Meeting One's Maker: Commemoration and Consumer Choice in York Cemetery

Two Volumes, Volume One

Susan Buckham

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

York University

Department of Archaeology

October 2000

ABSTRACT

The thesis presents an analysis of Victorian memorials within a self-contained case study of York Cemetery. As one of the first major archaeological investigations of a modern cemetery, this research offers an evaluation of their potential as evidenced by both the material and documentary records. The study provides a methodological and theoretical structure to examine, classify, and interpret Victorian Gravestones as a specific type of archaeological data. A headstone typology is created and applied to the memorial sample to investigate the interaction between consumer-producer relations and memorial design. The interpretation of the memorial survey's results is informed by consumer choice theory. This framework illustrates that by uniting the spheres of memorial production and consumption it is possible to reveal how objects become part of peoples' lives. The wider social processes involved within the production and purchase of memorials in Victorian York are explored through a series of contextual frameworks. The contexts for analysis include the consideration of nineteenth century cemeteries as a specific type of burial landscape, commemoration as social practice, and the ways in which information concerning memorial design were transmitted. The thesis concludes by considering an agenda for the future study of Victorian memorial design.

Contents

VOLUME ONE

Abstract
List of Figures
List of Charts
List of Tables
List of Drawings
List of Plates
List of Maps
Acknowledgements

Chapter One: Theoretical Background to study: Academic Context, Literature Review and Research Agenda

Chapter Two: The Historical, Cultural, and Archaeological Contexts of York Cemetery

Chapter Three: Refining Recording Techniques, Methods of Analysis, and Research Questions

Chapter Six: Conclusion

VOLUME TWO

List of Figures

VOLUME TWO

List of Plates

VOLUME TWO

List of Charts

VOLUME TWO

List of Tables
VOLUME TWO

List of Drawings
VOLUME TWO
Drawings prepared by Peter Gouldsborough

List of Maps
VOLUME TWO

Acknowledgements

The quality of this research has been immeasurably assisted by the generous support provided by Hugh Murray, David Poole, and the York Cemetery Trust. Hugh's kindness at allowing me free access to his personal research archive cannot be thanked enough. Thanks must also be made to David Poole for providing me with the results of his stonemasons' signature survey and to the York Cemetery Trust for allowing me to reproduce images from the York Cemetery Company's memorial pattern book (Figures 15 & 16) and for providing an electronic copy of the York Cemetery Company's burial registers. Dr Julie Rugg generously allowed me access to her doctoral archive. Julie's support and encouragement has provided me with many insights into, and an abiding enthusiasm for, nineteenth-century cemeteries. Chris Shires, Julie's husband, is also thanked for the patience and endurance he has shown through the many cemetery discussions he has been unable to escape.

Several archives and research libraries were consulted during this research. The staff at the York City Archives cannot be thanked enough for their assistance with the York Cemetery Company's business record archive and for permission to reproduce images from the York Cemetery Company's pattern book. Special gratitude is expressed for their kindness at reproducing this pattern book in its entire for the purposes of this study. Invaluable assistance was also received from the staff at the York City Reference Library, the York Minster Library and the British Library. The staff at the York Minster Stone Yard are also thanked for sharing their expertise on the subject of stone carving.

Finally, a huge debt of thanks must be paid to my friends and family who have shown the patience, humour, and encouragement above and beyond the call of duty. In particular I would like to thank Hen, Catherine, Alice, and Vicki and Jeff. My parents have furnished me with numerous pieces of equipment (special thanks for the camera and computer!) but it was their unswaying belief in me that showed the'r true support. Thanks are also made to my sisters for the surprisingly few puns they made concerning the subject of my research. I would also like to pay thanks to

my colleagues at the Council for Scottish Archaeology, and in particular the Director, David Lynn for his proof-reading services. Finally, thanks to Gareth for counting to five thousand.

Author's Declaration

The research presented in this thesis is the work of the author. A preliminary consideration of the York Cemetery Company's pattern book and the memorials in York Cemetery has been published elsewhere (Buckham 1999). Results from this paper have been extensively revised and developed within the present study and represent original research.

This Thesis is Dedicated to

Julie Rugg

and to the

Memory of My Grandmother

Annie Buckham

born April 1 1913

died February 28 2000

who was my familiar past

CHAPTER ONE: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND TO STUDY: ACADEMIC CONTEXT, LITERATURE REVIEW, AND RESEARCH AGENDA

1.0 Introduction to Research

This research studies the material culture of death in order to explore past lives. The objective of this thesis is to provide both a methodological and theoretical approach to recover and analyse the range of consumer choices for memorialisation in York Cemetery. Particular reference is paid to how the production and consumption of memorials interacts with the social context of York Cemetery. Research will create and test a typology for the analysis of Victorian gravestones and explore the archaeological potential of nineteenth-century cemeteries. The Victorian era is a known and documented period, within which both short-term changes and long-term trends can be identified. An emphasis is placed upon cultural contextualization, since the ways in which individuals understood and related to their world affected how they chose to commemorate death.

Death is universal. The study of its manner, management, and meaning has been conducted within numerous disciplines including history, the social sciences, art, and architecture (Panofsky 1964; Curl 1972; Ariès 1974; 1983; Shibles 1974; Gittings 1984; Metcalf & Huntington 1991; D. Clark ed. 1993). Indeed over the last twenty years the scope of research (Kearl 1989; Pardo 1989˙ Llewellyn 1991; Walter 1992; Wells 1994) has removed the study of death from its former status as the 'last great social taboo'. As a result of this transformation there is a wide prospective audience for an academic study of death. A multi-disciplinary approach, however, can be problematic. Different disciplines may not only ask different questions, but also have their own part cular approaches to recover answers. This has been acutely observed by Asa Berger's discussion of how scholars from different academic disciplines may variously 'read' a McDonald's hamburger, French fries and milkshake as

34

material culture (Berger 1992). In attempting to adopt approaches from more than one academic field, there is a danger that the material will not be addressed to the satisfaction of any one position. This thesis adopts a primarily archaeological approach but it acknowledges a debt to gravestone research and associated mortuary studies carried out within other disciplines.

The specific archaeological context that frames this research is the study of the later historical period. In Britain, research on this period has generally been conducted within the subcategory of 'post-medieval archaeology', while in North America studies have been carried out under the heading 'historical archaeology'. Although the 'archaeology of death' may initially appear as a more appropriate academic context, this framework was rejected for two reasons. Firstly, this thesis prioritises an understanding of gravestones as historic artefacts; but the theoretical and methodological approaches of mortuary archaeology have overwhelmingly been constructed for, and applied to, prehistoric data (J. Brown ed. 1971; Chapman, Kinnes & Randsborg eds. 1981). This is problematic because, as Little (1994,12) has pointed out, to adopt the same language, models and research questions as prehistory encourages historical data to lend itself as a testing ground for prehistoric models and concepts. In such circumstances the validity of historical investigation on its own merit is in danger of being negated. Moreover, any potential innovations in theories and methods applied to historical evidence may be tempered by the abstract quality of data that prehi t ric contexts can be expected to yield. In short, this thesis considers that the study of Victorian memorials is most suitably approached within an academic framework where the historical particularity of data can be contextualised, and an implicit prehistoric-centred tendency within wider archaeological practice challenged.

The second reason that the archaeology of death is considered an unsuitable framework for analysis is a simple preference of perspective. In the same way that a glass may be half empty or half full, an understanding

of society can be approached from perspectives which argue that life underpins death, or conversely, that death underpins life. This research concurs with the former perspective, and places a primary emphasis upon gravestones as commodities that are associated with practices of everyday life, such as shopping. The social ideologies and behaviour surrounding the production and consumption of goods is a major research theme within historical archaeology (Paynter 1988; Stewart-Abernathy 1992). The production and purchase of gravestones will be examined in this case study using an interpretative framework of consumer choice theory, an approach which has previously been applied to historical archaeological data (Spencer Wood ed. 1987).

This chapter will first explore the implications of locating this study within the academic contexts of post-medieval archaeology and historical archaeology. While these traditions share common ground, they also have significant differences in practice. The discussion will then review the range of approaches, which have been previously employed to study gravestones. This chapter will conclude by setting out the theoretical approach and specific research agenda of this thesis.

1.1 Academic Context for Research
1.1.0 Introduction to Historical Archaeologies

The relationship between the sub-disciplines of North American historical archaeology and British post-medieval archaeology can ostensibly be easily defined; both study the m   rial culture of the later historical period but within different geographic parameters. Yet a growing number of British studies using historical data, including this thesis, have chosen to associate, if not locate, their work with the academic context of historical - rather - post-medieval - archaeology (Johnson 1993· 1996; A. Brooks 1997; Tarlow & West eds. 1999). This section will explore why this should be the case and the implications that such affiliations hold. A historiography tracing the emergence and development of practice is set out separately for historical archaeology in North America and

post-medieval archaeology in Britain. The concluding discussion considers how the approaches of historical and post-medieval archaeology can be most profitably integrated to develop British historical archaeological research. This study recognises the global nature of historical archaeology (Scott & Deetz 1990; Birmingham 1992; Pedrotto & Romero 1998), but discussion will examine only North American and British practice as these have been most instrumental in directing historical archaeological analysis at an international level (Orser 1999).

1.1.1. Historical Archaeology in North America: Anthropology with a History Book or History with a Spade?

The emergence of historical archaeology in North America can be attributed to three major influences: field excavation, the Historical Preservation Movement, and folk history. From the mid-1930s onward a number of historic sites were excavated, the most influential of which included J.C. Harrington's 1936 excavation of Jamestown, Virginia and his 1940s excavations at Fort Raleigh, North Carolina, and John Cotter's programme of urban rescue archaeology in Philadelphia during the 1950s (Cotter 1993; Orser & Fagan 1995, 23-32). Precedents for such excavations have been traced back to the 1796 British Boundary Commission's survey of St Croix River, Maine and James Hall's 1856 survey of Miles Standish House at Duxbury, Massachusetts (Cotter 1993, 4; Orser & Fagan 1995, 23; Deetz 1996, 38-41). The excavations at Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia fr m 1957 onward by the British archaeologist Ivor Noel Hume were particularly notable in directing the development of historical archaeology. Not only was the excavation methodology innovative in its stratigraphic artefact recovery and artefact based site chronology, but on the basis of this experience Noel Hume produced two of the seminal studies of early American historical archaeology: *Historical Archaeology* (1969), and *Guide to the Artefacts of Colonial America* (1970). The former became popular as a manual for field techniques, whilst the latter became a key research text for historic

material culture. Neither of these works was an attempt to synthesise theoretical approaches to excavation and interpretation, but as a body of work they indicated the potential of historical archaeology as a distinct discipline.

By 1953, *American Antiquity* had recognised a nascent field of archaeology that focused upon the more recent past and correspondingly its 'News and Notes' section included a summary of such work under the heading of 'Historic Sites' (Cotter 1993, 9). In 1955, J.C. Harrington produced 'Archaeology as an Auxiliary Science to American History' (later republished in 1978), subsequently described as a 'pioneer statement at a time when no one was listening' (Noel Hume 1969, 337). This paper, which developed issues raised by Fish as early as 1911, was significant as the first explicit attempt to identify historical archaeology, albeit in a role of 'handmaiden to history', as a separate discipline under the umbrella of archaeological practice. Over the next twenty years, several authors offered opinions as to how a known historical context and material culture analysis should be used together (Fontana 1965; Dethlefsen & Deetz 1966; Schuyler 1970; Deagan 1982). These largely considered historical archaeology in the role of 'filling in history's gaps' or using a historical framework as a control, whereby historical archaeology could be used to test the theories and methods employed in prehistoric, or anthropological, contexts. The validity of using historical archaeology as the 'handmaiden' to history or prehistory, however, was not fully questioned until considerably later (Deagan 1982; Beaudry ed. 1988; Little ed. 1992).

The concept of historical archaeology as a defined area of archaeological research was further articulated at the 1958 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association within a session entitled the 'Role of Archaeology in Historical Research'. Cotter has claimed that it was during this session that a prediction was first made that a society, with its own journal, would be formed dedicated to the study of historical archaeology (Cotter 1993, 9). In 1959 a group with such interests met at the Conference on Historic Site Archaeology (CHSA) and

these papers and subsequent meetings were published as CHSA annual proceedings (Cleland 1993, 29). A national body dedicated to the study of the historic past, the Society for Historical Archaeology was formed in 1967, fulfilling Cotter's prediction of ten years earlier.

The Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) represents North America's most influential and enduring platform for historical archaeological research. The SHA immediately recognised the importance of producing its own journal, yet there was significant debate to what form this should take, not least because of the controversy over the direction the discipline itself should follow. The latter debate mainly centred on the question of whether 'the historical archaeologist should be an historian with a spade or an anthropologist with a history book' (Dollar 1968: 4). These tensions, as Cleland (1993) has pointed out, were the result of both professional and theoretical schisms. At the time of the Society's foundation there were only a small number of practicing historical archaeologists. These members had largely been trained within humanities and history and their research followed normative or traditional culture history agendas that sought to recognise culture through artefact typologies and chronologies (for example, J.C. Harrington 1957; Noel Hume 1969; 1970; Jelks 1973). Yet with the founding of the Society for Historical Archaeology their pre-eminence was challenged as:

> 'the field was instantly overwhelmed with archaeologists trained in prehistory who for the most p rt knew precious little about documentary research or the artefacts which resulted from industrial processes. To make matters worse, most of the prehistorians were advocates of the "new archaeology"'. Cleland 1993, 13 (see also Noel Hume 1967).

The theoretical perspective of these 'new' or 'processual' archaeologists rejected the primacy of the historical context found within a normative approach, in favour of recovering cultural processes by means of

'scientific', theory-informed methodologies. 'New archaeology' was initially heralded by the publication of Binford and Binford's *New Perspectives in Archaeology* in 1968. This volume, which focused on prehistory, set out a manifesto for processual archaeology. Archaeological practice, it was argued, should first devise models for past societies, which then could be tested by hypotheses. In this way general laws of behaviour could be constructed to explain cultural process.

Processual archaeology was applied to historic data in the seminal studies of Stanley South (1977a; ed. 1977), who embraced this theoretical paradigm with the zeal of the newly converted:

'These contributors to this volume [*Research Strategies in Historical Archaeology*] are explorers; they are not merely *willing* to risk the insecurity of the nomothetic depths of the iceberg to delineate deep pattern - instead they feel that they must do so to fulfil the obligation and responsibility they have toward the development of archaeological science. They are not content to remain safely on the surface exploring the details of the particularistic tip knowing the depths of the pattern yet to be explored. They are not content merely to snorkel around on the surface intuitively recognising an occasional pattern, nor are they satisfied by an implicitly scientific shallow dive from time to time to bring up a percentage to make a point.' South 1977b: 11.

In 1977 South published his mo important work: *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology* within which he constructed a method for recognising 'artefact patterns'. Using data from several of his excavations of colonial sites in the Carolinas, South argued that households that shared a common cultural tradition would deposit the same kinds of artefacts in similar ratios. South sought to construct a universal law to predict which artefact distribution patterns would be produced by different site types, to enable him to make generalising statements about cultural behaviour based on his quantified data (South 1977a, 83-139). His

methodology quantified material culture by means of categorisation under headings of 'kitchen', 'bone', 'architectural', 'furniture', 'arms', 'clothing', 'personal', 'tobacco pipe' and 'activities'. Artefact patterns were constructed from a mathematical equation which took into account each category's percentage and ratio to the total assemblage.

South's research made several valuable contributions to the discipline of historical archaeology. His research encouraged both inter and intra site comparisons, and also recognised the potential of international comparisons (South 1977b, 2-4). His methodology, constructed specifically within, and for, the discipline of historical archaeology, provided a means for classifying and quantifying large quantities of data which had proved problematic in the past. Whilst South's research has influenced numerous subsequent (for example, King & Miller 1991), ultimately, South's rigorously - one could almost say vehemently - 'scientific' processualism has not stood the test of time. Beaudry *et al*, for example, have described South's method as: 'a battery of ahistorical, statistically derived patterns based on 'neutral' artefact groupings that in the long run have proved to be devoid of ethnographic import' (Beaudry, Cook & Mrozowski 1991, 175). Yet other studies, that were more broadly processual in nature and less dependant on the 'functional' reading of material culture, have fared better. In particular the merits of the 'historical structuralism' proposed by Henry Glassie and James Deetz, and the 'critical materialism' expounded by Mark Leone have been widely, though not entirely uncritically, appreciat d (Yentsch & Beaudry eds. 1992; Little 1994).

The 'historical structuralist' approach of the American folklorist Henry Glassie and the archaeologist James Deetz are central to any historiography of American historical archaeology (Orser & Fagan 1995, 190). In an historical structuralist approach objects are seen as 'meaningful things', with artefacts able therefore to be used to recover and interpret the covert ideologies, mentalities, and beliefs that ordered the human actions which formed the archaeological record (Deetz 1993,

41

35-6). This perspective was a distinct departure from a South-influenced processualist stance, where artefact interpretation was largely the by-product of quantified data. The broad processual influences within historical structuralism, implicit within Deetz's focus upon the material processes denoting cultural change, were more explicitly set out within Glassie's study:

'Structuralism is social scientific modernism. It is modernist in its concern with principled abstraction rather then particularist realism. The structuralist's interest is in process more than product, in hidden law more than manifest shape.'   Glassie 1975: 41.

The seminal study, *Folk Housing of Middle Virginia*, published by Glassie in 1975, used a case study of vernacular architecture in Virginia dating from the pre-Georgian and Georgian periods. Glassie composed an architectural grammar to show the range of choices available to individual builders when constructing a house. Using this grammar, Glassie demonstrated that individual builders consistently selected the same specific building options. This, he argued, was evidence of a deeply embedded cultural logic, a structuring ideology which he termed 'Georgianization" that governed the actions of everyday life' including house building. Glassie's work was highly innovative, since it provided both an idealist and a materialist analysis. To summarise briefly, an idealist approach views culture as being engendered by human thought, whilst a materialist approach sees culture as enacted by human interaction with the environment. Using the former approach some elements of social action cannot be predicted from a material basis. The latter approach, however, assumes that beliefs and ideology can be reconstructed from social behaviour such as economic, technological, nd material production. Glassie's research was important because it raised questions concerning the role of ideology and symbolism upon material culture. Yet

in many ways, Glassie's work is most notable for its influence upon the research of James Deetz (Deetz 1996: ix-xiii).

In 1977 Deetz published *In Small Things Forgotten*, which examined early colonial life in New England. Rather than examining one class of material culture like Glassie, Deetz discussed a range of everyday artefacts used by ordinary people - the 'small things forgotten'. Tombstones, ceramics, architecture, foodways, and music were all examined to study how the deeply embedded ideologies of 'Georgianization' connected to early colonial life.

Deetz examined his data over an extended time frame. Using evidence of dramatic material change, he was able to divide his chronology into three units that were correlated to the global diffusion of European culture. For example; until *c*.1680 Deetz saw 'English' culture as dominant. These cultural traits, however, were superseded from *c*.1680 by the emergence of a regionalist American folk tradition. After *c*.1760 this tradition was replaced in turn by a final cultural transformation and the 'Georgian' worldview became dominant. Deetz, like Glassie, saw deep structure as a grammar of rules that existed outside of social consciousness, that both organised and ordered society. Deetz used historical structuralism to look further than a technological explanation of change favoured by more 'scientific' processual approaches. For example, Deetz interpreted innovations in food processing as reflecting covert social thoughts. He argued that the change from hacked cuts to portion controlled and neatly sawn meat d noted an ideology that recognised the individual (Deetz 1996, 171). Deetz identified ideas of symmetry, logic, and individualism as central to the Georgian worldview and argued that this mindset operated at an international scale. Artefacts from one society, Deetz argued, would resemble those from another contemporary society because, although for historical reasons they inhabi ed different parts of the globe, they shared the same culture.

Deetz's primary innovation was to identify synchronised change across a variety of processes, such as the erection of buildings, the

commemoration of death, foodways and refuse disposal. Like Noel Hume, Deetz did much to popularise historical archaeology, but, importantly at the same time advanced its academic credentials. The enduring nature of Deetz's work can clearly be seen within the later generation of historical archaeologists (Yentsch & Beaudry eds. 1992). The primary limitation of the historical structuralism demonstrated by Deetz's and Glassie's research was an absence of a detailed examination of causality (Johnson 1993; Hodder 1982). Neither study addressed the question of why change happened when it did and in the way it did. As a result 'Georgianization' is simply presented as an unstoppable, and somehow inevitable, transformation, which is both outside human control and consciousness.

A further figure important to the development of historical archaeology is Mark Leone, whose 1973 study of Mormon fences as a strong example of 'critical materialism' (Orser and Fagan 1995,194-6). Leone's critical, or neo-Marxist, position adopts the position that all research is inherently subjective and either explicitly or implicitly influenced by the (class) interests of the individual researcher (Orser and Fagan 1995,194). His study of Mormon fences was loosely processual in the sense that Leone proposed that archaeology could be understood as a 'science of technology' and questioned the process by which technology could affect culture. However, Leone differed from South's functional-processual approach by recognising that technology could also be manipulated by culture. More importantly, Leone (1973: 149) recognised that archaeological inv stigation is not an objective 'scientific' process, but is 'a product of the present; it is used in the present'.

From the early 1980s, the processual 'new' archaeology was subject to an overwhelming critical revision that developed several of the themes raised by Leone and Deetz. In particular, strong criticisms were levelled against the claims to 'scientific' and political objectivity within processualist approaches (Hodder 1982; 1987a; 1991; Beaudry et al 1991; Shanks & Tilley 1994). These responses varied: indeed it may be argued that the strongest unity shown by post-processual research is simply an

opposition to what went before. This is amply demonstrated by the various labels used to identify post-processualist approaches, including: radical, critical, and structuration theories, and post- modernism, Neo-Marxism, contextual, symbolic, and gender archaeologies. It is not possible to consider in detail myriad post-processual approaches adopted by historical archaeology. However, a consensus of opinion concerning the limitations of processualism means that there are several common post-processual themes. These themes include: a consideration of the symbolic aspects of material culture (developing earlier historical structuralist research), the recognition of the artefact's active role in structuring social relations, and analysis that prioritises an understanding of both the individual and the disenfranchised group (a politicising of the discipline in light of critical materialism). Several reviews have examined the development and multiplicity of post-processual approaches, and have suggested coherence may be achieved through using linking frameworks for interpretation, such as capitalism (Paynter & McGuire 1991; Little 1994) and globalism (Falk ed. 1991; Orser 1996). This thesis discusses a selective summary of post- processual case studies to indicate the breadth of approaches and research themes addressed in current North American studies.

Leone (1984) developed his Marxist approach in a case study of William Paca's garden at Annapolis that examined the relationship between landscape and social order. Paca was a member of the Maryland social elite and signed the American Declaration of Independence. Leone interpreted garden features, such as the use of perspective, as metaphors for social relations. He viewed the garden as reflecting Paca's challenge to the legitimacy of Colonial rule, whilst at the same time consolidating his own social influence. Leone's Marxist approach saw ideology as a tool manipulated by the elite to mask inequalities within social relations and used to present the social order as a natural, and therefore, legitimate hierarchy. The formal garden settings situated close to the house, Leone argued, symbolised the power of man

over nature and therefore social order. This 'order' was challenged the further one travelled towards the estate boundaries, where the landscape became more 'naturalised'. A major drawback of Marxist theory, and thus Leone's approach, is that does not take into account the potential for disadvantaged groups to superimpose their own values onto the ideologies of the elite (Hodder 1991, 66-72; Paynter & McGuire 1991).

One example of a case study that has investigated marginalised groups as active rather than passive social entities is Mary Beaudry and Stephen Mrozowski's (1989) analysis of a nineteenth-century cotton mill in Lowell, Massachusetts. While the textual evidence relating to the site detailed the lives of the male mill owners, their thousand employees were entirely anonymous. This workforce did emerge with a group identity, however, from material evidence recovered during excavation. Account books, which initially appeared to be complete and comprehensive, detailed the foodstuffs provided by the mill owners to their workers, but bone and plant remains were found in the mill living quarters which represented food types not recorded in documentary sources. This discovery showed the active everyday consumer choices and food-related activities of the workers that were not recoverable from the written evidence alone. The recognition of the political nature of historical archaeology in North America has brought to the forefront of research the analysis of other once 'anonymous' groups (Singleton ed. 1985; McDonald *et al* 1991; Seifert 1991; Yentsch 1991a; Ferguson 1992):

> 'The adequate treatment of the disenfranchised groups of America's past, excluded from historical sources because of race, religion, isolation or poverty, is an important function of contemporary historical archaeology and one that cannot be ignored.' Deagan 1982
> (cited in Orser & Fagan 1995: 199)

In contrast to the above studies of group identity, Shackel's 1993 study of Annapolis, Maryland focused upon the correlation between the

individual, ideology, and material culture. This research examined the effects of capitalism and colonialism upon personal discipline. Shackel used both material culture and documentary sources to identify long-term shifts in patterns of consumption and production. These transformations were then correlated to changing social ideologies and relations, most famously by Shackel's analysis of the toothbrush. In Britain during the early nineteenth-century, the manufacture of the toothbrush became standardised. Machine technology and precision replaced manual artisan skill to locate and pack bristle holes. Shackel correlated this change in production as linked to a shift in manners and personal hygiene which was part of a wider cultural transformation that saw the advance of an individualised routine.

Shackel's study is one strong example from a large body of research which has explored the question of why, from the eighteenth into the twentieth centuries, there was such a dramatic expansion in the production and consumption of goods (Paynter 1988; Little 1994). Explanations for change have adopted three main approaches, the idealist approach, Marxist models, and market models. Each approach has its own merits and drawbacks. Idealist models, as exemplified by Deetz and Glassie, view material culture as the physical representation of social mores. Although able to demonstrate the physical manifestations of change using typologies to identify spatial and temporal trends, an idealist approach does not explain why change actually takes place. Marxist interpretations tend to emphasis production-led change and view the manufacture of industrially produced goods as a system whereby unequal class relations could also be reproduced (Leone & Potter 1988; Paynter 1988; McGuire 1991; Paynter & McGuire 1991; Wurst 1998). This approach has argued that a surplus in production and an unequal access to resources enabled capitalists to exploit their workers and influence consumer choice (*ibid.*). Manufacturers, it is argued, were responsible for creating new needs that were then served by new products in the quest for profit. However, producer- led interpretations have often ignored how

consumers may reassign meanings to goods in accordance to their own values (Stewart-Abernathy 1998).

Market models can be exemplified by the small body of research carried out under the umbrella of consumer choice theory (Spencer-Wood ed. 1987; see also Henry 1991; Klein & LeeDecker 1991). Previous applications of consumer choice theory have been characterised by a processualist systems-theory framework (after Binford eg. 1971; *ibid.*), which used a ladder of inference biased towards the recovery of technological, rather than ideological, evidence. Analysis has therefore focused upon conditions that effect supply and demand in the marketplace, such as technological change, population increase, and transport routes (Spencer-Wood ed. 1987). The major concern of consumer choice theory has been to relate archaeological evidence to known socio-economic groups to understand how acquisition and discard patterns affected formation processes (Baugher & Venebles 1987; Spencer-Wood 1987). Market access has largely been considered in economic terms and social status has accordingly, also been defined in economic, rather than cultural, terms. Wider social identities, such as gender and ethnicity, for example, have largely been examined as factors that qualify the economic resources of different class groups (L. Clark 1987). As will be shown in section 1.3, a primary research objective of this thesis is to demonstrate the potential of consumer choice theory when applied within a post-processual paradigm.

1.1.2. Post-Medieval archaeology in Britain: Living in the Past?

The structure of historic past in the Old and New Worlds is not directly analogous. Whereas the colonisation of North America represents a discontinuity with the past, in Britain - as indeed in Europe as a whole - the historic past is characterised by continuity and change across different periods. Historical archaeology in Britain has been characterised by the analysis of investigative sub areas (Pedrotto & Romero 1998). A series of

48

labels exist to frame an analysis of the later historic period; including medieval archaeology, post-medieval archaeology, industrial archaeology, landscape archaeology, and church archaeology. The degree to which the relationships between these research areas have been clearly defined is contestable (Giles 1998; West 1999). The transition from the medieval to the post-medieval periods, for example, has been consistently, although not un-problematically, defined by a date (P. Courtney 1997). Yet other areas of study, such as landscape, church, and industrial archaeology, are not defined by a particular period as such but, as their names suggest, by themes of study which cut across rigid chronological confines. Whilst subareas of investigation exist within North American practice, underwater archaeology and Afro-American archaeology are obvious examples, an important difference lies that within the remit of historical archaeology they share a common platform of expression (Schuyler 1977).

This 'medieval and later' archaeology, or, after Tarlow and West (eds. 1999) the archaeology of 'later historical Britain' (the term preferred within this thesis) has developed from a number of distinct fields, including: urban excavation, landscape studies, building archaeology, and economic history. The sub-area that this thesis most closely relates to is post-medieval archaeology. In this thesis, post-medieval archaeology is defined in the broadest sense: the study of material culture dating from c.1450 to the present day. The period studied in this work, the Victorian era, therefore defines this research as 'post-medieval'. Yet research of the Victorian period has not been freq ntly undertaken within post-medieval archaeology, where a date of 1750 has traditionally been employed to define the end of the period (D. Crossley 1994; Matthews 1999). Other historic sub-fields, notably industrial archaeology, have more successfully encompassed the study of later periods (Palmer & Neaverson 1998), but the research objectives of this thesis are not compatible with the issues traditionally studied by industrial, church, or landscape archaeology. For example, the vast majority of Victorian memorials were not mass-produced by means of heavy industrial machinery, as with glass

bottles, tin cans, or ceramics - the artefacts more commonly studied by industrial archaeologists. Cemeteries are not strictly speaking ecclesiastical burial sites. Indeed their secular status is a defining aspect of cemeteries. Therefore this study does not satisfactorily fall within the established parameters of church archaeology (for example, Rodwell 1981). In this thesis the cemetery landscape is used to contextualise the primary focus of research, memorial designs, and the in-depth formal and spatial analysis that characterise landscape archaeology are not a remit of this case study. This research therefore offers a strong example of how difficult it can be to locate an investigation of the historic period within the existing framework of historical archaeological practice in Britain.

It is difficult to follow the evolution of post-medieval archaeology before the early 1990s with the clarity shown by North American studies for two reasons. Firstly, there is a problem with the visibility of published material dealing with the post-medieval period. Secondly, as a discipline, post-medieval archaeology has not followed the same fluid theoretical transitions as North American research. With the notable exception of D. Crossley (1990), post- medieval archaeology has been largely invisible outside the pages of the journal *Post-Medieval Archaeology*. This invisibility is not necessarily because material has not been examined, but rather a result of the ways in which research has been structured. For example, West (1999, 5) found that over the last seventeen years, twenty seven papers in *Norfolk Archaeology*, from a total of one hundred and twenty seven, had dealt with post medieval material. None of these studies, however, actively engaged with an academic context of 'post-medieval archaeology'. There has been a tendency for research to be conducted at narrow site-specific or regional contexts. This level of analysis, coupled with the compartmentalisation of research into investigative sub-areas, means that work relating to he post-medieval period has not usually been discussed with reference to wider research frameworks. In practice there are few national platforms which allow the investigative sub-areas of British historical archaeology to be brought

together to identify common themes. As a result work remains somewhat fragmented. Yet the point also needs to be made that the volume of studies on British post-medieval archaeology simply does not compare to the extent of the North American work, where several detailed overviews of literature have been produced (Deagan 1982; Little 1994; Orser & Fagan 1995; Orser 1996).

Several authors have remarked upon the atheoretical nature of post- medieval archaeology prior to the 1990s, and the fact that the vast majority of studies have followed traditional, normative (or particularistic) research agendas (Palmer & Neaverson 1998, 3-4; Gould 1999, 153; West 1999, 4-5). There are arguably few substantive differences, for example, between the theoretical positions adopted by studies published within the journal *Post-Medieval Archaeology* in the late 1960s and the early 1990s. The absence of theoretical developments can also be clearly seen within wider literature, most notably D. Crossley's 1990 book *Post-medieval Archaeology in Britain*. This work represented the first substantial effort to define post-medieval archaeology as a field of study. Crossley's thematic coverage set out typologies for both urban and rural landscapes, specialised structures (churches, fortifications and shipwrecks), industries, and commonly recovered artefacts (ceramics and glass). His narrative emphasised a functional and chronological interpretation, where change was identified by technological and industrial developments and related to economic factors. Crossley examined artefacts within a typical tradition I' t paradigm, to illustrate manufacturing methods, standards, and centres, to map distribution patterns, and to date sites. This picture of post-medieval archaeology is barren indeed, devoid of the analysis of personal histories and meaning that represent the very cornerstones of contemporary North American research. Recently, a small number of British case studies have examined the production and distribution of goods using theory-informed methodologies that seek to place artefact patterns within their social and historic contexts. Examples include Yolanda Courtney's (*forthcoming*) study of regionalised marketing

51

patterns of Victorian pub tokens and Neil Ewins' (1997) analysis of the distribution and marketing strategies of the Staffordshire ceramic producers serving the American market between 1775 and 1880. Critiques of earlier traditionalist approaches, exemplified by Crossley, have shown how the research agendas followed by North American research can potentially be employed by British analysis to examine the reflexive and global aspects of consumerism (P. Courtney 1996; Y. Courtney *forthcoming*). The question nevertheless remains, of why post-processual influenced research exploring human experience and the 'meaning' of material culture, should have remained largely unexplored within British post- medieval archaeology.

Exponents of post-processualism better known for their work on other periods have used modern material culture to demonstrate their theoretical approaches. Two such examples include, Shanks and Tilley's (1994, 172-240) analysis of British and Swedish beer cans and Hodder's (1987b) analysis of bow ties and the modern work place. Furthermore, archaeological case studies that draw upon historical data have, however, explored issues related to the theoretical response to processualism, as Sinclair's (1989) study of eighteenth century candlestick and Jameson's (1989) analysis of Victorian dining rituals show. Yet the historical nature of the data in these studies was largely incidental to demonstrating the strength of a particular theoretical approach and as a result did not inform wider post-medieval practice. The absence of post-processualism in post-medieval archaeology prior t he early 1990s must also be correlated to the similar earlier absence of 'new archaeology', or processualist, studies. As a discipline, British archaeology has always been less influenced by anthropology than American archaeology (Noel Hume 1967; Mytum 1998). As a result, with a few notable exceptions (Clarke 1968; Rahtz 1981), British research was also less susceptible to adopting new archaeology to the extent of American studies. The application of processual theory within British historical archaeology was even less common than in prehistoric research. At this time historical

archaeologists placed a greater emphasis upon defining, (if not legitimising), the study of historical periods within mainstream archaeology, and outside the discipline of history, rather than taking part within wider theoretical debates (e.g. Gilchrist 1994). Although some processual studies were conducted within Medieval archaeology (Rahtz 1981), the lack of an embracing platform for later historic archaeology meant these debates were usually isolated within a particular period. That is not to say that no processual studies have been conducted within post-medieval archaeology, but examples are comparatively recent and rare (for example, Mytum 1993; 1994; 1999).

The way in which post-medieval archaeology was initially conceived was also sympathetic to issues of low-level data analysis, (for example, chronologies, ownership, occupation, function, and typologies), and as a result inhibited the development of new theoretical paradigms. Since the late-1960s post-medieval archaeology has had a professional body, the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology (SPMA) and a journal, *Post-Medieval Archaeology*. This society evolved from the Post-Medieval Ceramics Research Group that was founded in 1963. This history is significant. The Ceramics Group decided that the 'post-medieval period' should extend from 1450 to 1750. The basis for this decision lay in a research interest based on non-industrially produced ceramics:

'These two dates were carefully selected: by 1450 medieval influence in pottery was in rapid declin   nd imported wares were having noticeable effects on home products, and 1750 is the accepted date for the commencement of the manufacture of porcelain in England and its subsequent effects on traditional products.'

K. J. Barton 1967: 102-3

In 1966, the Ceramics Group was reorganised and SPMA was born so that the study of metalworking, glass working, early industry, and buildings might also have a platform for publication. Although the new society

possessed a wider research agenda than the Ceramics Group, the end date of the post-medieval period remained the same. The rationale that lay behind this view was the issue of the value of interrogating material culture in a period where documentary sources were plentiful:

> 'The publication of (or the survival of) trade pattern books and architectural plans, and the parallel work of the Encyclopaedists in France removes from archaeology much of its value in supplying information otherwise incapable of or difficult of recovery [After 1750 AD]. '　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　K. J. Barton 1967:102

Clearly, the idea that post-medieval archaeology post-1750 would be 'an expensive of way of knowing what we already know' was tacitly accepted without challenge. D. Crossley reiterated such sentiments in 1990:

> 'What is the overall framework in which post-medieval archaeological research should be placed? Without doubt, the economic history of the three centuries from 1450 is dominated by demographic recovery after the late-medieval epidemics, to which changes in agriculture, industry, and trade as well as in individual wealth and status are related. The archaeological record provides ample material evidence for these developments.'　　　　　　　　　　　　D. Crossley 1990:3

This perspective has curtailed th development of post-medieval archaeology. The idea that archaeological analysis should focus upon periods where there are fewer documentary sources places archaeology in a supporting role to history. Furthermore, the proposition that documentary sources tell us all we need to know about the past does not acknowledge the specific role of material artefacts in constructing this past. West (1999) has noted that it was precisely when North American historical archaeologists first asked the questions and found answers outside historical paradigms that the discipline began to develop. The

issue of archaeology acting as a handmaiden to history has been raised,
although not resolved, within medieval archaeology (Rahtz 1981; Gilchrist
1994). Yet because of an absence of an encompassing research
framework, a wider debate concerning the role of documents within British
historical archaeology has never taken place. D. Crossley (1990), for
example, uncritically presents the combined use of documentary and
material sources within post-medieval archaeology, and neither anticipates
the potential conflict between the two accounts, nor addresses
methodological issues of integrating material and documentary sources.
The edited volumes by Little (ed. 1992) and Beaudry (ed. 1988) show how
American Historical archaeologists have taken up such theoretical and
methodological challenges and demonstrate a sophisticated, albeit
unresolved, level of response.

A close analysis of the pages of *Post-Medieval Archaeology* shows
that on occasion the traditionalist parameters of practice have been
challenged. In the years following SPMA's foundation a plea was made
to 'breathe life into the dry bones of culture' (Jenkins 1968, 3). Writing
almost ten years before the publication of *In Small Things Forgotten*,
Jenkins argued that post-medieval archaeology should encompass folk-life
studies: 'The possession of a material object is but a starting point in the
study of the use, custom and language associated with that object'
(Jenkins 1968, 4). Although his argument for contextualization is implicit,
this paper clearly called for an analysis of material culture that moved
beyond typologies and chronologies to look at meanings. This challenge
was not widely taken up and folk-life studies have remained on the edges
of post-medieval archaeology. Conversely, current developments towards
a British 'historical archaeology' have found voice through journals
dedicated to folk-life studies, such as Paul Courtney's discussion of
Georgian consumerism (P. Courtney 1996). Landscape studies also made
a significant early contribution to post-medieval archaeology's research
framework with the idea of 'total archaeology' (Taylor 1974). 'Total
archaeology' or 'studies in the history of the landscape' proposed that

archaeologist and historians should both make use of documentary sources as well material evidence in order to reach the best understanding of the past. Yet while the potential of this idea was recognised, it was never really explored in widespread practice.

A sea change took place within British historical archaeology in 1993 with the publication of Matthew Johnson's *Housing Culture*. Johnson explicitly linked his research to the theoretical approaches of American historical archaeology whilst at the same time firmly placing it within a British context. In common with American research, Johnson was concerned with the meaning of material culture, in particular the ideologies, social relations, and behaviour associated with the house. Johnson initially set out to create a vernacular grammar in the model of Glassie's for his case study of late-medieval and early modern vernacular architecture in western Suffolk. This approach was ultimately unsatisfactory as Johnson dismissed simple economic and typological approaches and explanations. Instead, he focused upon the cultural and social aspects of the household, most notably the use of space. Johnson argued that buildings not only expressed social relations but also created and transformed social ideologies. These values, which may be consciously recognised in life, were maintained at a covert and unacknowledged level within the material culture:

> 'Material things thus become important through their very ordinariness. They stand for the vast und ˙de of cultural action, for values and aspects of their personality and world-view which men and women could not or would not express in words.'   Johnson 1993: xi

Johnson's comments echoed Deetz's sentiments of artefacts as the 'small things forgotten' that shape worldviews. Johnson termed this process 'closure'. Closure may be understood as both a physical change, such as a transformation in the spatial organisation of architecture, and as an ideological change, such as new perceptions of personal space. But in

contrast to Glassie and Deetz, Johnson emphasised causality, which he correlated to transformations of social, gender, and class relations.

The current visibility and practice of post-medieval and later historic archaeology in Britain today is encouraging. The Council for British Archaeology and English Heritage's 'Defences of Britain' surveys show that modern material culture studies are rewarding, revealing a resource to be managed with care (Council for British Archaeology 2000; English Heritage 2000). The Institute for Field Archaeology's 1996 conference included a session on the 'Social Archaeology of the Nineteenth Century' that addressed archaeological excavation, survey, and artefact analysis. The Grave Concerns conference, held at Bournemouth University in April 1997, shows that the post- medieval period is rich enough to support an in-depth exploration of a single theme (Cox ed. 1998). The Theoretical Archaeology Conferences in 1996 and 1998 both contained sessions dedicated to the discussion of theory-informed archaeological research of the later historic period. The continuing work of Johnson (1996; 1999) and others authors influenced by North American historical archaeology (for example, P. Courtney 1996; A. Brooks 1997; 2000; Y. Courtney *forthcoming*) are testament to the quality, if not quantity, of academic research being carried out today. Even a perfunctory examination of the collection of papers in the volume edited by Tarlow and West (1999) indicates the breadth of data being examined today; from the familiar artefacts of post-medieval analysis such as ceramics (A. Brooks 1999), to the less easily accessed eviden   of the food upon such plates (Pennell 1999). Whilst these studies are all broadly, post-processual, a range of different theoretical positions are adopted, such as consumer theory (Buckham 1999), and structuration (Giles 1999) to investigate themes such as nationalism (A. Brooks 1999), social control (Lucas 1999), and social identities (Mytum 1999). Many of the diverse investigative sub areas of the later historic archaeology, such as building (Lucas 1999), industrial (Gould 1999), graveyard (Tarlow 1999a), and landscape archaeology (Williamson 1999; Carmen 1999), have been brought

together within an encompassing platform, where common themes and
arguments may be more easily identified. Equally important is the
inclusion of a range of periods, from the medieval (Johnson 1999) to the
twentieth century (Matthews 1999) so that continuity and change can be
more easily recognised and discussed.

1.1.3 Discussion

The current interaction between British post-medieval archaeology and
North American historical archaeology has a number of precedents. A
mutual association can be traced back to the early 1960s through the
British archaeologist Ivor Noel Hume who was an active contributor to both
archaeological spheres (Noel Hume 1967; 1969; 1970; 1982). More
recently North American historical archaeology has been included within
the pages of *Post-Medieval Archaeology* (Yentsch 1991b) and
post-medieval archaeology has been included in *Historical Archaeology*
(for example, Johnson 1991). The association between the two societies,
SPMA and SHA, was further enhanced by two joint-organised conferences
held in Williamsburg and London in 1997. Two motives are offered to
explain recent moves by British archaeologists to associate their work to
the academic context of historical archaeology. Firstly, the notion of a
'later historic past' encourages an encompassing chronology to examine
the wide range of themes and data that have previously been studied
within isolated periods. Secondly, research within British investigative
sub-areas has been eschewed ecause of dissatisfaction with traditional
atheoretical approaches. The context of historical archaeology is favoured
because of its association with theory- informed analysis. This section will
consider why British historical archaeology cannot be simply defined by
North American practice and explore how these different traditions can be
employed to inform each other's practice.

Schuyler (1970) has argued that 'literacy' should be the influential
event that distinguishes historical archaeology from the prehistoric past.
The post-prehistoric past is, therefore, 'the study of the remains from any

historic period' (Schuyler 1970). Yet this definition would encompass established fields in Europe, such as classical archaeology, which are already served by their own distinct agendas, theories, and methods (for example, Scott 1993). Furthermore, it is unclear how this definition would accommodate the 'secondary prehistory' (the contact between literate and non-literate groups) found in New World contexts without an ethnocentric bias; since literacy was not a monolithic achievement nor a prerequisite to make history (Little 1994). In contrast, James Deetz (1996, 5), defined historical archaeology as 'the archaeology of the spread of European culture throughout the world since the fifteenth century and its impact on indigenous peoples'. This position sees the spread of European culture as central to the definition of a historic archaeology. Initially, the global diffusion of western culture may appear to be of greater relevance to 'New World' studies' where processes such as colonialism can be directly correlated to cultural change. But this change is reflexive; gravestones that commemorate slaves' tea merchants' cotton mill owners' soldiers who served in the colonies' and ship captains who sailed to far off lands' are just one example demonstrating how everyday life in Britain was affected by global expansion. Furthermore' Europe cannot be seen as monolithic' either in inter- or intra-state terms. Each country possessed a unique history and acted with distinct and often competitive agendas. Nor can non-European culture be seen as a direct binary opposite to European culture. Little research has been carried out within Europe in response to studies that has documented th impact of western culture in the 'New World', with the result that the impact of non-European culture upon European culture remains largely unaddressed.

The study of the modern age encompasses a number of separate themes that worked together to form a 'world system'. These themes include large-scale urbanisation, mass industrial production, consumerism, capitalism, literacy, and long-distance travel (Spencer-Wood ed. 1987; McGuire 1991; Stewart-Abernathy 1992; Leone *et al* 1992; Upton 1992; little 1994). Orser (1994; 1996) has emphasised the global dimension of

historical archaeology and has argued that analysis should be centred on linking themes including 'global colonialism, Eurocentricism, capitalism and modernity'. This definition of historical archaeology presents the most encompassing framework for New and Old World historical archaeology. Fundamental difficulties, however, are encountered with these parameters, such as the sheer breadth of data to be assembled and the highly intricate sets of dynamics that exist within a global network. British studies can make an invaluable contribution to approaching such an expansive area of research. The influence of the *Annales* school of history upon British historical archaeology provides a strong methodology to examine changes over a *longue durée* (Giles 1998; Tarlow 1999c). To understand the spread of western culture from 1450 onwards analysis needs to recognise that many elements of western culture, such as consumerism, have roots within earlier temporal periods (P. Courtney 1996, 18). The periodisation of British historical archaeology has the potential to reveal continuity and change in practice.

Whilst there are differences in the practice and definition of historical archaeology between both sides of the Atlantic, one role of historical archaeology has similarly been understood. Orser and Fagan (1995,22) succinctly described one purpose of historical archaeology as 'changing the way we perceive our ancestors and ourselves'. Such sentiments could be equally applied to prehistoric archaeology in Europe, but the significance of challenging familiar perceptions of the past has similarly been understood as a role of B ̇ h historical archaeology (West 1999). Historical archaeology in America has long concentrated on both 'official' and personal histories (Leone 1984; Stewart-Abernathy 1992) and a similar sense of contact with people in the past is currently finding a voice in British work (Tarlow 1999b; A. Brooks 2000). It can be argued that all archaeology is constructed from modern perspectives and for modern agendas; however, this thesis does not enter into the debates of archaeology as a tool of social politics. It nonetheless recognises the importance of historical archaeology in giving a historical existence to

groups that were not able to leave their mark on society through a traditional written past.

In summary, it is 'not difficult to find questions that count concerning the modern world after AD. 1500; what is difficult is finding a unique way of addressing them' (Little 1994, 4). As Deagan has pointed out 'different historical archaeologists ask very different kinds of questions' (Deagan 1982, 171) and it is clear that the majority of questions have been set by the theoretical agenda of American research. It is essential that British historical archaeology start both to ask and answer similar questions. It is equally important, however, that these questions are phrased from the cultural context and historic particularity of British data. Themes such as ethnicity, dominance and resistance, and colonisation, need to escape from a primarily New World- focused agenda. This shift would enable the reflexive aspects of cultural transformations to be presented from a European perspective. American research serves not only to illustrate how dynamic, challenging and all- encompassing historical archaeology can be, but how much Britain can potentially contribute to the 'New World' of historical archaeology. This thesis makes such a contribution to the British voice of historical archaeology.

1.2 Gravestone Analysis
1.2.0 Introduction to Gravestone Studies

Before offering a review of previous gravestone studies, it is necessary to define the parameters of thi d cussion. The memorials considered in this thesis are those stones which appeared outside in burial grounds, a practice which dates from the late seventeenth century onward (F. Burgess 1963, 116; Tarlow 1999c, 55). Discussion therefore excludes studies of internal memorials, such as wall table s, effigies, and brasses (for example, Esdaile 1927; Bertram 1972; Collinson 1975; Irwin 1981; Finch 1991). This commentary will concentrate upon an academic analysis of gravestones, although the importance of popular guides is appreciated for their role in bringing the study of gravestones to a wider audience (for

example, Wright 1972; P. Burgess 1980; Child 1982; Lees 1993). Memorials have been studied within a variety of disciplines, including social geography, material culture studies, art history, design, philosophy, genealogy, and history (for example, Panofsky 1964; Francaviliglia 1971; Bartram 1978; Ames 1981; Irwin 1981; Nelson & George 1981; Etlin 1984; I.W. Brown 1993; H. Crossley 1991). This thesis will focus upon archaeological research, where the key theories and methods to study gravestones have been developed. In keeping with the research objectives of this thesis, studies of gravestone conservation and burial ground management are not reviewed (National Trust of Australia 1987; Burman & Stapleton 1988;Mytum, Dunk & Rugg 1994).

The ways in which previous analysis has been conducted places a number of limitations upon how it may be reviewed. For example, the publication of gravestone surveys remains disproportionate to the actual number completed. This may be partially explained by the fact that small-scale graveyard surveys have been a favourite exercise for undergraduate dissertations (for example, Rimmer 1987; Buckham 1992). Many graveyard surveys lodged with local libraries, amateur genealogy, and local history groups have conducted churches and record offices. These surveys of memorial transcriptions do not usually include the quantification or interpretation of data, and cannot be considered as graveyard studies as such. The opportunity to examine early modern gravestones in conjunction with below-ground evidence is both rare and virtually undocumented (Buckh m 1997). The absence of a detailed archaeological and material context in which to place the evidence of gravestones is the result of both attitudes to and the legislation surrounding the excavation of modern burial sites. Rahtz (1982, 117), for example, has suggested that an initial reluctance to examine Christian deathways was the result of a disinclination to disturb remains which ostensibly share a cultural connection with modern society. Other practitioners, such as Noel Hume (1970) have argued that legislation to

monitor the excavation of modern burials is not often *sympathetic to* archaeological practice:

> 'There is, however, one factor that the historical burial site can call its own - the ability to bring all hell down on the archaeologist who finds it. Descendants and relatives are apt to spring from nowhere claiming that their family graves are being most foully and sacrilegiously robbed. Patriotic societies may claim that the honor of a generation or class is being defiled; the Civil Rights groups may be expected to take an equally gloomy view of disturbing a slave; and furthermore (and it is quite a furthermore), there may be a section in the state's penal code providing unattractive penalties for the desecration of human remains. In short, therefore, it is advisable to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of excavating human remains with considerable care. Unless the circumstances are very special, I would advise quickly covering them over and forgetting that you ever saw them.'   Noel Hume 1970, 159-160.

The above quotation relates to North American practice. Such sentiments have not been quite so forthrightly expressed within British literature, but it is clear that legislation and public opinion are issues which post-medieval archaeology currently contends with (Boyle 1999; Reeve & Adams 1993; Reeve & Cox 1999). This situation is slowly becoming redressed. Recent excavations, such as the Spitalfields Project, and the African Church cemeteries in Philadelphia and New York, have examined both the skeletal remains and material culture from modern mortuary sites (Parrington 1987; Molleson & Cox 1993; S.P.M. Harrington 1995; Plunkett 1997). This type of research is important because it is a first step towards establishing a broad material context for the wide ange of site types and artefacts (for example, Richmond 1999) found within modern mortuary analysis.

The study of gravestones is an international practice (Rahtz 1987; Willsher 1995b, 56-9; Mytum 1996a). This thesis will concentrate upon North American and British studies where research has made the greatest contribution to develop gravestone studies at an international level. It is possible to trace two different schools of thought between early North American and British studies. Early North American work was initially influenced by folk-history, and research aims primarily focused upon constructing iconography typologies, reconstructing areas of manufacture, and tracing patterns of distribution. In Britain, an interest in gravestones grew from church history, art history, and archaeological field practice. Early work concentrated on creating recording methodologies and identifying the retrievable data. The distinct traditions of North American research and British studies are discussed separately in sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. After the late 1970s developments of North American and British research are considered together since both traditions were influenced by theories developed within the archaeology of death. At this time gravestone analysis moved away from simply describing stylistic change to addressing how memorials could be used to structure social relations. Sections 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 summarise the theoretical developments in gravestone research from the 1980s to the present day.

1.2.1. Early North American Research

The publication of Harriet Forbes' *Gravestones of New England and the Men Who Made Them* in 1927 initially brought attention to gravestone analysis within the field of American folk-life studies. Forbes' work was lavishly illustrated with scores of photographs, but also presented a preliminary classification and interpretation of memorial decoration. This book set a number of precedents for future rese ch, including an art historical perspective that emphasised the role of the stonemason. Ludwig who published his own study of New England gravestones in 1966 developed Forbes' interpretation of gravestone symbolism in correlation to Puritan theological doctrines. Ludwig's study was important because it

64

recognised the influence of European traditions upon Colonial memorialisation and placed gravestone studies within an overtly academ c context. The 'Puritan school' of gravestone analysis was continued and developed in the works of Tashjian and Tashjian (1974) and Benes (1977;1987). Early analysis was entirely located within a New England context. Later research increased this geographic range (Jordan 1982 Burrell 1996). In 1977 and 1978 the Dublin Seminars for New England Folk Life held two colloquiums dedicated to the study of Puritan Gravestone symbolism and art (Benes ed. 1977; ed. 1978). These meetings led to the foundation of the Association of Gravestone Studies and its journal, *Markers*. This society has done much to increase the awareness, appreciation, and preservation of gravestone evidence within a multi-disciplinary perspective that maintains a folk-history emphasis.

An explicitly archaeological arena for gravestone studies was heralded by Dethlefsen and Deetz's seminal paper of 1966, 'Death's Heads, Cherub, Urn and Willow', which again employed a New England data set. Their study examined the diffus'on and emulation of gravestone symbolism, and its associated ideology, across time and space. Dethlefsen and Deetz identified a universal sequence of gravestone motifs that began with death's heads, which were then replaced by cherubs, which in turn were succeeded by a willow and urn design. Changes in designs were understood largely within theological terms. Death's heads were seen as representing the fate of the corpse, and cherubs the fate of the soul. W'llow trees and urns, in contrast, reflected a more secular attitude to death. The authors proposed that design changes originated from an urban cosmopolitan minority and noted that a similar stylistic sequence had taken place some seventy years earlier in England. They also found that a corresponding sequence of change was evident within the sentiments expressed by gravestone inscriptions. This study was hugely influential. Not only did it bring gravestones archaeological attention but also it set out a detailed context for further study. The authors argued that as a result of their manufacture and use,

65

gravestones were a data set ideally controlled by the dimensions of time, space, and form, and could act as a laboratory to test the theories used in prehistoric archaeology, such as seriation. As previously noted, the early study of historical archaeology was often implicitly 'legitimised' by its ability to use prehistoric analytical tools. The authors further argued that since a known cultural and historical framework could be used to contextualise variation in gravestone designs, many of the difficulties encountered when relating prehistoric artefacts to social values could be overcome. Dethlefsen and Deetz described at length a range of areas, such as demographics, style, and religion, which gravestone evidence could potentially inform.

Both authors have gone on to develop their ideas for gravestone analysis (for example, Deetz 1977; Dethlefsen, 1981) but Deetz has truly succeeded in making this field his own. In 'Remember Me as You Pass By', chapter four of *In Small Things Forgotten*, Deetz sets out at length his case study of New England gravestones. In this 1977 research Deetz identified three distinct patterns of cultural diffusion that followed the sequence of memorial designs identified by the co-authored 1966 paper. The first pattern was found in urban centres, the second in the surrounding countryside, and the third in the countryside beyond. In urban areas cherub and death's head designs were carved simultaneously. Deetz argued that death's heads represented more conservative religious attitudes than cherubs did and therefore changes in religious feeling were denoted by the ratio of the pr duction rate of one design to the other. In areas peripheral to the city Deetz noted a different pattern where the production of death's heads and cherubs were traced as an evolutionary stylistic sequence. In the deep countryside yet another pattern emerged. Here, the cherub design took longer to arrive, and in the meantime the death's head design evolved into an entirely different design. In common with the 1966 paper, Deetz interpreted these motifs as independently derived folk art designs. Deetz noted that the folk art designs were quickly abandoned once a preference for cherubs arrived at these more isolated

communities. In rural areas change appeared to be slow, with diversification and elaboration. In urban areas, where Deetz argued the communities held fashionable rather than traditional mores, changes took place at a rapid rate. Deetz explains anomalies within these general trends as the result of wider socio-economic factors, such as trading patterns, and local conditions. Deetz concluded his study by noting that the above trends were documented by other artefact forms, and supported a general pattern of Anglo-American cultural integration and change. Thus, at the same time New Englanders were using English-style tea services they were also the changing the Anglo-derived manner in which they commemorated the dead.

With this study Deetz set an agenda for gravestone studies which is still influential today. The great strength of this research was Deetz's use of gravestones in conjunction with other artefact types to show wide-ranging cultural change within a specific historical context. As noted earlier, Deetz's major weakness was that this change is described, rather than explained. As a result agencies, such as demographics, medicine, science, consumerism, and class and other social relations are not adequately related to his data, even though Deetz identified the importance of such correlation in his 1966 co- authored paper.

1.2.2 Early British Work

The study of British graveyard memorials has produced a less visible and voluminous bibliography than ı North American counterpart. Whereas a number of studies have collated North American material (Watters 1980; Hyijiya 1983; Meyer ed. 1989; Meyer 1989; Bell 1994), no overview essays, thematic volumes, or critiques have been completed for British research. An initial neglect of gravestones stemmed from an academic preference towards the study of elaborately sculptured medieval and renaissance monuments erected inside churches (for example, Esdaile 1927; Morrell 1944). In Britain, associations, such as the International Society for the Preservation of Church Monuments, and journals, like

Monumenta, have been dedicated to the study of elite funerary architecture. Even more 'humble' medieval memorials, such as floor slabs, have only been synthesised fairly recently (Butler 1987). In response to academic indifference and physical neglect, F. Burgess, wrote in his seminal 1963 study of British gravestones *English Churchyard Memorials*:

> 'During the present century the work of various scholars has firmly established the artistic importance of our English heritage of stone carving..... One branch of stone-carving, however, has received scant attention: our native monuments set out in the open air burial grounds, churchyards and cemeteries, commemorating not so much the rich, but the rank and file of humanity - the common man.'
>
> F. Burgess 1963: 11

The objective of Burgess' study was to map a national chronology of memorial form, design, and inscription styles from prehistoric to modern times. Burgess' narrative was descriptive, rather than analytical, and as can be expected with such an epic study, his interpretations occasionally suffer from an inclination towards anecdotal evidence. Preliminary interpretations of changes in designs were explained by shifting theological concerns, the changing social and economic fabric of society, and different production techniques. It was the latter aspect that Burgess emphasised in his study. Burgess viewed the post reformation period as containing the most dramatic hange in memorial production. From this time he argued the production of gravestones underwent a shift from commissions between 'the aristocrat and the master mason' to modern 'standardised designs which could be ordered through the medium of the illustrated catalogue, and imported ready made from abroad' (F. Burgess 1963, 114-115). The great success of Burgess's work was to provide a national chronology of monument forms and styles which has not been surpassed to this day. Significantly, this study also examined memorial forms both at a national and regional level, and distinguished between

rural and urban locations. Burgess's claim that gravestone studies had been previously ignored was largely accurate, although an analysis of gravestone symbolism and decoration in a similar vein to early North American work had occasionally been undertaken (Herbert 1944; Barley 1948). Certainly after the publication of *English Churchyard Memorials*, such studies appear more frequently (Charter 1976; 1977; Willsher & Hunter 1978; Willsher 1983; 1992). Burgess also encouraged several popular histories of churchyards (for example, Lindley 1965; 1972; Child 1982; Wright 1972; Bailey 1987) and raised awareness of memorial preservation and graveyard management (Stapleton and Burman 1976).

The promotion of gravestone studies resulted in the publication of several graveyard-recording manuals. The first and most widely employed of these was produced by Jeremy Jones (1976) in collaboration with the Council for British Archaeology. Similar volumes have been produced by the Council for Scottish Archaeology (Willsher 1985a; 1985b) and the Dublin Archaeology Society (1987). These recording manuals also emphasised that gravestones were an archaeological resource under threat and encouraged surveys to ensure the preservation of graveyards if only by record. As the result of the development of recording methodologies several important graveyard surveys were published that sought to explore the types of data which could be recovered from gravestones.

The majority of published graveyard surveys adopted the recording methodology set out by Jone (1976). The range of data recovered from these studies and their methods of analysis can be typified by the surveys conducted by Shoesmith at Llangar Church, (1980), Rahtz and Watts at Wharram Percy (1983), and Reeve at Witton, (1983). These surveys, which were each part of a larger, ongoing research project, also included supplementary documentary research. In each case evidence was presented thematically to illustrate the major trends of commemoration. Results were presented to indicate genealogical and demographic patterns and to illustrate social organisation. The major objective

underlying each survey was to demonstrate the wealth of archaeological data that could be retrieved from gravestones (Reeve 1983, 101). Each of these surveys has different strengths. For example, Shoesmith's survey concentrated upon a spatial analysis to reconstruct the development of the graveyard over time. Reeve's survey placed the results of the graveyard survey within the social and historical framework of their local context. As a result of their small data sample, Rahtz and Watts were able to produce detailed drawings of the different memorial forms and decoration (see also Rahtz 1985). Such surveys were successful in illustrating the potential of memorial surveys at the same time as raising their profile. Conversely, this was also their greatest failing, for although the breadth of archaeological potential is shown, no one issue is ever addressed in depth. As a result there is a dependency on depicting evidence as 'interesting' rather than informing. Studies were also weighted towards the recovery and interpretation of textual, rather than material evidence. These surveys are characterised by a low level of analysis. Shoesmith, for example, set out the frequencies of inscriptions in either Welsh or English but concluded that the 'social reasoning behind this distribution is beyond the scope of the article' (Shoesmith 1980, 79), a gaping lacuna which has since been filled by Mytum (1994) . Over time an emphasis on exploring the nature of gravestone evidence as archaeological data and the development of recording and analysis methods fell out of favour. Gravestone surveys subsequently became more focused upon using gravestone data to answer sp ific research questions (Mytum 1993;1994;1999; Tarlow 1995; 1998; 1999a; Buckham 1999). Recent studies have returned towards developing recording and analysis techniques, including the dating of memorials (Mytum 1996b; 2000; forthcoming).

1.2.3 Gravestone Studies and the Archaeology of Death

Two specific theoretical approaches to gravestone analysis have emerged from the archaeology of death. The first focuses upon how memorials are

used to construct social identities, most notably between competing social groups. The second approach engages with the ways in which memorials expressed personal sentiments and the aspects of their design and inscriptions which may act as metaphors for conceiving death. While neither of these perspectives is mutually exclusive, previous studies have tended to emphasise one position above the other. Before considering these two positions in more detail, the wider theories that informed these perspectives must be summarised.

