyard into the older cemetery. There is no tombstone for George now, but many of the St. Francisville stones, if they existed at all, are gone.

I looked in the cemetery for the people prominent in the early history of St. Francisville and Bayou Sara. It comes as no surprise that most are not there. The churchyard at Grace was not used until 1840. Earlier social and political leaders such as
Thomas Butler and the Barrows were from prominent plantation families and were buried on the plantation in family burying grounds. However, as the nineteenth century progressed, burial in the churchyard became more common. The burials in Grace reflect the social and economic history of St. Francisville and Bayou Sara, as well as the surrounding area. Twenty-two doctors from the Victorian period are buried in Grace Churchyard. Stephen Van Wickle operated the ferryboat between Bayou Sara and Pointe Coupee. Felix V. Leake, Max and August Fischer, and Conrad Bockel all owned mercantile establishments. Frances Mumford and William Ball owned apothecaries. Daniel Rettig owned a bakery and grocery store. Charles C. Weydert owned a hardware store. John F. Irvine, long time mayor of Bayou Sara, was a factor and commissioner. Another mayor of Bayou Sara, E. W. Whiteman, was a receiving, forwarding and steamboat agent. John H. Henshaw owned a livery stable and was active in the horse market; horse racing was popular among West Feliciana plantation owners. All of these men and their families lie in Grace Churchyard (Adams 1989:70; Dorr 1938:1135).

Inscriptions occasionally make one curious about the intimate details of others lives. On the tablet for Charles Weems, his wife had inscribed, “Erected by his surviving wife who, knowing him best, loved him most.” Charles was only 26 when he died in 1855. One wonders at the story behind this defiant declaration. No other Weems has a tombstone.

Another inscription credits the humanitarian efforts of Louis Adams, who died in 1853:

“A native of the state of New York.
Died of Yellow Fever
Aged 21
This stone is erected by a few friends to whom
he had endeared himself by his kind actions, unassuming manner and unwearied exertions during the prevalence of the scourge to which, alas, he himself fell a victim. 
Requiescat in Pace”

Yellow fever, the scourge to which the stone refers, was devastating. For most years in the 1850s and 1860s, the annual number of burial services performed averaged thirty-five. In September through December of 1853, fifty-three people were buried. Forty-seven of these died of yellow fever. Twenty yellow fever victims are shown as being buried in Grace. Nineteen of these have monuments.

The story of the Hart burial is well known. However, Grace Churchyard has a wealth of stories—some with denouement, some still a mystery. As with most old institutions, many of the stories of Grace are not recorded; they are just passed on as part of the church’s tradition.

William D. Hatch, a Bayou Sara merchant, died leaving no heirs (Adams 1989:36). He directed that whatever money was left after his debts were paid be used to purchase a monument. The result is the striking Gothic pedestal topped with a garlanded urn seen in Figure 5-10.

Dr. Ira Smith, who was instrumental in the organization of the church, is buried in a wonderful Egyptian Revival mausoleum (Figure 3-2). No one can be buried there now because a family member threw the key in the river. Ira’s widow had first been the widow of another Smith—Jedidiah Smith. Jedidiah was Captain of one of the military companies pivotal in the West Florida Rebellion. The Widow Smith commemorated both in Egyptian Revival; Jedidiah has a large obelisk
The other mausoleum in the cemetery is constructed of brick (Figure 5-11 and 5-12). A long stair descends into the vented crypt of the tomb. The structure is empty except for trash. The mausoleum can no longer be entered as the outer walls and roof are in danger of collapsing. The structure is held together by strapping and props. The wife of one of the Ball family was the first and only occupant. According to tradition, her husband often sat inside the crypt in his rocking chair. Their children were mortified. At the father’s death, the children reinterred their mother with their father in a standard cemetery plot (Ann Klein, Personal Conversation).

There are two other tombs in Grace which are constructed of brick. One, without identifying inscriptions, has a stair-step construction (Figure 5-13). The third tomb has a marble ledger on top. The Enochs signed ledger commemorates two Clark infants, Edmond Gaines and George Washington (Figure 5-14).
On February 26, 1859, several West Feliciana lawyers boarded the steamboat Princess at Bayou Sara bound to New Orleans on court business. Shortly after the boat left the docks at Baton Rouge on the 27th, the boilers exploded, killing seventy people. Among
Figure 5-13. “Stair-step” vault. Grace Churchyard.

Figure 5-14. Enoch signed mortared brick monument for George Washington and Edmond Gaines Clark.

these were four attorneys from St. Francisville who are buried in Grace Churchyard: Seymour H. Lurty, Henderson C. Hudson, Uriah B. Phillips and Lorenzo D. Brewer (New Orleans Christian Advocate 1859:3). The first three have monuments; Brewer’s burial place is based solely on Grace Church burial records.
Although many of the monuments in Grace are simple, inexpensive marble tablets, homemade markers are an anomaly. The markers for members of the Roth and Dedon families are homemade and date around the beginning of the twentieth century. They lie in a small area surrounded by a chain link fence on the northwestern edge of the cemetery. These graves were probably not a part of the churchyard.

Given the wealth of some of the families buried in Grace, outstanding examples of monuments and iconography are to be expected. The cemetery has two outstanding examples of beds. One of these is signed Enochs, the other is unsigned. I have only seen similar ones in Philadelphia, so I assume that both are probably Enochs (Figures 3-32b and 5-15).

In the Collins-Lewis family plot, a pedestal with canopy and urn commemorates Andrew Collins of Providence, Rhode Island, whose descendents are associated with Ambrosia plantation. The monument has rosettes, garlands and inverted torches (Figure 5-16). The monument to the Reverend Daniel Smith Lewis, the man credited with revitalizing the church in the 1840s, is also in this family plot. At least seven other ministers are buried in the cemetery. Another interesting tombstone in this plot is that of Andrew Collins Lewis. It incorporates an anchor leaning against a tree trunk which sits atop a pile of rocks. Andrew was forty-four when he died in 1889. Forty-four was not particularly young, for that time. That makes the use of the tree unusual (Figure 3-14b).

There are five “trees” in Grace Cemetery including the Lewis monument. Two of them are Woodmen of the World monuments. Three were erected to symbolize a life cut short. A particularly interesting tree trunk honors a young man killed in the Philippines
during the Spanish-American War (Figure 3-15b). His helmet, sword, canteen, dispatch bag, blanket roll and rifle all hang from the branches.

Figure 5-15. Enochs signed bed monument.

Figure 5-16. Pedestal, urn and canopy.
Three members of the McCrindell family have stones with ivy covered cross icons. The stones for the two who died in 1880 and 1884 are signed Enochs’ tablets (Figure 5-17a and 5-17b). The one dated 1903 is unsigned and of slightly poorer quality than the others. As Enochs was not in business in the 1900s; the family must have commissioned another company to duplicate the earlier stones (Figure 5-17c).

Another interesting Enochs monument is a type of bed for four of the children of John and Belle Leake. All died before their first birthday. Instead of a child lying in the bed, a lamb sleeps there atop a cross (Figure 5-18a). Another, more conventional sleeping child lies on a pallet atop a scroll. Five children are commemorated with that monument (Figure 5-18b). In that children buried in Grace are mostly children of the middle class or better, the cemetery graphically illustrates the odds against a child surviving to adulthood.

![Figure 5-17. McCrindells, similar iconography. a. Enochs signed stone for Harry Stirling McCrindell. b. Enochs signed stone for Dr. L. S. McCrindell. c. Non-Enochs stone for Thomas Butler McCrindell. ](image-url)
Grace Churchyard has wonderful angels. The monument for Daniel and Martha Turnbull, the builders of Rosedown Plantation, is a marble gothic obelisk. On the western side is a beautifully carved bas relief of a manly archangel Michael (Figure 5-19a). The pyramid obelisk for infant Rebecca Thorp bears a bas relief of an angel carrying a child to Heaven (Figure 5-19b). On the head of the bed for Mary Harbour, a prayerful angel looks to Heaven (Figure 5-19c).

Grace has several of what I call “angel children.” These are not cherubs; there are no cherubs in Grace. These are children with wings; their downcast eyes and solemn faces are beautiful. I’m sure some examples of this type of statue must have been stock statuary, but none of the angel children at Grace are completely alike (Figure 5-20). Like the lamb, these children reflect the innocence of the children whose graves they mark.

In the shade on the eastern side of the church stands a woman holding the anchor of hope. On the western side of the pedestal on which she stands is a bas relief of a hand reaching from Heaven. One finger points to an eagle which holds arrows in its claws. Below the eagle a sun rises over a wavy sea which is bounded by tree lined shores. The
Figure 5-19. Bas relief angels. a. Archangel Michael on Turnbull monument. b. Angel carrying child on Rebecca Thorp monument. c. Angel looks to Heaven on Enochs signed bed to Mary D. Harbour.
meaning is rather obscure until you read the inscription on the opposite side of the pedestal (Figure 5-21).

“Unfading hope when life’s last embers burn
When soul to soul and dust to dust return,
Heaven to thy charge resigns the awful hour.
Oh! Then thy kingdom comes! Immortal Power!
Hark as the spirits eye with eagle gaze;
The noon of heaven undazzled by the blaze,
On heavenly winds that waft them to the sky,
Float the sweet songs of star born melody.
Wild as that hallowed anthem sent to hail
Bethlehem’s shepherds in the lonely vale,
When Jordan hushed his waves and midnight still
Watched on the Holy towers of Zion Hill!
Inspiring thought of rapture yet to be,
The tears of love were ceaseless, but for thee.”