Ian Kinnes first coined the phrase an 'archaeology of death' in the late 1970s (Kinnes 1992, 15). During the 1970s and 1980s archaeological interest in the analysis of mortuary evidence (J. Brown ed. 1971; Chapman, Kinnes & Randsborg eds. 1981) was matched by the resurgence of an 'anthropology of death' (Bloch & Parry eds. 1982; Metcalf & Huntington 1991 [first published 1979]). Both disciplines drew on long-standing traditions of examining funerary ritual and remains, which included excavations by archaeologists such as Pitt-Rivers, Petrie, and Childe, and ethnographic case studies by Durkheim, Hertz, and Van Gennep (see Daniel 1975; Bloch & Parry 1982; Fagan 1985; Trigger 1989; Metcalf & Huntington 1991). As previously noted, in North America archaeology was closely allied to the discipline of anthropology (Binford 1971; Leone 1972, 16) but this meeting of disciplines was also pronounced within British research (Humphries & King eds. 1981). An 'archaeology of death' was distinguished by the development of a number of theoretical and methodolog l approaches for studying funerary evidence (Tarlow & Boyd 1992; Bell 1994). Initially research challenged traditional normative approaches to studying mortuary remains, which used artefact categories and chronologies to defined social groups by their 'cultural signatures' (Childe 1956). In the mainstream of New Archaeology, Binford (1971, 17) proposed that the treatment of the dead was correlated to the social persona an individual held in life, and as a result funerary evidence could be used to recover social hierarchies and cultural complexity (see also Saxe 1970). Ranking within societies began to be

examined by theories of effort- expenditure (Tainter 1973; 1978; Renfrew 1973) and spatial and formal analyses (Peebles 1971; O'Shea 1981; Goldstein 1981). As time progressed ethnographic comparisons fell out of favour and a greater emphasis was placed upon the archaeological context of funerary evidence (J. Brown 1981; Mizaogchi 1993). During the 1980s, with the advance of post-processualism, the association between social personas found in death and those found in life were recognised as more problematic than the simple linear equations suggested by earlier work. A number of studies emphasised this point to explore the complex, reflexive, ways in which the social personas of the dead were used to reproduce ideologies and structure relations between the living (Shanks & Tilley 1982 ; Hodder 1984).

The theoretical positions outlined above were developed in relation to prehistoric societies. Two notable exceptions which employed historical data were Michael Parker Pearson's (1982) paper 'Mortuary practices, society and ideology: an ethno archaeological study' and Aubrey Cannon's (1989) paper 'The historical dimension in mortuary expressions of status and sentiment'. Parker Pearson's research, which drew heavily upon Marxist theory, correlated an ethnographic study of modern burial in the Cambridge area to a historical framework of Victorian and early twentieth century burial practices. Parker Pearson challenged several of the assumptions implicit within earlier studies. He specifically rejected the idea that social roles in themselves reconstruct social systems, on the basis that societies were form d through regulated social practice. Social behaviour, he argued, was constructed through repeated actions, which were governed by a set of changing tacit or overt regulations. The ideologies that underlay these rules reflected a perception of 'life' which legitimised the social order by masking inequalities to allow dominant groups to sustained their position of power. As a result, Parker Pearson contended that the social persona of an individual at death does not directly correlate to the roles enacted in life and the relations of dominance and subservience of the living were not directly reflected in funerary

practice. As section 1.2.4 will show, this paper was particularly important for two reasons; firstly the critical response to this paper, most notably by Sarah Tarlow (1992), has formed the basis for an analysis of the role of commemoration and emotion. Secondly and more immediately, Parker Pearson's paper encouraged a more critical reading of social relations from funerary evidence.

As section 1.2.4 will show, Cannon's study was important because it was the first study to consider memorials as commodities. This paper employed a case study of nineteenth century memorials in rural Cambridgeshire to explore the role of fashion upon gravestone design. Cannon's analysis was also characterised by a Marxist approach that saw the elite consolidating their social position through their control over fashion. Cannon saw the diffusion and emulation of gravestone designs associated with the elite by the middle and lower classes as challenging the social hierarchy. He interpreted the rise and decline of long-term cycles of elaboration in memorial design as strategies used by the elite to maintain their control over fashion and ultimately their social dominance. The production and purchase of gravestones will be reoccur as a central research theme of this thesis.

1.2.4 Gravestone Analysis: Social Status, Identity, and Personal Sentiment

As noted above, Parker Pearson (1982) argued that mortuary analysis needed to recognised how t e dead were manipulated by the living, and to accommodate this dynamic within a framework of competitive social display. Parker Pearson interpreted changes in burial practice from the Victorian era to the modern day within such a context, by correlating class interests to agencies of social control. This anal is was sets within a historical framework that was characterised by several specific features. Firstly, it was argued that the Victorian period was characterised by an apogee in the commercialisation of death. The widespread use of professional undertakers and monumental masons encour ged the

73

conspicuous display of wealth, and thus competition, between families. Indeed such was the alleged stigma of pauper burials at this time, even the poor allegedly invested considerable amounts of their income in mortuary practices. Furthermore, during the funeral a considerable financial outlay was incurred through the purchase of a huge variety of material goods. Whilst burial and commemoration provided further opportunities to denote differential economic status through the accessibility and visibility of burial plots and through memorial fashions. Parker Pearson argued that over the last 150 years the ability of the social elite to manipulate the dead was negated through the rise of new agencies of control, such as medicine, rationalism and science, which replaced traditional vehicles of control, most notably religion. As death became increasingly sanitised and appropriated by the medical profession, the Victorians' ostentatious celebration of death became replaced by the cost-effective disposal of the dead as 'unwanted matter'. Parker Pearson interpreted this lack of investment in funerals and memorialisation as an 'idealised' expression of an egalitarian society. He did not suggest that unequal social relations no longer existed, but that conspicuous consumption was no longer considered an appropriate strategy to express social differentiation. Parker Pearson viewed death as still possessing important social meanings, for example, through elaborate state funerals and war memorials, however these meanings no longer pertained to simple class distinctions but instead expressed ideas of national allegiance.

This argument is seductive. It appears to be both logical and infrangible. Yet as Sarah Tarlow (1992) has shown, once Parker Pearson's primary premise of power is challenged a number of significant difficulties emerge with his approach. It is quite possible to classify all human action as the result of self-interest and the exercise of power and influence. But as Tarlow (1992,110) has argued, this position ignores how death was 'profoundly meaningful and emotional part of human experience'. Tarlow a so took issue with the idea that individuals

consciously act with the primary motivation of consolidating or challenging the social order. Tarlow believes that the specific nature of funerary evidence has been decontextualised. Human emotions, she argues, are the underlying motivation behind funerary ritual and the manipulation of social relations is a secondary effect of mortuary behaviour (Tarlow 1999c, 24). Therefore, analyses that seek to explain mortuary practice in terms of class relations only offer an incomplete explanation. For example, Parker Pearson's approach does not explain the particularities of why specific memorial forms were considered as appropriate to express particular social groups or ideologies. Using a case study of memorials in Orkney dating from the reformation to the present day, Tarlow (1999c) offers an alternative interpretation of burial and commemoration which is correlated to shifts in personal, rather than class, relations and to the socio-economic changes brought by the expansion of capitalism.

Tarlow's narrative traces the development of a personal, sentimental attitude to death and burial, and a concern with the body of the deceased . A boom in the number of post reformation memorials which cannot be explained by simply by demographics or economics (Tarlow 1998) demonstrates primary evidence for change. This expansion of commemoration was characterised by a number of specific features. Firstly, memorialisation was carried out with greater social participation, and the erection of memorials was no longer primarily associated with the aristocracy and gentry. In the late eighteenth century, commemoration moved from inside the church ˙ to the surrounding graveyard. The social status of the deceased was no longer the primary information recorded on the gravestone, and instead prominence was given to family relationships and metaphors of death (Tarlow 1995). At this time burial plots also took on a more permanent nature. Tarlow (1998) argued that the purchase of graves in perpetuity corresponded to a widespread desire to visit the graveside in order to maintain personal relationships with the dead.

Tarlow (1995; 1999c) suggested that we may understand perceptions of death through the use of metaphor. Traditional symbolism

75

can take any number of forms within a system of signification. Metaphors in contrast are connotations drawn from a particular environment and placed within a new context to create new meanings (Hodder 1987a). Tarlow argued because metaphors possess non-arbitrary contextual associations they can be studied archaeologically. This approach offers a more critical and sophisticated understanding of textual evidence, than earlier studies where interpretation had relied upon more subjective and literary criticisms (for example, Rahtz 1983, 19).

Tarlow (1999a) found that a shift in the conception of death took place from the post reformation period to the modern day. Early representations of death emphasised aspects of bodily decay, but over time the imagery of death as 'sleep' became predominant. Humphreys (1982) also explored a similar association. Tarlow showed that the metaphor of death as sleep is articulated within memorial iconography and inscriptions. She also argued that this metaphor was used figuratively; the burial plot acted as a bed, the deposition of the body resembled a recumbent figure and gravestone profiles followed a 'bed head' shape. Tarlow correlated changes in attitudes to death to the restructuring of social relationships, using the historical and cultural frameworks established by the work of Lawrence Stone and Colin Campbell. Stone (1977) characterised the late eighteenth century as a period when an understanding of relationships stressed their unique personal nature, which he calls 'affected individualism'. Thus, Tarlow contends the idea of the bodily decay of a loved o   after death was no longer palatable to the sentiments of the bereaved. Campbell (1987) has characterised the interaction between material culture and social identity during the eighteenth century as driven by a 'romantic ethic' that prioritised the individual. Tarlow (1999c) correlates the widespread consumption of memorials and myriad of forms which exist by the nineteenth century as underpinned by a drive to construct and express ideologies of the self in a material form. Tarlow argues that the way to understand memorials is:

'as a public expression of deep personal feelings. To erect a monument is a way of showing how much an individual has meant to you, and showing that to the rest of the community. It enables you by marking the grave, to go on making gestures of grief such as visiting the beloved remains, laying flowers and being able to indulge in, and be seen to indulge in meditation and prayer, essential activities of the man or woman of feeling...The stone is a memorial to the deceased but also, crucially a memorial to a relationship. The significance of the stone was personal and emotional, and the fact that it was publicly visible should not make us cynical about the feelings of bereavement by those who erected them.'   Tarlow 1999c: 131.

Tarlow's position offers a convincing alternative to approaches that contended that commemoration was merely an arena to legitimise or challenge social power relations. Yet a number of questions remain unanswered by her approach. Firstly, Tarlow's depiction of personal relationships does not address the fact that not all relationships in the past were enacted within a nuclear family environment or as loving relationships, and that personal, as well as group, relationships are based on the exercise of power and authority. Furthermore, in the Victorian period the notion of the family was idealised through a 'Cult of Domesticity', which in itself acted as a social metaphor. It is not clear in Tarlow's approach how metaphors of death and family correlate to the actual range of human emot s and behaviour. Secondly, the scope of Tarlow's research means it is difficult to comprehensively demonstrate the range of interaction between material culture and social relations. As a result commemoration is largely presented as passively reflecting, rather than actively shaping, sentiments and ideologies. A small number of recent North American studies have also prioritised an understanding of death and emotions (for example, Burrell 1996) and death and the use of metaphors. Synder (1989), for example, has considered how the commemoration of children in Victorian America acted as a metaphor for

wider social relations that were constructed around the division between the home and the workplace. To date, however, the study of familial status and personal relationships has been far less frequently considered than issues of group social identities.

In North America, Marxist influenced studies of social class have been more frequently undertaken than in British analysis (L. Clark 1987; McGuire 1988; Wurst 1991). These studies have shown that an examination of class is most successful when explored in conjunction with other aspects of social status and identity, such as ethnicity or familial status, rather than understanding class as entirely economically defined (for example, Cannon 1986; 1989). Wurst (1991) considered the relationship between gravestone designs and social hierarchy in both rural and urban locations. Her study emphasised that social competition took place both within the hierarchies of these two different locations but also crucially between competing rural and urban elites. McGuire (1988) also considered the geographic context and social classes of his data sets and found that ethnic and familial status were important qualifying factors in the expression of social status and identity through memorialisation. His approach differed from Parker Pearson's, as McGuire argued that material culture could both mask and directly reflect social relations. Like Tarlow (1992), McGuire argued that at a fundamental level gravestones represent experiences of death which did not directly participate in power relations. To McGuire, 'ideology' should be understood at much wider' more general' and multiple l   ls. Unlike Tarlow (1995)' McGuire did not argue that power relations were the unconscious result of an emotional response to death but that ideologies of death and power operated simultaneously and in correlation to each other:

> 'The changes in the cemetery that create the appearance necessary
> for the denial of death are consistent with the changes that allow the
> denial of class and gender inequality...Over the last 150 years the
> form of the Broome County cemetery resulted from and justified the

existing ideology *and* the beliefs about death. In no case is the cultural landscape of the cemetery explicable solely in terms of only one of these systems of belief. Ideology and death must accommodate each other in the cemetery to create a minimal degree of consistency, so that appearances created by one set of beliefs does not contradict or challenge the other.'   McGuire 1988: 473

In Britain, Harold Mytum used a processualist perspective to examine the different strategies used within commemoration to display national and cultural alliances. A 1993 case study explored mortuary practice in Gibraltar, as an example of British Colonial practice in comparison to Spanish customs. Analysis showed that while the religious tradition may be the same in Spain and Gibraltar, the cultural association between Britain and Gibraltar proved more influential in organising cemetery design. The use of vaults for high status burial, however, showed an affiliation to Spanish and wider Mediterranean practices. In a 1994 paper, Mytum suggested that since both English and Welsh speaking populations could be found in close proximity in Pembrokeshire, the choice of language for memorial inscriptions could be seen as an indicator of cultural and national allegiance. A data set of six Anglican parishes was selected from each side of the 'Landsker' (the boundary between English and Welsh speaking Pembrokeshire). Nonconformist burial grounds in the same areas were also included in order to compare the two main religious comm   ities. In south Pembrokeshire, English was the dominant language, and this was reflected in both the nonconformist and Anglican burial grounds. In North Pembrokeshire, whilst English inscriptions predominated in Anglican churchyards, Welsh inscriptions made a minority appearance during the chronology of the study. In the nonconformist burial grounds North of the Landsker, Welsh was found from the start, although the majority of inscriptions were also in English. Mytum argues that social emulation was initially responsible for the predominance of English language inscriptions and represented the wider

79

acceptance of English culture, in an attempt to increased social standing. Over time, however, attitudes concerning Welsh and English affiliations shifted as a result of wider social and cultural processes, such as education, religion, and the media. Mytum showed how the relative frequencies of Welsh and English inscriptions could be correlated to changing ideologies of national and cultural alliances.

In North America, theoretical approaches have also sought to recover evidence of social identity, such as L. Clark's (1989) analysis of the relationship between ethnicity and class in commemoration which used consumer choice theory. Clark argued that class limited the consumer choice of memorials at the same time as income offered increased options. Whilst the higher classes had a greater income, this did not necessarily mean that individuals possessed unlimited options since choice was modified by class-based conventions. Clark argued that higher-class individuals were associated with prestigious behaviour which lower social orders emulated because of aspirations of upward social mobility. However, those who could not afford to emulate or participate within prestigious social behaviour adopted a different set of rules for commemoration that gained prestige from within their own social group, although this was not recognised by the higher classes. Clark saw ethnicity as also creating further consumer choices through the different funerary traditions that were held by the immigrant population. She argued that since immigration was associated with the lower social classes that these traditions did not hold p estige. As a result, 'non-ethnics' did not adopt the immigrant traditions for the same reason that the higher social orders did not adopt the commemorative options favoured by the lower classes. If social prestige was sought, Clark argued that ethnic populations would adopt non-ethnic commemorative practices. If upwardly mobile commemoration conventions could not be adop ed, Clark argued that ethnic identity, like working class behaviour, would be maintained by participation within a different set of behavioural codes. The role of social emulation between competing social groups formed the basis of Cannon's

80

(1986; 1989) exploration of the relationship between memorial design and fashion.

1.2.5 Gravestone Analysis: Cannon's Model of Fashion and Social Emulation

Cannon's analysis of nineteenth century commemoration was initially developed as an unpublished doctoral thesis (Cannon 1986). In a paper published three years later Cannon included two further historical case studies to suggest that his thesis was supported by comparative analysis across a range of historic societies: however, this discussion will consider his analysis of 3,500 nineteenth-century memorials from rural Cambridgeshire. Cannon agreed with Parker Pearson's (1982) general characterisation of Victorian burial practices, and also challenged the premises upon which elaborate mortuary practice had been correlated to high social status. However, Cannon's position diverged from Parker Pearson's as he argued that the resources invested into mortuary display varied independently of emotional or religious concerns for the deceased. Instead of being intrinsically symbolic, Cannon argued that commemoration was governed by fashion in the same way as other aspects of culture, such as dress, luxuries, and etiquette. Therefore changes in commemoration style, namely the degree of memorial ostentation, were the material expression of a process of differentiation and emulation among individuals. But the key difference in Cannon's approach, in contrast to Parker Pearson's, was the fact that Cannon sought to recover information about the behaviour of material culture rather than social relations:

> 'It might also be possible to provide, from a   aterial culture perspective, some insights into nineteenth century society, however any such insights are incidental to the central concern of this study, which is to provide insights into the nature of material culture.'
>
> Cannon 1986:2

81

Essentially, Cannon maintained that there were three key stages of stylistic change within mortuary behaviour that could be correlated to socio- economic shifts in society. These were represented by long-term cycles of simplification and elaboration in memorial design. Cannon proposed that during the mid to late eighteenth century, commemoration was characterised by stylistic restraint. The mortuary rituals of the elite were fixed and there was no widespread emulation of their behaviour by middle classes. Commemoration in the Edwardian period to the modern day was also notable for its simplicity and restraint, and - as Cannon suggested - neglect (see also Gorer 1965). In contrast, Cannon saw the Victorian period as characterised by the heights of ostentatious display; where rituals filtered down from the aristocracy to be emulated by the middle classes, which were in turn copied by the working classes. Cannon argued that initial stylistic elaboration was always the result of an socio-economic flux brought about by increased affluence and status uncertainty. In the Victorian period this was represented by the wealth of a burgeoning middle class and an increase in the relative affluence of the working classes. Cannon argued that the ensuing status uncertainty was the result of a widespread aspiration for social advancement. The ability to control fashion was one of the strategies by which the aristocracy was previously able to maintain social control. However, by the nineteenth-century Cannon suggested that the lower orders now possessed both the desire and the means by whi   o adopt fashions that had been previously been the preserve of the rich. Thus in order to maintain social authority, Cannon argued that the aristocracy was forced to abandon a memorial style once they had been adopted by the lower orders. He found that in each case a style was associated with the upper classes before it peaked in popularity. At the height of its popularity, a fashion was associated with the middle classes and when a design had peaked in popularity, it was associated with the working classes. Inevitably, there is a finite point at which the expression of competitive status by ostentatious

display can be achieved. For example, Cannon noted that in his data set, a peak in diversity of form occurred in the mid-nineteenth century, and at that point other strategies were used to distinguish monuments of the elite, including variations of material and inscription styles. Ultimately, however, when competitive social behaviour brings stylistic elaboration it will also subsequently result in a simplification of forms. Cannon supported this interpretation by arguing that chronological inconsistencies show that the social controls of religion and regulation did not bring a simplification of commemoration, as argued by Parker Pearson. The reason the elite abandoned memorials to competitively demonstrate status and adopted other practices, notably cremation, was because commemoration became expressively redundant. This redundancy was brought about firstly because the material possibilities for differentiation had been exhausted and secondly because ostentation had become associated with the lower orders.

Cannon's published paper was subject to peer review (1989, 447-457). Three main criticisms were levelled against his approach, the first of which concerned Cannon's research framework. In particular, it was questioned as to whether patterns shown by commemoration could be applied to funerary behaviour as a whole, since this represented only a single stage of a multi-phased ritual. To be fair to the author, several issues raised by Cannon's paper were discussed in more depth in his earlier research. In his thesis, Cannon defended his research framework more closely, noting that an alysis of memorials in themselves was justified because of the great visible impact they had on the landscape (Cannon 1986, 42-46). Yet his critics were correct to note that by using memorials to stand for all types of mortuary evidence, rather than developing his interpretations within the specific nature of commemoration practices, Cannon to a large degree invited such questioning.

A second area of criticism surrounded Cannon's use of the term 'style'. Chapman, for example, noted that a wide ranging debate surrounded the archaeological definition and interpretation of 'style'

which Cannon's paper did not attempt to engage with (although it can be pointed out that major studies prior to 1986 were reviewed in Cannon's thesis) . In a response to his peer review, Cannon countered this criticism by arguing that a 'cycle of fashion simply establishes a baseline which in itself does not require specific explanation'. While it can be quite reasonably argued that an in-depth explanation of style and fashion as phenomena was not necessary, Cannon's response was insufficient, because it did not demonstrate why such debates were not relevant to his case study. Archaeological literature concerning style is expansive, abstract, and complex. Most studies have attempted to define 'style', and have questioned for example, whether it is integral to or an addendum of material culture (Wiesser 1983; Sackett 1985) or even whether it is a meaningful concept in itself (Boast 1997). Other studies have addressed the different means by which style may be used to communicate information (Wobst 1977; D. Miller 1985; Conkey & Hastorf ed. 1990; Wiessner 1990). However, since these debates have been framed almost entirely within ethnographic or prehistoric contexts, where the cultural particularity of the artefact is prioritised, interpretative approaches are difficult to apply to historical data. It is quite possible to analyse the appearance of gravestones, as memorial 'styles' without entering into complex debates over style because documentary sources, while incomplete and not without problems, do reveal the ideologies associated with memorial design (Sinclair 1989).

The greatest issues of   ntention within Cannon's approach, however was his dependency upon social emulation, as a 'human constant' as the impetus for social behaviour. Curren has rightly pointed out that Cannon's argument that death provided an opportunity for upward social mobility for the deceased is something of an oxymoron. Furthermore the high resulting expenditure, particularly for working class households, actually reversed the fortunes of the bereaved. Curren instead argues that commemoration represented the consolidation of family relations, since death was a threat to the family structure, rather

84

than the social order (see also Tarlow 1999c). The behaviour of the higher classes was not adopted for purposes of social advancement, but because they were seen to possess the most appropriate ways in which to demonstrate 'proper respect' towards the dead. Thus emulation was the result of 'fitting in' rather than 'climbing up' the social ladder. More recently Strange (2000) has shown that a more nuance understanding of attitudes to bereavement, mourning and commemoration can be recovered by studying the meanings actively ascribed by the working classes to funerary behaviour usually associated with an elite , such as the purchase of private grave plots. From a historical perspective, several commentators have noted that the hostility between the aristocracy and the middle classes during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries means that it is difficult to see why the middle classes should choose to emulate a section of society for which they often felt antipathy (Campbell 1987; 1995; Humphreys 1989; Martin 1993; Tarlow 1995). Moreover several authors have contended that it was the middle classes, rather than the aristocracy, whose taste controlled fashions at this time (Mrozowski 1988; Praetzellis, Praetzellis & Brown 1988; Abelson 1989; Earle 1989; Barry 1991; Richards 1991). Notwithstanding these criticisms, Cannon's research demonstrated that nineteenth-century memorials offer a valuable data set to the archaeologist and that an investigation of memorial design can profitably be examined as within the context of fashion.

1.2.6 Discussion

Section 1.2 has demonstrated the variety of research frameworks that have been applied to contemporary gravestone analysis. A common feature of these different approaches is the way in which the exploration of the unique nature of gravestone data has been eclipsed by the consideration of wider social issues. As a result, the range of ways in which gravestones could actively shape social identities, personal sentiments and social control has not been fully appreciated. Significant issues which remain overlooked within past studies include a broader

understanding of commemoration as social practice and the different life stages a memorial may possess. In particular, many studies have negated an examination of the production and purchase of memorials as meaningful action (Parker-Pearson 1982; Cannon 1986; 1989; McGuire 1988; Mytum 1989;1993;1994; Snyder 1989; Wurst 1991; Tarlow 1992; 1995), or have considered these areas only as separate, rather than interrelated spheres (L. Clark 1989; Burrell 1996; Mytum 1999; Tarlow 1999c). The research objective of this thesis is to offers both a theoretical and methodological approach to examine the conception, production, and purchase of memorials as interrelated and dynamic processes.

1.3 Consumer Choice Theory

1.3.0 Introduction

This thesis will explore the interaction between the producers and purchasers of memorials to show that an interpretation which prioritises a potential for negotiation between the two parties offers a more nuanced reading of how Victorian commemoration could be structured by social controls. Research will employ a framework of consumer choice theory, which is a specific approach within a much wider study of the consumption of goods. The study of consumption during the later historical period is a longstanding and expansive field, which spans numerous disciplines including the social sciences, history, economics and archaeology (Douglas & Isherwood 1979; D. Miller ed. 1995). A number of authors have examined this extensiv terature in detail (Glennie 1995; D. Miller 1995; Martin 1993; McCants 1995; Slater 1997; P. Courtney *forthcoming*), therefore only a brief summary of the study of consumption is set out here. Several significant studies of consumption date from the turn of the nineteenth century, including Veblen's (1899) study of how conspicuous consumption could be used to denote social status and Simmel's (1896) observations that competitive social display could be enacted through the emulation of material goods. More recently, analysis within the social sciences has prioritised an understanding of how the consumption of

goods constitutes symbolically meaningful action in itself (Mukerji 1983; D. Miller 1985; 1987; Appadurai ed. 1986; McCracken 1990). Research agendas have concentrated on the emergence and development of modern consumer society (McKendrick, Brewer & Plumb 1982; Brewer & Porter eds. 1993), and the factors that acted as catalyst for change: for example, whether change was supply-or-demand-led (De Vries 1993; Shammas 1993) and whether consumer demand was characterised by the needs of the aristocracy or the middle classes (Campbell 1987; 1995; Weatherill 1988). Given the extent and complexities of these previous studies, it is important that this thesis sets out clear parameters for research of the production and the purchase of Victorian memorials.

Analysis is located within the academic context of historical archaeology, rather than wider, interdisciplinary debates over the agendas for consumer choice studies. This thesis will furthermore show how consumer choice theory, which was developed within a processual perspective, can be applied within a post processualist paradigm in light of recent developments in consumer theory and archaeological practice. The research considers memorials as a specific artefact domain and prioritises their particular cultural and historic context within the Victorian period. Relatively few historical archaeology case studies have examined consumer and production issues of Victorian artefacts (G.L. Miller 1980; Praetzellis, Praetzellis, & Brown 1988; Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992), and the vast majority of research has examined North American, rather than British, material (notable exc   tions include Ewins 1997; Buckham 1999; Y. Courtney *forthcoming*). A bias towards consumption and production in earlier periods, notably in relation to the 'Georgian world view' is evident both in historical archaeology (Deetz 1977; Mrozowski 1988; Leone *et al* 1992; Upton 1992; Johnson 1993; J.A. Gibb 1996) and in wider consumption studies (Mukerji 1983; Weatherill 1988; McCracken 1990; Brewer and Porter eds. 1993). Often the analysis of the nature of specific artefact types has been eclipsed by the propensity to investigate social groups. Moreover, the social identities in question are frequently held by

marginalised or small elite groups. As a result, an understanding of the widespread normative practices of a 'silent majority' have tended to be been overlooked (Praetzellis, Praetzellis, & Brown 1988). Patently not all individuals are equal, and consumer choices are undoubtedly made in accordance with the cultural values of particular social groups (L. Clark 1987; Bourdieu 1989), but they are also made on the basis that not all goods are equal. An analysis of consumer choice therefore must recognise the specific context of production, purchase and use of different artefact domains. By adopting this perspective consumer choices theory can explore the nature of commemoration as social behaviour and how the management and patronage of specific types of burial landscapes may have regulated the available consumer choices for memorial designs.

1.3.1 Consumer Choice Theory within a Post-Processual Paradigm

The majority of consumer choice analysis has been applied within a processualist paradigm which primarily sought to use consumer goods to define socio-economic status (Spencer Wood ed. 1989). Such an approach depended on viewing material culture as a reflection of social stratification, and emphasis has been placed upon recognising general patterns and devising quantitative methods (*ibid.* ; Klein & LeeDecker 1991). More recently, as a result of post-modernist analysis in the social sciences and post- processualism, the study of consumption within historical archaeology has moved away from viewing consumption as an analytical tool recognising that consumer behaviour is meaningful action in itself (Cook, Yamin & McCarthy 1996). This study will consider both how sources other than advertising informed people's consumer choices and how processes such as shopping brought obje into people's lives. These research questions are also currently seen as integral to the wider application of consumer theory (Glennie 1995, 190). Whilst processualist research aimed to construct general laws and models, within a post-processualist paradigm, consumer choice analysis w ll focus upon the

88

specific cultural and historic context of Victorian memorials. Objects are laden with cultural values: for example, the Victorians saw goods as possessing a moral dimension which could have direct influence over the individual to good or bad effect (Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992; Briggs 1988). The use of consumer choice theory in this thesis prioritises an investigation of the active reflexive and multiple roles that memorials played in shaping commemoration and social relations.

The characteristic attributes of a consumer society have been clearly set out by Glennie (1995: 164) and can be summarised as follows: the rise per capita in the consumption of goods; the intensive production of commodities with a re-organisation of their distribution; and the correlation of consumer acquisition to fashion and advertising. As has already been noted, these key features of consumerism were manifest within the conspicuous consumption of Victorian society, but they were also evident within the manufacture and purchase of gravestones. In the industrial age goods began to be mass-produced and distributed by means of a retailer. Manufacturers were not only unknown to purchasers but did not necessarily share the same cultural values as the consumer. Buyers had neither direct influence over, nor information about, the design and manufacture of industrially produced goods (Stewart- Abernathy 1992:101-2). Gravestone production in the Victorian period was atypical since it displayed attributes of both industrial and non-industrial manufacture and supply. The use of advertisements and the impact of technological, trade and tran ort developments enabled the producer to manufacture and market memorials in a comparable way to mass-produced goods. Yet with the absence of an intermediary as distributor, the hypothesis can be explored that the consumer could affect the end product by means of face to face negotiation with the producer.

A major criticism of previous economic-based analysis of social relations has been that they have focused either upon modes of production or rates of consumption, rather than addressing the reciprocal dynamics between the producer and consumer (J.A. Gibb 1996; Wurst

1998) . As a result research has tended to view the market as either producer or consumer-led, resulting in an insufficient analysis of the individual needs of, and the negotiation between each of the two parties. Producer-led interpretations typically see manufacturers as responsible for creating new needs that are then served by new products in the quest for profit (Paynter 1988). However, this perspective ignores how consumers reassign meanings to goods in accordance with their own values, since consumption is not a goal in itself - but a means by which to fulfil objectives. In contrast, consumer-led interpretations generally understand the market as created by downward emulation between social classes (for example, Cannon 1989; Parker Pearson 1982). But emulation is only one factor influencing the acquisition of goods. Other considerations, which are prioritised above a class analysis in this research, include the need to cement family and social relations, religion, and a fascination with novelty or a concern with tradition. This analysis will demonstrate production and purchase as inter-linked, rather than separate, spheres. With the wider theoretical framework now in place, the next chapter will move to a more specific discussion of York Cemetery itself.

CHAPTER TWO: THE HISTORICAL, CULTURAL, AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXTS OF YORK CEMETERY

2.0 Introduction

The inception of modern cemeteries in the 1820s represented an innovative and radical challenge to the traditions of churchyard burial. This chapter shows how York Cemetery's unique history is embedded within a larger movement that saw the nation-wide - indeed international - establishment of modern cemeteries. The primary purpose of this section is to demonstrate why York Cemetery is a suitable location to examine the research questions set out in Chapter One. A further objective is to show how an appreciation of the particular context of nineteenth century cemeteries enables a fresh understanding of Victorian memorials.

Following a summary of the historical sources available for study, this chapter explores the many potential meanings modern cemeteries hold. An initial discussion highlights the complexities involved in defining cemeteries as a distinct type of burial site. Attention is drawn to the key features of their design that distinguished cemeteries as unique landscapes. The widespread establishment of cemeteries during the nineteenth century is discussed in relation to three specific themes: religious politics, burial overcrowding, and business practice. Particular emphasis is given to both how York Cemetery may reflect national trends and to practices which are specific to this site. The York Cemetery Company's business ethos is compared to that of other cemeteries in order to explore the extent to which cemetery company's rules and regulations could influence the range of available consumer choices. The archaeological research potential of York Cemetery is also considered alongside York's other burial landscapes. A con luding discussion summarises the strengths and suitability of York cemetery as a case study.

2.1 Available Historical and Documentary Resources

Cemeteries are emerging as a distinct area of research within the study of the modern world (Curl 1982-94; C. Brooks 1989a; 1989b; Rugg 1992-2000). Before discussing the cultural dimensions of cemeteries, this section will briefly summarise the wealth of documentary evidence available for a study of York Cemetery. The Victorian age is a known and documented period, and established historical frameworks exist at local, regional, and national levels. Previous historical research has addressed the interaction between material culture and social relations during the nineteenth century (Briggs 1988; Abelson 1989; Bronner 1989; Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992). Victorian attitudes to death have received attention, either as part of longer-term studies (Aries 1974; 1983; Whaley ed. 1981; Houlbrooke ed. 1989; Litten 1991) or as a defined area of research in itself (Morley 1971; Curl 1972; Jalland 1989; 1996; 1999).

York is a city of national importance both in the distant and recent past (Drake 1736; W. Hargrove 1818; Nuttgens 1976; Hutchinson & Palliser 1980). The City's focus as a religious centre, a lynchpin of the British transport network, and as a place of heritage is of cultural significance (Benson 1911-25; Tillott ed. 1961; Royal Commission 1962-1981). Several studies have investigated the social history of York in the Victorian period (Armstrong 1974; Peacock 1974-81; Royle 1981-85; Owston 1992; Emes 1996). A number of York's burial grounds and their monuments have undergone previous historical, genealogical or archaeological survey (Mor l 1944-8; Beckerlegge 1985; Rimmer 1987; H. Murray 1994). In particular, York cemetery has been the subject of historical research, most notably by H. Murray (1991; see also H. Murray 1992; Degnan 1994; Poole 1994-7) and has been included within wider historical and architectural studies (Curl 1982; C Brooks 1989a; Rugg 1992).

The principal documentary sources available to this research are the York Cemetery Company's business records held at the York City Archives (YCA Acc. 107, 239 & 247), which are described in Chapter

Three. Other primary sources that record the establishment, use, and public response to York Cemetery include newspapers, guide books, and trade directories (the York Herald; W. Hargrove 1838; Williams and Co 1844). Two memorial pattern books also survive, the first compiled by a local stonemason, William Plows (YCL Y718.PLO), and the second produced by the York Cemetery Company (YCA Acc.107/65:1). Numerous printed memorial pattern books are also available for study (including Thomas 1848; Dodson 1860; J.B. Robinson 1862-72; Borrow dale 1881). Several other cemetery companies also possess surviving documentation, enabling preliminary comparisons to be drawn between the York Cemetery Company and wider practice (Grundy 1843 NCL; Barker 1869). Further primary sources provide more general commentaries on Victorian attitudes towards cemeteries, burial, commemoration, and memorial design (Bloxham 1834; Markland 1843; Paget 1843; Milner 1846; Carter 1847; Heywood 1856; E. Stone 1858; Pettigrew 1864). By using a synthesis of sources, this study is able to engage critically with the material and documentary records, an objective that is currently seen as integral to the analysis of cemeteries within historical archaeology (Bell 1997).

2.2 Defining the Cemetery

York Cemetery opened in 1837, the year in which Queen Victoria acceded to the throne. Widespread cemetery establishment gained momentum during the pre- Victorian period: the Rosary Cemetery had opened in 1819 at Norwich and cemeteries   anced by joint-stock companies were established at Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle and Great Yarmouth during the 1820s (Rugg 1992). By 1850 over 100 cemetery companies had been founded, more than half of which went on to establish cemeteries (Rugg 1992).

The emergence of modern cemeteries as cultural institutions displays a complex chronology. Although several events are widely cited as antecedent to the British cemetery movement, their precise influence is yet to be fully established. Precedents for expansive, non parochial burial

grounds have been drawn from English, British, European, and colonial practices. After the Great Fire in 1666, Wren put forward an unadopted proposal that several large burial grounds should be built on the outskirts of London (Mytum 1989, 286; C. Brooks 1989a, 3; Curl 1993, 136). In the capital, large shared burial grounds, such as the New Churchyard and Bunhill Fields, were already in existence before the seventeenth century (Harding 1998). Furthermore, within the British Isles, two large municipal burial grounds opened in Belfast and Edinburgh during the 1770s (C. Brooks 1989a, 6; Curl 1993,148). Moves to create extra mural burial grounds had occurred in France, Sweden and Germany from the latter half of the eighteenth century onwards (McManners 1981; Whaley 1981; Etlin 1984; Curl 1993; Kselman 1993).

The opening of Père Lachaise Cemetery in Paris in 1804 is widely considered to be the most influential precedent for British cemeteries. The grand scale of Père Lachaise's planning and design, coupled with its economically viable marketing of death, marked a dramatic departure from the utilitarian arrangement of earlier large burial sites (C. Brooks 1989a, 7). On an wider, inter-continental stage, the burial grounds founded by European colonists during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, notably in the Indian sub-continent, South East Asia, and America, have also been seen as important antecedents to British practice (Linden-Ward 1989; Mytum 1989; Sloane 1991; Curl 1993). This study prioritises an analysis of the development of cemeteries in Britain, but recognises that, as a global phenomena, cem teries have the potential to be studied at an international level (Rotundo 1974; 1984; Linden-Ward 1989; S.P.Q. Rahtz et al 1989; Sadek & Šedinová 1989; Weston ed. 1989; Sloane 1991; Goody & Poppi 1994; Nichol 1994; Czerner & Juszkiewicz eds. 1995; L. Murray 1997).

Modern cemeteries can be simply defined by their appearance: large, enclosed areas of landscaped ground situated on the outskirts of towns; and by their purpose: the ritualised disposal of the dead outside the direct control of the Church. Few authors have moved beyond such

prefatory definitions to examine in detail the range of associations and features that a cemetery may possess (notable exceptions include: Rugg 1998c; *forthcoming*; Buckham *forthcoming*). One reason why cemeteries are difficult to decipher is because they are not characterised by a single feature but are instead composed of a number of elements whose combination may differ from site to site. Moreover, primary sources clearly show that the ideologies associated with cemeteries were manifold, diverse, and often conflicting:

> 'It is not to the success of the project [the Leeds General Cemetery]
> as a mercantile speculation that they would refer... Nor do they
> allude to the advantages of the Cemetery as a place of healthful
> recreation, which does honour the taste and public spirit of the
> town...Your Committee are persuaded that the Proprietors will
> derive a higher and purer satisfaction, from the consciousness that
> they have been instrumental in providing, for every class of this vast
> community, the means of decent and undisturbed sepulchre,
> according to the rites of their own religious faith.'
> Report of the First AGM of the Leeds General Cemetery Company,
> 1836:1, YCA Acc.107

In many ways cemeteries represent a landscape of oppositions that resist simple explication. For example, cemetery companies were commercial enterprises with   siness interests of mercantile speculation. Yet at the same time cemeteries could fulfil the philanthropic interest of providing decent burial facilities for the poor (Rugg 1998a). It is possible to see cemeteries as contested spaces since they could be established to benefit a particular group, such as Dissenters (Morgan 1989) or the middle classes (Tyson 1994). On the other hand, cemeteries could harness a community's public spirit, and integrate collective ideals of civic pride (Rugg 2000). Cemeteries protected both the dead and the living. Within the cemetery's walls the corpse was offered decent and undisturbed

sepulchre, and spared the disturbance found in overfilled churchyards (Hargrove 1847). Until 1832, cemeteries also guarded the dead from the nefarious intrusion of the resurrectionists (Richardson 1988; 1989). Concurrent with the idea of affording security to the corpse was the belief that the living needed to be protected from the dead, and cemeteries were one aspect of a wider movement that sought to improve the health and sanitation of the living (Mytum 1989). The notion that the cemetery could be used as a public park and educational resource did not detract from the sanctity and sentimentality of its landscape, which was specifically designed as a context within which to express private grief (Tarlow *forthcoming*).

The ideologies that not only underpinned the need to establish a cemetery but also its appearance and use were susceptible to change over time. An analysis of the incentives to establish cemetery companies represents the most comprehensive study of cemetery development in Britain (Rugg 1992). This research identified four overriding factors leading to the foundation of cemeteries before 1850. In roughly chronological order the main issues involved were; religious politics (notably the actions of Dissenting groups), concerns with health reform, financial speculation, and notions of civic pride. Before examining these motivations in more detail and in light of the case study of York Cemetery contained in sections 2.4 to 2.6, section 2.3 will consider the relationship between the ideology and the appearance of cemeteries.

2.3 Cemetery Design

2.3.0 Introduction

Documentary sources reveal that cemetery design was a recognised and widely discussed professional field of endeavo   (Strang 1831; Loudon 1843; W. Robinson 1880; Holmes 1896). As noted earlier, several simple physical features distinguished cemeteries from other burial sites. The definitive aspect of cemeteries however, lay in the sense in which their design was conceived to elicit specific emotions and behaviour. It is not the

purpose of the present study to offer an exhaustive inventory of the features associated with different burial site types. Rather this section will summarise the features and ideologies which denoted cemeteries as particular landscapes, and show how the design of York Cemetery can be located within the framework of changing cemetery fashions which has been established by previous studies (Meller 1981; C. Brooks 1989a; Elliot 1989; Curl 1993; 1994).

2.3.1 Cemetery Landscapes, Architecture and Planting: An Overview of Fashions and Meanings

At its opening, the landscape and buildings of York Cemetery followed the fashions of the day (Figure 1, Pates 1-13). The gateway and enclosing wall were embellished with stone carvings of a sphinx, sarcophagus, and urns (Plates 1-2). The entrance and enclosures were distinctive aspects of cemeteries, offering not only security but reflecting the demarcation of space away from the living by adopting the iconography of death. Indeed, the features of cemetery entrances were sufficiently predictable to enable Pugin (1843, 12) to caricature this single feature in order to attack the notion of cemeteries as a whole. Once through the gateway, York's landscape was set out in a circular geometric plan to the east and in a converging elliptical design to the west (Figure 2). The chapel area had been moderately elevated as the gentle slopes of the main ground were evened out (Plate 3). This layout reflected the general principles of a garden cemetery, as exemplified by the plan of Kensal Green three years earlier (Curl 1993, 218). Little is known of the earliest cemetery landscapes, since many 1820s cemeteries such as Every Street and Chorlton Row, Manchester no longer survive, but it is believed that their plans followed a more functional, grid style patt rn (C. Brooks 1989a, 9). It is the move from a functional burial area to a consciously designed landscape, in the manner of a pleasure garden or a public park, which denotes the garden cemetery. The garden cemetery design predominated for the entire Victorian period, although less frequently ad pted cemetery

styles included the 1830s' cityscape landscape at Glasgow Necropolis
(Curl 1993, 157) and the systematic planned grids proposed by Loudon
(1843), as executed at Cambridge (C. Brooks 1989a, 38).

Cemetery landscapes were defined not only by their plan and
buildings but also by their planting. The earliest garden styles are largely
lost today (Elliot 1989). As cemeteries developed, their horticulture was
both susceptible to changing fashions and vulnerable to destruction. Some
idea of the importance of planting at York Cemetery can be gauged by the
Company's1837 gardening design competition, which offered a first prize
of 5 guineas (YG 19/11/1837). Before the 1850s, several cemeteries
included elaborate botanical features, such as the arboretum at Abney
Park (Barker 1869, 23). The grounds at York were planted with trees,
shrubs and flower beds, and at one point included a cross composed of
trees, located to the south-west of the main entrance (Figures 1& 2; YG
16/09/1837). After the 1850s, elaborate styles of planting fell out of
fashion, as they became viewed as more suited to pleasure grounds than
places of burial (Loudon 1843). Popular tastes began to favour more
symbolic and sombre planting, using dark foliage and trees such as the
weeping willow. This asceticism was short lived, and flowers were popular
once more by the 1870s (Elliott 1989).

Cemetery landscapes were specifically contrived both to reflect
sensibilities of grief and to act as a place of rational recreation (Curl 1972;
Meller 1981; Tarlow forthcoming). Numerous depictions of cemeteries
portray visitors perusing m   rials or promenading through tree-lined
walks (Figure 3, C. Brooks 1989a, 15; 29; Curl 1993, 233, 241,290, 296).
The roles of cemeteries for both the living and the dead were stressed by
leading designers and commentators of the day. To Strang (1831, 58-62),
cemeteries should be beneficial to public morals and the most convincing
token of a nation's progress in civilisation and the arts. Loudon (1843,1)
concurred with Strang, but believed a cemetery's primary purpose was to
dispose of the dead in such a manner that their decomposition and return
to the earth shall not prove injurious to the living, either by affecting health

or by shocking feelings, opinions or prejudices. Such comments express widely- held sentiments, but the extent to which designers and commentators were proactive, rather than reactive, to the cemetery zeitgeist is less clear.

The chapel at York was used by all denominations, and lay on the dividing line between the consecrated area for Anglican burials to the east, and the unconsecrated ground for the burial of Nonconformists and Roman Catholics to the west (Figure 2, Pate 7). At York, the use of a single shared building denoted religious tolerance (*YCA* Acc. 247/28), although as Curl (1982) has noted, the chapel was originally divided internally. As H. Murray (1991) has pointed out, this arrangement was also a more cost-effective option. More commonly, two separate cemetery chapels were built, one for use by Anglicans and another for Dissenters, although later fashions sometimes employed a *porte-cochère* to connect separated chapels (C. Brooks 1989a, 66-67). The wider arrangement of cemetery chapels has yet to be studied systematically, and could prove a valuable indicator of inter-denominational relations. In addition to the chapel, below which the catacombs were located, York Cemetery also included a gate lodge, which was later extended for further office space, and a stone yard which no longer survives (Figure 2). The architecture at York won praise from both contemporary and current critics, and the gate house and chapel are Grade II listed buildings and four memorials have also been listed (Hargrove 1838; Grundy 1846 *NCL*; Curl 1982; C. Brooks 1989a, 180). The designers at York later   ved significant upon a national stage. After completing York Cemetery, the architect James Piggott Pritchett became a leading figure within cemetery design (C. Brooks 1989a, 180; H. Murray 1991,11) and Walker, the local foundry responsible for the ironwork at the cemetery, later made gates for the British Museum (C. Brooks 1989a, 180; H. Murray 1991,11).

In common with the majority of early cemeteries, the buildings at York are executed in a Greek neo-classical design. In the early decades of the nineteenth century, classical styles rediscovered and reclaimed during

the Enlightenment predominated for the architecture of the living and of the dead (Curl 1993). The Gothic style was first fully employed for a cemetery at Norwood in 1837 (C. Brooks 1989a). This style had begun to find favour after a Gothic design was selected for the new Palace of Westminster in 1835 (C. Brooks 1989a, 21). Pugin's series of treatises (1836; 1841; 1843) were instrumental in popularising the Gothic form for the Roman Catholic Church in Britain (Meller 1981; C. Brooks 1989a; Curl 1993). As the Gothic style began to be more frequently adopted, it was promptly claimed by the Anglican High Church Movement, and became widely considered as the most appropriate style for Christian architecture (Ecclesiological Society 1847). Once Gothic was favoured by the Anglican Church, neo-classical styles, with their pagan associations, began to be seen as inappropriate for Christian places of burial (Markland 1843; Paget 1843; Trollope 1858). Some authors have argued that from this point, classicalism became more closely associated with Dissent (C. Brooks 1989a, 62). The Egyptian style enjoyed a brief popular interlude between the 1830s and 1840s, but tended to be adopted for individual buildings, notably the catacombs and circle at Highgate, rather than for an entire cemetery design. This architectural style appears to have been more neutral in concept and bore no special association with Papists, Anglicans, or Dissenting groups (*ibid.*).

Adopting specific phases of the same general style could also show religious affiliation. C. Brooks (1989a, 67), for example, noted that the Torquay cemetery chapel f   nglicans was completed in the decorated style, whereas the Dissenters chapel, which was also of a Gothic form, was executed in perpendicular style. C. Brooks argued that different architectural features, such as bellcotes, were also used to denote religious affiliation (*ibid.*). These architectural fashions influenced memorial design and similar, although largely untested, hypotheses have argued that the choice of memorial design was also used to expresses religious affiliation (Meller 1981; C. Brooks 1989a; Curl 1993). Most interpretations of architectural styles as signifiers of religious affiliation have been put

100

forward on the basis of documentary evidence. Parties seeking to advance the interests of a particular religious group (for example, Ecclesiological Society 1847), largely composed these sources. The influence of these religious treatises upon the cemetery companies is yet to be comprehensively demonstrated. At present, there is no way of distinguishing the extent to which cemetery companies acknowledged the religious politics of architectural styles above non- sectarian considerations, such as fashion and aesthetics. Interpretations have also to address the importance of cemetery design within a wider civic ethos, and the transmission of cemetery designs outside of a documentary context.

In 1846, the sub-committee of Northampton Cemetery Company completed a report to provide plans and estimates for a new cemetery (Grundy 1846, *NCL*). For this report, a deputation had visited several cemeteries across England, including York. Their account of York Cemetery was most favourable,   concluding that York's design   may be viewed as a desirable model for imitation (*ibid.*). This document reveals two important aspects of cemeteries, firstly that they were a self-reflexive phenomena, and secondly that their prospective audience was not limited to a local community. A letter to the Yorkshire Gazette further evidences this second point in 1850, which noted that:

> 'Amongst the attractions of York, the cemetery occupies a high rank. Whenever a ple   re train arrives I meet large parties on their road to explore it. Nor is it to be wondered at, considering the natural beauty of the situation and the taste with which it is laid out'.
> *Yorkshire Gazette* 26 September 1850:3

Cemeteries were an important feature of the urban landscape design, and enveloped by notions of the civilising nature of cities (Rugg 1998). They were frequently included in city guides (Hargrove 1838: 148-152), and indeed some cemeteries had their own guid books (Clark

1843; Haywood 1856; Justyne 1858; 1865). Yet cemeteries were not simply passive indicators of urban improvement; they could also actively enhance the reputations of individual cities and towns. Rugg (1998, 50) relates the complaint of a Leeds resident to the Directors of the Leeds General Cemetery Company, who on visiting the Portsea Island Cemetery of Portsmouth, felt aggrieved at its architectural superiority, which was a disgrace to Leeds considering its superior wealth . York residents also felt strongly about the appearance of their cemetery. The above letter to the Yorkshire Gazette continues with suggestions for how the cemetery could be rendered still more attractive (*YG* 26/09/1850). Each city laid claim to the most attractive cemetery and local enthusiasm in York was no different, contending that:

> 'No city in the kingdom possesses a more beautiful cemetery than
> ours. There the dead may rest in peace...beneath the verdant
> hillocks of the *Père la Chaise* of York' A.E. Hargrove 1847: 11

An analogy between York Cemetery and Père Lachaise, one of the world's most famous cemeteries, cannot be taken seriously in any literal sense. Yet such a comparison very clearly portrays the sense of community pride that rested within York Cemetery's presence and appearance. The following sections will further consider the interaction between cemeteries and society by exploring the various motivations to establish cemeteries.

2.4 Cemetery Establishment and Religious Politics

2.4.0 Introduction

Several studies have considered how theological controversies surrounding the doctrines of judgement, heaven and hell affected Victorian attitudes to death (Morley 1971; Rowell 1974; Wheeler 1994). Recent research, notably by Rugg (1992-2000) and Morgan (1989), has suggested that religious politics were a primary agency underlying the establishment of cemeteries (see also Laqueur 1993; C. Brooks 1989a;

Tyson 1994). During the nineteenth century, the numerous social disadvantages faced by Dissenters included a lack of legal recognition for their marriage services, restricted admission to universities, and restrictions on participation in local and national government (Stiles 1995: 93-6). Of greater significance to this study are the restrictions that surrounded Nonconformist burial. Dissenter's grievances towards the Church of England hinged on two main issues. Firstly, parish burial excluded the possibility of Nonconformist funeral services; moreover, churchyards were consecrated and some Dissenting groups sanctioned burial only in unconsecrated ground. A second grievance surrounded the universal payment of the parish church rate. Edward Baines, a Dissenter and MP for Leeds, voiced the Nonconformist opinion when he argued that parish churchyards:

> 'belonging to the respective parishes of the Country are public property, and have been provided by rates levied on the inhabitants generally, to which Protestant Dissenters have contributed their full portion, we ask therefore, that these, which in many cases are the burial places of our fathers may be open to us to bury our dead, in our way, without being compelled to submit to the ritual of the church of England.'
>
> *Patriot* 11 December 1833.

The Clergy in turn realised t   any threat to its monopoly over burial provision would jeopardise the recovery of the burial fees which played a crucial part of the Church's income (Hargrove 1847: 7; Rugg 1999a: 318). Between the 1820s and 1850s, many Anglican clergymen began to feel compromised when presiding over the burial of Nonconformists. In particular, the 68th Canon forbade the church burial of anyone who was unbaptised. It could be difficult for clergy to decide whether baptism by a lay or Dissenting minister was valid. For example, Unitarian baptism did not invoke the Trinity, and Baptists typically reserved this rite for adults

(Laqueur 1993: 194; Rugg 1998b). Yet also present amidst the many theological and financial issues was a far more simple hostility. A letter to the *British Magazine* in 1834 described the burial of Dissenters according to Anglican rites as a painful duty, since the blessing of those who had reviled the forms, ministers and doctrines of the Church was an insult to those buried with the same rites who had been loyal Anglicans (*British Magazine* 5,1834: 449).

2.4.1 Religious Politics and Joint-Stock Cemetery Companies: A National Overview

Several Nonconformist groups, most notably Quakers, have a long, if modest, tradition of providing their own burial facilities. The secularly owned New Churchyard and Bunhill Fields burial grounds in London were particularly associated with the burial of Dissenters (Harding 1998, 61). In 1819, the Nonconformist minister Reverend Thomas Drummond founded the Rosary cemetery at Norwich (Nierop-Reading 1989). Although the Rosary can be seen as Britain's first cemetery, it was not originally founded by a joint-stock company. This is an important distinction: joint-stock ownership provided the infrastructure to enable the widespread introduction of cemeteries. Indeed, this aspect of early cemeteries has been seen as the key feature that enabled the change in burial practice to take place (Morgan 1989; Rugg 1999a). Of the twelve earliest cemetery companies (dating from the 1820s and 1830s), nine were composed of Dissenting trustees and Rugg (1999a) has argued that these Nonconformist-led companies can be seen as directly evolving from church rate battles.

In 1820, Manchester saw one of the earliest large-scale church rate battle victories. Since the level of the church ra   was fixed at vestry meetings through a system of public voting, it was possible for Dissenters to deliberately crowd an assembly and vote for either the suspension of, or a particularly low church rate (Morgan 1989; Rugg 1999a, 309). The defeat of the church rate at Manchester brought two major consequences for

burial provision (Rugg 1999a). Firstly, the ensuing tension between Church and Chapel meant that a legislated solution to Dissenters burial grievances became increasingly improbable . Secondly, the Dissenters victory fuelled Dissenters to attack other Anglican institutions, including the clergy's control of burial provision, by founding Britain's first cemetery company. The Rusholme Road Proprietary Cemetery, informally known as the Dissenters Cemetery , opened in 1821 (C. Brooks 1989a: 9). Manchester had set a precedent, and over the next twenty years more than nineteen specifically Dissent-led cemeteries were established (Rugg 1992). The role of these cemeteries in resolving burial grievances was emphasised at length:

'Abney Park has never received Episcopal consecration; every portion of this cemetery is accessible to all parties, without distinction or preference. There is no invidious separating line, either open to view, or, for reasons of policy, concealed to divide this peaceful abode of the dead... The Object of this Company is the establishment of a General Cemetery... which shall be open to... all denominations of Christians without restraint in forms. Here sects and parties are extinguished; denominational distinctions annihilated; no discordant sounds disturb the repose.'

Barker 1869:22

Levels of religious ten ˙ n, co-operation, and tolerance varied from company to company. The cemetery at Kidderminster, for example, was set up as a direct response to a single action of clerical provocation (Rugg 1998b). In 1842 Richard Fry, pastor of the Unitarian church at Kidderminster, died and his final wish was to be buried alongside his family in the parish churchyard. The response of the parish vicar was unequivocal; in a letter to the undertaker conducting Fry's funeral arrangements he stated:

'If the corpse is brought to the church I shall not refuse to bury it but
if it is brought I am thus required to perform the service, I shall take
the fact of the funeral coming to the church as a tacit
acknowledgement that the deceased did not wish to be regarded in
death as a dissenter from our community.'

Quoted in Evans 1900: 104.

Fry's bereaved chose to inter him in the graveyard adjoining the Unitarian
chapel, and a cemetery company was established soon after where
ecclesiastical bigotry and High church despotism shall have no control
(Evans 1900: 105). Curl (1993: 219) has incorrectly stated that all early
cemeteries were divided into consecrated and unconsecrated areas. In
fact Rugg (1992) has shown that from a total of seventeen cemeteries
opened before 1840, the vast majority were entirely unconsecrated and
only five cemeteries, including York, were at least partly consecrated. The
remaining cemetery, St James Liverpool, was entirely consecrated. The
Dissenting cemetery companies at Nottingham and Swansea were unusual
as their Trustees embraced the principle that if their grounds were to be
truly open to all, part of the cemetery should be consecrated and therefore
available to Anglicans (Rugg 1998b).

The established church reacted to the emergence of cemeteries in a
number of ways. As a result of clerical influence, government legislation
forced cemetery companies founded by Acts of Parliament to pay the
parish compensation when bu ls took place in the cemetery instead of
the churchyard (C. Brooks 1989a, 42; Rugg 1998a, 137-8). Sufficient
pressure was brought to bear by Anglican opposition that the cemeteries
planned for Hereford and Oxford were abandoned, despite their local
support (Rugg 1999a, 319). The attitude of the Church to the idea of
cemeteries was not entirely censorious, however. Three specifically
Anglican cemetery companies were founded at Liverpool, Birmingham, and
Nottingham in 1826, 1846, and 1851 respectively (C. Brooks 1998a, 41;
Rugg 1999a). Furthermore, the rhetoric of these Anglican companies could

be every bit as confrontational as the politics expressed by the Dissenting voice. For example, at Liverpool's St James Cemetery, the Company argued that their site would provide for the members of the Established Church and for others who prefer burial in consecrated ground and would be a project which will tend materially to give additional strength and stability to the ecclesiastical establishment of the country (MS Minute Book of the Trustees of St James Cemetery 2/09/1825 cited in Rugg 1999a: 319).

2.4.2 Religious Relations in York and the Establishment of York Cemetery

York's longstanding focus as a centre for Nonconformist and Roman Catholic thought continued into the Victorian period (Royle 1981-85; Ellerby & Pritchett 1993; Emes 1996). Quaker, Unitarian, and Congregationalists burial grounds had been established in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries respectively, and two graveyards for Catholic orders were opened during the nineteenth century (Rimmer 1987; H. Murray 1994). The 1837 Manchester Statistical Society's Survey and the 1851 National Census of Church Attendance both noted that in York the adult presence at all places of worship was between 53-55% of the total population, a figure which was considerably higher than the national average (Royle 1983, 3; Armstrong 1974, 72). Whilst church attendance is not a measure of religious belief as such, these surveys provide a broad idea of the distribution of religious affiliations within York and indicate the presence of both a significant Roman Catholic and Nonconformist population (Charts 1-3).

While a full history of church rate battles in York has yet to be written, existing studies have not emphasised th church rate as a central issue of the inter- religious relations of the day, nor its role as the catalyst within the foundation of the York Cemetery (Royle 1981-85; H. Murray 1991). One study, however, suggests that church rate battles took place with a frequency that enabled at least one solicitor to specialise in this type

of case (Peacock 1981, 236). During the 1830s, notable tensions existed between Nonconformists (which in York primarily meant Independents and Congregationalists) and the Anglican Church over such matters as the rating of chapels and the provision of education (Royle *pers. comm.*). In 1832, significant inter-denominational discord was aroused over the location and management of a municipal burial ground for victims of the cholera epidemic (*YC* 31/071832/;*YG* 04/08/1832; 18/08/1832; *YH* 28/07/1832). This dispute hinged on the crucial issue of whether the cholera burial ground should remain unconsecrated. The ensuing confrontation was not simply the result of different religious beliefs, but involved wider, secular considerations and above all, local politics (Tolhurst 1985). It was the Council's intention that once the cholera epidemic was over, the burial ground would be closed. Should the land be consecrated, then the burial ground would no longer be available for future development. On the one hand, the Cholera Burial Ground would become an increasing financial drain upon the Council, but on the other hand, consecration would serve the public's, or at least a majority's, interests, since the dead would be protected from future disturbance. Tensions were eventually resolved when the Council finally bowed to public pressure and politically manoeuvring, and elected to grant the land to the City of York in perpetuity (Tolhurst 1985).

Shortly after the cholera epidemic of 1833, part of the York Board of Health met to discuss the possibility of forming a cemetery. A year later the committee that, like the B   d before it, was an interdenominational body, decided to issue a public circular outlining their intention to form the York Cemetery Company. No further action was taken due to a subsequent proposal by the Archdeacon of York to found cemeteries in each of the city's wards (Hargrove 1838; Tolhurst 1985). It quickly became apparent, however, that the Clergy's plans were untenable because of a scarcity of suitable land (*ibid.*). In 1835, plans for a cemetery were raised before the York Council. Again action was postponed, this time the result of the Council's lack of vested interest (H. Murray 1991, 4) Impetus once

more returned to the private sector, as a second joint- stock company venture, the York General Cemetery Company, issued a prospectus (H. Murray 1991). Galvanised back into action, the original York Cemetery Company re-issued its own prospectus and an application for shares (*YH* 28/08/1836). This action finally succeeded in raising both the necessary interest and finances to establish a cemetery and in 1837 York Cemetery opened.

An accord between religious denominations had been intimated in the 1836 York Cemetery Company Prospectus, but was clearly set out within 1837 York Cemetery Company's Deed of Settlement (*YCA* Acc. 247/29).

> 'That the privilege of burial and purchasing graves, vaults and rights of interment in the said cemetery shall be open upon equal terms to persons of every religious denomination; And the friends of the deceased persons of all religious denominations shall be entitled to use any decent and becoming funeral rites and ceremonies.'
>
> York Cemetery Company's Deed of Settlement (*YCA* Acc. 247/29).

The Deed of Settlement legislated that one half of the cemetery grounds would be consecrated, while the other half would remain unconsecrated. The Deed further required of the Cemetery Trustees that one half of which Committee shall be members of the Church of England, and the other half members of other religious denominations (*ibid.,* clause 6). In reality, this clause regularised the shared ter-denominational interests that had been present in the committee from the time of its initial meeting in 1834. The Deed of Settlement also ensured that the chapel would be able to accommodate the funeral services of all religious persuasions. Only one instance of religious tension appears to have surrounded the opening of the cemetery, for although the Company had conferred the right for parish priests to perform the burial rites for their parishioners, it had great difficulty in persuading the clergy of York to do so (*ibid.,* clause 30). As a result, the Cemetery was forced to appoint its own cemetery chaplain (H. Murray

1991). Since the cemetery was established by Deed of Settlement, rather than by an Act of Parliament, no compensation needed be made to Church of England in lieu of burial fees. The Anglican clergy were well represented amongst the trustees and had been actively involved in the creation of the cemetery. In fact no less a figure than the Archbishop of York had presided over the cemetery's consecration ceremony (YG 16/09/1837). This reluctance to preside over funerals, can therefore be best interpreted as the response of individual clerics to the cemetery rather than the Established Church as a whole.

2.4.3 Discussion

Dissenters' campaigns against the established church were enacted at a local, rather than national, level and the degree of religious conflict involved could differ from town to town (Rugg 1999a). It is clear that York cemetery was established without the same degree of animosity evident at some other cemeteries. Yet it is difficult to determine in more precise detail the full effects of religious politics as a dynamic within the cemetery movement. It remains unclear, for example, exactly how the inter-denominational tolerance or conflict shown by cemetery companies compared to other types of businesses and committees. The level of co-operation found within the York Cemetery Company was certainly more successful than other contemporary joint, albeit non-speculative, civic endeavours. In 1843, for example, an attempt was made to establish an inter-denominational National chools Committee, but this proved unworkable, and an inclusive school board was not established until 1889 (Royle 1985, 26). Actions that osten ibly reflect religious politics may also have been swayed by non-sectarian concerns. For example, C. Brooks (1989a) argued that the decision not to consecrate Abney Park Cemetery was made in light of strong financial, as well as political, considerations. Religious relations were not static and current studies have yet to address how religious politics effected the continued use of cemeteries. Particularly germane is the extent to which cemeteries may have actively created,

rather than simply reflected, social relations. The Report of the 34th Annual General Meeting (AGM) of the York Cemetery Company, for example, states that there was no doubt that the institution of the cemetery would tend to promote a friendly feeling between the different denominations (*YG* 22/07/1871). Finally, one further issue yet to be resolved is the extent to which the cemetery companies rhetoric was representative of wider perceptions of inter-denominational relations, which may be voiced, for example, by the consumer choices adopted in the cemetery.

2.5 The Establishment of Cemeteries as a Response to a Burial Crisis

2.5.0 Introduction

Most studies have agreed that a crisis in burial provision and concerns for the health of the living were both underlying factors leading to the inception of modern cemeteries (C. Brooks 1989a; Morgan 1989; Curl 1993; Tyson 1994; Rugg 1992-1999b; Tarlow *forthcoming*). Some authors, notably Mytum (1989), have predominantly viewed cemetery establishment as the result of sanitary reform (see also Morley 1971; Curl 1972, 22; Tolhurst 1985; Litten 1991,134; H. Murray 1994, 149). Other authors have disputed such a direct causal link on the grounds of chronological inconsistencies (eg Laqueur 1993, 182-3; Rugg 1998a, 45; Tarlow 1999c, 126).

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw an unprecedented growth in the urban population (Zhao 1996; Tranter 1985: 34-7). In 1801 the inhabitants of England and Wales numbered 9,000,000, but by the close of the century the population had soared to 32,500,000. At the start of the century less than 20% of people were town dwellers, yet by 1901, 75% of the population of England and Wales lived and died in an urban setting (C. Brooks 1989a,1). In York the populat n increase was dramatic, rising by over 71% between 1801 and 1841. Yet for the same period, the industrial cities of Leeds, Huddersfield and Bradford displayed an even more striking increases as their populations rose between 186% to 444% (H. Murray 1991, 3). During the nineteenth century churchyard

burial provision rapidly proved to be inadequate and the congested conditions of the living also prevailed amongst the dead. Earlier overcrowding had been ameliorated through the use of charnel houses, but this practice was abandoned by the late eighteenth century (Tarlow *forthcoming*; Curl 1993, 358). Nonconformists burial provisions were simply too modest to alleviate churchyard overcrowding. In Leeds, for example, between 1730 and 1820, Anglican burial grounds received between 93% and 96% of all the city's dead (Morgan 1989). Overcrowding, already exacerbated by earlier influenza epidemics, further escalated with the cholera outbreaks of 1831-2 and 1848-9 to become a national burial crisis (Rugg 1998a, 217-9).

2.5.1 Burial Overcrowding: A National Overview

Crowded burial grounds were condemned as a serious threat to public health. One contemporary opinion described graveyards as infecting centres whose pestiferous exhalations were no respecters of persons (Walker 1839). From the 1820s, controversy raged over the most appropriate forms of action. This debate, which was to continue over the next thirty years, was initially fired by a series of campaigners who brought particular attention to the burial overcrowding in the Capital. The potential of cemeteries to improve public health was first raised by George Carden in the 1820s (Prospectus of the General Burial Ground Association, 1825, *BL* 7320 b21; Curl 1993, 207-8). Carden was later able to put these arguments into practice with hi involvement in the establishment of Kensal Green, London's first cemetery. Indeed, the 1833 cemetery company prospectus noted that the establishment of Kensal Green took into account...the most important consideration of all - the preservation of the public health (Prospectus of the General C metery Company dated 1830, *BL*, 7320 b21: 21). In 1839 G A Walker, a London doctor, published *Gatherings from Graveyards*, which described the state of London's churchyards in lurid detail: Here in this place of Christian burial you may see human heads, covered with hair; and here, in this cons crated ground,

are human bodies with flesh still adhering to them. Walker proved to be particularly successful in bringing the burial crisis to popular and widespread attention (Rugg 1998a, 53; 1999a, 220) and later completed three further exposés of London burial practices (Walker 1841; 1843; 1846).

The government made its first response to the problems of burial provision in 1842, when W.A. Mackinnon chaired a Government Select Committee on Interment. A parliamentary bill was introduced, but later withdrawn, that set out to prohibit intramural burial in London and to permit vestries to build cemeteries outside the city (C. Brooks 1989a, 33, 37). A year later Edwin Chadwick published a Special Interment Report (Chadwick 1843; Finer 1952). While this work did not bring immediate legislation, it was quickly used to inform subsequent investigations, such as the 1845 Royal Commission on the Health of Towns (C. Brooks 1989a, 34, 37). In his report, Chadwick recommended a nation-wide ban on intramural burial, the closure of all city graveyards, and the provision by central government of extra-urban cemeteries (C. Brooks 1989a, 35-6). Legislation was first enacted by the Cemetery Clause Act of 1847 which facilitated the compulsory purchase of land for burial and regulated the management of cemeteries (C. Brooks 1989a, 41-2).

By the mid-1840s, discussion of the burial crisis was no longer restricted to political circles and lone campaigners, but was widely raised in the press and by journals such as the Lancet and the Builder (Rugg 1998a, 52-3; C. Brooks 1989a, 32-33 Nor did debate focus solely upon the capital; as a nation-wide problem the crisis was discussed all over the country (Milner 1846; H.J. Smith 1850; Ranger 1851; Lee 1852). Moreover the Public Health Act of 1848 initially proved effective outside of London (C. Brooks 1989a, 34). This act established a central General Board of Health, whose powers included, amongst a range of other sanitary and health related matters, the regulation of burial grounds. Local boards, which were subordinate to General Board, could apply for the closure of overcrowded burial grounds in the interests of public health (C. Brooks

1989a, 43). In 1850, with the Metropolitan Interments Act, London became subject to the authority of the General Board of Health. This bill contained more extreme regulations than the 1848 Act, including the compulsory purchase of existing cemeteries by the government, but these were not widely applied due to the swift introduction of the Burial Acts of 1852-7 (C. Brooks 1989a, 45-50). This series of acts essentially usurped the authority of the General and Local Boards of Health and placed burial provision into the hands of central and municipal government. Local Burial Boards were founded with the authority to levy a burial rate to establish cemeteries (*ibid.*). The provision of burial space in this way provided a solution to the burial crisis but also an infrastructure that ensured that the foundation of cemeteries by joint-stock companies swiftly became superfluous.

2.5.2 The Burial Crisis in York

In 1815 York possessed twenty-four parish churchyards and three Nonconformist burial grounds (Royle 1981,205; Rimmer 1987; Figure 5). A return made to the York Board of Health in 1832 denounced this provision as both insufficient and dangerous to the health of the citizens (Hargrove 1838,148-9). This board had been established a year earlier to guard against the pestilence of cholera (Hargrove 1838, 49). Finding space to safely inter cholera victims in the city's churchyards proved impossible, and after great difficulties suitable land was found for the previously discussed cholera burial ground (Tolhurst 1983; H. Murray 1991, 4). As discussed, private enterprise   sponded to the lack of burial facilities and two provisional cemetery company prospectuses were published in the local press between 1834 and 1836. Both companies made strong cases for the necessity of a cemetery in York on the grounds of public health (*YG* 7/07/1834; 14/05/1836; 28/05/1836; 04/06/1836· 11/06/1836; 09/07/1836). The call for improved burial provision was not only made by leading citizens and vested parties, but also by the general population. A petition issued by the parishioners of St Deny's Walmgate, for example, argued that   no remedy but a public cemetery can prevent the evil of churchyard

overcrowding (*YC* 31/01/1832; *YH* 16/06/1832; 22/091832)

In 1847, ten years after York cemetery opened, Alfred E. Hargrove, a member of York City Health in Towns Association, gave a public speech at the Merchant's Hall. This lecture set out at length the unpleasant evidence of overcrowding in York's graveyards and the threats posed to public health:

> 'In no city is an inquiry of this kind so much wanted as in York; for, where do grave-yards abound to a greater extent? or, where are they more crowded? Desecration is daily taking place - desecration of the most indecent, disgusting, and pestilential nature. Corpses are consigned to out crowded church-yards, already sodden with human flesh and gore, or deposited in a damp and ill-closed vault, either under the pew of some family, or in the aisle where, probably, a stove is erected, the heat from which draws forth the noxious fumes of corruption, that which, in many cases, has terminated in death.'   A.E. Hargrove 1847: 6.

At the time of this lecture five graveyards had been closed because it was absolutely impossible to find room for any more graves (A.E. Hargrove 1847, 11). A.E. Hargrove's description of St Martin's testifies to the condition of all but one of York's churchyards: St Martin's is in an exceedingly crowded state. In fact, *graves are violated* whenever an interment takes place; and, i   t weather, *the exhalations* from the graveyard *have been distinctly felt, in the street,* by passers by (*ibid.*, 15). In 1853 the York Board of Health applied for the closure of every churchyard and Nonconformist burial ground in the City of York (H. Murray 1991, 16- 17). With the ending of intramural burial in the following year, the Cemetery Company gained a virtual monopoly over the burial of all of York's dead.

2.5.3 Discussion

Documentary sources show that the establishment of the York Cemetery Company and its cemetery involved a pronounced awareness of health issues (Rugg 1992; H. Murray 1994). This awareness is unusual since the York Cemetery Company was established in 1834, while nation-wide debates over health reform and cemeteries would only become prominent from the 1840's onwards. However, to directly ascribe concerns for public health as the over-riding dynamic to establish York Cemetery is difficult given the length of time that elapsed between recognising burial overcrowding as a problem and action actually being undertaken. Much the same criticism has been made against more general studies that view cemeteries as a simple corollary of wider health reforms. Undoubtedly the Victorian period saw a lack of sanitary burial spaces reach a crisis point. Yet burial overcrowding was a widely discussed theme of urban planning across Europe in the eighteenth century (Rugg *forthcoming*), and had been recognised as a problem in London from as early as the sixteenth century (Harding 1999, 55). Interpretations of cemetery establishment as the direct result of churchyard overcrowding are also further unsatisfactory since they fail to take into account how shifting attitudes towards the dead relate to changes in burial practice.

Overcrowded churchyards offered neither respect nor protection to the corpse (Walker 1839; A.E. Hargrove 1847), and contemporary accounts reported the moral transgressions brought by the burial crisis in conjunction with a scientific i   ctment of overcrowding:

> 'Decently dispose of the dead , says a popular writer, and vigilantly secure their remains from violation, are among the first duties of society...The most barbarous of mankind would burn with indignation at beholding the last remains of a beloved relative exposed, mangled, or mutilated - and yet, among us, in a moral and Christian country, the abode of the dead is openly violated - its deposits are sacrilegiously disturbed and ejected.. so eager indeed

has sometimes been the haste to dispossess the previous
occupants, that time has not even been allowed for the gradual
dissipation of decaying human putrescence, which is given out in
gaseous profusion, contaminating, as it circulates, the habitations of
the living.'   Anon cited in A.E. Hargrove 1847: 6

By the eighteenth century there was a growing disinclination to disturb the
dead: charnel houses had become redundant, remains were no longer
removed from *their graves and there was a general feeling that the grave*
should belong to the family of the interred or the deceased themselves in
perpetuity (Tarlow 1999c; Mytum 1989). The gravesite began to take on
special importance as a commemorative focus and as a locale for the
expression of personal relationships between the bereaved and the
deceased (Jalland 1996;Tarlow 1999c). The carefully designed, expansive
grounds of cemeteries described in Section 2.3, created an appropriate
setting for such sentiments and stood in stark contrast the horrors of the
city churchyard where each new interment required disturbing those
already laid to rest. Before the early 1830s, resurrectionists posed a
further, more nefarious threat to the corpse - not to mention immeasurable
distress to the bereaved - and several studies have demonstrated the
importance of cemeteries in offering security to the corpse (Richardson
1988; 1989; Morgan 1989; Laqueur 1983). The threat of resurrectionists
was a widely perceived fear, and not simply a problem for cities with
medical schools (Richardson   89; Bailey 1991). York, for example, lay on
the main coach route to Scotland, where the earliest and largest medical
schools had been founded. Between 1828 and 1834, numerous reports of
body snatching appeared in the York local press and sent the city into
panic (Peacock 1974). Indeed, in 1830 the trunk of a body in a most
horribly mutilated stage was found in Rigg's nursery, an area of land that
in seven years would make up part of the York Cemetery (*YC* 09/11/1830).

The changing attitudes towards the corpse and its place of burial
are evident both in connection to the burial crisis at York and the

foundation of the cemetery. It has already been noted that the desire to protect the dead against future disturbance was one reason for the widespread public support to consecrate the cholera burial ground. The York Cemetery Company's rules and regulations emphasised the security they offered to the dead: It is laid down as an invariable rule, that no grave, either public or private, when filled shall again be opened, so that no human remains may be dug up or disturbed...The ground is effectually guarded at night (Hargrove 1838). Sentiment and business practices are two dimensions of cemeteries that may appear, at least superficially, to represent distinctly polarised positions of propriety against profit. Section 2.6 will explore the role of speculation as an impetus to found cemeteries.

2.6. Cemeteries and Business Practice.

2.6.0 Introduction

Cemeteries... are to death what Lombard Street was to bills of exchange or the stock market to equities; no mere venue but a sign that the underlying cultural assumptions of capitalism had taken root...If one could trade in death, one could trade in anything. Laqueur 1993: 185; 186.

In contrast to preceding and later periods, Victorian funerary practice has been characterised by its considerable ostentation and expense (Morley 1971; Curl 1972; Parker Pearson 1982; Cannon 1989; Litten 1991). The desire to give the dead a decent funeral was acutely felt at all levels of society (Laqueur 1983; Richardson 1989; Strange 2000). Chadwick's1843 survey, for example, alleged that the quality of life of the poorer classes was detrimentally affected by their desire for an elaborate funeral. The Victorian funerary industry has been portrayed as exploitative both by contemporary critics and modern scholars alike (Paget 1843; Trollope 1858; Morley 1971; Curl 1972; Cannadine 1981, Litten 1991; Laqueur 1993). Undoubtedly the speculative aspect of joint-stock cemetery companies sat uneasily with the sentiments invoked by bereavement and grief, and tension existed between notions of propriety and the profits that could be gained from turning death into a commercial ventu e:

'Sir - I was somewhat agreeably surprised on reading the last report of the York Cemetery Company, to find it was attended with such pecuniary good results; judging from the very discreditable state of the grounds. I was impressed with the idea that lowness of funds, bad dividends, &c., were the cause. I have visited several cemeteries, and in no instance have I seen such a thorough disregard for decency as in the one in York.... I cannot suppose that the Directors are influenced by a desire to have as much profit as possible from the public (who in this matter cannot at present help themselves), but, surely 10 per cent with a bonus should serve to keep the grounds in better order, and every one interested in the cemetery has a right I think to so much consideration.'

Letter to the *York Gazette* 7 July 1876

Several studies have proposed that speculation was a widely held incentive to found cemetery companies (Laqueur 1993; Tyson 1994). Such arguments depend on two inter-linked lines of argument. Firstly, that cemeteries were viable commercial concerns because they were more or less the exclusive preserve of the middle classes, who were not only patrons, but also cemetery trustees and shareholders (Meller 1981; Pickles 1993; Tyson 1994). Secondly, that burial and commemoration within cemeteries was distinct to the parish churchyard (C. Brooks 1989a, 25; Laqueur 1993; Pickles 1993· T son, 1994). A linking theme between these two positions contends that competitive social display underpinned both the consumer choices made in the cemetery and the business strategies of the cemetery companies.

The right to be buried in a churchyard depended both upon membership of the parish and demonstrating moral integrity to the clergy (Rugg 1999a). In contrast, burial within the cemetery rested entirely on financial resources and consequently the cemetery has been characterised as a landscape where the opportunity to pay and display enabled the elite

to maintain social authority at the expense of the working classes (Laqueur 1993; Tyson 1994). The private ownership of graves in cemeteries was in direct contrast to the ambiguity of proprietorship and the impermanent nature of burial space in the churchyard (Mytum 1984; Curl 1993; Tarlow 1999c). The permanency of the grave site offered enduring memorialisation, a further feature of cemeteries that has been linked to competitive social display (Meller 1981; C. Brooks 1984a; Tyson 1994). Laqueur (1993: 197; 192) in particular has emphasised how stratification in burial location and the subsequent cost was related to social status, with the public mass graves of the poor representing a sort of wholesaling of interment, and the private plots of the middle classes lined up to afford a view. Yet the characterisation of cemeteries as bourgeois *espace imaginaire* (*ibid.*), is by no means clear-cut (Strange 2000). Rugg (2000), for example, has contested the idea that speculation was either a widespread or particularly successful motivation to cemetery companies and argues that a range of civic-based interests, such as those described in Sections 2.3 to 2.5, were at least as influential to cemetery business practice. The following sections will consider how the management of burial and commemoration at York Cemetery compares to the business ethos evident at other cemeteries in order to question the degree that speculation was a motivating interest of the York Cemetery Company.

2.6.1 Burials at York Cemetery

At York cemetery, burials cou d ke place either in the open cemetery ground or at the chapel, where facilities included vault interment under the portico and in catacombs. The Cemetery Company offered several classes of burial plot, known as private, public, second class and children's graves. Private and public graves were available from the time the cemetery opened, while second class and children's graves were later innovations.

Private graves were burial plots sold in perpetuity for the burial of an individual, family or other social group. In the open ground, burial could

either take place within an earth grave, which could typically accommodate up to 4 coffins, or in a vault, a stone lined grave that could accommodate a further coffin. A grave's depth, and therefore the number of coffins it could hold, needed to be decided before the initial interment. As a limited resource, the authority to control entry to a private grave was a significant right. Control was maintained over who could be buried in the grave through the ownership of a grave certificate, which could be transferred between private individuals (Hargrove 1838, 152). The York Cemetery Company's Grave Plan Books record the transfer of grave certificates and for whom remaining grave space was reserved (YCA Acc. 239; for wider case studies see Strange 2000).

The cost of a private plot depended on the type of grave used, for example, vaults were more expensive than brick lined graves. The first interment was always more expensive since it also included the sinking of the grave (Hargrove 1838). The cost of a private grave at York was more expensive than at other regional cemeteries (H. Murray 1994, 13), but the company did not charge different prices depending upon location, but rather a single price applicable throughout the cemetery. At other cemeteries, such as Edinburgh and Candie Cemetery, Guernsey, the cost of a private grave depended upon the exclusivity of its situation (Address by the Directors of Edinburgh Cemetery Company, N.D., Edinburgh General Library Acc. YRA 630; Tyson 1994). Public graves, (also known as common graves, Figure 4), were analogous to churchyard pauper graves. These company-own plots held multiple interments, but the deceased normally bore no relationship to one another save the proximity of their death dates. Moreover, those buried together in unconsecrated public graves did not necessarily share the same religious denomination. A survey of the York Cemetery Company's Burial Registers shows that public graves could hold between five and forty-eight individuals, with figures ranging between seven and ten the most frequent (YCA Acc.107/1). It was the York Cemetery Company's policy that once a public grave had been closed it would be planted over and never reopened (Hargrove 1838;

15th AGM of York Cemetery Company *YCA* Acc 247/155/8). Several cemetery companies, including Abney Park, distinguished between areas of private graves and areas of public or common burial (Figure 4). For nearly all the Victorian period, the York Cemetery Company elected to mix the locations of public and private graves since it was felt to be improper for the former to be in a distinct part of the ground deemed least valuable (15th AGM of York Cemetery Company *YCA* Acc 247/155/8). York's strategy was sufficiently unusual for Grundy's 1846 survey to remark most approvingly upon its practice. The Cemetery Company's policy changed, however, for the opening of the Eastern Extension in 1899: this area was exclusively used for public burials (Figure 2). The cost of public graves at York compared favourably to other cemeteries, and prices were calculated on a sliding scale depending on property rates (Hargrove 1838,151; *YCA* Acc. 247/28). For the occupiers of a property with a rateable value below 5 per annum, interment in a public grave cost 4/6, a price that merely covered the basic costs incurred by the Cemetery Company. When the deceased lived in a house rated above 5, the burial fee was set at 10/6, which realised a profit of 6/- for the Cemetery Company. By 1840 a third price of 7/6 had been introduced for the burial of those who lived in homes with a rateable value above 5 and below 10 (3rd AGM of the York Cemetery Company *YCA* Acc. 247/155/1a). The practice of public burial at York is strikingly at odds to the picture painted by Laqueur, who described how cemetery companies could exploit public burials for optimum profit (see also C. Brooks 1989a, 2 .

'the right mix of bodies could yield a tidy profit: four stillborns at 2s. 6d. did not take up the room of an adult at 11s. 6d., so a cemetery like Bradford or Leeds could make as much as 23 per grave if the size distribution of dead paupers was optimal. This of course was not possible with every grave but all common graves seemed to have yielded more than comparable space given over to private burial'. Laqueur 1993: 198

In 1848, in consequence of enquiries by persons who have wished to bury relatives in the Cemetery, and have not yet required a whole grave or vault, and at the same time did not wish to avail themselves of the ordinary public graves the Cemetery Company introduced a third type of burial plot, known as second class graves (11th AGM of the York Cemetery Company YCA Acc. 247/155/2). This type of plot, which could be a bricked earth grave or a vault, bore two essential distinctions from public graves. Firstly, these graves would contain a maximum of six persons and secondly, the deceased would be commemorated on the Company supplied memorial that marked the grave. Like public graves, the Cemetery Company owned second class graves, and once filled they were closed and planted over. In common with public plots, there was usually no relationship between those interred other than the proximity of death dates. Other Cemetery Companies, including Rusholme Lane, Manchester, Saint Mary s, Liverpool, and Sheffield offered similar burial and commemoration packages (Leeds University Library Acc. 421/119/12; Grundy 1846 NCL; Barnard 1990).

By 1870 the Cemetery Company introduced a further type of plot, known as a child's grave. These burial plots were either a standard grave that was divided into four smaller graves, each able to accommodate a child-sized coffin , or non- standard sized plots. There is no record of the sale of these plots in the Grave Receipt Books, suggesting that like public and second class graves, th   metery Company retained ownership. At York an extant price list distinguishes between the cost of burial for children from adults only when infants were stillborn (Hargrove 1838). The burial price for stillborn babies was considerably less than an adult s, and a sliding scale of costs was again available and calculated by property rates. At other cemeteries, children's burial may be priced to take into account a range of age groups; for example at Saint Mary's Cemetery, Liverpool, increasing costs were payable for a stillborn child, for a child below two years in age, for a child above two and below six years and for persons

above six years (Leeds University Library Acc. 421/119/6).

2.6.2 Memorial Production and Regulation at York Cemetery

The ways in which a cemetery company's control over commemoration could regulate consumer choice is an under-researched theme within cemetery studies. The production of memorials could play a crucial part within a company's income and it was possible to maximise profits by implementing regulations that favoured the cemetery's stone yard above external masons. From York Cemetery's opening, a stone masonry business was incorporated within the Company. This was initially located in the Nonconformist half of the cemetery (Figure 2), but in 1847 a stone yard was established outside the north-east corner of the ground to free this land for burial (Figure 2). As the cemetery's burial business took off, so did the stone yard; the 1848 York Cemetery Company's AGM (*YCA* Acc, 247/155/2) noted that the great increase in the number of funerals has been accompanied with a corresponding increase in the masons' department. The production of memorials dramatically expanded from the mid-1870 onwards through the efforts of Thomas Brown, superintendent of the Cemetery (H. Murray 1993, 24-5). An advertising campaign and the purchase of several other stonemasonry businesses had ensured that by 1876 the profits of the stone business made up the significant proportion of the shareholder's dividend (H. Murray 1991). In addition to producing and supplying memorials, the Yo k Cemetery Company also cut inscriptions and offered stone cleaning, the maintenance of graves in perpetuity, the removal and refixing of stones for interments, the laying out of graves (including their stone lining), and the laying of stones and other delineation around plots (Daily Ledgers and Cash Receipt B oks, *YCA* Acc.107/1-29)

Cemetery companies could regulate the consumer choices for commemoration in three ways. Firstly, companies could restrict the right to erect a memorial on particular types of graves. Secondly, they could exclude the erection of stones that had been produced by external

masons. Thirdly, a cemetery company could maintain aesthetic control over the designs and content of memorials and their inscription. Unlike other companies, York did not enforce a limit for the length of time within which a gravestone had to be erected over a grave. At Great Yarmouth, Rusholme Lane, Manchester, St Mary s, Liverpool and Gravesend, if a memorial was not erected on a private grave within twelve months of purchase, then without special dispensation the rights to memorialisation were forfeited (Leeds University Library Acc. 421/119/6, 421/11/12; *NHCL L9 20, NRO*). An even shorter period of six months was similarly enforced at Kensal Green. Some companies such as Great Yarmouth and Rusholme Lane, Manchester operated a fine system after three months for each month a plot was without a stone (*ibid.*).

At York, memorials could be erected over all of the graves and vaults in the open cemetery. The Edinburgh Cemetery Company distinguished between private plots with and private graves without the right to erect a memorial, the latter being the cheaper option (Address by the Directors of Edinburgh Cemetery Company, N.D., Edinburgh General Library Acc. YRA 630). At York, consumers (should they choose to) also had the right not to erect a stone. But at Great Yarmouth and Kensal Green, all private graves had to have gravestones erected above them (Leeds University Library Acc. 421/119/10, *NRO*). Tyson (1994, 613) noted that at *Candie Cemetery, Guernsey, particular memorial types were* designated to certain parts of the cemetery; for example only tombs may be erected on graves next to   ths. At York two forms of burial - second class graves and interment in a catacomb vault - included a standard memorial in their price (Hargrove 1838). Although the York Cemetery Company provided a sliding scale of costs for public burial, no similar subsidy was available for commemoration over public graves. While the working classes had less available resources to invest towards memorialisation (Strange 2000), at York commemoration was not automatically weighted against the poor. Unlike other cemetery companies, such as those at Gravesend, Kensal Green, and Edinburgh, York did not

legislate against the erection of memorials over public graves (see also Strange 2000). The York Cemetery Company acknowledged that the erection of stones on public graves was a relatively rare practice and utilised this situation to their benefit: an action that demonstrates the complex interaction between cemetery companies philanthropic concerns and business practice.

> 'One of the reasons why it [the cemetery] is so approved of by the poor arises from the circumstance that the graves appropriated for public graves are not in a distinct part of the ground deemed less valuable, but are indiscriminately placed among the private or family burial places, this is advantageous to the latter for as monuments are very seldom placed on public graves, open space is thus secured round the tombs which would otherwise be crowded together more frequently than at present.'
>
> 15th AGM of York Cemetery Company *YCA* Acc 247/155/8

York cemetery did not possess a monopoly on the provision of monuments, unlike, for example, the cemeteries at Rusholme Road, Manchester and St Mary s, Liverpool (Leeds University Library Acc. 421/119/6, 421/11/12). At Yarmouth the company rules and regulations noted that for the sake of uniformity and of economy to the Public, the Committee (*NRO*) provides the Grave and Vault stones. What is less clear is the extent to which the Ce ery Company provided the monuments erected in York cemetery. Over the history of the cemetery a number of regulations were established that weighted consumer choice towards monuments produced by the York Cemetery Company. The first of these took place at some point before 1846, when a fee (initially five shillings) was levied on all memorials brought into the cemetery that were produced by external masons (Cash Book, *YCA* Acc/107/13). The cemetery company had always maintained some authority over external workmen within the cemetery, such as their working hours (Hargrove 1838).

However by 1894 the terms and conditions regulating the use of external masons were presented in such as fashion that York Cemetery Company's memorials appeared as a more convenient and economical option (Charges and Regulations at the York Public Cemetery March 1894, loose paper *YCA* Acc. 247). A 1894 price list shows that by this time the company also reserved the exclusive right to supply all the stone work on public graves, in addition to the execution of all work underground, together with the removing and refixing of any memorials (*ibid.*).

In common practice, York exercised control over the design and content of the memorials, and inscriptions erected in the cemetery, 'so as to exclude anything manifestly objectionable' (Hargrove 1838, 152). A copy of an intended memorial design and its inscription, should it contain more than the name, date of death and age of the deceased, had to be submitted to the Superintendent of York Cemetery whenever an application to erect the memorial was made (Charges and Regulations at the York Public Cemetery March 1894, loose paper *YCA* Acc. 247). No record of a refusal by the company to allow a memorial into the cemetery survives. It is therefore difficult to establish the criteria for exclusion and how frequently the company may have exercised this authority. Indeed, whilst the cemetery itself indicates a range of sanctioned memorial choices, and pattern books portray a range of available - but not necessarily adopted - choices, no record exists of memorials which consumers may have wished to purchase but were refused permission to erect. The most authoritative   trolling power of cemetery companies is therefore extremely difficult to discern from either the archaeological or documentary records.

2.7 Archaeological Resources

Issues of cemetery conservation have formed the basis of a number of studies, but none of these surveys have been conducted from an expressly archaeological perspective (Macken 1985; C. Brooks 1989a; Dunk & Rugg 1994). This section considers the archaeological potential of York

Cemetery. Discussion will show that, in comparison to York's other burial grounds, the cemetery has an unparalleled material integrity which encompasses the widest available spectrum of social relations.

The number of memorials surviving at the cemetery, and the level of their preservation, is far higher than at any other burial site in York (Tables1-2). The memorial survival rates at York's other burial grounds (Figure 5, Map 1) vary widely, from the two stones standing at St Samson's to the hundreds of memorials found at St Olave's. In contrast to the cemetery, the vast majority of York's other burial landscapes have suffered acute post depositional damage. The loss of a place of worship, or a change in its use, often results in some form of destruction to the graveyard; for example, after the demolition of St Crux's church and the sale of the Congregational Chapel at Lendal, both associated graveyards have been lost without a trace (Tables 1-2). In other cases, graveyards survive at least in part; after Holy Trinity, Kings Square, was demolished, its graveyard was converted to a public square and a small selection of memorials has been utilised for paving. Further examples of how burial landscapes may be transformed include the churchyards at Saint Mary's Bishophill Senior and St Helen's, Davygate, which have been converted into a public garden and open courtyard respectively (Tables 1-2). York Cemetery, in common with most cemeteries, was located on the outskirts of the Victorian City. Although currently surrounded by suburban housing, the location of the cemetery has not proved to be as vulnerable to urban development as city centre b l grounds (Tables 1-2). Limited space within city centres has resulted in several churchyards being encroached upon by shopping precincts or falling prey to road widening schemes (Tables 1-2). Yet urban development is not simply a modern dilemma. Similar demands were faced in Victorian times, as the loss of part of St Michael's graveyard for the erection of a public toilet in 1857 demonstrates (H. Murray 1994).

Significant post-deposition movement has effected both the above-ground and below-ground evidence of York's churchyards (see Tables

128

1-2). In Victorian times, disturbance was the inevitable result of burial management techniques. In 1847, A.E. Hargrove (1847, 6,15) observed that the methods used to maximise burial space included the importation of soil or rubbish to increase the depth of ground, and the use of an iron borer to assess whether at best the ground below was clear, or at worst coffins were suitably decayed, in order to accommodate further interments. Under modern management, memorials have often been moved to the graveyard's periphery in order to facilitate the upkeep of burial grounds (Stapleton & Burman 1988). At St Cuthbert's, for example, only one or two memorials remain *in situ*, and the vast majority of stones have been removed to the boundary walls (Tables 1-2; Figure 5). This thesis views the relationship between artefacts and their setting as of central importance. Monuments were produced and purchased for use within a specific physical context, and if this spatial integrity is destroyed, memorials lose a crucial aspect of their ideological dimension.

Since space for graves was inevitably limited, cemeteries were inevitably wasting assets as long-term business ventures. Beset by financial problems from the 1950s, the Cemetery Company fell into voluntary liquidation in 1961, and the cemetery grounds and buildings fell into a state of considerable disrepair (H. Murray 1991, 46). The York City Council was forced to intervene and take responsibility for the site until 1987 when, for a token payment, the cemetery was sold to the present owners, the York Cemetery Trust (H. Murray 1991, 53). Under the Trust, the cemetery buildings and g   nds have been repaired and restored, and the site is managed today as a heritage and educational resource, as well as a burial ground.

There are thus many reasons, archaeologically speaking, why the cemetery is an important site for analysis. Whereas the memorials in York Cemetery have been subject to the same positive transformations as the rest of the grounds since the advent of the Trust, the memorials of York's churchyards and other graveyards have been affected by a wide variety of post-depositional problems. The variation between formation processes

across York's other burial site mean that memorials located outside the cemetery do not form a homogenous data set in and of themselves. The archaeological processes visible in the city's churchyards, for example, took place over centuries. In contrast, the cholera burial ground was opened and closed within a single year. No single site, with the exception of the cemetery, can offer a sufficiently large data set that can be sampled over a chronology of the site's period of use (Tables 1-2).

The Cemetery's period of use is significant. From 1854/5 York's city burial grounds were closed, and until Fulford Cemetery opened in 1915 York Cemetery possessed a *de facto* monopoly for all of the City's burials. As a result of this monopoly, the cemetery reflects the widest possible range of social groups - although it should be noted that Quaker burials could still take place in the burial grounds of the Retreat, Heslington. In contrast, denominational burial grounds reflect specific populations; at the Roman Catholic burial ground of St Joseph's, burial was exclusive to adherents of Catholicism (H. Murray 1994). The social inclusiveness of a burial ground may also dictate the level cf material variation between memorials. For example, the forty-six memorials at the Quaker burial ground on Bishophill are not only identical in material and form, but also feature a similar presentation of text (Rimmer 1987). Until 1850, Quakers religious doctrines advised against the erection of memorials (Book of Discipline 1738, cited in Stock 1999), and an account of 1818 observed burials at Bishophill were simply marked with mounds of earth (Hargrove 1818).

The cemetery, parish graveyards and York's other burial grounds can all be considered as primary archaeological sources. Each represents a collection of above-ground data - memorials - located within a specific material context. If this physical context is fragmentary, as in the case of York's parish churchyards, or the result of a single event, such as the cholera burial ground, or encompasses only a restricted population, as with York's Nonconformist and Roman Catholic burial grounds, then the evidence recovered is only partial. To gain a wider insight into

commemoration in Victorian York, a wider context is necessary. York Cemetery represents just such a context. Here data share common post depositional processes, and since all stones were subject to the same rules and regulations of the York Cemetery Company, they also share a common depositional practice. Control over commemoration is less easily compared across York's other burial grounds since as elsewhere practice was not universally regulated. Rules could differ from site to site depending, for example, on the views of individual clergymen or religious beliefs.

2.8. Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that a case study of York Cemetery offers both a valid and a strong data set with which to explore the research objectives set out in Chapter One. In contrast to York's other burial grounds, the archaeological context of York Cemetery provides the most statistically viable, well-preserved data set available for the entire chronology of the site's period of use. The monuments surviving in the cemetery have been subject to common post-depositional processes and the same social controls over commemoration. A wealth of primary and secondary sources is available to supplement an archaeological analysis of York Cemetery. Importantly, an extensive archive relating to the York Cemetery Company also survives.

An analysis of the historical and cultural context of this case study has revealed that York is a p   cularly suitable location within which to examine commemoration and consumer choice within a Victorian Cemetery. Several authors have previously examined the history of specific cemeteries (Barnard 1990; James 1991; H. Murray 1991; Wade-Matthews 1995). This study, however, represents one of the few examples of research that have sought to place the history of a specific cemetery within the wider cultural and historic context of the British cemetery movement. During the first half of the nineteenth century, provincial, rather than capital cemeteries, were the most typical and

common landscapes - an observation which has perhaps been obscured by the quantity of work which has concentrated upon London (Meller 1981; C. Brooks 1989a; Curl 1993; Pickles 1993). Analysis has also shown how the York Cemetery Company's policies governing the regulation of commemoration were less restrictive than those found at other sites. As a result, it appears that there was potentially a greater freedom of choice available to consumer at York in contrast to other cemeteries. The next chapter will focus upon the vehicles expressing such consumer choices: the gravestones and monuments themselves.

CHAPTER THREE: REFINING RECORDING TECHNIQUES, METHODS OF ANALYSIS, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

3.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodologies used for data collection, management, and analysis. The chapter begins by describing the material and documentary evidence to be investigated. Discussion then sets out the sampling strategy, field recording technique, and methods of analysis used in both a pilot study and the main data collection used for analysis. The chapter concludes with a case study that compares the social affiliations shown below-ground through burial practice to the affiliations demonstrated above-ground by the memorials.

3.1 Description of Data to be investigated

3.1.0 Introduction to the Material Evidence

A history of York cemetery and a description of its appearance are contained in Chapter Two. This section will provide an archaeological assessment of the cemetery landscape, including a discussion of the extensions made to the cemetery grounds, the sequence of use over the cemetery layout, and the organisation of burial plots. An introduction to the memorials offers a preliminary visual assessment of the gravestone forms found in the cemetery and a description of the memorial inscription survey carried out by the York Famil   ˙story Society.

3.1.1 The layout of the Cemetery

The layout of the cemetery has undergone a number of changes and expansions since it opened. Figure 2 shows the original layout of eight and three-quarter acres, which is referred to in this study as the Original Victorian Extent. The first extension, known as the New Ground Compartments 113-143, was first used in 1858 and increased the consecrated area of burial by three acres. Two further extensions were

opened during the Victorian period: the New Ground Continued Compartments 144-175' that was first used in 1899, and Section A which was first used in 1893. These three extensions were all consecrated and received Anglican burials. No unconsecrated extensions were made to the Original Victorian Extent during the period under study. In each case the land used for the extensions was purchased some considerable time before it was actually put to use. Land for two further extensions, Section B and Park Section C, was also purchased (but not used) during the Victorian period (Figure 2). Two final additions, known as Lily Pond First Section and Lily Pond Second Section, were opened for use in 1931 and 1941 and brought the cemetery to its current extent of twenty-five acres (Map 1).

The landscaping of the Original Victorian Extent was essentially two phased. During the initial landscaping, a gentle slope to the east of the site was levelled and the resulting spoil was use to create an elevated terrace on which the chapel was built (H. Murray 1991, 10; Plate 3). The pathways were laid out in a pattern of concentric circles enclosed within a rectangular box (Figure 1; Plates 8 & 9). It was anticipated at the time of the cemetery's opening that there would a lower demand for Nonconformist burial, although as Chart 2 shows there was a majority Nonconformist and Roman Catholic service attendance in York at this time. In the Nonconformist section (the western extent of the cemetery grounds), only one acre was laid out for burials, with the three remaining acres rented out as orchards (Figure 2). By 1848 a number of changes had been made to the layout, most notably in the Nonconformist half of the cemetery. The cottages and orchard (shown as the shaded area and '4' on Figure 2) were removed, as this area's layout became more formal.

One significant difference between the Original Victorian Extent and subsequent extensions lies in the different sizes of the graves. In the Original Victorian Extent, plots measure seven feet and six inches by three feet - but grave sizes were increased to nine feet by four feet in all of the extended areas. This increase in size was in accordance with the

recommendations made by the London Burial Boards and was a
prerequisite for the new areas to be approved for burials by the Home
Secretary (*YG* 25/07/1857). In order to recoup the potential income from a
corresponding reduction in the number of graves, a higher price was set
for graves in the extended areas (Charges and Regulations at the York
Public Cemetery March 1894, loose paper *YCA* Acc. 247).

The cemetery was laid out in a grid system composed of numbered
rectangular compartments, which were further subdivided into rows of
grave plots. Each grave plot was individually numbered and, as with the
grave compartments, the numbering system ran along an east-west axis
(Figure 2). Compartments 1-112 lie in the Original Victorian Extent of the
cemetery and contained grave numbers 1 to 16048 (*YCA* Acc.
247/22/1-16). Landscaping features were laid out over this grid system
and as a result, a number of these grave plots could not be employed for
burials, as they were located under pathways. As noted, a distinction was
made between areas designated for Nonconformist burials and for
Anglican burials, although this was not physically marked on the ground.
Other areas were employed for the burial of specific groups: public graves
for the interment of epidemic victims, most notably cholera in 1849 and
influenza in 1891, were placed to the rear of the chapel and the new
ground compartments 113-143 respectively (H. Murray 1991,15; 25). From
the early Edwardian period onward, two plots of land were set aside for
the burial of children: the first in Section A - which was consecrated - and
the second area directly to the w st of the main entrance - which was
unconsecrated (YFHS Memorial Inscription Survey Area A Figure 2; Plate
4).

3.1.2 The Memorials

Before discussing the observations made during a preliminary visual
survey of York cemetery, some basic definitions of terms are necessary. In
this thesis the terms *memorial* and *gravestone* are used generically, while
headstone and *monument* denote the two basic memorial cl sses. A

135

headstone is an upright slab that is taller than it is wide, and is usually only decorated and inscribed upon one face (Drawings 1-18). Monument is the term used to describe all other types of memorials, and includes three dimensional forms such as tombs, obelisks, and free-standing crosses and horizontal forms such as ledger stones (Appendix 4).

An initial visual survey of the cemetery layout revealed that large areas of the cemetery, in particular sections O, E, F2, W, Y, were extremely overgrown and difficult to access (Plates 5, 7 & 13). Over the course of the fieldwork the York Cemetery Trust undertook a programme of clearance and undergrowth in the cemetery is currently under control. Chapter Two noted that the York Cemetery Company's regulations did not require particular monument classes and forms to be located in specific parts of the cemetery.

The initial survey of the cemetery showed that the cemetery company's written policies appeared to reflect general practice. The preliminary visual survey showed that the predominant memorial class in the open ground of the cemetery was the headstone (Plates 6 & 8) Larger and more elaborate monuments were much less frequent. The stereotypical cemetery landscape, dominated by large sculptured monuments and popularised by both metropolitan cemeteries such as Highgate, Kensal Green and Norwood, and by regional city cemeteries, such as Bradford's Undercliffe and Bristol's Arnos Vale (Meller 1981; C. Brooks 1989; Curl 1993), is not representative of the appearance of York. In York Cemetery there are ve few large-scale or sculptured memorials, although notable exceptions include the Gothic monument to the Gray family and the recumbent shrouded effigy to Charles Ellis Hessey (Plate 12). A large number of the memorials in the cemetery have been surveyed as part of a monumental inscription project organised by the York Family History Society.

3.1.3. York Family History Society's Memorial Inscription Survey

In the 1980s and 1990s, the York Family History Society (YFHS) undertook a memorial inscription survey of York Cemetery. This survey recorded over 7125 memorials from the Original Victorian Extent of the cemetery and areas in Sections A and B (Figure 2). This survey was carried out as a genealogical project, and therefore data of archaeological value, most notably details of memorial design were not recorded.

The YFHS survey was compiled as a paper record, and copies are held at both the York City Archive and the Reference Section of the York City Library. The survey includes a transcription of the text from all the extant memorials in the survey areas. The YFHS survey was not limited by a particular temporal span, and both modern and Victorian memorials were recorded. The survey lay upon the reproduction of the inscription content, rather than recording physical aspects of the text, such as lettering styles, script size, technique of execution and placement on the stone. The use of lettering case and Italics and further details of layout, other than line breaks, were also excluded from the survey. Memorials with eroded or destroyed inscriptions were still included in the survey, and the level of legibility was noted. The survey did not systematically include textual information other than commemorations and stone masons' signatures and grave numbers were therefore usually excluded.

The YFHS survey was organised by dividing the cemetery into alphabetical sections that we ordered by the cemetery's paths (Figure 2). Since there were more sections than letters in the alphabet a double alphabet reference was used for sections AA to II. Due to undergrowth, Section F was divided into F1 and F2. The rows of memorials inside each section were numbered following an east to west axis. The position of each monument along a section's row was calculated from the south end of the row. Each memorial was allotted a unique number; for example memorial M/01/01 would be followed by M/01/02. In this way the YFHS referencing system first denoted the burial section where a stone lay, then

the particular section row, and finally the position of a memorial along this
row.

This YFHS survey represents an extremely valuable, well-organised
collection of data and is testament to the considerable dedication and
support for the cemetery within the local community. However some
problems are encountered when using the numbering system of the
survey on the ground today. The YFHS survey found the position of
memorials along the rows of sections difficult to calculate, as rows are not
composed of unbroken lines of memorials. The survey attempted to
overcome this problem by estimating how many burial plots lay in the
spaces between memorials. Each 'burial plot sized' space would then be
given a unique reference code in the same way as a memorial, and the
record would note that no monument was visible. Unfortunately, this
system often proved unreliable; some sections included numbered spaces
between stones, while other sections did not. Fortunately, as the majority
of transcriptions also note some basic details of the stones the inscription
is placed upon, it is generally possible to locate memorials. This
accompanying information, however, varies widely in comprehensiveness,
from simply denoting that the inscription was found on a monument or
headstone, to noting the material type (for example granite) and basic
shape of the memorial (for example pointed headstone).

The major drawback of the referencing system created by the
YFHS is that it cannot be correlated to the York Cemetery Company's
numbering system for burial pl s. The YFHS survey used a numbering
system that runs along a south to north axis, whilst the system used by the
Cemetery Company ran along an east to west axis. As a result it is not
possible to even approximately correlate the position of memorials
identified by the YFHS survey to the burial plots on which they stand.
Other problems with the YFHS survey are minor and have simple
solutions. For example, on the small number of occasions when a
memorial number was duplicated, a letter was added to the reference
code to differentiate between memorials, for example M/12/21a and

M/12/21b. Despite these problems, there is no doubt that the data in the
YFHS survey provides an invaluable research tool.

3.1.4 Introduction to the Documentary Evidence

Section 2.1 of Chapter Two contained a summary of the range of
documentary sources available to aid an archaeological analysis of York
Cemetery. This section will describe the primary textual sources used in
this thesis: the burial registers and business records of the York Cemetery
Company. An analysis of York Cemetery is significantly enhanced by the
fact that documentary sources survive which relate specifically to the
unique landscape of the cemetery itself, the people who used it, and the
monuments that composed it. Yet it will be shown that the potential of this
body of information is not without significant qualitative and quantitative
drawbacks.

3.1.5. The Burial Registers

The York Cemetery Company's Burial Registers covering the period from
17 January 1837 until 14 August 1904 are held in the York City Archives
(*YCA* Acc. 107/1-11). These eleven volumes detail each interment that
took place in the cemetery during this period. Later and current volumes
are held at the Cemetery itself. The York Cemetery Trust has converted
these paper records into an electronic format. The computerised version of
the burial registers adheres to the original structure and content of the
paper record, and entries are   thfully reproduced. Any anomalies found
in the original burial registers are also present in the electronic format. As
the computerised version was essentially a typed copy of the original
records, physical evidence, such as the signature of the informant of
death, was not reproduced. The York Cemetery Trust made the
computerised version of the burial registers for the period of 1837 to 1904
available for this study.

The electronic version of the burial registers contains 73,220 entries
and includes the following information for the deceased:

* Accession numbers (a running total for all interments).

* Grave number (the number of the burial plot in which the
  deceased was buried. Occasionally further information is provided
  for plot type, for example private or public graves, or for the location
  of burial, for example, the chapel catacombs)

* Date of death (day, month, year)

* Date of burial (day, month, year)

* Name (first names and surname)

* Age (in years and - where relevant - months, weeks, days, hours,
  minutes and seconds)

* Rank, trade, or profession (see below)

* Sex

* Residence (varies from full address, house name or number, street,
  suburb, town, to a partial address or institution, for example,
  workhouse)

* Cause of death (varies from detailed medical conditions and
  accidents, to the more general, such as Visitation from God)

* Signature (or name in the electronic format) residence, and rank,
  trade or profession of the informant of death (identities of the
  informant ranged from family and friends of the deceased to
  institutions and specialised funerary personnel, such as
  undertakers)

* Name and address of the officiating minister (the name of the
  minister is usually provid d, however addresses were recorded
  inconsistently and the burial registers do not provide a statement of
  the religious affiliation of the deceased)

There are several reasons why the information held in the burial
registers cannot easily be extracted and quantified. Firstly, although the
burial registers are in a computerised form that resembles a database, the
electronic format is not a database in itself: the information was not
compiled as standardised variables, but entered as original text. The
original compilation of the burial registers thus used a range of

expressions for the various information categories, and data therefore cannot be systematically compared and cross-referenced between the different entries.

The amount of detail given for each individual can vary widely. Several entries record the name of the deceased simply as unknown or child of, and not every burial register category (as listed above) was completed for each person interred. In many cases the type of information recorded for the deceased is dependent upon their particular social status. Bias is especially notable in the category of the deceased's rank, trade and profession. The information given for adult males usually provides a social title, such as gentleman, or a job, such as railway inspector, but the status of children and women is largely expressed by their association to a male relative, such as son of, or by marital status, such as widow or unmarried woman. The burial registers provide incomplete evidence for the professional life of women. For example, the information contained in the inscription commemorating Mary Ellen Spetch (YFHS Ref.: M/09/15) shows that she was the head teacher at a infant school, but the burial register records her status as 'wife of Thomas Spetch printer' (Burial Register Acquisition Number 19,190). At the same time, the burial registers provide less kinship information or details of familial status for adult men than for women and children. In other cases, the deceased may be described by their ethnicity, (Irish, Cypriot, etc.) or state of health (lunatic, etc.) rather than by a profession, social rank or familial status.

Several difficulties are e ountered when attempting to relate the information recorded in the burial registers to the social status the deceased may have held in life. A number of studies have used the profession or the location and value of the residence of the deceased to calculate their socio-economic status (Parker Pearson 1982; Cannon 1986). This thesis views this approach as unsatisfactory, not only because it negates perceptions of status made on a wider basis than simple economics, but also because several important methodological issues remain unresolved. It has already been noted that different information is

provided for individuals depending upon their inherent status, but
identification of ascribed status is also problematic. For example, a range
of different professions, incomes, and social positions may be covered by
the terms such as 'gentleman'. A preliminary examination of the burial
records indicated that a deceased individual described as a gentleman
could be associated with numerous professions (including medical doctor,
railway agent, fitter, victualler, clerk, currier, painter and druggist) which
did not necessarily carry the same degree of social prestige. Social
mobility and life stages, such as retirement or widowhood, mean that
status is not static. Descriptions of the deceased's rank, profession or
trade depended upon the perceptions of those responsible for
classification. For example, at the time of his death in 1846 aged 64 years,
William Harrison's rank, trade, or profession in the burial registers was
noted as 'letter carrier' (Burial Register Acquisition number 1,932). Two
years earlier, upon the death of his daughter his status was described as
'labourer' (Burial Register Acquisition number 1,279), and four year
earlier, after the death of his son, William Harrison's profession had been
recorded as 'formerly wine merchant' (Burial Register Acquisition number
849).

Some studies have attempted to recover the social status of known
individuals and resolve these problems by employing a wider range of
variables than profession and residence. For example, Baugher and
Venables (1989) study of the consumer choices shown by ceramic
assemblages associated with th middle and upper classes in colonial
North America used twenty-two different variables to reconstruct social
status. These variables included profession and residence but also annual
income, expenditure, land holdings and behavioural characteristics such
as, gracious, rude or alcoholic. In addition, several variables were specific
to the cultural and historic context of their case study, such as number of
slaves and number of generations in America. The burial registers of the
York Cemetery Company do not supply such an extensive range of
variables. The time and manpower needed to complete supplementary

documentary research for even a small sample of individuals
commemorated upon the gravestones, do not lie within the remit of this
thesis research framework - although it could certainly form the basis for
future research of York Cemetery. In this study, the burial registers are
used to provide supplementary biographical information to the evidence
contained in the memorial inscriptions. The recovery of inherent and
familial status is prioritised above the calculation of social status as
denoted by social class and position. The major application of the burial
registers in this study, however, is to allow the above ground evidence of
memorials to be compared to the below ground evidence of burial,
information which is undocumented within previous gravestone analysis.

3.1.6 York Cemetery Company's Business Records

A large number of records survive relating to the York Cemetery
Company's business practices, and these are held at the York City
Archives (*YCA* Acc.107; 239; 247). The documents can be divided into
seven groups:

*   Records dealing with the purchase of the land prior to the
         Cemetery's inception and for the expansion of its grounds, including
         title deeds and legal papers.

*   Records dealing with the organisation and sale of burial plots,
         including Grave Books containing counterfoils of grave certificates,
         Grave Plan Books, showing the location and status of plots, and
         Grave Interment Books d tailing the acquisition numbers or names
         of those buried in a grave.

*   Records dealing with financial transactions made with, and by, the
         York Cemetery Company, including the Daily Ledgers, Cash Books
         (which were separated as Cash Receipt B   ks and Cash
         Expenditure Books from 1885 onwards), Bank Books, Wages
         Books, and Account Books with Blacksmiths.

*   Records dealing with the business practice of the York Cemetery Company, including Reports of the Annual General Meetings, and the York Cemetery Company Deed of Settlement.

*   A memorial pattern book from the York Cemetery Company's Stone Yard.

*   Records setting out the rules and regulations of the York Cemetery Company and price lists for burial, memorials, and other services.

*   A wide variety of miscellaneous correspondence, which deals with issues such as national burial legislation and the removal and reburial of bodies.

Although an extensive number of records survive, several problems are encountered with their use. Firstly, a significant number of records from the archive as a whole relate to the history and business practice at the site after 1901, and are therefore outside the period of study.

Secondly, the survival rate for documentation relating to the nineteenth century varies. For example, only a portion of the total number of Annual General Meeting Reports (AGMs) has survived (although this number may be supplemented by the summaries of the AGMs that appeared in the local press). In particular, only two price lists survive, the first dating to c.1846 (flyleaf of Cash Book, *YCA* Acc.107/13) and the second, also containing the cemetery rules and regulations, dating to 1894 (Charges and Regulations at the York Public Cemetery, March 1984, loose paper *YCA* Acc.247). One further 1837 price list, with the cemetery rules and regulations, was ide ·fied as it had reproduced in full in a local guidebook (Hargrove 1838, 151-152). The absence of further documentation means that changes in products and prices can not be precisely dated. The lack of detailed information about the range and prices of services offered by the Cemetery Company also affects how other sources may be used. The Daily Ledgers and Cash Receipt books, for example, both list payments made to the Cemetery Company for burials and memorial purchases. However these volumes only provide general information about the service provided (for example, stone work)

and total amount paid. The surviving price lists do not provide sufficient information for cross-referencing the costs of general services to specific products.

A further difficulty lies in the more general cross-referencing of the different documentary records. The organisation of the Burial Registers, for example, was structured around an ascending acquisitions number that correlates to the identity of the deceased. In contrast, the Daily Ledgers and Cash Books, which detail the burial and commemoration expenses for the deceased were organised by date and correlate to the individual who made payment for the services. The cross-referencing of these two sources is inhibited by the fact that the identities of the deceased and the individual paying are very different categories. It is not usually possible to trace the identity of the deceased by family name, since the person who made payments to the cemetery may not have been related to the deceased, as in the case of a friend, work colleague, institution, or undertaker. Even family members may not necessarily have shared the same surname as the deceased. The time lapse between the period when an individual died, when services were ordered, and accounts settled, means that the date of payment does not necessarily correspond to the deceased's date of death, and therefore the record cannot be cross-referenced by date.

A final drawback to the use of the York Cemetery Company's business records within this thesis is the fact that no separate accounts exist for the stone yard, except for a single volume of memorial designs. In order to resolve many of these issues the documents of the York Cemetery Company's archive would need to be the primary focus of analysis, rather than act as supplementary data - as in the case of this thesis. Ultimately, the evidence of the Cemetery Company's business policies used in the current research are the Deed of Settlement, Annual General Meetings, price lists, rules and regulations and the pattern book of memorial designs. The study is able to incorporate the remaining sources second-hand from H. Murray's (1991) study of York Cemetery, which

utilised the full range of available records. The documentary data will be
returned to in later chapters. The remainder of this chapter describes the
sampling strategies used to collect data from the material evidence: the
memorials.

3.2 Sampling Methodology

3.2.0 Introduction

The data set investigated in this research represents a sample of the total
number of monuments in the Cemetery, as a complete survey of each
memorial found across the twenty-four acre grounds was neither practical
nor necessary. In order to recover the normative trends of
commemoration, however, it was imperative that the sampling strategy
should be considered in detail. For this reason, the data collection was
structured by a two level enquiry, with a pilot survey preceding the major
data collection. The purpose of the pilot survey was twofold: firstly, to
assess the completeness and accuracy of the YFHS's survey so that it
could be used to calculate the necessary sample size and location.
Secondly, a pilot sample enabled the sampling criteria of memorial date
range and forms to be refined.

The first stage of the sampling methodology was to use the YFHS
memorial inscription survey to calculate the approximate number and date
of the 7,125 stones found across the 37 burial areas (A-II, Figure 2). For
the purposes of the sampling strategy the date of a memorial was defined
as the death date of primary   mmemoration and the deceased who
appears first in an inscription, is described as the primary commemoration.
The records of subsequent deaths are described as secondary
commemorations. The next step was to compare the results of the
inscription survey analysis to the surviving mem   als on the ground.
Section M was arbitrarily selected as the pilot study area (Figure 2), on the
grounds that the section selected should be easily accessible, medium
sized (for time and data management considerations), and that the
general composition and arrangement of memorials should be reasonably

representative of other sections (as evidenced by a preliminary visual survey). The pilot study demonstrated that whilst some memorial loss had taken place, the YFHS inscription survey still provided a reasonably reliable basis from which to gauge the size and location of a representative data set sample. The main data collection used both selective and random sampling strategies. These are described in the following sections.

3.2.1 Main Survey Selection Criteria: temporal span, form, and location

Temporal span

A time span of 1837 to 1901 was adopted as the chronological framework for analysis. 1837 saw both the opening of York Cemetery and the accession of Queen Victoria, whose reign ended in 1901. This chronology was chosen for two reasons. Firstly, this time frame enables the current research to be contextualised within the recognised historical period of the Victorian age. As Chapter Two has shown, this time frame was also significant within the development of the British cemetery movement (Rugg 1992), and to the particular history of York Cemetery (H. Murray 1991). Secondly, a time span of over half a century allows short-term changes to be studied in conjunction with the long-term shifts in commemoration practice that have been identified by previous research (F. Burgess 1963; Mytum 1989· Tarlow 1999c). A case study of York cemetery also enables an investigation of a potentially localised response to these widespread, national, long-term commemoration trends.

Form

The survey included all classes of memorial forms, including headstones, ledger stones, and larger, more elaborate monuments, such as tombs, obelisks and free-standing crosses (Appendix 4). Other components of memorials, such as decorative urns and flower holders, kerb stones,

corner posts, and railings, are subject to significant post-depositional movement and loss, and were therefore only included in the survey when they appeared *in situ* and could be associated with a specific memorial.

Location

The sample area was refined by three characteristics: firstly, by restricting data collection to the Original Victorian Extent of the cemetery (Figure 2), secondly by recording randomly selected burial sections (Appendix 1), and thirdly by surveying alternate rows of gravestones in each of the sampled burial sections. It was decided to survey the Original Victorian Extent of the cemetery as the continuity and standardisation of practice in this area was unique within the cemetery. Gravestones dating from 1837 onward can be found in the Original Victorian Extent of the cemetery. In contrast the extensions of New Ground Continued and Section A were not opened until the final decade of the nineteenth century, and extensions Section B and Park Section C are post-Victorian (Figure 2). Although the first extension, the New Ground Compartments 113-143 opened in 1858, well within the remit of study, the Original Victorian Extent remained the most popular location for burial and commemoration. This preference was largely due to the fact that graves were more expensive in the New Ground. As already noted, a higher cost for burial in the New Ground Extension was not the result of differential prices charged by the Cemetery Company on the basis of a superior burial location, but was rather due to a change in burial plot size br   ht about by the London Burial Board survey of 1856.

Memorials from three further burial locations were also excluded from survey: under the chapel portico, in the chapel catacombs, and along the North Wall (Figure 2). These additional areas were not representative of the normative commemoration practices within the open ground of the Original Victorian Extent. Burial at the chapel was decidedly unpopular; only thirteen people over the history of the cemetery have been interred in the catacombs (H. Murray 1991, 13). Higher expenses were incurred with

catacomb and portico burials. Not only was the price of a vault at the
chapel higher than for open ground, but more expensive lead or iron
coffins were required when interment did not take place in the earth
(Charges and Regulations at the York Public Cemetery, March 1894,
loose paper YCA Acc. 247). Memorialisation at the chapel also used wall
tablets, a different type of memorial class than found in the open ground.
The tablet memorials found on the North Wall (Plate 5) are also
unrepresentative of the forms found in the open cemetery, and the
specialised planting of this area, known today as Butterfly Walk, means
that the area was not accessible for field survey.

A total of 22 different burial sections were located within the sample
area - the Original Victorian Extent (Table 3, Figure 2). Sections A and T
were by necessity excluded from survey as they were both entirely
composed of memorials post-dating 1901. Section O was additionally
excluded due to severe undergrowth and resulting problems of access.
Using a plan of York Cemetery (Figure 2), the remaining sample burial
areas were identified as either consecrated or unconsecrated. Given the
religious affiliations indicated by the 1837 and 1847 religious censuses
(Charts 1-3), it was decided that the sampling strategy should record equal
numbers of stones from consecrated and unconsecrated ground. Results
could then be compared to assess whether commemoration trends
differed on the basis of religious affiliation. Two separate lists were
compiled for unconsecrated and consecrated burials areas from the
remaining 19 sections.

Sections were selected randomly (literally from a hat) to select the
order in which they would be surveyed. In the pilot study area, every stone
meeting the sample criteria had been surveyed. For the main data
collection, however, it was decided that a sample, rather than a complete
survey, should be made of each burial section s mpled in order to cover
the widest possible extent of the landscape. Therefore every stone was
surveyed on alternate rows of each section until at least 30% of the total
number of available stones within the sample area had been recorded. It

was anticipated that this approach would still recover primary spatial
trends, such as the diffusion and emulation of designs from neighbouring
memorials. Furthermore the pilot study showed that the majority of family
plots were laid out adjacent to one another, and the practice of surveying
alternate rows would still allow evidence of kinship ties to be recovered.

3.2.2 Sample Size and Summary

In total, 1,274 memorials were surveyed from 12 different burial sections
(Tables 4-5; Appendix 1). Of this total, 647 memorials were sampled from
the consecrated burial sections (D, M, N, P, and Q, X, Y) and 627
memorials were sampled from unconsecrated burial sections (B, C, R, S,
and V). The YFHS survey recorded a total of 5,144 memorials within the
burial sections of the Original Victorian Extent of the cemetery (Table 3).
Of this number, 1,364 memorials post-dated 1901 (Table 3). Therefore the
sample data set represents 34% of the total monuments available from the
study period located in the Original Victorian Extent, as recorded by the
YFHS. The pilot study recorded a memorial loss rate of 17.7% between
the time of the YFHS survey and the present survey. If this loss rate is
consistent across the total number of monuments available to study from
the correct period, then the memorial data set sampled represents 41% of
the total number still available for study. The following section describes
the specific methods actually used for the collection of this data.