Figure 5-20. The “Angel Children” of Grace Churchyard. (See also Figure 3-16a).

Grace Churchyard epitomizes the ambiance of the Victorian cemetery: wonderful monuments in a beautiful, natural setting. Early in the morning when the birds are singing and before the heat of the day, wandering through Grace is indescribably peaceful (Figure 5-22). The most important aspect of this cemetery, however, is not the static beauty. What
makes Grace a part of the garden/rural cemetery movement is that it was, and still is, a living part of the community in a way that modern lawn cemeteries will never be (Nance 1999:49). Because St. Francisville is a historic town, and Grace is an important part of that, tourists frequently wander through. But the people of St. Francisville also see the cemetery as a part of the community. For two nights during the annual Pilgrimage, some of the occupants of the Churchyard return to tell their stories in a tableau.

Although cemetery board members might cringe at the thought of children playing among the stones, the founders of the early Victorian cemeteries would be delighted. Joggers run down the shaded paths. The occasional dog walker cuts through the back of the cemetery. Tourists wander through reading the old stones. Family members visit and
pause to remember. And after all, that is what the Victorians wanted: to know that they would not lie in dark, dank graves alone and unremembered.

Figure 5-22. The beauty of nature in Grace Churchyard.
ST. HELENA’S EPISCOPAL CHURCH

To determine if a time lag occurred in the use of Victorian elements in Southeastern cemeteries, I chose to compare Grace with a churchyard cemetery in Beaufort, South Carolina. Beaufort is located on one of the Carolina Sea Islands. St. Helena’s Parish of the Anglican Church was established there by an act of the provincial government in 1712. Due to unrest among the Yemassee Indians the first church, a brick building 40’ by 30’, was not constructed until 1724. The church was enlarged in 1817 and in 1842 (Hardy ND:1-2, 5-6; Presgraves and Presgraves 1987:1). Beaufort became a center serving the cotton and rice plantations of the Sea Islands and the nearby coast.

In November of 1861, the minister and his entire congregation fled before the invasion of Union troops. When they returned in 1866, they found that the soldiers had turned the church into a hospital. The pews and other furnishings had been removed; a second floor had been made by flooring over the balconies. The ledger stones of low cemetery monuments had been brought inside to serve as operating tables. The only remnant of the antebellum furnishings is the small marble font. The Rev. Joseph R. Walker held services in the church in the spring of 1867, although the building was still badly in need of repair (Hardy ND:7).

The parish boundaries established by the colonial legislature include what are now the counties of Beaufort, Hampton and Jasper as well as part of Allendale County. (Hardy ND:1). Within these boundaries, St. Helena’s was responsible for the organization of six additional congregations between 1745 and 1981. From these, eleven more congregations were established. Few of these chapels of ease still exist. In some cases the structures
have been sold to other denominations; other structures were destroyed by war, fire or hurricanes (Hardy ND:10-12).

Of particular interest to me are Prince William’s Parish, known as Old Sheldon (Figure 6-1), and the Chapel of Ease (Figure 6-2) on St. Helena Island. To match the possible inclusion of cemetery markers from St. John’s of Laurel Hill, Louisiana, and the early St. Francisville Cemetery in further study, I recorded the cemeteries around the ruins of these two South Carolina churches.

![Figure 6-1  Prince William’s Parish or Old Sheldon](image-url)

Old Sheldon was formed in 1745. During the American Revolution, the British burned it down. After the war, the church was rebuilt only to be burned again by Union troops. The church was not rebuilt. Since 1923 the clergy of St. Helena’s have held a memorial service annually at the ruins on the second Sunday after Easter (Hardy ND:11, 7-8). In addition, the owners of the property rent it out for weddings, picnics and other events. The surviving monuments in the churchyard cemetery mostly predate my study.
They include three beautiful chest tombs. However, fourteen tombstones fall within the appropriate dates. Because the area is rented out, the surviving stones are relatively well cared for.

![Figure 6-2 Churchyard of the Chapel of Ease on St. Helena Island](image)

The Chapel of Ease on St. Helena’s Island was established in 1812 and was an active parish until the Civil War. After the war, the building was leased to the Methodists until it was burned by a forest fire in the 1880s (Hardy ND: 12). The cemetery has suffered from neglect. There is one mausoleum, but the floor burial chambers are empty. Tree roots have disturbed some of the ledger stone markers, and others are buried in the mud. Eighteen of the markers that could be deciphered fall into the pertinent time frame.

**Cemetery**

St. Helena’s sits roughly in the center of a churchyard cemetery. The cemetery and church take up a whole block and are surrounded by a tall, brick wall (Figure 6-3). There
Figure 6-3. St. Helena’s Churchyard, Beaufort, South Carolina. After a survey and plot by Arthur O. Christensen, 1946. Published in *Old Cemetery of St. Helena’s Episcopal Church*. Figure not to scale, but property covers one city block.
are gates in each side of the cemetery wall. Family or group plots are delineated by low walls of brick and brick/tabby, curbs and wrought iron fences. Interestingly, these low, brick walls have no openings (Figure 6-4). According to Ruth Little (1998:35) the enclosures kept livestock from damaging graves and tombstones. Early cemeteries functioned much as a commons, for grazing and gatherings. Examples in North Carolina have brick steps or stiles for mourners’ use. There is no evidence of stiles at St. Helena’s, but steps may have been made of wood and rotted away. For recording purposes one must climb over the walls. The wrought iron fences have gates. Newer graves in a cemetery addition in the adjacent block are not enclosed in any way. As in the surveyed portion of Grace, no part of the cemetery is any older than any other part. Burials are determined not by time, but by family. However, when the church was enlarged some of the earliest graves were covered by the new construction.
There are two mausoleum type tombs in the cemetery. One is in the Classical style. Burials do not fall in the desired time frame, but the structure was built in 1905. The second mausoleum is brick with a sloping roof that gives the appearance of a house buried up to the eaves (Figure 6-5). The plaque with the inscription is missing. However, according to church history, the tomb was built by a Dr. Perry. He knew of a person being buried alive. Therefore, he had his friends promise to put a loaf of bread, a jug of water and a pick axe in his grave (Colman 1997:20; Presgraves and Presgraves 1987:6). One assumes that that the supplies were not needed.

Like Grace Cemetery, St. Helena’s has some interesting inhabitants. The Reverend Mason L. Weems, the man responsible for two famous George Washington legends – chopping down the cherry tree and tossing a coin across the Rappahannock River – died a
pauper in Beaufort and was buried in the churchyard. His family later moved him to the Weems plantation in Virginia (Presgraves and Presgraves 1987:8-9).

St. Helena’s churchyard has a corollary to the story of John Hart in St. Francisville. British officers Lieutenant William Calderwood and Ensign John Finley died in the American Revolutionary Battle of Port Royal Island on February 3, 1779. Captain Barnwell, a member of St. Helena’s, visited the battlefield the next day and retrieved their bodies. He buried the two and read the burial service. He is reputed to have said, “We have shown the British we not only can best them in battle, but that we can give them a Christian burial” (Hardy ND:3-4). A stone marker was erected several years ago.

The tree used to denote a life cut short appears in an interesting local variation with the marker for Citadel Cadet Hugh Toland Sams. Sams was killed in 1860 fighting a fire at the school (Presgraves and Presgraves 1987:13). He is remembered by a palmetto with the top cut off (Figure 6-6).

Figure 6-6. Lopped off palmetto. A life cut short, South Carolina style.
Another local adaptation of Victorian iconography is found on the marker to Ernest A. Scheper. The sheaf of wheat is often used to symbolize the Body of Christ. However, on Scheper’s scroll marker, a sheaf of rice was used: an acknowledgement of the importance of rice to the local economy (Figure 6-7).

![Figure 6-7  A sheaf of rice](image)

Outside of the south door of the church is a plaque honoring the thirty-three men of Beaufort killed in the Civil War. Following a listing of names and dates and locations of death is the inscription:

“The triumphs of might are transient, they pass and are forgotten, the Sufferings of right are graven deepest on the chronicle of nations.”

The people of St. Helena’s took the tolls of the War of Northern Aggression hard. Inscriptions on the monuments to those who died in the war differ from those found on most Victorian tombstones. War records are detailed; the sorrow of promising lives cut short is spilled. There is no attribution of God’s hand in the death. At Grace, only one burial memorializes a Confederate soldier killed in the conflict. The inscription merely
relates where he died. For St. Francisville veterans, standard tablets with the Confederate
Cross and regiment of the deceased are the only indication that a man fought in the war.
There are a few of these at St. Helena’s.

I chose St. Helena’s to compare with Grace because of similarities between the two
in history, demographics, economics and religion. Both are one of the earliest churches in
their area. Both congregations were involved in plantation agriculture and suffered
economically following Emancipation. Grace and St. Helena’s were both seriously
damaged during the Civil War, and damage to the structures was not completely repaired
for fifteen to twenty years. However, while the population of Grace remained in their
homes during the war, the congregants in Beaufort left. Burials occurred at Grace, not at
St. Helena’s. However, if the wealth and social importance of the congregants made them
more open to innovation, both churchyards should be dotted with Victorian monuments.
This was not the case.
RESULTS

My study was based on the analysis of Victorian elements in tombstones, particularly as found in Grace Episcopal Churchyard. I selected several type and iconographic “markers” to do this. The Victorian cemetery was characterized by the use of Classical Revival, Egyptian Revival and Gothic monuments. I selected tablets, Gothic tablets, obelisks, columns, beds, crosses, statues and urns, rock piles and scrolls as types to track. In light of an anomalous condition found at St. Helena’s Churchyard, I added variations of the ledger stone. This included any monument topped by a ledger stone: chest or box tombs, low monuments and ground level ledgers (Tables 7-1 and 7-2).

The category “Other” on both charts refers to monuments which do not fall into the above categories. These may include blocks, raised-top tombstones and wedges, which are more indicative of the transition period into the early twentieth century. Blocks are just that: thick blocks of stone generally wider than they are tall. Raised-top monuments are flat, rectangular stones which are placed horizontally on the ground, slightly raised above the surface. Wedges could be called short pulpits. The appearance is of a block of stone with a wedge removed from the top, front edge. Other categories lumped into “other” are shapes which appear in the two churchyards too infrequently to track. These include pulpits, vaults and trees. Many of the monument types and much of the iconography discussed under Victorian tombstones are illustrated with examples from Grace, St. John’s and St. Helena’s.

The Beaufort Anomaly

Although St. Helena’s in Beaufort originally appeared to be a good match for Grace in St. Francisville, I discovered that Victorian elements were underrepresented in
Table 7-1. Types of monuments at Grace Episcopal Churchyard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TABLET</th>
<th>GOTHIC</th>
<th>OBELISK</th>
<th>COLUMN</th>
<th>BED</th>
<th>URN</th>
<th>CROSS</th>
<th>STATUE</th>
<th>LEDGER</th>
<th>ROCKS</th>
<th>SCROLL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Total 40.0% 11.3% 11.0% 1.9% 2.4% 0.9% 2.4% 2.2% 4.1% 1.9% 1.3% 20.6%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TABLET</th>
<th>GOTHIC</th>
<th>OBELISK</th>
<th>COLUMN</th>
<th>BED</th>
<th>URN</th>
<th>CROSS</th>
<th>STATUE</th>
<th>LEDGER</th>
<th>ROCKS</th>
<th>SCROLL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of TOTAL     | 38.1% | 26.8% | 2.6%  | 0.4%   | 1.5%  | 23.0% | 0.8% | 6.8% |

Table 7-2. Monument types at St. Helena's Episcopal Churchyard
that South Carolina churchyard. This should have presented little problem had the situation at Beaufort reflected that of nearby coastal towns. To find that upriver Louisiana Episcopalians had accepted Victorian elements in the cemetery before parishioners along the southern Atlantic seaboard had, would have been surprising, but interesting. However, cemeteries from the study period in both Charleston and Savannah exhibit Victoriana in all of its elegant glory. Could the rejection of Victorian architectural elements be a local anomaly? Monuments at St. Helena’s lacked the rich diversity found at Grace. While in both cemeteries tablets and gothic tablets predominated (51% at Grace, 65% at Helena’s), at St. Helena’s many of the other types found at Grace are absent or found only in small quantities. There are no columns, beds, rock piles or statues in St. Helena’s. Obelisks, urns, crosses and scrolls make up only 5.3% of the total Victorian period monuments.

Ledger based monuments represent only 4.1% of the monuments at Grace. All but four of these monuments occur in the early part of the period (prior to 1861). However, ledger based stones account for 23% of the monuments at St. Helena’s Churchyard (Table 7-3). Although transition, such as that at Grace, might be normal in the early part of the period under study, ledgers at St. Helena’s still occur with some frequency in the latter part of the period.

Did local preference determine cemetery architecture? Ruth Little (1998:15) writes that ledger stones in England, originally the monument of choice for the wealthy and elite during the Middle Ages, were placed into the church floor to mark the graves of the wealthy and high-born. The rise of a prosperous middle class after the Reformation meant that graves of the less elite in the churchyard could be marked. The ledger was the most
Table 7-3. Chronological comparison of ledgers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Stones</th>
<th>Grace Ledgers</th>
<th>St. Helena Ledgers</th>
<th>Total Stones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Total 4.1% 23.0%

popular monument. Little believes that the elite of North Carolina preferred ledgers, chest or box tombs and low monuments because of the style’s popularity in England. Some of these tombstones found in areas without stone were imported from England during the colonial period. According to Little, the ledger based monuments were popular in North Carolina until the Civil War when more fashionable Victorian styles became popular. If one translates this pattern to South Carolina, ledgers should have disappeared in the last half of the century. This change did not happen at Beaufort. Why?

I considered the possibility that the people of Beaufort might not have had access to the more elaborately carved Victorian monuments. Poorly skilled carvers and lack of
money were the two most likely reasons for that lack of access. I recorded makers’ marks on the tombstones in both Grace and St. Helena’s Churchyards. In St. Helena’s there were forty-three signed stones. All but two of these monuments are ledger based with no iconography. The Walkers and the Whites of Charleston figure prominently on the list of makers (Table 7-4). Were these monument makers incapable of producing Victorian styles and iconography?

The Walkers and the Whites were an extended family of accomplished stone carvers who were active in Charleston for over a century. On some of their work, the carver’s name is followed by the title “Sculpt” (Combe 1986:73-78, 112, 116, 130, 178; Little 1998:121, 195, 307). Monuments in Charleston signed by these carvers indicate that they were well qualified to produce Victorian iconography.

If the carvers furnishing ledger stone monuments were capable of producing Victorian style monuments, perhaps the choice was dictated by cost. If the end of the Civil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>W.T. WHITE</th>
<th>J. WHITE</th>
<th>M. WALKER</th>
<th>M. GANNON</th>
<th>E.R. WHITE</th>
<th>D.A. WALKER</th>
<th>F. CHEURX</th>
<th>J.A. PURCELL</th>
<th>MONTAL</th>
<th>BRONZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
War should have marked the change from ledgers to Victorian monuments, what happened? Why were planters in St. Francisville able to erect wonderful columns, obelisks and pedestals? I believe that the answer lies in the relative degree of financial recovery made by plantation owners in coastal South Carolina and in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana during Reconstruction.

Recovery after the Civil War was affected by the kind of slavery that had been practiced in an area (Harris 2001:3-5). Slavery was not homogenous. The rice grown in the coastal areas of South Carolina and Sea Island cotton were both labor intensive. The planters in these areas practiced task slavery. Slaves were given specific tasks. When the task was completed, a slave was free to work for him or herself. They hunted, manufactured goods, and raised plants and animals for food and for sale. After emancipation, returning planters and freed laborers had conflicting ideas of how wage labor should work. Former slaves completed their job and went home. Employers wanted a full day’s work for a day’s wages. Laborers accustomed to participating in a market economy were able to accumulate money and purchase small farms. Owning their own land made them less dependent on the wages received from the planters and, thus, an unreliable labor pool. In addition to contending with an unstable labor force, Beaufort area planters were dealing with land that had been abandoned for the period of the war. Rice planters struggled for decades to produce a profitable crop and did not fully recover until the end of the nineteenth century. Sea Island cotton planters never recovered (Harris 2001:9-26).

The experience in West Feliciana differed because a different type of slavery had been practiced. Cotton plantations along the Mississippi depended on gang labor. Slaves
worked all day, moving from one task to another. Slaves were given no opportunity to participate in the market. During Reconstruction, Louisiana planters turned to sharecropping and tenancy to produce a profitable crop. This arrangement, more profitable to the planter than his sharecroppers and tenants, assured that the planters near St. Francisville recovered more quickly than their counterparts near Beaufort (Harris 2001:38:49).

In short, the Beaufort economy was depressed until the end of the Victorian period, while the economy in Bayou Sara and St. Francisville grew, albeit slowly. The parishioners of St. Helena’s may have preferred ledger based monuments for the entire Victorian period or may have been unable to afford fashionable Victorian monuments after the Civil War. The parishioners at Grace clearly preferred Victorian monuments and started using them at least fifteen years before the Civil War. Reconstruction in West Feliciana Parish appears to have had no affect on the price of monuments erected during the last half of the nineteenth century.

Tablets are represented in both cemeteries fairly equally (40% at Grace to 38.1% at St. Helena’s). However, the more elegant gothic monuments represent only 11.3% of the monuments at Grace, but are 26.8% of the markers at St. Helena’s (Figure 7-5). Gothic elements are representative of the Revival movement popular in tombstone design of the mid 1800s. Possibly the Gothic monument was used at St. Helena’s Churchyard in place of more expensive monuments, such as obelisks, beds, columns, and urns.

**Iconography**

The iconography that I selected to study included the use of roses, wreaths and miscellaneous flowers, lambs and broken buds, crosses and acanthus leaves. Icons occur
Table 7-5. Comparison of Gothic tombstones at Grace and St. Helena’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Stones</th>
<th>Grace Tablets</th>
<th>Gothic Tablets</th>
<th>Total Stones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Gothic 11.3% 26.8%
% Tablet 40.0% 38.1%

on only 39% of the monuments at St. Helena (Table 7-6). With two exceptions, specified types were underrepresented on the monuments with iconography. Crosses began to appear following the Civil War. These are not the modified Maltese crosses found on monuments for Confederate veterans. Few of the Southern Crosses of Honor were found in St. Helena’s Churchyard. In addition, these Confederate States of America markers do not date from the Victorian period. The cross is symbolic of the redemption of Christians by Christ and central to the Victorian yearning for life after death. Comparisons made with cross icons at Grace Churchyard show that, like Victorian tombstone styles, the
Table 7-6. Chronological table of specified iconography at St. Helena’s Churchyard, Beaufort, South Carolina. Not all icons are depicted, and more than one icon may appear on the same monument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Stones</th>
<th>Total Icons</th>
<th>Broken Buds</th>
<th>Lambs</th>
<th>Rose</th>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Wreaths</th>
<th>Cross</th>
<th>Acanthus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parishioners at Grace began using this particular new iconography before their fellow Episcopalians in Beaufort (Table 7-7). The other Victorian icon found in St. Helena’s Churchyard is acanthus leaf in its various forms. The vegetation appears more frequently at St. Helena’s than at Grace, but, like the cross was accepted later (Figures 7-6 and 7-8).