3.3. Recording Methodology
3.3.0 Introduction

Recording methodologies is an issue that has been comprehensively
addressed by previous gravestone studies (Jones 1976; Shoesmith 1980;
Willsher 1985a; Dublin Archaeological Society 1987; Rahtz & Watts 1983;
Reeve 1983; Mytum 2000). Research has set out at length the relative
merits of the different types of gravestone data recovered from
archaeological analysis, and this information is not repeated here. The
recording methodology used for this thesis was a proforma recording

sheet adapted from Jones (1976). As discussed in the previous section, a
two level methodology was used, with a pilot survey preceding the major
data collection. The pilot study enabled the specimen recording form to be
tailored to the gravestone variables present at York (Appendix 3), such as
specific materials and forms. The pilot study also provided an opportunity
to assess which data would be most relevant in identifying design
variables during the main data collection. Finally, the pilot study provided a
means by which data excluded from the main data collection (most notably
inscriptions) could be evaluated (Appendix 2).

3.3.1 Methodologies Used in the Pilot Study and Main Data Collection

Inscription Survey

An analysis of inscription form and content was only undertaken during the
pilot survey). Prior to data collection, an inscription grammar was
constructed from the YFHS memorial survey of the pilot section (section
M). This grammar is set out in detail in Appendix 2. Not every aspect of
the grammar (summarised below) was necessarily included for each
person commemorated - rather the grammar denoted the range of
potential information which could be conveyed and the order in which it
was usually relayed. The grammar's basic structure was as follows:

* Introductory term
* Name of deceased
* Biographical details (kin status, profession, geographic affiliation, or residence)
* Date of death
* Age at death
* Additional details (location of burial, indiv dual responsible for commemoration, further professional details)
* Epitaph

The creation of a grammar facilitated a detailed examination of inscriptions
that marks a significant departure from previous methodologies (e.g

Jones 1976; Shoesmith 1980; Cannon 1986; Willsher 1985a; Mytum 2000). By identifying the general structure of inscriptions prior to survey, information on the content, lettering style, script size, technique of execution, and placement could be analysed for each variable of the grammar and for each individual commemoration on a stone (Appendix 2).

Memorial Numbering System

The YFHS survey numbering system was used to locate memorials on the ground in the main data collection and for the initial pilot study. This system was adopted to simplify the cross-referencing of the physical evidence of stones to their previously transcribed inscriptions and to facilitate the application of data from this study within any future work. In the pilot study, any memorial found that met the criteria set out in 3.2 but had not been identified in the YFHS survey was also recorded. However, during the main data collection, only those memorials that had been identified by the YFHS survey were recorded. This change in methods reflects the disproportionate resources needed to survey memorials not previously identified in the field and to locate those whom they commemorated within the burial registers.

Variables Used to Record the Physical Evidence of Memorials

Appendix 3 includes the recording forms used in both the pilot study and main data collection, and the range of variables that were recorded. The categories included are largely self-explanatory (see also Jones 1976; Willsher 1985a; 1985b; Mytum 2000). The pilot study enabled the recording methodology used for the main data collection to be refined in several ways. Firstly, a large number of variables could be excluded from the main data collection. The pilot study show d that there was no significant deviation from the normative orientation practice, and that the vast majority of memorials in the cemetery face east (Appendix 3). Memorial location could be calculated from the YFHS reference and cemetery plans, and this information was also excluded from the main

survey. Prior to the pilot study it was anticipated that specialised memorial sizes may be encountered, such as the reproduction of headstones in miniature forms (Plate 4) or double-width headstones which commemorated individuals (usually a husband and wife) horizontally rather than vertically. In practice only miniature forms were found, and these were noted by the main data survey (Appendix 3).

A survey of memorial size was undertaken during the pilot study, but this information was excluded from the main data collection. The pilot study showed that memorials, particularly headstones, were executed in standardised sizes. Significant post-depositional movement had resulted in a large number of stones being displaced. Therefore size could be calculated as efficiently from photographic evidence as from field measurements. The pilot study also demonstrated that the clarity of a photographic record made the completion of a field sketch redundant.

A final variable recorded during the pilot study, but not included within the main data collection, was evidence of stonemason's signatures. The vast majority of these signatures were placed at the base of memorials, although exceptions exist. As noted, many memorials suffered from post-depositional sinkage, and the extent of undergrowth meant that the lower portion of the stones were not accessible without considerable clearance of vegetation and excavation. The pilot study indicated that the vast majority of memorials were unsigned: from a total of 97 memorials surveyed, only 20 headstones and two monuments bore signatures. It was concluded, therefore, that fi ding signatures would be too difficult and time-consuming given the meagre data recovered. A previously completed survey of masons not employed by the Cemetery Company was, however, made available for this thesis (David Poole *pers. litt.*). Signatures were still selectively surveyed when deemed necessary (see Chapter Five).

3.4 Method of analysis

3.4.0 Introduction

The method of analysis employed in this thesis was based on a
computerised system of data management and quantification. The
memorial recording forms were translated into a database format to allow
variables to be most efficiently cross-referenced. It was expected that the
database would aid the identification of relationships between different
variables that could then be measured to recover both a framework of
available consumer choices and normative commemoration behaviour
(see Chapter Four).

The most important aspect of the computer application was to create
a system where the memorials could be related to the individuals they
commemorated, and the material evidence of the stones correlated to
documentary sources of the Burial Registers (*YCA* Acc.107/1/1-11). This
section will first describe the construction of the actual databases, and will
conclude with a discussion of the methodology used to date memorials, an
issue that arose during the initial quantification of the data.

3.4.1 Computer Analysis

Three main databases were compiled for this thesis using Borland
Paradox Version 7 software. The first database dealt with the material
evidence of the memorial sampled from the cemetery (Appendix 6.0). The
second database contained information about the individuals
commemorated on the stones (*ibid.*). A third database contained the pilot
study's memorial inscription survey (*ibid.*) and was sub-divided into
several smaller database tables, each dealing with a specific aspect of
the content or physical attributes of the inscriptions. The structure of the
inscription's database tables and the results o analysis have been set out
in Appendix 2 and will not be discussed further here.

The same codes used to record the memorial variables in the
cemetery were used to enter information into the relevant fields of the
memorial database (Appendix 3.2; Appendix 6.0). Each memorial was

dated (see 3.4.2) and placed within a date group. These date groups

represent five-year periods over the sample chronology (starting from

1837 to 1841, until 1897 to 1901) - and a further group contained stones

that could not be dated. The YFHS survey burial section location, and

whether the ground was consecrated or unconsecrated, was noted in the

database for each stone. It was important that the structure of the

memorial database table could be related to further tables dealing with

the physical appearance of stones, most notably the memorial typology

(described in Chapter Four; Appendix 6.1). Referential integrity between

separate database tables, (or a way of ensuring that ties between like data

in separate tables could not be broken), was achieved by using a key

variable . A key variable is a common code that creates a primary index

for each table. Simply put, this meant that each object in a table, in this

case a memorial, possessed a unique reference code that remained

constant across the different database tables. The key variable used for

the memorial database was the YFHS reference number.

The commemorations database was compiled from the electronic

format of the burial registers. The extraction of information followed a

complex series of steps, since as noted in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.5, there

was no existing method of cross-referencing the burial registers to the

YFHS memorial survey. The situation was further complicated due to the

size both of the burial registers, which contained over 72,000 entries and

the population commemorated on the stones, which included 4,111

individuals. The first step of this process was to convert the electronic

dBASE software format of the electronic registers into a Paradox 7

database format. Basic cleaning of the register records was carried out to

ensure that each accession numbers was unique. This ensured that the

accession number could act as the key variable in the commemoration

database. The electronic registers were sub-divided into separate tables in

order to maximise data efficiency (Appendix 6.2).

The inscription index (which listed each of the deceased by a YFHS

stone reference) and burial registers could be cross-referenced to one

other using the variables of forename and surname. An electronic index of the forenames and surnames of the deceased commemorated upon each stone recorded in the YFHS survey was made available for this thesis by Hugh Murray. Whilst the name of the deceased provided a suitable match for a large number of entries a variety of problems was encountered. For example, the names given on the memorials do not always match the burial registers. The duplication of names was also common, as more than one person could have the same name. In these cases the individuals was selected from a possible range of entries in the burial registers by using date of death, age at death, and status shown in the inscriptions. When information in the inscriptions was incomplete or had changed (due to remarriage, for example), a selection of other variables such as grave number, age or death date could be used to search for individuals in the burial registers. To aid standardisation, information in the burial registers was given more weight than data in the inscriptions. However, if information was missing from the burial registers, then this was added from the inscriptions when possible.

A major difficulty encountered was that several people commemorated in the cemetery had not been buried there. In these cases, information was entered into the database directly from the memorial inscriptions, and a unique accession number also had to be allotted. Once all of the individuals commemorated on the sampled gravestones had been included in the commemoration database, the final step was to allot each individ al a commemoration number. This number denoted the order in which the deceased were mentioned on the stone as inscriptions did not always follow the order of death. Table 6 shows a breakdown of the number of people commemorated together and the frequency of stones. The commemoration and memorial databases could be cross-referenced using the YFHS reference, which in conjunction with the commemoration number, would show each individual commemorated on each stone. The commemorations database could also be

cross-referenced to the burial registers (for each person buried in the cemetery) using the accession number (Appendix 6.2).

3.4.2 Dating the Memorials

An issue that arose during data collection was the dating of gravestones, which is often more problematic than initially anticipated (*contra* Dethlefsen & Deetz 1966; Tarlow 1999c 13-4), especially when precise dating is sought over a short-term chronology (Wilson 1992; Mytum 2000, 56; Mytum *forthcoming*). Chapter Two has shown that, unlike other cemeteries, York did not legislate that the erection of a gravestone must take place shortly after death. Recent research by Strange (2000), however, has shown that even when legislation did occur, the bereaved could use several strategies to negotiate with cemetery companies to allow the delay of commemoration, often to an almost indefinite period. Most surveys have dated memorials using the death date of the primary commemoration as a *terminus post quem* date. However when stones were erected to more than one person, some studies have preferred to use the last date of death from the secondary commemorations as a *terminus ante quem* date.

This study elected to date memorials using the year of death for the primary commemoration (the first person recorded on the stone) as opposed to the *terminus ante quem* date. Seventy nine percent of all memorials in the main data sample commemorating more than one person, had a period of at l   t ten years between death dates of the primary and final commemorations (Table 7). Using a *terminus ante quem* date would result in a significant bias for the dating of multiple-commemoration memorials, which made up 79% of the total number of memorials sampled (Table 7), in comparison to stones which commemorated only a single individual, which made up 18% of the total sample (Table 7).

Using the pilot study data, a case study investigated three further sources which could be used to date memorials; the physical appearance

of the inscription text; references to the purchase of memorials in the
documentary sources; and the date when the grave plot associated with a
memorial was first used. Inscriptions were considered in terms of both
primary and secondary execution. Primary execution was defined as work
carried out before a monument was erected, whilst secondary execution
was work carried out after deposition. In cases of multiple
commemoration, a visual survey was carried out to assess whether an
inscription was executed as a single or multi-staged process, so as to
determine which commemorations were earlier, contemporary to, or later
to one another. This survey was inconclusive as the majority of
inscriptions showed a tendency towards standardisation, and each
commemoration on a stone adhered to the same script style and layout.

A survey of the documentary sources also proved to be inconclusive.
As already noted in Section 3.1.6 the lack of explicit detail for entries
means payments for the erection of a stone, vaulting, grave edging,
stone cleaning, the removal of the headstone before interment, and the
laying of ground for a gravestone cannot be easily distinguished from each
other.

An analysis of grave plot use was more successful. This survey was
carried out on the premise that a memorial could not be erected over a
grave before the grave itself had been purchased. In five instances, the
date of the primary commemoration preceded the date of the purchase
and use of the grave which the stone marked (YFHS refs. M/02/16,
M/03/06, M/05/05, M/18/14 d M/19/03). Therefore, a comparison
between the date of death and the date of purchase and use of a grave
offered a valid way to calibrate the dating of a memorial, and this
methodology was also applied to the main data sample. In total 31 stones
from a total of 1,275 memorials in the main data sample could not be
dated as their inscriptions were illegible (Table 7). In the small number of
cases where monuments were inscribed upon more than one face and it
was difficult to identify the primary commemoration, the earliest date of

death from the commemorations on the head of each inscribed face was used.

3.5 Case Study Examining Commemoration in Relation to Burial Practice

3.5.0 Introduction

Gravestones do not simply function as grave markers; they also act as a focus for individual and communal remembrance. There has been little opportunity, however, to explore whether potential consumer choices for commemoration were constrained or extended by burial practice. A case study was carried out for the pilot study area to compare commemoration practice, as evidenced by gravestones, to the burial practice, as evidenced within the documentary source of the Burial Registers (*YCA* Acc.107/1-11). It was immediately evident that the picture of burials provided by the gravestones did not resemble the actual practice denoted in the registers. This was most simply seen by the fact that commemoration was selective, and not everyone who was buried in the cemetery was recorded upon a stone. Furthermore, expressions of kin relationships did not concur with evidence of burial groupings for almost 40% of the monuments surveyed. In order to explore the relationship between commemoration and burial analysis examined three specific themes: firstly, the association between commemoration and plot types. Secondly, analysis compared the affiliations demonstrated by burial to those shown by commemoration, and thirdly, the study examined the correlation between commemoration order on a memorial and the order of death.

3.5.1 Plot Type and Commemoration

The pilot study area contained 471 burial plots (as opposed to memorials) of which 150 were private graves and 290 were public graves. Several plots had not been used and could not be identified as either public or private. The area contained no second class graves. Calculations of the

numbers of plots were made from the York Cemetery Company Plans
(*YCA* Acc. 339) and statistics of burial plot status compiled by Hugh
Murray (*personal communication*). Figures are approximate since
features such as paths were imposed over the initial grid of grave plots.
The ratio of two public graves to each private grave in the pilot area
appears to be slightly higher than found in other areas of the cemetery.
During the pilot survey 98 monuments, including both headstones and
larger, more elaborate memorials, were surveyed. The actual number of
monuments recorded by the YFHS survey was 116, but in accordance
with the sampling strategy set out in 3.2 several monuments were
excluded from the survey. Judging by the memorials included in the YFHS
survey, 25% of the grave plots in Section M had monuments erected upon
them. The Burial Registers record that 554 burials took place in the graves
found on rows one and two of Section M. The monuments that mark
graves on these two rows, in contrast, record the deaths of only 68
individuals, which is a commemoration rate of 12%.

In the pilot study area, 56 of the stones (rather than burial plots)
sampled were erected on private graves, 28 memorials stood on public
graves, and seven were placed on children's graves. The status of the
plots for two markers with illegible inscriptions could not be discerned.
Several of the memorials placed on private graves were associated with
more than one burial plot (M/01/07; M/02/08; M/03/06; M/04/07; M/18/09;
M/18/10). In these cases, multiple private graves had been purchased
together to act as a family pl t. Informal family plots also evidenced the
desire for relatives to be buried in close proximity to one another. For
example, memorial M/02/24 marked a private plot (6915) that had been
purchased next to a public grave (6902) in which the primary
commemoration on the stone was buried. The secondary
commemorations on the stone were buried below the memorial in the
private plot.

In summary, in accordance with York Cemetery Company policy,
grave type did not constrain the ability to erect a memorial. A number of

observations can be drawn concerning the available consumer choices for
the location of a grave plot. In the pilot study area and in each burial
sections sampled except B, grave plots were not used up in any
discernible order. Therefore there appears to have been some degree of
freedom to select both a burial section and the grave's position in the
section. The Grave Receipt Books showed that of the 57 private graves
located (from a total of 60 private plots surveyed), the vast majority was
not purchased before death. In fact only two plots (9415; 9439) were
purchased prior to the death: the first had been purchased a few days
before death and the second nine years earlier. For each example of a
family plot, multiple private graves had been purchased at the time of one
person's death in preparation for future interments. In contrast, public
graves remained open until filled, and it was company policy that they
should not be reopened (Section 2.6.1). Therefore, the selection of a burial
location in these cases would have been restricted by availability of open
graves.

Analysis also showed that the Cemetery Company's policy of not
restricting particular memorial classes and types to specific parts of the
cemetery (Section 2.6.2) was indeed followed in practice. It was noted,
however, that a high proportion of memorials commemorating children,
and executed in miniature form, were located at the section peripheries,
next to paths. The Plan Books (*YCA* Acc. 339) showed that the laying of
paths had encroached upon these outlying grave plots and as a result that
they could only accommod t child-sized coffins. As noted in Section
2.6.1, children's graves inside sections were composed of an adult-sized
grave that had been divided into four small plots. Should each child be
commemorated, as in the case of plot 10857, several headstones would
be erected over the same grave (M/11/01, M/12/01, and M/12/02). A
similar situation occurred with public graves, for example two memorials,
M/10/17a and M/10/17b, were erected over the grave 9414 to
commemorate two individuals from the multiple interments that had taken
place.

3.5.2 Burial and Commemoration Affiliations

From the pilot study data set of 97 memorials, 59 stones were identified as commemorating each of the individuals buried in the grave marked by the stone. Analysis could not be completed for two stones with illegible inscriptions. For the remaining 38% of the data set

- an individual had been commemorated in the cemetery but interred elsewhere, as was the case for nine stones

- an individual was interred and commemorated in the cemetery, but the actual grave was not marked by the stone, as was the case for 20 stones

- an individual was buried in the cemetery in a grave marked by a stone, but not commemorated upon the stone, as was the case for 14 stones

A single memorial may have reflected more than one of the above conditions (Appendix 6).

External burials Commemorated within York Cemetery

Evidence that an individual was commemorated on a memorial in York Cemetery, but had been interred elsewhere, was recovered both from documentary sources and from data provided by the inscriptions (Appendix 2.0). Using the Burial Registers and Daily Ledgers, a record of burial was searched for each person commemorated on stones sampled from Section M (YCA Acc.107/1/1-11; YCA Acc.107/1-6). The Burial Registers recorded the personal details, accession, and grave numbers for each interment and the Daily Ledger noted all burial expenses. Therefore, every individual who was buried in the cemetery should appear in both of these records. An omission from one source could be an oversight of compilation, but if an individual was excluded f m both records it was concluded that in all probability the deceased had been interred elsewhere. In total 16 individuals who were commemorated on memorials could not be located in the documentary sources. In contrast, in only five cases was it explicitly stated in inscriptions that an individual was not

buried in the cemetery. The location of burial for three interments was outside York, in London (M/19/03), Leeds (M/17/01) and Stockton-on-Tees (M/01/05), whilst two individuals were buried in York parish churchyards (M/10/17a; M/19/03). It was clear in the main data sample, that several individuals were recorded on memorials in the cemetery but were buried elsewhere since their date of death took place before the cemetery actually opened (for example, the primary commemorations of B/01/02; D/13/08; D/15/02; Q/05/17; Q/15/30). The death dates of the two individuals (M/10/17a; M/19/03) noted as buried in York parish churchyards fell between the time of the cemetery's opening in 1837 and before the time of the closure of the city centre burial ground in 1854 (Chapter Two).

The move from burial in the City's churchyards to patronage of the cemetery was complex and multi-staged. This shift was influenced by myriad issues, including the wider social dynamics and politics set out in Chapter Two. Change was also made on the basis of more personal responses, such as a desire to maintain the established burial affiliations and locations of remembrance within the parish and Nonconformist burial grounds, simple economics, practical convenience, and sentiments of fashion or perceived social prestige. An examination of memorial M/08/13 shows how complex the dynamics of this change can be to interpret. This stone commemorated an adult male (the primary commemoration) and the earlier deaths of his nine infant children (the secondary commemorations). All of the children were com emorated in the same manner, and with the barest of detail. The documentary sources revealed that four of the children were buried in separate public graves in the cemetery whilst the remaining five were not. The missing children were born after the cemetery was opened and before the parish grounds were closed, and it is probably that they were buried in the latter. The preferences expressed for the different burial location of these children was not chronologically determined, since the place of burial did not change at a point in time but shifts back and forth from one context to the other over time. This example

both shows that the ideologies and motivations which underlay specific
consumer choices may not be recoverable through archaeological
analysis, and that they could vary even though these choices related to
members of same family, who possessed similar inherent status.

Interments in York Cemetery which are commemorated but not marked by memorials

Some memorials commemorate individuals buried elsewhere in York
Cemetery. From the sample surveyed, 22 stones commemorate
individuals who are buried apart from their memorial. In eight instances
monuments had been erected on a private grave after the burial of the
individual recorded as the primary commemoration had already taken
place in a public grave. In two cases, multiple interments in public graves
had taken place prior to the erection of a gravestone over a private grave.
There were five memorials recording group commemorations where the
deceased had been buried in separate public graves, and two instances
where those commemorated together have been buried in separate,
private graves. In a small number of cases, inscriptions denoted that
individuals commemorated together had not been not buried together by
using the phrase 'near this spot'. Future analysis could examine the
articulation of separation over time to see when and for which groups it
may be emphasised or masked. For example, separate burial locations
for children from their parents may not have been articulated as it
challenged the ideology that children should remain in close physical
proximity to their parents, which may be grounded in ideas of social
organisation, sentiments of nurture or incomplete social identity.

Depending on the time of erection, there may have been a choice of
location for a memorial when the deceased had been buried separately.
The choice of location may have been dependant upon preferences
towards both the individual commemorations and the grave plot marked by
the memorial. For example, it may be that priority was given to the resting
place of one commemoration over another or the status of the grave as

public or private, its location and visibility and whether a headstone has already been erected on that spot. The latter issue may have been especially relevant for public and children's graves where members of several families were buried together and competition over available space may have existed. More data is needed in order to fully explore the complexities of the relationship between the location of burial and place of commemoration, although preliminary analysis confirmed that private plots were favoured above public plots (Appendix 6). When a stone commemorates multiple individuals in both public and private graves, the move from public burial to private interment can not be understood simply as economically determined by the ability to meet the rising burial costs. This change is located within a wider set of choices made by the living which is dependant on both the social position of the deceased and who was responsible for burial - conditions which may not be the same for each individual of a commemoration group. Thus we find that children were often buried in public plots when adult relations were buried in private graves.

Uncommemorated Burials

An analysis of the burial registers covering the period between 1837 and 1910 (in electronic format) revealed that interments that are not recorded on the gravestones above took place at 20 of the private graves marked by memorials. This may be seen as an inversion of the aforementioned affiliations, since those w o were buried together were not commemorated together. Uncommemorated interment could have taken place before, during and after a time frame established by the death dates of those who were commemorated. Using documentary sources it was possible to tentatively establish a kinship tie f r 37% of individuals interred (but not commemorated), to the commemorated individuals with whom they had been interred. Recent research by Strange (2000) offers a potential explanation for un-commemorated burials in private graves. Strange challenges the dichotomy that correlates poverty with public

graves and wealth with private graves as this does not take into account
the large number of private graves actually purchased by working class
consumers. This fact demonstrates that there was a range of complex
responses to the notion of the private plot. Private plots were indeed a
commodity that could be given, pawned, loaned, sold and even sub-let to
others.

3.5.3 Commemoration Order and Order of Death

The commemorations on 20 gravestones, 21% of the sample, record
individuals in non-chronological order of death (Appendix 6). Between
them, these gravestones carry 40% of the total number of
commemorations. The monuments in question are found both on public
and private grave plots. They include commemorations to individuals who
are buried elsewhere in the cemetery and also to external burials. Almost
50% of all gravestones which carry inscriptions in non-chronological order
are erected on single private graves that contain the remains of all the
people commemorated above. It woula seem, therefore, that the
expressions of kin affiliations that are found in groups with dispersed
burials is a negligible factor within the chronological organisation of
inscriptions.

Inscriptions outside a chronological order can occur both for the
primary commemoration, when the first person recorded is not the first
death to have taken place, and for secondary commemorations. For
example, the fourth comm   ration may record the death of an individual
who died before the date of death of the second and third
commemorations. Therefore there may be multiple examples of later
deaths being recorded before earlier ones on a single monument. A
number of general observations can be made concerning commemoration
outside chronological order. First it is very common for adults to be
primary commemorations despite their children's death date preceding
their own, as evident on 16 stones. In other cases one half of a married
couple is commemorated before a pre-deceased spouse. There was little

evidence of gender bias at this level of enquiry since this occurred almost as often for wives as for husbands. The possibility of making an evaluative distinction between the first person to be commemorated and the secondary would appear to be enhanced by the existence of commemorations outside chronological order. By selecting an ndividual to be commemorated outside chronological order they are given prominence in the inscription structure over others on the stone. The date of inscription is important: if the carving is executed as a single stage process then this also maximises opportunities to spatially link, and thus emphasise, specific relationships. The commemoration of a husband, for example, is followed by that of his wife although deaths of other relatives have taken place in between. In the pilot study this prominence was shown to the relationship between parent and child as well as for marital partners.

3.5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has both described the documentary and material evidence used to structure the thesis, and the methodologies used to collect data in the field. It is important to stress that gravestones do not merely relate who lie below, they create a unique account of the past. In the same way in which history is written into existence, a reality of past events is voiced and legitimised by the visibility and materiality of gravestones. It is acknowledged that if the area was to be excavated according to traditional archaeological practice, ano er set of data may well present a slightly different picture to Burial Registers. The specific ideologies that engender commemoration trends can be independent of actual burial practice. Commemoration practices allow familiar and other relations to be articulated whatever the temporal and spatial c nstraints. The material expression of these commemoration practices will now be considered in Chapter Four through a discussion of gravestone typology.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the memorial survey described in Chapter Three. Specifically, an in-depth analysis of one particular aspect of commemoration, the design of headstones, is investigated through the design and application of a headstone typology. The appearance of headstones is examined to assess which variations between designs are random, and which differences appear to be the result of structured choices. Analysis identifies both the range of available consumer choices and the normative patterns of commemoration in York Cemetery. The results in this chapter will form the basis for a more interpretative analysis of gravestones in Chapter Five, where the wider cultural and historical contexts that informed memorial designs are explored.

The first part of this chapter considers the general theoretical issues involved within typological analysis, followed by a description of the typology structure specifically created for this research. The second part of the chapter sets out the results of typological analysis.

4.1 Introduction to Typological Analysis

Before setting out the typology methodology, this section considers the theoretical issues involved within typological analysis. The section concentrates upon three main themes; firstly, what advantages are offered by organising a data set with a typology. Secondly, discussion considers the precedents for memorial typologies. Finally, this section describes the specific theoretical framework that underpinned the typology that was created for, and implemented in, this study.

4.1.0 Why Employ A Memorial Typology?

The cemetery is a complex landscape. It initially appears to offer an accessible, quantifiable, and homogenous data set - a re iment of upright

markers stationed above the dead for row upon row (Plate 5). Yet, on closer inspection, commemoration is both variously and extensively articulated. Once the decision to commemorate an individual is made, material expression is dependent upon a series of choices. A primary decision, for example, is whether to commemorate the deceased individually or as part of a commemorative group. Subsequent choices include the selection of a memorial design, its material, size, decoration and location, and the content and form of an inscription. Selections are drawn from an extensive, yet finite, series of culturally approved norms. These norms are not fixed but may vary over time and between different social groups.

Past research has persuasively argued that whether consciously articulated, manipulated, or deeply embedded, commemoration allows a host of social affiliations to be voiced which define not only the dead, but the living themselves (Parker Pearson 1982; Cannon 1989; Wurst 1991; Mytum 1994). Unravelling the complexities of how social identity can be expressed in material form is an underlying theme of archaeology (Beaudry *et al* 1991; Yentsch 1999a; Wurst 1998). Memorial inscriptions appear to offer tantalising evidence of both of the individual and personal sentiments (Tarlow 1999c). However, as the case study set out in Chapter Three has shown, the dynamics of commemoration are far more complex in practice.

The cemetery is a uniquely constructed landscape because its character is largely depend   t upon the material contributions made by a wide variety of individuals and family groups. Deposits are both uniform, since they represent a single artefact type, and deliberate. What is less easily understood is the extent that an individual or group could contribute to the final appearance of memorials and how consciously they selected specific designs. A second, associated issue, is the degree of familiarity with which an audience might have read these memorial designs and the extent to which this information may be recovered by archaeological research. The appearance of gravestones during the Victorian period is,

as yet, a largely unexplored topic. This thesis explores the research potential of memorial design as one specific aspect of gravestone data by questioning the degree to which the selection of a memorial design is structured. This question is an important starting point from which further research can begin to unravel the complexities surrounding the expression of social identities in material form. For example, building on this research, future studies may investigate whether social meanings were conveyed in a different way when an artefact's design could be directly influenced by the purchaser rather than when the appearance of objects was predetermined by the producer.

By typologically defining the data set, the range of available options chosen for headstone designs can be quantified. Using the results of typological analysis, a grammar of material variability can be constructed and interpreted within a variety of frameworks. This thesis focuses on consumer choice as one of the most informative theoretical frameworks. By correlating a single gravestone (an example of individual consumer choice) to the cemetery assemblage as a whole (representing wider social norms), a typology provides a system to distinguish between those patterns of behaviour which are normative, and those which are the exception. In summary, a typology acts both as a data management system and as an analytical tool. It creates a coherent assemblage of data from which specific research questions may be investigated. Finally, and most importantly, a typology offers a coherent way to communicate and frame information for future mparative analysis.

4.1.1 Precedents For A Memorial Typology

Not all historical objects have been studied equally. Unlike other post-medieval artefact types, such as ceramic , clay pipes, and glass, where a detailed typology of forms can constitute a paper or even an entire volume (Noel Hume 1969; Jones & Sullivan 1989; Gaimster 1997), memorial typologies remain largely undiscussed and unpublished. This situation reflects the nature of the data in question, as much as it is a

consequence of past research. Gravestones are not found on a wide range of sites and have only relatively recently emerged as a field of study within mainstream archaeology. More significant perhaps is the sheer volume of data that survives. As an artefact type, gravestones were made and survive over a considerable period of time, and from the late seventeenth-century onward were in widespread use. Permutations of material, form and decoration take place over time but are also sensitive to particular regional, and even site-specific, trends (Herbert 1944; Barley 1948; Willsher 1992; Lees 1993) The establishment of a comprehensive typology to identify these changes is an epic task. Early research has made an important start by establishing a general chronology of basic memorial types and examples of iconographic decoration over time (F. Burgess 1963). A further contribution was made by the work of Jones (1976), Shoesmith (1980), and Rahtz (1985), that demonstrated the wide range of evidence recoverable from gravestones. Yet an in-depth consideration of any one specific memorial type, for example nineteenth-century headstone forms, has received far less attention. As a result, difficulties are encountered when a specific frame of reference is sought for comparative analysis.

As discussed in previous chapters, this thesis represents the study of one specific aspect of gravestone evidence, memorial design, and uses a data set that is spatially and temporally specific. Little study has been undertaken expressly of Victorian memorials in Britain (notable exceptions include Cannon 1986; Mytu   1994; 1999), and churchyards and chapel burial grounds have been the favoured context for analysis (*ibid.*), rather than cemeteries. Art historical and architectural studies have been influential in creating a bias towards the analysis of elaborate large-scale monuments and sculpture (Esdaile 1927, Morrell 1944), rather than the more commonplace headstone. An emphasis on production by localised craftsmen (Chater 1976; 1977; Willsher & Hunter 1979) has discouraged the analysis of memorials manufactured with any degree of industrialisation. An underlying notion seems to suggest that artefacts

belonging to societies where there is mass production somehow possess a less authentic expression of social ideologies (F. Burgess 1963; Dethlefsen & Deetz 1966), even when the artefacts in question remain largely hand-crafted. As a result, a detailed study of memorial design has yet to be written, and there is a predisposition to study material aspects, such as symbolic and iconographic decoration, which are considered more overtly meaningful or can be most closely identified to a particular producer (Ludwig 1966; Chater 1976; Deetz 1977; Turner 1985; Benes 1987; Wurst 1991; Willsher 1995; Tarlow 1998). A more general problem lies in the way in which previous research agendas may have been framed. Gravestones have been characterised as a data set that is tightly controlled by the dimensions of time, space and form (Dethlefsen & Deetz 1966; Jones 1976). As a result, a number of studies have used gravestones as an accessible data set from which to answer wide-ranging research questions (Clark 1987; Wurst 1991), without addressing the nature of memorials as a particular artefact type.

Virtually all gravestone analysis seeks to identify the similarities and differences within, and between, assemblages but there is often little or no discussion of the methods employed to classify data. Published papers understandably stress the interpretation of results over a lengthy discussion of the methods used to recover this evidence. A complete description of stone shapes and decoration is usually only published for sites where there are small number of monuments (Rahtz 1985) and emphasis is placed upon di nguishing between, rather than within, memorial classes. Both these factors restrict results from being utilised as comparative data. Even when analysis concentrates on single memorial class or type (Snyder 1989), form and decoration are often discussed as a series of observations, rather than being structured as a typology. In other cases, a specific memorial type may be used to identify a subset within a larger assemblage (Mytum 1994) which has been selected to study information such as inscriptions, rather than aspects of shape and decoration. Thus while memorial types that tend to be less frequently

adopted have been better researched in some respects, they can not be contextualised within a framework of normative behaviour as more widely adopted memorials forms have not been the focus of detailed analysis.

Whilst the publication of a memorial typology is not always a practical option in all studies, a greater discussion of methods is crucial. At present, there is no consensus as to how a memorial typology should be constructed, and even basic terminology is used inconsistently by different authors. For example, the tomb type described by Jones (1976) as a chest tomb is referred to as a box tomb in Rahtz (1985) and as an altar tomb by the Australian National Trust (1987). This general absence of agreed points of definition and reference within even basic theoretical and methodological issues results in memorial categorisation mistakenly being presented as self-evident and objective, and this is especially problematic in cases where there is insufficient illustration (Cannon 1986; Tarlow 1999c).

In summary, previous research has established a valuable preliminary framework that sets out the basic changes to memorial forms and decoration over time. Yet a more specific frame of reference to compare details of the specific memorial designs found in this survey remains absent. It was important therefore to articulate both the theoretical and methodological basis of the typological analysis implemented in this study. Furthermore, clearly defining the criteria for classification will enable further development of the typology used in this study in future analysis.

4.1.2 Theoretical Basis for the Memorial Typology

When a large assemblage is composed of a single artefact type, the possibility exists for a detailed comparison of objects. However, the corollary of this situation is the sheer volume of information that may potentially be recovered. A full analysis can not be undertaken for every possible avenue of inquiry, and ultimately the selection of data limits which results can be recovered. In the absence of an existing memorial typology, a critique of more general models provides a useful starting point. Within

archaeology, the typological study of artefacts has largely focused upon either historical objects which are mass produced, such as bottles and ceramics (Jones & Sullivan 1989; Gaimster 1997), or upon hand-produced goods that are created within a craft based economy, such as Anglo-Saxon spearheads or pottery (Swanton 1973; Evison 1979). Such models do not provide a suitable framework to study of Victorian memorials, which include both hand- and machine-manufactured objects. The structure of a typology for Victorian memorials needs to be able to distinguish between any variation in appearance which is the result of intended design, and unconscious differences which are the result of workmanship. A typology also needs to incorporate the wealth of historical sources that provide vital information about how memorials were both conceived and perceived. Material culture studies (which includes art history, museum studies and anthropological research) has produced several typological models that address variation in design and include a system to incorporate an object's specific historical and cultural context (see for example Kingery 1993; Elliot *et al.* 1994; Pearce 1994; Prown 1994). General typological models can be applied to a wide range of artefact types and cover an extensive range of attributes. The application of such models specifically for gravestone analysis is limited, however, by their generality and emphasis upon function. Unlike other types of artefacts, such as candlesticks or ceramics (Sinclair 1987; Gaimster 1997), there are no obvious differences between the function of different classes or types of memori l

The structure of a memorial typology in this thesis was framed by the interpretation of the cemetery as a context for the display of consumer choices. The criteria for selecting variables for analysis, from the range of information a monument possessed, was the ability to contribute to an understanding of consumer and producer dynamics. Aspects of decoration and form are prioritised above textual evidence. Appendix 2 has shown that choice of inscription was dependent upon a distinct, although inter-connected, series of consumer choices in the selection of a memorial

design. The cemetery is interpreted as a sensory landscape, where meaning exists within the interactive process between the viewer and object. In the first instance, evidence of meaning can be found in the manner in which the object is used to convey information; that is to say the material characteristics of an individual gravestone. This stage, where the appearance of each individual gravestone is described, represents the first level of typological analysis (Figure 6). In the second instance, meaning can be articulated by a code of signification, that is to say the associations that can be made between gravestones within the cemetery. This represents the second level of typological analysis where comparative analysis takes places between individual memorials (Figure 7). A third stage of meaning, addressed in Chapter Five, is expressed within the changing ideas and associations of the artefact type itself, that is to say the broad cultural placement of memorial designs by the viewer. This typology, therefore, emphasises the visual aspects of design above an in-depth consideration of the manufacturing techniques used to achieve a monument's end appearance.

4.2 The Typology Methodology
4.2.0 Introduction to Typology Methodology

This section will first show how the results of the memorial survey were used to refine the parameters of the typological analysis. Discussion will then set out the typology methodology and describe how it was implemented in the study. The typological analysis falls into two parts. The first level of the typology is concerned with the classification of individual headstones, and the second level of analysis uses this data to interpret the nature of the assemblage as a whole, though a series of inter-linked subsets. The purpose of the typology is to iden ify a range of options available for headstone designs through an examination of the similarity and difference in appearance between stones. From the outset, a distinction was made between the shape, or profile, of a headstone

(Sections 4.3 and 4.4) and details of design and decoration (Section 4.5). This distinction was made in order to explore the level of predetermined association between different shapes and decoration types. Specifically, this approach anticipated a scenario whereby a pre-cut stone shape might be bought off the peg, then modified by decoration to the individual needs of the purchaser. In this way it is possible to interpret the range of consumer-influenced variation which might be found in the appearance of headstones.

Several terms used in this chapter which refer to specific aspects of a gravestone's appearance are defined below (see also Figure 6):

Headstone Structure and Structural Groups

A headstone structure is the basic shape of a stone as dictated by head, shoulder, and body shapes. A headstone structural group is a sub-set of the headstone assemblage that is sorted on the basis of either the head shape, or the inclusion of shoulders.

Headstone Profile

The headstone profile is the specific, detailed outline of a stone, which builds on the basic stone shape by examining the inclusion of stylistic components.

Stylistic Component

A stylistic component is defined as a structural feature that dictates the profile, or specific shape, of a headstone. Figure 8 shows the range of stylistic components foun in the sample, including features such as mouldings, columns, and plinths.

Design Variable

Design variables are the more specific details of a headstone's appearance. Two sets of design variables are sed: the first is associated with a headstone's form, (size, material, panel, and edge types) and the second relates to the headstone's decoration.

4.2.1 Memorial Sample: A Summary of Results

Once the memorial survey had been completed, the data set was divided into basic memorial types (Appendix 4). Charts 4 and 5 show the composition of the data set by memorial class and type. Headstones are by far the largest class of memorial. They survive intact on 1073 occasions and make up 84% of the memorial sample. Fifteen headstones, two broken headstones and 15 other memorials, which were surveyed but could not be dated, are excluded from chronological analysis (see Appendix 7). Charts 6 and 7 demonstrate that headstones make up between 78% and 91% of the total data set for each five-year period of the sample chronology. Headstones appear with a frequency that permits a detailed examination of form and decoration. For head and kerb stones, broken headstones, and second class headstones (see Chapter Two Section 2.6.2), which each only make up 1% or less of the total sample, insufficient evidence survives to conduct an in-depth analysis of appearance. Cross headstones, which make up 4% of the total memorial sample, also represent a data set that is too small to support a detailed investigation of decoration and design.

Chart 6 shows that it was not possible to undertake an analysis of monument design in the same depth as for headstones. The memorial class of monuments, which represents 10% of the total data sample and 128 stones, encompasses a wide range of memorial types including, for example, obelisks, tombs and crosses. Chart 7 demonstrates that no single monument type occ   on more than 38 occasions or represents more than 3% of the total memorial sample. The variety within monument forms that are present in such small numbers means that designs can not be usefully categorised to the same level of detail as headstones. Furthermore, the variables of particular monument styles are difficult to cross-reference meaningfully with details of headstone designs. These monuments do, however, offer valuable comparative data to the more detailed investigation of memorial designs in Chapter Five. Since an important purpose of typologically defining a data set is to recover

normative patterns of commemoration, it is appropriate that the analysis of this chapter should focus upon headstones, the most frequently adopted memorial class.

4.2.2 Typology Methodology: First Level of Analysis

The first level of typological analysis considers the specific characteristics of individual headstones (Figure 6). As discussed in the previous chapter, a number of variables was collected during the field survey (Appendix 3.2) and translated into electronic format (Appendix 5). The information recorded included a memorial's class, type, material, size, location, and date. Occasionally, details of a stonemason's signature were also recorded (Chapter Three Section 3.3.1). It was important that the headstone typology could be cross-referenced with this existing data. This compatibility was achieved by setting out the typology in a computerised table using the same format as the memorial database (Appendix 6.1) and by using the YFHS memorial code as the key variable (Chapter Three, Section 3.4.1).

As shown on Figure 6, a headstone is considered first in terms of its general shape. The structure of a headstone is divided into three elemental parts; the head, shoulders and body. The basic shape of each element was noted when applicable, but not all headstones are made up of all three parts. A rectangular-shaped headstone, for example, is classified by body shape alone (Drawing 12.1, G8). In contrast, a lancet-shaped headstone is clas ified by its head and body shape (Drawing 12.1, L1), and a shouldered stone is defined by head, body, and shoulder shape (Drawing 12.2, SH19). The general headstone shape is then examined more closely to consider how the specific headstone shape, or profile, is created by using features such as m uldings and columns. These features are termed stylistic components . The types of stylistic components found in this survey are illustrated by Figure 8 and the range of styles are shown by Drawings 5-11. It should be noted, that a single headstone might include more than one type of stylistic component.

Once a headstone's structure and profile are described, a number of further variables are classified. These fields, which are termed design variables , provide more specific details of a headstone's appearance. Two sets of design variables are used: the first is associated with a headstone's form, (size, material, panel, and edge types) and the second relates to the headstone's decoration.

4.2.3 Discussion

Section 4.1.1 discussed the lack of a standardised terminology for memorial shape, but a terminology to describe a stone's appearance is equally lacking. This proved to be the major difficulty encountered with the classification of a stone's appearance. F. Burgess noted a lack of a specialist vocabulary in the early 1960s, and more recent studies have also failed to resolve this issue (Jones 1976; Willsher 1985a; Mytum 2000). One reason for the absence of a widely accepted terminology is that previous studies have tended to present data visually, rather than textually describing forms (Shoesmith 1980; Rahtz 1985; Tarlow 1999c). Contemporary pattern books and catalogues do not survive in sufficient numbers or cover a large enough range of memorial types to provide an all-encompassing stock of definitions. These types of documentary sources also generally rely on a visual communication of designs (Thomas 1848; Hallam 1856; Prang & Co 1860; Roger 1872). Modern day memorial production does not use designs that are similar to Victorian forms, and current terminolo   is therefore largely inapplicable.

The ideological and technological associations between buildings and memorials has long been recognised (F. Burgess 1963; National Trust of Australia 1987). Within past research there has been a tentative, rather than widespread, application of architectu al terms to describe memorials. This study uses a comprehensive range of architectural terms in conjunction with published glossaries (Parker 1896; Ellwood Post 1964; Child 1996) and provides detailed illustrations of profile forms and design variables (Figures 8-13; Drawings 1-18). As a result, information can be

effectively communicated for the purpose of current research and to allow future comparative analysis to take place. It should be emphasised, however, that architectural terms used in this thesis denote only shape, since a shared function can not be assumed between the use of particular forms for buildings and for memorials.

4.2.4 The Typology Methodology: Second Level of Analysis

The second level of analysis in the memorial typology addresses the comparative data (Figure 7). Here associations between headstones can be measured by means of inter-linked subsets of the variables used to describe individual stones (Section 2.4.2). These sub-sets can be interpreted through numerical, chronological and spatial analysis. As a result of comparative analysis, a series of increasingly specialised headstone sub-sets are created. The large number of variables that can be cross-referenced, however, offers some protection against imposing an artificial order onto the data. Figure 7 sets out the structure of the comparative analysis, which is organised by three different stages of data sorting:

* First Stage: Headstone Structural Group

* Second Stage: Headstone Profile

* Third Stage: Completed Headstone Designs

The first data group represents a general ordering of stones on the basis of perceived structura mphasis. In practice this is defined in three ways:

* by head shape (as for example in the case of the semi-circular; lancet; triangular and scroll headstone groups: Drawings 1.01; 1.02; 1.05; 1.10)

* by the relationship between the head and the body of the stone (as for example in the case of the pedimented head surmounting moulded flank headstone group: Drawing 1.03)

*   by the presence of shoulders (as for example in the case of the

shouldered headstone group: Drawing 1.09).

A miscellaneous grouping, geometric and 'other' headstones , was

created for stones which did not fall within the above groups (Drawing

1.13; 1.14). These seven different categories of headstone sub-sets are

termed structural groups . A second sorting of data was carried out for

three structural groups, scroll, shouldered, and pedimented head

surmounting moulded flank headstones. The stones in these groups

showed sufficient variation within their basic structure to allow sub-sets of

specific structural emphasis to be created (Figure 7).

The next stage of comparative analysis identified the individual

headstone profiles (or unique shapes) within the structural groups. Each

headstone was allotted either a shared or unique profile number

(Drawings 5-11). It should be emphasised that a specific profile shape can

be shared by a number of headstones in the sample. It is also possible

that profiles which are unique in the headstone data set (that is to say are

represented only by one memorial in data sample) are reproduced

elsewhere in the cemetery. A general interpretation of the relative

popularity or scarcity of particular profiles in the Victorian cemetery can be

gained, however, by their frequency in the sample.

The final stage of the typological analysis sorts each headstone by

profile group using the design variables of form (material, size, edge type,

panel type), and decoration to identify a final range of chosen headstone

designs (Appendix 8). The   re and definition of a headstone design

should be clarified at this point. A distinction is made between a proposed

headstone design, (the headstone shape and decoration as initially offered

to the consumer by the producer), and a chosen headstone design (the

end appearance of the memorial erected in the cemetery). Such a

distinction is made in order to investigate the hypothesis that without an

intermediary as a distributor, the customer had the opportunity to shape

the end appearance of a memorial through face to face negotiation with

the stonemason. For example, modifications to a stonemason's proposed

product might have been made prior to purchase, in accordance to the consumer's needs, through the use of the design variables. Such modifications would enable a range of variations to exist between headstones that are ostensibly the same design. An investigation of the potential strategies used by the producer or purchaser to modify memorial designs is set out in Chapter Five.

4.2.5 Discussion

The structural divisions used in this typology have several precedents in past research (Mytum 2000). However, this typology's recognition of specific profile shapes that can be cross-referenced to a wide range of design variables marks a departure from past studies. This development is important for two reasons. First, because the current typology considers a headstone as a collection of structural parts, stylistic components, and design variables, it allows a headstone's appearance to be analysed to a much higher degree of detail than has been possible in the past. This structure gives equal priority to the relationships both *between* and *within* different headstone groups to show how each may relate to other stylistically. In short, rather than simply producing a catalogue of the different memorial designs found in York cemetery, the typology used in this study offers a system for describing, categorising and communicating the differences and similarities between stones. This is a methodological and theoretical departure from traditional approaches where headstones have been viewed within st ti divisions of form defined on the basis of a single structural or stylistic feature (Cannon 1986; Tarlow 1999c).

Second, this typology contributes to the refining of the parameters of future recording methodologies by evaluating the research potential of the different types of information included. Gra stones are an extremely data-rich artefact type, and the archaeological merit of specific information - such as memorial design - has yet to be fully evaluated by in-depth analysis. A distinction must be drawn between interpreting meaningful differentiation between memorial designs and describing the *level of*

difference between stones; the latter may be calculated to a meticulous, yet not in itself necessarily significant, degree. This is an important methodological issue that can be addressed by comparative analysis of this study's typology. Aspects of similarity and difference are complex to measure since they may be perceived rather than concrete judgements. Considerations which can be resolved by comparative analysis include the level of variation which can be expected between examples of the same profile and decoration types as a result of different times of carving, levels of expertise and the use of different materials or technology (Mytum 1999). This study therefore seeks to identify the point at which the level of data that can be retrieved is overwhelmed by the time and resources required to recover it. It also tries to assess the degree at which information is so specific to an individual headstone that it becomes difficult to recover a wider contextual meaning for that stone. In brief, this research asks at what level of analysis do we stop seeing trends : and when does differences become random as opposed to structured ?

In summary, the typological analysis in this thesis is concerned with two main issues. The first issue is to identify the range of structural parts, stylistic components, and design variables found within the data set. This range is then used to construct a material grammar of headstone designs chosen by the consumer, and to interpret the range of designs potentially offered by the producer. The second issue is to identify trends of popularity for the different memorial variables in order to reveal the underlying patterns that stru   ed consumer behaviour over time.

4.3 Headstone Structural Groups

4.3.0 Introduction

Following the methodology set out on in Section 4.2.4, the first stage of the typology's comparative analysis identified seven different headstone sub-groups. Chart 8 shows the percentage of the total number of headstones found within each of the seven structural groups. Their relative

numbers define each sub- group as either a major of minor group. The major headstone groups are:

* Semi-Circular Headstones

* Lancet Headstones

* Pedimented Head Surmounting Moulded Flanks Headstones

The four minor headstone structural groups are:

* Triangular Headstones

* Scroll Headstones

* Shouldered Headstones

* Geometric and 'other' Headstones.

The headstone data set is dominated by semi-circular stones that comprise just over half the total headstone sample. The two remaining major structural groups, lancet and pedimented head surmounting moulded flanks headstones, are of similar size to one another and each represent approximately one-sixth of the total sample. The four minor structural groups contain considerably smaller numbers of stones. Indeed, together they only form approximately one-sixth of the total headstone sample. Statistically, minor structural groups can not be subject to the same level of analysis as larger groups, but they nonetheless offer valuable evidence of available consumer choices.

4.3.1 Structural Analysis: A Summary of Results

Semi-Circular Headstones

As Drawing 1.1, 1.01 shows, semi-circular headstones have a curved head upon a rectangular body, resembling the shape of a semi-circular arch. Variation is found in the arc of the curve, which may be an approximation of a semi-circle, and stones are produced in a range of different sizes. Semi-circular headstones are the argest headstone group, containing 545 stones.

Chart 9 shows the frequency of semi-circular headstones in comparison to stones of other structural groups per five-year period over the sample chronology. Semi-circular headstones display an enduring

184

span of use extending over a sixty-year period starting from 1842. Semi-circular headstones clearly display a steady increase over time, and peak in popularity between 1867-1871. A decline in numbers between 1872 and 1881 corresponds to a drop in the overall frequency of headstones. This fall in numbers can be explained by different patterns of use between the sampled burial sections of the cemetery and does not necessarily represent a decline in the actual use of headstones themselves. Between 1857 and 1896 semi-circular stones are more popular than all the other headstone forms combined.

Lancet Headstones

Lancet headstones are the second largest group, containing 169 stones, and have a pointed head upon a rectangular body, resembling a lancet style arch (Drawing 1.1, 1.02). Variation can occur in head shape, with more obtuse angles occasionally employed (see for example Drawing 6, L14). Lancet stones are reproduced in a number of different sizes. As Chart 8 shows, lancet headstones make up 16% of the total number of headstones available to study.

Chart 10 shows the frequency of lancet stones in comparison to headstones of other structural groups over the sample chronology, per five-year period. Lancet headstones are found from 1846 onward but do not appear with a significant frequency until after 1867. Early lancet stones may reflect limitations of the dating methodology (Chapter Three, Section 3.4.2). It is possible that lancet headstones pre-dating 1867 are in fact later in date, commemorating individuals who died before the headstone was erected. Chapter Five will consider the evidence for, and the implications of, this practice in conjunction to memorial purchase and production, but a methodological issue is empha´sed here. The limits of *terminus ante quem* dating mean that the emergence, or initial availability, of specific memorial forms is less clearly demonstrable than patterns of popular use. Lancet headstones clearly display a steady rise in popularity, however this increase does not peak within the sample period. In

particular, the rise in lancet stones between 1877 and 1881 is significant. Not only is this rise disproportionate to preceding and following years, but - atypically - it does not reflect a general decline in numbers found in the sample as a whole at this time.

Pedimented Head Surmounting Moulded Flank Headstones

Pedimented Head Surmounting Moulded Flank headstones (PHSMF) are defined by the relationship of the head to the body of the stone, rather than head shape. The standard form is comprised of headstones which have either a pointed or curved shaped pedimented head, which surmounts flank mouldings on a rectangular shaped body (Drawing 1.1, 1.03). The most common styles have a triangular shaped head and resemble the profile of a Dutch gable. Variation occurs in the elevation of the pediment, the degree to which this may be stylised (that is to say, the extent to which the head appears to be separated from the body) and the size of flank mouldings. Stones are also produced in a variety of sizes. This subset contains one stylised form (Drawing 1.1, 1.04) which is distinguished from other PHSMF stones by a unique form of flank mouldings and increased proportions, most notably width. This headstone structural group is the third largest, comparable in size to the lancet type. The group contains 159 stones and from this number only one headstone is a stylised form. As Chart 8 shows, PHSMF stones represent 15% of the total headstone sample.

Chart 11 shows the fr quency of PHSMF stones in comparison to headstones of other structural groups over the sample chronology, per five-year period. PHSMF stones appear from the time of the cemetery's opening in 1837 until the end of the sample chronology in 1901. PHSMF represents a popular choice of stone shape for o er thirty years between 1837 to 1866. Their popularity peaks between 1847 and 1851, when PHSMF proved a more popular choice than the total number of all other available forms. From 1877 onward the use of PHSMF forms declines considerably. A general methodological issue can be emph sised at this

point. As discussed in Chapter Three (Section 3.5.1), analysis showed that graves were not generally purchased before the date of death of the first interment, and as a result it was unlikely that stones were commonly erected as markers prior to death. Therefore trends can be most confidently demonstrated at the point when a particular form begins to become obsolete rather than at the point when they initially emerge. The use of PHSMF stones, for example, endures for at least 30 years after they ceased to be the most popular choice of memorial form. Indeed, the decline of PHSMF stones lasts for almost the same length of time as their period of popularity. A number of factors may have influenced the continued use of a style that has peaked in popularity. For example, stones may have been produced earlier as blanks but remained as part of a mason's stocks. An analysis of the role of fashion within the purchase and production of gravestones is explored more fully in Chapter Five.

Triangular Headstones

Triangular headstones have a triangular-shaped head upon a rectangular shaped body, resembling a plain gable profile (Drawing 1.1, 1.05). There are three sub-groups within this class. The first sub-set is pedimented stones which have a triangular head surmounting a rectangular shaped body (Drawing 1.1, 1.06). The second sub-set is pyramid head shaped stones (Drawing 1.1, 1.07), while the third sub-set consists of a stylised triangular head on a rectangular body (Drawing 1.1, 1.08). Triangular headstones are the largest o e minor headstone structural groups, with 63 stones, and as Chart 8 shows they make up 6% of the total headstone sample. The vast majority of triangular stones, 53, adhere to a standard triangular shape, while seven stones are pedimented, two headstones are pyramid-headed and one headstone is a stylised form.

Chart 12 shows the frequency of triangular stones in comparison to headstones of other structural groups over the sample chronology, per five-year period. The frequency of triangular stones over the sample period appears to be random, and with such small numbers trends in

popularity can not be demonstrated. It is worth noting however, that Chart 12 shows that the use of triangular stones is not a widely adopted choice at any stage of the sample chronology.

Shouldered Headstones

Shouldered headstones have pronounced shoulders and a rectangular body, and a variety of head shapes is employed (Drawing 1.2, 1.09). Drawing 3 shows that four different shoulder shapes are found: angular, ogee, round, and square. This structural group contains 55 stones and Chart 13 shows their frequency in comparison to stones of other structural groups. In common with the other minor structural groups, shouldered headstones appear to be randomly distributed over the sample chronology. It is worth noting that although there is a slight concentration of stones between 1887 and 1901, shoulder headstones never appear as a widespread choice of headstone shape.

Scroll Headstones

The Scroll headstone structural group contains 46 stones, and is the second smallest grouping. Chart 8 shows this group makes up only 4% of the total number of headstones available to study. Standard scroll stones have a head shape that resembles a double scroll shape, and a rectangular body (Drawings 1.2,1.10 ; 4). This standard form is represented by 38 of the 46 headstones in the group. The group also contains two sub-sets; vestigial scrolls (Drawing 1.2, 1.11) and stylised scrolls (Drawing 1.2, 1.12). Vestigial scroll headstones deviate from a standard form in that their scroll returns are not fully resolved. As a result the head shape terminates in a plain fillet at the flanks and loses its characteristic central dip to instead resemble a semi-circle. This sub-set contains five headstones that appear in four different shapes (Drawing 10: S7; S8; S9; S10). Stylised scroll headstones represent much more of a stylistic departure to the standard scroll shape. Their association to a standard form (Drawing 1.10) can be traced through the deviation of

stylised styles (Drawing 1.2, 1.11) from the vestigial scroll form (Drawing 1.2, 1.12). This association is measured by an interpretation of structural emphasis, rather than a rigid adherence to a basic shape. Since the criteria used to classify a stylistic scroll stone are by necessity more encompassing than the prescriptions for standard forms, this sub-set contains a wider divergence of stone shapes. In total, four stylised scroll headstones, each of a different design, are found in the sample (see Drawing 10: S11; S12; S13; S14).

Chart 14 shows the frequency of scroll stones in comparison to other shapes over the sample chronology per five-year period. As previously noted, the small number of stones found within the minor structural groups means that trends can not be clearly demonstrated (Chart 16). In the case of scroll headstones, however, a concentration of scroll headstones between 1837 and 1851 indicates a more specific period of use. This concentration may translate, with a larger sample size, to a period of popularity. However, such an interpretation would need to recognise the relatively small numbers sampled in the data set as a whole prior to 1851 (Chart 6).

Geometric and 'Other' Headstones

The structural group Geometric and 'Other' headstones act as a generic category. All but two of the stones in this group have various geometric shaped head forms (Drawing 1.2, 1.13). The two exceptions feature heads which resemble a shell shap   Drawing 1.2, 1.14). This subset is the smallest of the minor structural groups and contains 36 stones. Chart 8 shows that geometric and 'other' headstones contains only 3% of the total number of stones available to study. Chart 15 shows the frequency of geometric and 'other' stones in comparison to headstone of other structural groups over the sample chronology, per five-year period. As this group contains a wide range of shapes, in addition to its small numbers, it is predictable that the stones are randomly distributed over the sample chronology.

4.3.2 Structural Analysis: A Discussion of Results

Chart 17 shows the distribution of the seven structural groups calculated as a percentage of the total data over the sample chronology per five-year period. This chart illustrates trends more clearly than Charts 9 -15 since it negates the effects of the overall sample's decline in memorial numbers between 1871 and 1881. Chart 17 demonstrates that the structural sub-groups have an integrity and consistency that clearly indicates trends in preferred general headstone shapes over time. Variations in the range of available options for basic headstone shapes can be explored in order to recover the trends that structured consumer behaviour.

Chart 17 shows that the number of available choices remained more or less constant over time, with between five and seven different basic shapes being used in any five year period except between 1837 and 1841. However, within this range there are preferences for specific structural groups that clearly change over time. Over the sample chronology, preference is usually split between one or two popular basic stone shapes. From the time of the cemetery's opening in 1837 until 1846 the preferred choices are scroll- and PHSMF-shaped stones. Over the next ten years, between 1847 and 1856, the most favoured shapes are PHSMF and semi-circular stones, with the former more frequently selected. The popularity of these two structural groups reversed between 1857 and 1866. Semi-circular stones did not immediately replace PHSMF forms. In the period from 18   to 1861, whilst semi-circular stones represent 46% of all headstones, PHSMF forms are still selected for 32% of the total stones sample. For the next ten years, between 1867 and 1877, semi-circular stones remained the most frequently adopted stone shape, but there is no clear second preference between PHSMF and lancet stones. After 1878, however, lancet stones emerge as the second most popular structural group to semi-circular headstones. The popularity of semi-circular stones eventually wanes in the last five years of the

sample chronology (1896 to 1901) when lancet stones become the most frequently adopted headstone shape.

As Chart 17 shows, of the minor structural groups, only scroll headstones display a distribution that indicates a possible period of frequent use. The distribution of scroll stones suggests that this shape peaked in popularity before York Cemetery opened in 1837, but is adopted in sufficient numbers to appear as a declining style within the site. The remaining groups - triangular, shouldered, and geometric and 'other' headstones - all appear in small numbers throughout the sample chronology. The random distribution of these minor groups suggests that there were at least two basic stone shapes consistently available as an alternative to the more popular choices.

The rate of change between the popular choices of stone shapes is difficult to fully discern within the sample period. This is because only semi- circular headstones rise, peak, and decline in numbers within the studied time frame. This is interesting in itself because it demonstrates that some long-term trends can be identified over a relatively short chronology. The distribution patterns of PHSMF and lancet stones shown by Chart 17 indicates that at least one stage of the rise, peak, or fall in popularity takes place outside the sample chronology. Consumer behaviour is consistent in that a preference for one basic stone shape replaces another over time. However, these preferences are not exercised at a uniform rate. For example, between 1867 and 1871 the frequency of PHSMF stones show a disp   portionate decline in numbers that correlates to an increase in the frequency of semi-circular stones. Between in 1877 and 1881, a disproportionate rise in the frequency of lancet stones briefly lessens the prominence of semi-circular stones. Several potential factors may be responsible for change taking place at an irregular rate. For example, It could be that within a consumer-led market, the perceived value of a novel shape is initially higher than any prestige associated with a more conventionally selected style. Alternatively, in a producer-led

market, the stone mason may choose to deliberately flood the market with a particular stone shape to gain consumer recognition for a new product.

An analysis of headstone structural groups suggests that the supply of several main shapes was available over a relatively long-term period of approximately fifty years. The rate of change of preference between these different shapes, however, takes place over a shorter period of time, ranging between ten to twenty-five year cycles. The sequence of headstone forms shown by PHSMF, semi-circular and lancet stones is reminiscent of the sequence of iconographic change illustrated by Dethlefsen and Deetz's 1966 analysis of Colonial gravestones, where death's head motifs were replaced by cherub symbolism, which was in turn replaced by a willow and urn design (Chapter One, Section 1.2.1). In contrast to this popular sequence of change, a small minority of purchasers exercised more unusual choices by selecting shouldered, triangular and geometric and 'other' shaped headstones. The adoption of these more unusual choices is a much longer-term pattern of behaviour and one that remains at a constant rate in the sample chronology. It is important to note that whilst the rate of unusual, or individualistic, choices might remain constant, the actual number of headstones erected increases over time (Chart 16). Therefore an increasing number of people are erecting headstones of more popular, or conventional, shapes, and correspondingly a smaller proportion of all headstones are of individualistic forms. Consumer choices that are denoted as individualist do not, however, necessaril represent individualistic consumer behaviour; if the selection of stones of less popular structural groups is a widespread practice, then this variability in itself becomes normative behaviour.

4.4 Headstone Profiles

4.4.0 Introduction

The second level of the comparative typological analysis examines the stones shape in more detail to recover the number of different headstone

profiles. A profile is the specific shape of a stone, which is determined by the basic headstone structure (Section 4.3) and by the type and style of stylistic components it may include. A stylistic component is defined as a structural feature that dictates the profile, or specific shape, of a headstone. Figure 8 shows the range of stylistic components found in the sample, including features such as mouldings, columns, and finials. Drawings 5-11 illustrate the 143 different profiles identified in the sample, which are arranged by headstone structural group. A headstone profile can be shared by a number of different headstones in a structural group. An investigation of profile shapes uses two inter-linked data sets; one is the headstone sample (which contains 1,073 stones) and the other is the number of unique profiles (which is 143 profiles in total). Analysis tries to clearly distinguish between these two data sets. This section first identifies the general trends visible within the seven structural groups (Section 4.4.1). A discussion of results then compares profile trends between structural groups (Section 4.4.2). An analysis of the frequency of the stones executed in each profile shape (the reproduction rate) is a primary way of quantifying the profile data set. Section 4.4.3 examines the rate of profile production as shown by both the individual structural groups and across the headstone assemblage as a whole. Finally, Section 4.4.4 discusses the resources that were invested in each profile shape through the construction of a scale of elaboration.