**Icon Analysis at Grace**

Because so few of the St. Helena’s monuments have iconography, I chose to use only iconography found at Grace for further analysis (Table 7-8). Only icons which appear with some frequency in Grace will be analyzed here. Among those not included are doves, angels, gates, fingers and hands, the rising sun, and various forms of generic vegetation, although some of these will be discussed. The icons under study are broken buds, lambs,
Table 7-7. Dates and frequency of appearance of cross iconography at Grace and St. Helena’s Churchyards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total W/ Icons</th>
<th>Grace</th>
<th>Total W/ Icons</th>
<th>St. Helena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

roses, other types of flowers, wreaths, and acanthus leaves. Crosses and acanthus have already been discussed.

Broken buds and lambs are usually used to symbolize innocence and the untimely death of children and young adults (Jeane 1987:71; McKillop 1995:94-95; Smith 1987:96). To verify the broken bud’s association with early death in Grace, I selected the tombstones with the desired iconography and classified each by age and gender of the deceased (Table 7-9). The symbolism holds with two exceptions. The male and female adults with broken bud icons were 68 and 71 years old respectively.
Table 7-8. Chronological and type iconography at Grace Churchyard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>W/ Icons</th>
<th>Buds</th>
<th>Lambs</th>
<th>Roses</th>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Wreaths</th>
<th>Cross</th>
<th>Acanthus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>462</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-9. Comparison of rose/rosebud usage by age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Roses</th>
<th>Broken Buds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Adults</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Adults</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Juveniles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Juveniles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lambs, which represent the innocence of the young, may be three dimensional figures or inscribed into the stone (Jeane 1987:71; Smith 1987:99). An interesting pattern forms when one looks at the dates of the monuments with broken buds and/or lambs (Figure 7-1). Buds were more prevalent between 1846 and 1871. Lambs became popular in the last quarter of the century. It should be noted that the lamb and broken bud are on
the same monument in the period 1851-1855. Additionally, between 1855 and 1860, one of the broken buds noted appears with the lamb on a single stone. Unfortunately, the only other cemeteries for which I have detailed iconographic records either do not fall in the correct time frame or do not have a creditable sample of the two forms. It would be interesting to see if this pattern holds on a regional basis.

Floral iconography (not including the broken bud) also shows definite chronological patterning. At Grace, roses were popular for the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The distribution at Grace based on gender and age (Figure 7-9), reveals an interesting phenomenon. More men had roses on their markers than almost all other age and gender categories combined. I have no explanation, but would surmise that the monuments were selected by female relatives and reflect the purchaser’s rather than the recipient’s taste. According to Diana Combs, the association of the rose with the descending hand of God, the dove and other cemetery commemorative symbols was so strong that the rose’s use in other contexts is often mistaken for funerary art. Does a picture of a rose on the pillow of a sleeping child mean that he or she is dead? Is the portrait of a woman holding a rose commemorative art or merely a portrait? Is a rose just a
rose, or is it a symbol? The rose was one of the first floral icons to appear on North American tombstones and reinforces the concept of the cemetery being the garden of Heaven. Rose iconography is considered an element of the transition period between New England type monuments and the Victorian cemetery (Combs 1986:204-209). Therefore, its timing at Grace is typical. (At Grace, few of the tombstones prior to 1850 had iconography). However, beginning with the 1880s, the use of the rose was replaced by other varieties of flowers or mixed bouquets. Specifically, the lily, dogwood and morning glory are found in Grace. Particularly well done is a dahlia or zinnia type bloom found in mixed flower groupings by Enochs of Philadelphia (Figure 3-31). These groupings include roses, cabbage roses, lilies, tulips, daisies and a stephanotis-like bloom. Another early icon is the floral or foliage wreath. Use is not dependent on either age or gender. The garland or wreath is a Victorian motif without religious meaning (Jeane 1987:72). The wreath, like the rose, virtually vanishes after 1880 (Table 7-10).

Inscriptions

In addition to tomb shape and iconography, certain themes of inscriptions were common to the Victorian Era. I looked at the relative popularity of each as well as chronological patterning. Although other categories might also have been appropriate, I chose to examine those which referred to family ties, places of birth, religious themes, domestic themes and epitaphs which refer to reunion in Heaven (Table 7-11). Because inscriptions may cover many subjects, one monument may be represented under more than one category.

Family epitaphs usually take the form “Father of,” “Our Mother,” or “Beloved Wife of.” These epitaphs place the deceased in his proper place within the structure of the
family. Possibly the connection was also intended to imply the structure of the Heavenly family. For later family members, these epitaphs were aids in the process of remembrance. Today family epitaphs are the meat and drink of the genealogist.

Religious inscriptions are often found on tombstones (Jeane 1987:76). As this cemetery is a part of Grace Episcopal Church, the presence of Biblical quotations and religious rhetoric are hardly surprising. Some of these inscriptions also mention a future meeting with deceased family members in Heaven. Domestic themes occur on fewer monuments (Jeane 1987:77-78). Nevertheless, the subject is included on some tombstones. Given the intent of the domestic emphasis of the period, these inscriptions occur on monuments commemorating women. Some of these will be discussed
Table 7-11. Incidence of inscription types in Grace Churchyard chronologically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Origins</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Heavenly Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

later in connection with the consequences of the domestic obsession on type and iconography, as well as inscriptions.

What seemed to me an inordinate number of tombstones include the origin or birthplace of the deceased. This category was the third largest, missing second place by only four instances. Distance does not appear to be a factor. St. Francisville and towns within one hundred miles of it are mentioned as frequently as other states, which in turn are mentioned as often as foreign countries. Gender and age appear not to be factors in the presence or absence of this type of inscription. Local, national and foreign locations occur in all time periods.
At Home in Grace

Grace Churchyard echoes the domestic aspects of the Victorian Era cemetery in inscription, iconography and tombstone shape. The virtues of the mother as the central figure in the home, the moral center of nineteenth century life (Snyder1989:13), were celebrated on several tombstones. The inscription on the monument to Theresa Carmena praises her domestic skills (Figure 2.9). When Susan Hargadine died in 1855, her commemoration read:

Here lies a devoted wife and affectionate mother.  
Is not e'en death a gain to those whose life to God was given.  
Gladly to earth their eyes they close to open them in Heaven.

The need for assurance that death was not the end and that separated family members would meet again was expressed on many tombstones at Grace. When the twenty-six year old wife of J. L. Flynn died, his yearning was captured on her monument:

Tis hard to break the tender cord when love has bound the heart,  
Tis hard so hard to speak the words must we forever part,  
Dearest loved one we have laid then in the peaceful glorious embrace,  
but the memory will be cherished til I see thy heavenly face.

And on another stone is a similar message:

“When we leave this world of chances,  
When we leave this world of care,  
We will find our missing loved ones,  
In our Father’s mansion fair.”

The use of beds in Grace Churchyard places the cemetery well within the domestic confines of the American Victorian Era. Grace is unusual in, not only the large number of beds found there, but in the large number which commemorate adults. Beds of one kind or another are often used for children’s burials. However, some authors have used the Victorians’ reluctance to speak of adult bedrooms to symbolically segregate children’s
monument beds from adult markers. To them, children’s beds represent innocence. The unspoken connotation is that adults’ beds do not (Snyder 1992:16). However, adult monuments carrying the “bed” inscriptions, such as “Only Sleeping” or “At Rest,” fail to produce the same raised eyebrows. Out of thirteen beds at Grace, only five are for children. Of the others, six are for women, and two are for men. It is doubtful that the purchasers of these monuments associated the cemetery bed with eroticism.

Clasped hands, another Victorian symbol of parting and reunion (Jeane 1987:73; Smith 1987:99), are found on two monuments in Grace. The hands on the monument for James and Dorcas Howell (Figure 3-36), appear to be joining the two halves of their joint stone. The inscription on the other monument, for Philip Wittie, makes plain that the hands of husband and wife reach across the void to a time when they will be reunited:

To my loving husband
I shall know the loved one who has gone before,
And joyfully sweet will the meeting be,
When over the river.

In the Victorian mind, the cemetery was the garden of Heaven. Flowers were present as landscaping and in stone. Flower iconography has already been discussed. A particularly Victorian icon is the garden gate. The gate is usually interpreted as being the gate of Heaven (Jeane 1987:73). Sometimes the city of Jerusalem can be seen in the background, at other times the words “At Rest” or a dove hover over the open gate. Grace has only one monument with the garden gate. Unfortunately it was carved into a block of variegated marble and does not photograph well. Reflecting the analogy of God reaching down to pluck a “flower” from his garden (Jeane 1987:73) is the tombstone of Thomas Lawson—a hand reaching from the clouds to pick a bouquet of daffodils, roses, lily of the valley and tulips (Figure 3-30a).
Although this venue is not intended to present a definitive analysis of the demographics of the burials in Grace, a few interesting patterns surfaced in my fieldwork and research. Using information taken from tombstones to look at gender frequency in adult burials, some periods show a marked difference in male to female burials. Given the traditional wisdom that women died more frequently than men, the numbers in Table 7-12 are a little surprising. I looked through the burial records for explanations for the discrepancies. From the records, no particular cause of death should have struck one gender more than the other. Even the War appears to have had minimal effect on gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

221 172 393
based deaths. By inscription, only one burial obviously contains a war victim. Perhaps the more worldly life of men placed them at greater risk: the spread of disease, work-based accidents or violence. Table 7-13 looks at gender differences in death among children. Again being male appears to put a child at a disadvantage for survival. As little boys were not exposed to the same risk factors as men, the gender based difference in deaths is even more incomprehensible. These discrepancies may simply be the product of the general population having more males than females rather than a gender based propensity to death.