4.4.1 Profile Analysis: A ummary of Results

Semi-Circular Headstones

Drawing 5 sets out the 14 profiles identified within the semi-circular headstone structural group. Profiles SC1-SC9 are all two-dimensional forms. Profiles SC2- SC9 are all shapes which c uld be created from a template in the shape of SC1. A template is a pre-carved stone, in this case in the shape of a semi-circular arch. The stylistic components found on these profiles include necked flanks, mouldings, plinths, and projecting, and supporting corbels (Figure 8). Profiles SC10-SC14 are all

three-dimensional forms which incorporate more elaborate structural components such as gablet-style corbels, surmounts, pilasters, and pedestals. The most frequently reproduced profile is SC1, which is also the most simple in design. In total 530 headstones share the SC1 profile shape. This figure represents 97% of the stones found in the semi-circular sub-group, but also 49% of the total headstone data set. Only one further profile, SC7, occurs more than once in the sample and this shape is found on three occasions. Although a wide range of stylistic components are used on profiles in this structural group, they occur in too small a number to display clear trends over time. Chart 18 shows that an alternative profile shape to SC1 is consistently available, but rarely adopted, over the sample chronology. The trends ascribed to the structural group of semi-circular stones, therefore, are largely characterised by the single profile type SC1.

Lancet Headstones

Drawing 6 illustrates the 28 profiles identified within the lancet headstone structural group. Profiles L1-L18 are all two-dimensional forms and the profile shapes of L2-L18 could be achieved from a template in the shape of L1. The stylistic components found on profiles L1-L18 include battered and necked flanks, mouldings, and projecting and supporting corbels (Figure 8). Profiles L19- L28 are three-dimensional forms that use more elaborate structural components, such as projecting hood mouldings, surmounts, columns, pillars and pilasters. The plainest stone shape, profile L1, is also the most frequently reproduced. In total, 108 headstones share profile L1, which represents 64% of the entire number of lancet shaped stones. Profile L1 is the second most frequently reproduced profile in the headstone data set and 10% of all headstones sampled bear this shape. The next most frequently reproduced lancet profile is L4, which is used for twenty headstones. The reproduction rate of other profiles is low, and profiles L2-L3, L5-28 are each represented by between one and five headstones.

Lancet profiles differ from semi-circular profiles as they encompass a wider variety of shapes. Several profiles share the same type of stylistic components which differs in the details of its design. For example, profiles L10-L18 all have different styles of projecting or supporting corbels, and profiles L25-L28 each have different styles of columns, pillars, or pilasters. Profiles L2-L28 are broadly contemporary to one another, indicating that a wide range of stylistic components can be used on lancet headstones at any one time. The small number of headstones represented by L2-L28 profiles, however, means that distinct preferences can not be measured chronologically between the different types of stylistic components. Chart 19 clearly shows an even, aggregate increase over time in the proportion of lancet headstones that include stylistic components, L2-L28, to the proportion of profile L1 stones, which do not use any stylistic components. During 1872 and 1891, as lancet stones rise in numbers, L1 shaped headstones are more frequently erected than the total number of lancet stones of other profile shapes. However, during the final ten years of the sample chronology (1892 to 1901), the number of L1 headstones is equalled by the number of lancet stones erected in other profile styles.

PHSMF Headstones

Drawing 7 shows the 17 different profiles identified within the PHSMF headstone structural group. With the exception of profile P17, which is a stylised PHSMF form, all PHSMF profiles resemble each other much more closely than the profiles found in the semi-circular or lancet structural groups. Headstones in this group have flank mouldings, but none of the standard PHSMF profiles (P1-P16) include any further stylistic components. The identification of profile shapes can therefore be organised firstly by moulding style and secondly by head shape (Figure 7). Drawing 2 illustrates the five styles of flank mouldings identified in the sample: round fillet, cyma recta, cavetto, scroll, and cyma reversa. Table 8 shows that each moulding style, with the exception of cyma reversa, is common to more than one profile. In total, two styles of moulding, round

fillet and scroll, appear in at least one modified form and variations in moulding detail are classified as separate profile shapes (Drawing 7). Table 8 shows that the most frequently adopted head shape for PHSMF stones is triangular, but alternative head shapes are also used to define profiles. The most frequently reproduced profiles, P6, P8, and P10 have standardised mouldings and the more common triangular shape head (Table 8). Indeed, 139 - of a total 159 - PHSMF stones conform to this general trend.

The PHSMF structural group is distinct from the other major headstone groups because no one profile design is dominant. Chart 20 shows the frequency of headstones of P6, P8, and P10 profiles over the sample chronology per five-year period. Each profile displays a distinct period of popularity. P10 profile stones with scroll mouldings peak first in popularity between 1847 and 1851. This profile is then replaced by profile P6, which has cavetto style moulding. Once P6 headstones have peaked in popularity, between 1852 and 1856, profile P8 stones, with cyma recta moulding, peak in popularity between 1862 and 1866. Profiles with identical or modified moulding styles to P10, P6 and P8 occur randomly throughout the period of use shown for each moulding type. Variations upon the more popular PHSMF profile shape are always available, and therefore variations of form can not be characterised as an evolutionary stage in a profile design, nor as an attempt to re-introduce a waning style in a more fashionable or innovati e way.

As can be seen in Table 8, profiles with either cyma reversa or round fillet mouldings make up only a small proportion of PHSMF headstones. Profile P1, occurs once within the sample in 1858. Profiles with round fillet mouldings, P2-P5, have a defined eriod of availability between 1848 and 1859. Whilst trends can not be demonstrated by such small numbers, these stones do show that a range of further options for head shape and moulding style are available for PHSMF headstones during their peak of popularity. The stylised PHSMF profile P17 occurs once within the sample. This headstone is a much more elaborate shape,

with attached pillars and a combination of scroll and fillet moulding which is unique within the data set. This stone has a date of 1899, which is considerably later than the dates attributed to standard PHSMF profile headstones.

Triangular Headstones

Drawing 8 illustrates the 21 profiles identified within the triangular headstone structural group. Profiles T1-T14 are standard triangular profiles which are two- dimensional forms and profiles T2-T4 are all able to be achieved from a pre-carved template in the shape of T1. The stylistic components used on these profiles include battered and necked flanks, mouldings, and acroteria (Figure 8). Profiles T5-T14 are three-dimensional forms and use more elaborate structural components such as gablet-style corbels, finials, hood mouldings, columns, pillars, and pilasters. The pedimented headstone profiles T15-T18, pyramid profiles T19-T20, and the stylised triangular profile T21, are also three-dimensional forms. Like semi- circular and lancet profiles, the most frequently reproduced triangular profiles, T1 and T2, are the most simple shapes. The remaining triangular profiles, T3-T21, appear on the ground only once or twice in the sample. This data set is too small to explore potential preferences between profile shapes over time.

Shouldered Headstones

Drawing 9 illustrates the 28 profiles identified within the shouldered headstone structural group. As noted in Section 4.3.1, shouldered headstones can have one of four different shoulder shapes, and one of five different head shapes. Profiles are first identified by shoulder shape (Drawing 3), secondly by head shape, and thirdly by the use of stylistic components (Figure 7). The reproduction of the same basic shoulder shape can vary in its specific proportions from one profile to another (Drawing 9). Several profiles can be very similar in form, sharing the same basic structure and stylistic components, but differ in the shape of

their head (for example, profiles SH6 and SH7) or in the details of shoulder shape (for example SH10 and SH13). Template profiles are less easily identified in this structural group because of the range of proportions that can be used for different shoulder shapes. Only SH19 (Drawing 9) can be interpreted as a possible template form for other square shouldered profiles, SH20-26. A second difficulty involved with shouldered profile forms is determining the dimensions of each profile design. Over half of the profiles are clearly two dimensional forms, SH1, SH3-SH6, SH8-SH18, SH23, and SH28, and the most common types of stylistic components on shouldered stones are necked and moulded flanks, and filleted shoulders, SH5-SH8, SH14, SH16-18, SH22-SH26. Profile SH27, and profiles SH20 and SH21, which have attached columns and projecting carved details respectively, are executed in three-dimensions. However, the frequency of stone sinkage means that the use of pedestals, which determine profiles as three - rather than two - dimensional shapes, can not be always be gauged for stones executed in profiles SH2, SH7, SH19, SH24 and SH26 (indicated on Drawing 9 by a dashed line).

The angular shoulder form used on profile SH1 is the least frequent shoulder shape, occurring on one profile and one headstone. In contrast, ogee-shaped shoulders are used on profiles SH2-SH8 and are represented on the ground by 21 stones. Square-shaped shoulders are used for profiles SH19-SH28 and are represented by 19 stones in the sample. While round shoulders are found on the most number of profiles, SH9-SH18, they are represented by fewer stones than ogee or square shoulder profiles, and appear upon 14 headstones. Table 9 shows that although preferences for different styles of shoulder and head shapes are not demonstrated by such a small data set, two po ts can be noted. Firstly, in the second half sample chronology (1877 to 1901), a rise in frequency occurs for ogee, round, and square shoulder shapes, and for lancet and semi-circular head shapes. Secondly, Table 9 reveals that a choice was consistently available between at least two options of shoulder and head shapes.

Scroll Headstones

Drawing 10 illustrates the 14 profiles identified within the scroll headstone sub-group. Profiles S1-S6 are standard scroll forms, S7-S10 are vestigial scroll profiles, and S11-S14 are stylised scroll profiles. Drawing 4 shows that standard scroll profiles are classified by the moulding types that dictate their head shape. Drawing 10 shows that only two profiles, S5 and S6, share the same moulding style but that these profiles differ in appearance as S6 has round fillet necked flanks, whereas S5 has straight flanks. Profile S6 is the only example of a stylistic component on a standard scroll profile form. As can be seen on Drawing 4, the scroll mouldings of the S1 and S2 profiles are very similar in shape: S2 is only distinguished from S1 by the inclusion of a fillet in the lower scroll return. No template styles are identified for standard scroll profiles, and forms are all two- dimensional in shape. Profiles S1-S3 are the only standard scroll profiles found more than once in the headstone sample. Preferences for different standard scroll profiles can not be demonstrated by such a small data set. Table 9 does, however, show two notable points. Firstly, that standard scroll profiles predominantly occur during the first 25 years of the cemetery's use and secondly, that there are at least two different profile styles available to choose from between 1837 and 1856.

Vestigial and stylised scroll forms are both represented by four different profiles, none of which can be characterised as a possible template form (Drawing 10). Vestigial scroll profiles, S7-S10, are all two-dimensional forms that do not use any stylistic components, and are found either once or twice in the headstone sample. Stylised scroll profiles, S11-S14, are each found once within the s   ple. S11, which does not use any stylistic components, is the only example of a two-dimensional stylised profile. The data sets of vestigial and stylised profiles are too small to explore potential preferences between profile shapes over time.

Geometric and 'Other' Headstones

Drawing 11 identifies the 21 profiles identified within the geometric and 'other' headstone structural group. The broad grouping criteria of this group means that only general observations, rather than trends, can be described. Only two profiles, G1 and G2, are reproduced more than twice in the sample. These profiles, like profiles G3-G5, G8, and G11, are plain two-dimensional forms, and none appear to be a possible template form. The majority of profiles, 14 from a total of 21, include at least one type of stylistic component, and three- dimensional forms are most common. This data set is too small to explore potential preferences between profile shapes over time.

4.4.2 Profile Analysis: A Discussion of Results

The trends shown by the headstone structural groups in Chart 17 largely reflect the use of specific profiles over time. The profiles in each headstone structural group can be summarised as following one of three basic patterns. The first trend is for one profile to dominate a structural group, as with SC1 and L1 profiles. Such profiles are characterised as popular headstone choices and are examples of normative commemoration behaviour. Alternative profiles in the semi-circular and lancet structural groups are consistently available, but less frequently adopted. These profiles, SC2-SC14 and L2-L28, can be characterised as more individualistic commemorative choices. A second trend, demonstrated by the PHSMF headstone group, is for several profiles to display consecutive periods of popularity. In this case profiles P6, P8, and P10 closely resemble one another: their general form is constant, and only the style of a particular detail, in this case flank mouldings, changes over time. Alternative profile designs (P1- P5, P7, P9, P11-P16) are also available but rarely erected. Again, their relative frequency characterised profiles as either popular or individualistic headstone choices. The third trend is shown when no particular profiles have marked popularity, and this is as shown by the triangular, shouldered, and scroll structural groups

- although it is possible, given the close resemblance of standard scroll profiles to each other, that they would follow the same trend as standard PHSMF profiles if found as a larger data set. As an *ad hoc* grouping, geometric and 'other' profiles inherently reflect individualistic choices. This individualistic nature is further evident by the low level of geometric and 'other' profile reproduction.

In order to understand how these three trends may interact at an assemblage level of analysis, a method of quantifying similarity and difference between headstone profiles is needed. Therefore, an analysis of the rate of profile reproduction and the use of stylistic components was carried out to assess whether preferences for headstone profiles reflects similar patterns of consumer behaviour over time.

4.4.3 Profile Reproduction Rates

Chart 21 compares the number of different profiles to the number of headstones erected per five-year period over the sample chronology. It is interesting to note that, with the possible exception of 1887-91, whilst the number of stones erected increases there is no corresponding percentage change in the number of headstone profiles. If the production or purchase of a headstone design is a random choice, an increase in the number of stones could be expected to coincide with a rise in the number of profiles. This suggests that the headstone market is structured in terms of supply and demand. To determine whether consumer behaviour changes over time, the frequency of individualistic profiles shapes can be quantified against the number of more conventional profile choices.

Table 11 shows that the rate of profile reproduction is characterised by two distinct patterns. The first trend is for a large number of profiles to have a very low reproduction rate. From a total number of 143 headstone profiles, 134 profiles are represented by less that ten stones on the ground, with 99 of these profiles occurring just once. The number of stones erected in these 134 profile shapes represents 20% of the total headstone sample. A second trend is for a small number of profiles to

have a reproduction rate above 40 stones. Table 12 shows that four profile shapes, SC1, L1, P8, and P6, make up 70% of the total headstone data set, but that there is significant difference in the scale of reproduction between these profiles. Only five profiles, P10, S2, T2, L4, and T1, have a reproduction rate that falls mid-range between the two aforementioned patterns, with their headstones making up 10% of the total number sampled.

To examine these patterns more closely, Table 13 identifies how many profiles and headstones occur with a single, low, mid-range or high reproduction rate per five-year period over the sample chronology. These scaled levels are set to reflect the reproduction rates that occurred in the sample as shown on Table 11. The reproduction rates are defined as follows:

* Single: a head profile is reproduced once in a five-year period.

* Low: a headstone profile is represented by fewer than ten stones in a five-year period

* Mid-Range: a headstone profile is represented by between 11 and 40 stones in a five-year period

* High: a headstone profile is represented by more that 40 stones in a five-year period.

Table 13 allows individualistic and popular choices to be gauged more accurately as the frequency of profiles is assessed over a series of points in time. As a result, the emergence and decline of a highly reproduced profile is distinguished from its period of popularity. Profiles that have a low rate of reproduction in the assemblage as a whole may represent popular, rather than individualistic, choices if they are all erected within a similar period. Table 13 first shows the number of profiles per scaled reproduction rate (or when there are less than three profiles by the profile codes), and secondly calculates the percentage this represents of the headstone assemblage. The small number of stones available to study between 1837 and 1846 mean that these assemblages are excluded from discussion.

Table 13 reveals how consumer behaviour changed over time. The numbers of profiles with a single reproduction rate remain more or less constant over time, but as a percentage of the headstone assemblage their popularity slowly declines between 1857 and 1886, before rising in numbers again towards the end of the sample chronology. The percentage of the assemblage composed of low reproduction rate profiles similarly declines, but this takes place over a longer time frame and is more pronounced. Between 1847 and 1861, approximately half of each five year assemblage is composed of headstones in low reproduced profiles. This figure drops below 17% from 1862 until 1891. From 1892 until the end of the sample in 1901, the percentage of low reproduced stones increases again to represent between 22% and 25% of the assemblage. Therefore individualistic headstone profiles are more frequently selected during the earliest and latest periods of the sample chronology.

An examination of profiles with a higher reproduction rate shows that the trends for individualistic profiles can be directly correlated to the frequency of one profile type, SC1. Between 1847 to 1901, each five-year assemblage is normally dominated by two of the following popular profiles: P10, P6, SC1, P8, and L1. However, for the ten-year period between 1867 and 1876, only one profile, SC1, is frequently selected. Therefore, fewer individualistic choices are made during the period when a single profile type dominates. Similarly, more individualistic choices are made when choices are split between two profile shapes. In summary, when design preferences change they are most clearly seen in the relative frequency of popular, rather than individualist, memorial choices.

4.4.4 Profile Scale of Complexity

An analysis was carried out to see whether consumer behaviour changes in relation to the level of profile complexity over time. Creating a scale of complexity to precisely measure the level of complexity or elaboration

between different profiles is problematic because of the immense diversity found in the data set. Firstly, as Drawings 12.1 and 12.2 show, even the plainest profile shapes appear in a wide variety of forms. A comparison of the degree of workmanship required by a mason to create these different profiles is impossible to determine because it largely depends upon how stone was delivered as a raw material from the quarries - and this is not known. Secondly, stylistic components are also difficult to quantify because they occur in a wide range of types, each of which may appear in numerous specific designs. For example, Drawings 13.1 and 13.2 illustrate the profiles identified in the headstone sample that have columns, pillars, and pilasters. Profiles SC11 and L25 represent two of the very few instances where a stylistic component is exactly reproduced on two different profile shapes. A further problem lies in that a number of different stylistic components may be used together on a single profile. Drawings 13.1-13.2 show that columns, pillars and pilasters are used in conjunction with pedestals, hood mouldings, carvings, finials, kneelers and gablet-style corbels. A further example of the difficulties posed by variation is demonstrated by Drawing 14, which shows the diverse effects that can be produced by using necking and mouldings on just the flanks of a stone. Anecdotally, it is clear that while this variation is extensive, it appears to operate within some degree of structure. For example, the moulding and necking on profiles L5, SC7 and SH17 is identical (Drawing 14). This composition is adapted for a slightly different effect on profile SC9 by using battered and necked flanks, and on profiles L18 and L7 by adding further moulding detail (or in the case of profiles T6, L14, and SH16 by using a different moulding style altogether). A detailed analysis of the structures of this variability is not possible, however, because the many permutations are not represented by headstone data sets large enough to study.

A system was devised to compare profile complexity from a more general perspective. This was organised on the basis of calculating the increasing level of resources needed for designs, starting from the

plain forms such as those illustrated on Drawings 12.1 and 12.2. The resources considered included the level of material wastage, skill, and manual labour required. Drawing 15 shows the profiles identified in the sample which are classified as one of the following scales:

*   Level One: a plain profile shape that does not included any stylistic components. With the exception of T19 all of these profiles are two-dimensional in form.

*   Level Two: a profile shape that could be achieved from using a Level 1 profile as a template by means of simple reduction. This incorporates stylistic components such as necking, battering, the use of mouldings and kneelers. With the exception of T20, all profiles are two-dimensional forms.

*   Level Three: a profile shape which can be achieved by reduction from a template design, but includes stylistic components which are more complex in nature to create a three-dimensional design. The stylistic components found in this level include; pedestals, hood mouldings and carvings.

*   Level Four: a profile shape that can not be achieved by reduction from a template design. This includes designs that are not carved from a single piece of stone. These profiles are all three-dimensional in form. The stylistic components found in this level include; columns, pillars, pilasters, carvings, and surmounts.

Chart 22 shows that while a significant proportion of profiles, 38%, are level 3 or above in complexity, the actual number of stones this represents on the ground is very small and makes up only 6% of the headstone sample. Therefore, the majority of complex profiles are reproduced only once within the headstone sample. Elaborate profiles are therefore highly individualistic headstone choices, not simply because of the visual difference between profiles, but because of their low rate of reproduction on the ground. Conversely, through expectedly, the percentage of headstones in the cemetery which are level 1 in complexity far exceeds the frequency of level 1 profiles (Chart 22).

The frequency of the levels of complexity are examined over time for both the profile and headstone sub-sets. Chart 23 shows the number of profiles executed at each scale, per five-year period over the sample chronology. Chart 24 shows the number of headstones at each level of complexity erected in the cemetery. Chart 23 shows that, with the exception of level 2, the number of profiles at each of the levels of complexity slowly increases over time. Level 2 profiles appear with a higher frequency and have a distinctive distribution pattern that peaks twice in popularity. Level 3 and 4 profiles appear more sporadically, but a significant proportion are found between 1862 and 1901. As expected from a discussion of reproduction rates, the distribution of level 3 and 4 headstones, shown by Chart 24, exactly reflects the distribution of level 3 and 4 profiles. The correlation between the number of profiles and the number headstones for levels 1 and 2 demonstrates some interesting changes in consumer behaviour. Chart 24 shows that although there is a marked increase in the number of level 1 headstones erected between 1857 and 1896, and a significant decrease between 1897-1901, the number of level 1 profile shapes remains consistent at between 4 and 7 different options. Therefore, while more people are choosing the same headstones when specific profile design(s) are most popular, when level 1 headstones begin to decline wider preferences are exercised. A different trend is shown by the comparison between the number of level 2 profiles and the frequency of level 2 headstones. Between 1837 and 1882, the relative frequency can be consistently correlated between the numbers of profiles and the frequency of headstones. But from 1872 onward, a much higher number of profile shapes is available in comparison to the frequency of level 2 headstones.

An increase in the diversity between level 2 headstones can also be seen in the types of stylistic components used. The vast majority of level two headstones before 1871 are standard PHSMF or standard scroll profiles. These profile shapes only bear the stylistic components of flank and head mouldings that define their structural group (Drawings 2 and 4).

As Chart 20 has shown, PHSMF mouldings appear as a series of distinct fashions over time. After 1872, however, the vast majority of headstone profiles use a wider range of stylistic components that also have a great diversity in their arrangement on the stone. In summary, there is a greater degree of standardisation in headstone shapes before 1871 in comparison to later periods, when profiles become more diverse.

4.5 Design Variables

4.5.0 Introduction

A design variable is an element of a headstone's composition, other than shape, that characterises the memorial's appearance. The design variables identified in this study fall into two categories: design variables associated with a memorial's structural form (material, size, panels and edge type), and design variables associated with a memorial's surface decoration (borders, banners, and miscellaneous decorative motifs, panels and shapes). The range of decoration types found in the sample are illustrated by Figures 9-13. Appendix 8 sets out the design variables recorded in the sample for each profile by headstone structural group in order to show the final range of chosen headstone designs. An analysis of design variables is important for two reasons: firstly because, as discussed in detail in section 4.2.5, it helps to resolve methodological issues such as the level of detail at which gravestone analysis fails to recover trends; secondly because it offers further evidence of the potential range of consumer options which were available. A summary of the major trends is discussed separately for each design variable, firstly by form (Sections 4.5.1 to 4.5.4) and secondly by decoration (Sections 4.5.6 to 4.5.11). The chapter will then conclude with an overview of all results to consider what patterns distinguish normative behaviour in commemoration in York Cemetery.

4.5.1 Design Variables Form: Material

The choice of material has implications for the level of resources invested in a stone. It may also be an opportunity to create variation between stones of the same profile shape. The character of the stone may restrict the available options for a headstone design. For example, hard stones such as granite and marble are better suited to three dimensional headstone profiles than softer materials such as limestone and sandstone. The primary stone type and the use of any secondary materials were noted for each memorial (Chapter Three, Section 3.3.1). This classification included the choice of stone for a headstone's basic structure, any stylistic components, such as columns, and design variables of form, such as panels, but did not include materials that had been added as surface decoration. The stones in the sample are executed in a variety of materials, which are classified by generic stone type and by stone colour in the case of marble and granite. Chart 25 shows four main stone types are found in the cemetery: sandstone, limestone, marble, and granite. The category of other material includes three headstones where more than one material was used, (one L1 sandstone headstone with a marble panel, one grey granite L24 headstone with pink granite columns, and one G1 sandstone headstone with a pink granite panel), and two headstones made from slate. An increasing scale of complexity for material type is constructed on the grounds of basic economic cost (which takes into account distance of importation and the level of rarity in the cemetery), and how difficult the stone is to work. The scale of complexity for material is as follows:

* Level 1: sandstone
* Level 2: limestone
* Level 3: slate
* Level 4: marble
* Level 5: granite.
* Level 6: combination of materials

Chart 25 shows that sandstone, largely of the local form known as York Stone , is by far the most popular stone type, and 83% of all headstones sampled are made from this material. Marble is the second most common material (found only as white marble), followed by variously coloured granites (grey, black, and pink) and limestone (Chart 25). The use of a combination of materials or slate is so unusual that it does not appear as a percentage in the sample. Chart 25 shows that the level of complexity for marble, limestone, and granite does not directly correspond with the numbers of headstones fashioned from these material types in the sample.

Chart 26 shows that while sandstone is the most popular material type throughout the sample chronology, its use declines slightly by the end of the nineteenth century. The use of limestone is established as an alternative, albeit a much less popular one, to sandstone by 1846. After 1866, limestone headstones are found only intermittently. The use of marble and granite is sporadic before 1871. Due to the limitations of dating through a *terminus ante quem,* a distinction must be drawn between periods of availability to periods of frequent use for granite and marble stones. Marble slightly predates the frequent use of granite. From 1877, marble becomes the second most common material until the end of the sample period. Over the sample chronology, there is an increase in the number of material types that are available and in the range that is selected. In the first half of the sample chronology, two materials, sandstone and limestone, are frequently adopted. However by the close of the nineteenth century, three material types are found: sandstone, marble and granite - and the latter is available in three different colours. An in-depth analysis of preferences for granite colours is not possible because of the small numbers involved (there are 27 headstones in grey granite, 19 in pink granite, and ten in black granite). It is clear, however, that these different colours were concurrently available from 1881 onward.

As already noted, the use of different materials for headstones of the same profile can create a visual distinction between stones of the

same shape. Table 14 notes the frequency of headstones of the same profiles that are executed in different stone types. A statistical analysis is not possible for most of these profiles due to their low reproduction rates, but it can be generally observed that different materials are used concurrently for stones of the same profile shape. A number of points can be raised for the nine most frequently reproduced profiles (Table 12). As may be expected, the two profiles with the largest reproduction rate, SC1, and L1, use the most diverse range of materials (Table 14). More unexpected is the diversity found with profile T1 headstones, represented by a data set of 18 stones and found in five different material types. Conversely, the use of more than one material type for the three PHSMF profiles, P8, P6, and P10 (the third, fourth, and fifth most frequently reproduced profiles shapes), is consistently low and indeed non-existent in the case of P10. The headstones of Profile T2 are very unusual since they use two different material types, limestone and sandstone, in more or less equal numbers. Table 14 also shows that the choice of a stone type other than sandstone could result in a greater degree of headstone variation in two ways. Firstly, it could be used to further enhance the individualistic nature of headstones in profiles with a low or singular reproduction rate (for example, G2, S1, or SH15). Secondly, in the case of highly reproduced profiles where the majority of stones are made from sandstone, the adoption of a different material creates visual variation between headstones that are the same shape on the ground (for example, L4, P6, SC1).

4.5.2 Design Variable Form: Size

As noted in Chapter Three, Section 3.3.1, the size of headstones was calculated using an approximate scale from the survey photographs. The pilot study showed that headstones were produced in a range of standard sizes, and this was also evident within the main data sample. A range of sizes were concurrently available for each of the headstone profiles with a mid- to-high reproduction rate (Table 15). Profiles that occur less

frequently may also be found in a range of standard sizes, but the small data sets involved in this study did not demonstrate trends. One size of headstones however is worthy of closer inspection because of its consistent appearance over time and throughout a number of different profile shapes. The reproduction of headstones in miniature size (Plate 4) is found on 50 occasions, and represents 5% of the headstone data set. Table 15 shows these stones are found in nine different profile shapes, four of which, G4, SH13, G16, and SH12, only occur in a miniature size. Miniature stones are found in each of the most frequently reproduced profiles, SC1, L1, P6 and P8, and are randomly distributed over the period of use associated with these profiles (Charts 18-20). There is no corresponding increase of the frequency of miniature stone in relation the rise in the total number of headstone erected over time, but this may simply be the result of sample size.

The selection of a size of a headstone has obvious economic implications, but this does not preclude an aesthetic factor or any potential wider cultural significance. The size of a monument may also determine the level of decoration and inscription text that may be included, and thus the number of individuals who may be commemorated. At a conscious or subconscious level, therefore, at its point of purchase a memorial's size may reflect the range of familial or other commemorative affiliations that were anticipated or intended to be recorded upon a headstone.

4.5.3 Design Variables Form: Panels

A panel can be defined as a sunk or recessed surface that occupy part or nearly all of the stone. A total of 34 different panel types were identified in the survey, which are represented on the ground by 100 headstones. Just over half the panel types occur on profiles found only once in the headstone sample, and in each case the panel types are also unique (shown on Drawings 5-11). Drawings 16-18 illustrate the panel types that occur on profiles that are reproduced more than once in the sample.

These styles are either unique to particular profiles, or, as shown by Table 16, are common to a number of different profile shapes.

A number of general observations can be made about panel types that are unique but found on profiles that are reproduced more than once in the sample. Panel types 21, 29 and 30 (Drawings 16 and 17) appear to have been used to rectify mistakes since they do not aesthetically marry with the overall appearance of the stone. Panel style 21 (Drawing 17) is possibly a recycled stone since the entire obverse face, with the exception of the decorated area at the head of the stone, has been removed. Panel style 29 (Drawing 16) has a rectangular area removed at the start of the inscription text. This panel is interesting as it may be a corrected mistake, but could also indicate that the primary commemoration of the stone was changed at a later date. A final observation can be made for panel type 10, which is found on one of the two headstones executed in profile style T16 (Figure 16.4). The use of this panel type is interesting since the two headstones look virtually identical and share the same ostensible design, but their final appearance was achieved by different manufacturing techniques.

Table 16 summarises the frequency of panels types which are used across a range of headstone profiles. These panels are used for the entire obverse face. Panel types 1, 2, and 2.5 are all square-filleted designs whilst panel types 3 and 3.5 are both cavetto-edged styles (Drawings 16 and 17). Panel types may differ to one another in only small details: for example panel 3.0 is exactly the same as panel style 3.5, but the panel edge of the former is chamfered, whilst the latter's is rolled (Drawing 16). Table 16 shows that although panels occur in small numbers, it is clear that square filleted styles (1 to 2.5) predate the use of cavetto styles (3 and 3.5). A final point that can be noted is that each headstone executed in profile T2 has a type 2 panel (Drawing 8): this is significant as no other profile shape reproduced more than once in the sample constantly includes panel as a design variable.

In summary, within the headstone sample, panels are characterised by their individualistic nature. They do not occur in large numbers but appear over a large range of profiles. Panels represent a further level of resources invested in a headstone's production, and on the whole are not generally found in the sample before 1856. As a design variable, panels are more likely to be integral to how a headstone design was initially conceived, as they are closely associated with the arrangement of text and decoration.

4.5.4 Design Variable Form: Edge Types

A variety of techniques can be used to finish the edges of a headstone, and Figure 9 sets out the range of main edge types found in the headstone data set. Tables 17 and 18 show that the vast majority of edge types, 22 from the total number of 38, appear as unique within the sample. Only two edge types, square and bevelled, are found with a frequency that can be analysed over time (Figure 9.0). A total of 390 headstones have square edges and 73 stones have bevelled edges. For the purposes of analysis, the remaining 36 edges are grouped together either as a chamfered edge type or as a moulded or carved edge type (Tables 17 and 18). Chart 27 shows that chamfered or moulded and carved edges are not frequently used, and that each group only makes up 6% of the total data set. Different styles of edging can be used together: for example, the flanks of a headstone may be chamfered while the head is finished with nailhead moulding (Figure 9.1). Each combination of edging and the particular location of use is classified as a separate edge type. The general grouping of an edge type is made on the basis of the most complex style used: for example, nailhead hood and chamfered flank is classed as a moulded, rather than chamfered, edge type. The scale of complexity for edge types set out below is calculated on the basis of the level of manual skill required and the degree of material wastage (although the latter factor is only a significant consideration for projecting styles, such as rolled hood edges):

* Level 1: square edges

* Level 2: bevelled edges; chamfered edges ; moulded edges

   (including torus moulding some rolled edge and hood mouldings)

* Level 3: moulded edges (including cable moulding nailhead

   moulding, triangle moulding, dogtooth moulding, some rolled edge

   and hood mouldings)

* Level 4: carved edges

The amount of manual work necessary for each edge type is not always clear. Level four carved edges obviously require a high level of manual labour and skill (carved foliate edges are illustrated by Drawing 6, L18, L19, L23; Drawing 8, T12; and bay-leaf hood edge is shown on Drawing 5, SC13). Level 3 moulded edge styles are also most likely to be executed by hand (Figure 9.1; cable hoods shown on Drawing 5, SC14 and Drawing 6, L17; roll hoods shown on Drawing 8, T13, and Drawing 11, G13, decorated and moulded roll hoods show on Drawing 6, L24; Drawing 9 SH20, SH21; Drawing 11, G18, G19). It is more difficult, however, to calculate the resources invested between Level 1 and 2 edge types, such as square and bevelled edges, since results could be achieved either by hand or by machine. Should both edge types be machine finished, similar resources are used, but if the work was completed manually, considerably more resources are need to finish a stone with a chamfered or bevelled, rather than square, edge (Figure 9.0).

Chart 28 shows the frequency of edge types over the sample chronology. Square is the most common edge type, found on between 64%-95% of the total number of headstones for any five-year period. The second most frequent type, bevelled edge, has a distinct period of popularity that peaks between 1862 and 1871, during which bevelled edges are used on 21% of all stones. Moulded or carved and chamfered edge types appear regularly from 1866 onwards, but in much smaller numbers. Moulded or carved styles appear at a constant rate, and between 1866 and 1901 they are found on between 3% and 16% of the data sample for any five-year period. An increase in the complexity of

edge types over time is not demonstrated by a significant increase in the number of carved or moulded edge styles. This data set is also too small to recover preferences between the different styles of moulded or carved edges. The use of chamfered styles gradually increases over time. In 1862-1866 chamfered styles are used for 4% of the total number of headstones, but by 1887-1901 26% of all stones have chamfered edges. Chart 29 shows that some preference is shown for the use of different chamfer styles, as moulded and partially chamfered styles become more common once fully chamfered edges have peaked in popularity.

Different edge types could be used for headstones that shared the same profile shape. Table 19 shows that 13 profiles used more than one type of edging. However, only two of these profiles, SC1 and L1, are reproduced in a range of edges in sufficient numbers to consider in detail. Charts 30 and 31 set out the frequency of edge types used for SC1 and L1 profiles per five year period over the sample chronology (Chart 31 is reproduced at twice the scale of Chart 30 to compensate for the smaller numbers involved). Both Charts show that the edges used on profiles SC1 and L1 profiles correspond to the general trends shown across the sample as a whole. Two points are worth noting, however. Firstly, bevelled edges are predominantly found on the SC1 profile; indeed, in the data set as a whole only two profile G1 stones also have bevelled edges (Table 19). Furthermore, the frequency and defined date range of the bevelled-edge SC1 headstones suggests that they might be considered as a distinct sub-group of SC1 stones. The second point to note is that the ratio of L1 stones with moulded or carved and chamfered edge types to L1 stones with a square edge is considerable higher than with corresponding stones in the SC1 profile. While this observation does not demonstrate a trend towards increasing variation in itself, a pattern of diversification is more clearly indicated when considered in conjunction with two other factors. Firstly, Chart 32 shows that the number of different edge styles available per five-year period increases steadily over time. Secondly, profiles that use a variety of edge types, notably SC1 and L1, are most

popular from the middle to the end the sample chronology, whereas
profiles that are most popular during the earlier stages of the chronology,
such as P6, P8, P10 and S2, are only executed with square edges
(Appendix 8).

In summary, edge types operated within broadly successive trends
of popularity which display a tendency towards an increasing variety of
forms over time. Different edge types may be used to create a visual
distinction between headstones of the same profile shape. Edge types that
occur in frequent numbers, such as SC1 bevelled edged headstones,
could represent offered designs predetermined by the producer.

4.5.5 Introduction to an Analysis of Decoration

An investigation of headstone decoration has three primary objectives:
firstly, to identify the types and range of decoration found on headstones;
secondly, to recover chronologies and reproduction rates for these
decoration types; thirdly to identify the final range of chosen headstone
designs by cross-referencing headstone decoration and profile types
(Appendix 8). As result of these aims a detailed account of the full variety
of available consumer choices can be identified and characterised as
either normative or individualistic practice.

In this thesis, decoration is defined as any treatment to the obverse
face of a stone, excluding an inscription text. None of the headstones
sampled are decorated on their reverse face. In the sample four broad
categories of decoration are identified; borders (Figure 10), scroll
decoration (Figure 11), banners (Figure 12) and miscellaneous
decorative motifs, shapes and panels (Figure 13). Decorative borders are
confined to the periphery of a headstone and trace the outline of the stone
shape. The remaining categories encompass a great range of individual
forms and styles, but can be generally defined as the embellishment of the
upper parts of the stone by the use of decorative motifs, shapes, and
panels, which can be used singly or in combination to one another. A
single stone may be embellished with more than one type of decoration;

for example a headstone may include both a border and a banner. Only one type of border, banner, and scroll can be used on a single memorial; therefore, the frequency of borders, banners, and scroll decoration can be calculated per headstone. The rate of miscellaneous decorative motifs, shapes, and panels must, however be calculated by the frequency of examples in the headstone data set as more than one example of this category can occur on a memorial. Each type of decoration is reviewed separately and an overview of trends is set out in section 4.5.10.

4.5.6 Design Variables Decoration: Borders

From the total number of headstones sampled, 381 stones have some form of border decoration, and in 22% of examples this is the only type of decoration used. Table 20 lists the full range of borders found in the sample. A general division is made between border styles based upon the level of their complexity and analysis identified two general groups: linear borders (Figures 10.0-1) and elaborate borders (Figures 10.2-5). Whereas elaborate borders use a more intricately incised pattern, mouldings or carvings, linear borders are simple incised lines. Linear borders are either plain in design or can include embellishments such as swash decoration or round fillets. In total, there are eight different styles of linear border and Figures 10.0 to 10.1 illustrate the six most frequently reproduced types: line all , line box , line hood , line swash and line cartouche .

A total of 47 different styles of elaborate border are found in the headstone sample, and these are also grouped by complexity. A scale of increasing complexity is ordered as follows:

* incised styles

* moulded styles

* carved or projecting styles

As Figure 10.2 shows, elaborately incised borders fall into two distinct categories: elaborate filled borders which double trace the outline of a stone and use floral or geometric shapes to fill the space in between, and

styles which use a decorative pattern or motif to trace a single outline. There are a total of 19 different elaborate incised filled borders and five different single borders, and each elaborate incised border is unique within the sample (Table 20). Figure 10.3 illustrates three examples from the range of nine moulded borders that are reproduced more than once in the sample. There are three different groups of carved borders: foliate , tracery and bay leaf (Figures 10.4-5). The first two of these occur five and six times respectively in the sample, and on each occasion appear in a different design. In contrast, the bay leaf border is reproduced on 14 occasions in the same design, although hand-carving results in some small differences in detail, for example the central ribbon may appear in several different styles. Figure 10.4 shows one example, from a total of two found unique within the sample, of a projecting border type.

Chart 33 demonstrates that the total number of available border designs increases over time, and peaks in numbers between 1877 and 1891. Table 21 shows linear styles are much more frequently adopted than elaborate designs; indeed as noted, only three moulded styles - rolled , half nailhead and stylised dogtooth - and one carved design - bay leaf - are found more than once in the sample. Chart 34 shows the frequency of linear border types in comparison to elaborate border types per five-year period over the sample chronology. These two groups show distinct trends. Linear borders appear to peak in popularity twice: initially between 1852 to 1856 and next between 1887 to 1891. From 1851 to 1876, the frequency of elaborate borders remains more or less constant at between two to nine stones per five-year period. Numbers increase slightly between 1877 and 1891, before returning to their previous frequency. The range of variation between elaborate borders and their low reproduction rates mean that this type of decoration represents a highly individualistic form of embellishment.

Linear borders appear in sufficient numbers to undertake a more detailed analysis. Table 21 shows that line all borders appear over the entire sample chronology and dictate the frequency of linear borders

shown by Chart 34. The borders styles line all , line all swash , line box and line hood occur much less frequently, but appear to have distinct periods of availability. Line box borders are predominantly found between 1837 and 1861. Line hood and line all swash both have small data sets, made up of 11 and 15 stones respectively, but each type has a concentration of stones within a fifteen year period: line hood between 1877 and 1891, and line swash between 1887 and 1901. The emergence of these two types occurs when line all borders enjoy a resurgence in popularity, and therefore could represent sub-trends within a more general fashion.

Using Appendix 8, which sets out an index of chosen headstone designs, a number of general observations can be made between particular border styles and other design variables and profiles. The border type line all is found on 23 different profiles, but as Table 22 shows 89% of these examples are found on profile P8, P6, L1 or SC1 headstones, and this explains the border's apparent double peak in popularity. The use of line all borders on PHSMF profiles peaks between 1856-1871, whilst its use on semi-circular and lancet profiles does not reach a peak in popularity until 1886 to 1896. Line all borders are used on significant proportion of L1 and SC1 headstones and make up 30% and 15% of the stones in each structural group respectively. However, this border type is found on 94% of all headstones executed in the PHSMF profiles P6 and P8, a correlation that becomes more distinctive when the other widely reproduced stand   PHSMF profile, P10, is also taken into consideration. Profile P10, whose popularity predates that of profiles P6 and P8, does not generally include a decorative border; indeed only four P10 stones from a total of 28 have a line all border. With the rise in popularity of profiles P8 and P6, the use of line all borders on PHSMF headstones becomes a standard and widespread convention. Table 22 shows that line all borders are used infrequently on profiles other than those discussed above, but when they do occur they are found within the chronology of availability established by PHSMF, SC1 and L1 profiles. It is

possible that elements of decoration, such as line all borders, may have been one of a range of features that could be used to adapt a template or blank design to meet an individual purchaser's needs. The possibility for individual consumer choices using template headstone forms and a series of pick and mix design variables is considered in more detail in Chapter Five.

In contrast to line all borders, which are adopted by a variety of different profiles over time, other borders types appear to be more profile specific (Appendix 8). The border style line box is found on 33 stones, 29 of which are standard scroll headstones (profiles S1, S2, S3). The border type line swash, including the variant form (line swash1') is found only on lancet shaped headstones (profiles L1, L3, and L4). The border type line hood is found only on L1 and SC1 stones that have the edge type nailhead hood and moulded chamfered flank . The specific designs of elaborately filled borders are all unique in the sample, and while not associated with a particular profile shape, they do display a strong correlation with the use of granite. In summary, it is possible to view the use of borders as performing a number of functions within specific headstone designs. The inclusion of a border may be act as a constituent variant within a specific design concept, as exemplified by the use of line hood borders in conjunction to nailhead and chamfered edging on L1 and SC1 stones, or within a structural group, as argued for standard PHSMF stones, where decoration encompasses a number of profile types. Borders can also be used as an ndividualistic form of decoration that distinguished between stones of the same profile shape. In the sample, 15 (from a total of 43) unique border designs are used on stones in the shape of the two most frequently reproduced profiles - SC1 and L1. In the case of profiles with a low reproduction rate, borders m y further enhance their individualistic appearance, and 21 borders that are unique within the sample are also used on profiles that have a single reproduction rate.

4.5.7 Design Variables Decoration: Scroll Decoration

Table 23 provides a summary of the decoration used on the six standard scroll profiles in the sample (S1-S6). Figure 11 illustrates the range of scroll designs in the headstone sample. Since the data sets for profiles S4, S5 and S6 are composed of only single stones, discussion will concentrate on the trends shown by profiles S1, S2 and S3 profiles (Table 23).

The decorations found on scroll profiles S1, S2, and S3 employ two different motifs, flowers and spirals, and all but two stones in these shapes have this type of decoration, the exceptions being entirely undecorated. In total there are three different styles of flower designs and four different spiral designs. Whilst examples of a particular design may show some small variations in detail, they clearly adhere to a standard composition which strongly suggests that the decoration is hand-crafted from a number of archetype designs. Table 23 shows that each scroll profile is associated with two different styles of scroll decoration. As far as can be determined from the available dating evidence, the two designs are produced concurrently for each profile. On account of the strong correlation between profile shape and decoration style, S1, S2 and S3 stones appear to be standardised headstone designs offered by the producer. Variations to these offered designs may be the result of a consumer preference towards individuality, or may represent a stock design associated with a different stone mason. The notion of the standardised production of scroll designs is further indicated by the absence of other decoration design variables on standard scroll profile stones (Appendix 8). It can be noted, however, that any standardisation in offered designs did not preclude the possibility of purchasing a plain scroll headstone. The question of the extent to which a consumer actively sought an individualistic memorial design is considered in more detail in Chapter Five.

4.5.8 Design Variables: Banners

Banner decoration types are defined as decorative panels and motifs that are intended to house some form of text (usually an introductory term or

epitaph) and are placed at the head of a stone. Table 24 lists the 20 different styles of banner decoration identified in the headstone sample. The different types of banners encompass a number of different execution techniques, edge styles, and motifs. Four basic shapes are used: band (Figure 12.0-1), biquetra and triquetra (Figure 12.2), ribbon , or fern and shield banner shapes (Figure 12.3).

Chart 36 shows that the number of available banner designs increases steadily over time, with an especially rapid shift in numbers taking place between 1887 and 1896. Table 24 shows that the most frequently reproduced banner is the cartouche design (Figure 12.0). The cartouche banner is found on 251 stones, or 23 % of the total headstone data set. Chart 35 shows that cartouche banners rapidly increase in numbers from 1851 onwards. Their peak between 1867-1871 is followed by steady decline until the end of the sample period. In fact, with the exception of 1882-1886, the occurrence of cartouche banners is almost a perfect uni-modal popularity curve. Two other styles of banners are very similar in design. The first, Cartouche inscribed , is an inscribed outline of the cartouche shape and the second, 'Cartouche 1' is a pointed version of the cartouche panel (Figure 12.0). The pointed form occurs once within the sample in 1887. The inscribed cartouche is the second most common banner design and appears on 26 headstones. Chart 35 shows the inscribed design appears most frequently once the more popular style of cartouche banner has peaked in popularity. The introduction of the inscribed banner may represent an attempt to offer a less labour intensive or expensive alternative to the cartouche type, or may represent an attempt to create a more novel form of a waning style. The dimensions of the three cartouche banner types is relative to the length of text they house: thus panels which contain the phrase sacred are smaller in size to those bearing longer expressions such as 'in affectionate remembrance of'.

Table 24 shows that all other band designs in the sample occur less than three times, with the exception of nailhead banners, which are

found on ten headstones (Figure 12.1). Figure 12.2 illustrates examples of banners that are biquetra or triquetra in shape - variations of inter-linked elliptical ovals that contain a carved ribbon motif on which text is placed. Figure 12.3 illustrates the two different ribbon banners and the fern and shield banner types found in the sample. Table 24 shows that, with the exception of cartouche and cartouche inscribed banners, no banner types appear on more than ten headstones in the sample. The low reproduction rates of non-cartouche banners mean that preferences can not be statistically demonstrated between specific types, although it may be observed that these banners represent example of individualistic decoration. Trends are revealed, however, when different banner types are considered by their general groups: biquetra or triquetra, ribbon, and fern and shield. Table 25 shows that these groups each have a defined period of availability, which predominantly occurs once the two main cartouche styles have peaked in popularity.

Analysis shows that number of designs are associated with particular profile types (Table 24). All of the curved biquetra style banners, for example, are associated with SC1 headstones. Cartouche and incised cartouche banners are also predominantly found on SC1 stones and from the remaining five curved band styles, four are also found on SC1 stones (Table 24). There is a similar tendency for pointed band banners to be found on L1 headstones. Since SC1 and L1 profiles are the two most frequently reproduced in the sample, the preponderance of banner types on headstones in these shapes is expected, and their use may be read as a strategy to increase the variability in appearance between stones which share the same shape. Triquetra, ribbon, and fern and shield banner types, in contrast, do not favour a particular profile. A general trend can be seen, however, in that the shape of banner reflects the head shape the stone (Table 24).

4.5.9 Design Variables Decoration: Miscellaneous Decorative Motifs, Shapes, and Panels

Miscellaneous decorative motifs, shapes, and panels (Figure 13) were found on 209 stones which represents 19% of the total headstone sample. As noted, an individual headstone may have more than one example of this type of decoration. This decorative group includes 154 designs that occur in a wide variety of forms. The majority of designs, 64%, are composed of a decorative motif within a panel (for example, Figure 13.8-11; 13.13-15). In seven instances the decoration inside panels had not survived, and in one case the decoration appear to have been left incomplete (Appendix 8; Table 11, S11). Motifs without a panel occur less often, and make up 32% of all examples of miscellaneous decoration (Figure 13.0). Panels as decoration in their own right occur much less frequently and make up only 4% of all examples. The majority of all miscellaneous decorations, 87%, are executed as incised bas-carving (Figure 13.1), but other techniques include incised outlines (Figure 13.2), attached carvings (Figure 13.7), lead-inlaid designs (Figure 13.12), and inserted panels of a different stone (Figure 13.4).

The great level of diversity found in this *ad hoc* group precludes an in-depth discussion of specific types. Appendix 8, which lists the complete range of chosen headstone designs, demonstrates the full extent of the variation. Further difficulties of quantification occur because of the low levels of reproduction of specific decoration types. In fact less than 17% of designs are found more than once in the sample, and as Table 26 shows, these designs are only reproduced between two and seven times. It is interesting to note that reproduced designs, with the exception of crosses, mainly occur between 1881 and 1901. Cross designs occur earlier than other types of decorative motifs, but are generally less complex than later designs (Table 26). As Table 26 shows, reproduced types of decoration do not necessarily occur on stones of the same profile shape. The concentration of designs that appear more than once during the last twenty years of the sample indicates a change in attitude towards the

reproduction of decoration, but none of the designs appear to be machine worked and there is little evidence of a change in manufacture techniques over time.

Variation between different decorative designs can be achieved in a number of ways. Motifs can vary in their specific appearance; for example, a variety of cross forms are found, such as Latin, pommée, and fleurée (Figure 13.12-13). Motifs can vary in the structure of their composition; flowers, for example, may appear as a single stem, a sprig, as a bouquet tied with a ribbon, or as an arrangement placed in a vase (Figure 13.0-1). Increased variation is further possible as the same motifs can be placed in a wide variety of panel shapes and, as noted, a small range of different materials types and construction techniques could also be used. This enormous diversity between the specific details of different styles is in itself significant, while other trends are visible at a more general level. Chart 37 shows that the use of miscellaneous decorative motifs, shapes, and panels increases dramatically over time. Over the five-year periods, the frequency of decoration rises from being used on less than 10% of stones to appearing on over 90% of stones. Although, as already noted specific designs are highly individualistic, it is possible to look at the general themes used as motifs over time. This is facilitated by the infrequent use of composite designs (when decoration is made up of more than one motif or symbol).

Few traditional iconographic designs (F. Burgess 1963; Willsher 1985b; Mytum 2000) are found in the data set but those that do occur include coiled serpents, the dove (Figure 13.8), wreath (Figure 13.4), urn (Figure 13.6), crown, clasped hands (Figure 13.9), pointing finger, cherub / angel's head (Figure 13.7) and willow tree (Figure 13.5). None of these motifs (which are usually unique designs) are found on more than three stones in sample (Appendix 8). Religious symbolism is more frequently found: crosses appear on 51 occasions (Figure 13.12-13) and IHS (an abbreviation of Christ when written in Greek) appears 22 times in the headstone sample (Figure 13.14-15). The most common theme for

decoration are flowers and foliage, often used in conjunction with one another (Figure 13.0-5). In the Victorian period, particular plants, trees and flowers were used as religious symbols, as well as being embedded with secular meanings (Mytum 2000). As noted in Chapter Two, specific attention was given to laying out cemeteries with trees, flowers, and plants that were appropriate for a context for grief and mourning. In addition to being associated with the grave, plants were also used to convey non-religious meanings, and flowers in particular acted as language for a host of sentiments (Ingram 1870). Between 1852 and 1901 (when more than 50 stones are available to study per five year period), the number of themes used consistently remains at between 4-9 different motifs. An increase in the number of stones over time, does not therefore, bring a corresponding rise in the number of themes available. As Chart 38 shows, the frequency of floral and foliate designs increases steadily from 1867, and they remain the most popular theme for decoration in the remainder of the sample period. A consistency in the number of available themes is achieved by an availability of crosses and other designs that are found randomly over the sample period.

In summary, in comparison to other forms of decoration the use of miscellaneous decorative motifs, shapes, and panels is difficult to quantify by the frequency of specific designs. It is clear however, that the frequency of this type of decoration increases steadily over time and that this sort of embellishment represents a highly individualistic form of decoration.

4.5.10 An Overview of Decoration Types

Analysis shows that trends take place both within and between the different decoration types. Chart 39 shows that the broad trends shown by the different types of decoration appear as a sequential pattern, in a manner similar to, although not as distinctly shown by, headstone structural groups (Chart 17). Scroll decoration and other linear borders are popular at the beginning of the sample chronology, but decline in numbers once line all borders increase in numbers. With the emergence

of cartouche banners, line all borders decrease in popularity until 1882 when they increase again in numbers as the cartouche banners fall in popularity. By the end of the sample period miscellaneous decorative motifs, shapes and panels emerge as the most popular type of decoration.

4.6 Conclusion

The value of a typology for organising archaeological data is undoubted, but until now there have been no adequate typologies to study Victorian memorials. This chapter has provided a comprehensive typology for an analysis of York Cemetery and, most importantly, a system that could be successfully implemented to demonstrate conclusive trends. This typology provides both a method to organise an extraordinary amount of data and a means by which an in-depth analysis of headstone design can be structured.

The level of analysis in this thesis is an important development from past studies (Cannon 1986; 1989; Tarlow 1999c), and provides a more detailed reading of memorial designs. Previously, Victorian memorials have been characterised by two almost polarised perspectives. The first perspective classified the appearance of nineteenth-century memorials as standardised designs (F. Burgess 1963; Dethlefsen & Deetz 1966; Lindley 1972; Willsher 1985b). The second perspective has emphasised the great diversity of forms (Cannon 1986; Tarlow 1999c, 56). The results of this chapter have shown that both perspectives need to be taken into account to appreciate the major trends for memorial design in York Cemetery. For example, a huge variety of headstone profile shapes and design variables is visible within the data set at York, yet the most popular headstone profile, SC1, makes up almost half the headstone sample. The results of Tarlow's case study of Orcadian memorials from the nineteenth century showed that from approximately 1,800 memorials, 52 different stone shapes were recorded, the majority of which were reproduced on less than four occasions. This thesis has shown that a similar diversity is apparent within the design variables of edge types, panel types and

decoration, and more pertinently, that this variety - whether it is characterised as popular or individualistic - operated within a series of defined structures.

Chapter Five will explore the results set out in this chapter in relation to their specific historical and cultural context. At this juncture, an important issue is raised concerning the memorial survey's results and an interpretation of social relations. Cannon's 1986 analysis of Victorian memorials concluded that social emulation was the over-riding impetus determining the selection of a memorial design (see Chapter One, Section 1.2.5). Cannon's analysis employed a memorial typology which organised his data set into eight groups of monument types (including, cross; obelisk; pillars; coped tombs; and pedestal tombs) and three types of headstones (plain, more complex outlines and stones with a top piece). In conjunction with documentary sources, Cannon used his typology to argue that varying levels of social prestige could be correlated to the adoption of particular monument forms, and as a result changing fashions in memorial designs were engendered by social competition. The results of this chapter indicate that social emulation and competitive social relations can not be applied to, nor account for, the majority of consumer choices at York. Firstly, only a very small number of people actually chose to erect monuments; indeed headstones were by far the most popular memorial form adopted (Chart 40). Secondly, the vast amount of choice between different headstone profiles and design variables can not be explained by social emulation nor by competition since the same level of resources could be used to create a huge variety of chosen designs. Therefore, in the final chapter, in order to explore the nature of consumer choices shown by the data set at York, the results from this typology will be applied to a more interpretative analysis to examine relationship between the producer and purchaser of memorials.

CHAPTER FIVE: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXTS OF MEMORIAL DESIGN, PRODUCTION, AND PURCHASE

5.0 Introduction

This chapter brings together the results of the typological study and the monument survey within a more detailed, interpretative framework. Chapter Four provided a method through which Victorian memorial designs could be systematically studied. Analysis showed that both form and surface embellishment operated as a series of widespread fashions over time but also that random variations operated concurrently within the main trends. The first objective of the current chapter is to explain how the diversity of designs could be achieved within the particular historical and cultural context of Victorian memorial production. The second aim of the chapter is to assess what the range of final appearances of memorials in York Cemetery reveals about consumer behaviour. These objectives additionally draw together two wider themes raised along the course of this work. The first of these is a broader understanding of the range of actions involved within commemoration as a social practice. The second issue is the degree to which the nature of York Cemetery, as a particular type of burial landscape with its own individual history, may have influenced commemoration practice within its walls.

Research will begin by identifying the social and historical processes that enabled consumers to erect a broad range of memorial designs in the cemetery. These mechanisms will then be examined to explore how a consumer-producer relationship could influence or be directed by wider social behaviour. The chapter will start and conclude by considering the range of identities wrapped up in the term 'consumer' and the complexities of defining consumers as 'buyers' and 'users' of memorials. The intervening sections are organised as a series of case studies.

The initial case study (Section 5.2) will examine the identity of the producers supplying memorials to York Cemetery. Building upon this, the second case study (Section 5.3) examines producer-consumer interaction in the first stage of their relationship: the selection of a particular mason by a consumer. Market access will be evaluated in relation to the potential controls over consumer choice from supply monopolies, product range and business location. In particular, the study will evaluate whether the experience of shopping depended upon either the type of product purchased or differential market access. Having considered the initial stage in the producer-consumer relationship, analysis will next address the purchase of a memorial.

The third case study (Section 5.4) will assess whether all consumers were able to make a purchase from a range of available designs, and whether a selection process also included the opportunity to directly affect a memorial's end appearance. The analysis will consider the significance of different modes of production, the type of product purchased, and the level of investment made by the consumer. The study will identify which aspects of behaviour were shared by all consumers and where differential resources may have limited or extended consumer choice. The results of the three case studies will be brought together in a concluding discussion that will identify the most significant aspects of consumer behaviour evident within the shopping process.

The final part of the thesis will examine how consumers engaged with the diversity of designs that were available to them. The specific emphasis of this study is to characterise to what extent behaviour can be seen as 'other'-focused, that is to say whether memorial designs were primarily used to voice affiliation to social groups or whether diversity shows a closer correlation to an 'internally' directed dialogue that primarily sought to express personal relationships. The relationship between designs and group identity is investigated in a further three separate case studies. The first study considers profession as an indicator of socio-economic status. It tests whether an explanation of design diversity as the

result of social emulation is applicable at York in the same way as has been argued for other sites (Cannon 1986, Clark, L. 1987). The second and third studies examine memorial design in conjunction with religious affiliation and the commemoration of children respectively.

It must be stressed that the examination of social relationships in conjunction with memorial design in this thesis is intended to answer one specific issue – the relationship between consumer behaviour and design diversity in York Cemetery. As a result this study does not present a definitive reading of the full interplay between specific design choices and social relationships, although several such examples are identified during the course of analysis. Nor does the study attempt to define the specific needs of individual consumers, which are often subtle and difficult to unravel, as these revolve around many factors, not all of which are necessarily conscious or readily identifiable. Indeed both of these questions demand an extensive investigation in their own right and can be explored in future studies building on the results of this research.

5.1 Defining the Term 'Consumer'

The term 'consumer' is, by necessity, used in this thesis to represent the actions of both the buyers and users of a memorial. It is important to consider the potential dynamics that this broad classification includes and to explain why more specific definitions are unsuitable. The type of evidence available at York that may initially be expected to clarify the identity of a consumer is not ultimately revealing. For example, the vast majority of stones do not state who was responsible for erecting a memorial; of the data sample of 1,273 stones, only 26 include information about the persons responsible for commemoration. Table 29 shows both that most stones are erected by immediate family members and that in most cases the actual identity of the parties involved is not stated. The role of family members is in keeping with other burial sites where inscriptions are more directly forthcoming on this point (Tarlow 1999c, 66).

In most cases, the surviving documentary evidence does not show who was responsible for the payment of a memorial. For example, the York Cemetery Company's business records do not easily reveal the identity of the purchaser as the cash books do not note any correlation between the payee, the deceased, a particular product and the surviving material culture in the cemetery. More generally, the documentary sources frequently only note that the payee was the undertaker who was acting as an intermediary between the bereaved and the Cemetery Company.

It is important to note that establishing the identity of the payee would not necessarily reflect the range of people involved in the design selection process. Documentary sources indicate that the choice of memorial could be a decision made by both the wider family or by the closest relative of the deceased (Burrell 1996; Jalland 1996, 215, 290). In either case it is virtually impossible to know how far the choice considered the wishes of the deceased. At York, the Cemetery Company's Plan Books show that, prior to their death, an individual had occasionally expressed a preference for their burial location. It may be assumed that similarly some people would have set out their wishes for a particular memorial type. However, even if a prior decision had been made by the deceased, this might still necessitate a wider discussion with relatives since most stones were used to record a family group. Chart 41 shows that, at any point over the sample chronology, between 75% and 94% of all individuals are commemorated within the context of a family unit. In situations where employers, work colleagues or friends erected stones it is highly likely that surviving family members would not be consulted about a stone's design, especially in those cases where the latter might later appear as secondary commemorations (e.g. C/07/07 and M/09/15).

Through their inscriptions, memorials initially appear to offer a direct connection between an object and its user - but in practice it is more difficult to determine for whom a memorial was purchased. The selection of a memorial is the first stage of a multi-phased process, and only the final stage of commemoration is visible in the cemetery. The identity of the

intended user at the point of purchase cannot automatically be assumed. A memorial could be selected to be appropriate for an individual or be intended to commemorate a family unit of several members. The identification of the intended user is not necessarily less complex in cases of individual deaths as it is still possible that at the time of purchase a stone would have been intended for future use by other family members. Finally, since members of a family would not only be responsible for selecting a memorial but also would most likely eventually be commemorated with the deceased, even distinguishing between the roles of consumers as buyers and users is not clear cut. Given the range of possible scenarios involved within the selection of a memorial and its intended use, but also the extent of available data, the term 'consumer' can only be applied on a practical level to denote the actions of a family dynamic. Over the course of this chapter, however, evidence will be sought to provide examples where the identity of consumer can be more clearly defined.

5.2 Who Were the Producers?

5.2.0 Introduction

Any discussion of production should ideally consider the identity of the producers. Two main sources are available to help identify the masons who supplied memorials to York Cemetery. This first source is a survey of masons' signatures completed by David Poole, and the second is the Trade Directories relating to the city of York. Appendices 9 and 10 list the information contained in these two sources in detail, while a brief description of each source is set out below.