Figure 7-13. Burials by gender in children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Age at death is another cemetery demographic. However, looking at average age at death can be misleading. For example, averaging the age at death of an infant and an octogenarian could lead one to believe that most people died in their forties. A table

156
(Table 7-14) comparing the number of deaths by category (very young children, juveniles and adults) can be helpful in finding patterns of vulnerability. As used here, young children are five years old and under; juveniles are between six and seventeen. Adults are eighteen and older. The yellow fever epidemic of 1853 is readily evident in Table 7-14. Information on cause of death from the burial records offers no clue to the drastic jump in deaths in the five and under category for 1901-1905.

Table 7-14. Burials in Grace by age category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Juveniles</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-1835</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1850</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1855</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1860</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1870</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1875</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1880</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, even after months spent deciphering the burial records, the finished product is spotty. Some years have complete records, while for other years there are blank spaces. This can be due to fugitive inks, information never entered or illegible handwriting. In some instances one knows that the person on that line was buried in Grace,
but the name may be missing. Since not all people buried in Grace have tombstones, without a name, one cannot assume that any entry is represented in the data base of monuments. For that reason, I’ve not done any statistical analysis based on the burial records.

The records do reveal the causes of death in nineteenth century West Feliciana Parish. Of course yellow fever and consumption lead the list. Just looking at the entries in the record should have given the people of West Feliciana a hint for avoiding yellow fever. Of the forty-seven who died in 1853 and were buried from the church, thirty-three are listed as living in Bayou Sara. Bayou Sara was located in the marshy area along the Mississippi River. Only one victim lived in St. Francisville. In addition to yellow fever, cholera, typhoid and generic “fevers” also carried off the living.

Death in childbirth was not uncommon. Learning one was pregnant must have seemed a mixed blessing, given the number of women who did not survive the delivery. As late as the turn of the century, young women were still dying in childbirth. Young children died from “teething,” infantile cholera, or infantile fevers. In addition, children died of diphtheria and measles, as well as the diseases which carried off their elders.

As the practice of medicine improved during the century, less generic causes of death were listed in the burial record. Although the diseases were not new, the names are more familiar to the modern reader. By the last half of the nineteenth century, doctors were diagnosing stomach problems, kidney diseases, heart disease, pneumonia, cancer, dropsy, appendicitis and peritonitis, and apoplexy. Some people like eighty-five year old Louise Gids died simply of old age. Nineteenth century doctors were more willing than
modern ones to accept that death at an advanced age was not a disease, but the order of things.

Of course one didn’t have to get sick to die. At least ten people died from the effects of exploding steamboats. Six are buried in Grace. William Turnbull’s death by drowning was not uncommon in an area so dependent on the rivers and bayous. Adam Reed and Levi Blount committed suicide. Five year old Phoebe Ann Woodruff was burned to death. In 1890 a twenty-three year old was burned to death in a building. Industrial accidents occurred in the parish. E. B. Turner was killed in a mill explosion. In September of 1900, Decatur Barrow died in the explosion of a gin boiler. All of the above are buried in Grace Churchyard.

Bayou Sara was a rough and rowdy town. Violent deaths were not uncommon. The notation “killed” seems ambiguous. However, some entries are more explicit. Felix Henderson died of a gunshot wound. Mathias White was “shot by a Negro.” Van W. Matthews was killed by a pistol shot just three weeks before his infant son died from “congenital weakness.” William Dedon was “killed by his uncle.” Adonis Weydert was “accidentally shot in the brain by a Negro.” Edwin Judson was murdered. Norman Johnson was accidentally shot. William Winter was “shot at his own door.” Most of these victims of violence are buried in Grace.

In 1903, an unknown man was buried “outside the fence.” The accompanying notation says that he was found dying in an abandoned (cotton) gin house in Bayou Sara on December 8. Although some of the notation is illegible, the gist of the story is that in his pocket was found a steamboat ticket in the name of O’Leary for three day deck passage on the packet to Bayou Sara. The ticket had been purchased from the Labot Agency in St.
Louis. Although the person to notify in case of accident was given, there is no notation of the body being moved.

**The Enigmatic Enochs**

Unlike cars and computers, gravestones seldom bear the name of their makers. Carvers whose work was confined to a specific area did not need to advertise their skills in that way. Usually signatures appear on monuments shipped to another area or works of particular intricacy or beauty. In the cemeteries that I’ve recorded, signatures rarely appear on stones after 1900. Thus, the majority of tombstones in a cemetery are not signed. The churchyard at St. Helena’s had forty-three signed stones from between 1830 and 1910. St. Johns in Laurel Hill has nine signed out of twenty-three Victorian Era tombstones. Both of these ratios are relatively high. Grace Churchyard has only eighteen signed stones that fall within my date range (Table 7-15). Of these, eleven are signed “Enochs Phil’a.” Of the nine signed monuments at St. John’s, eight are signed by Enochs (Table 7-16). In the group of tombstone pieces which have been dislocated from what might have been either the St. Francisville Cemetery or disputed parts of Grace, there are two signatures. One of these is Enochs (1853); the other is Edward Jamison of Cincinnati (1855). As mentioned in an earlier chapter, Enochs monuments were also found in Innis and Baton Rouge, Louisiana, as well as in Woodville, Mississippi. This is an extremely large concentration of signed work by an out-of-state monument company. There are also unsigned stones at Magnolia and St. Stephens, as well as at Grace and St. Johns, which bear the appearance of Enochs’ work.

To understand how unusual the Enochs presence in Louisiana is, one must consider the times and the place. Plantation owners were the group most adversely affected by the
Table 7-15. Monument makers at Grace Episcopal Churchyard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enoch Rosebrough Kunsteed&amp;B Struther Barret Foy Snyder&amp;A</th>
<th>Phila</th>
<th>St. Louis</th>
<th>N.O.</th>
<th>Phila</th>
<th>N.O.</th>
<th>N.O.</th>
<th>Humbolt TN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-16. Monument makers at St. John’s Episcopal Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enoch Rosebrough Stroud Struther Barret</th>
<th>Phila</th>
<th>St. Louis</th>
<th>N.O.</th>
<th>Phila</th>
<th>N.O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil War. At least seven of the monuments at St. John’s and Grace were purchased during Reconstruction. In addition, some of the earliest monuments were probably purchased and erected around the time of the Civil War. Why did these particular people purchase from a northern firm? Had the business been in Louisiana long enough to have lost the stigma of being Northern?

While some of the work done by Enochs was exceptional, similar monuments were produced by Kursteedt and Bienvenu of New Orleans and Rosebrough of St. Louis. Not all of the signed Enochs’ monuments are elaborately carved. Some of these stones are simple tablets and ledgers with no iconography. Although I have not found manifests to determine the shipping charges to the port of Bayou Sara, common sense dictates that the trip from Philadelphia would be more costly than that from St. Louis or New Orleans.

Advertisements in local newspapers indicate that G. B. and E. Enochs were operating a “branch” in Bayou Sara at least from 1858 through 1871. The first instance of Enochs that I found was in the Pointe Coupee Democrat of December 18, 1858. The business is listed as a dealer in “Mausoleums, Monuments, Tombs, Head and Foot Stones, Garden Statuary &c. Corner of Ridge and Girard Ave. Phil ‘a. Branch at Baton Rouge and Bayou Sara.” Later advertisements indicate that that the firm had added iron railings to their stock. The advertisement in the January 3, 1870 Tri-Weekly Advocate, a Baton Rouge newspaper, directed purchasers that “all orders left with N. Piper, Baton Rouge will meet with prompt attention or by addressing G. B. and E. Enochs, Bayou Sara”

Unlike the case with N. Piper, where orders could be left, the ads indicate G. B. and E. Enochs had a physical presence in Bayou Sara. This is made clearer in The Bayou Sara Ledger of June 15, 1861. The Enochs advertisement reads:
“G. B. and E. Enoch’s thankful for their past patronage would again call the attention of those in want of either MAUSOLEUMS, MONUMENTS, TOMBS, HEAD OR FOOT STONES to their large variety just landed, MANUFACTURED in Philadelphia of Italian and American marble. To be seen at the old stand corner Commerce and Principal Streets opposite John H. Henshaw’s livery stable, Bayou Sara.”

By referring to the Sanborn maps and a survey map drawn by W. B. Smith in 1898, I can narrow the location to one of two buildings (Figure 7-2). Unfortunately, the buildings, like all of Bayou Sara were swept away by the Mississippi River.

According to census reports for 1850 through 1880, there were no Enoch’s in West Feliciana Parish. In fact, City Directories for the City of Philadelphia list home addresses for George B. Enoch’s from 1850 through 1895. Who would a potential purchaser see at Commerce and Principal Streets, Bayou Sara?

In a strange twist, the company whose monuments were so popular in South Louisiana left almost no evidence of their existence in the city of their main office. My surveys through Laurel Hill, West Laurel Hill, Woodlands, and various Episcopal churchyards in Philadelphia uncovered no signed Enoch’s monuments. Searches at the Library Company of Philadelphia and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania turned up only the listings in the city directories. Harvard C. Wood III, is a noted historian of the monument industry whose family’s monument company has been in business since 1855. Mr. Wood had never heard of Enoch’s. Were it not for the presence of the lovely monuments along the Mississippi River, one could almost believe that Enoch’s never existed.
Figure 7-2  1898 Survey map of Bayou Sara drawn by W.B. Smith, September 16, 1898. Red designates the two possible locations of G. B and E. Enochs. From Bayou Sara: 1900 – 1970, by Beulah de Veriere Smith Watts. Reprinted by permission of the publisher, Claitor’s Publishing Division, Inc.
A TALE OF TWO CHURCHYARDS

This study has become a textbook case of what can happen when you begin an investigation with preconceived ideas. In the best of all possible worlds, Grace and St. Helena’s Churchyards would have produced neat, straight forward data that definitively displayed simultaneous adoption of Victorian elements or a quantifiable time lag in acceptance. The data produced neither. In the end, the project became far more interesting because of, rather than in spite of, the anomalies and contradictions. The new questions raised encouraged me to look at the Victorian cemetery from a different angle. What, other than fashion, influenced the choice of cemetery monuments?

Stones So Witty as to Speak

The theoretical argument involving tombstone choice revolves around the motivation of tombstone purchasers. Were funerary structures purchased during the Victorian Era meant to honor the dead or to negotiate power for the living? I looked at several premises about monument use. Aubrey Cannon believed that cycles of elaboration drove changes in funerary behavior in Victorian England. That is, the lower classes imitated the upper classes, with the upper classes raising the standard ever higher until cost and taste drove the upper classes to adopt simpler behavior. This, in turn, was imitated by the middle and lower classes until all had abandoned elaborate behavior.

Opposed to that is the idea that how the dead are treated is a reflection of the prevailing view of death. Deetz and Dethlefsen advanced the premise that the changing iconography of tombstones reflected changes in Puritan society’s beliefs about the destination of the dead. This is much the same as Aries’ belief that how the body is treated is related to how culture relates to the emotional and spiritual aspects of death. In
the United States, tombstone iconography moved from death’s heads to winged cherubs or soul figures, to urn and willow and then to Victorian motifs and architecture. This path can be traced starting with the belief in Calvinist predestination to the belief that all were capable of achieving salvation. The former was represented by a skull—the body moldering in the ground. The latter was represented by the winged cherub or soul figure—the deceased’s soul winging its way to Heaven. Willows and urns introduced a less personalized remembrance out of which has grown Victorian and modern funeral customs. Carrying Deetz and Dethlefsen forward into the Victorian Era, one finds that changing iconography—flowers, crosses, angels and lambs—chronicle the beginning of the Victorian search for proof of an afterlife.

This same tenet can be followed through the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. Although I have not addressed the changing face of cemeteries in the early 1900s, the raised top and wedge tombstones found in the end transition period at Grace presage the early twentieth century distancing of death. As Aries pointed out, from the eighth century people have seen and acknowledged the natural connection between life and death. Although Victorians were uneasy about what lay ahead after death, they sought to reduce the emotional distance between the living and the dead. At least in the rural south, the sick were cared for at home and the dead remained there until the funeral. By the 1900s, population mobility, bureaucracy, and the growing involvement of the funeral industry began to work to distance the living from the dead. Death has become impersonal. People die in the hospital and their bodies are taken to a funeral home. Illness and death are hidden away. The face of the cemetery followed the changing face of death.
In the early twentieth century cemeteries became as impersonal as death (Jackson 1977:229-234).

Parker Pearson follows the belief that tombstone choice was driven by ambition. Tarlow says that choices were made from sentiment. In truth, most of the wealthier members of the Grace Churchyard population are commemorated by wonderful, expensive monuments. Parker Pearson would say that the Turnbulls and Barrows were negotiating power. Tarlow says that to assume that human beings are driven only by a desire for power is to discount their humanity. Did the rich spend more to commemorate their dead? Yes, because they could. Did the rest spend as much as they could to express love and loss? Yes, because emotionally they must. Death is an emotionally charged event. Under normal circumstances, the period of mourning is not a time for toting up the columns on the power or status balance sheet. This was certainly true for the Victorians who desperately wanted to be assured of an afterlife with their families and to know that they themselves would be remembered.

In an interesting twist, the Victorian tombstone is an ideal venue for illustrating Lewis Binford’s social persona: a Victorian tombstone identifies the person by name, family relationship, ancestry and age. In addition, there may be symbols celebrating the deceased’s membership in societal groups: a Masonic Lodge, Sons of the American Revolution and others. Virtues, afflictions, good deeds and religious propensity are honored. The more important the individual, the more aspects of his or her social persona are honored on the tombstone.

Given that the Victorians were going to do their best to commemorate the dead, why did they make the choices that they did? I believe that sentiment was the driving
force behind the purchase of a tombstone, but that fashion, cost, the prevailing view of
death and idiosyncratic decisions about what was appropriate determined the choice.

As we saw in Chapter 3, Victorians had a much wider choice of monuments and
iconography than did their ancestors. In chapter 7 I surmised that price might have had
something to do with the choice of ledgers in Beaufort so late in the period. However,
there were cheap fashionable choices other than ledgers. Unadorned tablet stones would
have been acceptable. The people of Beaufort chose the slightly more elaborate Gothic
tables 27% of the time as opposed to the people of St Francisville who chose the shape
only 11% of the time. Was the Gothic stone the poor man’s version of the other, more
expensive, monuments of the Victorian period? The numbers would appear to support
that hypothesis.

However, one is still left with that anomalous 23% of ledgers at St. Helena’s.
Perhaps the people of Beaufort preferred ledgers because of the increased space for
inscription. On some of these stones, the inscription runs from the top to the bottom.
Parents, grandparents, children, good works, charity and an account of their death —all
were catalogued. For example, one woman’s low monument reads:

Sacred to the Memory of...
Widow of... Daughter of...
Born in this parish...
Died there...
Her cup was full of earthly blessings,
Her heart of gratitude, her mouth of praise.
Of large benevolence and tender sympathy.
Prompt to kindness and devout in spirit.
It was her aim and her delight to do justly,
To love mercy and to work humbly with her God
In the faith and hope of the gospel
In communion of the church, In charity with all the world and
With blessings of children's children unto the third generation.
She rests from her labors after a pilgrimage of eighty three years.
Thankful in life, trustful in death.
She awaits in peace the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ

The ledger stone inscription for a young man reads:

Sacred to the memory of ...son of...
who departed this life in Beaumont
on the... of a disease contracted while
serving in Mexico with the Palmetto Regiment
of which corps he was a member.
Aged twenty years.
He was truthful, affectionate,
generous and brave; and his youth
which was freely offered for his country,
had given promise of a noble manhood.
He had felt the call of patriotism and of glory,
but ___ the first year___ was satisfied.
He passed into an honored grave.
Many warm and devoted friends
mourn his untimely end.

Unfortunately all of the long inscriptions occur before 1860. Those in the latter part of
the century are much shorter. Some are as brief as the name and the dates of birth and
death.

If cheaper, more fashionable monuments were available and the bereaved no
longer needed large spaces for inscriptions, I am left with only one reason for the choice
of ledger type stones: a need to cling to tradition. With all of the economic and social
changes foist on the people of post-bellum Beaufort, did they choose to cling to the old
and familiar when burying their dead?

The story at Grace Churchyard was very different. By the beginning of the Civil
War, thirty-one obelisks had already been erected in the churchyard. There were also five
columns and four beds. As the century closed, the cemetery was already exhibiting the
community’s readiness to accept new ideas. Beginning in the 1890s, raised top and
wedge markers, the next wave of mortuary architecture, were being used.
From the late eighteenth century, West Feliciana had, not only the culture and wealth to desire and acquire the latest fashions, but a convenient place to do so. The port of Bayou Sara served not only Feliciana, but also west central Mississippi and much the territory of the western district of West Florida. Customers were wealthy and sophisticated. The town of Bayou Sara had factors as well as several mercantile establishments.

**Grace and the Enoch Phenomenon**

In addition, Bayou Sara had a direct source for the most fashionable in monuments: Enoch of Philadelphia. Some of the most beautiful as well as some of the plainest monuments in Grace are signed Enoch. The last of their signed work along the Mississippi is a tablet with columns dated 1887 in Magnolia Cemetery in Baton Rouge. Enoch Enoch disappeared from the Philadelphia City Directory in the 1860s. He last appeared in the census of 1870 in Montgomery County, a suburb to Philadelphia, where he was classified as a marble cutter. Andrew Enoch worked with the firm until his death in the late 1870s. The last listing for an Enoch classified as a cutter—George B.—is in the Philadelphia City Directory of 1900. What appears to be a family business died with the last marble working Enoch.