5.2.1 Poole's survey

David Poole, an amateur historian, completed a survey of stone masons' signatures in York Cemetery between 1993 and 1995. The project excluded stones signed by the York Cemetery Company. Poole found that across York Cemetery as a whole (including the modern extensions) 1,111

memorials bore a stonemason's signature. Poole kindly provided the results of his survey of the original Victorian extent of the cemetery (YFHS sections B, C, D, E, F1, F2, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, U, V, W, X, Y and the North Wall) and the nineteenth-century extensions (YFHS sections AA, G, H, I, K, L, and Z) for this thesis. This information included the mason's name, the family name associated with the stone and the YFHS memorial reference. Occasionally, the latter data was unavailable if a stone had been overlooked by the York Family History Society and in these instances an approximate location in the cemetery was provided instead. In total 545 signed stones were found in the original Victorian extent and nineteenth century extensions (Figure 2) and 420 of these dated between 1837 to 1901 (Chart 42). A list of all mason businesses with signed work in the cemetery was also provided by Poole. This inventory included data about addresses, period of business, and date of death of the master mason. For selected entries, biographical information about the mason or individuals commemorated on the stones was added, but unfortunately a list of the sources consulted was not included.

5.2.2. Trade Directories

A survey of Trade Directories relating to the city of York was completed for all businesses listed under the trades and professions of *stone masons*, *marble masons* and *sculptors* (Chart 43). Not every year of the sample methodology was covered by the directories, and few volumes were found for the period between from the 1880s to the early 1890s. The directories consulted were published by several different companies, and the categories of *stone masons*, *marble masons* and *sculptors* could be listed together or separately. No sub-lists were found under these headings, although for certain years an asterisk was used to denote sculptors. As a result it is not explicitly stated within the directories which businesses produced memorials as opposed to - or in addition to - other types of stonework.

Publishers also provided an opportunity for businesses to advertise within the directory and to have their names and addresses listed in bold typescript. The costs and general availability of these services for masons is not known; only a small number of businesses are displayed in this manner, and only on an occasional basis (Table 30). Sometimes advertisements communicated specific pieces of information in addition to publicising a business. Examples (Figure 17) include noting when a business was taken over (Swalwell and Barnett's 1881 advertisement), if a business had moved premises (Atkinson's 1872 advertisement), or when a business first started (Thistlethwaite's 1881 advertisement).

5.2.3 Other Sources

Two additional documentary sources revealed supplementary information about stone masonry in York, but this data only provided quantitative information for businesses practising prior to 1837. These sources were the York Freeman Rolls and Apprentice Lists. Before 1835, with certain exceptions, an individual was required to be a Freeman in order to trade in York. The status of Freeman could be achieved at the age of 21 if a man's father was a freeman, if one had been apprenticed to a freeman or through an order (i.e. by payment). The Freeman Rolls are useful for the study of stone masonry from 1272 to 1835 as they contain data on when a mason started to practice, the continuity of family businesses and which masons were employing the most apprentices. The latter information may also be checked through comparison with the York Apprentice List, a source that again is less reliable post 1837. For example, while there are 13 pages listing apprentices for all trades in 1784, by 1872 there are only two pages showing all the apprentices in York.

5.2.4 Comparative analysis of Trade Directory Entries and Poole's Survey

A comparison between the masons represented in the cemetery by signed stones and entries in the Trade Directories revealed that 45 masons were

found in both sources, 59 businesses were in the Trade Directories but not found in Poole's survey and 28 businesses were in Poole's survey but were not evident in the documentary record (Charts 43 & 44, Tables 31 & 33).

Charts 43 and 44 suggest that Skelton, Fisher, Atkinson and Cole were major producers. This is indicated both by the number of Trade Directory entries and by the number of signed stones in the cemetery. As a result of gaps in the documentary sources, the extent of Thompson's work in the cemetery is less obvious from the Trade Directories, despite his producing more signed stones than Cole. In contrast to the major producers of signed work, trade directory entries could not be used to distinguish between masons with ten to fourteen stones in the cemetery and those producing less than seven signed stones. In particular, the number of documentary entries for Shaftoe, Plows, Bradley and Weatherill during the earlier decades of the nineteenth century might well lead to an expectation of much higher numbers of signed stones being found in the cemetery than is actually the case.

Masons generally appear in a matching time period in both the archaeological and documentary records (Appendixes 9 & 10). Any differences in dates tends to result from the incomplete coverage of the documentary record. The Trade Directories include a mason's address and - unlike Poole's data - also show when a mason moved premises (Maps 9-12). Neither the frequency or size of advertisements, nor the use of bold typescript, automatically reflect the significance of masons in the signed stones sample in the cemetery. Fisher, for example, seems not to have used either service. The dates of advertisements instead appear to suggest that they coincided with periods when there was heightened competition between stone masonry businesses in York, most notably in 1881 and during the 1890s (Table 30, Chart 51).

Trade Directories entries for masons who are absent in Poole's survey can easily be explained if they were not monumental masons but producers of other types of stonework. Although this is the most likely

explanation, it is only possible to demonstrate this for Simpson & Sons, and Jackson and Likley. These firms' advertisements indicate that they are general builders and make no mention of gravestones. It is also difficult to assess to what extent monumental masons may be practising in York without necessarily producing signed work in the cemetery. The 1881 advertisement by Swalwell and Barnett (Figure 17) helped to identify the only known example of a York-based monumental mason business without known signed work in the cemetery, but given the imperfections in the documentary and material records, it is unlikely to have been the only case.

Table 31 shows that many of the masons who appear in Poole's survey but which are not listed in the documentary sources were businesses based outside York and which would therefore not have been included in the York Trade Directories (or the York sections of regional directories). However, there were at least twelve masons working in York with signed stones in the cemetery who do not appear in the York directories (Table 33). Many of these masons, notably White, Dixon, Spencer, Morritt, Mills and Scott, were active in the late 1870s and 1880s, a period for which the identified documentary evidence is somewhat sporadic, despite an extensive search (Chart 43). It is entirely possible that these firms were represented in contemporary directories, but that these no longer survive. Less easily understood is Warrilow's absence since the documentary sources cover the early years of his business from the 1890's onwards. Carlill, whose two signed stones are both made from slate, is in fact found in the Trade Directories, but under the category of *slate merchant*. This is the only known example of a signature associated with a supplier of a particular material. Two masons, J&T Biscomb and Walter Hall, may not feature in the documentary sources because earlier family businesses continued to be listed (Chart 43). The remaining masons absent from the documentary record, Barnett, Dixon, and Jackson, produced only one signed stone each. These masons may well

have been working for someone else, or were perhaps in business for too short a period to have appeared in the directories at all.

The appearance of the York Cemetery Company's stonemasonry business in the Trade Directories only from 1893 onwards (Chart 43) is interesting in light of the fact that the Company's business records clearly show that the Cemetery supplied monuments from the time of its opening in 1837. Although H. Murray (1991, 25) has noted that the Company was indeed included in one earlier 1885 trade directory, there are no known entries for the period between 1838 and 1882. This absence may be related to the fact that before 1872 the company did not take on any work external to the site itself (*ibid.*). As a result, the York Cemetery Company's masonry business may have been unknown to the directory publishers or simply excluded from entry because it served a specific, restricted market. From 1872, with the appointment of Thomas Brown as Superintendent of the Cemetery, a programme was initiated to develop the Cemetery Company's stone yard. Several large-scale advertising campaigns were initiated in order to win commissions outside the cemetery (*ibid.*). The Trade Directories clearly show the promotion of the Company's masonry business during the 1890s as the number of York Cemetery advertisements exceeds those of any other masonry businesses (Table 30).

5.2.5. Discussion

Data Bias and Methodology

An important aspect of the application of consumer choice theory is to examine what bias may exist in the historical and documentary records, so that future comparative study can take place (Spencer-Wood 1987, 3). Such a critique is important in order to show not only the limits of any single case study but also what may be possible if further data is available at a different site for future analysis.

Trade Directory lists are a key source for reconstructing the stone masonry businesses in York and are more inclusive than, for example,

newspapers, another source often used by masons to advertise their businesses (Murray, H. 1991, 25). Section 5.3.3 will consider how the directories may have been used by potential gravestone purchasers. It should nonetheless be stressed again that, on their own, Trade Directories can only reveal who was entered under the headings of *stone masons*, *marble masons*, and *sculptors* and not necessarily those who were specifically producing gravestones.

Bias is not limited to the documentary record. Certain inherent practical issues in the material record mean that recovery rates for signatures in the cemetery simply will never be high. The extent of pervasive undergrowth in the cemetery has meant that large amounts of vegetation and soil build-up are present at the base of stones (Plate 13). In terms of conservation this means that whilst signatures may survive, they are not in practice accessible. Nor can permission be gained to remove vegetation as much of it results from managed natural regeneration and the deliberate planting of shrubs and plants completed by the York Cemetery Trust as part of the cemetery's development as a nature reserve (Plates 5, 7, & 13). The potential destabilisation of a stone caused by digging around the foundations also raises significant health and safety issues. Thus there is an inherent bias towards the recovery of signatures from a headstone's upper flanks or at least above ground level. Furthermore erosion was also an issue (Plate 14). The signed stone sample was compared to evidence of William Plows' pattern book. As Appendix 11 shows, when designs listed as erected in the cemetery occur in the pattern book they are shown with complete inscriptions, including a mason's signature. Yet there is no evidence of a signature on any of these stones in the cemetery today. In each case the stone surface was degraded and it is likely that the signatures had eroded away. A preliminary visual survey suggests that rates of carved stone decay in the Cemetery are relatively high, largely due to the friable nature of sandstone, the material from which the vast majority of stones are made (Plate 14).

Thus on many levels, the gathering of signature data presents a significant logistical challenge. For example, Poole's survey only recorded evidence of mason's signatures, and although no other data was taken, his project took several years to complete. In addition, the vast majority of stones in the cemetery have no surviving signature. The pilot survey (Chapter Three) indicated 80% of stones were unsigned and Poole's more specific survey found that less than 9% of the total number of stones in the burial sections forming the main data sample (YFHS survey sections B, C, D, M, N, P, Q, R, S, V, X, Y) were signed by external masons. Further analysis showed that, with minor exceptions, it is not possible to attribute these stones to their producers.

Yet despite these methodological challenges and data biases, valuable data can be gathered from a study of the signed stones in the cemetery. The remainder of this discussion will focus on two themes: firstly, how to understand the practice of signing stones generally and secondly, how to collect evidence for and understand the signatures completed by the York Cemetery Company.

Understanding the Practice of Signing Stones

Understanding why stones were signed may offer significant data for examining the relationship between monument style and individual masons. While a study of memorial designs at York (discussed in more detail in Section 5.4) suggested that individual stylistic features could not be correlated to specific masons, other studies elsewhere, most notably in North America (Forbes 1927; Ludwig 1966; Tashjian & Tashjian 1974; Benes 1977; Deetz 1977) - and to a lesser degree in Britain (Herbert 1944; Barley 1948; Chater 1976, 1977; Willsher 1992) - have been more successful in this regard. However, these studies have examined eighteenth-century stones with folk art designs where there is an opportunity to examine stylistic change in figurative carving. Changing modes of production and fashions mean that this approach can not readily be applied to the nineteenth-century stones. In York Cemetery, there are

few memorials featuring decorations that are not moulded or geometric in design (Figures 9-14 & 16), something which has been previously identified as limiting the study of Victorian memorials (Chater 1976). Many of the motifs that occur more than once in York Cemetery, such as on inset panels or attached marble carvings appear to be machine- or mass-produced (Figure 13). Moreover, as Tables 27 and 28 show, the vast majority of decorative techniques and styles were employed by a number of different producers. However, this observation is itself significant and could not have been made without the existing evidence of signed work. Therefore, while detailed quantitative data for the rate of output from specific masons may be lacking, the evidence of signed stones provides extensive qualitative data about the numbers of producers who supplied the memorials in the cemetery and the range of monument designs they offered.

An examination of the extent of signing (between 9% and 20% of all stones according to data from Poole's survey and the Pilot Study) must recognise both present survival rates and also the rate of signed work that was produced by day-to-day business practice. None of the existing literature on gravestones has offered an in-depth examination of the process of signing stones, and the evidence at York Cemetery reveals the complex nature of the practice of signing work.

Charts 45 and 46 show that the practice of signing work was consistent over time so there is no indication that the signing of stones took place as a result of masons competing for market control at specific points in time. Whilst there is some basic correlation between the overall number of stones erected in the cemetery and the frequency of masons' signatures *per annum* (Chart 45), there is a far stronger association between the number of signed stones and the number of active masons (Chart 46). Although it is not possible to discover the exact quantity of stones each mason signed, Chart 46 clearly demonstrates that it is a relatively consistent portion of all work produced. Each mason signed only one or two stones in any two-year period regardless of the total number of

signed stones per mason. Furthermore, this observation is common to the vast majority of businesses. A second piece of evidence confirms that only a small part of any one mason's output was signed. The York Cemetery Company's business records show that several of the masons paid a 5/- fee to bring external memorials into the cemetery (see Chapter Two, Section 2.6.2). Although inconsistencies in the layout of information in the Cash Books mean that figures are not complete, Poole was able to demonstrate that several masons placed significant numbers of unsigned stones in the cemetery (Table 34). Whilst it would appear that only Fisher signed a significant number of monuments, as Poole's data only provides partially quantitative evidence these figures should not be overstated.

The factors that influenced when and why producers sign work cannot be comprehensively identified and proved through the current archaeological and historical evidence. Several key issues can, however, be considered and these may well be a productive avenue for future research. There is an obvious benefit to the producer for signing stones as advertisements of work. But there might also be benefits to the consumers if some sort of social cachet was attached to aspects of a producer's work. It might well be asked, therefore, if it was always the producer alone who determined which stones were signed. It is possible, for example, that no signatures survive on the ground today on stones from Plows' Pattern Book because the customer objected to their presence for whatever reason (Figure 14, Appendix 11).

Some authors, such as Burrell (1996), have argued that only a mason's best work is signed, but there is no evidence that the stones included in the York Cemetery Company's pattern book - presumably examples of 'best work' - were signed. The pattern book lists the names of several individuals for whom a stone was produced; each of these (identifiable through the YFHS survey) was checked on the ground, and none of them was signed (Figure 15, Appendix 11). Furthermore, the vast majority of signed work on the stones in the main data sample (including data taken from Poole and the pilot study area) is modest, rather than

elaborate, in design. While it is possible that signed stones represent the work of the master mason of a business, rather than his co-workers or apprentices, this is perhaps less likely than the other possible reasons. There is no evidence, for example, that at this time individual craftsmen, rather than companies, possessed an enhanced market prestige through their artistic merits. While it is possible that signing may take into account the social status of the deceased, analysis of the individuals appearing on signed stones shows that they practised a variety of trades and professions, and lived in different parishes. Thus it was not only prestigious individuals who lived in the more exclusive areas of the city and associated with the highest status professions that commissioned signed work.

The inescapable conclusion is that, given the small number of signed stones, the reasons or justifications for adding a signature were actually quite limited. Yet the fact that all masons, as far as can be known, were participating in this practice suggested that signing fulfilled a specific marketing role. Certainly it seems highly unlikely that signatures were intended purely as advertisements. It is far more probable that advertising operated in conjunction with other factors. One factor may include indicating to potential customers the range of available products; thereby signed stones can show when a new product line is initiated. Masons may sign a stone if the memorial is intended to be erected in a new context and by ensuring that at least part of his supply to any one site is signed he can demonstrate to possible customers that his company serves that particular market.

The documentary evidence shows that people visited the cemetery on a regular basis for leisure purposes (Figure 3, Chapter Two). During these visits it is probably that visitors would become familiar to some degree with new gravestone designs. It must be highly unlikely that producers could feel confident that visitors to the cemetery would have been always able to spot their signatures amongst an increasing majority of unsigned stones. It seems equally unlikely that visitors would have

recognised from sight alone the mason responsible for completing an unsigned stone. If masons had wanted to simply advertise their work then it would have been far more effective to sign all of their output. Instead with only specific stones signed, masons would have had to purposely direct a potential customer to their signed work in the cemetery. In this way masons could use the cemetery as a show room for their new designs. There is circumstantial evidence to support this theory. As noted, Chart 46 shows that masons were only signing one stone each year in the cemetery during their time in business; if these stones were intended by the mason to demonstrate new or available lines, then the possibility of some sort of producer-led advertising strategy is enhanced.

The York Cemetery Company

In the absence of data from Poole's survey, coupled with the problems already discussed with recovering signed data, the signatures of the York Cemetery Company present a particular challenge. Data sampling from Chapter Three's Pilot Study showed that a sampling strategy for the collection of signatures for York Cemetery was necessary. This strategy had to consider both the problems of access and resources raised in the first part of this discussion. Documentary sources were eventually employed to create a data set of memorials known to have been produced by the cemetery, which would also complement those signed stones already identified in the pilot survey. This was possible due to the surviving business records for the York Cemetery Company, a resource of a type that does not exist for any other masonry business in York.

The first data set was established from York Cemetery Company's pattern book, which also noted the names of several individuals for whom a stone has been produced. The YFHS reference for each of these stones was identifiable. The second data set was established from stones erected on public graves. The cemetery's rules and regulations for 1894 note that all stonework on public graves was completed solely by the York Cemetery Company, but further documentary evidence indicates that this

practice existed from at least the mid-1840s onward. Grundy's 1846
survey of York Cemetery (see Chapter Two, Section 2.6) notes that:

> 'The plan of intermixing private graves with those used for common
> interments has a much better aspect, than of just keeping them
> distinct as at Nottingham, and the prejudices against common
> interments do not prevail to any extent. The company undertake the
> whole of the work for the gravestones and ornaments and the
> profits from this service form an important item in the yearly
> accounts, while at the same time it adds to the order and regularity
> of the establishment'.   Grundy 1846, *NHRO* 1997/324

An analysis of all signed stones confirmed that no external mason
had signed a stone that lay on a public grave. Indeed, in the small number
of instances where the primary commemoration on a non-Company signed
stone was buried in a public grave, the stone was erected over a private
grave below which a second individual, also commemorated on the stone,
was buried (e.g. D/15/15; D/25/35; C/07/25; C/19/01; P/09/21; Q/21/13;
S/07/21 and V/25/20). The York Cemetery Company's pattern book
predominantly contains monuments and complex headstone profiles and
these represent the highest levels of economic investment by the
consumer. The data sample of York Cemetery Company's signed stones
is also likely to represent the poorer classes, however, since burial within
public graves required less of an economic investment than private burial
(Chapter Two, Section 2.6.1).

Quantitative data on the York Cemetery Company's output cannot
be extracted consistently or easily from business records. The records of
stonework profit in surviving Annual General Meetings serves as partial
evidence to show that the Company increased its production of stonework
over time (Murray, H. 1991, 25). Similar increases in output can be
inferred from the Company's Cash Books, which show a rise in the amount
of stone purchased as a raw material and an increase in the number of

masons employed over time. However, as noted earlier, the York Cemetery Company's work was also being erected at sites other than the cemetery, and thus does not offer a clear indication of how many stones the Company may have erected in the cemetery itself. This data is important as it serves as a reminder that competition between masons was taking place both inside York Cemetery and also at sites further afield, and that business practice at the Cemetery could be affected by wider factors, such as the price of materials and transport.

In summary, whilst the exact output of individual masons with work in York Cemetery is difficult to estimate precisely, it is still possible to consider the rationale that underlay the practice of signing work. Furthermore, what is crucial to this analysis is not the precise calculation of the numbers of stones erected in the cemetery by different producers (although this would offer valuable data for wider analysis if it were retrievable) but the ability to investigate both what the selection of a particular producer by consumers reveals about market access and also if the organisation of production might influence the control and variability of designs in the market place. The available evidence of masons' work at York is clearly capable of beginning to address such questions.

5.3. Market Access and Consumer Choice

5.3.0 Introduction

Another important element of the producer - consumer relationship is the extent to which the producers control the market and the degree to which there may be differential consumer access. The following discussion will consider these issues using the frequency of signed stones as a general indicator of a mason's productivity.

5.3.1 Major and Minor Suppliers

Chart 44 shows a breakdown of all signed stones from Poole's survey by mason. As briefly discussed in the previous section, the chart shows two general groups of masons. The first group is characterised by the

observation that 61% of all signed stones are the work of nine masons (Fisher, Atkinson, Skelton, Thompson, Cole, Scott, Keswick, Bowman and Clark). These nine are the 'major suppliers' to York Cemetery. The remaining 163 stones are the work of 66 different masons, and these can be categorised as the 'minor suppliers'. In order to understand what this distribution may reveal about market access, this analysis will first consider how many masons were available to prospective customers over the course of the sample chronology, and then assess whether one producer may have dominated the market at any specific period.

Charts 47-51 show the frequency of signed work erected in the Cemetery by each of the nine main producers over the course of the sample chronology. With the exception of Skelton, who appears throughout the sample period (Chart 48), the producers with more than twenty signed stones each worked within specific periods of production that form a seriated sequence of production peaks. Fisher, for example, has the earliest business amongst the major producers, and peaks in output during the late 1860s (Chart 47). Thompson's period of production occurs from the late 1850s until the late 1890s, peaking in the 1870's (Chart 49). By the end of the sample chronology, Atkinson and Cole reach their production peak (Charts 47 & 49). Thus as one business declines in output, another mason rises in production. In contrast to the largest businesses, Chart 50 shows that the remaining major suppliers with less than twenty signed stones each do not have distinct peaks, nor do their patterns of production show any relation to each other.

The number of signed stones in the York Cemetery Company's data set (Map 4) indicates that the Company was also a major producer. Documentary sources have shown that the Company produced stones during the entire sample chronology. As such the York Cemetery Company represents direct competition to each of the major producers identified by the Trade Directories and in Poole's survey. Therefore, while there tends to be three or four major suppliers producing stones at any

one point in the sample chronology, a small number of these are particularly prominent.

In order to examine whether the main producers dominated the market, the total number of major producers (Fisher, Atkinson, Skelton, Thompson, Cole, Scott, Keswick, Bowman, and Clark) was compared to the total number of other masons with work in the cemetery. This was done for each year of the sample chronology. In the earliest years of the cemetery, the small numbers involved mean that no definitive conclusions can be drawn (Chart 51). The initial peak in the aggregate number of masons in 1855 can be correlated to the closure of the York's' city churchyards and other burial grounds. At this point the market becomes focused upon a single setting for commemoration and may reflect competition between both types of suppliers to establish a presence within the cemetery. In the early 1860s, and notably in 1865, options became slightly more restricted as a small number of major suppliers dominated the market. Between 1870 and 1881 there is no market dominance by these major producers and prospective purchasers could select one of a number of masons, who may be major or minor suppliers of stones in the cemetery. 1881 marks a stark break, and from this date there are fewer masons overall in the cemetery. Indeed, 1881 is itself an unusual year because no major producers are represented in the cemetery. It is also the time at which the largest number of masons were advertising their businesses in the Trade Directories (Table 30) and it may be that after the decline of Fisher's business at the end of the 1870s (Chart 47) several firms sought to become more established in the market. From 1898 to the end of the sample period, the minor masons with less than ten signed stones each appear on a more sporadic basis (Chart 51). During the 1890s, both Atkinson and Cole increased the number of signed stones they supplied to the cemetery (Charts 47 & 49). The decline in both the number of major and minor suppliers could therefore be a reflection of market dominance by these two producers. If this indeed is the case, then by the end of the sample period the consumers' choice was limited to a

smaller range of masons in the market place. It must be emphasised, however, that for the vast majority of the sample period a customer could select a mason from a range of producers with work in the cemetery. Indeed, their range of options would be considerably larger when all of the businesses producing memorials in York are taken into consideration (Chart 43).

5.3.2 Market Restrictions: Product Range and Business Location

So far analysis of the masons supplying memorials to York Cemetery has suggested that both major and minor businesses were significant forces in the market place, and that the former group did not have a monopoly of business. In order to consider what limitations existed on the potential consumer choice shown by Charts 47 - 51, this next section will consider if consumer options were restricted by the range of products offered by masons or the location of their business. In particular it should be considered whether consumer desire for a particular memorial type may have dictated, or indeed been restricted by, the choice of mason or if different masons' businesses offered a similar range of products. This analysis will first consider these issues for those masons based outside the City of York and then for the York-based firms.

Table 31 lists the masons based outside York with signed stones in the cemetery that pre-date 1901 (see also Appendix 9). Table 32 lists masons with work post-dating 1901. Table 31 shows that no stones signed by masons working outside York appear before 1855. This may be because of transport costs before the development of railway network, which entered its first significant phase in York in the mid-1850s (Tillott ed. 1961, 270-2; Feinstein 1981,129), made transporting memorials into York prohibitively expensive. There is a distinct difference between the location of non-York businesses before 1901. Before 1901 there were two main locations, masons based in Aberdeen or masons based in the main cities (or in the case of Beverley, a major market town) of the north-east of

England (Table 31). After 1901, in contrast, masons supplying stones to York Cemetery came from a much wider geographic spread, and included businesses based in the Midlands, the north-west and the south-east of England (Table 32).

Given its nickname of 'the granite city', it is perhaps not surprising that all of the memorials produced by Aberdeen-based masons were made from granite - although York masons also used this material. The granite memorials produced by Scottish masons date from 1867 to 1880 (Table 31). In contrast the dates of granite memorials signed by York- based masons is considerably later: 1884 to 1895 - although a 1881 monument by Milburn is partially made from granite (V/13/02). Once York-based masons begin to supply granite, signed work by Scottish masons no longer appears in the cemetery. Therefore the selection of Aberdeen-based masons (and an 1876 granite stone from a Newcastle-based company), was dictated primarily by a consumer preference for a particular material type. Granite is a hard stone that must be machine cut. Involvement in this market would initially have required a great investment by the producer, and it would appear that consumer demand drove the producers in this direction. The masons in York may have acted as middlemen for the Scottish suppliers through the use of catalogues. Such a catalogue is indeed contained in the York Cemetery Company's pattern book, although the company Robertson & Law are Inverness-based, and do not have any signed stones in the cemetery (Appendix 11). Evidently producers in their catalogues offered some degree of stylistic variation, since none of the imported granite memorials are of identical designs. The involvement of middlemen may additionally explain why in 1872 Atkinson advertised the availability of granite at his workshop, but produced no signed granite stones until 1884 (Figure 17).

There is no discernible difference between the general styles of non-granite memorials made by masons working outside York and the types of memorial being produced by York-based masons. As a result it is not possible to conclude if the use of a non-York mason was the result of

preferences for their work instead of the range of goods offered by masons in York. Yet there are no apparent advantages for the consumer on the basis of increased choice in designs to import memorials, and there would be an obvious disadvantage due to an increase in costs. In these cases it would seem more probable that the person responsible for selecting a memorial lived outside York.

A connection between the deceased's family and the location of a mason can be demonstrated for several cases (Table 31). Poole, for example, argued that the Jameson family who lived in York commissioned the firm of Jameson's based in Darlington to produced a stone for the cemetery because of a kin association (pers litt). He also notes that Captain George Hotham, who was commemorated on memorial H/03/24, was born in Beverley, where the mason responsible for his memorial, Robert Whitton, was also based.

Occasionally the memorial inscriptions in York Cemetery provide some information about either the most recent or native residence of the deceased. The burial registers show that the informant of death for Thomas Mawson (commemoration four on stone D/22/30) was from Sheffield, where the monument producer Hobson was also based. The memorial inscription on this stone also records that Thomas Mawson junior (commemoration three) was buried in Burngreave Cemetery, Sheffield. The two memorials produced by the Bradford-based Stake firm can also be correlated to the residence of the deceased and their family. The memorial inscription on stone C/07/35 records that Elizabeth Hannah Calvert (commemoration three) died at Liversage and burial registers show that she lived at Mill Bridge near Bradford. Similarly the burial registers and memorial inscription for the first commemoration on stone Q/12/26, note that Helen Leak was buried in Howden, a village near Bradford.

Although subject to general widespread fashions, Victorian memorials display elements of pre-industrialised craftsmanship through the use of local materials and expertise. As the next section will discuss in

more detail, in the absence of an intermediary acting as a distributor, gravestones were one of the few objects whereby a purchaser could enter into a direct dialogue with the producer. Therefore the proximity of the customer to the mason and to the cemetery itself may have influenced the range of options within the process of choosing a memorial design. Someone who lived outside York would probably be less familiar with the range of memorial designs previously erected in the Cemetery than someone who lived in York. Design conventions tied to local traditions would not necessarily be recognised outside York or influence a consumer's choice of memorial. A customer living at a distance from the producer may also have less easily directed the fine details of a memorial's appearance due to the more limited opportunity for direct dialogue.

The product range of each York-based mason with signed work in the Cemetery was examined to see if an initial choice of mason could subsequently restrict a consumer's available options of memorial designs (Table 35). Evidence was also sought to assess whether any masons had a specialised product range that might indicate if a customer had pre-determined the style of memorial they intended to purchase. In the latter case, the choice of memorial limited the consumer's choice of producer. A comparison between masons can be made on the basis of the range of materials used and if the producer supplied headstones or monuments. The results from Chapter Four were used to create preliminary sub-groups within these two memorial classes. Monuments were classed by their general type, such as altar tomb, obelisk, free-standing cross and others (see Appendix 4, Chapter Four). Headstones were noted as either being template profiles, Level One in complexity, or Level Two and above in profile complexity (Drawing 15). The production of more detailed design variables will be considered in the following sections. The relatively small numbers found in some of the data sets of pre-1901 signed stones for the 54 masons based in York (Chart 44) means that project ranges could not be studied over time.

Table 35 shows that the composition of product ranges can be sorted into three main groups. The first group is composed of masons only producing sandstone memorials in template profiles. Chapter four has shown that this style of monument is by far the most common in York Cemetery and required both the least use of resources by the masons and the lowest economic investment by the consumer. The thirty-one producers in Table 35 are all minor suppliers to the cemetery (Chart 44). The work of the fifteen masons who make up the second group is also characterised by sandstone headstones in template shapes. This group, however, also has an increase in the diversity of their product range, which is seen either by the inclusion of more complex memorial types, such as complex profiles and monuments, or because work is executed in a second material type. Again the producers in this group are mainly minor suppliers to the cemetery. Although the major suppliers Bowman and Clark also fall into this category, they feature the fewest signed stones of any of the major suppliers (Table 35, Chart 44). Milburn's range of memorials is particularly notable amongst this group of masons since he is the only producer who supplied more complex headstone profiles and monuments than template style headstones, which suggests that he may have served a more exclusive market than the other minor suppliers

Two pieces of information highlight that the fact that the data recovered is partial and that the signed stones in York cemetery are not necessarily representative of the total output of each of the minor suppliers. Plows' pattern book contains several non-template profile headstones and large-scale monuments that are known to have been completed and erected in the cemetery (see Appendix 11). Poole also points out that Hessey produced an elaborate unsigned sculptured effigy stone (Plate 12) in addition to the two signed template headstones (*pers litt*).

Table 35 shows that, from the evidence of surviving signed work, the product range of the major suppliers to the cemetery appears to be more extensive in the types of memorials and materials offered than any of

the minor suppliers. The three largest suppliers, Skelton, Atkinson and Fisher all offered the widest ranges of monuments and complex headstones in their group but interestingly they each also supplied the less expensive template style headstones. This is significant as it demonstrates that their potential customers were not necessarily restricted to one part of the memorial market. However, Atkinson only produced marble or granite template headstones, rather than working in less expensive sandstone. Even though by the end of the nineteenth century (when Atkinson's business was flourishing) granite and marble would have fallen in cost due to more favourable supply conditions (F. Burgess 1963, 27, 63), they were still a more expensive option than sandstone. This suggests that Atkinson may have served a more exclusive end of the memorial market than either his main competitor Cole (Charts 47 & 49), or any of the minor suppliers shown in Table 35.

The total sample demonstrates that for all types of memorials, and therefore for all levels of economic investment, even with the acknowledged gaps in the data, customers were able to choose between at least two or three masons offering comparable ranges of memorial designs (Table 35 & Figure 18). In fact it is notable that the widest choice of available masons existed for those customers making the most modest economic investment, who were the consumers erecting the types of memorials forming the largest part of the data sample set out in Chapter Four. There is little evidence that masons specialised in a particular type of product apart from Atkinson and his use of granite. Indeed, Carlill is the only business in the entire sample of masons who appears to offer a specialised product range. Both of Carlill's stones are made from slate. This material is rarely used in the cemetery (Chart 25) and is only used by one other mason, Fisher (F2/12/05). The unpopularity of slate is further shown by the fact that when masons advertised in the Trade Directories the range of materials that they offered, none mention slate. Slate was not a locally quarried material in York (British Geological Survey 2001), and it is possible that the cost of slate, in contrast to sandstone and marble,

made it unattractive to consumers and therefore was not a regular part of a producer's range. It is less likely that producers simply chose not to work in slate since this material is readily inscribed, and this stone type could easily have been used to create the most common headstones design in York cemetery. Since both of the signed stones demonstrate a personal connection between the deceased and Carlill this suggests that there was limited market access to slate memorials. Stone F1/13/03 was erected to Carlill's son, while for stone C/07/01 the informant of death for the primary commemoration, William Ellis (later the third commemoration on the stone) was a slater by trade. As already noted, Carlill was entered in the Trade Directories under the category of *slate merchant* and may therefore not have been a regular supplier of gravestones to the general public.

Carlill was not the only mason in the cemetery to supply memorials for his relatives; Bowman (D/21/42, D/21/40), Cole (D/18/46), Connell (B/14/30), Hessey (K/02/30), Jackson (R/04/25), Fisher (F2/15/01, Q/17/19), Morritt (C/19/13), J. H. Plows (S/14/39) and Welsman (D/24/21) also produced stones for family members. Poole further notes that Hebdon produced two stones for his family that are no longer extant (*pers litt*). Since Jackson's only signed stone is for a family member, and therefore a private commission, this may explain why he does not appear as an entry in the Trade Directories; the focus of his business may well have been elsewhere. A potential professional relationship may also be seen with Barnett's stone commemorating the death of his fellow stonemason John Henry Precious. It is possible that since neither mason appeared separately in the Trade Directories that they were colleagues employed within a larger firm. In these cases the choice of mason presented a different dynamic between the producer and consumer through a personal connection to the deceased.

Other factors dependent upon wider funerary consumer choice may have influenced a customer's selection of mason and the available choices for memorial design. As previously noted, the York Cemetery Company reserved the right to supply all stonework to public and Second

Class graves, and as a result not only was the choice of mason predetermined but the available options for memorial style were restricted to the product range of the Cemetery Company. In the case of Second Class gravestones the memorial style was also pre-determined by the Company (Plates 10 & 11).

It is very common for funerary personnel to appear as the informant of death in the York Cemetery Company's burial registers. As a result it was possible to assess if there was a correlation between the undertaker used and the mason employed. A particular note was made of the undertakers associated with the deceased on Keswick's stones, as his advertisement of 1881/2 records that his firm also acted as undertakers (Figure 17). Although Keswick's firm is recorded as the informant of death in the York Cemetery Company Burial Registers on at least five occasions (accessions 25,503; 42,973; 45,150; 46,645; and 46,906), none of these deceased are commemorated on signed Keswick stones and the deceased who do appear on his signed work employed other undertakers. In fact analysis clearly showed that there was no evidence that the selection of undertaker determined the choice of mason either formally, through some form of 'package deal', or more casually, through an informally arranged referral system between particular funerary personnel and masons.

Documentary sources do not suggest that membership of a Friendly Society or Trade Union influenced the choice of mason. Although most Friendly Societies and Trade Unions had some form of burial club, whereby a payment was made on the death of the member, this amount would only have covered the funeral and burial costs. For example, Rowntrees' 1901 study of poverty in York noted that most societies and unions made burial payments of between £10 and £12 (Rowntree 2001, 420ff). Yet the least expensive funerals set out in Chadwick's 1843 Survey on the Practice of Interments in Towns cost between £5 and £10 (cited in May 1996, 7; see also Elton & Foster 1986, 67). By the end of the nineteenth century, rising funerary costs would have meant that £10 would

not have covered a funeral, burial or even the most modest stone with only a few lines of inscription (*Charges and Regulations at the York Public Cemetery*, March 1894, *YCA* Acc. 247). Since the death premiums did not cover the price of a memorial it is unlikely that Friendly Societies and Unions would have had a regular arrangement with a particular mason.

The final aspect of market access considered was the location of a mason within York and where their customers lived. This was examined in order to see if consumers simply selected their nearest mason, or whether factors other than convenience influenced their choice. Maps 2-12 show the results of this study for each of the signed stones in Chapter Four's data sample. This took into account 40 different businesses (excluding the York Cemetery Company), 109 different stones, and the commemoration of 426 people. Map 4 includes only customers of the Cemetery Company who bought memorials for private graves or from the pattern book. Convenience was obviously not a factor when purchasing gravestones for public and Second Class graves since these could only be bought from the York Cemetery Company. The study had to include each appropriate address if more than one person was commemorated on a given stone before 1901, as the date of purchase may not have related to the primary commemoration. In addition, purchasers may have lived at the address of a secondary, rather than primary, commemoration. For 60% of stones more than one address was plotted and the commemoration number relevant to each additional address was noted. The study only included addresses found within the modern city of York. Many of the addresses included in the burial registers no longer exist today and their location could only be recovered from studying first and second edition Ordnance Survey maps.

Client bases can be identified for Skelton, Fisher, Cole, Thompson and Atkinson, the six largest major suppliers to the cemetery (Maps 2 & 3). For example, Skelton, who was based on Micklegate, served customers in both Clifton and Bootham. Fisher, on the other hand, had a market that radiated across the city centre from his business in Goodramgate. Skelton

was the main competitor to Fisher in the market for more expensive memorials. Their client bases were by no means mutually exclusive, although many customers did appear to favour one above the other on the basis of locality (Map 2). During the later stages of the sample chronology a slightly different picture emerges in the competition between the major suppliers. Whilst client bases can be discerned for Cole, Atkinson and Thompson these areas appear to show a greater degree of overlap (Map 3). For example, both Cole and Thompson serve the Groves area, although Thompson also has a strong client base in the Clementhorpe area. In contrast, both Atkinson and the York Cemetery Company served clients from all areas of the city (Maps 3 & 4).

Maps 5 - 8 show that the distribution of the clients of the minor suppliers to the cemetery. No clear patterns of patronage are discernible from these much smaller data sets; some customers used their nearest masons, others employed a mason within their general locale and some consumers patronised masons on the other side of town.

In summary, whilst it is evident that locality influenced some consumers to choose one business above another, convenience was not an overriding concern for potential customers. In contrast, an examination of the establishment of stone yards over time shows that proximity to potential consumers was significant to producers. Maps 9 -12 show that as York's suburbs developed from the 1850s onwards, notably in the Groves, Nunnery Lane, Clementhorpe and Fulford areas, masons began to position their businesses accordingly. It is interesting to note that the development of the suburbs was a greater influence upon the location of masons' yards than the cemetery itself.

5.3.3. Discussion of Consumer Behaviour and Market Access

The analysis in this section has shown that the memorial market in York can be divided into three distinct groups. The first category is composed of major suppliers of memorials, identified by a high number of signed stones

in York Cemetery, and whose product range included the supply of both monuments and elaborate headstones. This group also includes any York Cemetery Company's business associated with private graves. The second category, the minor suppliers, is characterised by the supply of mostly template forms of headstones (though exceptions exist) and the masons in this group have only a small number of signed stones in the cemetery. The final category is the monopoly enjoyed by the York Cemetery Company for the provision of Second Class headstones and memorials for public graves. Unlike the latter, the first two groups were made up of several masons operating in competition. There is little evidence of any restrictions on market access that may have influenced the choice of mason by the customer within these general categories other than the Cemetery Company's monopoly. Only a small number of exceptions to this pattern can be seen in more unusual circumstances, such as when a mason supplied work to commemorate his own family, or when masons not based in York have signed work in the cemetery.

The archaeological record is unable to provide information about several factors that may have influenced the choice of mason. Undoubtedly masons would have offered different services to the public and would have priced these accordingly. No business records survive to show exactly how each business differed. The York Cemetery Company's business records do show one strategy used by their stone yard to increase business: the charging of a 5/- fee for all memorials brought into the cemetery and supplied by another company. Yet without wider documentary sources, it is not possible to identify if this affected the relationships between consumers and producers or the dynamic between the York Cemetery Company and other businesses. It is possible, for example, that masons simply absorbed the Cemetery Company's fee into their own pricing structure. In this way the fee was deducted from a producer's profits rather than a consumer's pocket, but without additional evidence, this must remain speculation.

It is likely that consumers had some prior knowledge of several masons' businesses which enabled then to make an informed choice about the producer they selected. Customers would have had a degree of familiarity with those businesses located in the city centre or within their own suburb. Recreational visits to the cemetery possibly provided consumers with an opportunity to become familiar with the range of masons supplying the site and with the products they offered. Several masons supplying gravestones also supplied stonework for civic and ecclesiastical buildings. Examples include Hessey's bust of Shakespeare on the gable of the Theatre Royal, Milburns' statues of William Etty in Exhibition Square and Cole's drinking fountain outside the Museum Gardens. Not only would such work demonstrate the skills of the producer but their public profile may have made them attractive options to consumers. Documentary sources show that a mason's memorial work could also become widely known when they were associated with people who had a public profile within the community. For example, William Hargrove describes in great detail the stone made by William Plows, paid for by public subscription, to commemorate a local tragedy when six children from one family died in a boating accident on the Ouse (Hargrove 1838, 173-4). A lithograph of this memorial can also be found in Plows' pattern book (Appendix 11).

Advertisements were an obvious strategy for producers to attract business and could be placed in newspapers as well as in the Trade Directories. On their own the trade directory entries would have offered little assistance to a consumer seeking to select one producer from another since they neither showed which stonemasons produced memorials or indicated the type of products they offered. Advertisements, however, would have offered some information about the skills and products on offer. The illustrations of memorials in advertisements (Figure 17) were most likely standard images owned by printers, but whilst they could not directly show the specific products of a producer, they may have indicated the types of memorial that a producer could make.

Advertisements could also include businesses from outside York; the Post Office Directory for 1861 includes advertisements for stone masons in Leeds (Lee and Welsh) and Keighley (Hargreaves). The trade directory advertisements also show that many masons were involved in supplying more general stone work, such as kitchens, fireplaces and chimneys. It is therefore possible that the choice of mason could be influenced by work previously completed and in these circumstances the conditions of the memorial market were of less significance. The following section will consider in more detail the possible ways in which a producer and consumer dialogue may have been structured.

5.4 Memorial Selection and the Consumer - Producer Relationship

5.4.0 Introduction

The results of the preceding section strongly suggested that most consumers were able to make informed decisions about the masons that they patronised, and were not constrained by supply monopolies, location or individual product ranges. Before moving on to explore how designs may express social relationships, this section will examine consumer-producer relations leading up to the purchase of a memorial. Analysis will concentrate upon evaluating if all consumers were able to make a selection from a range of choices and how options may be limited. In particular, there is a focus upon identifying options that were predetermined by the producers and the circumstance when designs may be the result of a dynamic between the consumer and the producer. This distinction will be examined in the context of different modes of production. Consideration is also given to the varying levels of financial investment in memorials to study similarity and difference in consumer behaviour based on memorial cost. This study also explores the ways in which information about designs may be communicated to consumers and between producers. The different spheres for communication considered are the

masons' workshop, memorial pattern books and the possibility that the cemetery itself acted as a showroom for designs.

The final purpose of this section is to show how the range of designs discussed in Chapter Four helps to refine the characterisation of Victorian memorials as either entirely standardised or possessing such diversity in appearance that variation appears random (e.g. F. Burgess 1963; Dethlefsen & Deetz 1966; Lindley 1972, Willsher 1985b). Before moving on to consider these issues in relation to second class headstones, headstone blanks and individually commissioned memorials the method and wider contexts of this case study are set out below.

5.4.1 Methodology

The results in Chapter Four have demonstrated that the primary aspects of headstone memorial design (class, shape, material, edge type, use of panels and decoration) can be independently recorded, classified and quantified to reveal a series of broad processual trends in fashions (Charts 17, 20 & 39). These broad trends are shown by a small number of styles of shapes or surface embellishment which appear on a high number of stones. Yet each of these elements also features less frequently reproduced designs, which appear in the sample as patterns of random variation (Charts 28, 29, 34, 35, & 38). Together these two contrasting trends have resulted in extensive permutations within the final appearance of memorials.

In the sample of 1073 headstones, there are 143 profile shapes that appear as 367 uniquely designed stones. Appendix 8 shows that differentiation between designs was determined by a combination of profile shape and surface embellishment (edge type, use of panels, and decoration). This classification does not consider further distinctions between the final appearance of memorials that share the same design but feature different size and stone materials. When design variables are considered in conjunction with specific profiles, the extent of variability means that any underlying structure of product control cannot be easily

discerned. For example, while individual design elements may be commonly associated with a particular profile, their use was not constrained by headstone shape. Thus while cartouche banners are predominately found on SC1 profile stones, they also occur on four other profile shapes (SC7, SH26, P9, and G2). Trends are further complicated because reproduction rates vary widely between designs. For example, amongst the 1073 sampled stones, the maximum number of stones that share exactly the same design is 166 (Appendix 8, SC1 sandstone headstone with square edge and cartouche banner design), whilst 288 designs occur only once in the sample. As a result it is difficult to appreciate the full extent of options available to purchasers and therefore recover evidence for consumer behaviour.

In contrast to headstones, typological analysis could not be completed for either monuments or cross style headstones because of their relatively small numbers. In the case of second class gravestones, typological analysis is redundant since there was no choice of design. A system was devised to compare the resources used to create the designs found in the memorial sample as a whole and to examine the structure of the headstone sample in more detail. There are several inter-linked attributes that can be used to provide a structure through which consumer behaviour and the range of memorial design in the data set as a whole can be studied. The basic cost of a memorial can be characterised by class, type and complexity (which form a group by themselves) and by method of production. It was important that these attributes could reflect that, within a particular class or type of memorial, differing levels of investment could be made depending upon the size, material and the complexity of shape and decoration. Furthermore, it was important to show that several alternative categories of memorial could be available to the consumer beyond the first level of investment (Figure 18).

Figure 18 shows that there are five basic levels of investment. These rise in scale from the purchase of a Second Class commemoration package (Level One) to the selection of an altar or pedestal tomb (Level

Five). Second Class headstones make up less than one percent of the sample, whilst investment Level Two stones make up 80% of the total number of memorials. Level Two represents the lowest level of investment where consumers were provided with some choice of designs. Level Two headstones are 'blank headstones' - partially pre-fabricated memorials used by the mason as his stock-in-trade. This category includes 309 designs from the total of 367 recovered by typological analysis. The remaining memorials all represent the types of stones that were usually produced as individual commissions. This data set contains headstones from the typology data set that have a complexity rating above Level Two. These stones appear in 58 different designs and make up five percent of the memorial sample as a whole. Other individually commissioned memorials include the monuments and cross style headstones that form 14% of the data set as a whole. For these memorials a discussion of consumer and producer relations can be made in conjunction with documentary sources, including two memorial pattern books compiled by York-based masons.

Only one memorial type, ledger stones, fails to fit into a production or investment-based system of classification. The York Cemetery Company's Cash Books indicate that the majority of ledger stones sampled, nine from ten, were produced as pre-fabricated blank stones. One elaborately decorated stone, however, was individually commissioned from the York Cemetery Company's Pattern Book. Fortunately, since ledger stones are such a small number of the data set, the proposed system can be still be used, and remains representative of the data set as whole.

The Wider Context for the Study of Memorial Designs

Shopping is widely recognised as a key stage in understanding consumer behaviour (e.g. Miller, D. 1995; Cook, Yamin & McCarthy 1996). Yet the material record can only directly reveal evidence for erection of a chosen design. This is the phase of commemoration practice which follows the

selection and purchase of a design and may in itself may be made up of several stages if secondary commemorations are added to a memorial. As a result, evidence of an initial purchase and the process of shopping must be extrapolated from the material record and read in conjunction with available documentary evidence. Pattern books represent a primary documentary source that can be used to examine interaction between the producer and consumer. The two relevant York pattern books, those of Plows and the Cemetery Company (see Appendix 11) can in turn be compared to several nationally-distributed pattern books. The evidence of such pattern books is valuable since, as already noted, business records for York masons either no longer exist or, as in the case of the Cemetery Company, are of limited application since they are not laid out separately from wider commercial accounts. Pattern books in general, and the two York volumes in particular, have not been widely studied. As a result their application raises many wider methodological and contextual issues. These issues have been explored in detail in conjunction with the two pattern books of York-based masons and this case study is set out in Appendix 11. The salient points from this case study are summarised in Section 5.4.4.

Wider examples of documentary evidence for gravestone production do not usually reveal information about designs in conjunction with commission and/or purchase. Mason's oral testimonies, for example, tend to emphasise aspects of craft change, not their own or the customers' role in the creation of particular designs (e.g. A. Brown 1989). A valuable outline of the changes in production technology and supply from the medieval period into Victorian times is provided in F. Burgess' 1963 study *English Churchyard Memorials*. His study of memorial design, however, does not provide data precisely compatible to this research since F. Burgess considers wider influences on production (evidenced by printed pattern books and clerical tracts), rather than a direct consumer-producer relationship.

No personal accounts exist for York of consumers' experiences of shopping for a memorial, although wider anecdotal evidence shows that this was important to many families (Burrell 1996; Jalland 1996, 215, 290). In the absence of such texts, it is impossible to discern the relationship between the many variables that could structure an individual's choice of design. Furthermore, individual accounts would only articulate the conscious factors that informed an individual consumer choice, rather than the subconscious associations that structured choice. It is possible, however, to examine the characteristics of consumers' general behaviour and this is the focus of this case study.

An important facet of the case study is to identify what can be positively said about the production and purchase of designs in conjunction with the available material and documentary sources. In the absence of wider supporting evidence and with the biases in the case study data, a discussion of the significance of consumer and producer relationships on memorial designs represents an exploration of relevant issues, rather than a definitive study. Nonetheless this discussion remains vitally important as it is one of the few instances where gravestone research considers how objects entered people's lives, and the implications this may hold for an understanding of social behaviour associated with commemoration.

The case study will now separately consider consumer behaviour in the selection of second class headstones, pre-fabricated memorials and individually commissioned memorials. The concluding discussion will compare the trends across these three groups.

5.4.2 Second Class Headstones

Sixteen Second Class gravestones are found in the memorial sample (Plates 10 & 11) and these make up less than one percent of the total data set. Second Class headstones are distinctive for several reasons. Firstly, only the York Cemetery could supply this type of memorial and they also maintained ownership rights. Second Class stones were purchased in

conjunction with the right both to be buried in a public grave with a maximum of six other individuals, and to have the death of the deceased recorded by six lines of text. A second reason why Second Class gravestones are notable is because there was no choice of design. Plate 11 shows that the stones were all produced in one material type, without any surface embellishment and with inscriptions executed in a standard script. However, it appears that consumers had some limited options for the content of inscriptions. A range of introductory terms and expressions of death appear on the stones. Whilst most texts simply record basic information about the deceased (name, age and date of death), several entries have epitaphs (C/01/05, C/01/08) and others reveal details of address (C/01/01) and kin relations (C/01/11). Second Class inscriptions also confirm that family members could not generally be buried together.

The level of choice available to consumers for the location of burial is unclear. Certainly the Company initially decided which graves were to be used for this type of burial. Once a grave was opened it would be used for Second Class interments until the Company decided it should be closed. Since the Second Class graves in the data sample are all located in on a single row in Section C (C/01/01 – C/01/16), it is unlikely that the consumer could choose a particular section in the cemetery. H. Murray (1991) has noted that customers could be buried in Second Class graves in both the consecrated and unconsercrated halves of the cemetery. In the nonconformist areas of the cemetery, burial with members of different religious groups was also inevitable. However, the degree to which a choice between consecrated and unconsecrated ground was always available may be called into question. One Second Class stone found in the unconsecrated half of the cemetery contained burials that were presided over by entirely Anglican clergy (C/01/04), and at least 55 other individuals recorded on other Section C Row One stones were also buried with Church of England services. Further evidence shows that the deceased could be buried by a minister of their own denomination. For

example, other burials on Section C Row One were presided over by Roman Catholic, Baptist, Presbyterian and Wesleyan ministers.

The final reason that Second Class stones are unique in the data set is because they are the only example of commemoration that is stated to be the directed result of a producer responding to consumer demand. The minutes of the York Cemetery Company's 11th AGM state that the introduction of Second Class stones was 'In consequence of enquiries by persons who have wished to bury relatives in the Cemetery and have not required a whole grave or vault, and at the same time did not wish to avail themselves of the ordinary public graves' (*YCA*, Acc. 247/155/2). Two types of Second Class burials were introduced in 1848 (*ibid.*). The first option cost £1/5/- and included burial in a grave with a maximum of six other bodies and commemoration on a marble slab. The second type, which is not found within the data sample, cost £4/4/- and included interment in a vault with a maximum of five bodies and commemoration on a marble slab. These prices were highly competitive in comparison to the minimum cost of burial in private grave (c.£4/10/-) or vault (c.£9/-/-), but reflect a significant increase in investment from the maximum cost of burial in a public grave (10/6d).

Three pieces of evidence show that the introduction of Second Class graves was not successful with consumers, and this evidence in fact directly challenges the Cemetery Company's statement of intent. Firstly, the actual number of burials in Second Class graves was far below the numbers of burials taking place in either private or public graves. For example, in 1852 four people were buried in Second Class graves. In the same year 453 were buried in public graves and 110 individuals were interred in private plots. Twenty-five years later, only eleven people were buried in Second Class graves, in contrast to the 372 buried in private graves and 829 persons buried in public plots (*YCA*, Acc. 247/155). Secondly, at some point between 1848 and 1888, the Cemetery Company stopped using marble for Second Class stones. Indeed all of the Second Class stones sampled were made of sandstone, a much cheaper

alternative. During the 1890s, the Company also sold several partially filled Second Class graves at a reduced price as private graves (Murray 1991, 25). Finally, although the Cemetery advertised the fact that Second Class graves were to hold no more than six people, the Burial registers show that between one and six further bodies were placed in each of the sample Second Class graves but not recorded on the stones above.

In summary, the consumer behaviour associated with the purchase of Second Class gravestones reveals little evidence of a producer - consumer dynamic. In fact, in contrast to pre-fabricated or individually commissioned memorials, the decision to commemorate an individual upon a Second Class stone not only meant a restricted set of options over the design, inscription and location of a stone, but also a more limited opportunity to express an affiliation to a social or family group. It is not possible to state conclusively the reasons why Second Class burial proved unpopular with consumers. It may be important that consumers were unable to pick a design that appropriately expressed the deceased as an individual or the uniqueness of the personal relationship between the bereaved and the dead. As will be demonstrated in the following sections, all other memorial types are characterised by an extensive number of available designs. Certainly the least popular choices for burial in the cemetery, Catacomb and Second Class burials, both offered only one standard design of stone that was predetermined by the Cemetery Company. This is not to suggest that other contributory factors were not involved. For example, Second Class burials may have held some degree of social stigma, and distaste for *intra-mural* burial or a lack of visibility in the burial landscape may have shaped attitudes towards catacomb burial. It is further notable that a key characteristic of commemoration at York, the ability to be buried with one's family, was also constrained by Second Class stones. In contrast to the design constraints of Second Class stones, the following section will explore the myriad designs that were achieved with the production of pre-fabricated stones.

5.4.3 Pre-fabricated Memorials

Production background

The term 'pre-fabricated' memorials (including 'templates' and 'blanks') refers to stones that were in some way pre-worked before being selected by the consumers. Included in this category are stones purchased in bulk by the mason from a quarry or from a stone merchant which formed the basis of the mason's stock-in-trade. Pre-fabrication has a longstanding history and is not unique to the Victorian period (F. Burgess 1963, 115). There is little evidence in the existing volumes that pattern books were used to sell blank headstones (Appendix 11). Whilst it is possible that such books have not survived, there would have been little necessity to use drawings to demonstrate simple architectural shapes. Instead, available choices could be easily shown in a mason's workshop through the use of the blanks (1852 Advertisement for the Sheffield General Cemetery, *Directory of Sheffield*, William White, Sheffield). The purchase of pre-fabricated headstones represents the second level of investment in commemoration at York Cemetery (Figure 18).

The preceding section has demonstrated that virtually all of the masons with signed work in the cemetery were producing stones in template forms. The forms were identified in Chapter Four as prefabricated shapes that could be easily modified to produce both new profile shapes and differently decorated memorial designs. Although incomplete, available documentary evidence indicates that this type of stone would form only one part of most masons' repertoire (Table 35). The number of masons active in the cemetery (as evident by signed work) does not directly correspond to the number of different permutations of template designs. Whilst there are problems calculating this definitively, given the large proportion of stones that are unsigned in the cemetery, this lack of correlation can be stated most confidently for the latter half of the nineteenth century. During the second half of the sample chronology there is a trend of increasing diversity amongst template designs (Charts 56-58)

yet at this point in time the numbers of active masons begin to decrease (Chart 51).

Even from only a sample of stonemason signatures, Tables 27 and 28 show that the skill and knowledge of the techniques needed to accomplish this extensive range of designs cannot be ascribed to individual producers. The fact that this knowledge of profile shapes and design variables was shared is evident within both the diversity and similarity of headstone appearance. Different masons often used common techniques in distinctive ways (for example, chamfered edging), as well as applying these techniques to the same effect (for example, stones with panel type 1 and bay leaf carved borders). This shared knowledge is apparent for both headstones with profile shapes with higher reproduction rates (such as SC1 and L1) as well as with profiles of lower reproduction rates (such as L15 and SH7). The fact that a common range of techniques and design variables were employed by a number of masons suggests that the cemetery landscape itself acted as a self-referential context for memorial design. Thus the cemetery had audiences associated with both production and purchase.

Returning to the issue of investment, the lack of surviving documentary evidence makes it difficult to measure precisely the cost of any specific memorial purchase. Whilst three price lists and several cash books survive for the York Cemetery Company, these do not provide details on specific costs. For example, while the Cemetery Company provided headstones costing between £1/18s and £10/- depending on the date of purchase, the actual designs of these stones are unknown. Differences in price could reflect the extent of surface embellishment but they may equally be determined by size or material. Comparing the cost of different designs is further complicated by the large number of variations that exist. A general comparison can, however, take place using the scales of complexity developed for each aspect of design (profile shape, material, panels, edge types and decoration) as set out in Chapter Four (Tables 36 & 37).

There are two factors that are important to a study of pre-fabricated stones. The first is the level at which stones were worked when supplied to the producer and the second is the extent to which designs were pre-determined by the producer before being offered to the consumer. Unfortunately there is little evidence for York on the extent of prefabrication that took place after stone was initially quarried but before it was supplied to the mason. The York Cemetery Company's business records, for example, show that headstones and ledgers were bought as blanks over the entire sample chronology (*YCA*, Acc.107/1-36). However these entries do not indicate what level of profile shaping, or indeed more detailed work, had already taken place. The second factor, the extent to which a producer may have worked a stone prior to purchase, may however be investigated. As a result it is possible to test Chapter Four's hypothesis that a distinction can be drawn between the designs of headstones initially offered by the producer and designs chosen by the consumer.

Summary of Variation and Standardisation Within Pre-fabricated Memorial Design

The most frequently reproduced template style profiles in the headstone data set are P6, P8, P10, SC1 and L1 and these represent 77% of all stones that are below Level Three in complexity. Other options were available to consumers that involved similar levels of investment. These included forms that could be achieved by means of simple reduction from the aforementioned profiles (eg SC2, L2, and P2) or selecting a stone of an entirely different gene l shape, such those found in the groups of 'scroll', 'triangular' or 'geometric and other'. The former choice represents seven percent of all headstones below Level Three in complexity and latter represents 16%. Since an understanding of form is required for both these types of changes it is most likely that these options were pre-determined by the producers, rather than consumers. Although these choices show one means by which design variation in the data sample was achieved,

they do not account for either the majority of stones erected in the cemetery (23% of the total) or the majority of end designs (28% of a total number of 309 designs). Therefore, this discussion will concentrate on the diversity shown between the designs of stones created from the five most common profile shapes, each of which will be discussed in turn.

Charts 52 to 54 show that the variations between headstones can generally be grouped on the basis of reproduction rates for each of the five most frequently reproduced profiles. Chart 52 clearly shows that each of the three PHSMF profiles has one combination of decoration and form, suggesting a standardised design the mason initially offered to the consumer. Alternative designs, form between 6 -24% of the P6, P8 and P10 profile data sets, are more likely to be the result of a consumer - producer dynamic. Appendix 8 shows that modifications from standard designs could feature either an increased decoration (for example, through the addition of a border on P10 profiles or by using a decorative motif on P6, P8 and P10 stones) or a reduction in embellishment, for example, the exclusion of a border on P6 and P8 stones. Any design modification would require a corresponding increase or decrease in resources needed both by the producer to make the stones and by the customer to purchase them. The clearest example of choices resulting from a consumer-producer dynamic can be seen with the inclusion of a cross motif. As will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.5.2, the cross has particular religious and political associations, and it is significant that it was only infrequently used across all profiles. It is extremely unlikely that a producer would have emplo ed cross iconography unless a mason was assured of a market (in this case to Catholics). Cross decoration is therefore highly likely to have been a consumer-selected variable.

The stylistic sequence associated with the PHSMF profiles is structured by shape and to a lesser degree by surface embellishment. Each of the profiles has a different shaped moulding, (P10 scroll, P8 cyma recta and P6 cavetto). P10 stones are usually plain, whilst P6 and P8 stones have the most simple style of surface decoration, a 'line all' linear

border. Most of the design variables identified in Chapter Four are not used in conjunction with P6, P8 or P10 profiles, which suggests that in this instance production controls limited the choices available to the consumer. For example, only square edges are used for these profiles and no stones are found with elaborate borders, banner decoration or panels. In the case of P10 headstones no design variables were produced in significant numbers on any of the memorials in the cemetery. However, by the time P8 stones were popular, different styles of edges and banners were becoming more widely available yet these attributes still do not feature on PHSMF standard template designs. During the first part of the sample chronology a larger proportion of template headstones was erected in the cemetery (Chart 53). Since diversity was able to be achieved through variations of form it is possible that this influenced the extent of decorative variation between P10, P8 and P6 stones.

A much more complex picture is presented by diversity between designs on SC1 headstones, the template shape that chronologically follows the PHSMF profiles (Chart 53). Whereas the139 P6, P8 and P10 stones included a total of 14 different designs (1 design to 9.9 stones), the 530 SC1 stones include a total of 158 different designs (1 design to 3.4 stones – see Appendix 8). The SC1 stones in fact are a more representative microcosm of the headstone sample as a whole. Chart 53 shows that six designs have significant reproduction rates in the data set. One design, square edge with cartouche banner, is the predominant type, comprising almost one third of the sample. The remaining five designs comprise approximately one third of the data set and are variously represented by between 22 and 64 stones. The level of reproduction of these six groups strongly suggests that they were standardised designs offered by the producer to the consumer. However, the remaining 152 designs in the 'Other' category also represent approximately one third of the total data set.

The designs found in the 'Other' category were achieved in three main ways. Firstly, by adding further decoration to any of the four most

common designs which already have banner or border decoration. Secondly, by modifying one of the design variables within a specific category, for example, adding decoration to either of the two plain designs, or using a more elaborate edge type in conjunction with a 'line all' border. At this point the grouping of designs becomes far more complex. Firstly, design alterations could be created from one of several main designs. For example, a stone with a bevelled edge and a decorative motif may represent either an addition to a plain bevelled edged stone or modification to a bevelled edge stone with a cartouche banner (whereby the banner is replaced by a motif). Additionally, modifications may use styles of edges and decoration not found within the main design groupings. For example, in addition to square and bevelled edges, there are nine further styles of edges found on SC1 stones (Appendix 8). There are ten further styles in addition to 'line all' borders and eight other banner styles in addition to 'cartouche' and 'cartouche inscribed'. Within these complex interactions, the third and final group of 'Other' category memorial is designs including a combination of edge types, panels and decoration achieved by amending more than one component in any of the six main designs. As a result of these inherent complexities, it is much easier to use the first type of 'Other' stones than the next two when attempting to distinguish between stones that result from a producer-consumer relationship and those that were largely pre-determined by the mason.

Appendix 8 shows that in a small number of cases less frequently reproduced designs from the 'Other' category used design variants in fixed combinations. On occasion modifications were made to these designs suggesting that, although the combinations were pre-set by the producer, they could also be adapted at the request of the purchaser. Thus the producer-consumer dynamic may potentially moderate both those producer-determined designs that were made in large numbers and those that occur on a far more restricted scale. It is significant that the pre-determined designs that occur only in small numbers employ more complex design variables in features such as panels and edge types. As

with PHSMF stones, it is more likely that consumers chose to negotiate embellishment to offered designs in the form of decoration. This does not mean that more structural and detailed aspects of designs were not appreciated by the consumer. Any design changes could either increase or decrease the resources needed to make and purchase a stone. Indeed panels and moulded edges were more costly than many other design options (Chapter 4). Furthermore if it was important to a consumer that their purchase should be distinct in some way to other designs, then fine details of design would be of concern. It is most probable however that a customer would rely more upon guidance from a producer when choosing edge type and panels, than decoration.

Although the SC1 data set is not characterised by a rigid organisation of designs (in fact Appendix 8 illustrates the complete opposite) producer control can be seen within the organisation of designs in one more important manner: not all of the standard designs were available at the same time. There was a general chronological order for when designs were first introduced. The sequence begins with square edge stones that are either plain or have 'line all' borders, followed by square edge stone with cartouche banners, then by bevelled edged stones (both plain and with cartouche banners) and concludes with stones with a square edge cartouche inscribed banner. However, once a design combination, or style of decoration had been introduced they remained part of the set of options available to consumers.

Chart 54 shows that an internal structure for L1 stones is more complex to determine than SC1 stones. In contrast to the six SC1 designs, the L1 data set can only be divided into three standard designs with significant reproduction rates. Furthermore, where the SC1 standard designs are introduced in four phases (Chart 53), only one L1 design is introduced at a later stage to the others (Chart 54). The conditions within which it is possible to determine direct evidence of a consumer-producer dialogue raised in relation to SC1 stones remain true to a study of L1 stones. Judging how the L1 data group may reflect a consumer-

producer dynamic is more difficult to quantify than SC1 stones because from a total of 49 designs just over half are reproduced less than seven times and many occur just once in the sample (Appendix 8). As a result 57 stones, from a total of 95, fall within the category of 'other' designs. Notwithstanding the complexity of this data set, it can still be shown that there were instances where a producer-consumer dynamic was responsible for modifications to designs initially offered by the producer. These include the addition of a carved cross to plain square edge stone or the addition of I.H.S. decoration upon a stone with panel style 2.5 (Appendix 8). Interestingly, several of the 'fixed designs' used on SC1 headstones also occur on L1 stones (for example, stones with nailhead hood and moulded chamfered edges with line hood borders, and headstones with the panel type 3.5, rolled edges and elaborate 11 style borders), showing that some design compositions could cross profile groups.

A chronological analysis of SC1 and L1 stones can not fully determine the number of designs that resulted from a consumer-producer dynamic, but it does reveal a significant shift in consumer behaviour from the purchase of P10, P6, and P8 stones. Chart 56 shows that prior to 1866, there were between three and five different designs produced in each five year period including the standard P6, P8 or P10 designs. In contrast the advent of SC1 stones brought a notable increase in the number of designs available for customers to choose from (Chart 57). During the period when SC1 stones were most popular (1862 -1891) between 11and 24 different designs were available for selection. The L1 data set, which is comparable in numbers to the PHSMF subset, shows that this trend of increasing diversity continued. Chart 58 shows that a smaller ratio of L1 stones in standard designs were being reproduced in high numbers and that a larger proportion of the data set was executed in alternative designs. Thus, a steady increase in variation takes place over time, from the relatively rigid PHSMF options to the highly varied L1 options, with SC1 representing a middle stage. Together Charts 56 -58

show that whilst producers limited the number of standard designs in the initial part of the chronology, by the end of the century the market is defined by extensive sets of options available to consumers.

Discussion

The case study of prefabricated memorials has clearly shown that the diversity in memorial design increased over time and that a range of available designs existed for all but the most restricted budget (Table 36 & 37, Figure 18). The study has also shown that this diversity was structured through a relatively small number of design elements but that these were used in an extensive array of combinations. Analysis has also evaluated the evidence for Chapter Four's hypothesis that a distinction can be made between the producers' 'offered designs' and the appearance of headstones in the cemetery as 'chosen designs'. Within this hypothesis the consumer was able to select certain headstone shapes 'off the peg' and adapt their appearance using a series of 'pick and mix' design variables. Analysis has shown that whilst this pattern of behaviour can be shown, it is not possible in every instance to determine if designs were produced by a dynamic between the producer and consumer or predetermined by the producer alone. On the one hand, broad structures were imposed upon consumer choice through the standard pre-worked options offered by the producer. Yet on the other hand, the extent of variability demonstrates that there was no pre-set uniformity. Undoubtedly some variation was likely to be chosen by the producer as experimental design - to test the market t see what would be popular. Ultimately the material evidence offers no neatly boxed divisions or simple categories with which to distinguish the respective input of the consumer and the producer. There are several factors, however, that implicitly suggest both that a consumer-producer dialogue existed within template production and that design diversity could conveniently be produced as a dynamic between the two parties.

The blank headstones on view in a mason's workshop would be constrained by both the limits of available space and the amount of resources that would be tied up in having a large quantity of pre-fabricated stock. However, a demonstration of a range of available skills - rather than the extent of end designs - could still be achieved using a small number of stones. For example, it is unlikely that the stones studied were all entirely pre-worked, since this would require a prohibitively large investment of resources by the stonemason. It is far more probable that some of this variation was specifically made to order, and that some consumers took an active role in shaping end memorial designs. The 'pick and mix' system based upon pre-fabrication would be the most efficient technique of production. Under this theory, elements of design, such as superficial surface treatment (such as linear borders) may be easily added to profiles which are already made. Similarly, the expenditure of resources with cost-heavy decoration (such as mouldings and carvings) without a definite market could be avoided if simply added to pre-cut headstone forms when required.

A dialogue between the consumer and mason can also be seen in circumstances which did not result in the modification of a pre-determined design. Chapter Four has already noted that the size of cartouche banners depended on the length of an inscription's introductory term (Appendix 2 sets out the range of phrases used as introductions in the Pilot Survey). SC1 profile stones with cartouche banners represent nearly 50% of the total profile subset. If banners were not carved on demand, a significant range of sizes would need to be pre-cut to accommodate the range of consumers' inscription choices.

At a more general level of interpretation, it is possible to argue that a shift in the emphasis of designs provided an increased opportunity for consumers to enter into a dialogue with the mason. The stonemason had a knowledge and understanding of gravestone form, and worked within an underlying structural grammar. By contrast, it is probable that a consumer's appreciation of memorial design was more superficial, typically

free of technical expertise or experience. At the beginning of the sample chronology, memorial design was more closely focused upon structure rather than surface decoration. Chapter Four demonstrated that the stylistic sequence of PHSMF designs was based upon the adoption of different moulding styles (Chart 20, Drawing 2). PHSMF headstones, in contrast to SC1 and L1 profiles, are not simple architectural shapes (such as a semi-circular or lancet arch) but reflect an architectural composition through their pedimented head form. With the advent of SC1 and L1 headstones, a new design emphasis was placed upon the decoration of headstone shapes which did not adhere to an architectural grammar of form. In this way knowledge about memorial designs could be more easily imparted to the consumer by their own viewer response to more familiar, and less specialised architectural, adornments. As a consequence of the shift away from a pre-acquired specialist knowledge, an increased opportunity existed for the consumer to understand gravestone design. As a result, consumers could enter into a more informed dialogue with the producer and potentially play a more active role within the creation of memorial designs.

5.4.4 Individual Commissions

Introduction to the Production Background

The analysis in this section considers individually-commissioned memorials. The stones included in this category represent several levels of investment and cover many different types of memorial, including monument types such as t mbs, free-standing crosses and obelisks and more complicated headstone forms such as cross-style headstones and complexity Level Three and Four profile shapes (Drawing 15). The available documentary sources suggest that the main way of presenting these designs to the customer was through pattern books.

Although it has been argued that pattern books had a crucial impact on memorial design (e.g. F. Burgess 1963, Cannon 1968, Pickles 1993), only two studies of individual pattern books have been completed

280

(McDowell 1989; Procyk 1995). The two surviving memorial pattern books relating to nineteenth-century York are those of William Plows, a local York-based stonemason, and the York Cemetery Company, compiled by William Ruddock. A complete discussion of these pattern books may be found in Appendix 11, and a summary of relevant analysis is set out later in this section to show their role within memorial selection and the consumer-producer relationship.

One complication in an analysis of individual commissions is that there is little surviving information on the price of these memorials. For example, the Cemetery Company Cash Books do not systematically permit the correlation of a payee with a specific product identifiable in the cemetery. Furthermore, the two pattern books included in this study do not regularly include costs. Indeed, Plows' volume has only one priced design (an elaborate headstone that cost £14) and prices in the Cemetery Company pattern book appear in an alphabetical code that resists deciphering. Very basic costs extracted from several masons' account books and a price list from Kelkes' 1851 *Churchyard Manual* are set out in Burgess' 1963 study of *English Churchyard Memorials.* This data permits a general investment structure to be discerned, but variation within group types has to be compared on an approximate basis through size, material, and level of elaboration in both structure and decoration (Figure 18).

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Cemetery Company Cash Book lists the producer's expenditure for specific materials. While this still does not permit the specific pricing of stones, it does provide important data on individual monument supply. For example, it becomes apparent that while the Company produced its own elaborate headstones and monuments, they also purchased several granite and marble memorials. Yet as granite and marble were additionally purchased as raw materials the Cemetery Company acted both as a middleman for another producer as well as producing their own specialised memorials (*YCA*, Acc.107/30-36). This evidence is valuable in showing the complexities of investigating different modes of production. In the

cemetery it is not possible to distinguish between stones purchased as completed memorials by the Company and those made by the York Cemetery stone yard.

A summary of Design Standardisation and Variation Within Individually Commissioned Memorials

This section will consider the appearance of memorials that could not be studied typologically because they occur in insufficient numbers. This includes cross-style headstones and eleven different categories of monuments: head and kerb, rustic block, pedestal tomb, low tomb, sculptured scroll, flat monument, obelisk, free-standing cross, 'other' tomb, ledger stone and altar tomb. Chart 40 shows that the number of stones contained within each of these categories varies. Given the small number of stones involved, a study of the relationships between the different designs of a particular memorial type cannot be completed in as much detail as for pre-fabricated memorials. Nonetheless, some analysis is possible for the more common monuments in this category (altar tombs, pedestal tombs, low tombs, obelisks and free-standing crosses). Unlike prefabricated stones, it is possible to study the designs of the individually commissioned memorials in this section in conjunction with documentary sources and to explore the extent of design choices and the consumer-producer relationship in more detail. This section will therefore first examine each class of memorial separately and compare the findings, before moving on to consider the documentary evidence of pattern books.

Chronologically, on of the first monument types encountered in the memorial sample is altar tombs (Chart 59). A total of 12 altar tomb designs were recorded, represented on the ground by 18 stones. Plates 15 to 18 illustrate the general range of designs. Four designs of tombs, which each occur once, are particularly distinctive because of their extensive surface carving (Plate 16). Other tombs are less highly decorated, but are more elaborate in structure (Plate 15). There are three designs fitting this description in the sample, each of which only occur

once. The most common general style for designs features a rectangular base with panel detailing (Plates 17 & 18). Two designs in this category, from a total of five, are reproduced more than once. One of these designs appears on three stones, two of which are signed by Skelton. Whilst two of these stones are identical in appearance, the third has been embellished with a family-specific heraldic carving (Plate 17), clearly indicating design modification through the producer-consumer dynamic.

There is no evidence that altar tombs were offered to the consumer in a range of sizes. With one limestone exception, all of the tombs are made from sandstone (Plate 15). Although different materials were occasionally employed for panels it does not seem that material type played a major role in the design options available to, or chosen by, consumers. Any difference in the costs between different altar tomb designs is therefore largely dependant on the level of carved detail featured on the surface of the stone. However, even the plainest tomb would fall within the highest level of investment, as defined in Figure 18.

In total, three of the altar stones have been signed, all by Skelton, and these designs fall into each of the three general groups previously described. The York Cemetery Company's pattern books shows that the Company were responsible for executing three altar tomb designs. Atkinson and Fisher also have signed altar tombs in the cemetery, but these are not included in the memorial sample.

Pedestal tombs were produced during the same general period as altar tombs (Chart 60). A total of 11 pedestal tombs were sampled, each with a unique design. Indeed, the designs on this type of monument vary so much that they resist simple grouping (Plate 19). They differ through the inclusion or exclusion of a surmounting feature (such as an urn, obelisk or cross) as well as in their structural shape. The predominant material type used is sandstone (eight stones), which can be ornamented with grey granite or marble panels. However, since single examples of tombs made from limestone, marble and from iron and sandstone exist, material type appears to form one of the range of design choices available

to, or chosen by, the consumer. The stones are executed in a variety of sizes and with differing degrees of surface embellishment. Therefore, whilst they fall within the same general investment category, the cost of individual pedestal tombs would have varied greatly. There are two signed stones in the sample, one by the York-based mason Atkinson and one by Stake, based in Bradford. The York Cemetery Company's pattern books shows that the Company was responsible for executing one further pedestal tomb in the sample. There are two pedestal tombs in the cemetery, not included in the sample, signed by Keswick and Atkinson.

Low tombs were introduced slightly later than altar and pedestal tombs, but they were available over a far longer period of the sample chronology (Chart 61). In total, 29 stones were sampled and these occur in 15 different designs (plates 20 & 21). On a very basic level, this group can be divided into plain tombs (one design reproduced 14 times) and tombs with crosses (eight designs on a total of nine stones). The plain tombs are produced in a range of materials including sandstone (five stones), granite (six stones), marble (three stones), and sandstone with marble panels (one stone). There is limited variation in the sizes of stones, which may or may not be on a pedestal. A small number of designs are distinctive due to the inclusion of moulded features, but none of the stones feature carved decoration. In contrast, all but one of the stones with crosses feature carved decoration, the exception being a cruciform-shaped design. The presence of carving immediately increases the number of available designs, and only two of these stones are exactly the same. As with pedestal tombs, the price of low tombs would have varied greatly depending on the level of decoration and material type. Most low tombs would have fallen within the second highest investment category (Figure 18). However, the most elaborate designs, such as the stone with a surmounting cross (V/ 13/02, Plate 20), would fall within the highest level of investment. There are signed stones in the sample, two by Fisher, one by Milburn and one by Atkinson. The York Cemetery Company's pattern books shows that the Company were responsible for executing

two further tomb designs. Several other masons have signed low tombs in areas of the cemetery that were not sampled, including Skelton, JH Plows and Brumby.

The next style of monument to be introduced in the cemetery was the obelisk (Chart 62). There are 11 designs of obelisk in the sample, and these occur on 13 stones. Obelisks are made from sandstone (seven stones), granite (five stones) or marble (one stone). They also vary significantly in size from the extremely large obelisks that tower over all other memorials to three examples which are essentially the same size as headstones (Plate 22). One design is reproduced three times in the data sample, but in each instance the end appearance of the memorials differs due to size, material type or further decoration (*ibid.*). Several of the stones feature decoration, which occurs as either attached carvings (three stones) or incised linear borders (two stones). Obelisks feature the largest set of design variables available to consumers making a selection within one specific monument type. As a result, the purchase of an obelisk form could be made across several different investment categories. Only one obelisk in the sample is signed (Benzie, Aberdeen) but in the cemetery as a whole several other obelisks are known to have been produced by Bailey, Beall, Cole, Fisher, Grange, Hebdon and Legge.

Free-standing crosses were the final monument type introduced within the sample chronology (Chart 63). A total of 38 crosses were sampled. The headstone crosses fall into two design groups. The first group is composed of one design, a roman cross on a stepped square pedestal made up of two or three blocks, and is represented on the ground by 26 stones (Plate 23). The remaining 12 designs, each reproduced only once in the sample, are composed of stones that have different styles of pedestals, cross bases or cross forms (Plates 23 & 24). The materials used for free-standing crosses are marble (20 stones), sandstone (11 stones), and granite (seven stones). Free-standing crosses are therefore unusual because they are predominantly made from more expensive types of stone. This type is produced in a range of sizes and seven stones

appear in a miniature form. On eight occasions crosses are also embellished by decorative motifs such as I.H.S. or wreath carvings. Free-standing crosses are unusual in comparison to most other monument forms (obelisks to a certain extent excepted) since they spanned several investment bands. There are signed crosses in the sample by Milburn, Atkinson and Cole. Several other masons have signed stones in the cemetery that were not sampled, including Skelton, JH Plows, Hall, Dobson and Thompson.

Charts 59 to 63 reveal that monuments, as with headstones, follow a sequence of fashions whereby monument types are available within specific periods of time. As noted in the discussion of prefabricated headstones, it is more likely that fashions in form were producer-led (though not producer-determined). Consumers were able to select from a range of designs within particular memorial types. However, the actual number of monument categories was limited at any one point in the sample chronology to between one to three types. It is notable that over the sample chronology, the investment level needed to purchase a monument decreases. For example all altar tombs and pedestal tombs, the earliest types, fall within the highest price bracket. With the introduction of free-standing crosses (and to a lesser degree obelisks) the purchase of a monument - albeit in a most basic design – can be made at a much lower level of investment. An increase in consumer choice with mid-range investment on the basis of memorial types can also be seen in headstones forms, just as the frequency of designs of more complex headstone forms and cross style headstones also increases over time (Charts, 23, 24 & 64).

There is little evidence of stylistic diffusion between the different types of individually commissioned memorials and those produced through a system of prefabrication. More expensive material types are used within all modes of production in approximately the same frequency and during the same time frames. None of the decorative motifs reproduced more than once on template stones are found on individually produced stones. In

fact there are only two significant examples of design variable used in template production which are found on individually commissioned headstones. In each instance stones were produced at a similar time and the variable in question appears on more template stones (Appendix 8 banner style 'Ribbon1' and banner style '2Wrp'). However, it is difficult to gauge the full extent of options that were available to purchasers of individually commissioned memorials, since the cemetery reflects only selected designs. This question may be further examined through the pattern books produced by William Ruddock for the York Cemetery Company and the York based mason William Plows.

Summary of Comparative Analysis between the memorial sample and the memorial designs of the pattern books compiled by William Ruddock for the York Cemetery Company and William Plows

Several significant issues were raised through comparison of the two pattern books to memorials in the cemetery (Appendix 11). Most notably the case study demonstrated that the selection of individually commissioned memorials was characterised by both an extensive choice of possible designs and an ability to modify these designs through a consumer-producer dynamic. A study of the organisation of the pattern book designs showed how the producer was able to create a dialogue between himself and the consumer. On a more general level, the study of the Plows' volume brought to attention many of the complex issues that are involved in studying commemoration as a social practice. In particular, the presence of stones carved in an entirely different design than those contained on paper posed questions of whether the nature of commemoration may be less permanent and more multi-staged than is evident from the archaeological record alone (Appendix 11). The pattern books also offered a means of ascribing a small number of memorials to two masons that was impossible from the material evidence alone. This section will consider these points in more detail by first discussing the

relationship between the designs of memorials on the page and those actually erected in the cemetery. It will conclude with a summary of the role of pattern books within a producer and consumer dynamic.

Both the Cemetery Company and Plows' pattern book feature only a fraction of the designs actually erected in the cemetery. From approximately 202 designs in Plows' pattern book, only eleven memorials were erected in York Cemetery. A similar lack of correlation occurs for those designs in the Cemetery Company's pattern book (Charts 65 & 66); of the more than 200 designs in the latter pattern book, documentary evidence suggests that only 26 were erected in the cemetery, and only 13 were found in the memorial sample. While casual observation showed that a number of further designs had been erected outside the survey area, there is little evidence that the extent of un-sampled stones in pattern book designs would dramatically increase the level of correlation between the documentary and material records. Both books represent only a partial sample of the total number of more elaborate designs offered by the two companies, since neither covers the full period of their business. Moreover, these pattern books represent only two from the large number of the stonemasons who supplied memorials to the cemetery (Section 5.2) and each of these businesses would have compiled similar volumes. Thus the pattern books studied represent only a fraction of the total number of available designs of individually commissioned stones. This choice becomes even more diverse when it is remembered that nationally printed pattern volumes also existed. Thus to a large degree, pattern books can be characterised s reflecting aspirations, rather than directly mirroring consumer choices.

Analysis of the York Cemetery Company's pattern book clearly demonstrates that changes could take place between the designs shown in the pattern book and their translation into material form. All of the numbered designs in the subsequent discussion refer to designs in the York Cemetery Company. Comparative analysis has been able to distinguish between changes that were not necessarily due to a consumer

dynamic, and those that were more likely to have involved the consumer. For example, subtle differences between stones of the same ostensible design were probably due to the differences in workmanship between individual masons (Figure 16.4, 10-11). Thus while the consumer-producer dynamic remains central to this thesis, some differences in appearance are determined by other factors such as different workmen's level of expertise or simply the quality or type of available material.

Several types of changes between the books and the memorial's final appearance could take place as the result of negotiation between the consumer and producer. Figures 16.1, 3-5 show that the two stones produced from design 90 are executed in different sizes and in this case only scale, not the composition of a design was moderated. Modifications could also change the extent of decoration. For example, one stone produced from design 151 (D/23/41) excluded the decorative border shown on the original design. Whereas the decoration on the stone (V/15/07) reproduced from design 81 (Figure 16.5, 13), was amended so that the cross base appears as a Calvary form and the cross head is no longer enclosed. A border has also been added around the periphery of the stone in order to hold the inscription text. Similar changes can be seen in the headstone (Y/19/06) produced from Design 37 (Figure 16.6, 14 - 15) and altar tomb design 85. The survey identified seven altar tombs that were precise reproductions of design 85 (Figure 16.9, 22-23) but other reproductions of this type also feature less panel detail than shown in the design, or do not include panels at all (Figure 16.9, 24). One further tomb in the style of design 85 is d'stinctive as it features a lid in a different design from the pattern book. Therefore the potential range of final appearances for tombs in this very simple design is more extensive that might be initially thought from the pattern book.

Some changes, such as those made to the coped tomb of design 73 (Figure 16.7, 16-17), are more complex. While the size of the tomb itself has not been changed, the single raised cross on the tomb lid in the pattern book has been doubled in size in material form. Embellishments to

this cross, such as the pleat effect between the arms and decoration at the coped cross ends, which are found on the ground, do not appear on the page. When the pattern book is examined closely, it becomes apparent that the base of design 73 has been combined with the lid from a different illustration, design 1 (Figure 16.7, 18, Plate 18). In conjunction with the tomb executed from Design 85 mentioned above, this example of modification further strengthens the hypothesis that certain design elements (in this case lids) may be used as 'pick and mix' variables within the creation of a chosen memorial design.

The information that accompanies designs in the books also occasionally notes that commissioned memorials included 'some trifling additions' which are not shown in the pattern book designs (e.g. Design 6). For example, a stone created from Design 7, not included in the memorial sample, included a chalice and bible decoration. Occasional notes also accompanied one or two of the designs in Plows' pattern book to show that modifications had been made to a memorial's final appearance.

The changes described in this analysis are highly likely to have been a response to requests from the consumer, since they reflect modifications to designs that are specifically documented as being originally offered by the producer. Since these designs were compiled by the masons themselves, it is unlikely that changes were caused by a lack of available technology or skills. Sometimes the impetus behind such changes can be more easily identified for some stones than for others. For example the changes of heraldic devices (V/09/04, Plate 17) and the accompanying clerical symbols for the Reverend Radcliffe (Design 7) have an element of personalisation. It is important to stress that without the pattern books, modifications to individually-commissioned memorials are largely unidentifiable. In rare instances, these changes can be identified in the material evidence if more than one stone was commissioned from the same design. Plates 17 and 22 show the addition of cross details, and changes in material type and size found on obelisks of the same design

and the addition of a heraldic carving on a design of altar tomb that also appears without decoration in the sample.

An investigation of the organisation of Plows' and the Cemetery Company pattern book reveals a number of strategies employed by the producer to market the memorials to the customer. Firstly, the pattern books follow no obvious structure or logical sequence: designs are not ordered by monument style, type, or price. As a result, the customer could not automatically locate the full range of designs for a particular monument type. To find each obelisk design, for example, customers would have to more or less view the entire pattern book or be guided by the stonemason. This is a system that benefits the producer, since it maximises the opportunities to show the full range of monument forms and variations in design to the customer.

The books occasionally noted where and to whom stones had been erected. By including this information, masons could select particular designs as 'testimonials' to show that work been had satisfactorily carried out. These designs could then be examined on the ground and the customer would be able to see the effect of the monument off the page. This lends support to the argument raised in Section 5.2.5 that the cemetery acted as a 'showroom' for masons' designs. If this is indeed the case it may help to explain why the majority of stones do not appear to have been signed. Consumers may have more easily located a stone in the cemetery if they were first familiar with its design on the page. The disclosure of information about previous purchasers may have also been intended to indicate the sort of people whom the masons felt other customers might wish to emulate. This may not necessarily have been specifically calculated to encourage the selection of a particular design (or indeed social aspirations), but rather to suggest through its clientele that the company was a reputable business.

As previously noted, the Cemetery Company's pattern book lists costs in an alphabetical code (Figure 15, 2). As a result the producer presents enough information to allow the customer to consider what

products were available, but by withholding the price the consumer could not be sure that they could afford them. The ability and desire to meet the cost of a particular memorial would have become the final consideration to the customer once other preferences had been expressed. If price was a consideration to the purchaser, then the choice of monument would have been made by negotiation with the stonemason. Thus here an opportunity was created which permitted a dialogue where individual needs could be expressed and negotiated between the purchaser and producer.

This study of locally-produced pattern books shows that an important distinction can be drawn between the process of consumer choice as demonstrated by printed pattern books and catalogues. Victorian catalogues typically show a range of products on offer, which are ordered as seen (e.g. Bosomworth 1991). In contrast, pattern books display a range of skills and technologies, and offer initial designs which may be adapted to chosen specifications. This does not mean that modification could not occasionally take place to the objects offered by catalogues, but changes had to take place within clearly defined and pre-set options. For example, Rotundo (1989) has shown that zinc-cast memorials produced in America from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries (and purchased through catalogues) could feature some degree of personalisation through the inclusion of fraternity emblems and portraits. However, the producer and mode of production ultimately determined the final appearance of these monuments, since the consumer could not see the work in progress nor directly discuss the finer details of design face to face with the producer.

An important distinction can also be made concerning the consumer and producer relations engendered by hand-produced pattern books, such as the Plows and York Cemetery Company books, and printed volumes (for example, Geary 1840; Clarkson 1852; Borrowdale 1881; Gawthorpe 1881). Hand-produced volumes were specifically constructed for, and indeed actively interacted within, a direct consumer and producer dialogue. Printed volumes, on the other hand, could only be

used as a starting point for a consumer-producer dialogue; this was not the primary impetus for their compilation, which was most likely to gain future commissions for the authors, at which point a direct dialogue could take place.

Whilst the compilation and use of printed and hand-compiled pattern books are distinct from each other, they nonetheless represent inter-linked, rather than separate, spheres of social discourse. It is evident that both Plows and Ruddock (author of the York Cemetery Volume) referred to printed material to compose their own volumes. Plows affixed a printed design for an urn, possibly from an ornamentation book, in his pattern book. Ruddock credits Design 52 to Tottie, author of the 1839 work *Designs for Sepulchral Monuments*. Ruddock's descriptions of designs as 'Gothic', Grecian' or 'Early English' is also evidence of some attempt to engage with national fashions in memorial designs and wider stylistic movements (Chapter Two, Section 2.3.1). Indeed, by simply acknowledging these fashions, the pattern book could have been used to illustrate that the Cemetery Company was *au courant* with current styles, which could have acted as a sales technique in itself.

A final point to be made concerning the links between hand drawn and printed pattern books is that, as a phenomenon, Victorian memorials were remarkably self-referential. Chapter Two has already discussed how the organisation of cemetery landscapes and business practices of established cemeteries were frequently adopted as precedents when new cemeteries were formed (Grundy 1846, *NCL*). The copying of designs from existing memorials can also be seen within this general practice. Procyk's 1995 study of a German printed pattern book shows how this volume was compiled by surveying existing memorials within cemeteries from several major European cities. Information about designs was not simply communicated by textual sources, but also by the material culture itself. This translation from one medium to another enabled an infinitely rich diversity within the large range of basic forms. The potential for a consumer and producer dialogue to create further modifications allowed

an even larger range of permutations for the final chosen headstone designs.

5.4.5 Discussion

The most important finding of this study is that the primary characteristics of consumer behaviour are visible in both pre-fabricated and individual commissions and span all but the most basic levels of investment. Both systems of production are characterised by masons providing an extensive array of possible options to consumers within a structured system of choice determined by the producers. It seems that it was important for all consumers to be able to make their final selection from a range of possible designs regardless of the level of their investment.

The study has also demonstrated that it is possible to draw a valid distinction between designs that the producer initially offered on the one hand and a memorial's end appearances as the result of a consumer-producer dynamic on the other. The opportunity for individual consumers to affect the end appearance of a memorial existed for both blank headstones and individually commissioned stones. Without further data, it is difficult to demonstrate the precise balance between designs predetermined by the producer and those that were the result of negotiation between the mason and the purchaser. One unknown factor, for example, is the level of guidance offered by the producer to the consumer. Furthermore, it is difficult to quantity the gap between the expectations of the producer and those of the consumer. Thus while it may well be that a final memor l design is mutually agreed, the dialogue may be weighted towards either the producer or consumer at different stages. For example, Chapter Four has shown that several stones appear to feature corrected 'mistakes' and in at least one case, the decoration was actually unfinished. Yet these stones were still erected, perhaps favouring the producer's position (whatever the basis thereof), rather than the consumer's expectations. Notwithstanding these difficulties in identifying the specifics of the consumer-producer relationship, the recognition that a

dynamic dialogue took place is an important departure from previous studies of Victorian funerary behaviour. Wider studies frequently portray consumers of funerary goods as largely exploited by producers (Laqueur 1983; 1993; Litten 1991; Pickles 1993, 10; Glasnevin Heritage Project 2000, 134). Furthermore, these issues do not detract from the fact that an ability to pick one design from at least several options was important regardless of how variation was balanced between a range pre-determined by the masons or as a dynamic achieved with the customer. In sum, consumer behaviour involved a shopping experience featuring similar options, even if this shared experience did not result in the same end products.

This is not to suggest that the distinction between the range of choices available to consumers making modest purchases and those able to invest much more substantial sums is unimportant. There was patently a wider range of options in the selection of a type of memorial and its material, size and decoration for those with greater resources. This is not simply because greater financial resources enabled the purchase of the most expensive types of monument, but also because these greater resources would have permitted the acquisition of the range of choices available at other levels. Thus in theory, the more resources that were invested, the greater opportunity to make a visual impact in the cemetery. This analysis has also shown that in the early period design variation options (as seen on PHSMF profiles) appear to have been relatively limited, but by the end of the sample chronology the memorial types representing the highest level of investment were no longer in production. Instead there was a greater range of levels of investment and modification options within memorial groups – for example free-standing crosses and within the various guises of headstones. Thus over time mid-level investors also gained a larger choice of monument types from which to select.

The question of diversity and similarity between producers' work has also been examined closely. Several producers completed the same

style of work. In this instance the importance of the Cemetery landscape itself must be considered. The Cemetery in fact acted as a self-referential context within which knowledge of prevailing memorial fashions could be both shared and displayed. The identically decorated stones in profile L15 (N/03/14 and P/11/09) shown on Drawing 6 (see Appendix 8), signed by different masons, demonstrate that the potential for shared designs and knowledge was not restricted to masons working for the York Cemetery Company. Thus on one level masons would have been aware of the work of their peers simply through seeing that work in the Cemetery. The same is true to a certain extent for consumers, who could have been made aware of the prevailing trends through visits to the Cemetery.

Standard fashions can only really be explained as production-led, but variation, in contrast, potentially represents a more active consumer – producer dynamic. It should be stressed that the standard fashions, most notably in shape, occur across a variety of material culture types. Both consumers and producers were also members of the broader social context of Victorian York, and thus would have known about fashion trends from other objects from everyday life.

As was discussed in Chapter Two, leading architectural forms of the period, such as arches and mouldings, correlate between both gravestones and buildings. The surface embellishments on headstones also recall wider fashions of ornamentation which again occurred across a variety of material and artefacts (e.g. Trendall 1833; Eastlake 1886; Dresser 1886). For example, the border styles found on gravestones recall decorative features found in domestic interiors and on bookplates and ceramics. Thus while standard fashions may have been producer-led, the fact that these fashions operated in a wider social arena means that they can not be considered as producer-devised. Since they did operate as part of general fashions, this in itself may contain an aspect of a consumer-producer dynamic in terms of purchasers' expectations within the context of gravestone design. In most cases, customers would have expected to find both that memorials were appropriate in terms of current

fashions and wider shopping practice. Indeed the appearance of the vast majority of consumer goods in this period showed an adherence to changing fashions, within which there was an extensive array of available designs for objects (Briggs 1988, Abelson 1989; Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992). For example Forty (2000, 62) describes just one such instance, whereby a single catalogue offered 131 differently decorated pocket knives, which were themselves just one type of product from a vast array of goods offered. In contrast to buying memorials, however, purchases from catalogues offered no opportunity to affect the end design.

The diversity of designs and forms of objects has long been recognised as the primary characteristic that defined artefact production and consumption during the nineteenth century (ibid.). There are three main positions that can be used to explain design diversity within Victorian artefacts (Chapter One, Section 1.3). The first sees the market as producer-led (e.g. Praetzellis et al 1988, 194; Litten 1991; Pickles 1993, 10; Glasnevin Heritage Project 2000, 134). In this scenario the producers' strategy is to generate the maximum amount of sales, and thus profit, by creating new needs. These new needs are served by both expanding the number of types of goods produced and the number of designs of these artefacts, with fashions dictating the period of an object's life-span. Thus it is argued that the variations of soaps produced by the company Lever were essentially the same fundamental product but were packaged and advertised to suggest that they were designed to serve different purposes (Forty 2000, 87). Such arguments do not readily apply to gravestones, since these were one-off purchases intended to be used for an enduring period of time without being replaced. In fact a producer-led model makes most sense within the context of competition between masons. The overall market for memorials could not be expanded by producers since they could neither increase the total number of consumers in the market place nor the number of products customers bought. Therefore by adhering to the prevailing memorial fashions and by offering a diversity of designs

producers could complete against one another to maximise their share of a finite market.

A second theory has argued that the diversity in modern goods was consumer-led. This position, which has been set out in detail in Chapter One, argues that fashions were driven by social emulation (e.g. Cannon 1986; L. Clark 1987; Little *et al* 1992; Wurst 1998). This theory is tested against the data at York in Section 5.5.1. Many researchers (Martin 1993; Miller 1995; McCants 1995; Tarlow 1999c), however, adhere to the third position, that diversity is the result of a consumer-producer dynamic. This study offers a contribution to wider debates on modern consumption because it is one of the few examples where theory has been applied to a specific case study to explore the nature of both the producer-consumer relationship and the product itself. The results of this study so far have shown that an explanation of design diversity within the production and purchase memorials reflects a producer-consumer dynamic. The final part of this Chapter will focus on explaining the diversity of memorial design within the specific historical and cultural context of York Cemetery.

5.5. Social Analysis Case Studies
5.5.0 Introduction to Social Analysis

The preceding sections have shown how material diversity could be created as a result of a consumer-producer dynamic. Analysis will now clarify whether this material variety had any social function within consumer behaviour. At this point, analysis moves away from the specific contexts of production and urchase to the cemetery landscape itself. The final case studies will examine the possible role of diversity in memorial designs within wider social interaction. Analysis will test if existing explanations of the social meanings behind material variation are sufficient to explain the design trends recovered by a more detailed level of study at York.

Most research that has addressed the role of gravestones in the communication of social affiliations has argued from one of two positions.

The first position has interpreted the selection of a memorial as a strategy to voice group identities. Using this perspective previous studies have considered the expression of religious (Ludwig 1966; Deetz 1977; Benes 1977; 1978; Mytum 1999, Wurst 1991), class (Cannon 1986; 1989; Tyson 1994), ethnic (L. Clark 1987) or national (Mytum 1993; 1994) affiliations as the overriding impetus for commemoration. In contrast, a second perspective has argued that commemoration was an opportunity to express personal relationships above group affiliations (Brown I.W. 1993; Poole 1994; 1997; Burrell 1996; Buckham 1998; Tarlow 1999c).

A similar division has been made by studies of consumption over the fundamental motivation for consumers to purchase goods. The first position contends that the motive behind the acquisition of objects is the desire to communicate information about the consumer's position within the social hierarchy (Veblen 1899, Simmel 1904, McKendrick, Brewer & Plumb 1982). In this sense goods are used as part of an ostentatious display. Social communication is 'other' directed, and objects are embedded with symbolic values that allow the viewer to recognise the consumer's membership of a particular social group. The social relationships primarily associated with this type of communication are class based. One particular recurrent pattern of behaviour is associated with 'social class and other' directed consumption. This perspective holds that the social elite will maintain their position and authority through restricting market access to the products that stand to symbolise their group identity (ibid.). Additionally, in order to enhance their own positions the middle classes will seek to emulate the behaviour of the elite through consumption, and they will in turn themselves be imitated by the lower classes. Finally, as a result of emulation the material symbols of status are subject to change so that social distinction can be maintained between the different classes.

A second explanation for the acquisition of goods views the primary motivation of consumers as the need to gain a sense of self-affirmation by consumption (Campbell 1987; 1995, Burrell 1996; Tarlow 1999c; Forty

2000). Goods are used to reinforce the uniqueness of an individual or family unit within a cultural group or within wider society itself. Individuality can be articulated in this manner in several ways. Firstly, the acquired object itself can be stylistically distinct by means of hand production. Yet the act of purchasing mass produced goods could also provide a system of choice whereby a customer could feel more confident about their own individuality. As Forty (2000) has argued:

> 'A masculine looking pocket knife might underline a purchaser's view of himself as manly, but as long as it was the only men's knife available it would do nothing to make him feel different from other men. What would do this would be the opportunity to choose from a range of knives or to have a particular design which he alone among his acquaintances might possess.' Forty 2000, 87

Another way through which individuality may be constructed is by an absence of communicated meaning to the viewer. Thus while the act of consumption may hold symbolic meaning to the consumer the goods in themselves do not function to convey this message to a viewer (Campbell 1995 111ff).

The primary motivations underlying consumer behaviour will be explored in this section in conjunction with four specific case studies. These will examine consumer choice in relation to profession, religious affiliation, children and individualism.

5.5.1 Memorial Design and Social Emulation

Introduction

The purpose of the final part of this thesis is to gain a firmer understanding of the consumers taking part in commemoration practice. This case study will assess whether social emulation can explain the diversity of memorial designs at York. While issues of class are complex, social emulation may be defined for this section as the practice of the lower strata of a social

hierarchy emulating the behaviour of the upper strata. The theory of social emulation as an impetus towards the purchase of specific goods has been challenged on several levels (see Chapter One, Section 1.2.5, McGuire 1988; Finch 1991; Tarlow 1999c), but this issue must still be considered in the context of York Cemetery since it has previously been used as the primary explanation for diversity within Victorian memorial designs by Cannon and L. Clark (Cannon 1986; 1989; L. Clark 1987). Furthermore, Cannon's work is indeed the primary case study of the relationship between memorial design and economic groups in Victorian England. Before reviewing whether the conditions denoting social emulation set out by Cannon and L. Clark (*ibid.*) are visible at York the parameters of this specific case study must be established.

In order for social emulation to underlie memorial diversity, it must be possible to demonstrate that socio-economic groups achieve a collective group identity through their choice of memorial options, rather than consumer behaviour simply representing differential access to financial resources. Cannon's argument, also developed in a North American context by L. Clark, suggests that memorial designs actively served to show membership of a particular social class and that in order to preserve class distinctions the upper classes used changing fashions to re-enforce this separation in material form.

In his study of Victorian memorials in rural Cambridgeshire, Cannon argued that changes in commemoration style, specifically the degree of memorial ostentation, were the material expression of a process of differentiation and emulation among individuals (see Chapter One). In his data set this trend was suggested through increasing diversity in memorial designs from the beginning of the nineteenth century until the 1850s. From the middle of the nineteenth century, diversity between designs began to decrease; Cannon claimed that as more stones were being erected, the ability to express differentiation became imp ssible within the burial landscape. From this point Cannon noted that memorial designs became simplified, with little difference stylistically between one another. In

contrast to this trend, the results of Chapter Four show an increasing trend of diversity across the sample period, despite the decreasing number of stones erected in the Original Victorian Extent of the Cemetery.

One reason for the difference between the results from Cannon and Chapter Four is purely methodological, and stems from the methods used to subdivide the respective memorial assemblages. In both studies cross-style headstones and monuments are categorised by general type. However, in contrast to the headstone typology in Chapter Four, Cannon's study employed only two different sub-groups to classify headstones: simple headstone and complex headstone forms. As a result Cannon's analysis was unable to quantify the level of variation between headstone profile shapes over time. Given that Cannon's data set was predominantly composed of headstones, which appear as the most popular choice of memorial for his entire sample chronology, this is a significant drawback for Cannon's study.

A second difference between Cannon's analysis and this thesis is the range of design variables considered. Recognising that decoration was a far more problematic category to classify than memorial form (Cannon 1986, 47-8), Cannon considered two further design variables of material type and inscription lettering, of the which only the former is addressed in detail in this thesis. Here the evidence in York cemetery appears to directly contradict Cannon's findings. Only a small percentage of the stones found at York used a material type other than sandstone. While this factor cannot be subject to detailed analysis due to the small numbers involved, an examination of memorial distribution quickly shows that non-standard materials were used both for pre-fabricated headstones and individually commissioned memorials, and at the same time. The rarity of expensive stone types coupled with the varied range of occupations associated with these stones demonstrates that material alone was not a key signifier of social class at York Cemetery.

The evidence from the studies of pre-fabricated and individually commissioned stones also contradicts Cannon's findings. The headstone

typology in Chapter Four was used to create a system whereby fine details of design could be quantified. As a result, patterns of increasing variation in design could be demonstrated for edge types, panels, decoration and material. As noted in Section 5.4.4 there was no evidence that any design details featured on pre-fabricated stones were influenced by designs produced as individual commission. Given this lack of copying, there is no direct material evidence of social emulation occurring at York Cemetery through the diffusion of designs.

Cannon's theory of social emulation can only be used to explain the diversity of memorial designs over time, not the extent of design variation that existed at any one chronological point. The results of Chapter Four and Section 5.4 have shown not only that a range of different designs was available at all points in the sample chronology, but also that this range increased after 1850. Moreover, with the exception of Second Class stones, a choice of designs was consistently available irrespective of the actual level of investment made by the consumer. Given this range of variation across investment levels at all chronological points, social emulation can at best only be a partial explanation for the consumer behaviour visible in York Cemetery.

Occupation and Memorials

The primary method used by both Cannon and L. Clark to identify socio-economic groups was to categorise commemorated individuals on the basis of occupation. It is widely acknowledged that, on its own, the identification of occupation only provides partial information. However, it is also generally agreed that from all of the possible variables denoting socio-economic status, employment is the single strongest general indicator of status. Given the centrality of occupation to Cannon and L. Clark, it is necessary to consider this issue in some detail.

For the data set at York, several records were available for the recovery of information about the profession of the deceased. These included inscriptions, burial registers, Trade Directories and censuses.

However, the grouping of the highly varied occupations identified into meaningful analytical categories presents a major, and ultimately insoluble, problem. This was particularly the case since the vast majority of relevant past studies do not discuss the method used to correlate specific social identities with stones (Cannon 1986; L. Clark 1987; McGuire 1988; Wurst 1991). As a result, the cemetery data set resists a complete analysis of consumer choice and social class. The following sections will set out in more detail both the results that could be recovered and with the methodological issues and data biases that precluded a full study of this issue.

Given their intractability, the complexities of relating memorials to occupation need only be discussed here, rather than fully resolved. It is a relatively straightforward matter to correlate a memorial to an occupation when only one individual is commemorated and that individual is the head of a household. It is less clear, however, how to make this correlation when a single commemoration is for a dependant individual, or if different occupations are found for multiple individuals within a group commemoration. In this case study, the occupation of the head of the household was taken to reflect the status of all dependants. In circumstances when it was still possible for more than one occupation to be applicable (for example when two households were commemorated together) the occupation of the deceased whose death was contemporary to the erection of the memorial was used. This distinction is important because, as noted in Chapter Three, not all stones were erected near the death date of the primary commemoration.

Before discussing the issues of organising occupation data into meaningful categories, this section will define the specific evidence recoverable from the available sources as well as some of the problems involved. The material evidence of the stones themselves serves as a useful starting point in this discussion. By itself, the archaeological record only provides occupation information for a minority of the population represented by the memorial sample. As far as decoration is concerned,

carvings of chalices, crosses and bibles were found on a small number of memorials commemorating Catholic and Anglican clergy but the use of this type of trade-related symbolism is not used upon the vast majority of memorials at York. Data from inscriptions was also sparse. Indeed, of the 1,243 stones bearing inscriptions, only 166 contained information about profession, and of the 4,111 commemorations, only 198 featured a stated occupation. The use of inscriptions to record data on occupation occurs across all different levels of investment. It occurs on both blank headstones and monuments and across the sample chronology (Appendix 12). It is not restricted to one type of job or one level of society. The evidence thus suggests that the inclusion of this information was individual choice that formed part of defining the individual on the stone. Additionally, while the higher investment stones were generally associated with higher status occupations, such as the clergy, surgeons and solicitors, members of these professions were not only also found on lower economic investment stones, but in fact occurred on the latter more frequently, as of course did individuals with jobs that implied a much lower access to financial resources (Appendix 12).

Moving from the material to the documentary evidence, the complexity of urban social environments (such as York) is reflected not only in the categories of occupations listed in the documentary record, but also the range of available evidence that can be used. The burial registers initially appear to offer the most comprehensive relevant information about the deceased, since an occupation at the time of death is provided for most individuals. As noted in Chapter Two, although profession is provided for adult males only, in most circumstances women or children can be grouped with the male relative with whom they were buried. However, eight percent of all memorials could not be correlated to a profession, either because they did not include a relevant adult male, or because the Burial Registers were incomplete. Data on he residence of the deceased in the burial registers shows that a large number of people who are buried in the Cemetery did not actually reside in York. Since other available

documentary sources, such as censuses and Trade Directories, were organised by region a further advantage of the burial registers is that they provide information in a single source that could only otherwise be assembled from a range of records.

Other documentary evidence can provide supplementary data, though this is rarely straightforward. For example, additional information about the income of the deceased can in theory be easily gauged by examining Poor Law records. These records show the amount of tax paid by York residents, and are organised by street address. However, a preliminary assessment of the residence data in the York Cemetery Burial Registers showed that specific locations were often not included, and for many individuals the address provided was simply a parish or village. As a result, cross-referencing the burial registers to the Poor Law records to recover the rateable value of property could not be completed.

Similar problems were presented when attempting to cross-reference the registers with data from the national census. It is only after 1851 that the census provides details not found in the burial registers on the economic structures of households. An attempt was made to compare a four year sample of occupation data with the 1881 census (1881, 1882, 1888 and 1889). The exercise showed that incomplete information in the burial registers makes it difficult to locate an individual in other documentary sources. In fact, even when burial register information appeared to be complete (name, address, age, residence, known kin relations) for individuals who died within two years of the census, it was impossible to identify all of the relevant individuals (success rate of 24 from 33 individuals). This situation became even more complex once more than two years had elapsed from the census, and only 23 from 46 could be located from the later samples. In cases where the deceased could be identified, it became apparent that there was a surprising amount of movement within the population both in terms of residence and profession, and the sources often provided contradictory data. For example, of the 47 individuals located in the census, 24 lived at different addresses, four were

listed with different names and 15 were working in different professions. Even if the two-year samples had offered comprehensive evidence the available data sets that fall within a two-year period of the 1851-1891 censuses represent only a small proportion (17%) of the total number of stones erected. Since this sample would not be statistically representative of the population commemorated on stones or the range of memorial designs, the potential uses of the census data are minimal for this thesis' data sample.

Thus when used individually, the material evidence of gravestones and documentary evidence of Burial Registers is often useful, but also problematic. A comparison between the two different types of data also raised the point that while this can provide important supplementary data, the precise identification of occupation can shift depending on the data source, and no single source can be considered in any way comprehensive (Appendix 12).

When compared to the burial registers, the inscriptions sometimes provided more detailed information on profession, such as where the deceased worked, or the level of responsibility that an occupation entailed, such as foreman. In the case of one individual listed in the burial registers as a 'musician', the stone even recorded that the instrument played was a trumpet. In total, the information on the stone correlates to the burial register data in 73% of cases (Appendix 12). However, this means that conflicting information occurs on more than a quarter of the stones. Conflicting accounts of profession were both the result of inter-changeable terminology (such as 'builders', 'bricklayers' and 'stone masons') or more frequently because individuals described as 'gentlemen' in the burial registers are described by a specific occupations on their stones. The term 'gentleman' is particularly problematic to define, and the occupation information on stones demonstrates that it was used in conjunction with a wide range of occupations including builders, members of the military, a librarian, merchants, publicans, an actuary, a magistrate, manufacturers and barristers.

The inscription data also demonstrated conflicts between the inscriptions and burial registers that have wider implications for how individuals chose to define themselves. People may have had more than one profession and chose to be commemorated by one rather than the other. This was particularly notable for several dissenting ministers who choose to emphasise their religious role above their full-time profession (Appendix 12). A similar preference was expressed by individuals who were involved in local government. Given that these multiple roles could have different social class implications, the accuracy of either the documentary or material records must be questioned when it comes to independently showing the full range of occupations and social classes that an individual might have had.

Furthermore, the identification of a Baptist Church organist and Sunday School teacher through the inscriptions was instructive for pointing out that unpaid occupations relevant for consumer identities may be unrecoverable from many documentary sources. There is also a significant gender bias in the evidence as very few entries name the social activities or occupations of women. Only seven inscriptions feature this type of data, although unlike the burial registers this does include information about the paid occupation of women, however limited (Appendix 12). In theory census information should be able to clarify the occupations of dependants (since women and children were also listed by occupation) and the level of responsibility of the head of the household (for example, by stating the number of employees or if a 'master' tradesman). In practice, wider historical research has shown that this type of information was not standard or consistently entered (for a detailed discussion see Woollard 2002), a situation also confirmed by the sample of the 1881 census completed for this case study.

Thus whilst an analysis of profession does indeed have potential, it also has considerable problems. The most difficult problem, however, remains the issue of grouping occupations by meaningful categories.

Grouping Occupations

Before discussing the issues raised by attempting to group occupation into analytical categories, it is necessary to briefly note how Cannon's 1986 study was structured. Cannon examined the relationship between social groups in rural Cambridgeshire through the professions of those commemorated in his memorial sample. Using census data he was able to define three different groups of people commemorated on stones: gentry, yeoman farmers and agricultural labourers. An examination of profession in an urban context is far more problematic. Even acknowledging that Cannon may well have oversimplified the rural class structure, the social and economic structures of towns and cities - which cannot simply be categorised as large-scale villages - are significantly more complex than those in rural Cambridgeshire. Judging a level of income and social status associated with the 289 occupations identified for this study is an immense task for several reasons.

The first problem arises through simply attempting to identify and group those individuals who were engaged in the same activity, because the data is not standardised. Simple occupational titles are often confusing because they can mean both general areas of work and specific tasks, and these are not necessarily equal to one another. For example a 'tailor' can be understood not only as someone who makes clothes but also as a worker with a specific activity, in this case someone who sews together pieces of material that a 'Cutter' has shaped (Woollard 2002, 5). Another example of the lack of clarity in occupation titles featured in the data sample is the terms 'painter' and 'designer', which can potentially refer to an artist or to a more building-oriented occupation.

Another difficulty arises through the fact that a general occupation can itself feature several stratified levels. This is particularly the case for retail or handicraft occupations where it is pos ible that an individual owned his or her own business or equally could be an employee. For example, a 'mason' may be both a individual master mason or a mason

employing several subordinate employees. These different levels of occupation within a single category are more than just a minor semantic issue as they can have a significant impact on an individual's place within the social hierarchy. Thus a large percentage of the workforce can be seen to be either employers or employees without necessarily having their specific roles within a profession identified by the available sources. As Chart 67 shows this proves to be the case for the vast majority of identifiable occupations in York. Both McGuire (1988) and L. Clark (1987) have shown that in cities with more widespread industrial production, it is possible to distinguish between employers and their work force and thus group individuals accordingly.

The third problem is formulating a method by which different professions (and the hierarchies within them) can be compared. At present there is no easy way of doing this, and this lack of comparability between the different occupational classifications makes it difficult to produce accurate data sets. This is particularly true given the two previously discussed issues. As one term may both include more than one occupation and several different ranks within an occupation, meaningful comparisons on the basis of the available terminology becomes virtually impossible.

Existing documentary sources that categorise occupation by group are also unhelpful. Within the census, occupations are stratified on the basis of the category of material used by an individual within their daily working activities, not their available resources or perceived social status. For example, in the 1881 census the 'professional class' category includes individuals with occupations that could reflect an elite or upper middle class section of society, such as the clergy, doctors and teachers, but also includes clearly lower-strata professions such as private soldiers, postmen and pew openers. Thus the information on occupation contained in the census is a valuable tool for understanding the economic make up of an area, but can not be directly used to calculate the economic resources or perceived status of individuals by their occupation. In fact it is

notable that the majority of studies that have used census information have examined profession in conjunction to household structure to examine patterns of demography (e.g. Armstrong 1974; Woods & Williams 1995; Zhao 1996).

The extensive existing historical research on 19th-century York is also unhelpful as it provides general characteristics about social groups but not detailed parameters that would help to place an individual in a particular group (e.g. Tillott ed. 1961; Armstrong 1974; Feinstein 1981; Rowntree 2001). York was largely untouched by the industrial revolution and (with the exception of the advent of the railways) there was little change to the range of occupations available in York through the sample chronology (*ibid.*). However while the types of professions may be relatively stable over time this does not make them any easier to classify hierarchically.

For example, while it is possible to show a breakdown of professions using Armstrong's criteria (taken from the census) to show that these broad categories (Charts 67 & 68) feature within the data set, this does not solve the problem of translating this data into meaningful categories (Armstrong 1974). It simply shows that the deeply problematic and indefinable category of 'other manufacture' makes up half the data set in both the living and dead populations. If these categories were to be used for Cemetery analysis (Charts 69 -71), it would not only include a majority of second class burials (Level One investment) and blanks (Level Two in investment), but would also include the second largest number of monuments (Levels Four and Five in investment). Thus although Rowntree's 1901 survey of poverty demonstrated that economic divisions existed in York (Chart 72) it cannot be related to occupation (Rowntree 2001) . In fact Rowntree's survey demonstrated that occupations of 'other manufacture' are found in a range of his economic income divisions. It must also be briefly pointed out that whilst R wntree's survey is an invaluable historical document, it does not provide a system for this study

311

to assess occupation since its methodology employed contemporary documentary sources and interviews with the living population.

On a more positive note, the evidence contained within three Trade Directories does, however, permit a more detailed study of the consumer choices made by those with the highest levels of market access. In addition to providing information about businesses for specific years the directories also provide a list of the Clergy, Gentry and Nobility for the City of York. This information is provided by only three volumes, those of 1843, 1849 and 1855. While obviously incomplete, this data permits the study of whether the individuals in these three readily identifiable high-status categories, are actively defining themselves within at least a limited period. With only one exception (D/09/01) each of the deceased classified as 'gentleman' or with 'professional' occupations could be located in the directories. This data set was made up of 30 individuals. Although the documentary sources suggest a certain level of social unity, this was not reflected by the material evidence. In total 11 individuals were commemorated on monuments (five altar tombs, one pedestal tomb, three obelisks and one low tomb), but a far higher proportion of gentry, nobility and clergy were commemorated on sandstone blank headstones and other Level Two investment stones (19 stones). Finally, the remaining high-status individuals that can be confidently placed in the 'professional' category, for example doctors, lawyers and architects simply represent too small data sets to investigate (together these three professions represent less than two percent of all stones).

Discussion

By now, it should be abundantly clear that occupation is not a readily identifiable or useful category of analysis for York Cemetery. Furthermore, since previous studies have shown that this is by far the best means through which to investigate the issue of soc l emulation, the latter issue becomes almost as problematic. While it is clear that there are other circumstances where both of these issues can be examined profitably

(such as rural Cambridgeshire churchyards), this is not the case for York Cemetery. This is not to say that several noteworthy results can not be identified in isolation. These include, for example, the comparisons between occupation and memorial designs structured by the evidence of inscriptions and Trade Directories. Both studies showed that the majority of 'elite' consumers were participating in commemoration practice, purchasing modest headstones in common with the main part of the population. Thus anecdotal evidence strongly suggests that at York while access to financial resources did limit some consumers' choices it did not necessarily dictate which designs were selected by those consumers with a higher market access (contra L. Clark 1987). Furthermore the study has shown that there is little evidence of social emulation in variations of memorial decoration, material or type.

This may seem to be a very long discussion in order to establish negative data, but given the centrality of social emulation in Cannon's landmark analysis, it was necessary to examine this point in some detail. If social class and emulation were not a predominant factor in design variation, or simply cannot be proven to be involved, then it becomes necessary to examine other possible factors, such as religion and familial relationships. Finally, an implicit theme in this discussion is that the specific context of York Cemetery is significantly different from the social contexts used for past analysis. This important point will be returned to in the conclusion to the thesis.

5.5.2 A Case Study of Consumer Behaviour and Religious Affiliation

Introduction

This case study will consider whether memorial location and the selection of memorial designs were influenced by religious affiliation and if so, whether this may be seen as the behaviour of individual consumers or as a more widespread practice which denoted identifiable consumer groups. An investigation of whether memorial design can be correlated to religious

affiliation was prompted both by previous gravestone analysis and by the particular historical and cultural context of cemeteries. Previous research and contemporary accounts have both stressed the role of religious freedom within the inception of the early cemeteries (Barker 1869; Morgan 1989; Rugg 1998b), yet as Chapter Two showed the foundation of York Cemetery was unusual because of the level of apparent co-operation between religious groups.

The correlation of memorial iconography to theological doctrines, as outlined in Chapter One, is another important research framework, most notably within North American studies (Dethlefsen & Deetz 1966; Ludwig 1966; Benes 1977; 1978). Chapter Two contained a discussion of how numerous authors, including F. Burgess (1963), Elliot (1983), C. Brooks (1989a), and Curl (1993), have used contemporary documentary sources (such as Pugin 1836; 1841; 1843 and the *Ecclesiologist*) to contend that certain architectural styles were embedded with religious and political ideologies. This research has often argued that certain associations between architectural styles and theology means that denominational affiliations were also conveyed through similar features on memorials. In particular, these studies have drawn attention to the theological issues raised in certain tracts by Anglican clergymen which dealt specifically with memorial design (including, Markland 1843; Paget 1843; Carter 1847; Trollope 1858). Finally, a small number of case studies have shown that religious affiliation may be communicated by the selection of particular monument design (Mackay 1989; Tyson 1994; Elliott 1983; Mytum 1999).

Two issues are examined in the case study. The first issue is the relevance of the memorial location in either consecrated or unconsecrated ground, which will also be compared to evidence of inter-denominational affiliations. The second issue is an examination of whether memorial design might be influenced by theological perspectives, particularly as represented by the Anglican tracts on mem al designs and inscriptions (Markland 1843; Paget 1843; Carter 1847; Trollope 1858; Pettigrew 1864). As for pattern books, the cultural and historic contexts of these tracts are

extremely complex, and have yet to be comprehensively addressed within previous studies.

Memorial location and Religious Affiliation in York Cemetery

Burial in either consecrated or unconsecrated ground initially appears to be the most obvious example of overtly articulated social affiliation in York Cemetery (see Chapter Three). This expectation exists due to the importance given to this division in other cemetery research (Elliott 1983; Brooks 1989a; MacKay 1989), and because of the lack of any further spatial divisions at York. In contrast to other cemeteries, no areas are reserved for the exclusive burial of particular religious denominations and the ground is not divided on any other social basis (although private burial areas are laid out separately from public graves and two areas of the cemetery were set aside for children's burial at the turn of the century– see Chapter Two and Section 5.5.3).

As noted in Chapter Three, the memorial sample for this thesis was deliberately selected in order to record an equal number of stones from consecrated and unconsecrated areas. For the sake of simplicity, stones from consecrated areas will be referred to 'consecrated memorials' and stones from unconsecrated areas will be referred to as 'unconsecrated memorials'. Chart 73 shows that the frequency of memorials in the data set is evenly distributed between consecrated and unconsecrated burial areas. However, this situation is not necessarily representative of the cemetery as a whole.

Using the figures provided by the extant Cemetery Company Annual General Meeting records (YCA Acc 247/155), Chart 74 shows the number of burials between 1847 and 1891 in both consecrated and unconsecrated ground over the entire extent of the Cemetery (Figure 2). This chart clearly illustrates that the two areas were not used equally. During the sample chronology two extensions were made to the original Victorian extent of the cemetery, both of which were for consecrated burials (Figure 2). Because of these extensions, the number of burials in consecrated ground

in the cemetery as a whole steadily increased, the significantly lower number of burials in unconsecrated ground remained more or less constant over time. Since this thesis specifically focuses on the original Victorian extent, a greater number of consecrated memorials are found during the first half of the sample chronology (Chart 75) and a larger number of unconsecrated memorials are found during the second half of the sample chronology (Chart 76) as Anglican burials primarily take place within the consecrated extensions. Because of these trends, it is worth considering whether the patterns set out in Chapter Four are representative of a general population, or whether they are more representative of Anglican preferences in the earlier years but Dissent and Catholic preferences in later years.

In order to offset the bias in the distribution of memorials over time between consecrated and unconsecrated areas, the variables used in this analysis were studied as a percentage of the total number of memorials in each data set per five-year period. In this way the relative popularity of a variable could be more accurately gauged between consecrated and unconsecrated areas. Four different data sets were used:

1. headstones included in the typological analysis and erected in consecrated ground;

2. monuments surveyed within the main data sample and erected in consecrated ground;

3. headstones included in the typological analysis and erected in unconsecrated ground; and

4. monuments surveyed within the main data sample and erected in unconsecrated ground.

The variables selected for study were based on the trends identified by Chapter Four, and which therefore represent the largest available data sets.

The analysis for this section examined the selection rates within consecrated and within unconsecrated burial areas for the following variables:

1.   the frequency of standard profile PHSMF headstones (P10, P6, P8);

2.   the frequency of SC1 profile headstones;

2.   the frequency of SC1 profile headstones with cartouche banner decoration;

4.   the frequency of L1 profile headstones;

5.   the frequency of lancet headstone profiles L2-L28;

6.   the frequency of headstone profiles with a reproduction rate below 18 headstones; and

7.   the percentage of headstones with decoration (excluding linear borders, cartouche banners and scroll decoration).