Why Enoch chose Bayou Sara in particular as the location for its branch remains a mystery. Who represented George B. and Enoch Enoch at Principal and Commerce Streets is also a mystery. However, I intend to continue to investigate the enigmatic Enoch.
Summary

I’d like to refer back to my original research questions from Chapter 1 and summarize my findings. I intended to look at how Victorian ideas from England and/or the northeastern United States were accepted in the South. By tracking the dates of the appearance of specified Victorian elements in the churchyard, I hoped to show either fairly simultaneous acceptance or a quantifiable time lag between the elements’ appearance in Beaufort and their appearance in St. Francisville. Neither hypothesis was proved. Victorian elements appeared at Grace in St. Francisville, Louisiana, well before the Civil War. However, aside from a slightly elevated number of Gothic tablets, Victorian funerary architecture and iconography do not appear in appreciable quantities in St. Helena’s Churchyard during the period of 1830 to 1910. Since cemeteries in nearby Charleston and Savannah do have Victorian monuments, the early acceptance at St. Francisville may or may not be significant. A study dating Victorian cemetery architecture in other locations along the Atlantic Seaboard might establish a more meaningful chronological sequence. Distance certainly had an effect in other localities (Francaviglia 1971:502).

I wondered if one could assume that the acceptance of Victorian styles and shapes was universal or if local preference limited Victorian monument use. The findings at St. Helena’s indicate that, at least in this instance, one can not assume that Victorian monuments were universally accepted. It would be interesting to look at type surveys of other cemeteries. Is Beaufort truly unique?

If local preference limited the use of types, did it also favor specified markets? I tracked market preference using signed stones. In Beaufort the majority of trackable
stones were manufactured in Charleston, South Carolina. Exceptions were two White Bronze monuments from the Monumental Bronze Company of Bridgeport, Connecticut. In addition, there was a third White Bronze marker that was unsigned. For whatever reason, the people of Beaufort shopped locally. The situation was different in St, Francisville. Signed monuments in Grace were purchased from several firms in New Orleans as well as from St. Louis, Philadelphia and Humbolt, Tennessee. The majority of these signed stones are from Enochs of Philadelphia. The firm must have had a favored market position. The presence of a local branch would surely be an inducement to use Enochs’. However, my understanding of how the early monument business worked leads me to believe that only standard forms such as tablets, ledgers, and obelisks would be stocked locally. The other, more elaborate pieces were ordered especially from Philadelphia. Similar pieces were available from Kursteedt and Bienvenu in New Orleans and Rosebrough in St. Louis. Surely shipping from Philadelphia would be more than from either of the firms on the Mississippi River. Which came first, the Enochs physical presence in Bayou Sara or the firm’s participation in the area’s market for elaborate funerary pieces? Did Enochs move to Bayou Sara because the firm already had a customer base there?

What factors influenced the type of monument chosen? I decided that the determining factors in tombstone choice were fashion, cost, the prevailing view of death and idiosyncratic decisions about what was appropriate. Victorian funerary architecture, iconography and inscriptions were largely determined by the fears of nineteenth century people that death was the end. Inscriptions and iconography assured the bereaved that their loved ones had gone to Heaven and would be waiting in a Heavenly home for
reunion with the family. The use of beautiful cemeteries and monuments masked the
horrors of death and led to the phrase “beautiful death” for the Era. The other factors fall
within that broad classification. Cost and availability determined which of the many
types of monuments could be bought. Local and personal preferences determined which,
if any, of the available monuments would be bought.

Conclusion

A look at churchyards in Beaufort and St. Francisville indicates that, presented
with a cornucopia of monuments in all price ranges and styles, people in different
localities did not make the same choices. In the churchyard of St. Helena in Beaufort, the
bereaved chose to maintain tradition. In Grace Churchyard in St. Francisville, the
bereaved chose to be innovative. These choices had little to do with the rate of spread of
Victorian ideas. Both localities had equal access to monuments with the specified
elements. The price variation for different types of Victorian tombstones meant that, if
one could afford a tombstone, one could afford a Victorian one. Inscriptions, if not
tombstone styles, in both cemeteries emphasize the same beliefs about death. Inscriptions
in both also place importance on the home and women as the center of the home.

In the end, in these two churchyards, choices were made for different reasons.
The people of St. Helena’s based their selection on what was considered appropriate to
the time and the place. The people of Grace chose to follow fashion. If the monuments of
other Victorian churchyard cemeteries were analyzed, I believe that one would find that
each is unique in both content and motivation.
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APPENDIX A
FIELD SKETCHES OF MONUMENT TYPES
FOR FIELD WORK

Headstones

Tablet

Gothic

Pediment

Block

Columns

Plain

With Urn

With Draped Urn

Broken
**Ledger Based**

Ground Ledger  Chest Tomb  Low Monument  Table Tomb

---

**Obelisks**  *(Each type can have an urn, draped urn or cross on top)*

Gothic  Pyramid  Gable  Rounded

---

**Pulpit**  **Cross**

Celtic  Latin
Mausoleums

Gothic Revival

Classical Revival

Egyptian Revival
APPENDIX B
GRACE CEMETERY RECORD

On sheet for first burial in section, sketch section below:

[1] Section #

[2] Boundary (1) Stone Border (2) Fence (3) Brick Wall (4) Cement Floor
    (5) Gravel Floor (6) Grouping (7) None (8) Other
    (9) Granite (10) Concrete (11) Vegetation


   COLUMNS (13) Plain Column (31) Column w/ Urn (32) Column w/ draped urn
   (33) Broken Column
   OBELISK (28) Gothic Obelisk (29) Pyramid Obelisk (6) Gable Obelisk
   (34) Rounded Obelisk (35) Gothic w/ urn (36) Rounded w/ urn
   (37) Pyramid w/ urn (42) Gable w/ urn (37) Gothic w/ draped urn
   (43) Pyramid w/ draped urn (44) Gable w/ draped urn (45) Rounded w/ cross
   (46) Pyramid w/ cross (47) Gable w/ cross (48) Gothic w/ cross
   MAUSOLEA (21) Gothic Rev. Mausoleum (22) Classical Mausoleum
   (24) Egyptian Rev. Mausoleum
   VAULT TYPE (5) Vault (23) Low Monument (30) Table Tomb
   (49) Chest Tomb
   MISCELLANEOUS (3) Pulpit (4) Cross (10) Statue (14) Scroll (15) Urn (16) Tree
   (19) Headstone w/ Curb (20) Pedestal & Canopy (26) Rock (27) Heart

   (5) Concrete (6) Unknown (7) Other

[10] Marker Maker

[11] Orientation of Inscription (1) Faces North (2) Faces South (3) Faces East
    (4) Faces West (5) Faces both North & South (6) Faces East & West
    (7) Unknown (8) Other

[12] Footstone (1) Yes (2) No

[13] Footstone Placement (1) Unattached w/ this marker (2) no marker (3) normal

[14] Footstone Remarks

[15] Interment (1) Mausoleum (2) Below Ground (3) Slab (4) Sarcophagus (5) None

[16] Burial Type (1) Individual (2) Multiple (3) None

[17] Individual's Last Name

[18] First, Middle and Maiden

[19] Date of Death (from stone)

[20] Age (calculated)

[21] Date of Birth

[22] Age Category (1) Adult (18 & Up) (2) Sub-adult (12-17) (3) Child (0-11)

[23] Familial Epitaph (1) Wife of (2) Husband of (3) Son of
    (4) Daughter of (5) Mother (6) Father (7) Uncle (8) Aunt
[27] Epitaph

[28] Language of Inscription (1) English (2) French (3) Spanish (4) German
(5) Hebrew (6) Russian (7) Yiddish (8) Latin (9) Hungarian
(10) Mixed (11) No Inscription (name only) (12) Other

[29] Facing main marker inscriptions of husband & wife buried side by side:
(1) Woman on left (2) Man on left (3) Other (4) N/A

[30] Text Location by Gender on one stone (1) Male above (2) Female above
(3) Side by Side (4) Multiple mixed (5) N/A

[31] Main decoration technique (1) Carved (2) Inscribed (3) None (5) Other

[32] Motif (circle if one is major)
FLOWERS (5) Rose (6) Broken Buds (7) Lilies (8) Morning glories
(9) Daffodils (48) Dogwood (4 petals) (10) Flowers, Other
VEGETATION (11) Tree Stump (12) Tree, Willow (13) Oak Leaf (14) Acorns (15) Ivy (16) Ferns (17) Grapes (22) Wreath (51) Grape Leaves (60) Acanthus (61)
Unknown leaves
RELIGIOUS (1) Lamb (3D) (2) Lamb (inscribed) (3) Dove (3D)
(4) Dove (inscription) (18) Cross (19) Bible (20) Crown (21) Rising Sun
(22) Angel (24) Cherub (25) Finger Pointing to Heaven (26) Menorah (27) Harp
(28) Religious Scene (29) Praying Hands (44) Virgin (55) Gate (62) IHIS
(64) Wings (66) Hand from Heaven (70) Serpent Swallowing Tail (71) Eye of God
(72) Heart
MILITARY (49) Confederate Cross (59) Service insignia
ORGANIZATIONS (39) Masonic (40) Eastern Star (53) DAR (58) WOW
(58) Odd Fellows
MISCELLANEOUS (30) 5-Pointed Star (31) 6-Pointed Star (33) Rings
(32) Clasped Hands (34) Scroll (35) Bow (36) Drapery (37) Rope
(38) Urn (43) Musical (45) Geometric (50) Coat of Arms (54) Fleur de Lis
(57) Shield (63) Banner (65) Chain (73) Candle (67) Greek Key Design
(69) Upside Down Torch (56) Anchor and Rope (46) None (47) Other

[35] Associated Burial
[36] Last Name

[37] First, Middle and Maiden Names

[38] Date of Death (from stone)

[39] Age (calculated)

[40] Date of Birth

[41] Age Category (1) Adult (18 & Up) (2) Sub-adult (12-17) (3) Child (0-11)