Charts 77 to 86 show the results of this analysis. These charts demonstrate that the major trends in headstone profiles and decoration outlined in Chapter Four occur across the sample area as a whole. Although there are some differences between the frequencies of particular choices, these are likely be the result of an under-representation of unconsecrated memorials in the earliest decades of the sample chronology and an under-representation of consecrated memorials in the latter decades. The patterns of consumer behaviour, however, are the same between consecrated and unconsecrated burial areas. Furthermore, this behaviour is consistent for both 'popular' (Charts 77, 78, 80-83, and 85) and 'individualist' (Charts 79, 84, and 86) consumer choices. As far as these seven variables are concerned, there is no spatial variation in monument design based on broad denominational affiliation.

Memorial Design and Inter-denominational Affiliations

Having identified that the trends set out by Chapter Four do represent the pattern both of the cemetery as a whole and specific areas thereof, the second stage of this analysis of religious affilia ion considered the specific denomination of the deceased. Two potential methods exist through which the religious affiliation of the deceased can be established. The first

method is to identify their regular place of worship while the second is to identify the denomination of the deceased's burial service. The former is difficult to undertake in practice, since the religious census of 1851 reveals only patterns of general attendance, not the identities of individuals within congregations. This study therefore chose to follow the second method and used the record of the officiating minister at the deceased's burial service (a type data found in the burial registers) to infer the religious affiliation of the deceased. This data was then correlated with the same variables (see above) used to examine variation between the consecrated and unconsecrated areas.

There are several inherent biases within this system of determining religious affiliation. These include questions of whether the minister officiating at the service always shared the same religion as the deceased and whether the primary purpose of a funeral was entirely concerned with an expression of religious faith. These issues are highlighted by H. Murray's account of the response of James Parsons, Congregationalist minister, to one particular burial service in 1841:

> 'He [Parsons] had arrived early for the funeral of Jasper Logan, a tobacconist, and was horrified when the cortege arrived with a band at its head playing the Dead March. Logan was a member of the Society of Ancient Foresters who engaged the band to ensure their member had a fitting send off. Parsons refused to officiate and left the corpse... Luckily the Cemetery chaplain arrived to bury a soldier and agreed to officiate provided that Logan, a dissenter, was buried in consecrated ground with the rites of the Church of England.'   Murray 1994, 154.

It is also not possible to differentiate between 'High' and 'Low' Church Anglicanism for those buried in consecrated ground since attendance at parish churches was structured as much by locality as doctrine. Therefore parishioners were far less likely to choose a church

based on their personal Anglican doctrinal preference than is the case today. As a result, religious affiliations within Anglicanism can not be recovered from the identity of the officiating minister nor from religious census. It is far easier to identify denominational differences between Catholicism and the different types of Nonconformists, therefore this analysis concentrates on memorials in the non-consecrated half of the cemetery.

In the unconsecrated half of the cemetery there are 2160 individuals commemorated on 627 stones. Of this total, 2050 commemorations were found in the electronic record of the burial registers. The remaining commemorations were either of individuals not buried in the cemetery or who had died after 1910. The name of the burial's officiating minister (or a note that no service took place) is provided for 1655 entries. Therefore just under one quarter of all accessions bear no record of whether a burial service took place or the identity of the officiating minister. More problematic, however, is the fact that less than one percent of entries listing an officiating minister also included a minister's address. Without details of the church or chapel where a minister served it is not possible to infer the religious affiliation of the deceased.

Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, this lack of data on the officiating ministers presents a formidable logistical challenge which is impossible to completely overcome. No easily accessible lists exists for the Anglican clergy and Nonconformist ministers who worked in York during the Victorian period. While there are national directories, notably for Anglican, Roman Catholic and Methodist clergy, it was not feasible to use these national directories to identify all of the unknown ministers listed in the York burial registers. Cross-referencing between the registers and national directories was only possible on the basis of name, and this posed major difficulties due to variations in spell'ngs, name duplication, and completeness of entries (many forenames were abbreviated to initials). Nonetheless, a partial list of ministers and their denomination was

compiled using the Trade Directories and from secondary sources dealing with the history of York. From this list it was possible to identify the denomination of over half of the ministers who presided over burials in the nonconformist areas of the cemetery.

Religious affiliation could be inferred for a total of 1,043 individuals commemorated on stones in the unconsecrated half of the cemetery. This represented nearly 50% of the available data sample, across 517 different stones (Chart 87). In total seven denominations were identified in the sample: Anglicans, Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists or Independents, Methodists, Presbyterians and Unitarians. The occurrence of Anglicans in the unconsecrated area is an important observation that demonstrates that even the divide between consecrated and unconsecrated ground is not an absolute denominational division. The primary burial location for Quakers was at the Retreat, directly adjacent to the cemetery, but excluded from this analysis (Murray 1994, 135-9). The Trade Directories note that United Brethren and Swedenborgian, New Jerusalem chapels also existed in York during the period studied, but since these did not have resident ministers, members could not be identified through correlation with burial register entries. Specific denominations could not be identified for two individuals as the burial registers only noted that the officiating ministers were 'dissenting'. Six individuals commemorated in the sample did not have a burial service.

It is possible to subdivide the denomination data sets for the Anglicans and Methodists in the sample. Chart 88 shows that Anglican commemorations were performed both by the Cemetery Company's own chaplain and by parish clergy. The information provided by the Trade Directories enabled a further division of Methodists into United Methodist Free Church, Methodist New Connexion and Primitive Methodists (chart 89).

Not all stones could be fully classified with the same degree of confidence to show that they represented only one denomination. This was because 83% of the stones commemorate more than one person, and

not all of the ministers named in the burial registers could be identified for each commemoration. Nonetheless it was possible to recover complete information for 60 stones with a single person commemoration and 53 stones with multiple-commemorations. There were also a number of multiple-commemoration stones for which information could not be collected for all individuals, but the identified commemorations shared the same denomination. This subset was the largest and contained 292 stones. Finally, there were 112 stones for which the commemorations shared different religious affiliations.

Data sets were compiled from the first three categories to examine whether different consumer choices were exercised in the Nonconformist half of the cemetery by Anglicans, Methodists, Catholics and Independents or Congregationalists. Due to the small numbers involved, no data sets could be created for Baptists, Presbyterians, Unitarians and those identified solely as 'dissenters' (Chart 87). Analysis showed that the results shown in the Nonconformist part of the Cemetery as a whole were also the patterns of choice in each of the denominational subgroups examined. Therefore, just as memorial design choice remained constant between the consecrated and unconsecrated areas, it was also constant between denominations within more specific spatial areas, further proving that the memorial design in York Cemetery reflected consumer behaviour across all religious groups rather than specific denominational affiliation.

These observations raise some important questions, but ones with a fairly straightforward answer. For York Cemetery, memorial design simply did not operate as part of a wider social dialogue through which potential consumers spat lly expressed their religious affiliation within identifiable consumer groups. Above all, it should be remembered that of the total number of stones commemorating more than one person, just under 25% commemorated individuals with different religious affiliations. This subset also excludes stones associated with Second Class burials, where one would expect to find members of different denominations buried together. The 25% figure is probably a conservative estimate as 292 of the

345 stones classified as representing one denomination feature individuals for whom affiliations could not be determined. It may be that memorials which commemorate more than one person had to feature designs appropriate to all of the individuals commemorated, and therefore designs associated with a particular religious affiliation were actively avoided. However, since there is no visible denominational variation between stones definitively associated with specific denominations, this must be a minor factor at best.

The landscape of York cemetery itself, particularly the lack of formal spatial divisions between denominations other than the more general consecrated / unconsecrated divide, may also have been a factor that influenced consumer groups against showing religious affiliation through memorial design. The two studies that have shown that religious affiliation could be denoted by the choice of memorial designs have been conducted at sites where there is a structured division between the areas where different denominations were buried. For example, Mytum's 1999 research was conducted over a number of different burial grounds that were each associated with specific denominations. Mackay's 1989 study was completed at Rockwood Cemetery where different burial areas were reserved for the exclusive use of different denominations. Mackay argues that the Rockwood Cemetery Company thus enabled consumer groups to make 'one of the deepest symbolic acts ...[in]... the initial choice of burial in special sections of the cemetery. Tombs with no emblematic or iconic message nevertheless proclaim their symbolism by virtue of the section of the Necropolis where the burial has taken place' (Mackay 1989:42).

In contrast, other th n the division between consecrated and unconsecrated ground, the patronage of burial areas at York was informally organised. The Cemetery Company did not reserve particular burial sections for exclusive use by different denominations. There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that different bu 'al sections in the cemetery were favoured by particular groups. Section V, for example, appears to a have a higher frequency of Catholic burials than other areas

(Murray 1994), whereas Section U seems to be more frequently patronised by Methodists (H. Murray *pers comm*).

It is possible to chart the burial sections where stones associated with known denominations occur (Chart 90). The results, while not including all of the unconsecrated areas, suggest a number of important issues in the dynamics between different religious groups. When the cemetery first opened, only sections V, HH, U, R, and part of section C were available for burials. Sections C, B, and S were more formally laid out at some point between 1847 and 1857, but it would seem likely that the limited number of burial sections made any extensive level of formal patronage of specific areas by particular groups impossible. It is significant to note that after 1854 the cemetery held a virtual monopoly on burial in York; the cemetery was the only viable burial option for most individuals. Thus while specific groups may have favoured one area above another (in addition to the Catholics in V and Methodists in C, Presbyterians occur more frequently in section R) there is no exclusivity of area. Furthermore groups with quite starkly different theological perspectives could favour the same sections. Thus both Independents / Congregationalists and Catholics favoured section V, and groups of Methodists and Catholics in section C.

The absence of the Quakers from the Cemetery may have also resulted in a different dynamic at York for memorial design. This denomination had very specific rules about the appearance of memorials (Stock 1998) which would have had a definite visual impact and would have defined Quakers as an identifiable social group in the Cemetery. The Quakers (closely followed by the Methodists) were the most significant nonconformist group within the social, political, economic and religious life of York (Royle 1981; 1983; 1985), and their absence from the cemetery landscape is thus particularly significant.

The lack of surviving archaeological evidence from pre-Cemetery non-Anglican burial grounds in York makes it virtually impossible to compare these results with earlier periods for York alone. Nonetheless, it

is clear that spatial analysis reveals no widespread system of signification based on memorial design through which consumers demonstrated group affiliations on the basis of religion. However it is possible that any behavioural patterns which were the result of either individual consumer groups or individual consumers may not be recognised by the material record alone, since these trends would structure only a section of the data set as a whole.

External Theological Influences on Memorial Design - The Anglican Tracts

The final part of this case study will examine the potential influence that overt denominational theology (as opposed to denominational affiliation), as represented by tracts written by Anglican Clergy between the 1840s and 1860s, may have had on the expression of religious identity through memorial design. The tracts are a valuable documentary source as they provide an opportunity to examine memorial design in conjunction with explicitly articulated ideologies. Furthermore, they permit a more detailed examination of specific decorative elements than is sometimes the case with a more broad-based spatial analysis. Although patently partisan, the tracts could potentially influence not only adherents to the Anglican faith but also might indicate to other groups how they might distinguish themselves from the practices set out in the tracts. Mackay (1989), for example, has argued that this type of dynamic influenced the majority of consumer choices for memorial design at Rockwood Cemetery

There is extensive agr ment between the authors of the tracts on the preferred forms and decoration for Anglican memorials (Paget 1843; Carter 1847; Trollope 1858). For example the clerics argued strongly against the use of 'pagan' neo-classical motifs such as cherubs, urns, and broken pillars:

' For more than one century, mural monuments with cherubs, sculls, lamps, and twisted columns, with little variety were permitted

to deform our Churches. In later days we have had the Urn and the
Sarcophagus - strange ornaments in a Christian Temple! '

Markland 1843:89

Although several authors have argued that neo-classical imagery was
strongly associated with Dissenting religions (Elliott 1983; Meller 1981;
Brooks 1989a), there is little evidence to support this argument at York
Cemetery. At York the use of classical motifs was never a widespread
decorative practice, either before or after the majority of tracts were
written. Furthermore, on those rare occasions where such decoration is
found, these motifs were not associated with any specific religious
denominations, either positively or negatively. Thus neither the sentiments
of the clergy, nor wider reaction for or against these opinions appear to
have influenced consumer choice in the cemetery for this type of motifs .

In contrast to neo-classical imagery , the cross was endorsed by
the Anglican clergy as the most appropriate symbol for memorial designs
(Markland 1843; Carter 1847; Trollope 1858). Authors took equal pains to
refute direct papal connotations with the cross (e.g. Paget 1843, 22-23) as
they did to censure the use of 'pagan' symbolism. The promotion of cross
iconography is probably the most significant theme across the many
issues raised the various tract authors. Indeed the only major theme in
common between all authors is, ironically, a call for the practice of
memorialisation itself to cease. At York analysis of consumers' use of
cross iconography provides the strongest evidence for an aspect of
religious affiliation influencing consumer behaviour and memorial design.
Yet, contrary to what one might expect from the tracts, it is not Anglicans
with whom the cross proves to be associated.

Within the designs identified in Chapter Four, cross iconography
is found both as a decoration and as a memorial form. Crosses appear as
decorative carvings on 52 of the headstones sampled. Forty of these
stones are found in unconsecrated ground (Chart 91). An analysis of the
religious affiliations of the deceased commemorated on these headstones

revealed that Catholics are the group most frequently commemorated in this manner (Chart 92). The frequency of cross decoration on Catholic-associated headstones indeed provides the most direct evidence of consumer behaviour associated with denominational group identity. From a total of 30 headstones that commemorate only Catholics, 21 (or 70%) have carved cross decoration.

A comparison was made between the names of officiating ministers in the burial registers and trade directory entries for the twelve cross-motif headstones in the consecrated area of the cemetery. The available evidence showed that all individuals commemorated these headstones were Anglicans. While 18 Anglican headstones with cross decorations occurred in the total Cemetery sample, the actual proportion of total Anglican commemorations that this represents of the total number of stones erected to Anglicans is negligible compared to Catholics given that 535 headstones appeared in the predominantly Anglican consecrated part of the cemetery alone.

Other than headstones, cross decoration was found on 21 other monuments across the cemetery as a whole, and feature on a wide variety of memorial types, such as obelisks, flat monuments, altar, pedestal, low and 'other' tombs. There were eight monuments in consecrated ground with cross decorations and the available evidence showed that these stones all marked Anglican commemorations. However, once again the cross decoration was most common on stones commemorating Catholic burials. Table 38 shows that the 13 unconsecrated monuments all occurred in Section V and nine of these stones are known to commemorate Catholics only. Since Section V is the burial area most favoured by Catholics, it is indeed possible that the four monuments not classifiable also commemorated Catholics. Table 39 shows a similar association between cross style headstones and Catholics.

The one major exception in this association between the use of cross motifs and Catholicism occurred with free-standing cross monuments. As Table 40 shows, of the 38 free-standing crosses in the

Original Victorian Extent, 18 were in the consecrated areas, and 20 in unconsecrated ground. Only three of this total are associated with Catholic commemorations.

In summary, the use of cross was not only predominantly associated with Catholicism, but in fact a majority of Catholic headstones feature a cross motif. Nonetheless, the use of free-standing crosses and the cross motif on non-Catholic monuments show that the cross was not exclusive to one denomination. Thus while the cross could be used to denote Catholics as an identifiable social group within the York Cemetery landscape, with other denominations, most notably Anglicans, it represents only an individual consumer choice. This is in direct contrast to the theological advice advanced by the tracts of the Anglican clergy. While the evidence on the ground may not correlate with this particular documentary source, nonetheless the tracts have helped to highlight an important example of a specific association between memorial design and group affiliation.

Despite this notable finding, it is clear that at best only a very small number of Anglicans were following the Clergy's recommendations on memorial design, and there is little evidence to corroborate that the use or lack thereof of specific motifs was influenced by the theological perspectives in the tracts. It is also more than apparent that the Clergy's attempts to associate the use of cross motifs with Anglicanism did not deter non-Anglicans, particularly Catholics, from using them.

Perhaps too much emphasis may be given to the tracts as we do not know who either the target or actual audience was, nor the full intentions of the authors. The fact that these volumes were published does not indicate their contemporary significance, nor clarify the degree to which their content was reactive to, proactive to, or removed from widespread public opinion. More generally, the disparity in date between the publication of the tracts and the use of cross iconography by Anglicans demonstrates that consumer choices were at least as likely to be mediated by wider trends, such as fashion, as by theology (F. Burgess 1963, 124;

Cannon 1986, 51-3). It is worth noting in passing that at some burial grounds where a relationship between design and religious affiliation has been observed, the monuments and materials used to denote that affiliation are more expensive consumer investments. Mytum (1999, 221), for example, has observed that granite obelisks and urns were favoured by Nonconformists, while Mackay (1989, 33) noted that Methodists and Presbyterians favoured pedestals with urns and broken columns. However, these monument types do not frequently occur in York Cemetery.

Reaction to theology could be influenced by local behaviour as much as by general theological trends. Historical research has shown that after a period of tension between Chapel and Church in the 1830s, inter-denominational relations in York were characterised by a Catholic (including Anglo-Catholics) and Protestant divide (Royle *pers comm*). While, as observed earlier, it is impossible to separate high and low Anglican burials in York Cemetery, the possibility that the use of the key religious signifier of Catholic affiliation (the cross motif) by a number of Anglicans may have denoted high church Anglo-Catholicism should not be dismissed out of hand.

The move from parish burial grounds to York Cemetery may be one of the most significant factors in the lack of apparent Clerical influence on consumer behaviour in York. Prior to the opening of the cemetery, no monument could be erected in a churchyard without the permission of the parish priest, and this may have acted as a form of social control over commemoration (Paget 1843, 24; Jalland 1996, 292). This level of individual social control was simply not available in the Cemetery; even if individual Anglicans holding such views were part of the Cemetery Company, authority lay with a committee answerable to its shareholders, not with the parish priest. Future comparisons between burial grounds and cemeteries, combined with the use of the relevant documentary record, could examine this specific point in more detail.

Wider perspectives outlined in the tracts also give little direct correlation to consumer behaviour. One point stressed by all of the tracts is a call for a reduction in the number of gravestones erected. Instead the authors argued that a more fitting 'memorial' to the dead would be a contribution to the church itself, such as a stained glass window, altar cloth or alms plate (Markland 1843; Paget 1843). The tracts also clearly stated that the clergy should be the initial point of reference for a layperson when discussing a monument's design and content, and frequently criticise the standards and skill of stonemasons:

'I remember seeing this ornament sculptured on a tomb of a man who had been a market gardener. The bird was represented as hovering, with out-stretched wings, the tail raised, and the head downwards; but the design was very coarsely executed...the poor man's neighbours took it into their heads that his tomb was ornamented with a flying pine-apple, - of course an allusion to the profession of the deceased'.　　　　Paget 1843, 20-21

Thus the motives of the tract authors may have had less to do with aesthetics and propriety than with maintaining some influence over burial matters. It may be no co-incidence that the advocacy of control over commemoration was made at the same time as the Church began to lose its monopoly of, and therefore income from and influence over, the provision of burial space (Rugg 1999b).

Finally, it is worth briefly addressing one last difference between the data set in this thesis and research that has identified a correlation between memorial design and religious affiliation. Mytum's 1994 research on Welsh monuments in Pembrokeshire has shown a distinct division between the use of certain memorial designs and Anglicanism and Dissent. However, during the period under study, there was often an important cultural divide in between Anglican English-speakers and Nonconformist Welsh-speakers that also impacted upon memorial

design. Thus Mytum's work centred not just on a denominational divide, but also on an ethno-linguistic divide that, however important to Pembrokeshire, is essentially irrelevant to the specific cultural milieu of York Cemetery.

In sum, the evidence from this tract-based analysis is mixed. While evidence of a relationship between denominational affiliation and one element of monument design - crosses - has been identified, this remains the only decorative feature for which such a relationship does exist. In all other cases, decorative distributions are a function of behaviour rather than group affiliation. This analysis has also shown how the specific cultural landscape of York cemetery differs from other studies where such group affiliation has been proven. The theological perspectives represented by the tracts were not in most cases a significant factor in decorative distributions in York Cemetery.

Discussion

The significant findings from this case study of religious affiliation and decoration may be summarised in three core arguments. First of all, the spatial analysis of monument decoration reveals no denominational affiliations. Even within the consecrated / unconsecrated divide, the boundaries between Anglicans and Catholics and Nonconformists were less strict than might be expected, and some Anglicans were buried in unconsecrated ground. In the non-Anglican communities, there are some denominational clusters in specific areas, but these are non-exclusionary, and feature diametrically opposed theological perspectives (such as Congregationalists and Catholics) in the same section. Furthermore, these clusters and distributions do not correlate with the monument typology from Chapter Four. Therefore, from this analysis the distribution of monument types is seen to be behaviour, rather than denomination-specific.

Secondly, despite the existence of documentary evidence, in the form of clerical tracts, supporting a theological justification for the selection

of certain motifs or shapes, the only decorative feature with any real association with a specific denomination are crosses, which are closely associated with Catholic commemoration. While this finding does demonstrate the importance of examining denominational affiliation, it remains the only example of its kind in York cemetery. This has permitted the formulation of a more detailed argument than was the case with the spatial analysis alone. The analysis based around the tracts demonstrates that while as a whole most consumer choices on decorative features are based on behaviour, this does not rule out the possibility that an individual feature may have a wider group affiliation.

Nonetheless, the emphasis of the evidence from this case study is clearly on the importance of behaviour rather than group affiliation within York Cemetery. Yet this does not mean that all consumer choices were driven by this coherence to a social norm. Indeed, this study of religion only serves to emphasise that group affiliation was a much less important factor in consumer choice in York cemetery than more individually directed affiliations. This important point will be explored in more detail in Sections 5.5.3 and 5.5.4.

5.5.3 The Commemoration of Children

Introduction

This case study examines the commemoration of children in order to explore the role of memorial designs within the expression of personal relationships and group identities. Children were selected as a specific social group to investigate com emoration choices on the basis of both methodological issues and material evidence. Several potentially challenging issues surrounding the identity of the 'consumer' as 'buyer' are less problematic when dealing with the commemoration of children than of adults. It can usually be assumed that parents take responsibility for the commemoration of their offspring, and it is far less likely that a child, rather than adult, would be involved with any choices surrounding their own commemoration. As noted in Chapter One, several authors, notably

Tarlow (1999c), have contended that a gravestone's appearance and content conveyed information through the use of metaphors. A secondary theme considered therefore is the strength of metaphors as an analytical framework for the study and recovery of emotions.

With one notable exception, preliminary analysis of the connections between memorial design and inherent family status did not recover any conclusive trends. The reproduction of memorials in miniature form did, however, demonstrate a strong correlation with the commemoration of children. Therefore at this level of analysis, the vast majority of the memorials sampled did not demonstrate any correlation between design and the age and gender of either the family unit or the primary commemoration of a family group. This in itself is not wholly surprising, since there is no reason to suppose that gravestones were rigorously structured artefacts in terms of age and gender - unlike for example, clothing and ceramics (Praetzellis *et al* 1988; Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992; May 1996; Forty 2000). Furthermore, although ideologies surrounding the family may have embraced notions that the domestic realm was a feminised space (Davidoff & Hall 1987; Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992; L. Murray 1997), the family unit itself was composed of people of different sexes and ages. Anecdotal accounts have reported that several material accompaniments (such as cloth and flowers) were used at funerals (Morley 1971; Curl 1972;) and specific styles of coffin fittings (Litten 1991) were deemed appropriate for particular genders and age groups during the post-medieval period. However, archaeological research has shown that in the case of coffin fixtures such associations were not largely adhered to by the eighteenth-century (Molleson & Cox 1993).

This is not to say that more subtle structures of differentiation cannot be recovered from a different analytical framework. For example, in her study of commemoration and gender L. Murray (1997) argued that the adoption of specific memorials resulted in the ce etery landscape, rather than the memorials themselves, becoming a feminised social space. In this study, however, the strongest correlation between a memorial's

appearance and inherent status was shown by age group, rather than gender. Whilst the association between small sized monuments and children has been anecdotally noted by previous studies (McGuire 1988; Tarlow 1999c), this case study is able to quantify the material expression of children in relation to changes in consumer behaviour and to wider burial and commemoration practice.

The majority of headstones in the cemetery are full-sized but a distinct number of stones were executed in a miniature size and these most frequently commemorated children. Chapter Four (Section 4.5.2) noted that 50 headstones in the typology sample were reproduced in an especially small size. However several of these headstones are excluded from this analysis. They cannot strictly be considered as 'miniature' forms; their profile shapes are either not reproduced in standard sizes or they are foot stones associated with a standard-sized headstone. The relatively low frequency of miniature stones (less than 5% of the total headstone data set) does not detract from their significance as a commemorative trend which appears consistently both over the entire sample chronology (Table 15) and across a range of different profile types (Table 41).

As a total, the data set of miniature memorials contains 43 stones. These appear in the most frequently reproduced headstone profile shapes of SC1, L1, P6 and P8, and make up between 4-13% of the total number of headstones in each profile subset. Chart 93 shows a breakdown of the age groups commemorated on miniature stones and reveals that children are the predominant age group commemorated, either as single deaths or as part of a larger commemorative group. This distribution is particularly striking since children make p less than 18% of all commemorations in the headstone data set as a whole. The small size of the miniature stone data set means that it is difficult to make direct comparisons with the larger data set of standard sized stones. It can be noted, however, that small stones do not employ any design variables which were not found during a similar time frame on full-sized stones.

Table 41 shows that the range of consumer choices for design variables on miniature sized headstones did not preclude the selection of decoration or a complex edge type. A more striking consumer choice is the proportion of this data set of stones which were not made from sandstone. In the headstone data set as a whole, only 12% of memorials were made from either limestone or marble, yet 35% of miniature headstones were made from these stone types. In fact small miniature-headstones made from light coloured materials are even more closely associated with children; 83% of all miniature white stones commemorated children.

A small number of other memorial types were also reproduced in miniature size. It should also be noted that no designs for miniature memorials were offered by the pattern books studied. Therefore, information for these designs was communicated by material, rather than textual, sources. Both free-standing and cross headstones are found in this size, although the paucity of surviving inscriptions for free-standing crosses means that the commemoration of children cannot be quantified in relation to this memorial type. Cross style headstones were not subject to typological analysis but, as Appendix 4 discusses, preliminary analysis shows that they can be grouped by basic structural shapes. One of these structural groups (variation 1), which includes a number of different profile shapes, can be produced in a miniature size (Plate 4). A total of 22 variation 1 cross headstones were recorded during the memorial survey, and 17 of these were produced in a miniature size. In contrast to other memorial types, therefore, a miniature size was normal for variation 1 cross headstones. Chart 94 shows this memorial type was also strongly associated with the commemoration of children.

Miniature-sized cross headstones also show a distinct correlation with the use of a light coloured stone and 15 headstones, from a total of 17, were made from marble (Appendix 4.1, 14). This data strongly suggests that this memorial type was specifically produced and purchased for children. Research on other artefact types has shown that consumer

goods were increasingly tailored towards a child-aware market during the Victorian period (e.g. Dixon 1989; Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992). Indeed further evidence from York Cemetery suggests that the market was specifically organised over time to offer wider consumer choices specifically for the burial of children.

This thesis has previously noted that the miniature stones found at the edges of paths are associated with the landscaping of the cemetery, and whilst this positioning does not automatically denote social prestige (Chapter Three, Section 3.5), further evidence shows that the location of child burials is significant. When the cemetery first opened in 1837, no distinction was drawn between either the type or location of graves for adults or children. A standard plot size was used all over the cemetery. Yet by 1880, the period when small cross headstones began to appear in significant numbers, the Cemetery Company had introduced a new type of burial plot, known as a 'child's grave'. These burial plots were either the outlying grave plots at path edges, as described in Chapter Three, or a full sized internal plot which had been divided and sold as four separate graves each able to hold one child. At this time therefore, children began to be buried in a closer physical proximity to one another but still within a general location which was also populated by adults. By 1903, two specific pieces of land, one consecrated and the other unconsecrated (Plate 4), were set aside in the cemetery exclusively for children's burials, and in these areas graves were marked only by miniature sized memorials. This burial practice was a dramatic departure from the earlier desire to keep children in close physical proximity to their adult relations. Therefore, over time the ideologies underpinning burial practice no longer reflected sentiments whereby children were contained within a family structure, but expressed their identity independently from their adult relations.

This spatial separation between children and adults in death also mirrors the social relations of the living. For example, by the end of the nineteenth century 'child'-only environments had become widely

established as a result of compulsory schooling (Hendrick 1997; Horn 1999). Furthermore throughout the Victorian period many changes were made to the legal status of children which defined their statutory status separately from a family unit and autonomous parental authority (*ibid.*).

Discussion

The preponderance of light-coloured, small-sized monuments used to commemorate children immediately invokes several possible metaphors. An anthropomorphic interpretation, for example, might emphasise that these stones recall the physical size of children. Another interpretation might see the reduced resources invested in this size of monument indicating the perceived importance of children in society. The separated location for children's burials in conjunction with the use of small-sized stones could be seen as emphasising the dynastic extinction brought by childhood death. The choice of a white stone may be interpreted as reflecting sentiments of innocence and purity. Such sentiments have been used by several authors to argue that rather than directly reflecting a child's social status, the commemoration of children existed as a wider social metaphor. Thus it is argued that within the Victorian 'Cult of Domesticity', 'childhood' represented innocence, the home and nature, and that children stood as the antithesis of the morally corrupt, adult male marketplace (Davidoff & Hall 1987; Snyder 1989; Praetzellis & Praetzellis 1992; McKillop 1995). Examples of such research includes Snyder's (1989) work on children's gravestones and McKillop's (1995) analysis of children's coffins. Both of these studies suggested that commemoration behaviour was primarily determined by widely-held public ideologies articulated within 'the Cult of Domesticity'.

This level of explanation is unsatisfactory because the sentiments of nurture towards children expressed within the constructed public ideologies are not necessarily borne out by actual practice. Chapter Three has illustrated that when affiliations shown by commemoration are not reflected by actual burial practice, children are the most likely to be

excluded from commemoration or to be buried in a public grave. Indeed, a survey of the burial registers from 1837 to 1901 showed that approximately two adults were buried for each child interred. However, in the memorial sample as a whole, almost eight adults are commemorated per child. Chapter Three's pilot study also showed that when children were the first family member to die, a monument was often not erected until the death of an adult relation. Individuals commemorated together were not always buried in the same plot. When separate graves were used, children were most commonly buried in public graves (the cheapest burial option) while an adult relation was buried in a private grave. In these circumstances it was also more likely that a stone would be placed over an adult's grave, rather than the child's. Moreover, this study has also shown that although it was normative practice at York to record the deceased on a stone in the chronological order of their deaths, it is common for adults to be the primary commemoration despite the fact that their child may have died first. Such evidence strongly challenges the idealised notions of Victorian sentimentality towards children, especially as it relates to the actual practice of disposing of their bodies or of their immediate commemoration.

Furthermore, the practice of viewing children's commemoration as a metaphor does not match with the actual diversity of commemorative practice. A definition of 'childhood' is not simply a biological categorisation or a description of age in calendar years, but a term which is culturally constructed and which implies certain social values. It is imbued for example, with associations of sexual maturity, and dependency upon others (Sofaer Derevenski 1997). Furthermore, there is no acknowledgement that, as a set of values, the 'Cult of Domesticity' reflects ideologies that were largely a construct of a white, Protestant, urban, middle class and that alternative narratives of childhood and the family existed (e.g. Hendrick 1997; Strange 2000). For example, Table 42 shows that there were a number of concurrent conventions which could be adopted when commemorating children. These either highlighted the

status of the deceased as children - such as the use of small stones - or could depict the status of a child as a part of a family group. It is important to point out that the material identity of children was not expressed within a rigid set of rules, and there could be multiple co-existing meanings of childhood and children.

In summary, this case study has demonstrated shifting attitudes towards the commemoration and burial of children in the cemetery and that these practices do not necessarily reflect wider Victorian ideologies surrounding childhood and the family. Tables 41 and 42 show that within these generally-held sentiments, individual families differed in their response to the death of a child and a range of consumer choices existed to commemorate children. Personal sentiments were undoubtedly significant to the ways in which children were buried and commemorated. Yet this study has shown that the current paradigms for interpreting memorials through systems of metaphors - whether they relay public ideologies (Snyder 1989; McKillop 1995) or private sentiments (Tarlow 1999c) - on their own offer insufficient explanation for the range of consumer choices made within the cemetery.

As previously noted many studies of Victorian memorialisation have suggested that group affiliations underpinned funerary practices. Yet this ignores the fact that families making up such social groups are themselves composed of sets of relationships. The commemoration of children represents only one facet within the range of possible family relationships present at York. Chapter Three's pilot study has shown that several of the options available to commemorate children could also structure the commemoration of all family members. For example, the order in which the deceased are commemorated on a stone enabled both an individual or a particular familial relationship to be emphasised. Options such as these provided individual families with an opportunity to actively define their own personal relationships. This case study has shown that the use of design variables to express family relationship is most clearly visible for children. This does not mean that memorial designs were not more frequently used

to create an expression of other elements of family identity, rather that the ability to recognise this aspect of social behaviour is more difficult unless it is expressed at least partially within a visible group dynamic, as was the case with children. It is perfectly possible, even entirely likely, that all consumers selected a stone with a design that they felt was most appropriate to their own sense of family identity. For the period studied however, the significance of children took precedence in the cemetery landscape above the commemoration of other family members.

In summary, consumers' commemoration behaviour at York appears to show little evidence of a correlation between a material and social group unity. Therefore this study has shown that at York Cemetery it is easier to demonstrate that there was a lack of socially prescribed controls over consumer choice and that affiliations to competing social groups can not explain consumer behaviour. The final section will examine consumer behaviour and memorial design diversity in light of the potential consumer need to express individuality within the burial landscape.

5.5.4 Memorial Diversity and Individuality

Introduction

So far this research has shown that memorial fashions can be identified as a series of defined widespread trends over time. It has also shown that the trends of material culture cannot be matched to the same level of clarity with defined trends of social behaviour. As a result, the diversity of memorial designs can not be explained as consumer behaviour that results from consumers participating in a social discourse in order to demonstrate their membership of social groups. Indeed, there is little evidence that most people were collectively using memorial designs to articulate their identification with, or membership of, distinct social groups. Therefore the question remains whether, in the absence of an externally focused dialogue, diversity can be explained by a more internalised communication that articulates personal relationships.

Memorial design and the Expression of 'Individuality'

This study has demonstrated that there was an increase in the range of headstone designs as the cemetery became more fully used. One possible explanation for this diversity therefore is that there was an increasing consumer need to express 'individuality' in material form (Tyson 1993, 618, 621). Tarlow (1999c), for example, makes a similar correlation to argue that the increase in material variation in her data correlates to a desire to show the uniqueness of personal relationships through individualised memorials. Tarlow was able to make this argument in conjunction with other long-term shifts in mortuary practice. These changes include the purchase of graves in perpetuity, the widespread practice of erecting memorials and the role of burial grounds as a locale for mourning. These factors provide a context for this research - but as long term trends the processes themselves can not be traced within the sample chronology.

As Mytum (1999, 227) noted, a close comparison of memorial appearance by viewers in the cemetery can usually only take place if stones are erected directly adjacent to one another. A corollary of this is that the opportunity to create associations or distinctions between stones through the adoption of similar or contrasting stylistic details required a similar proximity.   Spatial analysis of memorial design concentrated upon the distribution of headstone designs in the cemetery as other types occur far less frequently. Table 43 sets out the number of headstones which are erected next to stones of identical design. The results show that only 10% of the total headstone sample (1,073 stones) were erected next to an identical stone. This result strongly suggests that consumers did indeed utilise the myriad headstone designs to express some sense of their own individuality. However, the particular nature of how York Cemetery was used for burial and commemoration means that demonstrating a direct causal link between the spatial distribution of designs and this consumer need is not feasible. In particular, it is difficult to distinguish between deliberate, structured material difference, and naturally occurring random

variation. This is because the cemetery landscape was not used systematically across time and space. Purchasers of burial plots were at liberty to choose the location of an unsold grave in any part of the cemetery and it is not always possible to know at what point after death a stone was erected. As a result the dynamic nature of the cemetery as an evolving landscape cannot be precisely measured against the visual effects of commemoration.

In fact, an analysis of similarity and difference between memorial designs demonstrated that material unity actually reveals clearer results for consumer choice in the cemetery. Table 43 shows that just under 50% of all stones erected next to a memorial of the same design commemorated members of the same family. This material unity is expressed both with profiles featuring a low rate of reproduction (for example T3 and T16 profiles) and with more popular headstone profile shapes (such as P8, S2, SC1 and L1 profiles). In the latter case, however, headstones more frequently favoured a combination of design variables which was not repeated elsewhere in the data set. For example, the only two headstones with chamfered edges, panel type 2.5, elaborate 12 borders and a carved I.H.S. miscellaneous decorative motif are adjacent. On occasion, adjacent stones with profiles associated with standardised decorations (for example, P10 and S2 headstones) could feature an extensive period of time (up to 40 years) between the erection date of the first memorial and a second (or indeed a third) adjacent headstone in the same design. Examples of such headstones include D/19/12 and D/19/11 headstones in the S2 profile, and D/03/01, D/03/02, and D/03/03 headstones in the P10 profile. In these cases more fashionable, and possibly more easily obtainable, designs were eschewed in favour of a memorial which could express familial associations. Not only does this show that in this specific instance choices of memorial design were not necessarily dictated by current fashions, but also raises the possibility that here selection potentially involved a different set of producer and consumer negotiations for designs which were no longer in frequent

production. More importantly however, the impact of design unity in demonstrating personal relationships between adjacent stones would have been further enhanced in the cemetery since practice was for most adjacent stones to feature different designs.

In summary, this thesis agrees with Tarlow's assertion that diversity in memorial designs over time provided an opportunity for consumers to express some form of personal identity in the cemetery. However this research notes that there were different levels to which a sense of individuality could be conveyed in this manner. Tarlow (1999c, 133) suggested that diversity in designs operated 'to express the unique personality of the deceased and the special relationship between the bereaved, a memorial needed to distinguish itself from the *mass of others'* [italics added]. It is difficult to imagine that the highly intricate sets of headstone variables (Appendix 8) could be assimilated by individual consumers in order to ensure that memorials were 'individual' across the cemetery landscape as a whole. In order to achieve this level of visual differentiation, a consumer would have needed to make a more considerable investment such as a large-scale monument. As Section 5.4.4 has shown, in the second half of the memorial sample such choices were becoming increasingly rare. Therefore, in practice it is likely that the details of designs for only those memorials surrounding the direct locale of the burial plot would be well-known to a consumer prior to the purchase of their own stone. The recognition that visibility could take into account different levels of investment is important because it further shows that there is little evidence that social competition played a significant role within consumer behaviour at York. This also shows how production could support this consumer need. For example, it was not viable for producers to make an unlimited range of designs, and in fact the evidence clearly shows that they did not. However within this fixed range of designs offered by the masons, consumers were still provided with an opportunity to erect a stone that would be different in some way from their immediate cemetery neighbours.

Finally, it must be emphasised that the preceding sections of this chapter have shown how the experience of selecting a mason and commissioning a memorial design could also have increased a sense of individuality within the commemoration process. A choice was constantly available for consumers to choose between masons offering the same general products. It is notable that the largest number of masons were those producing blanks in their myriad designs. A sense of choice nonetheless remained for those consumers who were able to invest larger amounts, since not only did pattern books represent a wider diversity of form and decoration than could possibly be reflected in material form, but this also had the dimension of a 'bespoke' service. There are several possible and largely unacknowledged benefits that a selection process could offer consumers. First is an ability to gain a sense that proper care is being taken of the deceased as one option is weighed against another. Secondly the fact that choice was available means that it was far more likely that any final selection contrasted with another consumer's and therefore be distinctive to at least some degree. A sense of distinction would be important to the bereaved who wished to feel that their close relationships were also unique (Jalland 1999, 247; Tarlow 1999c, 133). It may be that a range of possible designs was necessary so that a consumer could select the one which most appropriately expressed their own particular sentiments towards the deceased. This ability to choose between designs enabled individual consumers to engage with fashions in accordance to their own particular tastes. Thus fashion should not be seen as a form of social control but as a system whereby the consumer could articulate a sense of personal identity:

> 'In every consumer domain fashion provides opportunities for
> differentiation, in terms of speed of access to knowledge. Through
> such examples it becomes clear how the habitus acts both to
> generate the diversity of forms and in turn to classify these same
> diverse fields. It provides a set of dispositions promoting self

recognition and the creation of relationships such as friendships and marriages with others who share the same set or prejudices concerning the correct nature of things; but the individuals rarely possess any awareness of the social origins of these tastes.... [which] Accounts for the extraordinary ability of shoppers to select from a huge array those goods most appropriate to themselves and their close friends or relatives.'　　　　D. Miller 1987: 153-154

By examining both the actual process of shopping and the results, this thesis has been able to show how design diversity could be actively used by consumers and that memorial fashions were not simply foisted onto a passive population but instead were the result of a dynamic between the consumer and producer. This study has shown that consumers participated within a widespread and shared pattern of behaviour that prioritised the expression of preference and tastes - regardless of the extent to which the precise rationale for each individual act of consumption may have ultimately been unique.

5.6 Conclusion

The results of this chapter demonstrate three key differences from previous studies of memorial diversity. The first difference is the ability to show consumers as informed and active agents in the market place. Secondly, the study has also shown that on their own, the terms 'standardisation' and 'variation' are unhelpful constructs to apply to Victorian memorial designs. To use these terms is to dismiss the fact that at York both the level of design standardisation and the extent of variation were inter-linked and structured through production and purchase. Finally, the results of Sections 5.1–5.3 clearly demonstrated that the creation and purchase of stones involved a dynamic between a mason and consumer.

　　　　The major finding of this study has been to show that consumers used a diversity of memorial designs to help create an expression of personal relationships instead of wider social group relationships. In this

sense, rather than a social message being conveyed to a wider audience through a memorial's design, in many cases the significance of a particular design may be primarily understood by the consumer alone.

A diverse range of evidence points to the significance of expressing personal relationships and identities at York. This includes circumstances whereby members of the same family demonstrated a personal affiliation by the adoption of the same memorial designs, and the frequency with which families distinguished themselves from their immediate neighbours by selecting different stones. It is further shown by the fact that some parents highlighted the loss of their child in a manner visually distinct from all other types of loss.

Yet the context of the cemetery alone does not necessarily reveal a full appreciation of this consumer behaviour, since this shows only the final stages of a longer chain of events. Without examining the production and purchase of stones it is difficult to identify the common experiences within the purchase of different memorial designs. Yet without considering the context within which these designs are displayed, the significance of their use to convey an 'other' or 'internally' directed dialogue can not be gauged.

This chapter has shown that consumers actively engaged with current fashions, yet in the cemetery designs were not used to show affiliations to large-scale groups as at other sites (Parker Pearson 1982; Cannon 1986; L. Clark 1987; Wurst 1991 ; Little *et al* 1992; Mytum 1993; 1994; Tyson 1994;). This is a significant result in light of previous studies that have suggested Victorian funerary practice in general, and cemeteries in particular, were a focus for competitive social display (Meller 1981; Laqueur 1983; 1993; Brooks 1989a, 1989b; Curl 1993; Pickles 1993; Nash 2001).

The study identified a small number of social groupings, notably Catholics and children, but in neither of these cases can affiliation be explained solely in terms of social competition. What is of greater

significance is that while behaviour predominately reflects self affirmation it also enabled consumers to show affiliation to social groups.

As a result of the findings of this case study, several issues can be identified as priorities for future analysis. The importance of individuality in consumer behaviour has been shown to cut across distinctions of socio-economic groups and the study has demonstrated that social emulation did not underpin memorial diversity. The study is unable to show the exact levels of participation within commemoration practice in relation to York's living population. The pilot study in Chapter Three, for example, showed that many individuals were buried but not commemorated in York Cemetery and undoubtedly lack of funds prevented many from erecting stones. Furthermore Second Class burial also meant that some consumers were excluded from practice.

Analysis has shown that the unique landscape of York Cemetery could have influenced consumer behaviour since unlike at other sites no areas were designated for the exclusive use of particular social groups. The role of York Cemetery in structuring social relations can only be more clearly demonstrated, however, through comparative analysis both with other cemeteries and other types of burial landscapes. Similarly the question of how representative the consumer behaviour at York is of wider commemoration can only be fully appreciated in future work. Further research needs to address the significance of the social and economic structure of the city of York, particularly in light of the absence of wide-spread industrialisation, on the expression of social relations in material form. In particular this would help clarify the definition of the consumer and the roles of buyer and users of memorials. It would also be a valuable exercise to examine the expression of religious affiliation in relation to a cemetery that was established within a more contentious religious climate, such as Leicester or Kidderminster (Rugg 1999). The significance of consumer behaviour needs to be examined by comparative analysis to examine the extent to which market controls may provide a different set of circumstances for a consumer-producer relationships. Finally, the nature

of the product and its design itself must be compared to wider case studies. At York the headstones represent the primary product purchased and thus the primary vehicle for design diversity. Anecdotal evidence drawn from comparisons with published work and from visiting other burial sites suggests that York is unusual in the predominance of both the headstone form and the range of its designs. The extent to which this material uniqueness may reflect atypical consumer behaviour must be a priority for future investigations.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

6.0 Introduction

This final chapter will summarise and briefly discuss the contributions the thesis has made to wider gravestone analysis. The conclusion is set out in two parts: the first section will draw together the issues raised by the thesis research framework, and the second section will consider the themes and theoretical issues raised by the data analysis and interpretation.

6.1 Part One: Research Framework - A Conclusion

The research in this thesis has been structured by a series of frameworks that have addressed the particular archaeological, historical and cultural contexts of the data sample in order to prioritise an understanding of gravestones as a specific type of archaeological evidence. The contexts considered were the burial landscape, commemoration as social practice, the documentary record, and the memorial assemblage. The final context was the production and purchase of memorials. This framework was established to examine how memorials became part of people's lives and what this may reveal about social relationships. This context and associated issues are more fully discussed in Part Two of this conclusion.

The Burial Landscape

A range of different post-medieval burial landscapes is available to study. These include cemeteries, parish churchyards, Nonconformist and other denomination-specific burial grounds, as well as sites that resulted from extraordinary circumstances - such as the cholera burial ground in York and war cemeteries. This thesis has promoted the importance of engaging with the particular nature of the landscapes within which memorials were erected. Consideration needs to be given to both the type of burial landscape studied, in this case nineteenth-century cemeteries, and to the specific history of the site in question.

348

The study of a burial landscape should occur for two reasons. First, from an archaeological perspective, each of these different site types has undergone specific formation and post-depositional processes that affect the evidence available in the material record (Chapter Two, Section 2.7). The second reason why analysis needs to consider the nature of the burial landscape is because different types of burial grounds have their own associated ideologies (Rugg 2000) and these may influence how commemoration and burial practices were organised. This case study of York Cemetery is one of very few examples where the history of one particular site has been interpreted within the specific context of the British cemetery movement. As a result this study is able to contribute to a broader understanding of cemetery landscapes by showing that within this particular type of burial site, a range of different material features and ideologies may be site-specific.

One of the more intriguing aspects of this research is the consideration of the extent to which the specific landscape of York Cemetery affected commemoration practice. There was no attempt within the cemetery to separate commemoration by the level of economic investment or on the basis of religious affiliation beyond separating Anglicans from everyone else. Even the latter division was not invariably enforced. This marks a significant departure from past studies of areas or places where local burial practice was more sharply divided (Cannon 1986, MacKay 1989, Tyson 1994, Mytum 1999). It is likely that this absence of social division within the cemetery landscape is one of the factors that strongly affected the lack of expression of social affiliation within the memorial data set.

This type of analysis has special importance for an assessment of the levels of social control that a cemetery company may have exercised, and the potential this has to affect the material culture studied. In the past, gravestone studies have paid little attention to the extent to which the management (whether by the clergy, cemetery companies or municipal government) of a burial site could regulate consumer choice. Chapter Two

has shown that rules and regulations concerning commemoration in York Cemetery differed from those found at other cemeteries. With more case studies in this vein, the range of meanings held by cemeteries and the different levels of social control exercised by cemetery companies can be more fully investigated in the future.

Commemoration as Social Practice

Few studies of gravestones have questioned the nature of commemoration as social practice, largely due to a lack of opportunities to compare interments to the above ground evidence of memorials. In this thesis, the survival of comprehensive documentary evidence for burial practice enabled this comparison to be completed. Chapter Three's analysis of the familial affiliations shown on gravestones in contrast to those shown by burial practice revealed some significant aspects of commemoration as social behaviour. The most important observation was that commemoration practices could be manipulated to create a social reality of remembrance which emphasised or masked particular individuals and social groups independently of actual burial practice. For example, most simply, the function of gravestones as a focus for commemoration within York Cemetery did not always mean that the memorial also acted as a grave marker for each individual.

Supplementary evidence from inscriptions showed that the organisation of text on a stone offered opportunities for particular individuals (most notably adults above children) and personal relationships (most notably for husbands and wives or parents and children) to be emphasised above others (Chapter Three). The case study of the Plows' pattern book (Appendix 11), in conjunction with Chapter Three's results, showed that commemoration is a complex, dynamic social practice. The comparison of the designs contained in the Plows' pattern book with the memorials erected in the cemetery recovered several crucial points not only about the nature of commemoration as a social process, but also about the extent of these processes which may be recoverable from the

archaeological record. The case study showed that commemoration is a multi-stage process, of which the final stage is shown by the material evidence alone. Only by combining the material and the documentary evidence was it possible to trace the various stages of commemoration practice, such as secondary commemorations, the details of appearance that are secondary executions, or even the complete replacement of a stone.

Another important issue raised in this thesis is the consideration of the consumer as potentially both a 'buyer' and 'user' of memorials. In most cases, the inherent complexities of this issue make it a very difficult area to address, and at York it is only really for children that the issue can be examined in detail. Children, for example, are highly unlikely to have been involved in the selection of the memorial on which they were commemorated, making it much easier to distinguish between the buyer and the user. The case study of children was also valuable as it demonstrated that an appreciation of commemoration practice must embrace the possibility that there were multiple responses to death and commemoration within a personal context.

The Documentary Record

This thesis has explored the application of a wide range of documents that are associated with nineteenth-century cemeteries and memorials. Sources used include the York Cemetery Company's business records, business accounts from other cemeteries, trade directories, censuses, memorial pattern books, newspapers and guide books. The information from these sources complements the archaeological record by revealing how York and other cemeteries were perceived by both specialist and general audiences, and provides the necessary historical contexts within which to frame an archaeological investigation. In this way an application of textual sources provides an insight into human mentalities and social experiences that is readily accessible and allows a real sense of connection to the past. Examples of such evidence include letters in the

351

York press showing the importance of the appearance of the cemetery to civic pride (Chapter Two). These types of documents demonstrate the various discourses associated with cemeteries and memorials, which in turn provides a framework within which to examine the social behaviour evidenced by material remains.

It must be stressed, however, that the documentary record is incomplete. Missing from the documentary record in this instance, for example, is more specific information on prices and production and the identities of memorial purchasers (as opposed to the deceased). Yet documents that may initially appear to offer a wealth of important data about the population commemorated on stones are often deeply problematic. For example, on the one hand censuses and burial registers provide extensive data about the deceased, such as where and with whom they lived, occupation, cause of death, the minister who performed their burial service and cause of death. On the other hand, by themselves these sources do not provide an understanding of the wider social context that would enable information about individuals to be compared and meaningfully applied. As a result, the issues selected for study in this thesis could only be investigated by means of a synthesis of the documentary and material evidence.

The burial registers were used to reveal a dimension of information that cannot at present be accessed by archaeological analysis - data on below-ground burial practice. A comparison of the material evidence of memorials to the records of burial was conducted, not in order to prove or disprove archaeological evidence, but to refine an understanding of commemoration as social behaviour. This is important; if documents are simply used to test the archaeological evidence then there is the danger that the ability of historical archaeologists to use documentary sources will not develop. The debates that have looked at the best ways for documents to be used have often emphasised the role of textual evidence to support, contradict or fill in the holes of the archaeological record (Beaudry ed. 1988; Little 1994). Yet both material and documentary sources

concurrently create culture and the methods used by historical archaeologists need to accommodate this duality.

The examination of pattern books in Chapter Five and Appendix 11 illustrated the dynamic relationship between documentary and material evidence most successfully. Comparative analysis was able to recover aspects of human interaction such as a consumer and producer dialogue, which are simply not recoverable from the archaeological or documentary evidence alone. In contrast, the brief case study of clerical tracts that discussed memorial design demonstrated that the nature of the interaction between other documentary sources and the material culture is less easily understood. Historical archaeology still has a long way to go in developing the methods and theoretical paradigms needed to utilise fully the exhaustive range of sources available to the archaeologist dealing with later historical data.

A final important aspect of this thesis' use of documentary sources is that it has evaluated the merits and drawbacks of the sources specifically associated with York Cemetery, most notably with the burial registers, cash books and daily ledgers from the archive of the Cemetery Company's business records. The study of pattern books has also made a strong contribution to setting out the historical and cultural context of York Cemetery, as well as exploring the nature of pattern book use and compilation, and has provided an in-depth discussion of two particular volumes from which future comparative analysis can be made (Appendix 11).

The Headstone Typology

The headstone typology in Chapter Four marks this thesis' most important development and contribution. The typology was created specifically for this thesis, and when tested was shown to work successfully: the typology demonstrated clear stylistic trends over time across a variety of independent, but interlocking variables, such as form, decoration, and specific stylistic components. This structure is significant. In the past, the

level of headstone detail that could be examined for nineteenth century memorials was largely restricted to basic forms, and trends were most notably recovered for large monuments, rather than for headstones - the most popular form of memorial. In contrast, the typology developed by this research was able to recover trends of changing fashions in headstone design that have been hypothesised, but not able to be demonstrated, by other studies (Willsher 1985, 37; Cannon 1986, 47-8).

Use of the headstone typology also allowed a more considered appreciation of Victorian memorial design. As Chapter Four noted, previous studies have either described the range of available memorial designs as standardised (for example, F. Burgess 1963) or suggested that the diversity of appearance was almost random (for example, Cannon 1986). The typology created for this study has permitted a refinement of these two almost polarised positions, whereby the standardisation of form, as suggested by frequently reproduced profiles, has a series of diverse decorative and material embellishments, which operate as a series of discernible - rather than random - stylistic sequences. It is important to note that the stylistic trends were not just shown for the most common profiles; the typology clearly demonstrated that the less frequently reproduced stones also reflected trends that were consistent over time.

The value of the headstone typology was further demonstrated in Chapter Five, this time as a framework for more interpretative analysis. In the case study of the production and purchase of memorial blanks, the typology offered the only possible source of evidence, as no primary documentary sources survive. The typology also acted as an analytical tool to identify similarity and difference between headstones. As a result headstone designs in the cemetery could be explored in terms of their material unity and the patterns of consumer behaviour this revealed were also interpreted.

One aspect that could not be tested in this thesis is the wider application of the headstone typology beyond York Cemetery. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the headstone profile shapes that are found at the

cemetery are common to a range of sites both in Britain (Shoesmith 1980; Reeve 1983; Mytum 2000) and abroad (Weston ed. 1989). The extent to which stylistic details (as opposed to type categories) might be site-specific is more unclear, although evidence suggests that the general types of decoration (borders, banners, scroll, miscellaneous) are also common to a wide variety of sites in York, Britain and abroad (ibid; Rimmer 1987). However, the actual occurrence of this decoration in other contexts, either in absolute or relative amounts, is unknown. Future analysis will be able to address these issues in more detail.

Two points are significant to the issue of the wider application of the headstone typology, the first methodological and the second analytical. The first point to be made is that even if the specific styles of headstone profile, stylistic components and decoration recovered by this analysis do not cover the full extent of variables found at other sites, the basic organisation of the typology can accommodate new variables within its categories. The typology was constructed in order to take into account the full range of variables involved with the construction of a memorial's appearance. It is anticipated, therefore, that all Victorian headstones can be examined by this system because the classification structure (by general shape, profile, and design variables) is universally applicable. The second point concerning the wider application of the headstone typology is the question of the degree to which the designs represented by the headstones at York displayed localised traditions, and to what extent wider national discourses of commemoration were being followed. Without a standardised method to conduct inter-site analysis it is virtually impossible to answer this question. Thus the typology set out in Chapter Four is of further benefit for its potential to provide just such a system.

This concludes the summary and discussion of the research framework of the thesis. The final section of this conclusion will build on this summary to discuss the theoretical agendas and issues raised by the data analysis and interpretation.

6.2 Part Two: Analysis - A Conclusion

The potential of the consumer and producer relationship to illustrate commemoration choices is an important and, until recently, overlooked aspect of gravestone studies. Past research has tended to view the acquisition and production of memorials as separate, rather than inter-linked stages. As a result, there has been insufficient consideration given to the respective roles of the producer and consumer within the creation and use of memorials and, importantly, to the wider social context within which this relationship took place. This analysis has highlighted that a study of the consumer - producer relationship is a fruitful avenue available to future studies.

Victorian gravestones can be seen as commodities, subject to fashion, which were marketed through advertisements and catalogues in a society where a reliance was increasingly placed upon industrialisation and mass production. Yet they also display aspects of pre-industrial craftsmanship through their use of local material, local expertise and their potential continuation of traditional regional styles. This thesis suggests that previous gravestone research on eighteenth and early nineteenth-century memorials has adversely limited the framework within which Victorian gravestone design has been studied. These previous studies have concentrated upon production, rather than consumption, and have characterised the creation of memorials as a craft-based activity. Craft production is not simply a mode of production, but also holds cultural values. All too often these cultural values have been underpinned by twentieth-century perceptions which value craft-production above mass-production. As a result, studies of pre-Victorian memorial design have stressed innovations in form and decoration as the direct result of the stonemason's creative impulses and talents (for example, Chater 1976; 1977). In contrast, memorial production during the Victorian period has suffered from the inverse characterisation, as many authors consider this

to be a period when craftsmanship became debased, designs derivative, and memorial production suddenly became entirely standardised and profit-driven (for example, F. Burgess 1963). The characterisation of production in this way has led to two almost polarised classifications of the appearance of Victorian memorials, as either standardised or with such diversity in appearance that variation appears random. Through the application of a headstone typology in conjunction with an analysis of results using consumer choice theory, this thesis has demonstrated that such characterisations of memorial production and appearance are insufficient. Firstly and most simply, these characterisations simply do not reflect what is actually on the ground and secondly, they fail to consider how it got there.

This thesis examined memorial design to see whether any discernible structure existed (which could be recovered by archaeological analysis) to show whether stylistic similarity and variation had the potential to communicate social meanings. The results of Chapter Four showed that both form and design appear as a series of distinct trends over time. These results could be characterised by both similarity and by variation. Interpretation of these results has shown that social conformity is demonstrated by similarity, most notably in two features: memorial type (headstones) and profile shape (most notably P10, P6, P8, SC1 and L1, Chart 17). Individual choice, in contrast, is represented by variation; while this could be demonstrated by memorial type (monuments) and profiles (such as those which a low reproduction rate) it was far more widely demonstrated by the design variables of material, edge type, panels and decoration (Chart 39).

Memorial fashions occur as distinct trends. However an analysis of gravestone designs in the context of social behaviour revealed virtually no trends of social group affiliation. Instead, this analysis demonstrated that shared behaviour operated across all types of burial above the level of second-class stones. The active role and voice of the consumer within memorial production, acquisition and use has been demonstrated by the

series of case studies set out in Chapter Five. The potential for the customer to affect the end memorial design, and the level of difference between stones, has been demonstrated across a number of different modes of production. This has been shown by the potential availability and use of a wide range of pick and mix variables, and by the opportunity for alterations to the designs in the York Cemetery Company's pattern book during their translation from the page into material form. Therefore, while the uniformity found within the behaviour at York Cemetery suggests a consumer's place within a wider social network, the clearest trends from this study have been examples of the capability for autonomous choices within general fashions. For example, social analysis in this thesis showed that individual expressions of religious affiliation may be voiced through memorial design, as demonstrated by the use of the cross motif, and that a whole host of consumer choices are likewise visible when commemorating the death of a child. Examples of the ability to demonstrate familial affiliations between different stones were also noted in Chapter Five, whilst Chapter Three showed that a range of choices existed to highlight specific familial relations upon a single stone.

It should again be stressed that the consumer-producer relationship did not exist within a vacuum. Instead it operates within a series of social constraints. These restrictions were dependent not only upon the respective needs and resources of the consumer and producer, but also further moderated by the specific cultural context of Victorian memorial design as social phenomena. The exploration of the social context of memorial design in this thesis marks a departure from past approaches. In contrast to other gravestone studies, the analysis in this thesis has shown that memorial design at York was embedded within a *series* of social processes not the result of a *single* social constraint or *single* set of social relationships. For example, Cannon's 1986 study of nineteenth-century memorials argued that the selection of memorial design was the result of social competition between different class groups, which was conducted through fashion as a social control. This thesis has shown that social

competition is an insufficient explanation for the range of consumer choice made in York Cemetery, as huge variability exists across sets of memorials that cost the same and required the same level of skill to create. Furthermore, Cannon's interpretation does not accommodate the consumer's active engagement with fashion, as already outlined above. The fact that popular headstone designs with a high reproduction rate were selected long past their peak of fashion in order to articulate familial affiliations (*ibid*), also conflicts with Cannon's assertion of fashion as a social control: that styles which had fallen out of fashion were treated with scant respect if not outright scorn (Cannon 1986, 44).

Tarlow (1999c), in contrast, has shown that the choice of a memorial design was underpinned by the expression of personal relationships, a conclusion that the analysis in this thesis supports. The model by which she presented these relationships, however, uses a singular conditioned response to death influenced by ideologies of a 'cult of love' and 'affected individualism' (*ibid* 127ff). The study of children in Chapter Five shows that in fact the reactions to children's death had a variety of material manifestations within burial and commemoration, suggesting a range of actual responses to bereavement. Similarly the case study in Chapter Three shows that several strategies existed to commemorate individuals of the same social status on the basis of age, gender, and familial roles, whereas memorial designs in Tarlow's study mirrored a single set of social dynamics. A framework of consumer choice has provided this study with an opportunity to look at a range of responses by placing memorial design within a context of social actions.

In summary, this thesis created a headstone typology and used a theoretical paradigm of consumer choice to study Victorian memorial production and purchase. During the course of this research several recommendations have been made for future analysis. A major priority is to expand the current study of the population associated with the stones in York Cemetery, so that the question of how social identities may correlate to gravestones can be more fully resolved. In addition, such analysis will

provide further data to assist with determining the range of identities of the consumer as 'buyers' and 'users' of memorials. The second priority is to complete comparative analysis to assess the degree to which the layout of landscape, the memorial designs, and social relations at York Cemetery is representative of wider practice. The results of the present study have suggested that in contrast to other sites, the patterns of behaviour at York are atypical. However, it may equally be pondered whether these differences may also be the result of biases within current approaches to the study of Victorian memorials and cemeteries. For example, religious affiliation and competitive social display have frequently been cited as significant for burial and commemoration practices (Parker Pearson 1982, Cannon 1986, Clark 1987, Mackay 1989, Wurst 1991, Tyson 1994). Yet when explored in detail, neither of these issues can be demonstrated as significantly influencing practice at York. This thesis contributes to wider analysis, therefore, most simply by raising the issue of whether the questions most frequently asked of Victorian memorials and Cemeteries are in fact the most germane.

To conclude, the multi-contextual approach of this study has been used to develop a range of issues, such as: the specific nature of the burial landscape, commemoration as a social practice, the different systems used to transmit information about designs, and - finally - the relationships between the producer and purchaser of memorials. Through this approach, this thesis has shown that it is not necessarily a gravestone's final appearance that is the most important single focus for study. Instead, an exploration of the social interaction leading to its commission, production, purchase, and placement in the cemetery can provide insights into how gravestones became part of people's lives before becoming part of our own past.