[42] Familial Epitaph (1) Wife of (2) Husband (3) Son of
(4) Daughter of (5) Mother (6) Father (7) Uncle (8) Aunt
(9) None (10) Other

[43] Place of Origin

[45] Comments

[46] Epitaph
### APPENDIX C
#### ST. HELENA'S RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grave #</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker Shape</td>
<td>HEADSTONE (1) Block (2) Gothic (7) Tablet (25) Pediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLUMNS (13) Plain Column (31) Column W/ Urn (32) Column w/ draped urn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33) Broken Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBELISK (3) Gothic Obelisk (29) Pyramid Obelisk (6) Gable Obelisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34) Rounded Obelisk (35) Gothic w/ urn (36) Rounded w/ urn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40) Pyramid w/ urn (42) Gable w/ urn (37) Gothic w/ draped urn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43) Pyramid w/ draped urn (44) Gable w/ draped urn (45) Rounded w/ cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46) Pyramid w/ cross (47) Gable w/ cross (48) Gothic w/ cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAUSOLEA (21) Gothic Rev. Mausoleum (22) Classical Mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24) Egypt. Rev. Mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vault Type</td>
<td>VAULT TYPE (5) Vault (23) Low Monument (30) Table Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49) Chest Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS (3) Pulpit (4) Cross (10) Statue (14) Scroll (15) Urn (16) Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) Raised-top (9) Wedge (11) Bed (12) Lawn (17) Ledger Stone (18) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19) Headstone w/Curb (20) Pedestal &amp; Canopy (26) Rock (27) Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50) House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker Material</td>
<td>(1) Granite (2) Marble (3) Limestone (4) Sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Concrete (6) Unknown (7) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interment</td>
<td>(1) Mausoleum (2) Below Ground (3) Slab (4) Sarcophagus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial Type</td>
<td>(1) Individual (2) Multiple (3) None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle one)</td>
<td>Female Male Both Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Death</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from stone)</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category</td>
<td>(1) Adult (18 &amp; Up) (2) Sub-adult (12-17) (3) Child (0-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial Epitaph</td>
<td>(1) Wife of (2) Husband of (3) Son of (4) Daughter of (5) Mother (6) Father (7) Uncle (8) Aunt (9) None (10) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitaph</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Decoration Technique</td>
<td>(1) Carved (2) Inscribed (3) None (5) Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[32] Motif (circle if one is major)</th>
<th>189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLOWERS (5) Rose</td>
<td>(7) Lilies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Broken Buds</td>
<td>(8) Morning glories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Daffodils</td>
<td>(48) Dogwood (4 petals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Flowers, Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGETATION (11) Tree Stump</td>
<td>(12) Tree, Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Acorns</td>
<td>(13) Oak Leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Grapes</td>
<td>(15) Ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Wreath</td>
<td>(16) Ferns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Hand from Heaven</td>
<td>(51) Grape Leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60) Acanthus</td>
<td>(61) Unknown leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGIOUS (1) Lamb (3D)</td>
<td>(2) Lamb (inscribed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Dove (inscribed)</td>
<td>(18) Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Crown</td>
<td>(19) Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Cherub</td>
<td>(23) Angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Finger Pointing to Heaven</td>
<td>(29) Praying Hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(66) Hand from Heaven</td>
<td>(26) Menorah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64) Wings</td>
<td>(27) Harp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55) Gate</td>
<td>(28) Religious Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71) eye of God</td>
<td>(44) Virgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70) Serpent swallowing tail</td>
<td>(64) Wings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY (49) Confederate Cross</td>
<td>(59) Service insignia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONS (39) Masonic</td>
<td>(40) Eastern Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58) WOW</td>
<td>(53) DAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67) Odd Fellows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS (30) 5-Pointed Star</td>
<td>(31) 6-Pointed Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Clasped Hands</td>
<td>(33) Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36) Drapery</td>
<td>(34) Scroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43) Musical</td>
<td>(35) Bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) Fleur de Lis</td>
<td>(37) Rope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47) Other</td>
<td>(38) Urn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65) Chain</td>
<td>(45) Geometric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56) Anchor &amp; Rope</td>
<td>(50) Coat of Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63) Banner/Ribbon</td>
<td>(57) Shield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(69) Upside down torch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35] Associated Burial</td>
<td>Female Male Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[38] Date of Death (from stone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[40] Date of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[41] Age Category (1) Adult (18 &amp; Up) (2) Sub-adult (12-17) (3) Child (0-11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42] Familial Epitaph (1) Wife of (2) Husband (3) Son of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Daughter of (5) Mother (6) Father (7) Uncle (8) Aunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) None (10) Other (11) Child/Infant of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[43] Place of Origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[45] Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[46] Epitaph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Put any other associated burials on another form, marking both sheets with same grave # and noting that there is more than one sheet.
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July 8, 2003

Dear Pat Colquette,

As publisher and copyright holder of *Bayou Sara, 1900-1975, Then and Now*, we hereby grant you permission to reproduce the map contained herein for educational purposes.

The only request is that you give proper credit to the Author and publisher where necessary.
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Sincerely,
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Anthony Cassard
Claitor’s Publishing Division
RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS DEPARTMENT
Fax: 516-873-1401    email: ttorretto@doverpublications.com
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On any publishing or craft project, you may use up to ten* illustrations from each of as many Dover Clip Art and Pictorial Archive books and CDs as you like without requesting permission and without the need for any paperwork. A project might be a poster, a greeting card, or series of greeting cards packaged together, each card is a separate design project, a sales brochure, an issue of a periodical, a book, a book jacket, *advertising copy*, web site etc. (*A few of our books—mostly coloring books—specify on the copyright page a number smaller than ten as the number of illustrations which may be taken from it for any one project.) The images may be reproduced by photocopy, scanner or photography (done professionally or by the customer) and may be altered if necessary.

For example, on a poster or web site you might want to use three illustrations from one Clip Art book, ten from another, six from a third etc. That would be perfectly OK with us. We make no distinction between projects which are commercial or non-commercial as long as you stay within the specified limit of illustrations from any one book, and we place no limitation on the number of copies of any project you may produce and sell. Please note all use is non-exclusive.

**Fee for use of over 10 illustrations from any one book or CD in any one project.** There is a fee of $5.00 per illustration above the initial ten from any one book for any commercial use. Please let us know how many illustrations will be used and we will send an invoice. Illustrations from our Coloring Books Series will be billed at $10.00 per illustration above the initial 4 or 6 allowable for any commercial purpose.

The statement on the copyright page: However, republication or reproduction of any illustration by any other graphic service whether it be in a book or in any other design resource is strictly prohibited, means that you cannot use our Clip Art or Pictorial Archive material to become a publisher of clip art or pictorial archive illustrations. You may use our material to illustrate any sort of project but you may not use them to create products which are collections of illustrations for sale to others whether these are books, software, rubber stamps or in any other medium. To do this requires a licensing agreement with Dover.

**Licensing fees:**

Software: We will be glad to put you in touch with Dover’s agent. Please address inquiry to address above. Do this only if your product will be a collection of illustrations for sale. You need not apply if you are scanning illustrations for your personal use.

Rubber stamps: There will be a one-time, flat fee for licensing non-exclusive use of Clip Art material for rubber stamps of $15.00 per image; $50.00 per alphabet or set of numbers. This permission is for the life of your product and we place no limitation on how many copies can be made or sold. You need not apply if you are producing stamps for your personal use. You may produce rubber stamps for use in embossing or decorating in greeting card production and then sell the greeting cards, but you may not sell the stamps themselves.

If you still have questions, please contact us concerning them. We would prefer to receive inquiries by e-mail or fax. See the address and fax number above.

Thanks for your interest in Dover books.

Sincerely,

Terri Torretto
Rights and Permissions
PUBLICATION PERMISSION CONTRACT

Please read the following terms and conditions before completing this form. Return completed form to the attention of Rights and Reproduction. Please remember to include payment.

Terms and Conditions

1. Credit Line shall read: The Library Company of Philadelphia. A credit line must appear next to each reproduction.

   Failure to credit properly may result in refusal to grant future permissions.

2. Permission is granted for one-time use only. The Library Company considers one-time use to be: the use of an item within a project where the format has not been altered and the original purpose for giving permission has not been changed. Material may not be reused without the written permission of the Library Company.

3. The reproduction fee is listed on the reverse as well as on the accompanying invoice. Payment in advance is required. Permission to publish is contingent on the receipt of this fee unless waived in writing on the reverse of this form.

4. The Library Company requires 1 reference copy of the publication containing the item(s) reproduced. It is not necessary to provide a copy of the publication if the following space has been initialed. ☑️

5. This completed form will serve as official permission to reproduce Library Company materials. The Library Company does not, however, claim to own the rights of reproduction for all materials in its collections. The publishing party assumes all responsibility for clearing reproduction rights and for any infringement of the US Copyright Code.
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Marian Patricia Holt Colquette was born in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1946. Because of her father’s job, she lived in ten towns and attended twelve different schools before graduating from high school. After one year at Louisiana State University, the author married and raised two children, Shari Noelle Colquette and Trevor Holt Colquette.

In 1991 Pat returned to Louisiana State University and earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in history, graduating magna cum laude in 1998. In 1999 she entered the master’s program in anthropology with an interest in archaeology and indulged a lifelong passion for cemeteries. She presented a paper at the Southern Anthropological Society in Baton Rouge in 2003. Following graduation, she will continue her research on cemeteries.

In 2002 Pat retired from Lucent Technologies after working for them, as Western Electric, A T & T and Lucent Technologies, for twenty-six years. She is enjoying her leisure, cemeteries and her four grandchildren.